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The United Center is a community-based corrections center located in Middletown, Midwest. Funded by the Midwest Department of Corrections, and administered by local county government, it provides a sentencing alternative to the county's jail, and the state's prison system. Defined as a correctional "halfway-in house," the program provides offenders with employment and education related services, job placement, mental health services, and drug and alcohol counseling in a highly structured, but supportive environment. In operation since the early 1980's, the program has serviced some 400 offenders sentenced to short prison terms for low-level property and drug offenses. Compared to national rates of recidivism among state prison and probation releasees, the United Center cannot be regarded as anything less than a remarkable success. The effectiveness of the United Center in reducing offender recidivism measured in terms of postrelease arrest, provides major support for a reintegrative model of correctional practice. As such, it also provides an important refutation of the current "imprisonment reduces crime" ideology, which currently has a stranglehold on the criminal justice system in the United States.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The United Center is a community corrections project established in Middletown County, Midwest in 1982. This report represents an attempt to evaluate the effect of the United Center's treatment program on offender recidivism (measured in terms of post-release arrest), and other treatment related goals and activities over the past twelve (12) years of operation. As such, it is an evaluation of only one of many different forms of community-based custody, such as probation, parole, residential centers, work furlough, and other programs designed to manage the offender in the community (Duffee, 1986; Petersilia, 1993).

In the words of comprehensive plan developed by the Community Base Corrections Advisory Board in 1981,

The primary project objective is to establish a community based corrections program in Middletown County. This program will serve to offer sentencing judges an alternative to incarceration in the state's prison system and the county's jail facility, thereby decreasing the population and the costs associated with both, and providing an environment within which the maximum benefit can be gained from local rehabilitative services. This objective will be met by establishing a residency for convicted male and female adult felony offenders who qualify for placement in such a secured facility and who would, but for such a facility, have been incarcerated within our state prison system or county jail. Such a community based corrections facility will provide those convicted felons who could most benefit from the use of our local rehabilitative services with a structured program within which to do so. Such a residence under the umbrella of a community public services restitution project and a residential living program, which includes in and out of house counseling will be able to
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provide a variety of offender services. Such services will include, but not be limited to employment related services, job placement, mental health, drug and alcohol counseling. Most of all, the project will serve to rehabilitate the offender by not totally separating him from the community. Consequently, offenders will be less likely to recidivate, and more likely to become productive members of the local community. (Brochure)

There are at least four (4) testable assumptions underlying the Advisory Board's plan for a community-based correctional facility. They are as follows:

1. Offender rehabilitation in the community will reduce the commitment rate to jail or prison.
2. Offender rehabilitation in the community can be accomplished at a cost less than that of incarceration.
3. A community-based program will provide treatment services to offenders in a more effective manner.
4. The rehabilitation of the offender in the community is more effective in reducing recidivism than the prison/rehabilitation ideology.

These assumptions are very similar to those often made with respect to community corrections in general (See Duffee, 1986; Eskridge, Seiter, & Carlson, 1981; Wilson, 1985).

Due to cost, time, and space limitations, as well as significant problems associated with obtaining official arrest data for an additional 335 offenders (to serve as a comparison group), this research project is limited to an analysis of two (2) of the assumptions cited above: (1) the United Center's capacity to provide treatment services to resident offenders (assumption #3 above); and
(2) establishing the heretofore unknown recidivism rate for United Center releasees (assumption #4 above).

Further research, which is currently in the planning stage, will include an analysis of the United Center’s capacity to reduce prison and/or jail overcrowding; an assessment of the United Center’s capacity to reduce the economic costs associated with incarceration in the county’s jail, or the state’s prison system; a comparison of United Center releasees with a matched set of offenders committed to the Midwest Department of Corrections, and/or to the Middletown County Jail; and further assessment of the program’s success in rehabilitating and/or reintegrating the offender back into the community, using other measures of recidivism, such as the felony reconviction rate, and the reincarceration rate among United Center releasees.

For the purposes of this study, however, recidivism is operationalized in terms of rearrest within three (3) years of release. A number of social background characteristics such as race, age, and education will be tested for their independent effects on offender recidivism, as will criminal history, and treatment program variables. The items studied will be tested for their relationship to recidivism by a statistically significant index of association (Chi-square in this case).

It will be argued in this paper that the assumptions made by the Advisory Board are consistent with what Duffee (1986) has referred to as a reintegration model of correctional practice. It will
also be argued that the reintegration model is consistent with the major theoretical assumptions of the labelling and the anomie perspectives in criminology.

Like most correctional programs, the United Center has never been evaluated to measure program effectiveness, or in order to modify the program to more accurately address offender needs in the community. This was the primary objective of this evaluation, and the data generated reflect the information needs of the Midwest Department of Corrections and the United Center. For years criminal justice officials in Midwest and in other jurisdictions, as well as members of the media, and private citizens have asked MDOC officials and United Center staff the same two (2) questions:

1. What is the recidivism rate for United Center releasees?

and,

2. Is the recidivism rate for United Center releasees lower than the recidivism rate for prison releasees?

This research effort represents an attempt to answer both questions as accurately as possible. The answers obtained will provide important information to corrections officials not only in the state of Midwest, but in other jurisdictions planning to expand community-based programs as well. As Travis (1985) has commented, "the critical ingredient in the development of sound policies for the future is that decisions be based on the results of such investigations" (p. 6). Evaluations of programs such as the United Center may help to identify the optimal offender type for community
corrections treatment. This in turn, may help to reduce the likelihood that violent offenders will be retained in the community, and that non-violent offenders will be sent to prison. Moreover, evaluation of these programs should be continuous and in terms of their impact on recidivism, treatment goals, and delivery of offender and community services (Winterfield, 1980).

Rather than relying solely on measures of recidivism to assess program effectiveness, Joan Petersilia (1993) underscores the importance of including other intermediate outcomes in program evaluations. These would include measurements of the offender's activities while on probation or parole supervision, (e.g., rates of employment, drug use, participation in work and education) (1993).

While this study does measure post-correctional performance in terms of a return to criminal activity, it is precisely these other types of intermediate outcomes which are also measured in this report. And as Petersilia (1993) observes, to the extent that community corrections programs are unable to articulate goals and identify performance indicators they will, become increasingly vulnerable to budget cuts if they cannot clearly articulate what they do, with whom, and to what effect.

The MDOC requires information relative to program effectiveness in order to make funding decisions in the very near future with respect to community corrections, and will rely on the information generated by this evaluation in order to make those decisions. Of particular concern to the United Center director was an assessment
of the placement of inappropriate offenders in the program by the courts. Such placements were most often made over the objections of the United Center screening staff. This trend, which began several years ago, could result in a higher failure rate than would be expected if admission requirements were strictly followed. This may result in an unfair assessment of the efficacy of the United Center program not only in terms of reducing recidivism, but in terms of other treatment goals as well.

The state of Midwest, like many other states across the country, faces a crisis situation as more and more money is required to incarcerate an ever-increasing number of offenders with long prison terms to serve. County jail facilities throughout the state are filled to over capacity with convicted felons awaiting transfer to the Reception and Diagnostic Center in Middletown, Midwest, where the state assigns offenders to its ever-increasing number of overcrowded correctional facilities. In many counties, offenders wait as long as two (2) years to be transferred from the county jail to the Reception and Diagnostic Center, which as of November of 1994, was 44% overcrowded (Middletown Tribune, 1994). The Midwest Department of Corrections, which provides funding for the United Center, is committed to finding solutions to the problem of prison overcrowding, and has provided major in-kind support for this research project.
The United Center

Over the course of twelve (12) years the United Center has admitted 340 convicted felons to the residential program. Offenders are referred to the Center directly from the criminal courts on the recommendation of the defense attorney, probation officer, county judge, or prosecutor. Once the referral is made the offender is evaluated by United Center staff for suitability for the program. Initially, only property and drug/alcohol offenders with no prior felony convictions were eligible. Over time, however, the population has changed to include first offense child molesters, offenders found guilty on misdemeanor battery charges, and offenders with no more than one (1) prior felony conviction for a property or drug/alcohol related offense. Once an offender has been screened and deemed appropriate for the program, he is generally admitted to the center in a matter of weeks, or for a longer period of time if there is not a bed available. The average length of time an offender waits to be admitted to the United Center is 80 days; the mean for whites is 71 days; the mean for blacks is 94 days. Long delays are clearly related to the lack of bed space at the United Center and the number of offenders on the waiting list (as of January 1, 1995, there were 40 offenders on the waiting list).

The United Center is located on the northeast-side of Midletown, in a low-income, racially mixed neighborhood which is very close to the downtown area. The house itself is a large two-story, wood-frame structure, built during the 1920s. It has four (4) large
bedrooms, three bathrooms, and a very large living room, dining room and kitchen area. Although very clean, the house is definitely showing its age given the high level of activity in the house, and the number of residents (not to mention a good number of staff members as well). The United Center has 20 beds, and is always filled to capacity (there has always been an average of 30 offenders waiting to occupy the next available bed).

Residents must pass through a level system (in which they earn points for good behavior, and industry at school and/or work), while residing at the United Center in order to complete the program successfully. As a resident progresses through each successive level, he gains more responsibilities and privileges. Offenders are expected to make steady progress through the levels, or the responsibilities and privileges gained will be reduced, or in some cases, lost altogether. The key to the level system is that offenders have complete control over their own progress in the program. It all depends on the individual and his determination to change his life and accomplish the goals he has established for himself.

Conversely, progress through the level system may be impeded significantly due to lack of commitment to change, and self discipline. Staff members make the decision as to whether or not an offender is ready to assume the responsibilities of a higher level. Generally it takes approximately five (5) to six (6) weeks to advance from one level to the next.

New residents must spend a minimum of 30 days in the orienta-
tion phase of the program, prior to assignment to the first level. During orientation the offender reviews and signs the intake packet and develops a treatment plan with the assistance of the Residential Coordinator. At the end of each week the offender must fill out a weekly schedule and summary to keep track of program progress. Residents who are employed when they arrive at the Center, continue working--unless the job requires travel or other accommodations inappropriate for residence at a community corrections facility--and are transported to and from work by Center staff. During the orientation period, offenders may not make phone calls for the first fourteen (14) days; may not go to the store (a 7-11 convenience store is located less than half a block from the Center); and may not have visits from family or friends until the third week of orientation. Successful residents may receive a four (4) hour pass during the fourth week of orientation, and are advanced to Level I after the fourth week of orientation.

Level I

In Level I, offenders continue to handle routine in-house responsibilities such as keeping the Center clean and preparing meals when scheduled to do so; actively participate in all group sessions and house meetings scheduled by staff; begin job search activities approved by the Vocational/Educational Coordinator if unemployed; and attend any outside functions (school, counseling, AA meetings, court dates, and other meetings) subject to approval by the Residen-
tial Coordinator. Transportation to and from work and other outside activities is provided by the Center unless other arrangements are approved by Center staff. Level I offenders are also required to give one (1) informative talk during the Wednesday resident house meeting on a topic approved by the Residential Coordinator. While in Level I, offenders are eligible for one (1), eight hour pass, unless extra points are earned. Residents in Level I are not eligible for overnight passes.

Level II

Level II residents continue with all the activities initiated in Level I, and renew or revise their treatment plan with the Residential Coordinator. Level II residents are afforded the privilege of using alternative means of transportation to attend outside functions, subject to staff approval. They are also required to present a point/counterpoint discussion during the weekly Wednesday night house meeting. The topic, and debate partner are determined by Center staff. In Level II, residents are permitted no more than fourteen (14) hours out on a pass, unless extra points have been earned; they are not eligible for overnight passes at this level.

Level III

In Level III, residents renew or revise their treatment plan with the Residential Coordinator as necessary, and are permitted to make their own arrangements (subject to staff approval) for trans-
portation to and from outside activities. They are also required to submit a written report to United Center staff describing what they want their life to be like in two (2) years. Residents must be employed in order to move to Level IV, and will remain in Level III if their point average is below 90 points. In Level III, offenders are permitted no more than twenty (20) hours out on pass, unless extra points have been earned; they are not eligible for overnight passes at this level.

Level IV

In Level IV residents are expected to work toward completion of their treatment plan; assume a leadership role in the Center; and serve as a positive example for the other residents. Level IV residents are permitted (subject to staff approval) to make their own arrangements with respect to counseling, work, school, and other outside activities. Residents at this level who allow their point average to drop below 90 points, will return to Level III. The Residential Coordinator completes a final exit report for each offender at this point. Level IV residents must be employed, and must produce evidence of stable and appropriate living arrangements in order to be released. They are eligible for no more than a 24 hour pass which must be taken overnight.

The Point System

Offenders are expected to earn 100 points per week in all four
(4) levels. Points are based on satisfactory performance (judged by United Center staff) in the following ten (10) areas: (1) Education: attendance, performance, and planning, etc.; (2) Vocational: job planning, job search activities, work attendance, performance, and maintenance, etc.; (3) Court Ordered: restitution payments, community service, etc.; (4) Financial/Budget: fair share payments, personal finance, etc.; (5) Groups: participation, attendance, promptness, etc.; (6) House Maintenance: general house-keeping assignments, personal areas, etc.; (7) Cooperation/Attitude: interaction with staff, other residents, etc.; (8) Resident Responsibilities: personal hygiene, weekly schedule and summaries, etc.; (9) Counseling: promptness, level of cooperation, etc.; (10) Recreation/Extracurriculars: YMCA attendance, etc.

Residents may earn extra points for consistent behavior in one or more of the following areas: (a) extra work around the Center, (b) exceptional cooperation with staff and other residents, (c) individual improvement, and (d) making additional presentations at house meetings.

There are a number of standard correctional program rules--the violation of which will result in disciplinary action--that must be observed by the residents (i.e., no drug or alcohol use, no violence, no leaving the Center without staff permission, etc.). Sanctions range from verbal reprimands to termination from the program and transfer to the county jail, or to the Midwest Department of Corrections.
**Educational Policy**

Residents who do not possess a high school diploma (or its' equivalent) are required to attend educational programs as determined by staff. Attendance and participation in educational programs is mandatory; termination from such programs is grounds for removal from the United Center.

**Vocational Policy**

All residents are required to seek and maintain full-time employment. A resident's unwillingness to achieve this goal may be seen as evidence of his inappropriateness for community corrections assignment. Any resident beyond orientation who does not obtain suitable employment within a 30 day period will have passes limited to a maximum of four (4) hours.

All employment opportunities must be approved by the Vocational/Educational Coordinator, who may prohibit an offender from taking a job that is considered inappropriate due to location, job requirements, transportation, and/or employer history. More than one (1) resident may apply for the same job, however, only one may accept a job at the same place of employment.

**Fair-Share Policy**

Residents are required to make payments for room and board while housed at the United Center. Residents employed full-time are required to contribute 30% of their weekly gross pay; part-time em-
ployees pay 20% of their weekly gross earnings. Those residents who are unemployed are assessed fair-share payments at a rate of 30% of the current minimum wage for a 19-hour work week for each week they remain unemployed. This charge begins the 21st day of residence at the Center. Once employed, all fair-share arrearage must be paid within a reasonable length of time (determined by Center staff).

Pass time will not exceed four (4) hours per week until the fair-share arrearage is paid. Fair-share is paid on the residents' pay-day; failure to make fair-share payments is grounds for termination from the program.

Treatment Policy

Most residents are required to participate in some form of therapy, which may involve individual counseling, group therapy, and residential in-patient or intensive out-patient treatment. Residents must actively participate in and successfully complete such treatment, or face disciplinary action including termination from the United Center treatment program.

Store Run Policy

Residents who earn the privilege, may go to the 7-11 convenience store located less than a half-block from the Center. Store runs allow offenders to purchase soft-drinks, candy, and other personal items. Store runs may not exceed 15 minutes. Violations of this policy may result in disciplinary action ranging from the resi-
dent losing the privilege for a period of time, to full restriction or termination from the program.

**Urine Drop Procedure and Consequences**

All residents are subject to random urine drops at staff discretion or at designated times for residents who are suspected of illegal drug use. If a urine specimen shows positive, a report is sent to the county prosecutor for review. Sanctions may range from full restriction, to termination from the program and possible criminal prosecution. Residents may not refuse to submit a urine drop, and are required to pay for all urine-screen costs up to $25.00 per month.

**Pass Policy**

Routine weekly passes are intended to provide residents with access to their families. In order to go out on a pass, offenders must turn in a written request on Wednesday of each week. Pass plans must be detailed and will be approved only for constructive activities, in an appropriate environment. United Center staff make random checks on residents who are out on pass to ensure that they are where they said they would be on their pass request form. If they are not found at the approved location, they are immediately deemed AWOL. An AWOL for any length of time is grounds for termination from the United Center program, and a recommendation for full revocation of probation, or transfer to the Midwest Department of Cor-
Characteristics of the United Center Residents

The extent to which the findings of this study can be generalized to other jurisdictions depends upon the characteristics of the United Center residents at the time of the instant offense. The United Center houses what can be considered a criminally unsophisticated, largely youthful, urban offender population.

Social-Demographic

All offenders were male (there is no residential program for females at this time); 58.0% were white; 38.2% were black; and 54.6% were between 18 and 24 years of age at the time of the instant offense (mean = 24). Seventy-four percent were single at the time of the instant offense, and 55.8% had no dependent children at the time of the instant offense.

Employment/Education

Fifty-three percent of United Center offenders were unemployed at the time of the instant offense. Among those who had a job (N = 157), 35.2% were employed full-time, and 11.6% were employed part-time. Eighty percent of these offenders were without skills beyond those of a laborer. Among those who had a record of employment (N = 220), 50.0% had worked from only 1 to 3 months at their most recent job prior to the instant offense.
Sixty-five percent of the total population had less than a high school education at the time of the instant offense, and 85.0% had never served in the military. The majority were from Middletown, Midwest (77.3%), and most lived on the westside of town (23.6%), with either their parents, relatives, or friends (65.6%) at the time of their arrest for the instant offense.

**Juvenile Offense Record**

Fifty-nine percent of the offender population had a juvenile offense record; 29.8% were between 11 and 14 years of age at the time of their first juvenile referral; 40.6% were referred for a property offense at the time of their first juvenile referral; and 30.4% had between 1 and 5 official juvenile referrals (counted regardless of disposition). The majority (83.9%) had no record of any juvenile probation/alternative program failures, and 82.0% had never been committed to a juvenile facility for 30 days or more.

**Adult Criminal History**

Excluding the instant offense, 62.0% of the offender population had been arrested for the first time as an adult when they were between 18 and 24 years of age (mean = 20), for a non-violent (62.6%), Class D felony or less (63.5%). Thirty percent had between 1 and 5 documented prior offenses (counted regardless of disposition) as an adult, and as a group, the total population (N = 335) accounted for 2,171 offenses (mean = 6.4). Seventy-six percent had no prior
felony convictions. Among offenders who did have a prior felony conviction (N = 79) as an adult, 73.4% were convicted of a single, non-violent offense (88.6%). Eighty-one percent had no previous adult probation/alternative program failures, and 76.7% had never been committed to an adult correctional facility or jail for more than 30 days.

**Instant Offense**

The most common offenses for which offenders are sent to United Center include, burglary (22.1%), theft (21.2%), drug sale (7.2%), driving a motor vehicle while suspended as a habitual traffic violator (7.2%), child molesting (6.3%), and drug possession (6.0%). Eighty-three percent of the population were convicted of a single, non-violent (82.3%), Class C or D felony offense (81.0%). These are the offense characteristics of the target population identified for community-based treatment by the Midwest Department of Corrections.

Sixty-six percent were represented by a public defender on the instant offense, and 70.7% were released on bond. Bond for 44.7% of the population was established between $100.00 and $500.00. Over half (55.5%) of all offenders received a 1 to 4 year sentence (mean = 3.4 years). Forty-two percent did not spend any time in jail on the instant offense. Among offenders convicted of a second felony offense (N = 61), 81.3% were convicted of a non-violent offense, 36.0% of which were for Class D felonies. Most offenders (78.2%)
were not already on probation at the time of the instant offense for which they were sent to the United Center.

Substance Abuse Characteristics

A significant number of offenders (60.0%) were found to have official histories of alcohol abuse at the time of the instant offense; however, 63.0% were not under the influence of alcohol at the time of the instant offense. Fifty-four percent did not have an official history of drug abuse at the time of the instant offense, and 89.3% were not under the influence of a controlled substance at the time of the instant offense. Ninety percent had no documented history of mental illness at the time of the instant offense.
CHAPTER II

CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORY AND MODELS OF CORRECTIONAL PRACTICE

David Duffee (1986, pp. 74-103) identifies models of correctional practice which are informed by specific criminological perspectives. Three of them are the restraint, the rehabilitation, and the reintegration models.

The Restraint Model

An organizational focus is the basic management style in this case, characterized by a minimal concern for both community and offender. "There is little or no attempt to change people, and the supervision of offenders is kept as routine and trouble-free as possible" (Duffee, 1986, p. 92).

A correctional facility similar to Alcatraz provides us with a suitable image of this correctional model. For example, the only organizational goals of such a facility are to prevent escapes, and provide only those services necessary to keep offenders alive (i.e., food, clothing, shelter, etc.). Or, within a probation department, the primary concern would be with enforcing the rules of probation, maintaining surveillance over probationers, and initiating probation revocation proceedings whenever a technical infraction of the rules or criminal behavior is detected. Within this model, offenders are viewed as personally responsible for their actions, and treatment
consists of little more than punishment in the form of incarceration. Other, more general policy implications consistent with this model include mandatory sentencing; the abolition of parole; curtailment of individual rights; increased use of the death penalty; routine drug and alcohol testing; truth in sentencing provisions; and three strikes legislation. These policies are consistent with the punitive philosophy—let the punishment fit the crime—of the restraint model and are currently enjoying wide acceptance as the only way to reduce crime.

