

TERMINATING THE CRIMINAL CAREER

By

AGUSTIN TORRES

Bachelor of Arts

Oral Roberts University

Tulsa, Oklahoma

1988

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December, 1993

TERMINATING THE CRIMINAL CAREER

Thesis Approved:

Harjit S. Sandhu

Thesis Adviser

Carol Olson

Larry M. Perkins

Thomas C. Collins

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The decision as to what subject this thesis would pertain to required little effort. This author's life is dedicated to and consumed with trying to identify what social factors draw an individual into the criminal world and what personal and social factors provide an avenue out of criminal activity. Thus far only one pervasive element continuously repeats itself as an agent that has ill and positive effects on any individual where criminality is the issue. Individual intervention into other persons' lives can be either positive or negative and is either effective or not effective based upon the attitude and purpose of the one who is intervening. Far beyond society's impact, the dyad interaction is the most critical by far. Those who find themselves trapped in negative situations and scorned by society, for the most part, will require some socially legitimate person's assistance to reassimilate and resocialize into society. No greater deed can one human do in this life than provide hope and a chance to another individual to become a part of the whole once again.

Having been ostracized, demeaned and socially, economically, and individually separated from the whole of society, I personally can attest to the sincerity and worth of such an ordeal. It is only through the kind hands of

Dr. David Ford and Dr. Harjit Sandhu that I have been afforded a chance and hope. It is for this reason I dedicate this small work to them. Dr. Larry Perkins is acknowledged for his feat in taming my overactive self-indulgence in imagination. His efforts have reduced my errors in substituting illusions for facts. Dr. Carol Olson is equally commended for providing me the avenue to verbally demonstrate the worth of my understanding of the information brought to bear in this thesis. She graciously afforded me the opportunity to address her freshman classes. This proved to be an invaluable experience. The author also gives special thanks to Kathleen Hopkins-Torres for her dedication and personal support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
III. METHODOLOGY	14
Biases	14
Sample population	15
Instrument	17
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	22
Education	22
Income	24
Marriage	25
Residence	27
Religion	28
Government assistance	30
Family	31
Drug use	33
Prison programs	35
Support systems	37
Process of self-identification, internalization and redirection	41
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	55
LITERATURE CITED	61
APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Education	87
II. Income	88
III. Residence	89
IV. Religious Organizations	90
V. Reasons for Last Incarceration	91

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the field of corrections and penology one of the most frustrating aspects, whether it be in the area of theoretical discernment or application, has been identifying and determining precisely how to go about answering the questions concerning recidivism, a relapse into criminal behavior. At present there is only a general understanding of the overwhelming amount of information regarding the subject. Those who are most effectively involved with the issue of corrections and penology on a day-to-day basis, as well as the public at large, are increasingly disconcerted about the growing number of those who commit crimes and end up in the custody of state and federal prison systems. The disquietude seems to be focused not on the growing inmate population of first-time offenders, but rather on the repeat offenders. The issue of recidivism questions the capability of correctional institutions to effectively address the rehabilitation and resocialization of offenders. The recidivism rate has no indication of reduction regardless of what theory or program the present system has used to address the problem. But at the same time there is an even more perplexing issue that largely goes unaddressed by research and theory. When

reviewing the research done concerning the continuation of criminality. very little material on the issue of those who terminate their criminal careers is found. A review of any college text book on criminology reveals theory after theory of why criminality occurs along with lengthy discussions on recidivism. Yet the issue of those who do not return to the criminal justice system has not yet been adequately addressed. There is the possibility that by studying those who do not return to crime, theories and programs to further address the problems of criminality may be identified.

There are good indications in the field of criminology as to why people become offenders, as well as why recidivism occurs. However, there is not sufficient research as to why people terminate criminal careers. A review of the psychological and sociological theories suggests that a reasonable understanding of the process of becoming a criminal exists. Hagan (1987) reviews physical, environmental, economic, psychiatric and sociological concerns. He covers the areas of positivistic biological perspectives reviewing the works of Lombroso, Goring, Goddard, Hooton, Sheldon, and Moniz. In the area of psychology Freud, Skinner, and Hirschi contribute much to the understanding of the individual criminal's thought process that leads him/her into crime. From a sociological perspective, reviewing such theories as anomie theory, social process theory, social control theory, labeling

theory, conflict theory and radical theory, it becomes clear that much time and effort has been dedicated to identifying why and how an individual enters a life of crime. Internal and external concerns are identified.

