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When a convicted felon is considered for parole from a correctional institution, several factors relating to his experience while incarcerated are presented before the Parole Board. One of the factors which is considered favorably by the Board and indicative of rehabilitation is an individual's participation in educational programs while serving his sentence. This implies a non-verbal quid-pro-quo exchange. Its effect is to fill classrooms even where no formal requirement compels enrollment (Bowker, 1982, 241).

The purpose of this research was to determine if the completion of a two-year post secondary program while incarcerated, resulted in a lower rate of recidivism than that experienced by an inmate from a similar risk category that had not completed a two-year academic program while incarcerated.

The research was concerned with identifying those institutions within the State of Michigan which granted two-year degrees to inmates in the years 1975 and 1976. More specifically, the criminal activity of one hundred and ninety-three inmates was recorded allowing for a minimum of three years release time following incarceration. The risk category of the inmate was recorded to determine if a particular risk category of graduates was more prone to re-
cidivate than a sample of non-graduates with the same risk classification.

There was not a significant difference in the rate of recidivism between those inmates who had been graduated from a two-year college program while incarcerated and those inmates who had not graduated from a two-year program while incarcerated. The rate of success, defined as no new prison sentence being imposed on the released inmate, was independent of graduation. This study also indicated that dispersion among the risk categories for graduates who failed was similar to the dispersion among the risk categories for the entire released prison population in 1975 and 1976.

Inmate success, defined as no felony convictions following release from prison, was not associated with graduation, and the distribution among the five assaultive and three property risk classifications was similar for both graduates and non-graduates. Graduation from two year college programs while incarcerated does not appear to be instrumental in lowering rates of recidivism.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Problem

During the regular session of 1981, the 81st Legislature of Michigan appropriated in excess of three million dollars to support prison educational programs in the State of Michigan (Lee, 1980). The state financed the cost of education for two-year college programs. Two-year associate degree programs were conducted by nine community colleges and two four-year colleges—Northern Michigan University and Lake Superior State College. The community college programs were funded by direct state appropriations to the colleges. The four-year colleges were reimbursed for educational cost by the Michigan Department of Corrections.

Prison educational programs are costly efforts to insure or contribute to the rehabilitation of those individuals incarcerated in American prisons. The educational process is consistent with, and supportive of, the two generally accepted goals of American prisons (Glaser, 1973):

1. To evoke in offenders an enduring identification of themselves with anti-criminal persons;

2. To enhance the prospects that released prisoners will achieve satisfaction in legitimate post-release activities.
The goals of American prisons express society's desire that the individuals released from correctional institutions will not again engage in criminal activity. This re-establishment in the esteem of others is frequently referred to as rehabilitation. The repetition of criminal activity by an individual is referred to as recidivism and the frequency of criminal activity within an offender group is recorded as the rate of recidivism.

Recidivism rates reflect the amount of criminal activity an ex-offender conglomerate engages in subsequent to release or probation or from a correctional institution. Recidivism rates are vulnerable to criticism due to the discretion, selectivity, enforcement inherent within the criminal justice system, and the length of the follow-up study all of which consequently effect these rates. However, Martinson (1974) concluded that recidivism is the phenomenon which reflects most directly how well our present treatment programs are performing the task of rehabilitation. To date, research has not provided clear evidence that correctional education programs have affected recidivism rates. This has called into question the contribution of education to the correctional mission.

Research (Buttram & Dusewicz, 1977) indicated that there might be a relationship between post-secondary education and lower rates of recidivism. This research complements earlier research (Davidson & Robinson, 1975) that indicated that participation in educational programs was not as significant an influence on recidivism as was graduation from educational programs. Previous attempts to measure this relationship have been criticized for flaws in research design. Risk differentials of the prisoners participating in the
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various programs made interpretation almost impossible (Martinson, 1974). Cognizant of these criticisms, the question of whether post-secondary graduation affects recidivism by risk category still remained. This study sought to determine the effects on recidivism rates by risk category which resulted from graduation from a two-year college program while incarcerated.

Historical Context

Criminological inquiry began in the United States at the end of the 19th Century. Numerous sociological, psychological, and physiological explanations of criminogenesis have evolved. Theories that have indicated correlational relationships have frequently been interpreted as cause-effect relationships. These spurious conclusions arrived at due to inappropriate interpretation of causal relationships have clouded the issue more than it was prior to the commencement of such research. Too frequently relationships are rendered as a panacea to recidivism. The warning, "criminologist beware lest they should be accused of telling us even less important things at still greater expense" (Mannheim, 1965, p. 76) is as timely today as it has ever been.

What actually causes crime remains as much a mystery to researchers as how to reduce or eliminate crime. Due to centuries of disagreement with the former of these two issues, the focus of debate in recent years has been with the latter of the two issues, i.e., the means by which offenders are to be rehabilitated in order to reduce future involvement with criminal activity (recidivism).
Robert Martinson's comprehensive national study conducted in the 70's examined the attempts of our correctional institutions to reform inmates. The reform attempts were summed up in two words, "nothing works." However, it should be noted Martinson concluded his report with the following:

It is possible that there is indeed something that works—that to some extent is working right now in front of our noses, and that might be made to work better—something that deters rather than cures, something that does not so much reform convicted offenders as prevent criminal behavior in the first place. But whether that is the case and, if it is, what strategies will be found to make our deterrence system work better than it does now, are questions we will not be able to answer with data until a new family of studies has been brought into existence (Martinson, 1974, p. 369).

This new family of studies suggested by Martinson progressed and produced results that conflict with Martinson's statement "nothing works." Recent studies produced favorable results when the variable of education is introduced (Chaneles, 1976; Halleck & White, 1977; McDougall, 1976; Palmer, 1975; Quay, 1977; Serrill, 1975; Smith & Berlin, 1977). One of the anomalies of the debate over whether anything works is that the reviews of literature which led to the conclusion that rehabilitative programs failed were concentrated on a search of literature before 1967. To give Martinson credit, he recognized this fact when he stated, "Our studies ended in December 1967. How do I know the next 200 studies won't show tremendous success?" It appears Martinson was prophetic in his statement. Research completed in September 1977 (Buttram & Dusewicz) found ex-offenders enrolled in post-secondary educational programs to have violated parole and/or to
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have been arrested significantly fewer times than those in the non-enrollment control group. Davidson and Robinson (1975) used a time series analysis for a year prior and an average of 18 months after inmates completed their program. They compared graduates versus non-graduates and found those who completed the educational program had lower recidivism rates. This suggests that not only participation, but graduation from an educational program might be a significant variable in contributing to a lower rate of recidivism.

Conceptual Framework

There appears to be a strong relationship between education, self-esteem, and recidivism.

The only difference between the criminal and the normal individual is that the normal man partially controls his criminal drives and finds outlets for them in socially harmless activities. The power of controlling and of the domestication of the primitive unsocial tendencies is acquired by the individual as a result of education (Smith & Berlin, 1974, p. 21).

The beneficial effects of college-improvement in self image, social maturity, interests, competence and employment (Ramist, 1981) are as relevant to an inmate enrolled in an education program as they are to a student of the community. Psychologist Nathaniel Brandon devoted years of study to the role of self-esteem and states, "There is no value judgment more important to man—no factor more decisive in his psychological development and motivation—than the estimate he passes on himself" (Brandon, 1979, p. 109). In their book, Prison Treatment and Parole Survival (Kassebaum, Ward & Wilner, 1971), the authors cited a healthy acceptance of self as a criterion.
of positive mental health. A positive self-esteem is a critical fac-
tor between success or failure upon release from a correctional in-
stitution.

If a man is to achieve and maintain self-esteem, the
first and fundamental requirement is that he preserve
an indomitable will to understand. A human being
creates his own character; he does so by means of the
volitional choices he makes day by day (Brandon,
1969, p. 115).

Enrollment in an educational program is a volition exercised by
an inmate. The motivation for this volition was suggested in the
study completed by Buttram and Dusewicz (1977). Their study indi-
cated "the highest percentage of those enrolled in educational pro-
grams enrolled in order to improve themselves." This study provided
evidence of a desire to increase self-esteem. Whether it is the con-
tent of what is learned which makes the differences, or the symbolic
awareness of a college degree in and of itself is unclear.

To the college graduate, a diploma becomes symbolic of achieve-
ment. In a study of Educational Programs at the Oregon State Cor-
rectional Institution (Martin, 1976), researchers found those in-
mates enrolled in certified college courses to be more marketable
because the student tended to be identified more as a college student
and less as a person who took a course while he was incarcerated.

So intensely does a man feel the need of a positive
view of himself, that he may evade, repress, distort
his judgment, disintegrate his mind—in order to avoid
coming face to face with facts that would affect his
self-appraisal adversely. A man who has chosen or
accepted irrational standards by which to judge him-
self, can be driven all his life to pursue flagrantly
self-destructive goals—in order to assure himself that
he possesses a self-esteem which in fact he does not
have (Brandon, 1969, p. 110).
The adversity of a negative self-appraisal may be manifested in the form of repeated criminal activity, i.e., recidivism.

In summary, the completion of a college degree may be a significant ingredient in the elevation of an inmate's self-esteem, thus, obviating potential future criminal activity. Figure 1 indicates this possibility and its effects.

Research Objectives

The purpose of this project was to describe:

1. The difference in the rate of recidivism between inmates that have been graduated from college programs while incarcerated, and the rate of recidivism among all released inmates of similar risk classifications.

2. Studies relating to recidivism that have focused on education as a variable.

3. The effects of education on the general population.

4. The inmate population in Michigan.

5. Studies completed on risk factors relating to the release of inmates from prison settings.

6. The effects of education on the released felon.

7. Post-prison success prediction efforts.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of clarifying terms, the following terms were defined for this study:

**College Graduates.** Parolees who have completed a 2-year college/university program while in the custody of, or supervision of, the Michigan Department of Corrections. Inmates who had previously
Figure 1: Education as it affects the inmate's self-image and subsequent behavior
completed a degree prior to being incarcerated are not included in this category. The degree may be a two-year post-secondary degree in any field of study, that resulted in an associate degree.

**Discharge.** An ex-offender who has been unconditionally released from parole or unconditionally released from the institution in lieu of parole.

**Failure.** The conviction of a violent or nonviolent felony following release from prison, for which a new sentence of imprisonment was imposed.

**Felony.** Crimes punishable by imprisonment for more than one year.

**Parole.** A treatment program in which an offender, after serving part of a term in a correctional institution, is conditionally released by the Parole Board under the supervision of a parole agent.

**Post-Secondary Education Programs.** Any college courses available to inmates for which they can gain academic, transcripted credit toward a degree. This does not include vocational programs.

**Recidivism.** Inmate behavior while on parole or on discharge status that has resulted in a new sentence imposed on the individual. A parole violation that does not result in a new sentence is not considered as recidivism in this study. The subsequent sentence that evolves as a consequence of the behavior is not germane to this study.

**Rehabilitation.** An inmate reintegration into the community, with success dependent on a recidivism index scale of activity; the inmate demonstrates no illegal activity, technical violation, mis-
demeanor, nonviolent felony, and violent felony.

**Risk Factor.** A category assigned by the Michigan Department of Corrections at the time of parole. The risk groups were developed through the use of AID (Automatic Interaction Detection). The AID program is a technique designed to detect significant interactions among a large number of variables (360 per individual) in relation to a single dependent variable—recidivism. The risk factor subgroups within the parole population indicate either a higher or lower than average probability of committing a crime on parole or while discharged. The categories are: very high risk, high risk, middle risk, low risk, and very low risk. Each inmate is assigned an assaultive risk classification, and a property risk classification (Murphy, 1978).