The restraint model of correctional practice is informed by the classical perspective in criminological thought. The clearest statement of the classical perspective is found in Cesare Beccaria's book, *On Crimes and Punishment*, published in 1764. Within this perspective, crime is equated with free will or rational choice. Individuals are seen as attempting to maximize pleasure and minimize pain through the use of a personal cost-benefit analysis, or hedonistic calculus. "Social control involves primarily the use of large, centralized state prisons" (Pfohl, 1994, p. 79). From the standpoint of this theoretical perspective, success is often measured in terms of specific and general deterrence of crime (Wright, 1994). The classical perspective, which dominated correctional practice from approximately 1790 to 1879, has experienced a resurgence in popularity since 1975, due in large part to a hardening of public attitudes toward crime and criminal offenders. Consequently, correctional policy has become more punitive, and treatment programs
have been scaled back. The contemporary version of the restraint model, which has emerged from the revitalization of the classical perspective, has been referred to variously as the retribution or just desserts model.

There is, however, very little empirical evidence in support of the classical perspective and the notions of general and specific deterrence. Indeed, the restraint model of correctional practice, and the imprisonment reduces crime ideology, have been largely ineffective in terms of reducing crime or treating criminal offenders. It has almost become a truism among criminologists that far from helping offenders to assume a productive and law-abiding existence, the prison is seen as responsible for perpetuating criminal behavior (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 1989; Wright, 1994). In fact, some regard imprisonment as an important source of criminality in and of itself, along with poverty, racism, and social structured inequality (Currie, 1993; Elias, 1986; Greenberg, 1994; Irwin & Austin, 1994; Reiman, 1994). Although prisons have been in use in the United States since 1790 when the Walnut Street Jail opened in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, they have always been inhumane, costly, and largely ineffective. In 1973 the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals concluded that the "failure of major correctional institutions to reduce crime is incontestable" (Allen, 1985, p. 188). Indeed the evidence seems overwhelming that the inmates released from American penal and correctional institutions, go forth in great numbers to engage in crime again. According to a BJS
Special Report on recidivism (1985), 69% of parolees were rearrested within 6 years of release from prison; 53% were reconvicted, and 49% were reincarcerated. In a follow up of offenders released from California's prison system, 72% were rearrested within two years of release (Petersilia, Turner, & Peterson, 1986). The results of a study by the Rand Corporation revealed that persons sentenced to prison were rearrested, reconvicted, and resentenced to jail or prison at significantly higher rates than similar offenders sentenced to probation. Other studies of recidivism indicate that "60% to 70% of discharged prisoners are rearrested for felonies and serious misdemeanors within three-years" (Irwin & Austin, 1994, p. 118).

Many penologists blame this high rate of ineffectiveness on prisoners' becoming socially maladjusted due to the isolation, regimentation, and brutalization that are so much a part of prison life. In addition, putting people in prison isolates offenders from their communities imposing a stigma and a prison record that ex-convicts often find so indelible that committing more crime may be their only option. "By imprisoning people, we only harden prisoners to the criminal world and help teach or reinforce the skills and psychology of crime that often guide their behavior when released" (Elias, 1986, pp. 77-78). Moreover, as Elias concludes, making prisons more humane will not solve the problem. Yet we could, as other nations have, vastly reduce incarceration and help lessen some crime our system now seems to generate (pp. 77-78). Prisoners learn little of value during their stint behind bars and adapt to prison in immature
and often destructive ways. Consequently, they "leave prison no better, and sometimes considerably worse, than when they went in" (Johnson, 1984, p. ix).

In spite of the evidence of the criminogenic nature of prison, we continue to incarcerate offenders in record numbers in overcrowded and inadequate facilities; in what Irwin and Austin (1994) have referred to as an imprisonment binge. Oddly enough, high arrest rates among discharged prisoners have led many to argue for more and not less imprisonment to reduce crime (Irwin & Austin, 1994). "It is ironic that we expose so many people to the cruelty of prison when most prison wardens admit that only a tiny fraction of their inmates provide any danger to the community" (Elias, 1986, p. 8). Some penologists argue that "most offenders--perhaps as many as 85%--do not need to be incarcerated and could function better back in the community under supervision" (Allen & Simonsen, 1989, p. 74). According to Jerome Skolnick (1994), "intuition is driving the country toward desperate and ineffectual responses that will drive-up prison costs, divert tax dollars from vital purposes, and leave the public as insecure and dissatisfied as ever" (p. 30). While retribution gratifies basic human desires, it is a symbolic response that fails to diminish crime or the public's fear of it (Anderson, 1988).

Moreover, as DiIulio (1991) notes, there will be no escape from the reality that for the next 20 years, we will be forced to build more prisons, that our prisons will always be overcrowded, and
that we will not be able to build prisons fast enough to keep pace with the demand for more prison space. His concerns are echoed by Irwin and Austin (1994) who note that, the dominate "imprisonment reduces crime" ideology has a stranglehold on criminal justice policy (p. xv). Indeed, the courts are imposing longer sentences for such non-violent felonies as larceny, theft, and motor vehicle theft. In fact, "in 1990, 70% of the 475,000 persons sent to prison were sentenced for nonviolent crimes" (Irwin & Austin, 1994, p. 23).

There has, at the same time, been an explosion of arrests, convictions, and increasingly longer sentences for persons possessing and selling drugs (Walker, 1994). Mandatory sentencing provisions for drug offenders are jamming the prisons and jails, and according to Skolnick, three-strikes legislation will doubtless solidify our already singular position as the top jailer of the civilized world (Skolnick, 1994). Consequently, prison populations have doubled between 1980 and 1992. Significantly, this imprisonment policy is falling on blacks, Hispanic, and other people of color. The imprisonment rate for blacks is at least ten times higher than for whites, and Hispanics are incarcerated at a rate three times higher than whites (Irwin & Austin, 1994). It is also true that, even though the crime rate has not gone down, the costs of punishment have skyrocketed (Irwin & Austin, 1994). As of 1990, we were spending approximately 74 billion dollars each year to operate the nation's entire criminal justice system (Irwin & Austin, 1994).

The recent three strikes, and truth in sentencing proposals
are analogous, in some respects, to the demand for mandatory sentenc­ing in the 1970s. While mandatory sentencing has had little im­pact on crime (Skolnick, 1994; Walker, 1994), it has had a dramatic effect on prisons—filling them to over-capacity across the United states. Similarly, research on selective incapacitation suggests that such strategies are only slightly more effective against crime than current practices (Visher, 1987; Walker, 1994).

While some politicians and law enforcement officials claim that increasing the use of imprisonment has already reduced crime, other observers point out that what decreases in crime that have occurred have been related to factors other than increased use of imprisonment (i.e., demographic changes, the shift from property crime to drug trafficking as the crime of choice for many offenders, and the increased use of other punishments such as probation, parole, and jail sentences) (Irwin & Austin, 1994). The public, however, has accepted the claims of the politicians and criminal justice system officials who support the imprisonment reduces crime policy, in spite of compelling evidence to the contrary.

In one of the most recent discussions, and defenses of the no­tion of general deterrence, Richard Wright (1994), presents a rather weak argument for the imprisonment reduces crime ideology. Among other things, Wright concludes that much more research remains to be done on the effectiveness of punishments as general deterrents. In the meantime, the most that can be said is that the actual and perceived certainty of punishment (both arrest and imprisonment) is
moderately effective as a general deterrent to crime. As for specific deterrence, Wright concludes that legal/formal sanctions (including arrest and mild punishments) are only moderately effective as specific deterrents to crime. And with respect to both collective, and selective incapacitation policies, he concludes that such measures hold promise for bringing incrementally more efficiency and rationality to criminal justice decision making, and that such small successes are perhaps the most that policy makers should expect. This is somewhat less than a strong endorsement for the increased use of imprisonment as the most effective means to control crime. Indeed, it could be argued that the modest gains suggested by Wright hardly justify the enormous social and economic costs associated with what Irwin and Austin (1994) have referred to as America's imprisonment binge. Wright (1994) concludes with respect to the less punishment is better alternative of noninterventionism for offenders, that existing empirical evidence suggests that implementing this alternative would be less effective than current policies of incarceration (p. 133). However, in light of recidivism rates among state prison releasees ranging from between 62% and 70% within three (3) years of release (BJS, 1994), Wright's book In Defense Of Prisons (1994), is not reassuring.

The Rehabilitation Model

The rehabilitation model is characterized by a high emphasis
on the offender and a low emphasis on the community. Correctional identification is the basic influence style. Advocates of this type of correctional strategy emphasize helping the offender to understand him or herself more fully, and to develop more mature social relations (Duffee, 1986). The atmosphere sought approaches that of a hospital were the offender is sick rather than criminal, and the therapist is the idealized staff figure. Indeed, more than in any other correctional model, a bifurcation between treatment and custody occurs in the rehabilitation policy (Duffee, 1986).

The Elmira Reformatory, opened in 1876, provides an image of this correctional model. At Elmira young offenders were disciplined through the use of a military boot-camp training strategy. Dr. Hamilton Wey, a disciple of Cesare Lombroso, was the chief physician at this hospital-prison. The goal was to cure the offender of his physical and mental defects which were believed to be the causes of criminal behavior. Within this model offenders are not viewed as personally responsible for their actions; however, treatment is focused almost exclusively on the individual. Prisons became reformatories, and punishment became treatment in these moral-hospitals. Other, more general policy implications of this model include probation, parole and the indeterminate sentence; good-time provisions; counseling (usually reality therapy); work release and prerelease programs; educational, vocational, and re-socialization programs; Alcoholics Anonymous; drug therapy; and disciplinary measures such as segregation adn behavioral contracts wherein offenders agree to
certain behavioral conditions. Such policies are consistent with the major theoretical assumptions of the rehabilitative philosophy calling for change on the part of the individual offender, rather than on the part of the broader social structure within which deviant and criminal behavior occur.

The rehabilitation model of correctional practice is informed by the pathological perspective in criminological thought. Most historians date the origins of pathological theorizing to the 1876 publication of Cesare Lombroso’s *The Criminal Man*. Within this perspective crime is equated with sickness or disease; people commit crimes due to physical and mental pathologies (Pfohl, 1994). Individual human beings are seen as biologically unique, and differences in human biology are believed to cause many of the differences in human behavior. Moreover, criminals are believed to differ from normal people in ways that can be identified through the use of scientific knowledge and procedures (Holman, 1992). The social control of pathological deviance involves the use of various therapeutic measures such as physical, mental, and drug therapy, eugenics, and treatment in large centralized state prisons and mental hospitals (Pfohl, 1994). From the standpoint of this theoretical tradition in criminology, success is often measured in terms of the physical, mental, and moral rehabilitation of the offender.

The medical model of corrections, informed by the theoretical assumptions of physiological, psychological, and sociological positivism, had its heyday between 1940 and 1975. As Dilulio (1991)
notes, from 1940 to 1975, most observers thought correctional pro-
grams were effective instruments of rehabilitation. There was in
fact a strong belief that in terms of correctional treatment pro-
grams, everything works. But pathological theories of crime, whether
they are physiological, psychological, or social, all suffer from
some important limitations. Physiological and psychological theor-
ies of crime are, more often than not, highly individualistic, overly
deterministic, and eliminate the notions of human choice and
structured social influence. They are also characterized by a false
neutrality that belies the claim that pathological theories and
theorists are value-free. And finally, pathological thinking ignores
the essential politicality of all nonconformity (Pfohl, 1994). Theo-
ries of crime based on the idea of social pathology such as the soc-
ial disorganization, anomie, and learning perspectives, also tend to
be overly deterministic, falsely neutral, and ignore issues of soc-
ial stratification such as sexism, racism, and social class inequi-
ties (Pfohl, 1994). And although the social disorganization per-
spective, for example, emphasized treatment of society over that
of the individual, control policies remained focused on the indivi-
dual offender.

As was the case with the classical perspective, there is lit-
tle empirical support for the theoretical assumptions of the patho-
logical perspective. As a result, the rehabilitation model of cor-
rectional practice has also been inadequate in terms of reducing
crime and treating criminal offenders. A great deal of the evi-
dence that prisons fail to rehabilitate offenders or deter crime has already been reviewed in this paper, and will not be repeated here. However, it is worth pointing out that so much has been written on the failure of the rehabilitative model of correctional practice that it has almost become a truism in criminology that as Martinson concluded in 1975, nothing works. Indeed, in his recent book, *In Defense of Prisons*, Richard Wright (1994) provides an excellent review of the criminological research in the last twenty-five years which has cast considerable doubt on the ability of prisons to achieve rehabilitation. Wright concludes that the preponderance of empirical evidence quite simply indicates that prisons are ineffective in achieving the social outcomes of rehabilitation, retribution, and social solidarity. For correctional policy makers to continue to strive toward these goals flies in the face of both research and reason.

In fact, between 1975 and 1985, many researchers doubted or flatly denied that offender treatment programs were effective instruments of rehabilitation. However, as Dilulio (1991) has commented, having tried everything works and screeched into nothing works, we enter the 1990s in the spirit that something works. It is to a discussion of that something that brings us to a third model of correctional practice—the reintegration model.

The Reintegration Model

According to Duffee (1986), this model of correctional prac-
tice is characterized by a high emphasis on both the community and the offender. Correctional internalization is the basic influence style. Activities directed toward the community include not only creating greater access to social institutions and resources for the offender, but also developing within the community a greater tolerance for the life-styles represented by various groups of offenders. This strategy depends on the degree of tolerance that can be expected from the community; the ability of correctional staff to make resources more available to offenders; and the readiness of an offender to engage in various degrees of alternative activities without violating community standards and expectations which could reduce community tolerance during the period of correctional supervision.

Under this approach, control is more democratic than is the case with the other models, in that offenders have a stake in the formulation of their own treatment program. Decision making is shared by staff and offenders; both staff and offenders are controlled by the demands of the activity in which they are engaged. Rules are few but explicit and are linked to clear and important security measures and the observance of legal behavior. Punishment is perceived as the negative consequence of ineffective behavior, and more attention is devoted to how to make behavior more effective, or goal achieving in the future.

Within this model, offenders work with a range of alternative activities, while the major stress is on altering community resource structures. More importantly, this model attempts to reduce the
stigma attached to criminality that acts as a blockade to reintegration in the community. But emphasis on the community does not only mean a stress on maintaining its values. It also means a stress on promoting changes within its institutional structure to provide opportunities for offenders and to reduce systematic discrimination because of economic or cultural patterns.

Confinement is used as infrequently as possible under this model, as the preferred program is community supervision. Ideally, the correctional centers are close to or within the community of return. Staff members attempt to intervene in the community as well as in the life of the offender and are involved with community institutions: businesses, churches, schools, recreational facilities, treatment programs, and so forth. Staff distinctions are blurred, as all members are valued for the change-producing skills that they can bring to the team effort. The assistance of volunteers, students, and community workers is also sought, and is viewed as an integral part of the correctional program. Prerelease and work release programs are near the core of the reintegration model; breaks with the community are minimized, and lines of communication are kept open.

The United Center provides an appropriate image of this correctional model. This is community corrections, to the extent that offenders and staff develop treatment programs jointly. Some of the more general policy implications of this model include, probation, parole, and the indeterminate sentence; restitution and community
service orders; intensive probation supervision; house-arrest and electronic monitoring; community, police, and court-based diversion programs; decarceration; workrelease and prerelease programs; halfway houses (halfway-in and halfway-out); victim offender reconciliation programs; and a vast array of treatment programs for personal and family related problems. Such policies are consistent with the notion that offenders need more than anything else to be accepted by rather than rejected by their own communities.

The reintegration model of correctional practice is informed by at least two theoretical perspectives in criminology. To the extent that it attempts to reduce the stigma attached to criminality, to promote changes within the community's institutional structure to provide opportunities for offenders, and to reduce systematic discrimination because of economic or cultural patterns (i.e., racism, sexism, and classism), the reintegration model of correctional practice is consistent with the societal reaction perspective and the strain perspective in criminological thought.

Within the societal reaction perspective crime is equated with the social definitional process. This perspective assumes that no human behavior or activity is inherently deviant or criminal; that crime is socially defined, in that it is a property conferred upon certain acts by societal reactions; and the labels assigned to people affect their self-image, material well-being and thus, their behavior (Holman, 1992). Consistent with this theoretical perspective, social control would involve reforms that limit the discre-
tionary power of control agents, and guarantee the rights of all accused deviants; decriminalization of victimless crimes; and use of least restrictive control options (Pfohl, 1994). Labeling scholars' call for expanding due process was based on their critique of the rehabilitation model of correctional practice which placed enormous discretionary power in the hands of criminal justice officials. Individualized treatment was seen as merely a euphemism for judicial decisions that discriminated against the powerless. Decriminalization would limit the law's reach and thus reduce the extent to which people are labeled and treated as criminals (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 1989). Diversion, or the substitution of a less severe intervention for prison, would include community-based programs like the United Center. Labeling theorists also took special pains to detail the criminogenic effects of incarceration and to advocate vigorously the policy of lessening prison populations through deinstitutionalization. Success from this perspective is often measured in terms of reductions in offender recidivism after deinstitutionalization policies are implemented. Work within this perspective, often referred to as labelling theory, gained ascendancy in the early 1960s in the writings of Howard S. Becker, John Kituse, Erving Goffman, and Kai Erikson.

As previously mentioned, the reintegration model of correctional practice recognizes the importance of reducing the stigma attached to criminality which acts as a blockade to reintegration into the community. There is a long and rich tradition of work within
the societal reaction perspective with respect to the effects of a criminal label on the life chances of former offenders. For labeling theorists, extra-legal factors, such as an offender's race, class, and gender, are more important in regulating criminal justice labeling than legal factors, such as the seriousness of the crime or the offender's past record. Furthermore, societal reaction is the major source of career criminality.

Labeling theorists maintain that rather than diminishing criminal involvement, state intervention--labeling and reacting to offenders as criminals and ex-felons--can have the consequence of deepening the very behavior it was meant to prevent. The criminal justice system is seen as a major factor in locking people into a criminal career; state intervention is dangerously criminogenic (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 1989), and creates, rather than halts crime.

Early criminologists such as Bentham (1789), Lombroso (1911), Bonger (1916), and Shaw (1930), noted that especially prisons were breeding grounds for crime. Frank Tannenbaum (1938), however, was perhaps the earliest scholar to state in general terms the principle that state intervention is criminogenic because it dramatizes evil. Once this happens, an offender is labeled, and treated differently by the world around him for the rest of his life. This is particularly true for younger offenders who are sent to prison.

Offenders sent to prison suffer not only from the stigma associated with a felony conviction but from what Clemmer (1940) has referred to as a "process of prisonization" (p. 300). According to
this view, offenders who spend years in prison become institutionalized and are unable to adapt to free society once they are released. A classic example of this is found in the story of Jack Henry Abbott, author of *In The Belly of the Beast* (1981). After spending most of his life in penal institutions, Abbott was released from prison through the efforts of influential people who recognized his literary talents. Shortly after his release, Abbott murdered a waiter in a restaurant who allegedly insulted him. According to Abbott, he responded to a personal affront in the way he had learned to in prison.

Labeling theorists asserted that the false definition of offenders as permanently criminal and destined for a life of crime fulfills this very prophecy by evoking societal reactions that make conformity difficult and criminality necessary, if not attractive. Moreover, the labeling process stabilizes criminal activity, and the common response to escalating crime rates is not to minimize societal reaction but to arrest and imprison more people. Thus the problem feeds into itself becoming a vicious circle that perpetuates the crime problem (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 1989). And, according to labeling theorists, government officials would label the disadvantaged more than the advantaged, and would operate prisons that drove offenders deeper into crime.

Theoretical and empirical work within the labelling tradition continues to the present day, however, the criminal justice system is currently dominated by the philosophical and methodological
assumptions of the classical perspective in criminological thought, and the policy implications consistent with a restraint model of correctional practice.

The reintegration model of correctional practice is also consistent with the philosophical assumptions of the anomie, or strain perspective. At the heart of the anomie perspective is the notion that deviance arises as a result of unfulfilled human aspirations (Pfohl, 1994). Moreover, aspirations to deviate are rooted in the structural contradictions of society. In short, people want things they cannot have.

In general terms, the strain perspective assumes that not all groups within society benefit equally from the current social order; all societies attempt to control the methods by which their citizens attain goals; and that deviance and crime result from individuals choosing, as a result of group membership, to violate societal regulations (Holman, 1992).

Especially in the work of Robert K. Merton (1938), limitless aspirations lead to social deregulation or crime. A systemic disjuncture between goals and the means necessary to achieve those goals produces a strain in the direction of deviant behavior; anomie is produced by blocked legitimate opportunities (Pfohl, 1985). Strain is the fundamental underlying theoretical imagery in Merton’s theory of deviant behavior. It is the causal link between a contradictory social structure, and concrete instances of deviance (Pfohl, 1985). High rates of crime or deviance are said to be
structurally encouraged by contradictory developments in the organization of society (Pfohl, 1985).

Merton distinguishes culturally defined goals and institutional means of achieving those goals. However, societies vary in the degree to which they stress one or the other (Abercrombie, 1988). He argues that in American culture the goal of achieving wealth has been emphasized to the point that the institutionalized means are little reward in themselves (Vold & Bernard, 1986). For certain groups, particularly in the lower classes, a severe strain on the cultural values arises because, (a) the culture places a disproportionate emphasis on the achievement of the goal of accumulated wealth, and maintains that this goal is applicable to all persons; and (b) the social structure effectively limits the possibilities of individuals within these groups to achieve this goal through the use of institutionalized means. This contradiction between the culture and the social structure of society is what Merton defined as anomie. According to Merton, the drive to crime was in the culture, and not in human nature as the classical and the pathological perspectives suggested. Merton's explanation focused on the distribution of legitimate opportunities in the social structure to achieve wealth through institutionalized means. According to him, those opportunities were concentrated in the upper classes, and absent for the most part in the lower classes (Vold & Bernard, 1986). Although strain is a constant in American society, and is experienced to varying degrees by all of its' members, it is seen as especially
acute among members of the lower classes. Indeed, Merton’s theory is largely an explanation of lower class crime.