Goldfarb and Singer (1973) indicated repeat offender rates at 80 percent. Clear and Cole (1986) indicated that up to 75 percent of former inmates recidivate. These percentages are questionable based upon the above mentioned authors' own admissions. These authors contend that depending on what data base is used and by whom the data bases are manipulated, the rates can fluctuate. For the purposes of this study it is sufficient to identify that recidivism does occur. In 1963 (Goldfarb & Singer, 1973) the results of the Florida Gideon Case showed that 1000 inmates were released from prison because they had not been provided with appropriate attorney representation. A researcher from the state's Division of Corrections seized this opportunity to conduct a study which would identify if there would be an increase in crime and what the recidivism rate would be. He created two groups. The first group consisted of those who were released at the end of their sentences and the second group were those who were released prematurely due to the supreme court decision. In the first group of 110 inmates, 25.4% committed crimes within approximately two years. Of the second group 13% committed crimes within the same period of time. This clearly indicates that although there are differences in

percentages of recidivism which occur for a variety of reasons, it does exist. But what about those that did not return to the prison system?

The causes of recidivism are directly linked to the causes of criminality. In fact recidivism is a happenstance in the midst of a criminal's career. Plainly stated it is reviewed by most criminals as an occupational occurrence. Since recidivism is considered here as falling within the continuum of criminality, and since criminality has been shown to be adequately researched and theorized, therefore, so has recidivism.

Having identified this, a logical step in the progression of study would be to research those who break away from criminality and thereby stop the process of recidivism.

It is at this point that this inquiry breaks from the traditional line of study. For the most part research indicates an insistence in dwelling on individuals who have not left the crime cycle. This is either because there is not an understanding of the importance in finding a more appropriate sample population or because a more appropriate sample population cannot be found.

What appears to be needed is new research that focuses on the causes which bring about the termination of a criminal career. It is the chief purpose of this paper to address this aspect. By interviewing 30 ex-offenders who have been crime free for a minimum of two years, this

approach should add to the depth of research on reasons of why individuals stay free from crime. It would be better to survey and analyze a sample population which no longer shows evidence of criminality, instead of researching those who continue with criminal activity. Focusing the study on these individuals will provide insight into possible characteristics, theories, and programs needed to rehabilitate and effectively resocialize.

To date there have been only limited attempts to study characteristics and attributes of individuals who have terminated their criminal activities or experienced self-correction (Glueck, 1930; Cusson & Pinsonneault, 1986). The research that has been done does not stipulate that success entails anything other than not being back in the criminal justice system. Educational achievements, employment, social bonding and the changing of personal ideals and philosophical demeanor were not addressed as requirements for determining success in terminating the criminal career. There are a handful of studies (cited below) that see the importance in studying individuals who cease criminal activities. Yet even these studies have not focused on a population that gives indication of fully terminating crime.

What metamorphosis has taken place to produce an individual who goes from a life of crime to a law abiding citizen is presently not ascertainable given the lack of attention in researching those who have in fact changed

their lives. Yet if the present efforts are continued (researching subjects who fail to rehabilitate and resocialize), there will merely be a continuation of identifying and characterizing failure rather than success. It seems logical that to determine the processes and characteristics of success, research should focus on those individuals who have succeeded in a life-changing experience from crime to socially credible conformity. The main obstacle to conducting such research is that those few who do achieve this status are inaccessible to the average researcher. According to Cusson and Pinsonneault (1986, pg. 73), "Very few researchers have done this, and understandably so. It is not easy to trace, contact, and interview ex-prisoners who have been out of the system for several years. It was only after some difficulty that we succeeded in interviewing a small group of 17 ex-offenders..." Ex-offenders are reluctant to discuss their past. Perry (1986) experienced the same problem in having access to ex-offenders, and was capable of finding only 17.

In most cases, ex-offenders will not divulge their past to employers, extended family, or within social circles. In fact, those who are successful will not even succumb to the bonding of loved ones where generally one's past has little or no effect. They sequester their past as though if it were known, it would damage any of these relationships. These people generally refuse to share any segment of their life with social scientists, regardless of

the credibility of the researchers. There is only one way to approach these individuals. Ex-offenders will reluctantly entrust their existence, including their criminal past, to other ex-offenders. In fact, ex-offenders generally are capable of identifying other ex-offenders within a limited time of interaction. Many of those persons surveyed described an ability to sense the paranoia and fear. There appears to be a greater fear of being exposed by another ex-offender if some camaraderie is not initiated and maintained. Once they know each other as ex-offenders the trade-off is "You protect my ass, and I'll protect yours." Beyond this there is also a certain amount of understanding among successful ex-offenders of the pain and turmoil that surrounds such an endeavor. Ex-offenders have experienced an untrusting society and the rejection of so-called "loved ones," as such, they understand the necessity for protecting one's current lifestyle and life chances.