**Success.** No felony convictions following release from prison, that resulted in imprisonment. This includes ex-offenders who may have committed a misdemeanor or a technical violation and subsequently returned to prison or continued on parole.

**Limitations**

The following limitations are recognized within this study:

1. Following discharge the subject may have left Michigan, and have been involved in criminal activity in another state.

2. The subject may have charges pending. Pending charges would not be reflected in his record.

3. The subject may be currently involved with the Federal Prison system. His state record will not reflect this.
4. The reporting of violations is dependent upon the discretionary judgment of the individual parole officers. Some violations may have been handled informally, therefore, no record of the violation will be recorded.

5. A change in performance (success) may be the result of some treatment administered at the same time the individual was completing his degree.

6. Recidivism during any one particular time period may reflect unfavorable social-economic conditions.

7. Limitations inherent in a static group comparison (Campbell & Stanley, 1966, pp. 47-50).
   a. Selection—subjects are not selected at random, but are supplied as a result of graduation.
   b. Mortality—subjects that are included in the general population may be advanced in their education, paroled or discharged short of graduation.
   c. Differences—subjects may have been identified through the differential recruitment of persons making up the groups. In this study those inmates that have been involved in educational programs may have been selected as a result of preferential treatment. There was no indication that this took place at any of the institutions involved in this study.

8. Inmates may not subscribe to middle-class social values at all, but elect to enroll in the free education offered for reasons other than self-improvement, i.e., time filler - or to impress parole board to receive early release, etc. (Bowker, 1982, p. 241).

Summary

There is a strong relationship between an individual's educational achievement and an individual's self-esteem. There is also a strong relationship between an individual's self-concept and his adaptation to societal values and standards of behavior. It is logical to assume that these relationships hold true for those individuals that have been incarcerated as well as for those individuals.
within free society. There also exists a suggestion within the philosophy of correctional educators that an increase in the educational level of an inmate would result in an increase in support of societal values and standards by the inmate. The increased support in societal values should be reflected in lower rates of criminal activity (recidivism). This study was designed to measure, if in fact, a lower rate of crime resulted from an increase in inmate education, culminating in graduation.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Following a summary of the historical development of correctional education, this chapter includes a description of what the overall intent and goals of education within the free community are, with an emphasis on the role of education as it relates to the development of an individual's self-esteem. The relationship of correctional education and an inmate's self-esteem is then discussed. The union of education, rehabilitation and recidivism is developed by reviewing the findings of previous studies that have incorporated these variables. The final section of this chapter covers studies that have been instrumental in the development of risk factors and their predictive validity. The chapter concludes with a statement of a hypothesis based on available literature.

Historical Development of Correctional Education

Early Beginnings

"Correctional education is defined generally as the educational programs and treatment processes available to adult and juvenile offenders after adjudication. The term is also used to refer to institution-based education of inmates" (Education Commission of the States, 1976, p. 16).
The Quakers were the first group of prison reformers to introduce education in correctional institutions. Not only did they view education as an effective means of dealing with idleness in prison, they also believed that offenders required exposure to religious readings to help accomplish the moral reformation they thought to be critical for rehabilitation. Unfortunately, the Quakers had little impact on morality or recidivism, or, for that matter, on idleness in prison (Davis, 1978). The Quakers ran into opposition from individuals who thought educated criminals would be more dangerous to society upon release than uneducated ones (Chenault, 1951).

In 1825, the Boston Prison Discipline Society was co-founded by Louis Dwight, considered to be the first national figure in American Prison Reform (McKelvey, 1972). The primary purpose of Dwight and his followers was the imparting of religious beliefs to inmates. Their distribution of Bibles and tracts formed the nucleus of prison libraries.

Conducted at night or on Sundays, the classes were usually characterized by "...the chaplain standing in the semi-dark corridor, before the cell door, with a dingy lantern hanging on to the grated bars, and teaching to the wretched convict in the darkness beyond the grated door the rudiments of reading or numbers" (Lewis, 1972, p. 6).

The first school for public offenders was established at the Maryland Penitentiary in 1846, under the administration of Warden William Johnson. A "Sunday School" was established for the teaching of reading and writing to male inmates who had no education. The
school was in session on Sunday afternoon with custodial officers used as teachers (Davis, 1978).

Prison libraries were established at Sing Sing Prison in 1840 and at Eastern Penitentiary of Pennsylvania in 1844 (Roberts, 1973). New York State was the first to make annual appropriations for prison libraries.

The New York State Law of 1847 provided for the appointment of two secular teachers for each state prison (Tappan, 1960). This was the first legal recognition of academic education in correctional institutions (McKelvey, 1972). By 1865, instructors in New York and Pennsylvania, as well as chaplains in Connecticut and New Hampshire, made their rounds in this fashion; only Ohio maintained regular classes conducted by the chaplain three evenings a week. Education in the other prisons was limited to the Sabbath Schools.

In 1867, Warden Gideon Haynes convinced the Massachusetts State Legislature to appropriate $1,000 for the purchase of textbooks for each illiterate inmate and for semi-weekly classes at the Massachusetts State Prison. Haynes added a library, an active Sabbath School program, and a third educational feature in the form of lectures once or twice a month (Wines & Dwight, 1867; reprinted 1976).

To summarize the state of the art at this point in history, a quote from the 1870 report of the New York Prison Association follows:

Provision is annually made for religious and secular teachings among convicts in the State prisons. In the form of books for prison libraries, pay of chaplains and teachers, the State expends about $7,500 a year. All of this, except the provisions for chaplains, is
of comparatively recent origin, and ought to be of far greater value than it is. Now it is all conducted without system or order, often at the caprice of individuals, and is always accompanied by palpable violations of positive statute laws. . . . The system of instruction if so conducted as to amount to a farce. (Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Prison Association of New York, Prison Association of New York, Reports 1871-1873, Vol. 7, pp. 187-188).

At approximately the same time (1870) that the above observation was being made, the American Prison Association was formed, with the express purpose of professionalizing the penal system and implementing principles of rehabilitation, humanitarian treatment of offenders, and reduction of crime through application of behavioral sciences (Ryan, 1971). The first American Prison Association Congress declared that "education is a matter of primary importance in prisons." This famed congress included the call for universal education in its report "Declaration of Principles of Prison Discipline." These principles included: Rewards for good behavior, prison industry, and attention to academic learning. This was the birth of the inmate reformatory movement (Davis, 1978).

The Reform Movement

Zubulon Brockway, the warden of the Detroit House of Detention in Detroit, Michigan, led the reform movement when he was appointed to head the Elmira Reformatory in New York in the late 1870's. The reformatory housed young men between the ages of 16 and 30. This was the age group that he considered to be most responsive to treatment. There was also a college in Elmira, and it was used for the
academic talent needed for the teaching of the educational program that he began with an elementary school and continued through the university level (Mendez, 1979). Brockway, while at Elmira, established an educational system that taught inmates self discipline, as well as academic subjects. The division of academic and moral education was headed by college professors. Specific courses were taught by professors, public school principals, and lawyers (Johnson, 1965).

In 1915 enough interest and concern accumulated to establish the Correctional Education Association, which still exists today. Aided by a grant in 1927 from the Carnegie Corporation to the National Society of Penal Information, Inc., Austin MacCormick conducted a study of educational and library work in American prisons. MacCormick's study took him to all but three prisons in the United States. The focus of his research shifted when he realized the limited amount of work that was being done in education and he directed his attention to developing a philosophy for prison education that would give the movement a structured direction. His efforts resulted in an educational model for prisons that included academic, vocational, health, cultural, and social education. MacCormick's work was considered the first major work on prison education and was heralded by educators, social workers, counselors, and legislators. Since the publication in 1931 of MacCormick's classic, The Education of Adult Prisoners: A Survey and a Program, the number of academic programs continued to increase over the years. Prior to 1930, education in the nation's prisons was little
more than an attempt to eradicate illiteracy.

The Lewisohn Commission, 1930-1932, and the Engelhardt Commission, 1934-1938, agreed with the MacCormick study and made recommendations similar to those of MacCormick. The establishment of the Federal Prison System in 1930 and the appointment of a supervisor of education at each federal institution contributed to the progress of prison education at the state level. In 1933, a Bureau of Prison's report referred to the education and training of inmates by noting that the major emphasis in educational work was placed on providing academic instruction for inmates of low educational levels and for illiterates.

In 1934, Congress approved the establishment of Federal Prison Industries. Under provisions of the Federal Prison Industries Act, prison industries would serve as an activating force for learning. Shortly after passage of the Act, the Bureau established the position of Superintendent of Vocational Education and Training. The mission was to provide education which would enable federal offenders to participate in a more socially acceptable and productive life upon release. Compulsory courses for functionally illiterate inmates were established by the State of New York and the Federal Prison System in 1934. As early as 1939, post-secondary college courses were held inside a prison (Adams, 1975).

During the 1930's and through the 1940's, the nation's attention on the war effort distracted from educational innovation within prisons. Following the war, the advent of the G.I. Bill enabled many veterans to attend college. There was a renewed interest in educa-
tion, both within society and within the prison community via correspondence courses. This implies a non-verbal *quid-pro-quo* exchange. Its effect is to fill classrooms even where no formal requirement compels enrollment (Bowker, 1982, p. 241).

**Standards for Evaluating Educational Programs in Correctional Institutions** was published in 1941. Lloyd N. Yepson analyzed the standards for evaluating programs in corrections. He examined these standards according to the criteria of objectivity, reliability and validity. He found that the objectivity of the standards were approximately ten percent objective in all of the items. The standards represented an important advance in inmate education, for they provided some method of evaluating educational programs offered in correctional institutions (Davis, 1978).

In 1946, the American Prison Association's Committee on Education rose to the status of an affiliate of the Correctional Education Association; and, by 1948, many workers in the field hailed correctional education in penal and correctional institutions at last as having "achieved maturity" (Tappan, 1960).

Mendez (1979) made an interesting observation regarding prison riots and their correlation to the implementation of educational programs. In 1951-1952, there were 20 major riots or disturbances in prisons across the U.S. In 1953, the University of Kansas and Southern Illinois University began offering classes within prison walls and in 1954, the University of Maryland offered courses at Menard Prison. Although there is no evidence that the riots initiated the introduction of higher education programs, it is interest-
ing that one followed the other so closely. It should be noted that the prison studies and the attempts at prison reform in the early 1930's followed the prison riots of 1929.

In the 1954 edition of A Manual of Correctional Standards, it is stated that (in reference to education), "its full potentiality in the total treatment process has hardly been explored" (Coty, 1963; Davis, 1978). Building on successive editions of the manual, the American Correctional Association's Commission on Accreditation included 15 "essential" standards for the management of an approved educational program. Where a facility does not meet any of these essential standards, it must be denied accreditation (Conrad, 1981).

Colleges and universities located near prisons began to compete with correspondence schools by providing instructors who went into the prisons and taught classes directly to inmates. By 1957, the University of Kansas and St. Mary's College in Kansas made available to inmates at the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth instruction in analytical geometry, composition and literature, history of education, and social ethics (Davis, 1978). In the 1950's education programs were not expanded, due to the lack of essential funds and to people not committing themselves to the philosophy of rehabilitation.

The Modern Era

In the 1960's the number of programs offered inside prisons by colleges and universities increased rapidly. The Manpower Development Training Act of 1962 provided funds which were used by many
states to support intensive education and vocational training for of­
fenders.