Merton developed a typology of individual adaptations to the socially structured contradiction between cultural goals and available means of goal attainment (Pfohl, 1985). He described these options as conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism, and rebellion (Vold & Bernard, 1986). He uses the term innovation to refer to the creative use of illegitimate means to obtain valued legitimate ends (Pfohl, 1985). In this case, the cultural goals are accepted, however, the opportunity to legitimately achieve those goals has not been provided. Most crime takes the form of innovation (Vold & Bernard, 1986).

According to strain theorists such as Merton, effective social control measures would call for a significant reduction of the social class inequities inherent in American society. Efforts to eliminate the strain between societal goals and differentially available means through such measures as affirmative action programs; equal opportunity, antiracism, and antisexism strategies; and programs such as New York City’s Mobilization for Youth, and other national programs such as Head Start, and CETA, are typical of such policies. Strain theory implies that greater equality in the distribution of resources and opportunities among groups in society should result in greater social equality. Greater social equality among social groups should result in a general reduction in the crime rates of groups that presently have high crime rates, (i.e.,
the minority poor) as those groups use their newly acquired resources to legally pursue their own interests. Success could be measured in terms of a reduction in criminal activity among members of the so-called underclass who are provided with the legitimate means (i.e., employment, education, political power and influence) to achieve desired social goals.

The reintegration model is consistent with the strain perspective because of its stress on altering community resource structures, and understanding that social class, race, and gender, are the major determining factors in the treatment of criminal offenders. Not only do these factors influence the treatment of offenders once they are in the system, they are largely responsible for who ends up in the criminal justice system in the first place. Recognition of this situation requires that the principle of justice govern the operation of all correctional institutions, and justice requires the highest level of human and social development of all persons, including offenders. The administration of justice further requires that adequate correctional programs be developed and appropriately staffed to allow the courts sufficient flexibility in sentencing decisions, and to address the structured inequities of American society.

Although important work continues within the strain tradition, current correctional policy (i.e., the restraint model) is driven by the philosophical assumptions of the classical perspective.
CHAPTER III

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Community Halfway Houses

In 1986, David Duffee wrote that another current movement in correctional management was community corrections, or deinstitutionalization. Small residential programs (like the United Center) and new types of correctional field services were seen as necessary to better enable the offender to compete in free society (1986). According to Duffee, however, there was little if any evidence to support such programs. Indeed, at present there is very little in the literature relative to the effectiveness of community corrections programs similar to the United Center.

Strong political, if not empirical, support for community corrections has existed for a long time. In a statewide review of the impact of the Fair Sentencing Act of 1981, in North Carolina, the North Carolina Governor’s Crime Commission (1987), recommended, among other things, the expansion of local confinement facilities and alternative punishment programs to ease prison overcrowding and give courts a larger array of sentencing options. Such programs include pretrial release, deferred prosecution, restitution, community penalties, intensive probation, and treatment alternatives such as half-way houses (North Carolina Governor’s Crime Commission, Raleigh, NC., 1987). Over the past decade, numerous states have been
experimenting with a number of intermediate sentencing options, in­
cluding house arrest with or without electronic monitoring, court
ordered unpaid labor, boot camps, and the use of community sponsors
(Petersilia, 1987). According to Petersilia, if such programs are
successful, the criminal justice system will have demonstrated its
ability to design alternatives to incarceration that are safe, hold
offenders accountable, and are cost-effective. If they fail, the
public is likely to call for more incarceration (Petersilia, 1987).
According to Allen, while corrections remains in a crisis stage,
community-based corrections, improved screening, and better treat­
ment service delivery hold hope for the future (Allen, 1987). Ac­
cording to Nidorf (1989), the time has come for community-based
corrections and for programs that utilize probation and police co­
operative action, probation and prosecution cooperative action, in­
tensive supervision, electronic surveillance, and narcotics and drug
deterrence. Other community alternatives include work furlough pro­
grams, probationer violation and restitution residential centers,
day reporting centers, and paid intensively supervised work crews.
Legislatures will not endorse the alternatives, however, if the pub­
lic believes that the only real sanction for crime is incarceration
(Nidorf, 1989).

George P. Wilson (1985) provides a useful definition of half­
way houses which helps to clarify the subject matter of this re­
search effort. According to Wilson, the halfway house serves a wide
variety of offenders that generally fall into two distinct cate­
categories: the halfway-in and the halfway-out. The halfway-in house is relatively new and is primarily a diversion program for younger, first-time offenders. The halfway-out house, usually for parolees, is the traditional and better known halfway house facility. The United Center is a classic example of the halfway-in type of halfway house. Currently there is very little in the literature relative to the effectiveness of halfway houses on offenders who are halfway-in (See Hibbs, 1980; Johnson & Bonta, 1985). A useful discussion of halfway houses including definitions, history, and status of halfway houses nationally, is found in a report generated by the City Club of Portland, Oregon in 1981. This report reviews 35 different studies which dealt with the postrelease outcome of halfway house residents in terms of rearrest and reconviction for new crimes. Very little empirical support in terms of reducing offender recidivism was found for halfway-out programs. Moreover, the report concludes, "we were unable to find any evaluative studies on halfway-in houses. The fact that the majority of houses serve the parolee (halfway-out) may contribute to this apparent lack of data" (City Club of Portland, Oregon, Report on Halfway Houses, 1981, pp. 65-66).

Treatment programs in halfway houses depend to some degree upon whether the offenders are halfway-in or halfway-out. Generally speaking however, most halfway houses use the same basic programmatic elements of operation regardless of the type of offender population (Wilson, 1985). These elements include; an orientation period; employment training and/or educational placement; weekly manda-
tory group meetings; counseling (group or individual) for personal problems; community service; and routine probation supervision. The United Center includes all these and many more treatment components, all of which will be examined as to their relationship to measures of program success and failure.

The problems encountered when establishing a halfway house include, adequate funding, locating and establishing the halfway house in a community setting, preserving the anonymity of the house and its residents, and gaining community support. Many of these might well be eliminated or at least reduced if it could be shown empirically that the program was for the most part successful in reducing recidivism, and in providing treatment services such as education and employment to the target population.

As for the effect on recidivism, Wilson (1985) reports that there is fairly conclusive evidence that halfway houses are more effective than the traditional prison-parole cycle (1985). That is, more effective with offenders who are halfway-out. Wilson offers no evidence relative to the effectiveness of halfway houses on offenders who are halfway-in, which underscores the need for evaluations of such programs.

**Halfway-out Programs**

The halfway-out house, usually for parolees, is the traditional and better known halfway house facility. Most of the research on halfway houses has been done on this type of program. The halfway-
out programs reviewed in this section were selected because they employ many of the same treatment components found at United Center, and have a similar treatment philosophy.

Dismas House offers a supportive community for former prisoners who have no family, or who fear that a return to their former environment might lead to a return to criminal activity. Many need assistance in finding employment and in readjusting to life on the outside. A 1979 study of the Dismas House, in Nashville, found that the program provided valuable reintegration skills for ex-offenders and reported that the recidivism rate for participants was less than 20%, well below the national average for recidivism among halfway-out house residents. The program offers educational and employment counseling, assistance with drug/alcohol, and personal problems, and a limited amount of direct financial assistance. There are 10 Dismas homes currently in operation across the United States.

In a comparison between Federal offenders released from a Community Treatment Center and those released from prison, it was found that those released from the CTC did significantly better than those released from prison in terms of post-release employment success for both white and minority offenders. Releases through a CTC showed lower unemployment rates, more days worked, and more money earned. Relating these findings to recidivism, CTC release was found to be significantly associated with reduced recidivism for white offenders but not for minority offenders. This was believed to be due to the greater disadvantages minority offenders face in gaining employment.
In another study, offenders released from five Milwaukee community residential centers were monitored for 1 year to assess their parole success. Their outcomes were compared with those released from the Bureau of Adult Institutions. Eighty-three percent of the center releasees and 82% of the prison releasees had a successful parole outcome at the end of the 1 year follow-up period. Those released from the centers, however, had significantly lower employment needs, financial management needs, and overall parole supervision needs than those released from prison (Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services Division of Policy and Budget Bureau of Evaluation, 1982).

In an Ohio study, data came from the intake and termination forms from 409 clients who entered a halfway house program between January 1, 1980 and December 31, 1982. Overall, 65% of the clients were successful and 35% were unsuccessful. Females were more successful than males. While 70% of those over age 36 were successful, only 60% of those under 25 were successful. Only 57% of those arrested as juveniles were successful, while 86% of those whose first arrest occurred after age 25 were successful. Clients with more convictions were significantly less likely to be successful than those with fewer convictions (Donnelly & Forschner, 1984).

A study of recidivism among ex-offenders residing in a halfway house in St. John's Newfoundland measured reconvictions for criminal offenses two years following departure from the center. Over two
thirds of the sample (67.4%) were not reconvicted of a criminal of-

cense within 2 years of their release from the halfway house. For

the recidivists (32.6%), the average length of time before recon-
viction was 8 months. This study and two other Canadian studies
determined the efficacy of the Canadian Recidivism Index (CRI) in

measuring recidivism among study subjects (Holosko & Carlson 1986).

The Isaiah House Family Therapy Program provides pre-release

offenders from Connecticut prisons an intensely structured, 90-day

skill development self-help program in order to reintegrate into the

community. The residents, between the ages of 17 and 65, are se-

lected because of good prison behavior and their motivation to be-

come responsible citizens. The Family Therapy Program complements

the work release, career guidance, spiritual awareness, and indivi-
dual and group counseling components for the 14 men who are resi-
dents. In the future, Isaiah House will be initiating a major study
to measure the program's impact on the recidivism rate of its parti-
cipants (Sander, 1990).

The Montgomery County Pre-Release Center, in Maryland, is a
halfway house for low-risk offenders that provides services designed
to reduce recidivism among residents. As many as 3% of the resi-
dents escape, and approximately 20% are returned to jail or prison
before completing the program, often for using drugs or alcohol.
The center admits those serving short sentences; hardcore offenders
are screened out. Those admitted to the center have shown signs of
wanting to work on their problems. Most are assigned to the center
for 120 days and are required to hold jobs outside the facility. They pay 20% of their salaries to help run the halfway house, and the center provides drug and alcohol treatment as well as family counseling. Residents are encouraged to take furloughs to visit family and friends, so they can learn to handle increasing amounts of freedom. Some inmates perform community service and others pay a portion of their earnings as restitution for their crimes (Corrections Today, 1990).

Halfway-in Programs

The halfway-in house is relatively new, having become relatively popular within the last ten years, and is primarily a diversion program for younger, first-time offenders. Research on such programs is reviewed in this section.

A cost-benefit analysis of the Washington County (Oregon) Community Corrections Department Restitution Center, emphasizes that a resident is able to support himself and his family, defray a portion of the residential expense by paying room and board, pay restitution, and perform community services. Indirect benefits are also discussed, including the center's practice of finding employment for residents prior to release. In a straight dollar for dollar comparison, the daily expenses of the program were found to be slightly less than the county jail. Although an assessment of the center's effectiveness in terms of recidivism was not conducted, cost and productivity data indicate that it is a sound investment (Applied
Evaluation data was collected on all residents of Hawaii's Kamehameha Conditional Release Center (a residential facility that acts as an alternative to traditional incarceration for selected persons not requiring secure confinement) from its inception in April 1973 until May 30, 1978. Of the total (50), 17 completed the program and were paroled, while 20 failed and were returned to prison. The successful and unsuccessful groups were compared in a computer search for significant variables influencing success and failure. The successful resident was found to be between 20 and 30 years old, had less than four previous convictions, had a job skill, a high school education, and no previous commitments. After two years the successful clients had not been returned to prison for a new commitment. Program success appeared to be related to the careful selection process and the small group of offenders (Matsuo & Salisbury, 1981).

A report from Multnomah County, Oregon, concludes that halfway house programs cost about the same as institutional confinement in existing cell space and less than confinement in new cell space. In addition, the report concludes that halfway houses have the potential to rehabilitate some offenders more effectively than either confinement or probation/parole. The report recommends that Multnomah County should immediately reestablish the NW 20th and Lovejoy house as a halfway-in program for a sufficient period to determine its effectiveness (City Club of Portland Bulletin, 1981). The study
design included only 39 offenders, and no information was available to show how residents did after leaving the halfway house program.

Limited support for programs such as the United Center is provided in evaluations of similar, although less restrictive programs. Latessa (1985) reports on an intensive supervision probation program in Lucas County (Toledo) Ohio that successfully reduced commitments to Ohio State penal institutions, provided increased service and contacts, and reduced the costs of traditional incarceration while maintaining community safety. Program clientele (244 over four years) were diverted after conviction and recommendation for commitment to state prisons, and would have been incarcerated if not for the supervision program. The program resulted in a 17% reduction in the number of offenders sentenced to State prisons from Lucas County for the period February 1977 through December 1982 (Latessa, 1985). The savings generated by the program ($901,409.00) were determined by comparing IDU (Incarceration Diversion Unit) costs with those of incarcerating an offender in the Ohio penal system (Latessa, 1985). The Lucas County program appears to have met expectations (at least with respect to budgetary considerations) --reduce state commitments from the county and maintain community safety at a cost less than traditional incarceration. Latessa supports statewide application of the concept in Ohio. An assessment of the program's effectiveness in terms of recidivism was not conducted.

In a Texas study, the recidivism patterns of those placed in halfway houses were compared with those not residing in halfway
houses. Those placed in halfway houses tended to have drug-alcohol abuse histories and extensive criminal histories, suggesting that their placement was intended to provide treatment and close supervision. Even though halfway house residents were generally poorer risks than nonresident releasees, their recidivism rate was a percentage point less than nonresidents. Halfway house residents, however, had significantly higher absconder rates and trouble rates (arrests, violation reports, and warrants that did not result in return to prison). Halfway houses were particularly effective in curtailing the recidivism rates of alcohol abusers, the chronically unemployed, and assaultive offenders. Halfway houses had only moderate success in controlling recidivism for property offenders, those with no history of alcohol/drug abuse, and those considered to be fair to good risks. Halfway houses were notably ineffective in reducing the recidivism of those with drug abuse histories and stable employment (Eisenberg, 1985).

A halfway house for female offenders in Long Beach, California was evaluated by comparing the number and severity of offenses of graduates of the house to those of a matched group of women released in the same area and period. The two groups had comparable criminal histories. A U.S. Bureau of Prisons index was used to classify the severity of offenses. Results indicated that the halfway house reduced both the number and severity of offenses (Dowell, Klein & Krichmar, 1985).

The Success Rate Index was used to examine the results of Elk
Hill Farm, a private, nonprofit residential facility in Virginia for young men 13 to 17 years old for whom neither community living nor a state institution was appropriate. The success rate for all 160 youths released since August 1976 was 81.1%. Older youths were more successful after leaving the program (Giacobbe & Schneider, 1986).

Another study in the state of Michigan examined the feasibility of a prison diversion program for that state. Although this was not an evaluation of the effectiveness of community half-way houses like the United Center, the study concluded that experience with alternatives in four different states suggests that additional sentencing options can enhance community correctional programs and probation services. However, success of such programs has been mixed, and the majority of offenders participating in them has not been in the targeted population (Bynum, 1987).

A 1987 evaluation of a community diversion program for nonviolent offenders in Virginia (the Community Diversion Incentive) used discriminate function analysis to determine the extent to which the program was serving the intended population (Rog & Henry, 1987). Findings indicated that at least 46% of the divertees (out of a sample of 56) would have been incarcerated if the program had not been available. This study did not include postrelease arrest information, and was based on a very small sample of offenders.

A 1987 study of a co-correctional halfway house used discriminant analysis to determine the characteristics of persons most likely to succeed. The results indicated that strong socializing
and integrating ties in the community, and few previous contacts
with the criminal justice system were major predictors of success in
the program. The seven discriminators for females were used to ac-
curately predict 87% of the female misdemeanants, while the nine
discriminators for male felons correctly predicted 63% of the cases
(Donnelly & Forschner, 1987).

In Massachusetts a follow-up study of individuals convicted
of second drunk driving offenses indicated that mandated short-term
residential treatment for these offenders may provide an effective
intervention. Offenders admitted to the treatment program were sig-
nificantly less likely to be rearrested for drunk driving. Ten per-
cent of the treatment sample and 20% of the incarcerated sample were
rearrested. It was estimated that the risk of rearrest was 1.9 times
greater among incarcerated offenders than among those admitted to
treatment in the residential program (McCarty & Argeriou, 1988).

A residential program for sex offenders in Seattle, has dem-
onstrated the effectiveness of the community-based treatment concept
for this particular type of offender. Once admitted to the program,
each client's treatment is divided into three parts: control, treat-
ment, and transition out of treatment. Treatment consists of group,
individual, and family therapy. The final phases of family therapy
include home and overnight visits with the family (Wolf, 1988).

Using a detailed questionnaire, a 1990 research project ob-
tained data from all inmates assigned to house arrest (N = 156), and
to all residents of a community treatment center/halfway house (N =
in a metropolitan area in the Southwest. The interviews solicited information on the problems experienced by the two groups, their support networks in the community, their perceived opportunities and companions, their anticipated successes, and their attitudes toward the correctional programs offered them. At all time intervals, fewer house arrestees than halfway house residents reported problems of adjustment to the community following termination from correctional supervision. In both groups, women offenders perceived more problems and had more unfavorable attitudes toward supervision than did the male offenders (Sandhu, 1990).

Latessa (1991) compared a sample of offenders placed in a halfway house with a sample of offenders receiving regular probation supervision using three indicators of outcome: completion of the program, positive social adjustment, and recidivism. Data concerning the legal, social, and demographic characteristics, as well as the services received, and offenses committed were gathered from agency and police records over a 3-year period for both the 132 halfway house residents and the 140 felony probationers. Results showed no significant differences between the two sample groups on any of the indicators, although the halfway house offenders were considered at greater risk at the start.

In summary, only three of the halfway-in programs referenced above were comparable to the United Center in terms of program design (Eisenberg, 1985; City of Portland Bulletin, 1981; Matsuo & Salisbury, 1981), and only two of these, Matsuo and Salisbury, 1981,
and City of Portland Bulletin, 1981, were a close match. However, they all share one thing in common with the present study: none reports findings based on a comparison with a matched group of offenders in terms of recidivism.

In general, the research evaluations reviewed in this section— with respect to both halfway-in, and halfway-out programs—differ from the present study in at least four ways. First, the findings contained in the present study are based on an entire population of offenders, while the findings in the reports cited above were based on either very small samples, or a small population of offenders (less than 50 in both cases).

Second, in the present study, recidivism is operationalized in terms of all three (3) of the standard measures typically used (i.e., rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration) in evaluations of this nature. On the other hand, none of the studies identified above measured recidivism in terms of all three measures (if they measured it at all).

Third, the present study employed four (4) different sources of official arrest data to ensure the accuracy of the recidivism measures. None of the reports identified above used as many measures of recidivism, and some simply contacted offenders on the telephone to inquire as to their postrelease arrest record.

Fourth, the present study measured the level of participation, and the effectiveness of all United Center treatment components and services. None of the reports reviewed in this section was found
to be as complete in this connection.

Recidivism

One of the most stable predictors of recidivism is the age of the offender at the time of his first arrest (Bowker, 1982; Glaser, 1969; Healy, 1915; Hoffman, 1988; Pritchard, 1979). Based on a review of 71 studies of adult offenders, Pritchard (1979) found that, an offense of auto theft, the presence of prior convictions, stability of employment, age at first arrest, "living arrangements, current income, history of opiate use, and history of alcohol abuse appear to be the most stable predictors of recidivism" (p. 19). Bowker (1982) found number of prior adult convictions, living arrangements, a history of alcohol abuse, nature of the current offense, and age at time of first arrest to all be significantly related to offender re-arrest. Allen (1985) reports that the only two variables that appear to be consistently associated with parole effectiveness are age (the over forty group does better) and type of offense (with repeat property offenders more likely to fail than personal offenders, especially murderers). Bowker's findings lend support to the research on recidivism that has found age and type of offense to be two of the most stable predictors of recidivism. Of greater importance to the study of recidivism (and to this report), however, is the evidence that the longer the offender remains in prison, the more likely it is that he or she will be rearrested (Allen & Simonsen, 1989). This is a significant finding and one that is very
important to the present study of the United Center. While the present study does not include a matched set of offenders who were sent to prison instead of to the United Center (that will be done at a later date as a follow-up to this research), the evidence of the criminogenic nature of imprisonment supports the assumption made by the Community Corrections Advisory Board in 1982 that keeping people out of prison reduces recidivism.