This author, being an ex-offender, was afforded access to the sample of ex-offenders from which the majority of researchers are barred. Ex-offenders are defined as persons who have served time in prison and who have been out of the control of any legal system for at least two years. The sample population was surveyed using an open-ended questionnaire (Appendix A).

Subjects must have demonstrated some achievement of becoming credible. The areas that are to be used to

identify these achievements are: educational achievements, employment, social bonding and the changing of personal ideals and philosophical demeanor. The rationale is that if an ex-offender displays the above criteria of terminating a criminal career, then by researching them it should be possible to identify some characteristics required that an individual must follow in order to succeed. Additionally being able to examine rehabilitated individuals will set the ground work to begin identifying individuals in the correctional system who are at less risk in violating parole.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of manuscripts and books concerning the research of ex-offenders who have turned over a new leaf, changed lifestyles, seen the light, started a new life, had a new beginning, or terminated being a criminal has been extensive, but admittedly not exhaustive. All indications are that the majority of writings address ex-offenders or repeat offenders who are still within the confines of legal control.

Glueck and Glueck (1930) did a detailed investigation of what they identified as semiprofessional offenders. They examined the backgrounds and criminal histories of 500 Massachusetts Reformatory inmates who had been released during the years of 1921-1922. Their study initially followed these individuals to 1927, but it is noted that they maintained contact for research purposes for up to ten years. Beyond the age of the study which is effected by the changes in prison systems, the justice system and the overall social economic dynamics of society, there is some concern about their long-standing involvement in the ex-offenders' lives. There appears to be sufficient concern of their continual involvement when taking into account the Hawthorne effect. This refers to the impact that an

experiment has just because of the extra attention that people receive (Light & Keller, 1982, pg. 44). Their involvement was long term and initially took place prior to their separation from criminal involvement. This current study (Terminating the criminal career) surveyed its sample population after there was established evidence of terminating criminal activity.

The study by Perry (1986) entitled "Going Straight" reflected many of the concerns in which this researcher has interest. She inquired about the significance of changing from a life of crime. Additionally she reviewed the importance of education, support systems, and emotional and psychological evolvment at the personal level. Although the results of her study are supportive to this research, they do not parallel it. The key issue is that her study made inquiries about individuals who were residents of community-based correctional facilities. These individuals did not display characteristics of an individual who had gone straight simply because they had not yet been given the opportunity to operate autonomously. In contrast all 30 of the sample population for this study were at least two years totally and completely out of any and all jurisdiction of local, state or federal control. Perry's study was an effort in the right direction but still used an inappropriate sample.

Out of the remaining articles researched the use of short histories or diary-type material about the ex-

offender and his life after being released seemed to be dominant (Cusson & Pinsonneault, 1986; Nisbet, 1983; The Wilson Quarterly, 1983; Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1993; and, Shover, 1983; Glueck, 1930). Still, with the exception of Cusson & Pinsonneault, the populations studied were either under the control of the judicial system or were suspect of being effected by the Hawthorne effect. In addition there was little or no effort on the part of the authors to query the sample population as to why they had ceased a life of crime. The majority of these works were spawned from an interest in juvenile delinquency rather than from adult criminality. The need for theory-based research is evident in the inability thus far to produce a progressive program to address the rehabilitation and resocialization of ex-offenders. According to Cusson and Pinsonneault in The Decision To Give Up Crime (1986) and the Gluecks (1945) some inwardness and self-motivation is fundamental to a decision for change. Gluecks do identify maturity as a key factor in the rates of recidivism. The Gluecks saw maturity as being significant in exercising self-control, foresight and planfulness (pg. 85). Whether it be because of development in youthful years or a process of aging, maturity is a key factor in decision making to right-justify one's life according to the Gluecks. This fundamental change requires self-motivation based upon desire to conform to social norms in order to access the goodness of society. But this alone is not adequate in