In 1966 the Washington based Institute for Policy Studies re­
ceived a grant from the Ford Foundation to organize an experimental
program at San Quentin Prison to explore the feasibility of organized
college level instruction in maximum security conditions. The last­
ing significance of the San Quentin Prison College was the impetus it
gave to Thomas Gaddis and his colleagues toward the development of
Project Newgate with support from the Office of Economic Opportunity

Project Newgate (1967) provided for post-secondary education in
the rehabilitation of inmates through a full-time program encom­
passing pre-release counseling, intensive education, and a post­
release program of guidance and therapeutic support (Ryan, 1977).
What Newgate did for American penology was to institutionalize post­
secondary education as an accepted phase of a prison's program of

After the death of Dr. Martin Luther King in 1968, the colleges
responded by initiating opportunity programs. Opportunity programs
were begun in prison education in practically the same magnitude as
social opportunity programs (Mendez, 1979). A 1968 survey of col­
lege-level instruction found that 36% of all state prison systems
provided some sort of academic program, with slightly more than 1%
of the inmates participating (Adams, 1973).

Correctional education can be said to have reached a pinnacle
of success by the time that the last quarter of the century was
underway. For example, Driscoll noted:

During the past few years, education has assumed a dominant position among the many tools used by correctional personnel for the purpose of rehabilitating the criminal offender. The nature of these educational programs has evolved from those that were largely vocational in scope to those attempting to increase the scholastic achievements of the incarcerated individual (Driscoll, 1971, p. 37).

A survey conducted by Adams and Connelley in 1971 found that 270 colleges were involved in prison higher education (Adams, 1973).

In a report completed by the University of South Carolina (1977), the following statement appeared:

In a nutshell, it might be said with assurance and conviction that correctional education has developed to the point of having the capability for meeting the educational and training needs of offenders in the nation's correctional system of 1977 (Ryan, 1977, p. 9).

On June 7, 1978, the Federal Correctional Education Assistance Act (5.3170) introduced by Senator Bayh and Senator Metzenbaum and passed by the Congress provided federal financial assistance to the states to carry out educational programs for offenders. However, where general inmate educational programs showed improvement, college level programs lacked similar resources and were perceived as less adequate by LEAA in their national survey of such correctional educational programs in American prisons (Bell, Conard, Laffey, Lutz, Miller, Simon, Stakelom & Wilson, 1979).

Education As It Relates To An Inmate's Self-Esteem

To build a supportive argument for the merits of correctional education and its beneficial effects on the inmate, it is helpful to
establish support for the concept of education irrespective of the correctional setting. The end values to be sought through education must be identified, elaborated, and given operational meaning by reference to social conditions and personal experience.

Effects of Education

It is difficult to establish the purposes and goals of education in absolute terms, because they cannot be defined independently of the culture and institutions of the society of which they are a function (The Encyclopedia of Education, 1976, p. 418). To a large extent, educational goals are determined by the institution and to a certain extent, purpose is related to the character of the clientele and sponsorship of the institution. The educational institutions in this study offered liberal arts programs to the inmates.

Education and success in life are integrally related in this society. Education is as good a barometer as any to the likelihood of success in modern urban society (Pierce, 1976). Although we may lack the instruments to predict accurately the impact of education, apart from other personality and social factors, on future success, it is known that education is highly correlated with success of people in the general population (Ramist, 1981).

Education and Self-Esteem

Ramist (1981) cited the beneficial effects of college as improvement in self-image, social maturity, interests, competency, and employment. The concept of the improved self-image as a result of
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the college experience is critical to the hypothesis presented in this study. A self-image is certainly not unique to the college student, or to the inmate. Henry (1950) suggested that growth tendencies of a "real self" are present in everyone. Maslow (1954) postulated that there is an inborn motive to develop one's potentialities (self-actualization).

At the turn of the century, William James (1947) indicated our self-feeling in this world depended entirely on how we saw ourselves with respect to what we wanted to be. It is determined by the ratio of our actualities to our supposed potentialities; a fraction in which our pretentions are the denominator. Thus, according to James (1947):

\[
\text{Self-Esteem} = \frac{\text{Success}}{\text{Pretentions}}
\]

Such a fraction may be increased as well by diminishing the denominator as by increasing the numerator.

Psychologist George Mead's (1918) self-role theory complimented what James suggested. At the core of Mead's theory are the propositions that an individual (1) will conceive of himself much as he believes significant others conceive of him, and (2) will tend to act in accord with expectations he attributes to these significant others concerning the way "people like him" should act.

**Prisoner Self-Esteem**

The issue of self-esteem becomes particularly relevant when addressing the unique personality characteristics of those incarcer-
ated. The barrier that prisons place between the inmate and the wider world marks the first curtailment of self. Most men who go to jail have little self-respect to begin with, and their prison experience generally reduces what little self-respect remains (Roth, 1970). Frequently, offenders have experienced years of failure; failure in school, work, family life, and even at crime by being "caught" and labeled a "criminal." Poor self-image and feelings of inadequacy and worthlessness are prevalent among most offenders (Roberts, 1974).

As early as 1870, the National Prison Association alluded to the significance of education as it relates to the self-esteem of the offender population.

Education is a vital force in the reformation of fallen men and women. Its tendency is to quicken the intellect, inspire self-respect, excite the highest aims, and afford a healthful substitute for low and vicious amusements (Conrad, 1981, p. 1).

Correctional Education and an Inmate's Self-Esteem

Philosophical positions and appropriate methods of evaluation to the impact of education often results in contested issues within the free community. These issues vary from curriculum versus athletic emphasis, to the significance of the SAT scores generated by each graduating class. However, there continues to be universal support of the broad mission of education and its benefits to the individuals within a society. The impact of education on the offender remains a debated issue. The source of the debate is centered around what the desired outcomes of the education of the of-
fender are; and, secondly, of how these outcomes can be measured.
Two frequently voiced outcomes are (1) rehabilitation and (2) low recidivism rates. The conflict intensifies due to a lack of universal acceptance by researchers or practitioners of any one definition for either of the terms, rehabilitation or recidivism. The end results are that research findings remain relevant only to the definitions stated in a particular study.

The Correctional Education Advisory Committee (1976) did not choose to engage in this ongoing debate and stated its position in an elementary, but concise, fashion:

Although we may lack the instrument to predict accurately the impact of education, apart from other personality and social factors, on future success, it is known that education is highly correlated with success of people in the general population. Therefore, one would conclude that education will benefit the prison inmate (Correctional Advisory Committee, 1976, p. 13).

The case for education and training opportunities for prisoners rests on essentially the same kind of considerations which support education and training in society; namely, that education and training contribute to preparation for self-supporting and socially acceptable life styles (McCollum, 1975).

Ideally, prison college should transfer the misfortunes of a prison commitment into an opportunity to improve the offender's life so substantially that a return to crime would become improbable (Conrad, 1981).

Higher education attempts to eradicate the inmate's poor self-concept, replacing it with a positive concept of self. This is accomplished by presenting realistic opportunities for success. If one believes
that men turn to crime because legitimate avenues are blocked, then by providing post-secondary education and counseling (legitimate opportunities for achieving success) the inmate-student can become successful (Roberts, 1974, p. 214).

The Director of Corrections for the state of Texas, Dr. George Beto, is more direct regarding correctional education. "I don't think you have to prove that education is good. It has intrinsic value. I am persuaded that education changes people ... Every inmate...should get as much education as his mentality can absorb" (Conrad, 1981, p. 33).

**Education and Rehabilitation**

Suggestions for change often embody connotations for rehabilitation and lower rates of recidivism. Change also implies desired modification in personality traits, i.e., self-esteem.

An Associate Degree which seems feasible for most of the inmates who have a high school diploma offers not only increased employment opportunities, but more importantly, enhancement of self-confidence and self-image which most inmates need. The inmate's self-image can be greatly enhanced by his own accomplishments of being successful in college courses, and by the reinforcement and praise of the college staff (Roberts, 1973, pp. 230-231).

Intentionally circumventing elaborate discussion regarding the ideologies that abound as to what constitutes rehabilitation, some mention from the authorities in the respected disciplines are appropriate.

Pownall (1960), McCabe and Driscoll (1971) and continuing reports from the Rehabilitation Research Foundation indicate that there is a positive relationship between a person's involvement in education and training programs while in prison, post-release employment in some jobs, and "success" in staying out of prison (McCollum, 1973, p. 7).
Roberts (1974) expounded on this concept.

To rehabilitate offenders, they must be given the opportunity to participate in programs which will improve their self-images and modify their antisocial behavior patterns, thereby facilitating adjustment to society (Roberts, 1974, p. 211).

Self improvement follows self-respect in the process of rehabilitation (Roth, 1970, p. 441).

If one assumes that rehabilitation for parolees should include (a) developing the potential of the individual, and (b) providing training for living in a new situation, then educational intervention becomes an essential consideration (Murphy & Murphy, 1971, p. 46).

**Education and Recidivism**

From researchers who have focused on recidivism, the role of education to the offender is also encouraging: Education programs in penal institutions, and specifically adult basic education (ABE) programs help to reduce recidivism and thereby reduce crime (Cortright, 1972, p. 9).

Partlett (1975) cited the significance of an apparent correlation between education, personality, and recidivism:

There are strong indications that higher education changes subjects to a more analytic mode of perception and in addition accelerates moral development. This would assume more thoughtful and moral prisoners. This might lead to reduced criminal behavior (Partlett, 1975, pp. 10-12).

Herschler (1976) suggested caution in drawing spurious causal-tive claims regarding the relevance of education as it relates to recidivism:

Poor education does not necessarily cause crime. We can say, however, that the greater the problems of people, including educational problems, the more like-
ly it is they will resort to crime, either out of frustration or because of economic need (Herschler, 1976, p. 5).

Previous Studies on Recidivism

An ambitious review of previous studies regarding recidivism was undertaken at the outset of this study. However, to suggest differences or draw comparisons to other studies that have not incorporated the variables of this study; i.e., risk factor and college graduation, would suggest conclusions that have previously been criticized by Davis (1964). To compare results that do not use identical variables, methodologies, and recidivism categories is to draw conclusions that cannot be supported.

For those whose interest is in recidivism studies per se, Kucab (1977) completed a commendable effort of reviewing previous studies dealing with this topic. Bailey (1966) also contributed significantly to the study of recidivism by evaluating the results of 100 correctional programs. Ross (1980) offered a complete reference list of studies dealing with effective treatment programs. According to the Bailey (1966) and Ross (1980) studies, the recidivism rate for parolees was found to vary from 33% to 66% (Kucab, 1977). These diverse findings were influenced by the manifold definitions of what constitutes recidivism in a particular study. Lipton (1975) questioned the validity of any statistical comparison between studies because the meaning of recidivism varies in all studies of the subject.
Recidivism Studies with Education as a Variable

Recidivism studies that do address the issue of risk factor and college graduation are germane to this study and summaries of those studies are appropriate.

In the final report of the Effectiveness of Education Programs in State Correctional Institutions (Buttram & Dusewicz, 1977), which included both pre-secondary and post-secondary subjects, a single significant advantage was noted: Ex-offenders enrolled in post-secondary education programs had violated parole or had been arrested less frequently than ex-offenders not enrolled in such programs.

The first experimental assessment of a prison college program was recently completed. Stuart Adams reports on the low recidivism rates (less than seven percent returned to prison) among inmates in the D. C. Prison College Project and comparative rates of return (almost nineteen percent) for non-college student releases (Roberts, 1974, p. 215).

The Washington, D. C. Prison College Project, better known as the Federal City College Lorton Project, reported low recidivism rates (Roberts, 1974). The recidivism rate for the project overall was less than 15% for four years (Taylor, 1973). This project has been criticized because six months of potential exposure is not considered an adequate period on which to measure recidivism rates.