The U.S. Parole Commission has developed a scale called the Salient Factor Score, to assess a prisoner's likelihood of recidivism. This scale contains six items: (1) the offender's prior criminal convictions; (2) the offender's prior criminal commitments for longer than 30 days; (3) the offender's age at the time of the instant offense; (4) how long the offender was at liberty since the last commitment; (5) whether the offender was on probation, parole, or escape status at the time of the most recent offense; and (6) whether the offender has a record of heroin dependence (1991 Parole Commission Rules; 28 C.F.R. 2.1-2.67). "These items, individually and collectively, have been demonstrated to be associated with the likelihood of recidivism" (Hoffman, 1988, p. 2). All of these variables were included in the United Center study as well as the variables identified by the U.S. Parole Commission's Risk Prediction Scale. This scale includes such things as length of education; history of opiate usage; age at time of instant conviction (28 years or older is significant in terms of risk assessment); arrest-free period of five (5) or more consecutive years; few prior arrests (none,
one, or two); history of opiate usage; and at least four (4) months steady employment prior to arraignment for the present offense (Probation Division, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, 1981).
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH DESIGN AND QUESTIONS

In order to conduct an evaluation of this nature it was believed necessary to gain access to offender arrest records maintained by the FBI. Arrest records maintained by the Middletown Police Department, Middletown County Sheriff's Department, Adult Probation Department, Prosecutor's Office, and the Midwest State Police, in most cases, reflect only local and state arrest data. The FBI, however, receives reports from most law enforcement agencies throughout the United States. Assuming that at least some offenders migrate to other states following release from the United Center (which turned out to be the case), it seemed important to obtain arrest data that was not limited to the state of Midwest.

In October of 1992, the first attempt was made to obtain the information from the FBI in the form of a letter outlining in some detail why the request was being made, what research methods would be used, and how the data would be collected and analyzed. On 10-29-93 the following reply was received from the FBI:

We have given your request careful consideration and must advise that the FBI will be unable to assist you in your study. The FBI Identification Division (ID), which maintains the criminal history records you seek, has experienced significant personnel reductions and currently has a large backlog of fingerprint cards to be processed. Therefore it is necessary that our resources be utilized to ensure the ID's primary responsibilities to the law enforcement/criminal justice community are met. Although, we understand the importance of your research and realize that the information developed may be
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beneficial to the criminal justice community, it is simply impossible for the FBI to participate in research projects at this time. Further, even if we were able to assist you in your project, it appears that your research project is not Federally funded or at least supported in part by Federal funds. It is questionable whether your research project would meet the requirements set forth in Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 22.

This response was followed up by a telephone call to the FBI. The agent contacted mentioned that such a request would be responded to favorably if submitted by an official agency of the criminal justice system.

The United Center is funded by the state of Midwest through the Midwest Department of Corrections, and since the United Center Director requested this evaluation a direct appeal was made to the MDOC for assistance. The MDOC, through one of its deputy commissioners, was very enthusiastic about the project and offered not only to assist in gaining access to the FBI records, but to help with the data collection as well. The Commissioner of the MDOC personally requested the arrest information. The FBI in May of 1994, released the first batch of 100 arrest records to the MDOC.

It was also in May of 1994 that the preliminary findings of this report were sought for review at the meeting of state and local criminal justice officials convened to address the 30 person waiting list at the United Center, and the 40 empty beds at the Middletown Work Release Center. It was the opinion of most of the participants at that meeting, voiced strongest by a county Superior Court Judge, that the beds at the work release center should be released for use by the United Center. The MDOC (which was responsible for the re-
lease of the FBI records) requested 30 days to consider the request to release the beds. It was also at this point that both the Middletown County Prosecutor, and the Chief Probation Officer of the Middletown County Adult Probation Department, offered to release all of their offender arrest records for use in this research project. Shortly thereafter, the Superintendent of the Midwest State Police also agreed to cooperate as well. Consequently, four (4) different sources of arrest data were ultimately secured for this research project: FBI records; Middletown County Adult Probation records; records maintained by the Middletown County Prosecutor's Office; and Midwest State Police arrest records.

One objective of this research effort was to establish the rate of recidivism among United Center releasees, and test the claim that withholding offenders from a prison experience by placing them in a community corrections facility, would in fact reduce recidivism as compared to prison releasees. This comparison can only be made at this time with national data on the recidivism rates for prison releasees, as this study did not include a comparison group of similar offenders who were sent to prison or jail, instead of to the United Center. This must be recognized as a significant weakness in the present analysis, and one that must be addressed in the future. This is a problem, however, that is not unique to this study alone. Indeed, a review of the literature with respect to evaluations of community half-way houses like the United Center, reveals a significant lack of research in this area of community corrections.
The effectiveness of the United Center treatment program may be assessed by testing offender background, and treatment variables for their relationship to recidivism (postrelease arrest) as indicated by a statistically significant index of association. In this case, a one-sample chi-square was used to discover which variables were significantly related to high or low rates of recidivism within three (3) years of release from the United Center. Successful and unsuccessful groups can be compared for significant independent variables influencing success and/or failure (i.e., type of treatment program participation, employment history, educational background, vocational training, etc.). This will identify not only the types of offenders most likely to recidivate, but those offenders most likely to succeed or fail within the United Center's treatment program as well. Such analysis raises questions of policy for setting criteria for determining eligibility for placement at United Center. Specifically, it will help to answer questions such as, what are the unique characteristics of the offenders who succeed and who fail in the United Center program; and, What treatment elements are related to success or failure in the program? The answer to such questions should help to determine whether the United Center can be made more effective in the treatment of offenders, and provide the basis for specific program recommendations in that regard.

The results of this study are based on a 335 case population of all offenders released from the United Center since 1982. Postrelease arrest information was gathered from four (4) different
sources (i.e., the FBI, the Middletown County Prosecutor’s Office, the Middletown County Adult Probation Department, and the Midwest State Police Department) which allowed cross-checks of all identifiable arrests. Consequently, there is a great deal of confidence in the accuracy of the post-release arrest data collected for this study. Realizing that official arrest data is problematic at best, it is believed that in this case, no better job could have been done in following up on post-release criminal activity.

Data collection began in the spring of 1993, and was completed in September of 1994. For each case, detailed data were collected from the United Center offender files on prior criminal and juvenile history; the instant offense for which the offender was sentenced; sociodemographic items; period of residence at the center; center conduct; participation in treatment programs; and employment and educational activities. The data collection instrument included 140 different items. Its design was determined by the type of information the Center maintained, and the organization of the files themselves. Consequently, the order in which the items appear on the research instrument, was determined largely by the order in which each piece of information appeared in the files.

Many of the variables, however, such as juvenile arrests and incarcerations, age at time of first felony conviction, type of first felony offense, and involvement in treatment programs, were selected because they are consistently found in the research literature to be associated with recidivism (See section III above).
A United Center employee (the executive director's secretary, who knew the files better than anyone else) coded each data sheet to item #97. The coded sheets were then forwarded to the Midwest Department of Corrections in Middletown, Midwest, to be matched with FBI arrest records by staff members in the Research and Planning Division. The code sheets were then returned to the principal investigator who coded items 97 through 140. Although this process took an enormous amount of time (with essentially only two people coding all the data) it was believed to be necessary in order to ensure that the data were coded in a consistent manner. The FBI rap-sheets were cross-checked with probation department, prosecutor, and state police rap-sheets. Reliability checks were routinely conducted, by returning to the case files to verify the accuracy of the coding process.

Once all the data sheets were coded, the information was entered into the SPSS computer program. Reliability checks were also conducted during this stage of data collection.

This study used one (1) measure of recidivism (i.e., arrest within 36 months of release from United Center). All releasees had been discharged from the United Center for at least 12 months as of July 1st, 1994. Arrest is the most frequently used measure of post-correctional performance, and program effectiveness (Austin, 1986; Haas & Alpert, 1991; Petersilia, 1985; Vito, 1986; Wright, 1994). Consequently, in coding each offender's criminal history, each post-release arrest was recorded. This created a file of arrest events.
occurring both before and after the period of treatment in question.

The data on the rap-sheets for each of the 335 offenders was coded according to date of arrest, type of crime, number of charges, disposition, and length of incarceration (coded as any reimmprisonment of sixty (60) days or more). In total, the 335 cases produced 2,856 total charges reflecting both pre- and postrelease offenses. Together with the information collected from the United Center files, the data collected from the rap-sheets formed a complete record of each offender's entire criminal history, social characteristics, and imprisonment records.

A spread sheet was developed in order to enter the date of first release from United Center, and the date of the first post-release arrest. This provided the exact number of days between release and rearrest. Any identifiable arrest within 1,095 days (3 years) of release was recorded. Computation of frequencies and percentages produced the postrelease arrest rate as well as profiles of offenders most likely to be rearrested, and most likely to remain arrest free following release from the United Center. Means were computed on variables such as age, length of sentence, and number of pre- and postrelease offenses. Because there were only ten (10) Hispanics in the total population of 335 offenders, it did not appear necessary to include them as a separate category in the analyses of the data.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

Postrelease Arrests

As of July 1st, 1994, of the 335 offenders who have been discharged from the United Center since it opened in 1982, 196 (58.5%) had been rearrested at least once. This statistic is based on examination of four (4) different sources of arrest data on the offender population studied (i.e., FBI records; the County Adult Probation Department records; Middletown County Prosecutor records; and Midwest State Police arrest records). All records were cross-checked against one another to eliminate duplicate entries, and to ensure that every clear indication of an arrest was counted.

The most common offenses for which United Center releasees were re-arrested include, theft (8.7%), battery (6.9%), DUI (4.2%), driving while suspended as a habitual traffic violator (3.6%), weapons offenses, and criminal recklessness (both 2.7%).

Forty-two percent of the total population were rearrested the first time for a single, non-violent (45.0%), Class D felony (16.7%) offense. For 19.4% of the total population, this first arrest resulted in a felony conviction; for 15.8% in a misdemeanor conviction; and for 23.2% there was not enough information available to determine disposition. For 8.1% of the population, this first arrest offense resulted in a jail term of 60 days or more, and for
20.6% it resulted in a prison term of 60 days or more. Sentences received for these first arrests ranged from 1 to 6 months (5.3%); 7 to 12 months (5.9%); 13 to 24 months (4.4%); 25 to 48 months (7.1%); and 60 to 240 months (5.6%). A very small proportion of offenders (9.0%) were convicted of a second, lesser included felony as a consequence of the first postrelease arrest. The same proportion received a jail or prison sentence for this lesser included offense.

Excluding the first postrelease arrest offense, a significant number of offenders (31.0%) were charged with additional offenses which resulted in felony or misdemeanor convictions and a prison or jail sentence of 60 days or more. Among these offenders (N = 104), 95.1% had between 1 and 5 additional offenses, and 4.8% had between 6 and 8 additional offenses which resulted in convictions and prison or jail terms. Seventy-two percent of these additional offenses were for non-violent offenses, while 27.8% were for violent crimes.

Including the first postrelease arrest, a significant number of offenders (54.6%) had been arrested 1 to 5 times following release from the United Center. Four percent were arrested between 6 and 11 times. Regardless of disposition, 48.3% of all offenders were charged with between 1 and 5 postrelease offenses; 8.0% were charged with 6 to 10 offenses; and 2.0% with 11 to 22 offenses.

Rearrests

Of the 335 offenders placed at the United Center over the last
14 years, 56 were sentenced for Class B-felonies. It could be argued that these offenders were inappropriately placed at the United Center, and as noted previously, this was one of the issues of special concern to the current Executive Director of the United Center.

The rearrest rate within three (3) years of release, for the entire population, was 44.7%. This statistic includes all the B-felons. When the B-felons are removed, the rearrest rate increases to 48.6% within three (3) years of release. When only the rearrested B-felons are removed from the data set the recidivism rate falls to 42.4%. And finally, looking at the United Center in the most favorable light, with only the rearrested B-felons removed, and excluding fifteen (15) arrests which were either dismissed or could not be verified, the rearrest rate is 36.7% within three (3) years of release. This is probably a more accurate measure of the United Center’s effect on offender recidivism as measured in terms of rearrest. It is clear, however, that the B-felons have had a significant impact on the United Center’s rearrest statistics.

Probation Violations

Eight percent of the offender population had their probation revoked for technical violations following release from United Center. Unfortunately probation department records did not provide enough information to determine the nature of the violation. It was clear, however, that in all 26 cases there was no arrest made for a new offense.
Background Characteristics of the Rearrestees

In almost every respect, rearrestees are similar to the typical United Center resident at time of instant offense/admission to the United Center. This is not surprising given these are the characteristics of the majority of offenders who have been residents at the United Center since its establishment in 1982.

The typical United Center resident/rearrestee is a single, white male, between 18 and 24 years of age with no dependent children. He is unemployed, without major job skills, has an 11th grade education, and has never served in the military. He is typically from the west side of Middletown, and lives with his parents or other relatives.

He has a juvenile offense record, having been referred to the juvenile authorities for the first time when he was between the ages of 11 and 14 for a property offense. In total, he has between 1 and 5 juvenile referrals on his record (counted regardless of disposition), no record of any juvenile probation/alternative program failures, and has never been committed to a juvenile facility or detention center for 30 days or more.

As an adult, he was arrested for the first time (excluding the instant offense) when he was between 18 and 24 years of age, for a non-violent, misdemeanor offense. He typically has between 1 and 5 recorded offenses (regardless of disposition, and excluding the instant offense) as an adult, and has never been convicted of a felony (excluding the instant offense). He has never been on probation.
as an adult, nor has he ever been incarcerated in jail or prison for 60 days or more as an adult.

As for the instant offense for which he was placed at the United Center, the typical resident/rearrestee is most commonly convicted of a single, non-violent, Class D felony (i.e., burglary is the most common offense). He was represented by a public defender on the instant offense, and was released on bond established between $100.00 and $500.00. For the instant offense the typical resident/rearrestee received a one (1) to two (2) year sentence, and no jail time credit.

The typical resident/rearrestee has a history of alcohol abuse, however, he was not under the influence of alcohol at the time of the instant offense. And finally, he has no documented history of mental illness.

Treatment Characteristics of the Rearrestees

Low rates of participation in treatment activities are observed for most of the rearrestees. Low levels of participation among rearrestees were found on 14 (60.0%) of the 23 United Center treatment variables identified in this study. Indeed, some of the highest rearrest rates are observed among offenders who did not participate in these activities.

Background Characteristics of High Rearrest-Rate Offenders

At the time of instant offense/admission to the United Center,
the high-risk offender is young (between 17 and 20 years of age),
black, single, and has no dependent children. He is unemployed, has
no job skills, and no more than 11 years of formal education. He
has never served in the military (if so, he received a dishonor­able
discharge), and lives on the northeast side of Middletown (a pre­dominantly low-income, African-American neighborhood), with his par­ents or other relatives.

As a juvenile he was arrested for the first time when he was
between the ages of 11 and 14, for a drug or alcohol related of­fense, and has between 16 and 31 documented juvenile referrals (re­gardless of disposition). Furthermore, he has a record of one (1)
or two (2) juvenile probation/alternative program failures, and was
committed to a juvenile correctional facility or detention center
for more than 30 days.

As an adult he was arrested for the first time (excluding the
instant offense and regardless of disposition) when he was between
18 and 24 years of age, for a violent, Class C felony offense. He
has between 1 and 5 documented offenses (excluding the instant of­fense and regardless of disposition), as an adult, however, he has
no prior felony convictions, probation/alternative program failures,
or incarcerations as an adult.

High rearrest rates (60% or more rearrested) were found among
offenders sent to the United Center on single, Class D felony con­victions for offenses such as arson, burglary, weapons possession,
theft, robbery, possession of stolen property, auto theft, criminal
recklessness, criminal confinement, and incest. Offenders represented by a public defender, who received sentences ranging from one (1) to two (2) years, and who received no jail time credit on the instant offense were rearrested at very high rates, as were offenders who were already on probation at the time of instant offense/admission to United Center.

High rearrest-rate offenders had documented histories of drug, and/or alcohol abuse at the time of instant offense/admission to United Center, and were under the influence of alcohol or a controlled substance at the time of the instant offense. And finally, high rearrest-rate offenders also had a documented history of mental illness at the time of instant offense/admission to the United Center.

**Treatment Characteristics of High Rearrest-Rate Offenders**

High rearrest rates are observed for offenders with low rates of participation in treatment programs during their stay at the United Center. This relationship holds with respect to traditional treatment programs such as counseling, as well as with employment, education, and court ordered programs. The difference in the rearrest rates between those who participated in treatment activities while at the United Center and those who did not, is rather striking. Indeed, on all twenty-three (23) United Center treatment variables, the rearrest rate among non-participants was above 50%, and with respect to twelve (52.1%) of those treatment variables, the rearrest rate among non-participants was 60% or above.
Background Characteristics of Low Rearrest-Rate Offenders

Only 5.3% of the United Center population were between 41 and 55 years of age at time of instant offense/admission to the United Center. Similarly, only 9.6% of the population were employed as skilled tradesmen or professionals at the time of instant offense/admission to the United Center. Only 8.0% had more than a high school diploma. However, 35.2% had a full-time job, and 16.4% had a high school diploma at the time of instant offense/admission to the United Center. Nine percent of the population received a honor­able discharge from military service, and 31.0% had their own home or apartment at the time of the instant offense. Significantly, 41.2% of the total population did not have a juvenile offense re­cord, and 32.5% did not have an adult arrest record at the time of instant offense/admission to the United Center. Clearly there is a population of low-risk offenders in the Middletown County area who are very good candidates for community-based treatment, and the United Center would do well to screen for such offenders.

Treatment Characteristics of Low Rearrest-Rate Offenders

In contrast to the rearrestees, and the high rearrest-rate offenders, low-rearrest rate offenders participated in treatment programs at higher rates, particularly with respect to court ordered programs such as restitution, and community service. However, it is likely that the ability to pay fines, court costs, and make regular fair share payments was associated with the social-demographic,
employment, and educational characteristics of the low-risk offenders (i.e., they were older, married, had dependent children, a high school diploma, and significant work histories). Participation in programs that require financial payments may also reflect the success of the United Center in reducing unemployment among Center residents.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics Related to Postrelease Arrest

Cross tabulations were done on personal background characteristics in order to determine if any relationship existed between such variables and postrelease arrest.

Age at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

There was a significant relationship between age at time of instant offense, and arrest following release from the United Center ($\chi^2 = 14.02108; p < .001$). Offenders under the age of 18 at the time of the instant offense, were four (4) times more likely to be rearrested than offenders who were 46 years of age or older at the time of the instant offense (See Table 1). Furthermore, among all offenders who were under the age of 18 at the time of the instant offense, three (3) times as many were rearrested as were not rearrested. On the other hand, among all offenders who were 46 years of age or older at the time of the instant offense, five (5) times as many were not rearrested as were rearrested following release from United Center. This finding is consistent with much of the research.
on recidivism which suggests that younger offenders (14 to 24 years of age) are more likely to be rearrested than their older counterparts (over 40 years of age). Although these results appear rather dramatic, the relationship between age at time of instant offense and postrelease arrest for this population of offenders was rather weak (gamma = .37708). Consequently, age at time of instant offense may not be regarded as the primary determinant of postrelease arrest among United Center releasees.

Table 1
Cross Tabulation of Age at Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>75.0 (12)</td>
<td>25.4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>49.1 (82)</td>
<td>50.8 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>33.3 (26)</td>
<td>66.6 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-46</td>
<td>33.3 (5)</td>
<td>66.6 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 and Over</td>
<td>16.6 (1)</td>
<td>83.3 (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$\chi^2 = 14.02108$
$p = .00723$
$\gamma = .37708$

Race by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between race of offender and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 3.29531; p = .06948$)
(See Table 2). The postrelease arrest rate for African-Americans was relatively close to that of white offenders (51.3% vs. 40.3%).

Table 2
Cross Tabulation of Race by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
\(x^2 = 3.29531\)
\(p = .06948\)
gamma = -.21887

Marital Status at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

Postrelease arrest did not vary by marital status of the offender at time of instant offense. Except for offenders who were separated at the time of the instant offense, the difference in the rearrest rate across categories was not remarkable. The relationship between marital status and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant \((x^2 = 4.02156; p = .25915)\) (See Table 3).

Dependent Children at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

Post-release arrest did not vary with respect to whether or not an offender had dependent children to support at the time of the instant offense; the relationship between the two variables was
not statistically significant ($x^2 = 2.82390; \ p = .09287$) (See Table 4).

### Table 3

**Cross Tabulation of Marital Status by Postrelease Arrest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Arrested</th>
<th>Not Arrested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single % (n)</td>
<td>46.6 (99)</td>
<td>53.3 (113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married % (n)</td>
<td>36.8 (14)</td>
<td>63.1 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced % (n)</td>
<td>48.0 (12)</td>
<td>52.0 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated % (n)</td>
<td>14.2 (1)</td>
<td>85.7 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$
$x^2 = 4.02156$
$p = .25915$
gamma = .15293

### Table 4

**Cross Tabulation of Dependent Children by Postrelease Arrest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Children % (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested 39.0 (48)</td>
<td>49.0 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested 60.9 (75)</td>
<td>50.9 (81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$
$x^2 = 2.82390$
$p = .09287$
gamma = -.20148

**Type of Employment Held at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest**

Postrelease arrest did not vary by type of employment held at
time of instant offense, with the arrest rate remaining within a fifteen percentile range across all employment categories. Offenders employed full-time at the time of the instant offense were rearrested at a lower rate than offenders who were unemployed at the time of the instant offense (35.7% vs. 51.4%). However, the relationship between type of employment and rearrest was not statistically significant ($x^2 = 6.11890; p = .10597$) (See Table 5).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>35.7 (39)</td>
<td>44.8 (13)</td>
<td>51.4 (72)</td>
<td>50.0 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>64.2 (70)</td>
<td>55.1 (16)</td>
<td>48.5 (68)</td>
<td>50.0 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$
$x^2 = 6.11890$
$p = .10597$
$\text{gamma} = -.25402$

Status of Employment Held at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

There was no more than a five percentile difference in terms of the rearrest rate across the four categories of employment (i.e., unskilled, service sector, skilled, professional, unemployed). Unemployed offenders had the highest rearrest rate (51.0%), while pro-
professional workers had the lowest rearrest rate (33.3%). However, the relationship between status of employment at time of instant offense and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($x^2 = 4.71842; p = .31743$) (See Table 6).