giving explanation to why some ex-offenders put closure on a life of crime and others don't. The use of long-standing social theories that have been applied as explanations historically to the life cycle is prevalent. Hirschi and Gottfredson (1983) have identified that the life cycle itself (aging) becomes a definite factor with regards to willingness in accepting risk and the ability to conduct crime. Again, this does little to provide any insight as to why younger offenders go straight. The same is true for Jolin and Gibson (1987). They simply assert that age itself limits motivation and physical capability. Their research does reveal that the issue of aging does more to restrict the type of criminal behavior instead of curtailing criminal behavior altogether. With age criminal behavior becomes pannhandling and fraudulent scams instead of armed robbery and breaking-and-entering (Gluecks, 1945). Certainly this is not an answer as to why individuals completely cease criminal activity, and if it is it is not all pervasive nor does it address the characteristics of the ex-offender.

The lack of meaningful research which identifies the process of terminating a life of crime, while at the same time addressing issues that cause, support, and maintain this process is evident. For this reason it becomes necessary to identify a new approach. There are parts of the methodology used that need to be reconfigured, newly focused, and redefined, i.e., the sample population.

Instead of researching from a distance, soliciting answers from the successful source seems most logical and effective.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

It was decided that the only possible avenue to effectively research the successful rehabilitation and resocialization of some individuals was to go to the source. In reviewing possible professionally acceptable practices in which information can be acquired from those who have put closure on a life of crime, the choice was to use qualitative research. This was supported by Babbie's (1989) comments concerning observations that are not easily reduced to numbers. The concern is with observations which naturally demonstrate the characteristics of the surveyed population instead of hypothesized characteristics.

Biases

The author's personal biases are of real concern. Being one of those who have terminated a life of crime, the author holds preconceived ideology as to what will be identified as possible reasons as to why some individuals can successfully be rehabilitated and resocialized into society. Being able to identify this in itself serves to guard against the possibility of tainting or distorting the research. Yet the author's position is in fact the key to the research. In order to identify and understand the

population to be surveyed the author's experience as a successful ex-offender is important to conducting the research. Every effort has been made to minimize fabrications and interpretations by limiting the scope of the research. Purely the intent is to identify only those things that are common among those who have had the crime-closure experience.

One of the ways that bias was minimized was through the utilization of open-ended questions. Once the question was asked, the interviewer added nothing to the dialogue except an occasional gesture or word to show that the respondent was being heard. At times additional questions were asked but this was done in a manner that afforded neither a positive or negative connotation to responses. On occasion the interviewer was prompted to enter in the interview process by the respondent. The interviewer either redirected (with the use of leading questions) the request back to the respondent or went on to the next question.

The researcher maintained a flat demeanor during the survey. The only exception to this was during the negotiation to conduct the survey. At that time trust-building and rapport-building were necessary to establish an effective environment for surveying.

Sample Population

The sample population consisted entirely of white

adult male ex-offenders who had successfully demonstrated rehabilitation and resocialization by being out of the control of any legal institution for over two years and maintaining employment. This included being released from parole, probation or prison and payment in full of all fines or restitution. These individuals had demonstrated an upward mobility socially, economically, educationally, and in employment status. There also was an element of increased stability in personal relationships.

The sample population resided in Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Missouri and Arkansas at the time of the survey.

The first two individuals surveyed were involved with the author through Release Ministries, Inc., a non-profit organization which assisted ex-offenders and prisoners as they attempted to maneuver their way out of the criminal justice system. From these two successful ex-offenders, contacts were made with three others in similar status. Once the process of trust was established, referrals to further ex-offenders were forthcoming either through church organizations or along friendship lines. These friendship lines were similar to sub-cultures and many of the populations of these sub-cultures had long standing relationships. None of these relationships were reported to be pre-existing during criminal activity. All introductions were personally made, and in most cases each introduction required a divulging of the author's past. All introductions were arranged prior to an actual meeting.

Without exception all meetings and interviews took place away from their home and work. Most generally a socially neutral location was utilized, i.e., parks, libraries, churches and, in one instance, a museum. A snowball sample population of 63 were identified, but only 30 conformed to the established criteria to be surveyed. The actual surveying spanned from the fall of 1988 through the summer of 1991.

No gratuities were offered to the sample population for their involvement. It was identified that an effort was being made to research possible avenues to help other ex-offenders in their struggle to turn away from crime. This issue seemed to have been central to consent for involvement in the research. Only limited explanation about the research was offered.