Seventy-three participants and thirty-two comparison group members were identified from the Prison College enrollment and participation records. The participants had taken at least two quarters of academic work in the prison and had been released long enough ago to have experienced at least six months of potential exposure time in the community. The Comparison Group
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consisted of institutional applicants for the college program who left prison before becoming enrolled in the program of instruction. In the absence of a controlled experimental design, the Comparison Group provided the best available approximation to a true control group (Office of Data Processing, Research and Planning, D. C. Department of Corrections, Newsletter, March-April, 1972) (Roberts, 1974, p. 215).

Exceptionally high success rates have been reported by a parole plan sponsored by San Diego City College, San Diego. The recidivism rate in this project was reported to be less than one percent (Roberts, 1974). The success of this project might be attributed to the selection of individuals that qualified for the program. This program was a non-institutional, community based program which would preclude acceptance of participants that would be considered a threat to the community. Davidson and Robinson (1975) set up a community based program for male offenders. They used a time series analysis for a year prior and an average of 10 months after completing their program. The program increased school attendance rates by 59%, decreased arrest rates from three offenses per year to .46, and increased achievement test grade ratings by a full year. They also compared graduates of the program versus non-graduates and found that those who completed the program were more often employed. The short period of release, 10 months, used in this project may have been influential in regard to the high success rates reported.

Previous Studies on Risk Factors

An essential variable incorporated in this study is the variable of risk factor. The risk factor is a category assigned to the in-
mate by the Department of Corrections in the State of Michigan at the time of parole. The risk factor subgroups within the parole population indicate either a higher or lower than average probability of the released inmate committing a crime while on parole, or when discharged. The inclusion of this variable is vital in order to suppress the criticism of previous studies that did not include this factor. Risk differentials of the prisoners participating in the various educational programs made interpretations almost impossible (Martinson, 1974). A review of studies identifying the historical development of risk factors is appropriate.

The need for using a parolee risk factor is to assist parole board members in assessing the public risk of releasing an inmate versus the cost and personal disadvantage of continued incarceration (Michigan Department of Corrections, 1978). "If we seek to control delinquent and criminal behavior, then first we will need to be able to predict it" (Gottfredson, 1967, p. 186).

**Risk Factors and Their Predictive Ability**

Attempts to develop "parole prediction" devices are recorded as early as 1923. Warner (1923) used single input indicators and failed to show any significant relationships between historical variables and parole completion. Hart (1923) used combined input variables that provided insight into parole success. The first table of expectancy rates for parole violation were developed and adopted by the Illinois Department of Corrections in 1933. Other researchers stressed the need to calculate prediction tables for
each parole population examined (Tibbits, 1931; Sanders, 1935).

The Gluecks (1940) developed a table of probability scores for delinquents as a result of identifying five social factors that were basic discriminators between delinquents and non-delinquents. In the late 1940's, in a cooperative effort between Otis Duncan and Lloyd Ohlin, an "Index of Predictive Efficiency" was developed. It measured the percentage lost in predictability when using the experience tables, as opposed to the overall recidivism rate (Ohlin & Duncan, 1949). In 1955 (Mannheim & Wilkins), tables of experience for success and failure were developed and used for prediction. Laune (1956) recognized the importance of the inclusion of institution treatment variables in the prediction instrument.

In the 1960's, Gottfredson developed the base expectancy score model used in Wisconsin, Illinois, Washington, and California. David Glaser's work, *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*, reflected his research using a configural analysis technique. This is now used by the states of Massachusetts, Washington, Florida, District of Columbia, and New York to establish individual risk predictions.

It should be noted also that predictive studies, especially in the area of corrections do not exist without criticism of their validity to predict. Some of the more vocal in their criticism were Inciardo (1973), Schwitzgebel (1969), and Gottfredson (1967).

The practical needs of corrections administrators and parole board members gave impetus to the development of an empirically derived parolee risk classification scheme. Such a scheme could be
used as an objective aid in the management and decision-making responsibilities of the Michigan Department of Corrections (Michigan Department of Corrections, 1978).

Need For Research

Recently there has been a philosophical shift in attitude from rehabilitation to hardline policies. This attitude will force higher education to prove its benefits if the programs are to survive. At this point, their survival has been based on assumptions that are devoid from higher education in the free community. Whether these assumptions apply to the prison community or not, to date has gone unchallenged (Mendez, 1979, p. 18).

The need for research in reference to the impact of education of recidivism is well supported.

While considerable evidence exists that some types of offenders have relatively more or less likelihood of recidivism than others, there is, as yet, almost no evidence that available correctional alternatives have any impact on those likelihoods (Robinson & Smith, 1971, p. 67).

What is needed is evidence concerning the differential effects of educational programs on post release behavior (Lipton, Martinson & Wilks, 1975, p. 72).

Although the number of programs continues to increase, little or no research is available that studies the effectiveness of prison higher education (Mendez, 1979, p. 34).

Hypothesis

In light of the supporting literature identifying the relationship of an inmate's self-esteem with education and lower rates of recidivism, the following hypothesis will be pursued:
Inmates within a designated risk category who have been graduated from two-year college programs while incarcerated, experience a lower recidivism rate than released inmates of the same risk category from the total prison population.

Summary

The growth of educational programs within correctional settings is a relatively recent development. The continued support of educational programs relies on the same conceptual assumptions that underlie education within a free society; i.e., to enhance the development of society and encourage man's control over his own destiny. In addition to the philosophical concepts of education in general, correctional education serves two additional purposes: Correctional education attempts to evoke in offenders a more positive self-concept and discourage future criminal activity once released from a correctional setting. Although philosophically sound, the reality in terms of reduced future criminal behavior as a result of educational advancement has yet to be proven. The costly efforts to improve and increase the educational backgrounds of prison inmates are philosophically sound, however, to date they have not been empirically supported.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the characteristics of the subjects who were included in the study and to demonstrate how the sample reflects the inmate population in general. The design used in this study, process of data collection, instrumentation, and data analysis are also described.

Sample and Population

The sample in this study consisted of inmate graduates from two-year college programs in Michigan between January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976. To be included in this study inmates had to have completed their degree while incarcerated. A profile of a sample subject may be developed by reviewing those characteristics that are evident in the inmate population overall. This profile is a composite of statistics published in the annual publication of the Michigan Department of Corrections (1976) and incorporating information obtained from the Public Information Director of the Michigan Department of Corrections. Personal interviews and testing conducted by the Michigan Department of Corrections enabled an inmate profile to be developed. The statistics were compiled at the Michigan Department of Corrections reception center located in Jackson,
Michigan. All inmates sentenced in prison in the State of Michigan had to participate in an evaluation process conducted at the reception center.

A profile of 1975/1976 inmates showed that sixty-eight percent of Michigan inmates were natives of Michigan. Fifty-three percent of the inmates were non-white. The median interval of I.Q. was found in the 90-109 interval with an average educational level of 8.6 years. The average inmate age was 29 years, with 14% presently married. Approximately 23% had completed high school, and 30% were enrolled in education programs; 13% of those inmates incarcerated were enrolled in post-secondary education programs. On an average they were serving sentences that ranged from a minimum of five years to a maximum of fourteen years. Michigan had 1469 inmates serving a maximum sentence of life imprisonment. The average time served by all Michigan prisoners was 29 months. The percentage of graduate inmates that existed in the five risk levels for assaults and three risk levels for property crimes are listed in Table 1. The percentages distributed within the risk categories of inmate graduates reflected those percentages found within the general inmate population. The Michigan Department of Corrections does not classify property offenses in categories of very high risk and very low risk. Assault crimes include such crimes as homicide, criminal sexual conduct, assault, and robbery. Property crimes include such crimes as arson, burglary, auto theft, embezzlement and fraud.
Table 1
Percentage of Inmates Found in Each Risk Classification in the Total Inmate Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Property *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High Risk</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Risk</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Risk</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The annual report issued by the Michigan Department of Corrections does not account for the property categories totaling less than 100% (Appendix D)

Prior research has demonstrated (Mendez, 1979; Buttram & Dusewicz, 1977) that there is no significant characteristic difference between those inmates that participate in the educational programs and those inmates that do not participate in educational programs. Therefore, it is assumed that the sample contained subjects that are representative of the entire prison population. In Chapter IV a comparison of characteristics that existed within the sample of inmates that have been graduated, and the general inmate population is developed.

Eight tables were used to record the five risk categories associated with violence, and the three risk categories associated with property offenses for the two groups. The results are reported in
Chapter IV. These eight tables recorded the most serious violation of those who had graduated. The tables indicate the nature of the violation and the rate of recidivism. The desired statistics of age at the time of the first offense and the nature of the first offense were not accurately recorded in the individual's adult record. A narrative within the record would indicate juvenile involvement but did not indicate the nature of the offense or particulars involved in the offense. Out-of-state juvenile offenses were frequently not mentioned but only appeared as a result of the inmate offering the information during an interview.

Design

A Static-Group Comparison design was used (Campbell & Stanley, 1966) to compare those inmates from a specific risk category who had graduated from two-year college educational programs to inmates from the same risk classification, who had not graduated from two-year college educational programs while incarcerated. The comparison of graduates and nongraduates was possible because data provided by previous studies (1971) completed by the Michigan Department of Corrections on the general inmate population (nongraduates) were made available for this study.

In these earlier studies the violations for the inmates within the eight risk categories (5 violent risk groups, 3 property risk groups) were distributed among five categories of recidivism: no illegal activity, technical violation, misdemeanor, nonviolent felony, and violent felony. The first three classifications were
collapsed and identified as successful. The latter two classifications represented failures. Thus, a success, failure dichotomy existed.

**Static-Group Comparison Design**

A static-group design is a design in which a group which has experienced X is compared with one which has not, for the purpose of establishing the effect of X.

\[
\begin{align*}
X & \quad 0_1 \\
& \quad 0_2
\end{align*}
\]

In this design, X represents those inmates that have graduated while incarcerated versus those who have not. In contrast with the "true" experiment there are no formal means of certifying that the groups would have been equivalent had it not been for the X. This absence, indicated in the diagram by the dashed lines separating the two groups, provides a critical factor that needed control; i.e., selection. Table 5 in Chapter IV provides an indication of the representativeness of the sample as compared to the general inmate population.

**Data Collection**

The correctional institutions that are listed by the Michigan Department of Corrections as offering college academic programs are listed below.

1. Camp Ojibway
2. Camp Waterloo
3. Camp Lehman
4. Parole Camp 
5. Huron Valley Correctional Center 
6. Marquette Prison 
7. Michigan Reformatory 
8. Michigan Training Unit 
9. Muskegon Correctional Center 
10. Riverside Correctional Center 
11. State Prison of Southern Michigan (SPSM, Jackson) 
12. Kinross Correctional Facility 
13. Dunes Correctional Center 

Contact with each of the above facilities resulted in a revised list of those institutions that offered programs that had graduated inmates since January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976. The institutions that were listed as having post-secondary educational programs that were eliminated, were excluded because their programs offered only one-year certificates, or had no released graduates prior to December 31, 1976. Only three educational institutions indicated that they had graduates in 1975 and/or 1976 that met the criteria necessary to be included in this study. The three educational institutions in Michigan that had released inmates that had completed two-year college programs while incarcerated and had been graduated between January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976 were Muskegon Community College, Jackson Community College and Montcalm Community College. The classes necessary for graduation were provided by the educational institutions at the correctional institutions, with the exception of classes that required a lab. Classes that required a lab were completed on the college campuses.