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>38.5 (32)</td>
<td>61.4 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Sector</td>
<td>37.9 (11)</td>
<td>62.0 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>39.1 (9)</td>
<td>60.8 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>33.3 (2)</td>
<td>66.6 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>51.0 (72)</td>
<td>48.9 (69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$
$x^2 = 4.71842$
$p = .31743$
$\gamma = -.19648$

Length of time employed at current or most recent job at time of instant offense was significantly related to postrelease arrest ($x^2 = 16.93924; p < .001$) (See Table 7). While this relationship was significant, it was also weak ($\gamma = .06969$), indicating that other variables were involved in postrelease arrest among United
Center releasees. Offenders employed for only one (1) to three (3) months were almost three times more likely to be rearrested than offenders who were employed for six (6) years or more at the time of the instant offense (54.4% vs. 18.7%). Surprisingly, offenders who had worked from one (1) to three (3) months at their current or most recent job, were more likely to be rearrested than offenders who were unemployed at the time of the instant offense (54.4%, and 49.0% respectively). Based on these data it would appear that type and status of employment are not as important as duration of employment in terms of postrelease arrest.

Table 7
Cross Tabulation of Length of Time (Months) Employed at Current or Most Recent Job at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months Employed</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>54.4 (49)</td>
<td>45.5 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>23.5 (4)</td>
<td>76.4 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>45.8 (11)</td>
<td>54.1 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-36</td>
<td>38.8 (7)</td>
<td>61.1 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-72</td>
<td>17.6 (3)</td>
<td>82.3 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 +</td>
<td>18.7 (3)</td>
<td>81.2 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>49.0 (49)</td>
<td>51.0 (51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x² = 16.93924
p = .00951
gamma = .06969

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Although the rearrest rate decreased as educational level increased, the relationship between educational level at time of instant offense, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 6.54416; p = .36506$) (See Table 8).

### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Education</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.6 (7)</td>
<td>53.3 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.6 (21)</td>
<td>54.3 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>51.0 (25)</td>
<td>48.9 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>51.9 (40)</td>
<td>48.0 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.8 (24)</td>
<td>64.1 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>30.4 (7)</td>
<td>69.5 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>40.0 (2)</td>
<td>60.0 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282  \hspace{1cm} \chi^2 = 6.54416  \hspace{1cm} p = .36506  \hspace{1cm} \gamma = .14244

There was less than a 17% difference between the rearrest rate for offenders with no more than eight (8) years of formal education, and offenders with more than a high school education (46.6% and 30.4% respectively).
Location of Residence Within the City at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

Eighty-five percent of the United Center population lived within the city of Middletown at the time of the instant offense. Offenders who were living on the Northwest-side of Middletown at the time of the instant offense were arrested at the highest rate, while offenders living on the Northeast-side were rearrested at the lowest rate (60.9% vs. 33.3%) (See Table 9).

Table 9

Cross Tabulation of Location of Residence Within the City at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Residence</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North-side</td>
<td>36.6 (11)</td>
<td>63.3 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-side</td>
<td>54.4 (18)</td>
<td>45.4 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-side</td>
<td>53.3 (8)</td>
<td>46.6 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-side</td>
<td>47.0 (32)</td>
<td>52.9 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast-side</td>
<td>33.3 (3)</td>
<td>66.6 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest-side</td>
<td>60.9 (25)</td>
<td>39.0 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast-side</td>
<td>35.5 (10)</td>
<td>64.2 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest-side</td>
<td>37.5 (6)</td>
<td>62.5 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>30.9 (13)</td>
<td>69.0 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x2 = 12.00900
p = .15080
gamma = .10535
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The Northwest-side of Middletown in a high crime area of the city, occupied primarily by the minority poor. The Northeast-side on the other hand, is primarily occupied by white, upper-middle to high-income residents. While the difference in the rearrest rate between these two groups was rather dramatic (offenders from the Northwest-side of town were rearrested at almost twice the rate of offenders from the Northeast-side), rearrest did not vary significantly by the geographic location of offenders within the city at the time of the instant offense ($\chi^2 = 12.00900; p = .15080$).

Place of Residence at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

Although offenders who owned a home or lived in their own apartment at the time of the instant offense were rearrested at a substantially lower rate than offenders who were living with their parents/relatives, or friends at the time of the instant offense (37.8% vs. 50.0% and 50.0% respectively), the relationship between place of residence and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 3.90466; p = .27194$) (See Table 10).

History of Alcohol Abuse at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between alcohol abuse and rearrest was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = .08055; p = .77656$) (See Table 11). In terms of postrelease arrest, there was little difference between offenders who had a history of alcohol abuse at the time of the
instant offense, and those who did not (45.3% vs. 43.6%).

Table 10
Cross Tabulation of Place of Residence at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Home/Apt.</td>
<td>37.8 (31)</td>
<td>62.1 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Relatives</td>
<td>50.0 (70)</td>
<td>50.0 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>50.0 (7)</td>
<td>50.0 &lt;7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>39.1 (18)</td>
<td>60.8 (28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x^2 = 3.90466
p = .27194
gamma = -.06497

Table 11
Cross Tabulation of History of Alcohol Abuse at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Abuse</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>45.3 (74)</td>
<td>43.6 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>54.6 (89)</td>
<td>56.3 (67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x^2 = .08055
p = .77656
gamma = .03443
Moreover, whether or not an offender was under the influence of alcohol at the time of the instant offense, was not significantly related to postrelease arrest ($\chi^2 = .22911; p = .63218$). In fact, offenders who were under the influence of alcohol at the time of the instant offense, were rearrested at a slightly lower rate than offenders who were not under the influence of alcohol at the time of the instant offense (42.7% vs. 45.6%).

**History of Substance Abuse at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest**

The relationship between history of substance abuse at time of instant offense, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = .09777; p = .75452$) (See Table 12). The difference between offenders with a history of substance abuse, and those without, in terms of rearrest was less than 2.0%. In fact, offenders with a history of substance abuse were rearrested at a slightly lower rate than offenders without this background characteristic (43.6% vs. 45.5%).

And, as was found in the case of alcohol, whether or not an offender was under the influence of a controlled substance at the time of the instant offense, was not significantly related to postrelease arrest ($\chi^2 = .36608; p = .54515$). In fact, offenders who were under the influence of a controlled substance at the time of the instant offense, were rearrested at a slightly lower rate than offenders who were not under the influence (39.2% vs. 45.2%).
Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance Abuse</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>43.6 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>56.3 (71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282  
x² = .09777  
p = .75452  
gamma = -.03767

History of Mental Illness at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

Offenders with a history of mental health problems at the time of the instant offense were rearrested at a slightly higher rate than offenders without this characteristic (50.0% vs. 44.0%). However, the relationship between mental illness and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant (x² = .38429; p = .53532) (See Table 13).

Military Discharge Status by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between military service and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant (x² = 2.68856; p = .44217) (See Table 14). Although offenders dishonorably discharged from the military were rearrested at a higher rate compared to offenders who were either honorably discharged, or never served in the military
(66.6% vs. 33.3% and 45.6% respectively), it apparently made little overall difference in terms of postrelease arrest. The small number of offenders within the United Center population who served in the military (n = 54) may have contributed to this particular finding.

Table 13
Cross Tabulation of History of Mental Illness at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Illness History</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>50.0 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>50.0 (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
\( \chi^2 = .38429 \)
\( p = .53532 \)
\( \gamma = .11905 \)

Table 14
Cross Tabulation of Military Discharge Status by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorable</th>
<th>Dishonorable</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>33.3 (9)</td>
<td>66.6 (4)</td>
<td>42.8 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>66.6 (18)</td>
<td>33.3 (2)</td>
<td>57.1 (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
\( \chi^2 = 2.68856 \)
\( p = .44217 \)
\( \gamma = -.10460 \)
Only two (2) socio-demographic variables were significantly related to postrelease arrest among the population of United Center releasees: age at time of instant offense; and number of months employed at current or most recent job at the time of the instant offense. While both variables were significantly related to postrelease arrest, the relationship in both cases was weak. This indicates that other factors are involved in postrelease arrest among United Center releasees. However, both findings are what one would expect to see given the research literature on recidivism cited earlier in this report.

**Juvenile Offense History and Postrelease Arrest**

Some of the most significant relationships were those found between postrelease arrest and juvenile offense history. In fact, all six (6) of the juvenile offense variables were statistically significant.

**Juvenile Offense Record by Postrelease Arrest**

There was a statistically significant relationship between a record of juvenile delinquency, and postrelease arrest ($\chi^2 = 28.23483; p > .001$) (See Table 15). Offenders with a juvenile offense record were more than twice as likely to be rearrested as offenders without a juvenile record (57.4% vs. 26.0%). This finding is consistent with the research on offender recidivism, which suggests that a juvenile offense record is a strong predictor of adult
criminal activity. However, while the relationship was statistically significant, it was only of moderate strength ($\gamma = .59444$), indicating that a juvenile offense record was not the primary determinant of postrelease arrest for this population of offenders.

Table 15
Cross Tabulation of Juvenile Offense History by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Juvenile Record</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arreﬆed</td>
<td>57.4 (96)</td>
<td>26.0 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arreﬆed</td>
<td>42.1 (70)</td>
<td>74.1 (86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$
$x^2 = 28.23483$
$p = .00000$
$\gamma = .59444$

Age at Time of First Juvenile Referral by Postrelease Arrest

Age at time of first juvenile referral was significantly related to postrelease arrest ($x^2 = 28.83880; p > .001$) (see Table 16). Postrelease arrest varies in the direction one would expect; the younger an offender was at the time of his first juvenile referral, the more likely he was to be rearrested. Offenders who were between seven (7) and ten (10) years of age at the time of their first referral to juvenile authorities, were more than twice as likely to be rearrested as offenders who had never been referred. The rearrest rate across the three age categories, decreases as age
increases. Although this finding was statistically significant, it was only of moderate strength (gamma = .46723), which indicates that other factors were involved other than age at time of first juvenile referral. This finding is consistent with the research literature on recidivism cited in this report which indicates that the younger an individual is at the time of his or her first contact with the juvenile justice system, the more likely he or she is to be involved with both the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems in the future.

Table 16
Cross Tabulation of Age at Time of First Juvenile Referral (Regardless of Disposition) by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>63.6 (7)</td>
<td>36.3 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>59.7 (52)</td>
<td>40.2 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>54.4 (37)</td>
<td>44.9 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>25.8 (30)</td>
<td>74.7 (86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x2 = 28.83880
p = .00000
gamma = .46723

Offense Category of First Juvenile Referral by Postrelease Arrest

Postrelease arrest varied substantially across all six (6) offense categories with status offenders rearrested at the highest
Offenders without a juvenile offense record were rearrested at the lowest rate (44.4%). The relationship between offense category and postrelease arrest was statistically significant ($x^2 = 32.28428; p > .001$), however, it was only of moderate strength ($\gamma = .41559$), indicating that factors other than type of first juvenile referral were involved in postrelease arrest for this population of offenders (See Table 17). Status offenders were rearrested at a higher rate than both violent and property offenders (76.1% vs. 53.3%, and 55.6% respectively). This finding suggests that non-intervention might prove to be more appropriate for truants, runaways, and otherwise ungovernable children than processing through the formal juvenile justice system.

Table 17

Cross Tabulation of Offense Category of First Juvenile Offense (Regardless of Disposition) by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>53.3 (8)</td>
<td>46.6 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>55.6 (64)</td>
<td>44.3 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>76.1 (16)</td>
<td>23.8 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/Alcohol</td>
<td>66.6 (4)</td>
<td>33.3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>44.4 (4)</td>
<td>55.5 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>25.8 (30)</td>
<td>74.1 (86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$

$x^2 = 32.28428$

$p = .00001$

$\gamma = .41559$
Total number of juvenile referrals was significantly related to postrelease arrest in the direction one might expect: offenders with one (1) to four (4) juvenile referrals were almost twice as likely to be rearrested as offenders without a juvenile offense record (50.0% vs. 25.8%). Offenders with ten to fourteen juvenile referrals were more than three times as likely to be rearrested as offenders without a history of juvenile delinquency (81.4% vs. 25.8%). Although the relationship between number of juvenile referrals and postrelease arrest was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 42.37628; p = .00000$), it was also weak ($\gamma = .29892$) (see Table 18).

Table 18
Cross Tabulation of Total Juvenile Referrals (Regardless of Disposition) by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Referrals</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>50.0 (36)</td>
<td>50.0 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>47.9 (23)</td>
<td>52.0 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>81.4 (22)</td>
<td>18.5 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>73.3 (11)</td>
<td>26.6 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-31</td>
<td>100.0 (4)</td>
<td>00.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>25.8 (30)</td>
<td>74.1 (86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$

$\chi^2 = 42.37628$

$p = .00000$

$\gamma = .29892$
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Number of Juvenile Probation/Alternative Program Failures by Postrelease Arrest

There was a significant relationship between number of juvenile probation/alternative program failures, and postrelease arrest ($x^2 = 14.01942; p > .001$). However, while the relationship was significant, it was only of moderate strength ($\gamma = .51168$), which indicates that other factors contribute to the probability of postrelease arrest. Offenders with one to three failures were more likely to be rearrested than offenders without a record of probation/alternative program failure (65.9% vs. 39.6%) (see Table 19).

Table 19

Cross Tabulation of Number of Juvenile Probation/Alternative Program Failures by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-8</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>65.9 (29)</td>
<td>83.3 (5)</td>
<td>39.6 (92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>34.0 (15)</td>
<td>16.6 (1)</td>
<td>60.3 (140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$
$x^2 = 14.01942$
$p = .00090$
$\gamma = .51168$

Offenders with four to eight failures were more than twice as likely to be rearrested as offenders without a record of such failure (83.3% vs. 39.6%). This finding was consistent with earlier ones which suggested that the more contact an offender had with the
criminal justice system as a juvenile, the more likely he was to be arrested following release from United Center (See Table 18 above).

Placement in a Juvenile Correctional, Residential Treatment, or Detention Facility for More Than 30 Days by Postrelease Arrest

Offenders who were incarcerated as juveniles were significantly more likely than those who were not, to be rearrested following release from United Center ($x^2 = 9.93253; p = .001$) (See Table 20).

Table 20
Cross Tabulation of Placement in a Juvenile Correctional, Residential Treatment, or Detention Facility for More Than 30 Days by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Juvenile Placement</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>63.6 (35)</td>
<td>40.0 (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>36.3 (20)</td>
<td>59.9 (136)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$
$x^2 = 9.93253$
$p = .00162$
$\gamma = .44681$

Indeed, 63.6% of offenders incarcerated as juveniles were rearrested, while only 40.0% of offenders who were not, were rearrested. However, while the relationship between juvenile incarceration and postrelease arrest was statistically significant it was only of moderate strength ($\gamma = .44681$). This finding indicates that juvenile incarceration alone was not the primary determinate of postre-
lease arrest. It also suggests that criminal justice officials should use incarceration as a response to juvenile delinquency as a last resort.

Although statistically significant, most of the juvenile offense variables were only moderately related to postrelease arrest. In combination, however, it would seem reasonable to conclude that juvenile delinquency was an important predictor of postrelease arrest among the offenders studied in this research project. This conclusion is not without major support in the research literature on recidivism, which consistently suggests that delinquent activity is strongly related to adult criminality.

Adult Criminal Offense History by Postrelease Arrest

To determine the importance of past adult criminal behavior (excluding the instant offense) a number of criminal history variables were tested for their independent effects on postrelease arrest.

Age at Time of First Criminal Arrest/Offense (Regardless of Disposition and Excluding the Instant Offense) by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between age at time of first adult arrest/offense and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 2.26067; p = .68794$). As can be seen from Table 21, there was little difference between the postrelease arrest rate for offenders who were between the ages of 18 and 24 at the time of their first adult arrest/offense, and offenders who had never been arrested as
adults prior to the instant offense (43.6 vs. 48.0%).

Table 21

Cross Tabulation of Age at Time of First Criminal Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>43.6 (72)</td>
<td>56.3 (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>30.0 (3)</td>
<td>70.0 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>50.0 (1)</td>
<td>50.0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46+</td>
<td>00.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>48.0 (50)</td>
<td>51.9 (54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x2 = 2.26067
p = .68794
gamma = .12424

Crime Class of First Adult Arrest/Offense (Regardless of Disposition and Excluding the Instant Offense) by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between crime class of first adult arrest/offense, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant (x2 = .66659; p = .98475) (See Table 22). Postrelease arrest did not vary by the crime class charged, remaining within a thirteen (13) percentile range of the overall average for all crime classes.

Offense Category of First Adult Arrest/Offense (Regardless of Disposition and Excluding the Instant Offense) by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between offense category of first adult arrest/offense, and postrelease arrest was not statistically signi-
The lowest rearrest rate was found for violent offenders. In fact, they were rearrested at a lower rate than offenders who had no criminal history other than the instant offense (26.6% vs. 44.1%). Nevertheless, these findings suggest that type of first adult arrest offense had little or no impact on postrelease arrest, at least for this population of offenders.

Number of Prior Criminal Charges (Regardless of Disposition and Excluding the Instant Offense) by Postrelease Arrest

In order to measure criminal involvement, all officially recorded offenses were counted (regardless of disposition) rather than total arrests. This was done as in most cases individual arrests are for multiple charges, and it may be misleading to measure criminal involvement in terms of individual arrests alone. As can be seen in Table 24, the rearrest rate increases as the number of prior offenses increases. Offenders without prior criminal charges were rearrested at the lowest rate, and those with thirty-one or more offenses, at the highest rate (43.7% vs. 66.6%). This is perhaps what one would expect, however, number of prior offenses was not significantly related to postrelease arrest ($x^2 = 3.36953; p = .49799$) (See Table 24).

Number and Type of Prior Felony Convictions by Postrelease Arrest

Prior conviction for a felony offense was not significantly related to postrelease arrest ($x^2 = 2.16681; p = .14102$, Table 25.)
### Table 22
Cross Tabulation of Crime Class of First Adult Arrest/Offense (Regardless of Disposition and Excluding the Instant Offense) by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Class</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Felony</td>
<td>50.0 (3)</td>
<td>50.0 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Felony</td>
<td>50.0 (3)</td>
<td>50.0 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Felony</td>
<td>37.5 (6)</td>
<td>62.5 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>43.5 (17)</td>
<td>56.4 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>46.0 (65)</td>
<td>53.9 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>43.2 (32)</td>
<td>56.7 (42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282  
χ² = .66659  
P = .98475  
Gamma = .00387

### Table 23
Cross Tabulation of Offense Category of First Adult Arrest/Offense (Regardless of Disposition and Excluding the Instant Offense) by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>26.6 (4)</td>
<td>73.3 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>50.0 (23)</td>
<td>50.0 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/Alcohol</td>
<td>37.0 (10)</td>
<td>62.9 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>46.7 (43)</td>
<td>53.2 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48.0 (12)</td>
<td>52.0 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 23--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>44.1 (34)</td>
<td>55.8 (43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 282 \]
\[ x^2 = 3.41186 \]
\[ \gamma = .63676 \]
\[ \text{gamma} = -.03081 \]

Table 24

Cross Tabulation of Number of Prior Criminal Charges (Regardless of Disposition and Excluding the Instant Offense) by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Charges</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>44.3 (67)</td>
<td>55.6 (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>37.5 (12)</td>
<td>62.5 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>61.5 (8)</td>
<td>38.4 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 +</td>
<td>66.6 (4)</td>
<td>33.3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>43.7 (35)</td>
<td>56.2 (45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 282 \]
\[ x^2 = 3.36953 \]
\[ \gamma = .49799 \]
\[ \text{gamma} = -.04743 \]

The rearrest rate for offenders with a prior felony conviction was only 11.2% higher than the rearrest rate for offenders without a prior conviction (53.8% vs. 42.6%).
Table 25
Cross Tabulation of Prior Felony Convictions by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Felony</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>53.8 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>46.1 (24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x² = 2.16681
p = .14102
gamma = -.22222

The relationship between type of prior felony conviction was not statistically significant (x² = 4.74545; p = .19141) (See Table 26).

Table 26
Cross Tabulation of Type of Prior Felony Conviction by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>57.1 (42)</td>
<td>50.0 (4)</td>
<td>00.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>42.8 (18)</td>
<td>50.0 (4)</td>
<td>100. (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x² = 4.74545
p = .19141
gamma = -.20153

Property offenders had the highest rearrest rate (57.1%), while
offenders without a prior felony conviction were rearrested at the lowest rate (42.6%). Only two (2) offenders had prior felony convictions for both a violent, and a non-violent offense; however, neither was rearrested.

Prior Probation/Alternative Program Failures as an Adult by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between prior probation/alternative program failure, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 1.68507; p = .19425$) (See Table 27). Offenders with a record of such failure were rearrested at a slightly higher rate than offenders without such a record (53.0% vs. 42.9%).

Table 27
Cross Tabulation of Prior Probation/Alternative Program Failures as an Adult by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Failure %</th>
<th>Not Applicable %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>53.0 (26)</td>
<td>42.9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>46.9 (23)</td>
<td>57.0 (133)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$\chi^2 = 1.68507$
p = .19425
gamma = .20111

Prior Incarceration in Jail or Prison for 60 Days or More as an Adult by Postrelease Arrest

Prior incarceration for 60 days or more as an adult was not
significantly related to postrelease arrest ($x^2 = 1.82708; p = .17647$) (See Table 28).