Not during the survey nor to date has there been opportunity to meet any of the sample population either socially or privately. None of the sample population's families, friends or employers were contacted or offered for introduction. To date after the initial survey, each participant has been contacted twice for follow-up information. The author has not been contacted by any research participant voluntarily at any time.

Instrument

The survey instrument was developed under the guidance of Dr. Harjit Sandhu, professor of sociology at Oklahoma

State University. It consists of both qualitative and quantitative questions. The quantitative questions were used primarily to serve as a calming introduction to the survey. Questions easily answered about one's past set up a pattern of information giving which preceded the more personal open-ended qualitative questions which were the heart of the research.

The research instrument consists of three main categories, which require responses to the same questions at different times during the ex-offenders' rehabilitation and resocialization. These categories are: status prior to incarceration, status during incarceration, and status after incarceration. By reviewing the results of these questionnaires, a general sense of upward or downward mobility in the aforementioned areas could be easily established. The exploration of attitudes concerning self, relations to others, and societal concerns was done via open-ended qualitative questions. Other survey questions identified what if any types of programs and assistance were utilized by the ex-offender to effectively terminate his criminal career. Duration and content of these support programs are important in thinking about possible restructuring of existing programs.

The instrument was designed in such a way as to have balance and check procedures for consistency in answers. The questionnaire was orally administered, providing no time limit for responses. It was formulated in such a way

to provide the utmost safeguard and anonymity for the respondent. Great care was taken to ensure that there would be no linkage between the survey and the identity of the sample population. No names were attached to the survey and each interview was conducted personally by the author. The importance of this lies in the fact that many of those to be surveyed are not known as ex-offenders to family, friends and employers. Further ethical considerations were addressed in the pre-statement on the survey itself (Appendix A). The questionnaire was pretested to ensure internal validity. Additionally Dr. Babbie's book, titled The Practice of Social Research (1989), was heavily consulted.

Eight pretest interviews were done. None of the pretested interviews are a part of the final data. During the first two pretests it was identified that non-involvement in the gathering of information was absolutely necessary. In other words, no conversation with the respondent could be allowed. Conversation increased the time of the taking of the survey and led to story-telling as well as overly emotional circumstances. During the third pretest it was identified that setting would have a tremendous impact on the amount of information given. Locations would need to be out of the geographical areas where the respondent worked and lived. Paranoia was the chief cause of this requirement. Socially neutral places were found to be acceptable in the remaining pretests.

During all pretests it was identified that taping and taking detailed notes diminished the amount of response. The researcher was required to make key word notations and then immediately after the survey expand the survey notes. No time limit was set for the interviews during the pretesting, and the average time was two hours for the taking of information. As the study evolved (about the tenth survey) surveys began to take only an hour and a half. All surveys were done during the day between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. There were only two surveys that required being done in parts due to illness once on the behalf of the interviewer and once due to the respondent.

There were six surveys that were initiated of which the respondents requested to terminate the interview. Noteworthy is that one of those who terminated the survey was the sole female contacted. This particular individual was a part of the pretest.

At the beginning of each interview the purpose and the nature of the study were explained briefly. In all cases it was explained how it was that they came to be contacted. Assurances about anonymity were given to the respondents during the survey and in any reports that would be generated from the materials. Each respondent picked his own fictitious name. Respondents were provided with an understanding that the surveyor was also an ex-offender. It was explained to the respondents that their memories

were not being tested, nor would any other source of information be queried to supplement or support their responses. Furthermore they were told that there were no wrong or right answers, but that what was requested of them was to give truthful responses at the length and depth they felt comfortable with giving. The option to either not answer any and all questions was acceptable. The asking for clarification, offering of suggestions and criticisms were acceptable at any time.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Education

The survey was designed to identify change but self-proclaiming change. It was the intent that the survey evolve on its own and reveal by a natural course the most important aspects of change. It is for this reason that questions were asked that produced information which pertained to different points in time. For instance those surveyed were asked what their educational level was prior to incarceration which revealed that with the exception of seven, all had a high school education or less (Table I). The same question was asked concerning their education after terminating their criminal careers revealing that all had completed high school as a minimum, three completed Vocational Technical school as a minimum, 11 received associate degrees as a minimum, 11 acquired bachelor degrees as a minimum, and four were awarded Master's degrees (Table I). This was also reinforced by question 54 where 28 of the respondents identified education as one of the most important programs they participated in during imprisonment. It appears that educational institutions outside of the prison system could be another possible inroad in supporting self-correction as it affords many of

the same opportunities that religious organizations do. The immediate gratification of being accepted in the educational system builds self-esteem. The acquisition of information and the acquiring of grades, based upon ability rather than past, do much to support the ex-offender's efforts. There is little interest upon the part of the educational system about the ex-offender's past. There is a lot of interest on behalf of the educational system regarding the ex-offender's future, especially if the ex-offender does well. Religious organizations provide this and more in greater intensity but minus the education. It seems that some combination of support and utilization to and for the ex-offender will come from both educational institutions and religious organizations.