The inmate prison identification number from the list of inmates that had been graduated in 1975 and/or 1976 while incarcerated was entered in the central computer terminal at the Michigan Department
of Corrections in Lansing. An inmate card appeared on the computer terminal screen and indicated a movement code index number for the inmate (Appendix B). The movement code number is a two digit number which indicates the location of a particular inmate or ex-inmate at a given time. This movement code enabled the researcher to know the exact status (to within 10 days) of a particular inmate. This initial screening was essential to determine which inmates were still incarcerated, had been readmitted, were on parole, or had been discharged. Those inmates that had been graduated, but never released from the prison institution were eliminated from the study.

The files of those inmates that had been graduated during 1975 and released prior to January 1, 1977, were then recorded for the purpose of this study. If an inmate was currently on parole or readmitted to Michigan Correctional Institution since graduating, his file was located at the Michigan Department of Corrections central record office in Lansing, Michigan. Those files were coded on an instrument developed for this study (Appendix C). If the inmate had been discharged (completed parole) his file was retrieved from the Michigan State records storage by submitting a "records request form" to central records. It took approximately one week for records from storage to arrive at the central office. Upon receipt of records those ex-offenders were coded.

Instrumentation

Coding for each inmate in the sample was completed manually, with the following information coded for each inmate who had been
graduated from a post-secondary education program between January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976, and subsequently released:

Inmate Coding Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison #</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Date of Prison Commitment</th>
<th>Parole Date</th>
<th>Discharge Date</th>
<th>Time Served</th>
<th>Type of Degree</th>
<th>Date of Degree</th>
<th>Assaultive Risk Factor</th>
<th>Property Risk Factor</th>
<th>Subsequent Violation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Risk Classification**

The risk categories that were used in this study were those currently in use by the Michigan Department of Corrections. These risk categories were developed by the Michigan Department of Corrections circa 1977. The categories were designed for a 1977 study which classified all male inmates paroled between January 1971 and December 1971 in the state of Michigan. A randomly selected 50% sample of these parolees was chosen (N=2200). An explanation of how the risk categories contained within this study were developed follows:

Data were collected on 360 variables per individual. The independent variables were categorized into three different time frames: Time 1, any variable or measure which could generally be related to the inmate prior to his time of incarceration for the instant offense; Time 2, any variable which would be appropriately measured during the inmate's incarceration for the instant offense; Time 3, any variable or measure which generally related to the inmate's parole. The dependent variable, recidivism, measured the actual behavior of the crime rather than administrative-legal decisions af-
fecting a person's parole completion. A five point recidivism scale was devised for use in the study. The scale categories were: no illegal activity, technical violation, misdemeanor, non-violent felony and violent felony. Only the most serious applicable category was used in each case (Murphy, 1978, p. 2).

The final risk groups were developed through the use of AID (Automatic Interaction Detection). The AID program is a technique designed to detect significant interactions among a large number of independent variables (predictors) in relation to a single dependent or criterion variable. The AID analysis was used to systematically search and select from many possible combinations of predictors those which accounted for the highest and lowest rate of violent crime. This same search and select procedure was used to identify different configurations which differentiated the rates of non-violent felony on parole. The results of the original study are illustrated in Appendix D. The risk factor categories were found recorded in the inmate's prison file. The inmate risk factor categories were recorded on risk screening sheets or were found within the narrative report in the inmate's file.

The risk classification of a graduate was recorded in anticipation that the hypothesis of this study would be supported i.e., inmates who had graduated would experience a lower rate of recidivism than inmates who had not graduated. The support of this hypothesis would have resulted in the examination of each risk category to identify if the recidivism rates of graduates differed significantly from the recidivism rates of non-graduates within a particular risk category. A significant finding within a particular risk category
would be critical to the recommendations pertaining to which particular risk categories contain inmates that are more inclined to succeed or fail upon release.

Data Analysis

Each of the eight risk categories and subsequent offenses for the inmates who had been graduated were compared with similar risk categories and subsequent offenses of all released inmates taken from the study completed in 1971 (Michigan Department of Corrections). A chi-square test of significance was used in comparing the two groups: Those from the 1971 study and those who had graduated and selected for this study.

Table 2 indicates how incidents of no illegal activities, technical violations, and misdemeanors were classified as a successful inmate adjustment following release. A recorded incident of a non-violent felony or of a violent felony that resulted in a sentence of imprisonment was considered a failure or as unsuccessful inmate adjustment following release.

Methodology Justification

The methodology used in this study incorporates selected methods used in previous studies, while avoiding research practices that have been criticized in previous studies of recidivism. Numerous variables were instrumental in influencing the population that was studied. A cohort of inmates that were graduated in the year 1975 and 1976 was used for several reasons. Assuming the inmate would stay incarcerated
Table 2
A Collapsing of Recorded Incidents Into Categories of Success or Failure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Classification</th>
<th>Violation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Illegal Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaultive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for some time following graduation, a 1975 graduation date would allow for further custody and also allow for a minimum of three years release time prior to being coded for this study. A minimum three years release time is consistent with the earlier Michigan Department of Corrections study which established the base rate of recidivism...
to which this study was compared. A minimum of three years release
time has been suggested by researchers (Davis, 1964). A later
graduation date would not allow for additional incarceration time and
an acceptable amount of release time. Graduation prior to 1975 was
not included because inmate risk classifications were not consistently
practiced prior to 1975, nor was there significant numbers of in­
mates that had been graduated.

A weak static group comparison design was used to test the
hypothesis. Data were collected to inspect selection differences that
may have contributed to the findings. This check greatly contributed
to the certainty of conclusions that were drawn. The coding of vari­
bles that were not directly germane to the study (recidivist, non­
recidivist) was to aid the inquiry of future researchers. If such
information had been excluded, one could suspect that participation
in correctional education programs was biased due to racial prefer­
ences, age, previous record, time served, or juvenile history. The
inclusion of risk classification information was to discourage
critics who may suggest that only a certain type (designed by offense
or risk potential) of inmate participated in correctional educational
programs. Risk classification also was included in order to avoid a
second search for individual records in the event a significant dif­
ference in recidivism did exist between inmates that had been
graduated from educational programs while incarcerated and the
general inmate population.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This study was designed to measure the difference in the rate of recidivism between inmates that graduated from two-year academic programs while incarcerated, and the total inmate population. The proportion of inmates that graduate while incarcerated is less than 1% therefore precluding contamination of the findings. This was accomplished by comparing the individual records of those inmates that have been graduated from two-year college programs while incarcerated in the state of Michigan from January 1, 1975 until December 31, 1976, and released inmates from similar risk categories that have not been graduated. The three academic programs that graduated inmates in 1975 and 1976 were the programs sponsored by Jackson Community College, Muskegon Community College and Montcalm Community College. The total number of graduates included in this study was 193.

This chapter contains a restatement of the hypothesis being tested, followed by an interpretation of results and a discussion of the significance of these results. The chapter concludes with a summary section.

Restatement of the Hypothesis

Following an extensive review of the literature, the following
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hypothesis was generated:

Inmates within a designated risk category who graduated from college programs while incarcerated, experience a lower recidivism rate than released inmates of the same risk category from the total prison population.

Population Sample

Of 247 inmates that graduated between January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976 as provided by Jackson Community College, Muskegon Community College and Montcalm Community College, 193 were eligible for study. Thirty of the graduates were eliminated because they were serving their sentences and had not been released. Eighteen graduates were eliminated from the study due to incomplete or unavailable records. Reports were considered incomplete if pre-release summary reports indicated no participation by the inmate in post-secondary education programs. Inmates were also eliminated from the study if their record consisted of only a file jacket and limited, if any, documentation relating to institutional adjustment or participation in academic programs. Five of the 1975 and 1976 graduates had been released for less than three years and one inmate graduate had escaped subsequent to graduation. His escape was prior to ever being released on parole or formally discharged. Table 3 represents the status of those graduates who were considered in this study.

Of the 193 inmates who graduated from college programs while incarcerated in January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976, 23 committed a new felony that resulted in a new sentence subsequent to their release from prison. Only two of the 23 offenders were discharged directly from prison without a parole period accompanying their release.
Table 3
Population Contained Within The Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Graduates</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still incarcerated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete records</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released less than three years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaped prior to release</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total omitted from study</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total included in study</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of graduates that recidivated</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recidivism of these 23 graduate inmates from a total graduating class of 193 inmate graduates during the years January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976 represents a recidivism rate of 11.9% of those inmates who graduated and also met the criteria of this study. These percentages represent only those violations that resulted in a new sentence being imposed on the individual included in this study.

Subsequent Offenses

The 23 inmates who had graduated during the academic years January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976 while incarcerated, and who committed subsequent offenses that resulted in imprisonment, are represented in Table 4 by Roman numerals (I-XXIII). The offense for which they were originally serving their time is listed in the second column of Table 4 followed by their subsequent offense for which they received a new sentence of imprisonment. Their status with the Michigan Department of Corrections at the time of their second offense is listed in the third column.
### Table 4
January 1, 1975–December 31, 1976 Released Inmate Graduates: Original Offense, Subsequent Offense, and Inmate Status at the Time of Subsequent Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Offense</th>
<th>Conviction Following Release</th>
<th>Status at the time of Second Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Grand larceny</td>
<td>Grand larceny</td>
<td>Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Assault less than murder</td>
<td>Pandering</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Forgery</td>
<td>Uttering and Publishing</td>
<td>Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Rape</td>
<td>Robbery - Armed and Kidnapping</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Manslaughter</td>
<td>Drug Violation</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Assault to robbery - Armed</td>
<td>Robbery - Armed</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Robbery - Armed</td>
<td>Larceny in a building</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Breaking &amp; Entering</td>
<td>Bank robbery</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Robbery - Unarmed</td>
<td>Possession of a weapon</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Attempted breaking and entering</td>
<td>Larceny from a building</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI Assault to robbery - Armed</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII False pretense</td>
<td>Drug violation</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII Entry without breaking</td>
<td>Triple (3) Murder</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV Assault to robbery - Armed</td>
<td>Criminal Sexual Conduct 3°</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV Robbery - Unarmed</td>
<td>Attempted Breaking &amp; Entering</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Offense</th>
<th>Conviction Following Release</th>
<th>Status at the time of Second Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVI False-Pretense over $100</td>
<td>Criminal Sexual Conduct 1°</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII Murder 2°</td>
<td>Criminal Sexual Conduct 1°</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII Assault to Robbery - Armed</td>
<td>Criminal Sexual Conduct 1°</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX Robbery - Armed</td>
<td>Breaking &amp; Entering</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX Assault Less than Murder</td>
<td>Felonious Assault</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI Entry - Without Breaking</td>
<td>Robbery - Armed</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII Robbery - Armed</td>
<td>Carrying a Concealed Weapon</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII Assault Less than Murder</td>
<td>Carrying a Concealed Weapon</td>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 23 inmates who committed subsequent felonies that resulted in imprisonment, 21 committed new offenses while on parole and 2 had been discharged from parole, and consequently, were no longer being supervised by the Michigan Department of Corrections.

Graduate Recidivist Profile

In order to assist future researchers, brief biographical information pertaining to the 23 graduates who did commit offenses
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subsequent to graduation and release, is provided. The lack of a uniform procedure by the State for recording personal inmate data does not facilitate statistical analysis of ubiquitous variables that may exist among those inmate graduates who recidivate. The brief biographical information regarding those inmates who graduated in January 1, 1975 and December 1, 1976 while incarcerated in Michigan is provided to enhance future research that may attempt to isolate independent variables among those graduates who failed that may account for this failure.