**Table 28**

Cross Tabulation of Prior Incarceration in Jail or Prison for 30 Days or More by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incarcerated</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>52.6 (30)</td>
<td>42.6 (96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>47.3 (27)</td>
<td>57.3 (129)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$

$x^2 = 1.82708$

$\gamma = .19777$

There was only a 10.0% difference in the postrelease arrest rate between offenders who had been incarcerated prior to admission to the United Center, and offenders who had never been incarcerated as adults (52.6% vs. 42.6%). This finding was somewhat surprising given the vast amount of evidence (reported earlier in this paper) which suggests that prisons and jails are major sources of crime. However, in the present case, 84.2% of the offenders with a prior incarceration were offenders who were not released on bond for the instant offense. And as mentioned earlier in this report, 76% of the United Center population had no prior felony convictions, and 82.3% were sent to the United Center on non-violent felony convictions. It could be argued that the incarcerative experiences of the United
Center population were not significantly related to postrelease arrest because they consisted of relatively short jail terms in connection with the instant offense.

**Probation Status at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest**

Offenders who were already on probation at the time of the instant offense, were significantly more likely to be arrested following release from United Center, than offenders who were not on probation at the time of the instant offense ($x^2 = 5.03572; p < .01$) (See Table 29).

**Table 29**

Cross Tabulation of Probation Status at Time of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On Probation</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>58.4 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>41.5 (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$
$x^2 = 5.03572$
$p = .02483$
$\gamma = .33056$

This is what one might expect given the evidence relative to criminal recidivism cited earlier in this report, which suggests that as one’s contact with the criminal justice system increases, so does the likelihood of continued involvement. However, while the rela-
relationship between probation status at time of instant offense and postrelease arrest was statistically significant, it was only weak to moderate in strength (gamma = .33056). Again this indicates that other variables were important in contributing to the likelihood of postrelease arrest among United Center releasees.

In contrast to the juvenile offense variables, only one (1) out of nine (9) adult criminal history variables was significantly related to postrelease arrest: probation status at time of instant offense which was weak to moderate in strength. This is perhaps attributable to the fact that most of the offender population did not have a significant adult criminal history. Indeed, 36.8% of the entire population had never been arrested as an adult prior to the instant offense. Among those who had been arrested, 94% were arrested for the first time for a Class D felony or less, and 92.6% were arrested for the first time for a non-violent property or drug offense. Only 18.4% had been convicted of a felony prior to the instant offense, and 85.7% of them were convicted of a non-violent offense.

Instant Offense Characteristics Related to Postrelease Arrest

A number of instant offense variables were tested to determine their independent effects on postrelease arrest.

Multiple Convictions for Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

Whether an offender was sent to United Center on a single
conviction or for multiple convictions, made no difference in terms of postrelease arrest ($x^2 = 2.82390; p = .09287$) (see Table 30).

There was little more than a 2.0% difference between the rearrest rate for offenders with multiple convictions, and those sent to the United Center on a single conviction.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multiple % (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>46.6 (21)</td>
<td>44.3 (105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>53.3 (24)</td>
<td>55.6 (132)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$

$x^2 = .08543$

$p = .77007$

$\gamma = .04762$

Crime Class of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

The largest difference in the rearrest rate was found between offenders convicted of a Class B felony for the instant offense, and offenders convicted of a Class D felony (32.6% vs. 52.0%). However, the relationship between crime class of instant offense, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($x^2 = 7.26417; p = .06394$) (see Table 31).
Table 31
Cross Tabulation of Crime Class of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Class</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Felony</td>
<td>32.6 (17)</td>
<td>67.3 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Felony</td>
<td>38.9 (30)</td>
<td>61.0 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Felony</td>
<td>52.0 (76)</td>
<td>47.9 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>42.8 (3)</td>
<td>57.1 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x² = 7.26417
p = .06394

Offense Category of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between offense category of instant offense, and postrelease arrest was statistically significant (x² = 11.3496; p = <.01) (See Table 32). However, while this relationship was significant, it was also weak (gamma = -.02162), which indicates there were other factors influencing postrelease arrest. Property offenders had the highest rearrest rate next to traffic offenders (53.2% vs. 41.6%). Personal or violent offenders had the lowest rearrest rate next to drug/alcohol offenders (30.0% vs. 32.4%). It is possible that because of their offense, violent offenders are held to a higher standard than other offenders when screened for placement at United Center.
Table 32
Cross Tabulation of Offense Category of Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>30.0 (15)</td>
<td>70.0 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>53.2 (82)</td>
<td>46.7 (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Alcohol</td>
<td>32.4 (12)</td>
<td>67.5 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>41.6 (10)</td>
<td>58.3 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41.1 (7)</td>
<td>58.8 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282  
χ² = 11.34996  
E = .02290  
gamma = -.02162

Offense Class of 2nd Offense of Conviction by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between crime class of 2nd offense of conviction and postrelease arrest was statistically significant (χ² = 10.86952; p = < .01) (See Table 33). Offenders convicted on a Class D felony as the 2nd offense of conviction (in addition to the instant offense), were significantly more likely to be rearrested than offenders convicted for any other offense class, or offenders without a second felony conviction (70.5% vs. 43.8%). While this relationship was significant, it was also weak (gamma = .06235). This indicates that other offender background, and offense characteristics influenced postrelease arrest.
Table 33
Cross Tabulation of Offense Class of 2nd Offense of Conviction by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Class</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Felony</td>
<td>00.0 (0)</td>
<td>100 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Felony</td>
<td>40.0 (4)</td>
<td>60.0 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Felony</td>
<td>70.5 (12)</td>
<td>29.4 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>53.8 (7)</td>
<td>46.1 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>43.8 (103)</td>
<td>56.1 (132)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = 282  
x² = 10.86952  
P = .02807  
Gamma = .06235

Category of 2nd Offense of Conviction by Postrelease Arrest

Offense category of 2nd offense of conviction was significantly related to postrelease arrest (x² = 10.86952; p = < .01) (See Table 34). Property offenders had a higher representation in terms of postrelease arrest than any other offense category; 76.4% were rearrested. Violent offenders had a much lower rearrest rate as did offenders who were convicted of a single charge on the instant offense (45.4% and 43.3% respectively). While this relationship was significant, it was also weak (gamma = .15536), suggesting again that other variables were involved in postrelease arrest among United Center releasees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>45.4 (5)</td>
<td>54.5 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>76.4 (13)</td>
<td>23.5 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/Alcohol</td>
<td>00.0 (0)</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>50.0 (4)</td>
<td>50.0 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40.0 (2)</td>
<td>60.0 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>43.3 (102)</td>
<td>56.5 (133)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282  
x2 = 12.09032  
\( p = .03357 \)  
gamma = .15536

**Type of Legal Counsel for Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest**

Although offenders represented by retained counsel for the instant offense were rearrested at a lower rate than offenders represented by a public defender (34.7% vs. 47.3%), the relationship between type of counsel and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant \( (x^2 = 3.81140; p = .14872) \) (See Table 35).

**Bond Release for Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest**

The relationship between bond release and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant \( (x^2 = .66216; p = .41580) \) (See...
Table 36. The difference in the arrest rate between offenders released on bond and offenders who did not bond out on the instant offense was less than 10.0% (43.5% vs. 50.0%).

Table 35
Cross Tabulation of Type of Legal Counsel for Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appointed % (n)</th>
<th>Retained % (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>47.3 (91)</td>
<td>34.7 (24)</td>
<td>52.3 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>52.6 (101)</td>
<td>65.2 (45)</td>
<td>47.6 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x^2 = 3.81140
e = .14872
gamma = .13100

Table 36
Cross Tabulation of Bond Release for Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Released on Bond % (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>43.5 (102)</td>
<td>50.0 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>56.4 (132)</td>
<td>50.0 (24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x^2 = .66216
e = .41580
gamma = -.12821
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Bond Amount for Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

Postrelease arrest did not vary significantly by amount of bond posted ($x^2 = 2.48965; p = .77805$) (See Table 37). Offenders released on their own recognizance were rearrested at the highest rate (62.5%), while offenders released on $\$2,100.00$ or more, were rearrested at the lowest rate (36.3%).

Table 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Amount</th>
<th>Arrested</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROR</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100-500</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>(76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600-1000</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1100-2000</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2100+</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$x^2 = 2.48965$
p = .77805
$\gamma = -.03115$

Length of Sentence for Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between length of sentence for the instant offense, and postrelease arrest was statistically significant ($x^2 =$
18.34080; $p < .001$) (See Table 38).

Table 38
Cross Tabulation of Length of Sentence (Months) for Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Sentence</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>48.9 (24)</td>
<td>51.0 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-24</td>
<td>52.1 (48)</td>
<td>47.8 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-36</td>
<td>42.8 (15)</td>
<td>57.1 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-48</td>
<td>70.0 (14)</td>
<td>30.0 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>20.5 (8)</td>
<td>79.4 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-72</td>
<td>34.6 (9)</td>
<td>65.3 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73+</td>
<td>38.0 (8)</td>
<td>61.9 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$x^2 = 18.34080$
$p = .00543$
gamma = .18792

Offenders with sentences ranging from three (3) to four (4) years, were more than three times as likely to be rearrested as offenders with sentences ranging from four (4) to five (5) years (70.0% vs. 20.5%). Offenders with less than a four (4) year sentence, were at least twice as likely to be rearrested as offenders with sentences ranging from four (4) to five (5) years. Offenders with sentences in excess of five (5) years were rearrested at somewhat lower rates, however, they were still more than 10.0% more likely to be rearrest-
ed than offenders with sentences of four to five years. Although the relationship between length of sentence and postrelease arrest was significant, it was also rather weak (gamma = .18792), which indicates that it was not the primary determinant of postrelease arrest.

**Number of Days of Jail Time Credit for Instant Offense by Postrelease Arrest**

Post-release arrest did not vary by the number of days of jail time credit an offender received for the instant offense (See Table 39).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days in Jail</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-30</td>
<td>37.6 (32)</td>
<td>62.3 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-90</td>
<td>50.0 (14)</td>
<td>50.0 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-180</td>
<td>36.6 (11)</td>
<td>63.3 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181+</td>
<td>20.0 (1)</td>
<td>80.0 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>50.7 (68)</td>
<td>49.2 (66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 6.02815 \)
\( \gamma = .17431 \)

Offenders who did not spend any time in jail for the instant offense
were rearrested at a slightly higher rate (50.7%) than offenders who received at least one (1) day of jail time credit. However, the relationship between number of days of jail time credit received, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 6.02815; p = .19706$).

In terms of the instant offense, four (4) variables were found to be significantly related to postrelease arrest, and in each case the relationship was weak: offense category of instant offense; crime class of second offense of conviction; offense category of second offense of conviction; and length of sentence for the instant offense. Property offenders had the highest rearrest rate; however, they also represented 54.6% of the total population, so this finding was not unexpected.

Offenders convicted of multiple charges on the instant offense were not more likely to be rearrested than offenders with a single conviction, however, crime class and crime category of the second offense of conviction were both significantly related to postrelease arrest. Specifically, offenders convicted of Class D felonies and property offenses for the second offense of conviction, were significantly more likely to be rearrested than offenders convicted of other classes (i.e., Class B and C felonies), and types of offenses (i.e., violent crimes, drug/alcohol offenses, traffic offenses) as a second offense of conviction.
Treatment Characteristics Related to Postrelease Arrest

Nearly all offenders participated in some type of treatment program(s) such as counseling, educational, vocational, employment, or court ordered activities. In this section all treatment variables will be tested for their independent effects on postrelease arrest.

Age at Time of Admission to United Center by Postrelease Arrest

Age at time of admission to United Center was significantly related to postrelease arrest ($\chi^2 = 15.57180; p < .001$) (See Table 40). Offenders admitted to the program when they were 17 years of age were four (4) times as likely to be rearrested following release from United Center as offenders who were admitted when they were 50 years of age or older. Seventeen-year-olds were at least twice as likely to be rearrested as offenders in all other age categories except 18 to 24 year olds. Fifty-two percent of offenders admitted to the program when they were between 18 and 24 years of age were re-arrested, while 80.0% of offenders under the age of 18 at time of admission were rearrested. Offenders admitted when they were between the ages of 25 and 30, were rearrested at a much lower rate (30.5%), as were offenders in the 31 to 40 age group (32.0%). These differences are in the direction one would expect, and are consistent with the findings contained in this report relative to age at time of instant offense (See Table 1 above). However, while the relationship between age at time of admission to United Center, and postrelease
arrest was statistically significant, it was also only of moderate strength (\(\text{gamma} = .37401\)). This suggests again that other variables were involved with respect to postrelease arrest, at least among this population of offenders.

### Table 40

Cross Tabulation of Age at Time of Admission to United Center by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Arrested %</th>
<th>Arrested (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested %</th>
<th>Not Arrested (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n = 282\)
\(\chi^2 = 15.57180\)
\(p = .00818\)
\(\text{gamma} = .37401\)

Probation/Alternative Program Failure at Time of Admission to United Center by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between probation/alternative program failure and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant (\(\chi^2 = 2.29073; p = .13015\)) (See Table 41). Very few offenders fell into this category (\(n = 14\)), and it would appear that offenders who did,
were no more likely to be rearrested following release from United Center than offenders who did not.

Table 41

Cross Tabulation of Probation/Alternative Program Failure at Time of Admission to United Center by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Failure</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>64.2 (9)</td>
<td>43.6 (117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>35.7 (5)</td>
<td>56.3 (151)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x^2 = 2.29073
p = .13015
\gamma = .39815

Participation in Treatment Programs by Postrelease Arrest

For various reasons, a small number of offenders (n = 36) did not participate in treatment programs during the stay at the United Center. However, the relationship between participation and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant (x^2 = 3.11202; p = .07772) (See Table 42)

Payment of Restitution by Postrelease Arrest

Whether or not an offender made victim restitution payments during his stay at the United Center was not significantly related to postrelease arrest (x^2 = 2.24357; p = .13417) (See Table 43). This is perhaps to be expected as it may only reflect the tendency
of judges to enter restitution orders against certain offenders and not others, or the offender's ability to make such payments.

Table 42
Cross Tabulation of Participation in Treatment Programs by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>42.6 (105)</td>
<td>58.3 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>57.3 (246)</td>
<td>41.6 (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x² = 3.11202
p = .07772
gamma = -.30556

Table 43
Cross Tabulation of Payment of Restitution by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restitution</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>38.8 (40)</td>
<td>48.0 (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>61.1 (63)</td>
<td>51.9 (93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x² = 2.24357
p = .13417
gamma = -.18582

Participation in Community Service Activities by Postrelease Arrest

Postrelease arrest did not vary significantly by offender.
participation in community service activities ($x^2 = 3.78897; p = .05159$) (See Table 44). There was a 13.0% difference in the rearrest rate between offenders who participated in community service work, and those who did not (35.4% vs. 48.2%).

Table 44

Cross Tabulation of Participation in Community Service Activities by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrester</td>
<td>35.4 (28)</td>
<td>48.2 (98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrester</td>
<td>64.5 (51)</td>
<td>51.7 (105)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282  
$x^2 = 3.78897$  
$p = .05159$  
gamma = -.25926

Payment of Fines, Court Costs, Public Defender Fees, and Fair Share by Postrelease Arrest

There was a relationship between the payment of fines and fees, and postrelease arrest ($x^2 = 13.17234; p = > .001$) (See Table 45). Offenders who did not make such payments were more likely to be arrested following release from United Center than offenders who did make such payments (70.7% vs. 40.2%). However, while the relationship was statistically significant, it was only of moderate strength (gamma = -.56404). Most offenders made such payments (n = 241, or 85.4% of the entire population), however, among the small
group that did not (n = 41, or 14.5% of the population), the rearrest rate was relatively high.

Table 45
Cross Tabulation of Payment of Court Costs, Public Defender Fees, and Fair Share by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Made Payments % (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>40.2 (97)</td>
<td>70.7 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>59.7 (144)</td>
<td>29.2 (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
χ² = 13.17234
p = .00028
gamma = -.56404

Participation in Drug/Alcohol Treatment by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between participation in drug/alcohol treatment, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant (χ² = .01916; p = .88990) (See Table 46). The difference in the rearrest rate between offenders who did participate, and those who did not was less than 1%.

Participation in Individual Counseling by Postrelease Arrest

Offenders who did not participate in individual counseling were more than twice as likely to be rearrested following release from United Center, as offenders who did participate (55.2% vs. 25.3%) (See Table 47). Although the relationship between participa-
tion in counseling and postrelease arrest was statistically significant ($x^2 = 16.64911; p > .001$), it was only of moderate strength ($\gamma = -.52648$). This indicates that individual counseling was not the primary treatment determinant of postrelease arrest.

Table 46
Cross Tabulation of Participation in Drug/Alcohol Treatment by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>44.9 (93)</td>
<td>44.0 (33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>55.0 (114)</td>
<td>56.0 (42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$x^2 = .01916$
$p = .8899$
$\gamma = .01878$

Table 47
Cross Tabulation of Participation in Individual Counseling by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counseling</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>25.3 (20)</td>
<td>52.2 (106)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>74.6 (59)</td>
<td>47.7 (97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$x^2 = 16.64911$
$p = .00005$
$\gamma = -.52648$
Participation in Group Counseling by Postrelease Arrest

As with individual counseling, the relationship between group counseling and postrelease arrest was statistically significant ($x^2 = 13.62943; p > .001$) (See Table 48). Offenders who did not participate in group counseling were more than twice as likely to be re-arrested as offenders who did participate (50.0% vs. 22.2%). Although the relationship between participation in group counseling and postrelease arrest was statistically significant, it was only of moderate strength ($\gamma = -.55556$). Once again, this indicates that other treatment variables contributed to postrelease arrest among the United Center population of offenders.

Table 48

| Counseling Not Applicable |  
|--------------------------|---
| Arrested | 22.2 (54)  
| Not Arrested | 77.7 (42)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Arrested | 50.0 (114)  
| Not Arrested | 50.0 (114)  

n = 282  
$x^2 = 13.62943$  
P = .00022  
$\gamma = -.55556$

Participation in Alcoholics Anonymous by Postrelease Arrest

Participation in Alcoholics Anonymous was not significantly
related to postrelease arrest ($x_2 = .02834; p = .86630$) (See Table 49). Indeed the difference in the arrest rate between those who did participate and those who did not, was less than five-percent (45.0% vs. 43.9%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in Alcoholics Anonymous by Postrelease Arrest</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>45.0 (90)</td>
<td>43.9 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>55.0 (110)</td>
<td>56.0 (46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .02834$

$\gamma = .02222$

The relationship between participation in cocaine anonymous and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($x_2 = .00121; p = .97224$) (See Table 50). There was a slight difference in the rearrest rate between offenders who participated, and those who did not (50.0% vs. 43.6%).

The relationship between participation in narcotics anonymous and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($x_2 = \ldots$)
.62919; \( p = .42765 \) (See Table 51).

Table 50

Cross Tabulation of Participation in Cocaine Anonymous by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participated % (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>44.4 (20)</td>
<td>44.7 (106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>55.5 (25)</td>
<td>55.2 (131)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 282 \)
\( \chi^2 = .00121 \)
\( p = .97224 \)
\( \gamma = -.00569 \)

There was less than a 5% difference in the rearrest rate between offenders who participated, and those who did not (45.1% vs. 43.9%).

Table 51

Cross Tabulation of Participation in Narcotics Anonymous by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participated % (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>50.0 (23)</td>
<td>43.6 (103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>50.0 (23)</td>
<td>56.3 (133)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 282 \)
\( \chi^2 = .62919 \)
\( p = .42765 \)
\( \gamma = .12712 \)
The relationship between participation in the GED program, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($x^2 = .04080; p = .83993$) (See Table 52). There was less than a 5% difference in the rearrest rate between offenders who participated, and those who did not (45.1% vs. 43.9%), and it was not in the direction that one might expect (offenders who participated were rearrested at the higher rate). However, the U.S. Parole Commission does not regard an offender with a GED as a lower risk for parole release than an offender without a GED (See U.S. Parole Commission’s, Salient Factor Score, and its Risk Prediction Scale, cited above). It may be that obtaining a GED does not require or develop the type of discipline necessary for completion of one’s post-secondary education.

**Table 52**

Cross Tabulation of Participation in the GED Program by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>45.1 (75)</td>
<td>43.9 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>54.8 (91)</td>
<td>56.0 (65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$

$x^2 = .04080$

$p = .83993$

$\gamma = .02459$
Participation in the Academic Tutoring Program by Postrelease Arrest

The United Center used university student volunteers to tutor offenders in reading, spelling, and math, usually as a way to prepare them for enrolling in the GED program or in secondary school. The relationship between participation in the academic tutoring program, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($x^2 = .67989; \ p = .40963$) (See Table 53). In fact, offenders who did participate, were rearrested at a slightly higher rate than offenders who did not participate (46.7% vs. 41.7%).

Table 53

Cross Tabulation of Participation in the Academic Tutoring Program by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participated % (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>46.7 (78)</td>
<td>41.7 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>53.2 (89)</td>
<td>58.2 (67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$x^2 = .67989$
$p = .40963$
gamma = .10044

Participation in Secondary School by Postrelease Arrest

Although offenders who enrolled in a public high school program (usually night-school), were rearrested at a lower rate than offenders who did not (36.3% vs. 45.3%), the relationship between
participation and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = .66782; p = .41381$) (See Table 54).