Subject I

Subject I is currently on parole following his fifth term in prison. He is 40 years of age. He has no juvenile arrest record and his first arrest of providing alcohol to minors resulted in five days in jail. He was 23 at the time. Following the first arrest, Subject I has been convicted twice for auto theft, armed robbery, two convictions for grand larceny, and has escaped from prison twice.

His parents were divorced when he was 14 years of age. After living with his father for two years, Subject I joined the Navy, however, he received an early discharge due to continued failure of the Navy Proficiency Test. Subject I has a brother, half-brother, and half sister. In 1964 he was diagnosed as having a severe character disorder and since release continued to accumulate numerous sick days as an employee of General Motors. His illness was attributed to a nervous condition that has developed over the years. He has com-
pleted two associate degrees during his incarceration period. He has served a total of 13 years and one month in prison. He was released on parole, February 25, 1981.

Subject II

The psychiatric evaluation for Subject II indicates "an assaul­tive potential, particularly when he becomes frustrated or sees him­self in a situation that requires his proving his own masculinity." This evaluation appears to be accurate in light of his prison record. Subject II has served two prison terms for sadistic beatings of prostitutes. He is currently on parole (since March 1979) following a prison commitment for pandering.

Subject II was raised in a stable home environment in Missis­sippi. He dropped out of high school to join the service. He earned his high school diploma in the service and served as an in­terpreter of the German language while in the Army. He was honorably discharged as a sergeant in 1967. Following discharge from the ser­vice he became emotionally involved with a prostitute. The involve­ment eventually led to narcotics trafficking and gambling in Chicago. Subject II has no juvenile record and was arrested for the first time at the age of 22-years. He is 34 years old and is currently married and has a daughter. He has served in excess of four years in prison.

Subject III

Subject III is currently serving one to five years for escape
from prison. He had previously served six years for uttering and publishing and was paroled shortly after his college graduation in 1975. He committed a similar crime three years later and is currently serving time for an escape which took place in October of 1980.

His files are incomplete, however, there is no indication of a juvenile record. His adult record includes eight jail terms, two prior prison terms, three probation sentences, and one prison escape. He is known to be a drug and alcohol abuser and has received mental health treatment. He is presently divorced and 33 years of age. He has served eight years and seven months in prison.

Subject IV

Subject IV is currently serving his third prison term as a result of an attempted murder of another inmate. Prior to this he served terms for offenses of rape, armed robbery, and kidnapping.

This individual graduated from high school in 1966 and following completion of his associate degree in 1975 while incarcerated, he completed a bachelors degree at Wayne State University as a parolee in 1977. His records reflect an IQ score in the 120-128 range.

Subject IV has no juvenile offense history and his apparent criminal behavior began as a result of marital tension in 1970. Reports indicate this individual was dominated by his mother, wife, and mother-in-law. He has served nine years and eight months in prison.
**Subject V**

Subject V has served time on three occasions as a juvenile and once before for a manslaughter offense as an adult. The previous adult conviction was for beating his daughter to death. His current conviction is a result of a violation of the drug laws. He is presently 33 years of age and has served eight years and five months in prison. His second offense occurred six months after his release from his first offense.

**Subject VI**

Following a parole that began in July of 1975, Subject VI committed a second offense of armed robbery for which he is currently imprisoned. He had been on parole for nine months prior to his second offense. Subject VI is an only child and his father died when the subject was three years of age. He has no juvenile history. He has served six years and seven months in prison for the two armed robberies he has committed.

**Subject VII**

Subject VII is one of nine children. He has experienced three convictions as a juvenile, the first shortly before leaving home at the age of 16 to live with an uncle. His first adult conviction was for armed robbery, for which he served five years. His second conviction of larceny in a building was committed two and a half years after his release for his first offense.
He suffers from a nervous condition and has attempted suicide on two occasions. The second attempt was a self-inflicted shotgun blast to his stomach. He has served six years and two months for his two adult convictions.

Subject VIII

Subject VIII has served time in Ohio as a juvenile offender convicted of armed robbery. As an adult his first conviction was for breaking and entering and his second adult conviction resulted from the armed robbery of four banks in Michigan. He attributes his criminal behavior to his severe drinking problem. He had been on parole for three months prior to his second offense. His IQ score is 124. He has served seven years and ten months for his two adult convictions.

Subject IX

Subject IX has an extensive juvenile record that ranges from armed robbery to a conviction for manslaughter. He admits to an addiction to heroin since the age of 14. His psychiatric evaluation states he is "Intrenched in an anti-social and assaultive life pattern." He has adult convictions for armed robbery and possession of a weapon. He has served seven years in prison for these two offenses.

Subject X

The record of Subject X reflects ten different occasions of
larceny and breaking and entering as a juvenile. All three of his adult convictions were of a similar nature.

His mother is mentally ill as was this subject when initially evaluated. He finished last in his class as a junior in high school, repeated that grade, then dropped out of school. A report in his file dated January 1970 indicated "individual is too emotionally disturbed to be able to profit from any sort of direct educational experience." However, soon after a commitment to the Michigan Reformatory this individual began to excel in varsity football, boxing, and band in addition to his academic pursuits. When he was transferred to another institution (Michigan Training Unit), he immediately became a discipline problem forcing his return to the Michigan Reformatory. As a result of his performance at the Reformatory he became a clerk for the school counselor. He was transferred to Jackson State Prison in 1973 in order to continue his educational development. He became a teacher's aid and then became clerk to the Assistant Principal. He received certificates in public speaking, dramatics, athletics, and chess club. He was active in band, choir, and was the chapel organist.

He was paroled in June 1976 and has completed a second associate degree and a bachelors degree. Following three months of parole in 1975, he committed a second larceny in a building. He received a sentence of three years for this offense and was paroled in January 1978. He violated this parole two months later with a larceny from an auto conviction. He is presently serving time for this offense. He has been a prison inmate for ten years and seven months of the 29
years he has been alive.

Subject XI

Subject XI is a 47 year old male. He is currently serving a sentence for the robbery of $96,000 in jewelry. This is his third prison term as an adult. His first arrest occurred at the age of 13 for stealing beer from a boxcar. His mother died when he was five years of age and his father died as a result of a brain hemorrhage suffered during a street beating. The subject was evaluated as a "grossly inadequate personality, with an inability to sufficiently defer gratifying experiences, a mild neurotic involvement, and a tendency to engage in mild schizoid activity." His IQ score is 138.

Subject XII

Subject XII has an extensive criminal record which includes a rape at the age of 17 followed by convictions for carrying a concealed weapon, assault and battery, and absconding from parole. He has served 11 years and four months in prison as an adult. He is 32 years of age. He is an admitted heroin addict and suffers from "feelings of inadequacy and basic insecurity."

Subject XIII

Subject XIII was committed to Boys Training School at the age of 16 for the offense of auto theft. At the age of 24 he was placed on probation for armed robbery. While on probation he committed a second armed robbery and received a sentence of 6-20 years. He was
paroled in 1972. In 1973 he received a 2½-5 year sentence for Entry Without Breaking, and was paroled in May 1976. In August 1976 he was convicted of three counts of murder. He executed the proprietors of a party store including an 11 year old boy.

In an earlier prison institution report (February, 1974) he was diagnosed as a passive-aggressive personality, with dependent features. Therapy was not recommended for this individual because, "therapy is seen as a continuing process interacting with the individual's dependency needs and thus becomes dysfunctional."

This individual's overall grade point average upon graduation was 3.89 on a 4.0 scale. He was considered a "mathematical genius" by his counselor at Jackson Community College. Subject XIII also admits to being addicted to heroin.

Subject XIV

Subject XIV has an extensive juvenile record, and an adult record that includes convictions for armed robbery, prison escape, and carrying a concealed weapon while on parole. His criminal career began with his commitment to Boys Training School at the age of seventeen. He was convicted of felonious assault at that time.

Subject XV

Subject XV is present on escape status following a third adult conviction. He has two convictions for attempted breaking and entering and one for unarmed robbery. He was married at the age of twenty-five and both he and his wife had very lucrative recording contracts.
with Motown records. He attributes his criminal behavior to the influence of alcohol and heroin addiction, both of which began immediately following his mother's death in 1964. He has served a three year sentence on federal probation as a result of interstate transportation of forged securities.

Subject XVI

Subject XVI has an extensive juvenile, military, and adult record. His offenses are usually of a sexual nature or containing an element of fraud or deception. According to his criminal file this individual "uses over-representation, misrepresentation, and misinformation to obtain his desired ends."

During his periods of incarceration this individual has completed two associate's degrees from Jackson Community College, one in General Studies and one in the Arts. He has also received a Bachelor of Science degree in General Studies from Wayne State University during his last incarceration. He indicated plans to continue his education at Western Michigan University, obtaining a Master's degree in either Psychology or Business Administration. As of this writing, he has not pursued either of these.

Subject XVII

Subject XVII is due to be released in the year 2039. He received a sentence of sixty to ninety years for first degree criminal sexual conduct. His prior conviction was for the murder of the mother of his high school friend. He committed this offense at the age
of twenty and was on leave from the military at the time of the offense. At that time he had completed two tours of duty in Vietnam and was wounded both times.

He admits to earlier trying to strangle his mother and suffocate his sister. As a child he found his grandmother who had killed herself. He has been diagnosed as suffering from a personality disorder, with hysterical or explosive features.

Subject XVIII

Subject XVIII moved to Michigan from Mississippi following the death of both of his parents as a result of cancer. He was eleven at the time. He has no previous record prior to his conviction of armed robbery and his subsequent conviction of criminal sexual conduct. He was dishonorably discharged from the service in 1970 and admits to an eighty dollar-a-day heroin habit.

Subject XIX

Subject XIX was originally convicted of armed robbery and later convicted of breaking and entering following a five month parole from his first offense. He indicates his problem began when he became addicted to heroin while serving in the navy.

Subject XX

Subject XX was convicted for an assault less than murder following the shooting of his wife in the head. This individual has a record of mental health care, along with evidence of alcohol and drug
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abuse. Following a sixteen month parole he was convicted of felonious assault.

**Subject XXI**

Subject XXI is a heroin user whose extensive juvenile record began shortly after his transfer from a "structured Catholic school setting to a public school." In a short period of time he was convicted of two auto thefts, two breaking and entering charges, and one armed robbery.

As an adult, his fifteen months of parole following a conviction for breaking and entering was terminated due to a conviction for armed robbery.

**Subject XXII**

Subject XXII was convicted in 1975 for armed robbery. After serving two years and five months in prison he was released on parole. He was convicted two months later for carrying a concealed weapon.

**Subject XXIII**

The permanent file on Subject XXIII was not available for examination, however the central computer at the Michigan Department of Corrections provided limited information. His original conviction was for assault less than murder and his subsequent conviction was for carrying a concealed weapon while on parole. He is currently on parole.

Table 5 illustrates summary data for the 23 inmates that gradua-
ted from two-year academic college programs while incarcerated during the years 1975 and 1976.

Table 5
Characteristics of Graduate Recidivist Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate No.</th>
<th>Prison Term</th>
<th>Parole</th>
<th>Juvenile History</th>
<th>Age of First Arrest</th>
<th>Time Served To Degree</th>
<th>Time of Present Race Status*</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1mo</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Current Status: P=Parole, I=Incarcerated, E=Escape

Summary of Recidivist Characteristics

Uniform data was not available on all 23 graduate inmates who recidivated following release. From the data that was provided, no
one variable was characteristic of all 23 graduates, however, there were variables that were prevalent among those 23 who failed to avoid criminal activity following release from prison. Fifty-six percent of those that failed had served at least one adult prison term prior to the term in which they graduated. Fifty-six percent of those who failed had juvenile records. Half of those who failed admitted to drug abuse and health problems other than psychiatric problems. The average age at the time of their first arrest was 18.54 years. The range in ages at the time of first arrest was from 13 to 28 years of age. The time served by the 23 graduate inmates who had failed, up to the time of this study, ranged from a low of four years to a high of 13 years and one month. The mean prison time served by the 23 graduates who failed was eight years and one month. Seventeen of the 23 graduate inmates who failed are still serving time in prison as a result of their violations subsequent to graduation. Five of the 23 who violated are currently on parole, and one is on escape status.

Period of Release Prior to Subsequent Offense

Table 6 indicates the period of time the inmates that graduated with associate degrees remained on parole prior to committing their next offense, for which they received a new sentence. Forty-three percent of those graduates who recidivated did so within six months of being released from the institution. Sixty-five percent committed a subsequent offense within one year of release and ninety-one percent of those inmates that graduated and
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committed additional offenses following release did so within eighteen months of release.

Table 6
Parole Period Following Graduation and Prior to Next Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Year of Graduation</th>
<th>Subsequent Offense Occurred Within Indicated Months Following Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X = 11.2 mos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X = 10.8 mos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X = 11 mos)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow-Up Studies of 1975-1976 Parolees

A follow-up study of 1975 parolees (1979 Statistical Presentation) conducted by the Michigan State Department of Corrections indicates 17.2% of those inmates paroled in 1975 violated parole and received new sentences. Table 7 indicates the results of a comparison between all parolees of 1975 and those who graduated in 1975 and were paroled.
Table 7

Follow-Up Study of Parolees for 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Failure (PVNS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Success Rate in Percentage</th>
<th>Failure Rate in Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Graduates</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 8 a chi-square test for a relationship between graduates or non-graduate inmates, in 1975, and success or failure led to a decision to not reject the null hypotheses. The null hypothesis in this study indicates there will be no difference in recidivism rates between inmates who graduated from associate degree programs while incarcerated, and those inmates from a similar risk category, who have not graduated from associate degree programs while incarcerated. This indicates that success was not associated with graduation. Success as dependent on graduation from a two-year college program is not a tenable hypothesis.

Table 8

Expected Success and Failure Frequencies of Inmate Graduates in 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Failure</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(77.05)</td>
<td>(15.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Graduates</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2,521.94)</td>
<td>(522.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>3,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .675 \]

\[ .05 \chi^2_1 = 3.841 \]
Table 9 represents the comparison of the 1980 follow-up study conducted by the Michigan Department of Corrections for all inmates paroled in 1976 and the results of 1976 graduates who were later paroled.

Table 9
Follow-Up Study of Parolees for 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success (PVNS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Success Rate in Percentage</th>
<th>Failure Rate in Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Graduates</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>3377</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 10 a chi-square test for a relationship between graduates or non-graduate inmates in 1976, and success or failure led to a decision to not reject the null hypothesis. This indicates that success was not associated with graduation. Success as dependent on graduation from a two-year college program is not a tenable hypothesis.
Table 10

Expected Success and Failure Frequencies of Inmate Graduates in 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83.14)</td>
<td>(16.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Graduate</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2,807.85)</td>
<td>(569.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2891</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.450 \]

\[ .05 \frac{x^2}{1} = 3.841 \]

Table 11 combines the results of the two follow-up studies of 1975 and 1976 parolees conducted by the Michigan Department of Corrections, and the findings of this study.

Table 11

Combined Follow-Up Studies of Parolees for 1975 and 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Failure</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Success Rate in Percentage</th>
<th>Failure Rate in Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Graduates</td>
<td>5320</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>6421</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 12 a chi-square test for a relationship between graduate or non-graduate inmates in 1975 and 1976, and success or failure led to a decision to not reject the null hypothesis. This indicates...
that success was not associated with graduation. Success as dependent on graduation from a two year college program is not a tenable hypothesis.

Table 12

Expected Success and Failure Frequencies of Combining Inmate Graduates for 1975 and 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(160.20)</td>
<td>(32.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Graduate</td>
<td>5320</td>
<td>1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5329.79)</td>
<td>(1,091.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5490</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6614)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.628 \quad .05 \chi^2_1 = 3.841 \]

In this study a .05 level of significance was utilized in order to allow for a degree of flexibility due to the inaccuracy of inmate files. If a greater degree of flexibility were allowed significant differences would have resulted. This is readily apparent in Table 12 where minor adjustments in levels of significance would produce results contrary to those contained within this study.

Risk Classification of Graduates

The distribution among the five assaultive and three property risk classifications was similar for both graduates and non-graduates. The percent of releases and failure from each risk classification is supplied by the Michigan Department of Corrections (Dimensions, 1976). Table 13 indicates the number of graduates in each category, the an-
ticipated number of graduates that would recidivate from each category, and the actual number of graduates that did recidivate from each category.

Table 13

Expected Number of Graduates to Fail Within Each Risk Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Releases</th>
<th>Percent of Failures</th>
<th>Expected Number of Graduates To Fail</th>
<th>Actual Number of Graduates Who Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assaultive Risk Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Risk Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In none of the three property risk classifications did the graduates appear to fail in the frequency that was expected. This is consistent with the views held by most field practitioners which indicates a property offense usually results in a continuance on parole in lieu of prosecution resulting in a new sentence.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

In the preceding chapter the analysis of the data was presented. In this chapter may be found (1) a summary of the study, (2) conclusions based upon the data, (3) discussion (4) recommendations for further study.

Summary

Statement of the Problem

The question addressed in this study was whether the rate of recidivism by inmates who graduated from college programs while incarcerated was significantly different from the rate of recidivism experienced by the general or non-graduate released inmate population. Recidivism was defined as a new prison sentence awarded subsequent to graduation while incarcerated, and eventual release through discharge or parole. Those inmates included in the study had to complete a program of study that resulted in the granting of an associate degree from the participating educational institution.

Follow-up studies relating to Project Newgate (1970, 1972, 1973) and subsequent research by McCabe and Driscoll (1971); Roberts (1974); McCollum (1955); and Buttram and Dusewicz (1977) indicated that an
individual's lack of criminal activity was related to an individual's academic achievement. Research by Davidson and Robinson (1975) indicated that not only achievement, but actual completion of an education effort which culminated in the receipt of a tangible reward (diploma) was critical to the development of an individual's self-esteem.

James (1947) and Roberts (1974) contributed studies supporting the concept that a healthy self-esteem was critical to law abiding behavior. Partlett (1975) indicated that education accelerates moral development and consequently reduces criminal behavior. Mendez (1979) agreed with Partlett and suggested that future research should be directed toward supporting this concept. Following an extensive review of the literature the following hypothesis was developed, and pursued in this study.

**Hypothesis**

Inmates within a designated risk category who graduate from two year college programs while incarcerated, experience a lower recidivism rate than released inmates of the same risk category from the total prison population.

**Methods, Techniques, and Data Used**

The Michigan Department of Corrections supplied a list of education institutions that had previously or were currently offering educational programs to inmates incarcerated within the state of Michigan. These educational institutions were asked to supply a list of those inmates who had been graduated during the period of January
1, 1975 and December 31, 1976. There were three schools that offered educational programs that resulted in inmate graduates for the years 1975 and 1976. Educational programs were offered by Jackson Community College, Muskegon Community College and Montcalm Community College.

The study was confined to the State of Michigan for two reasons: (1) it was essential to have personal access to the records of those inmates that were to be included in the study and (2) Michigan is one of the few states that incorporates a risk classification in their evaluation of an inmate. This risk classification was essential to avoid the criticism that had been directed toward previous research efforts; i.e., a failure to recognize the propensity of a certain individual (designated by high risk classification) to recidivate at a greater frequency than the individual of a lower risk classification.

The study was restricted to those inmates that graduated during the years January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976 for several reasons. Records of inmates that have been involved with the Michigan Department of Corrections prior to 1975 have been destroyed. Also 1975 was the first year for which risk classifications were assigned with any degree of consistency.

Recognizing the fact that most inmates are not released the same year of graduation the research was restricted to the years January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976 to allow for additional incarceration following graduation and a minimum of three years of release following release or parole or discharge from the institution.

The granting of an associate's degree to the inmate included within the study, was stipulated to be consistent with previous research.
Research suggested evidence of accomplishment must be tangible and participation alone was not sufficient for the elevation of one's self-esteem. The elevation of one's self-esteem was a critical concern incorporated within the conceptual framework of this study.

The Major Findings

There was not a statistically significant degree of association between the rate of recidivism and graduation from a two-year college program while incarcerated. The rate of success, defined as no new prison sentence being imposed on the released inmate, was independent of graduation. This study also indicated that dispersion among the risk categories for graduates who failed was similar to the dispersion among the risk categories for the entire released prison population in January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1976.

Different results would have been realized if the definition for failure would have been adjusted to account for technical, misdemeanor, and felony violations that did not result in a recommitment to prison. However, the commission and disposition resulting from these offenses remains privy to the parolee agent supervising the case and is not recorded with central records in Lansing.

Discussion

Recent research (Buttram & Dusewicz, 1977) indicated a relationship between post-secondary education and lower rates of recidivism. This study did not support the previous research in the area of lower rates of recidivism. With a focus on obtaining the associates de-
gree, this research was not in agreement with research (Davidson & Robinson, 1975) that suggested that participation in educational programs was not as significant an influence on lower recidivism rates, as was graduation from educational programs. The short follow-up period incorporated in Davidson and Robinson's study may account for the low rate of recidivism reported in their study. Their study focused on juveniles which might demonstrate higher success rates than adults as a result of graduation.

Ramist (1981) recognized improvements in self-image, social maturity, interests, competency and employment as the beneficial effects of college. This study does not refute Ramist's findings. However it does suggest if these beneficial effects do occur as a result of college education, these characteristics do not exert a critical influence on one's reluctance to participate in criminal activity.

This study would suggest the "creation of one's character" may be of a more complex phenomena than suggested by Brandon (1969), when he asserted that an individual's character is created by the volitional choices he makes day by day. This study revealed that participation in an educational program by an inmate was voluntary. Either the participation in an educational program was not that critical in altering an inmate's character, or there were other variables more influential in the creation of the inmate's character upon release than education alone.

Buttram and Dusewicz (1977) indicated in their research that the highest percentage of those inmates enrolled in educational programs enrolled in order to improve themselves. It is possible that in-
mates do not view graduation from an educational program as indicative of improvement, but merely a means to some other end; possibly parole (Bowker, 1982).

The enthusiasm for inmate educational programs that contributed to their proliferation during the 1960's may have been generated by an overall enthusiasm for social programs in general that prevailed during the 1960's. This study demonstrates that the educational programs have not lived up to the expectations of the generally accepted goals of American prisons as identified by Glaser (1970):

1. to evoke in offenders an enduring identification of themselves with anti-criminal persons;

2. to enhance the prospects that released prisoners will achieve satisfaction in legitimate post-release activities.

An individual's motive to develop one's potentialities (self-actualized) as presented by Maslow (1954) may be realized by becoming involved in criminal activity upon release from a correctional institution. The released inmate may desire to be and do something other than what James (1892) had anticipated.* A reference to an individual's self-feeling in this world.

This study offers little support to the Correctional Advisory Committee's (1973) conclusion that education's high correlation with success of people in the general population is applicable to the released inmate population. Roberts (1974) suggested that men turn to crime because legitimate avenues are blocked; post-secondary education makes legitimate opportunities available. The recidivism rate of inmates graduating from existing post-secondary programs as reflected in
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This study does not indicate that the released inmates are experiencing these legitimate opportunities.