Table 54
Cross Tabulation of Participation in Secondary School by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>36.3 (8)</td>
<td>45.3 (118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>63.6 (14)</td>
<td>54.6 (142)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$\chi^2$ = .66782
p = .41381
gamma = -.18508

Placement in Residential Treatment by Postrelease Arrest

Offenders with serious drug and/or alcohol problems are referred to residential centers upon arrival at United Center, for a 30 to 90 day treatment program. United Center staff use ten (10) different treatment centers, and offenders are referred to any center that has an open bed. Offenders sent to residential treatment centers were rearrested at a slightly higher rate than offenders who were not referred for such treatment (48.0% vs. 42.8%). The relationship between placement in residential treatment and postrelease arrest, however, was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = .69061; p = .40596$) (See Table 55).
Table 55
Cross Tabulation of Placement in Residential Treatment by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment % (n)</th>
<th>Not Applicable % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>48.0 (48)</td>
<td>42.8 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>52.0 (52)</td>
<td>57.1 (104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x² = .69061
p = .40596
gamma = .10345

Participation in the Victim/Offender Reconciliation Program by Postrelease Arrest

Postrelease arrest did not vary significantly by participation in VORP (x² = .05597; p = .81299). There was less than a two percentile difference in the rearrest rate between offenders who did participate, and those who did not (46.1% vs. 44.3%). (See Table 56)

Participation in the Court Administered Alcohol Program by Postrelease Arrest

Although offenders who participated in CAAP were rearrested at a lower rate than offenders who did not participate (27.7% vs. 45.8%), the relationship between participation in CAAP, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant (x² = 2.22255; p = .13601) (See Table 57).
Table 56

Cross Tabulation of Participation in VORP by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>46.1 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>53.8 (28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
χ² = .05597
p = .81299
gamma = .03644

Table 57

Cross Tabulation of Participation in CAAP by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>27.7 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>72.2 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
χ² = 2.22255
p = .13601
gamma = -.37500

Participation in the Rage and Anger Management Program by Postrelease Arrest

Offenders who participated in this counseling program were rearrested at a higher rate than offenders who did not participate (52.0% vs. 43.1%). However, the relationship between participation...
in the program, and postrelease arrest was not statistically signi-
ificant ($x^2 = 1.31721; \ p = .25109$) (See Table 58).

**Table 58**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 282$

$x^2 = 1.31721$

$p = .25109$

$\gamma = .17695$

**Participation in the Parent Effectiveness Training Program by Post-
release Arrest**

The relationship between participation in the PET program, and
postrelease arrest was statistically significant ($x^2 = 3.90438; \ p < .01$) (See Table 59). Indeed, offenders who did not participate in
this program were more than twice as likely to be rearrested as of-
fenders who did participate (46.0% vs. 20.0%). However, while the
relationship between participation in the program and postrelease
arrest was significant, it was also only of moderate strength ($\gamma = -.54717$). This indicates that other variables were important in
terms of the postrelease arrest rate among this population of of-
fenders. Moreover, all of the offenders who participated in this
program had dependent children (53.3% were married with children) which limits the significance of this finding. Perhaps all that can be said is that offenders with dependent children who participated in the PET program, were rearrested at a lower rate than all other offenders who did not participate.

Table 59

Cross Tabulation of Participation in PET by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>20.0 (3)</td>
<td>46.0 (123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>80.0 (12)</td>
<td>53.9 (144)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
x² = 3.90438
p = .04816
gamma = -.54717

Number of Disciplinary Reports Received at United Center by Postrelease Arrest

The relationship between number of conduct reports received while at United Center and postrelease arrest was statistically significant (x² = 10.82108; p = < .001) (See Table 60). Offenders who received four (4) to six (6) conduct reports were almost twice as likely to be rearrested as offenders who did not receive any conduct reports during their stay at the United Center (55.2% vs. 32.3%). Offenders who received from one (1) to three (3) conduct reports, were only slightly less likely than offenders with four to six re-
ports to be rearrested, when compared to offenders who did not receive any disciplinary reports (49.5% vs. 32.3%).

### Table 60
Cross Tabulation of Number of Disciplinary Reports Received at United Center by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-3 %</th>
<th>4-6 %</th>
<th>0 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>49.5 (50)</td>
<td>55.2 (42)</td>
<td>32.3 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>50.4 (51)</td>
<td>44.7 (34)</td>
<td>67.6 (71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282  
χ² = 10.82108  
p = .00447  
gamma = -.30790

These findings are what one would expect: the more disciplinary reports received during the period of correctional supervision, the greater the likelihood of postrelease arrest. The inability to conform, or the refusal to comply with United Center rules and regulations, may be regarded as an indication of postrelease behavior. However, while the relationship between number of disciplinary reports received, and postrelease arrest was statistically significant, it was also of only weak to moderate strength (gamma = -.30790). Consequently, caution must be used when attempting to predict postrelease criminal behavior in terms of disciplinary reports received while under correctional supervision.
Type of Disciplinary Report Received While at United Center by Post-release Arrest

Disciplinary reports were divided into two classes: serious; and minor. Serious conduct reports were given for offenses such as fighting, threatening, theft, drug or alcohol use, and for being away from the Center without permission (AWOL). Minor conduct reports were given for offenses such as using the telephone without permission, making food without permission, or going up or downstairs without permission. The relationship between type of conduct report, and postrelease arrest was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 10.24054; p = < .001$) (See Table 61).

Table 61

Cross Tabulation of Type of Disciplinary Report Received While at United Center by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>52.0 (63)</td>
<td>51.7 (29)</td>
<td>32.3 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>47.9 (58)</td>
<td>48.2 (27)</td>
<td>67.6 (71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$\chi^2 = 10.24054$
$\ p = .00597$
$\gamma = .28590$

As might be expected, offenders who received conduct reports for serious infractions were rearrested at the highest rate. Indeed, they were almost twice as likely to be rearrested as offenders who re-
ceived no disciplinary reports (52.0% vs. 32.3%). Minor offenders were only slightly less likely than serious offenders to be rearrested when compared to offenders who received no conduct reports while housed at the United Center (51.7% vs. 32.3%). Although the relationship between type of conduct report, and postrelease arrest was statistically significant, it was also weak (gamma = .28590). Consequently, it would be wrong to attach a great deal of importance to this variable in terms of its effect on postrelease arrest among the United Center population of offenders.

**Educational Level at Time of Release From United Center by Postrelease Arrest**

Although there was a reduction in the rearrest rate as educational level increased, as one might expect, the relationship between educational level at time of release from United Center, and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant ($x^2 = 9.49079; p = .14780$) (See Table 62). This finding is consistent with earlier findings contained in this report with respect to the relationship between educational level at time of instant offense, and postrelease arrest; the relationship was not statistically significant. However, in terms of rates, offenders with no more than an eight grade education at time of release from United Center, were rearrested at almost twice the rate of offenders with a high school education or better (55.5% vs. 32.3%).
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Table 62

Cross Tabulation of Educational Level at Time of Release From United Center by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>55.5 (5)</td>
<td>44.4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>53.6 (22)</td>
<td>46.3 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>53.8 (21)</td>
<td>46.1 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>49.0 (27)</td>
<td>50.9 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.0 (37)</td>
<td>63.0 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>32.3 (11)</td>
<td>67.6 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>75.0 (3)</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282  
χ² = 9.49079  
ρ = .14780  
gamma = .20656

Type of Employment at Time of Release From United Center by Postrelease Arrest

Unlike the situation at time of instant offense, postrelease arrest varied significantly by type of employment held at time of discharge from United Center (χ² = 14.94808; ρ = > .001) (See Table 63). Offenders who were unemployed at time of release were almost twice as likely to be rearrested as offenders who were employed full-time (57.5% vs. 32.5%). Offenders who were employed only part-time at time of release were more likely to be rearrested than offenders employed full-time (50.0% vs. 32.5%), and were only slightly less
likely to be rearrested than offenders who were unemployed at time of release (50.0% vs. 57.5%). This is what one might expect to find; however, while the relationship between type of employment at time of release and postrelease arrest was statistically significant, it was also only moderate in strength (gamma = -.37386).

Table 63
Cross Tabulation of Type of Employment at Time of Release From United Center by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>32.5 (42)</td>
<td>50.0 (27)</td>
<td>57.5 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>67.4 (87)</td>
<td>50.0 (27)</td>
<td>42.4 (42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282  
x^2 = 14.94808  
p = .00057  
gamma = -.37386

Status of Employment at Time of Release From United Center by Postrelease Arrest

Postrelease arrest varied significantly by status of employment at time of release from United Center. The relationship between the two variables was statistically significant (x^2 = 11.83077; p = < .01) (See Table 64). As might be expected, skilled and managerial/professional workers had the lowest rearrest rates (26.3%, and 28.5% respectively), while unemployed offenders were rearrested at the highest rate (57.5%). Moreover, unemployed offenders were twice
as likely to be rearrested as skilled workers, and almost two times as likely to be rearrested as managerial/professional workers. Unemployed offenders were significantly more likely to be rearrested than both unskilled and service sector workers (38.4%, and 41.5% respectively). However, both unskilled and service sector workers, were significantly more likely to be rearrested than both skilled and managerial/professional workers. The relationship between status of employment at time of release from United Center and postrelease arrest, while statistically significant, was also weak (gamma = -.23372).

### Table 64

Cross Tabulation of Status of Employment at Time of Release From United Center by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>38.4 (40)</td>
<td>61.5 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Sector</td>
<td>41.5 (22)</td>
<td>58.4 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>26.3 (5)</td>
<td>73.6 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manag/Professional</td>
<td>28.5 (2)</td>
<td>71.4 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>57.5 (57)</td>
<td>42.4 (42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
χ² = 11.83077
p = .01866
gamma = -.23372
Number of Months at United Center by Postrelease Arrest

Although arrest rates did decrease in general as number of months at United Center increased, the relationship between the two variables was not statistically significant ($x^2 = 7.30392$; $p = .19900$) (See Table 65).

Table 65
Cross Tabulation of Number of Months at United Center by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Months</th>
<th>Arrested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Arrested % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>62.5 (20)</td>
<td>37.5 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>52.3 (22)</td>
<td>47.6 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>43.7 (28)</td>
<td>56.2 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>40.6 (24)</td>
<td>59.3 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>36.6 (22)</td>
<td>63.3 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>40.0 (10)</td>
<td>60.0 (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$x^2 = 7.30392$
$p = .19900$
$\gamma = .19861$

Offenders who were in residence at United Center for nine (9) to twelve (12) months had the lowest rearrest rate at 36.6%, while offenders who were there for less than one (1) month were rearrested at the highest rate (62.5%).
Status of Release From United Center by Postrelease Arrest

At the conclusion of their stay at United Center, all offenders were categorized as either successful, or unsuccessful in terms of program performance. The relationship between staff assessments of offender performance at United Center, and postrelease arrest was statistically significant ($x^2 = 5.50153; p = < .01$), however, it was also weak ($\gamma = -.27545$) (See Table 66). This relationship indicates that treatment staff assessments of offender performance are rather good predictors of postrelease arrest.

Table 66
Cross Tabulation of Status of Release From United Center by Postrelease Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>37.9 (55)</td>
<td>51.8 (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>62.0 (90)</td>
<td>48.1 (66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 282
$x^2 = 5.50153$
$p = .01900$
$\gamma = -.27545$

The data for three (3) treatment programs (Gamblers Anonymous; Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime; and Midwest Alcohol Rehabilitation Center) were not tabled or commented upon in this section due to the low number of participants in each program (less than 5 offenders), and because the relationship between participation in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
these programs and postrelease arrest was not statistically significant. It is not known at this time why so few offenders participated in these three programs.

On the other hand, ten (10) treatment variables were found to be significantly related to postrelease arrest: age at time of admission to United Center; payment of fines, court costs, fair share, etc.; individual counseling; group counseling; Parent Effectiveness Training; number of conduct reports received; type of conduct report received; type of employment held at time of release; status of employment held at time of release; and status of release from United Center. The relationship between seven (7) of these treatment related variables and postrelease arrest was of moderate strength. The relationship between three (3) of them (type of conduct report, status of employment, and status of release), and postrelease arrest was weak.

The biggest surprise here were the traditional treatment components (i.e., individual and group counseling; PET). Apparently, counseling does make a difference, as offenders who participated in these programs were rearrested at significantly lower rates than offenders who did not.
CHAPTER VI

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Class B Felons

While it is clear, for the most part, that the United Center has served the target population, a significant number of Class B felons (16.7%; n = 335) were also placed in the program by the courts. The offenses for which these offenders were sentenced to United Center were burglary (51.7%), drug sale (35.7%), conspiracy (5.3%), robbery (3.5%), theft (1.7%), and child molesting (1.7%). Six (6) of these offenders had prior felony convictions when they were admitted to United Center. This must be regarded as a significant problem for the United Center, given that 30 out of 56 of these offenders (53.5%) were rearrested after release from the Center.

Specifically, six (6) of the Class B felons were rearrested for B felonies; 7 for D felonies; 7 for Class A misdemeanors; 2 Class B misdemeanors; 1 for a Class C misdemeanor; and 7 for unspecified offenses. Seven (7) of the B felons were rearrested for violent offenses; 13 for property offenses; 2 for drug/alcohol offenses; and the remainder were rearrested for traffic and other offenses. Five (5) were rearrested for burglary; 2 for drug possession; 2 for possession of a deadly weapon; 1 for domestic violence; 5 for theft; 1 for a public order offense; 2 for robbery; 2 for possession of stolen property; 1 for HTV; 1 for driving after
having been suspended as an HTV; 4 for battery; 1 for criminal recklessness; 1 for false informing; and 2 for traffic offenses.

Given their number in the population of United Center residents ($n = 335$), the B felons were responsible for 15.3% of the first post-release arrests recorded for the entire population of 335 offenders. They were also responsible for 15.5% of the violent offenses recorded for the entire population on the first post-release arrest. Placement of these offenders at the United Center should be discontinued; they are high risk offenders and are inappropriate for community-based treatment.

Child Molesters

It is interesting that child molesters constituted a relatively high percentage of the population at the United Center, given that the program was designed specifically for low-level property offenders (6.2%; $n = 335$). Of the 21 offenders convicted for child molestation, 19 (90.4%) were white, and two (9.5%) were black. Only one (1) was convicted of a Class B felony child molestation; the rest were Class C and D felons. The mean age for these offenders was 36 at the time of the instant offense, while the mean age for the rest of the population of United Center residents was 24 at the time of the instant offense. Only six (6) of the 21 child molesters were unemployed and/or had less than an 11th grade education at the time of the instant offense. None of those placed at United Center for child molesting had a prior felony conviction for any offense;
six (6) were rearrested [four (4) of them for child molesting] after release; and five (5) were reconvicted on felony charges [four (4) of them for child molesting] after release from the United Center. Almost one half of the child molesters were represented by retained counsel on the instant offense, compared to 74% of the rest of the population who were represented by a public defender on their primary convicted offense.

As only two (2) of these offenders were released from United Center as unsuccessful program participants, it would appear that Class C and D felons convicted for child molesting are not inappropriate for placement at the United Center; that is unless one regards the four (4) out of the 21 child molesters (19%) rearrested and reconvicted for the same offense as representing too great a failure rate for this particular offense. In any case, the United Center was designed for non-violent offenders, and child molesters, or any offender convicted of sexual assault, should not be considered for placement at the Center.

High Risk Offenders

The preliminary findings contained in this report, with respect to postrelease arrest within three (3) years of release (n = 282), suggest that United Center screening staff should be very cautious about admitting offenders with significant juvenile offense records. This is especially true for those who became involved in delinquent activity at a very early age. This includes anyone who
was referred to the juvenile authorities when they were less than 15 years of age, and/or were referred to the juvenile authorities for the first time for a status offense. Offenders with ten (10) or more juvenile referrals (counted regardless of disposition) were rearrested at very high rates, as were offenders with one or more juvenile probation/alternative program failures, and who had been committed to a juvenile correctional, residential, or detention center. United Center offenders with one or more of these background characteristics were rearrested at very high rates within three (3) years of release, and offenders with one or more of these characteristics who are referred to the program should be carefully screened.

Furthermore, as was made clear in the findings of this research report, age at time of instant offense was significantly related to postrelease arrest. There is very little percentage in admitting offenders who were under 18 years of age at the time of the instant. Seventy-five percent of offenders with this background characteristic were rearrested within three (3) years of release from United Center. Moreover, 50.0% of offenders who were between the ages of 18 and 24 at the time of the instant offense were rearrested. Age at time of admission to United Center was also related to rearrest within three (3) years of release ($n = 282$).

In view of the fact that a full 41.2% of the United Center population ($n = 335$) did not have a juvenile offense record at all, and 94% were 18 years of age or older at the time of the instant
offense and when they were admitted to the United Center, it makes little sense to admit young offenders who were also very young when they first came to the attention of the juvenile authorities. United Center staff who are responsible for screening new applicants should resist pressure from the courts to accept young offenders. If judges commit young offenders to the Center, over the objections of United Center staff, this should be documented in the offender’s file to avoid criticism should any of these high risk offenders commit a serious crime while housed at the Center.

Another variable found to be strongly related to rearrest within three (3) years of release (n = 282) was number of months employed at current or most recent job at time of arrest for the instant offense. Fifty-two percent of offenders who were either unemployed or had worked for only one (1) to three (3) months at their current or most recent job at the time of their arrest for the instant offense were rearrested following release from United Center.

High rearrest rates (within 3 years of release; n = 282) were found for offenders sent to the United Center for driving after having been suspended as a habitual traffic violator (60.0% rearrested); property offenses (53.0% rearrested); and violent offenses (41.0% rearrested).

Among offenders sent to United Center on multiple convictions, 71.0% of those convicted of a Class D felony as the second offense of conviction were rearrested within three (3) years of release from the United Center. In terms of offense category, 76.0% of those
offenders convicted of a property offense as the second offense of conviction were rearrested within three (3) years of release.

Fifty-one percent of offenders sentenced to relatively short terms for the instant offense (1 to 4 years) were rearrested within three (3) years of release, and 58.0% of offenders who were on probation at the time of the instant offense were rearrested within three (3) years of release from the United Center.

Eighty percent of offenders who were under the age of 18 at time of admission to United Center were arrested following release, while 52.0% of offenders who were 18 to 24 years of age at time of admission were rearrested.

In summation, the policy implications that emerge from these findings suggest that in all cases United Center screening staff should be extremely wary of offenders who began their delinquent careers at a very early age (under 15 years of age, and regardless of the nature of the first juvenile offense); were referred for the first time to the juvenile authorities for a status offense; were referred to the juvenile authorities ten (10) or more times (regardless of disposition); have a record on one (1) or more juvenile probation/alternative program failures; and were committed to a juvenile correctional, residential, or detention center for 30 days or more.

Furthermore, offenders who were less than 20 years of age at the time of the instant offense; were convicted of driving after having been suspended as an HTV, as the instant offense; were con-
victed of a Class D felony for a second offense of conviction; were convicted of a property or violent offense for a second offense of conviction; received a sentence ranging from one (1) to four (4) years; or were on probation at the time of the instant offense, should be regarded as high-risk offenders.

Finally, offenders with a prior conviction for a violent offense as an adult, or a record of adjudication for a violent offense as a juvenile, should be eliminated from consideration regardless of other background characteristics. This recommendation is made because violent offenders are not part of the target population identified for community-based treatment by the Midwest Department of Corrections. And, although the United Center has a good record even with violent offenders, it will only take one (1) violent offender, and one event to put the program in jeopardy should he commit a serious felony while housed at the United Center.

The Optimal United Center Resident

The ideal United Center resident was 41 to 55 years of age (at the time of the instant offense/admission to United Center), married, had four (4) or more dependent children, and was employed full-time for at least one (1) year in his current (or most recent) job as a skilled or professional worker. He had a high school diploma or better, no record of juvenile delinquency, an honorable discharge from the military, and lived on the southwest-side of Middletown, Midwest, in his own home or apartment. As for the instant offense,
he was convicted for resisting arrest, or some other non-violent, Class D felony, was represented by retained counsel on the instant offense, and released on bond established between $2,500.00 and $10,000.00. He received no less than a four (4) year sentence, and between 187 and 540 days of jail time credit on the instant offense. In addition, he had no record of alcohol, drug abuse, or mental illness at the time of his arrest for the instant offense.

The foregoing description of the optimal United Center offender is based on less than 10.0% of the United Center population (n = 335), and is offered for illustration purposes only. More realistically, United Center staff should screen for offenders who were between 20 and 55 years of age at the time of the instant offense, and who have any of the personal background characteristics, with the exception of those significantly related to arrest within three (3) years of release.

Treatment Programs

The United Center would be well advised to emphasize programs that were found to be significantly related to postrelease arrest, and de-emphasize those that seem to have little effect on recidivism rates. Activities or programs targeted for increased emphasis include the payment of fees and fair share for room and board; Parent Effectiveness Training; and individual and group counseling. These program variables were significantly related to low rearrest rates (within three (3) years of release; n = 282) among offenders who
participated in them, and to high rearrest rates among offenders who did not participate in them.

Low rearrest rates were also observed for offenders who were employed full-time at time of release from United Center, were employed as skilled workers at time of release, and did not receive any disciplinary reports for inappropriate behavior while living at the United Center.

Less than 30.0% of all offenders remained unemployed during their term at the United Center (n = 335). Although this is not an unacceptable level by most correctional standards, the strong relationship between unemployment at time of release from United Center and rearrest calls for a significant increase in efforts to find suitable employment for all residents, particularly at time of release from the program. Gains in educational level, although significant, could also be improved upon especially with regard to post-secondary education.

When screening for potential residents, United Center staff should attempt to determine the offender's willingness to participate in those treatment programs significantly related to rearrest (i.e., individual and group counseling, etc.), and to find suitable employment. In this connection it should be pointed out that United Center staff have been remarkably accurate in identifying those offenders who were classified as unsuccessful program participants, in terms of their rearrest rate following release from the United Center. Consequently, they should feel confident in their ability to
select offenders for admission who may benefit most from the United Center treatment program.