This study deals with selected factors, i.e., post-secondary education associated with recidivism. The results of this study should not be interpreted as an indictment against higher education in free society or within the prison institution. Isolating the impact of post-secondary education on inmates alone without consideration of the configuration of the prison setting makes meaningful evaluation difficult.

It is recognized that college courses alone are not the only factors involved in the education process. The college community exposure to faculty, exposure to a cross-section of students, library facilities and extra-curricular activities all play a vital role in the process. It must be recognized and accepted that prison higher education programs as presently structured are not the same as higher education in the larger community; therefore the end product should not be expected to be the same (Mendez, 1979).

It must be recognized that the type of degree, and the degrees' practicality in free society play a major role in the future adjustment of the released inmate. Those subjects contained within this study received associate degrees in liberal arts. Future research should focus on the success of inmate degrees other than liberal arts. In addition, the usefulness of the degree is greatly enhanced with appropriate placement services prior to, or immediately following release from a correctional institution.

Prison higher education does not focus on the aesthetic values
of-education, nor is the prison setting conducive to conveying these values. The fatal flaw in correctional education programs stems from the assumption that people who happen to share a common address - a prison - share educational aptitudes, interests, and needs which can be served by programs that are frequently lacking in support services. College placement services, counseling, curriculum development and admission procedures must be integrated into the inmate's educational experience in order for meaningful conclusions to be made.

Cortright (1972) believed that educational programs in penal institutions, and specifically adult basic education programs help to reduce recidivism and thereby reduce crime. Cortright's focus on adult basic education programs was supported. Recidivism must be viewed as a function of experiences prior to, during, and after any corrections program and may include all three phases.

Abbreviated periods of follow-up ranging from six to ten months as evident in the Lorton Project, San Diego City College Plan, and Davidson and Robinson's (1975) research would have produced success rates similar to those reported. Less than sixty percent of those inmates who eventually recidivated would have been recorded as repeat offenders if a similar follow-up period had been incorporated within this study.

This study recorded the follow-up activities of released inmates that were not necessarily experiencing their first parole. If the study focused only on those inmates who were paroled for the first time, one would realize higher success rates than those experienced in this study. In addition, Michigan has recently required that
prosecutors must formally prosecute revocation actions and no longer engage in negotiations with parole officers regarding possible revocations. As a result of this ruling one may anticipate an increase in the number of parolees experiencing revocation.

The recording of individual risk factors as evident in this study would have gained in importance if a significant difference between the role of recidivism between graduates and non-graduates had materialized. The incorporation of risk factors in a study of this nature does limit the criticism that a bias exists within the study by not including inmates from various risk categories.

Recommendations for Further Study

Future study should focus on the nature of the degree earned by an inmate and how appropriate the degree is with respect to the existing job market at the time of the inmate's release on parole or discharge from the institution. Additional attention should be placed on the inmate's record previous to participation in an educational program, in order to evaluate the impact a demonstrated career in crime has with respect to future criminal activity.

Researchers should focus on measuring an individual's self-esteem and assessing whether an inmate's self-esteem differs from the general citizenry and the impact education has on the self-esteem of both populations.

Just as one educational institution may be more conducive to learning than another educational institution, the atmosphere of a particular correctional institution may be more conducive to meaning-
ful education than the atmosphere of another conditional institution. Future research should attempt to focus on correctional settings with comparable facilities and similar in atmosphere of support with reference to educational goals.

Future research should evaluate the impact of training other than "academic" training, and the correlation of this training to rates of recidivism. Both vocational and military training would be appropriate areas of concern for researchers. Researchers also should direct their efforts toward assessing the social and economic climate that exists at the time an inmate is released from custody.

This study is not vulnerable to criticism of earlier research (Martinson, 1974) that did not incorporate inmate risk factor differentials in studies on recidivism. Recidivism rates did not differ significantly between the graduate inmates and the general inmate population from identical risk categories. Martinson has suggested that "Nothing works." This study would contribute to this observation to the extent that graduation from two year college programs does not appear to be instrumental in lowering rates of recidivism.
January 23, 1981

To Whom It May Concern:

The purpose of this letter is to verify the approval and support of the Michigan Department of Corrections for the research now being initiated by Jim Haviland. Mr. Haviland, who is on the faculty of Northern Michigan University, and is doing graduate research at Western Michigan, is doing a follow-up study concerning Michigan prisoners who have completed college programming while incarcerated. His major question has a good deal of interest to the department, since it asks whether such programming has a favorable impact on later adjustment in the community, including reduced criminal activity. This is a broader scale question than previous inquiries which have looked at specific job training to see what impact that may have had on employment. It is conceivable that education may have an impact on adjustment in general which is not revealed in looking at employment exclusively.

In any case, we support this research and we will cooperate in any way possible in carrying it out. I hope that this cooperation can also be extended by others. If there is any question about the department's role in this research, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

William L. Kime, Deputy Director
In Charge of the Program Bureau
Dear Mr. 

This letter is pursuant to our telephone conversation on July 30, 1981, regarding Mr. Jim Haviland. It is my understanding that Mr. Haviland has requested certain inmate numbers from your college in order to complete a study which he is conducting at Western Michigan University. His request is being treated by your institution as one made pursuant to the Michigan Freedom of Information Act, 1976 PA 442, as amended; MCLA 15.231 et seq; MSA 4.1801(1) et seq.

You have agreed to release this information after receiving a letter of approval from the Department of Attorney General. Please be advised that the ultimate decision to disclose the information in question rests with you and not with this office. Thus, the Attorney General cannot approve or disapprove a decision of this nature. However, in order to help facilitate your decision, you should be aware of the following regulation with respect to prior consent for disclosure of educational records. 34 CFR § 99.31 states, in pertinent part, as follows:

"(a) An educational agency or institution may disclose personally identifiable information from the education records of a student without the written consent of the parent of the student or the eligible student if the disclosure is:"

"* * *"

August 5, 1981
"(6) To organizations conducting studies for, or on behalf of, educational agencies or institutions for the purpose of developing, validating, or administering predictive tests, administering student aid programs, and improving instruction; Provided, That the studies are conducted in a manner which will not permit the personal identification of students and their parents by individuals other than representatives of the organization and the information will be destroyed when no longer needed for the purposes for which the study was conducted; the terms "organizations" includes, but is not limited to, Federal, State and local agencies, and independent organizations."

I have contacted Ms. Pat Ballenger of the Family Education and Privacy Act Office, United States Department of Education, Washington, D.C., in order to ascertain a definition of the term "organization" as used in this regulation. Ms. Ballenger assured me that the underlying intent of "organization," within this context, would include a person such as Mr. Haviland who is conducting the type of research which he specifically described in his letter dated January 28, 1981 (enclosed). The FERPA office will be sending a letter of confirmation to this effect which I will forward to you.

In the interim, should you decide to release the information in question, Ms. Ballenger suggested that you may wish to request written confirmation from Mr. Haviland that he will not divulge the personal identification of the students to any other person and that any identifying information will be immediately destroyed when the study is completed.

It is hoped that this information is of assistance to you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have further questions regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,

FRANK J. KELLEY
Attorney General

Paula C. Reeves
Assistant Attorney General
7th Floor, Law Building
525 West Ottawa Street
Lansing, Michigan 48913

cc: Jim Haviland
Enclosure
### APPENDIX B

#### INMATE MOVEMENT CODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>New Commitment, Probation Technical Violator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>New Commitment, Probationer With A New Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>New Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>New Commitment, Parole Violation With A New Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>New Commitment, Escaper With A New Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>New Commitment, While Under Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Out of State Parolee Receiving Sentence in Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Out of State Parolee Receiving Sentence Out of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Returned While on Parole Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Returned As PV Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Returned From Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Conviction Reversed By Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sentence Reduced To Misdemeanor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Discharged By Court, Nolle Prosequi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Discharge On The Maximum After Parole And Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Death On Temporary Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Death On Limited Furlough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Death In The Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Released To Court On Writ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Discharged On The Maximum Without Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Discharge Furlough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Discharged While In ISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Death On Parole Furlough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Discharged From Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Death On Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Early Discharge From Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Administrative Discharge From Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Court Resentenced To Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Death On Escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Returned From Temporary Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Escaper Returned To The Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Returned As Parole Furlough Violator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Returned From Limited Furlough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Returned From Parole Furlough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Reinstated On Parole From The Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>First Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Paroled In Custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Reinstated On Parole At Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Reparoled While On Same Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Limited Furlough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Parole Furlough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Temporary Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Escape From The Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Escape Temporary Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Escape Limited Furlough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Escape Parole Furlough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Escape Walkaways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Returned From Charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Held For Charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Transferred Out ... Institutional or Caseload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Rel. To Mental Health Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Ret. From Mental Health Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Out of State Case Transferred Out Of Michigan For Termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Out of State Case Into Michigan For Parole Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Absconder From Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Technical Violator Of Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Stop Time Warrant On A Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Discharged While On Escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Transfer In --- Institutional or Caseload</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROCEDURE

November 15, 1980

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER

APPLICATION

SUPEREDER NO.

New

DATED

SUBJECT

COLLEGE ENROLLMENT

PAGE 1 of 2

BUREAU/INSTITUTION NUMBER

SUPERSEDES NO

OBJECTIVE: To establish guidelines for enrolling residents in college programs.

INFORMATION: This procedure will ensure that Department policy regarding academic eligibility is being followed.

Residents will be allowed to enroll in college programming when the school principal has documentary proof of eligibility. If an applicant has acquired college credits at another institution or prior to incarceration, the earned credits must be evaluated by the college to determine the additional credits needed to obtain the Associates Degree. If more than 62 credits are needed to obtain an Associates Degree, a plan must be developed with the student and mutually agreed upon by the college and the principal. Residents who have earned an Associates or higher degree will not be allowed to enroll in community college or other higher education programs at state expense.

A student may enroll in programs offered by more than one educational institution, but these instances must be documented and in accordance with this procedure and PD-BCF-41.03.

It is the Department's responsibility to keep the number of dropouts caused or anticipated by the agency at a minimum. The records of students who have a history of noncompletion must be reviewed to determine if the individual should be allowed to enroll in the following term. It is also the principal's responsibility to determine if the applicant will have sufficient time to complete the term for which he/she is enrolling. Both transfer and release eligibility must be considered.

Residents enrolled in college vocational programs are not required to have a high school completion or the equivalent, but may have earned an Associates Degree at state expense.

CSO-434 must be completed prior to each term.

PROCEDURE:

WHO

DOES WHAT

Resident

1. Goes to school principal's office and fills out resident portion of Certificate of Eligibility - CSO-434.
PROCEDURE:

WHO  

**Principal**

2. Reviews CSO-434 and completes, or if necessary:

   A. Schedules resident to take appropriate reading test if no reading scores are available.

   B. Has student sign necessary release form to send for documentation of high school completion, or equivalent, or college transcripts from previous schools attended.

   C. Informs resident when requested documentation arrives.

   D. Completes Certificate of Eligibility when documentation is available.

3. Attaches copy of college transcripts or evidence of high school or equivalent completion to CSO-434 and forwards to college, retaining original.

**College**

4. Reviews resident approved eligibility form and documents:

   A. Enrolls resident in appropriate program in accordance with college admission policy and returns completed copy of student’s school schedule to principal, or

   B. Rejects resident’s request for enrollment and forwards reason for rejection with the eligibility form to principal.

**Principal**

5. Files all documents in student cumulative record folder CSO-435.

6. Notifies business office if resident is applying for or is receiving educational benefits, i.e., S.S., VA.

7. If student transfers, follows student record transfer procedure OP-BCF-23.02.

**College**

10. Informs principal of all subsequent changes in student’s program.

AUTHORITY: PD-BCF-41.03

APPROVED: Wilburt Laubach, Education Director

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
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