The recommendations with respect to treatment programs should not be construed to mean that other programs should be discontinued. Rather they are intended to help fine-tune the overall treatment program and maximize treatment success.
CHAPTER VII

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

As mentioned at the beginning of this report, the Advisory Board's plan contains at least five (5) testable assumptions about what the United Center should do: (1) decrease the offender population in the county's jail facility and in the state's prison system; (2) reduce the economic costs associated with prison or jail confinement; (3) provide rehabilitative services to offenders; (4) rehabilitate the offender and reintegrate him into the community; and (5) reduce offender recidivism.

This research project was limited to an analysis of two (2) of the assumptions cited above:

1. The United Center's capacity to provide rehabilitative services to resident offenders (assumption #3 above), and

2. Establishing the heretofore unknown recidivism rate for United Center releasees (assumption #5 above).

To the extent that the United Center has been relatively successful in delivering rehabilitative services to offenders and/or producing a relatively low recidivism rate, a preliminary assessment of the program's success in rehabilitating and/or reintegrating the offender back into the community may be made. In addition, some very limited remarks may be made about the relative cost advantages associated with the United Center, in comparison with the economic
costs associated with prison and jail confinement.

Finally, the results of this study may provide some measure of support not only for the reintegration model of correctional practice, but for the criminological perspectives which inform it as well.

The United Center Treatment Program

Clearly the United Center has been successful in the delivery of treatment services to offenders. What follows is a summary of those services as delivered over the last twelve (12) years (n = 335).

At admission to the United Center, 55.2% of the population were between 18 and 24 years of age (mean = 25). Most (94.3%) were not admitted as probation/alternative program failures. During their stay at the United Center, 88.1% of the population participated in some type of treatment program. Virtually all offenders participated in recreational activities (91.9%), and 71.0% participated in the job search program.

Drug/Alcohol Treatment

Seventy-six percent participated in drug and/or alcohol treatment programs, 74.9% in the Alcoholics Anonymous program, 19.7% in the Cocaine Anonymous program, and 15.2% participated in the Narcotics Anonymous program. A fair number of offenders (26.3%) participated in individual mental health counseling, while 18.2% partici-
participated in group mental health counseling during their stay at the
United Center.

Employment/Education

Forty-eight percent of the population was employed full-time,
and 23.9% part-time while residing at the United Center. Fifty-nine
percent held jobs as unskilled workers, or worked in the service
sector during their stay at the Center.

A significant number of offenders participated in educational
programs while at the United Center; 58.8% participated in the GED
program; 59.1% in the tutoring program; and 6.9% participated in the
post-secondary education program.

Residential/Intensive Outpatient Treatment

Forty-one percent of the population were referred to residen-
tial or out-patient programs for drug and/or alcohol abuse treat-
ment. Offenders were randomly assigned to these treatment programs;
the major determinate for in-patient assignment being bed-space at
the various facilities. Among offenders referred to such programs,
9.2% were sent to the Old Way Rehabilitation Center; 7.5% were sent
to Good-House; 1.8% were referred to Lexington House; .9% went to
the V.A. Hospital; 3.6% were referred to the Frank In-Patient Pro-
gram; .9% were sent to the Finewood In-Patient Program; 3.0% to the
Frank Intensive Out-Patient Program; .3% to New Messages; and 14.3%
were referred to other programs for similar treatment. Among of-
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fenders who participated in residential or out-patient treatment programs (n = 139), 82.0% also received after-care services from the treatment provider.

**Court Ordered Programs**

A significant number of offenders (86.3%) paid fines, court costs, public defender fees, and made fair share payments for room and board. Thirty-six percent made restitution payments to victims, and 32.8% participated in the community service program. Significantly fewer offenders (16.7%) participated in the Victim Offender Reconciliation Program; 7.5% in the Court Administered Alcohol Program; and 6.5% in the Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime program. Nineteen percent participated in the Rage and Anger Management counseling program; 5.1% in the Parent Effectiveness Training program; and 1.2% in the Midwest Addictions Recovery Center program.

**Disciplinary Reports**

Sixty-three percent of the total population received some type of conduct report during their stay at the United Center for such things as fighting (4.5%), threatening another resident (9.0%), theft (.3%), drug or alcohol use (10.4%), or going A.W.O.L (16.7%). Nineteen percent received a conduct report for a minor violation of house rules, such as using the house phone without permission, or getting into the refrigerator without permission.
Release Status

According to United Center records, 56.4% of the 335 offenders studied in this research project were classified as having completed the program successfully at termination from the program. Twenty-two percent were classified as unsuccessful; 18.2% were classified AWOL; and 3.0% were released under other unspecified conditions. As for length of stay at United Center, 10.4% of the population were at the Center for less than one (1) month; 4.4% were there for 1 to 2 months; 34.0% for 2 to 6 months; 34.9% for 6 to 12 months; and 16.1% for 12 to 18 months (mean = 6.3 months).

Offender Characteristics at Time of Release

Significant improvements in educational level and employment status were realized by most offenders while housed at the United Center (n = 335).

Educational Program

The largest change is found in the number of offenders with GEDs. At the time of the instant offense, 8.4% of the population had a GED; however, upon release, 20.6% had earned one. Small changes were realized at other levels of education: The number of offenders with less than eight (8) years of education was reduced by 2.1%; the number of offenders with nine (9) years of education was reduced by 1.5%; the percentage of offenders with ten (10) years of education was reduced by 4.2%; and the number of offenders with
eleven (11) years of education was reduced by 7.2%. The number of offenders with a high school diploma did not change. The percentage of offenders with some college increased from 6.3% to 8.4%; however, the number of offenders with a college degree remained the same.

Employment

Significant improvements in type and status of employment were also realized by the United Center population. The number of offenders with full-time jobs increased from 35.2% at the time of the instant offense, to 45.4% at time of release from United Center. The number of offenders with part-time jobs increased from 11.6% to 18.8%. The number of offenders with unskilled employment increased from 28.7% to 34.9%, while those in the service sector increased from 10.4% to 20.3%. Significantly, 48.1% of the United Center population were unemployed at the time of the instant offense, however, at time of release from United Center, only 34.3% were unemployed.

Probation Discharge Status

A review of offender records obtained from the Middletown County Adult Probation Department in July of 1994, revealed that following release from the United Center, 56.1% of all offenders were classified as regular releasees. Twenty-five percent were sent to the MDOC; 1.7% had active arrest warrants on file; 2.1% had never been placed on formal probation and could not be formally dis-
charged; 1.2% had been sent to the county jail; .6% had their probation revoked; .3% were classified as other; and 12.5% were still on probation.

Recidivism

The rearrest rate for United Center residents within one (1) year of release (n = 335), was 23.6%; within three (3) years of release (n = 282), it was 44.7% (the effect of the B-felons on these statistics must be kept in mind). The national rearrest rate for state prison releases within one (1) year of release is 39.0%; within three (3) years of release the rearrest rate for offenders released from prison is between 62.0% and 70.0% (BJS, 1994).

Based on a recent study of a three (3) state area, the rearrest rate for probation releasees within three years of discharge from probation is 43.0% (BJS, 1994). However, in a 1988 study of probationers in Hawaii, 76.2% of a sample of 318 probationers were rearrested within two (2) years of discharge from probation (Hawaii Criminal Justice Data Center, 1988). A 1987 evaluation of New York City's Alternatives-to- Incarceration Program (ATI) which is a nonresidential program found that within one (1) year of release, 49.4% of program participants were rearrested, as compared to 41.9% among probation releasees, and 57.9% among state prison releasees (New York City Criminal Justice Agency, Inc., 1987). And, in a 1986 report on prison and probation releasees, the Rand Corporation found that 72.0% of prison releasees were rearrested within two (2) years.
of release, and that 63.0% of probation releasees were rearrested within the same time period (Petersilia, 1986).

The felony reconviction rate for United Center releasees within one (1) year of release (n = 335), was 6.8%; within three (3) years of release (n = 282), the reconviction rate was 19.1% for United Center releasees. At the national level, the felony reconviction rate for state prison releasees within three years of release is 46.8% (BJS, 1994).

Furthermore, the reincarceration rate for United Center residents within one (1) year of release (n = 335), was 7.8%; the rate within three (3) years of release (n = 282), was 23.0%. At the national level, the reincarceration rate for state prison releasees within three (3) years of release, is 41.4% (BJS, 1994).

As a group (n = 335) the United Center releasees were responsible for a total 664 offenses (first postrelease offense(s) and all other postrelease offenses counted regardless of disposition) compared to a total of 2,171 prior offenses (all prior offenses counted regardless of disposition) at the time of the instant offense for which they were placed at the United Center. The mean rate of offenses at the time of admission to the United Center was 6.4 per offender. After release from the United Center, the mean offense rate was 1.9 per offender. This represents a 69.4% reduction in criminal activity for this particular group of offenders.

Although it may be problematic to compare the United Center population with prison releasees, it is perhaps less so with proba-
tion release statistics. The United Center was designed for offenders who would, but for such a facility, have been incarcerated within the state prison system or county jail. All things being equal, we would expect to see United Center residents rearrested at higher rates than regular probation releasees. This, however, has not been the case. Based on the studies cited above, it would appear that United Center residents do at least as well, if not better than probationers. A true test of the program's effectiveness, however, would involve the identification of a comparison group of like offenders who, although qualified for placement at United Center, are sent to prison or to the county jail. Unfortunately, a test of this nature was beyond the scope of the present effort, and must wait until a later date. In the meantime, however, it does not seem at all inappropriate to declare the program a qualified success.

The Pains of Imprisonment

An assessment of the notion that community-based programs can rehabilitate, and/or reintegrate, offenders better than the traditional prison/parole philosophy, may be made by comparing the United Center with the typical American prison. In his classic analysis of a maximum security prison, Society of Captives, Gresham Sykes identifies what he refers to as the pains of imprisonment. According to Sykes, of all the painful conditions imposed on the inmates of a maximum security prison, none is more immediately obvious than the deprivation of liberty. The wall which seals off the criminal is a
constant threat to the prisoner’s self-conception in that he must be kept apart from decent men. Somehow the inmate must find a device for rejecting his rejecters, if he is to endure psychologically.

At the United Center on the other hand, offenders work and associate with people in free society everyday. At work the United Center resident is more likely to be treated as a co-worker, not as a social outcast who cannot be trusted in the company of decent men and women. At the Center, he is treated with respect and understanding, rather than with contempt and insensitivity. United Center staff provide an atmosphere more conducive to trust and communication than can be provided in prison, or perhaps even on regular probation. There is no need to develop strategies to reject one’s rejecters, as it is made clear to each and every resident that he has value and something to contribute to the world around him. The staff are instructed to be non-judgmental, and to encourage the residents not only to examine their faults, but to recognize their strengths, and positive qualities as well.

At the United Center there are no bars on the windows, or uniformed guards at the doors. If a resident wants to leave, all he need do is walk out the front door. Rather than being reminded every day that he must be kept apart from the civilized world, the United Center resident is reminded that he is still a trusted member of that world, and has a responsibility to himself and to the community to prove himself worthy of that trust.

Prison inmates live a rather Spartan existence, and suffer
what Sykes referred to as deprivation of goods and services. Assigned a number which is stamped on every personal possession and article of prison clothing, the prisoner has very little to remind him or herself of life beyond prison walls.

In contrast, at the United Center, residents wear their own clothing, and while there are some restrictions on dress, are allowed to express their own personal tastes and individual identities. Although it may seem trivial, a favorite article of clothing or small personal possession can be enormously important to the offender in maintaining his sense of self.

According to Sykes, who studied a maximum security prison for men, in a society composed exclusively of men, prison inmates suffer from the deprivation of heterosexual relationships. While this may be true, whether one is heterosexual or homosexual is not the issue. Prisons (particularly for men) are largely devoid of the affectional ties that make us human. The fact that conjugal visits are rarely listed among the demands made by rioting prison inmates belies the popular notion that correctional facilities for men are seething cauldrons of repressed heterosexual desire, ready to explode at any minute. What is absent in most prisons for men, and for women as well, is the lack of opportunity to develop healthy emotional and personal relationships with other people, without fear or intimidation.

At the United Center, offenders are able to maintain affectional ties and healthy relationships with their families and loved-
ones, and are spared the consequences of an oppressive environment where expressions of masculinity and self-assertion are perverted into exploitative and violent relationships. Indeed, many residents come to the United Center with significant histories of violence committed against their friends, spouses, and children. A prison experience would only provide them with further instruction in the methods of aggression, intimidation, and violence.

Sykes includes the restricted ability to make choices—the deprivation of autonomy—among the pains of imprisonment. The mechanical treadmill quality of prison life does little to prepare its inmates to lead normal lives in a complex social environment. In contrast, the United Center affords its residents an opportunity to make personal decisions each and every day at work, school, social events, and at home with their families. The United Center treatment program encourages and teaches positive self-discipline, not regimentation.

Perhaps the most important factor in the success of the United Center is contrasted with what Sykes referred to as the deprivation of security. Anyone who has ever been a prison inmate, or has worked in a prison for a significant period of time, knows how it feels to experience fear for one's personal safety on a daily basis. As Sykes (1958) so poignantly observes with regard to the inmate population:

Regardless of the patterns of mutual aid and support which may flourish in the inmate population, there are a sufficient number of outlaws within this group of outlaws to deprive the average prisoner of that sense of security which comes from
living among men who can be reasonably expected to abide by the rules of society. While it is true that every prisoner does not live in the constant fear of being robbed or beaten, the constant companionship of thieves, rapists, murderers, and aggressive homosexuals is far from reassuring. (pp. 55-56)

The fear that is endemic to most prisons is totally absent at the United Center. This has an enormous psychological effect on both the residents and the staff at the United Center. That this may sound like a rather dated, and perhaps inane, observation makes it no less true, and its importance to the subject at hand cannot be understated. Having worked in both a maximum security prison for five (5) years and at the United Center for over six (6) years, I can personally attest to the difference between the two situations, and regard it as one of the principal reasons for the success of the United Center in achieving such a low, and long-term reduction in recidivism among criminal offenders.

As a part-time employee at the United Center, I spent many enjoyable Saturday and Sunday afternoons in the company of the Center residents, most of whom were street kids whose lives have been devastated by cruel poverty and neglect. Watching a Sunday afternoon football game with the largely youthful residents, seeing them relax and enjoy themselves, was in stark contrast to the fear and foreboding I saw etched in the faces of men young and old in prison, who faced the real possibility of rape or murder every day. Anyone who believes that prison inmates deserve to live in constant fear, need consider only one thing--most prison inmates are not violent offenders themselves and could be managed quite effectively in a
community-based setting (See Irwin and Austin, 1994). It is impossible to effectively address one's personal problems when he or she lives in constant fear. The hostility and aggression that inmates are needlessly exposed to everyday in prison will only come back to haunt us later, when they are turned out by the thousands to practice the only trade they did learn while incarcerated—violence.

In summation, it may be argued that the United Center, with its excellent record of treatment service delivery, and relatively low recidivism rate, does afford an opportunity for offenders to work toward positive personal change and to assume productive roles in the community after the period of correctional supervision has reached an end.

Reduction in Costs and Commitment Rates

According to a brief report published by the Midwest Department of Corrections in the Fall of 1994, the United Center can maintain a bed for $11,200 per year, significantly less than the Department of Corrections at more than $25,000 annually. Furthermore, United Center residents earned $95,665 in wages; paid a total of $14,349 in taxes; and paid $28,699 in room and board.

The United Center and the Reintegration Model of Correctional Practice

The United Center is a form of correctional policy consistent with the reintegration model of correctional practice. As such, it is a point of departure from the legacy of failure represented by
the restraint and rehabilitation models of correctional practice. The findings contained within this report demonstrate the superiority of the reintegration model of correctional practice in terms of reducing criminal recidivism and delivering effective treatment services to offenders. The policy implications of this research (as opposed to a great deal of the research in community corrections) are unambiguous: non-violent offenders should be kept out of prison or jail and be treated in community-based corrections facilities.

The results of this study provide important support not only for the reintegration model of correctional practice, but for the criminological perspectives which inform it as well. The low rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration rate observed for United Center offenders, in comparison with recidivism rates for prison and probation releasees, lends important support to the societal reaction perspective. Offenders sent to the United Center are spared the trauma of a prison experience and are less likely to be socially crippled by the stigma associated with being a convicted felon. United Center residents are not temporarily or permanently isolated from the community and are assisted by Center staff in their efforts to find employment, participate in educational and/or vocational programs, and receive treatment for drug addiction or other personal problems. More importantly, United Center staff assist offenders in obtaining the community acceptance, support, and contact necessary for their return to a full and productive life following termination from the program. The reintegration model of correctional practice
approaches something more akin to what Braithwaite (1989) describes as forgiveness than to punishment. Offenders are allowed to repay the damage or injury they inflicted upon the community, and both attempt to put the event behind them. This is in stark contrast to the life experienced by most criminal offenders who are never allowed to return to the fold even after paying their debt to society in the form of a prison sentence or other judicial sanction. The problem with American culture is that for most offenders the punishment continues well beyond the period of correctional supervision or confinement. And, as most offenders come from the ranks of the minority poor due to their social, political, and economic marginalization within American society, they have even less chance to redeem themselves following conviction and incarceration for a criminal offense. For them the stigma of a criminal conviction and the trauma of a prison or jail experience very often make it nearly impossible for them to succeed in a culture which never embraced them in the first place, and will never forgive them for their criminal indiscretions in the second place.

The results of this research also lend support to the strain perspective in criminology. Because of their marginal status in society, United Center residents on their own have very little access to the type of resources necessary to compete with other more advantaged members of the community. In providing access to employers who under ordinary circumstances would not consider employing individuals with a felony conviction, the United Center helps of-
fenders overcome significant barriers to employment, barriers that are not ordinarily encountered by members of the economically and politically advantaged classes. For most middle- and upper-income Americans, employment, education, and other opportunities are acquired through social and political contact with other middle- and upper-income members of the community. United Center residents have very few, if any, of these important contacts. The Executive Director of the United Center, on the other hand, has frequent contact with local business owners, members of the local chamber of commerce, politicians, government officials, and other influential people within the community. This enables United Center residents to compete for jobs that, under normal circumstances, are well beyond their reach.

Summary

In view of the failure of our prison system to reform offenders, it is a reasonable expectation that saving them from a prison experience will improve their chances of successful adjustment to society after expiration of their sentence. This expectation has served as one of the major rationales for community corrections in general, and halfway houses like the United Center in particular (Eskridge, Seiter & Carlson, 1981; Petersilia, 1993; Wilson, 1985). It is this expectation that led to the establishment of the United Center in Middletown County, Midwest, over a decade ago. Indeed, the evidence that prisons and jails are inherently criminogenic, and
filled to over-capacity as fast as they are built, is overwhelming. Nonetheless, as Skolnick (1994) has noted, "intuition is currently driving the country toward desperate and ineffectual responses that will drive up prison and jail costs, divert tax dollars from vital purposes, and leave the public as insecure and dissatisfied as ever" (p. 21). In twenty years we will no doubt be in the same predicament that we find ourselves in today. And in the year 2,020, a new crop of politicians will tell our children and grandchildren that we need to build more prisons and jails.

The implications of this study are important at all levels of government with respect to criminal justice policy. Overcrowded prisons and the staggering number of offenders currently on probation, parole, and other forms of community supervision (an increasing number are violent offenders) demand that we learn more about what works, and abandon the punishment ideology that has failed to reduce crime and rehabilitate offenders. Building new jails and prisons takes everyone in the criminal justice system off the hook in terms of being accountable for their actions, and in terms of developing new and creative long-term solutions to the problem of crime. New and much larger prisons and jails, simply allow judges, prosecutors, law enforcement officials, and members of the criminal justice system in general to conduct business as usual; no one is required to think or to be creative. Moreover, without systematic and continuous study of the problem, we run the risk of leaving the next generation with the same legacy of failure we inherited from
the previous generation. We need to break the cycle of failure, not perpetuate it.

According to Joan Petersilia (1993), community corrections has suffered from a lack of evidence to show that it reduces recidivism, and a failure to define and measure intermediate outcomes such as rates of employment and participation in treatment programs. The findings contained in this research report go a long way in addressing both of these deficiencies and argue persuasively for the expansion of community-based programs like the United Center.

They should also help to provide some important guidelines when considering offenders for placement at the Center. Attempting to find the most appropriate offenders for treatment should not be construed as creaming, rather it should be viewed as attempting to identify the offenders most appropriate for community-based treatment. Even the optimal--and very rare--offender described above, is still a convicted felon whose success is by no means guaranteed. Indeed, to the extent that optimal offenders are unable to secure a placement in the program (due to lack of an available bed, or if the program did not exist), it could be argued that they are more likely to recidivate following release from jail or prison, than they would be following release from the United Center.

State and local policy-makers and criminal justice officials should be very pleased with the findings contained in this report. The United Center is able to report some very low numbers with respect to recidivism and has proven that treatment measures such
as counseling and community service are significantly reheated to low rates of offender recidivism. This is a success story that should not be ignored by anyone who is committed to reducing crime and providing effective treatment services for offenders.

The success of the United Center encourages us to experiment in developing new and more promising ways to deal with offender populations. This approach makes much more sense than the ineffectual imprisonment-reduces-crime ideology that currently has a stranglehold on criminal justice policy all across the United States. For the time being, however, prison incarceration rates will doubtless continue to climb, and increased construction of new prisons and jails is anticipated by most concerned observers. Trends toward mandatory sentencing, abolition of parole, and reduced funding will push correctional systems toward crisis, and violent and serious property offenders into community-based programs. However, while corrections remains in a crisis stage, community-based corrections, improved screening of offenders, and better treatment service delivery hold hope for the future (Allen, 1987). The United Center gives cause to hope.
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