Bill best identifies the general feeling of those 28 when he said, "I began to learn because I wanted to know what was wrong with me." Many of the respondents saw education as a way to do self-analysis while at the same time make their prison time worth something. Education became not only a self-indulgence but would prove to be a path by which effective rehabilitation and resocialization could be gained. Education is a long-range support system. The majority of the ex-offenders were willing to invest their limited funds and enormous amounts of time in achieving success in this area. Educational institutions concern themselves very little about who an individual is, and are more concerned about what an individual can do.

Education is a tremendous boost to seeking employment as it speaks highly as a rehabilitation tool. It is accepted as a mark which identifies an individual who has achieved. This society rewards achievers with little or no interest in how they achieved it. Oftentimes education is in fact where ex-offenders will make the decision to disclose their past thereby entering into a period of self-actualization.

Income

The same can be shown regarding income. Prior to incarceration those surveyed indicated that all but one had legal income less than \$30,000 a year, with the majority of these individuals averaging about \$15,000 a year (Table II). After leaving a life of crime, the majority of surveyed individuals had income of \$30,000 a year or greater. These individuals' average legal income was between \$35,000 to \$40,000 a year.

Money, as with anything else, is a necessary support. It buys access and promotes stability. It also denotes productivity and success. More importantly, it is the initial contributing factor which presents a deterrence to the necessity to return to crime in order to meet immediate needs. If immediate essential needs cannot be met legitimately and the possibility still exists to generate income illegally, illegal avenues may be used.

Marriage

Major changes were also identified in marital status. Prior to incarceration there were 13 legally married, six single, four common law married, six separated and one widowed (Question 12). After straightening out their lives 25 were legally married and five were single (Question 110).

Out of the 23 who were married prior to incarceration, all described their marriages as unhappy or unsatisfying (Question 15). Countless stories were told of the inability to adjust to married life while being involved in criminal activity. Either the spouse was unaware of the criminal activity and a dual-existence was required in order to hide criminal actions, or the spouse was not only aware but involved. If the spouse was involved, jealousy was the demise of relationships. The type of jealousy that was most destructive revolved around crime-related affairs and sexual involvements. Those respondents who experienced this type of jealousy in their marriages provided information that might indicate that, where drugs are involved, extra-marital relationships do occur. All 30 of the ex-offenders expressed a strong sense of well-being for their accomplishment of self-correction. However, those ex-offenders, who had spouses or ex-spouses that committed crimes but were not prosecuted or incarcerated, experienced jealousy at their not being caught. Thirteen of the 23 spouses had arrest records (Question 17). Conversations

with the respondents revealed that all who knew about their husbands' criminal activities were also involved in criminal activities but were never caught. There does not appear to be any information to substantiate jealousies concerning money, possessions or head-of-household. Yet there were eight respondents who identified jealousy issues about offsprings' liking one parent more than the other.

An example of this is that one of the respondents and his wife had a babysitting business. Their services were offered to affluent families of which most were corporate upward mobility types. Jim, the ex-offender surveyed, was bisexual, as was his wife. He related that during the three years that he and his wife owned and operated their lucrative business, they molested and video-taped over 100 adolescents. Most generally they would pick families that had both boys and girls where some dysfunctionism existed. While Jim would be molesting the female child, his spouse would molest the male child. Their crimes ranged from sodomy to rape. Although Jim was convicted of the rape of a 12 year old girl, his wife, who was indicted on four separate counts, still to this day has not suffered a conviction. It would appear from this example that there existed joint effort with spouses to commit crimes. Yet when any question was asked specifically about this subject, all but two surveyed were not willing to discuss it in detail. Although no clear reason was given for the unwillingness to discuss this subject, it appears that some

protection was being provided to partners in crime in an effort to protect that partner as well as the ex-offender. Some of the crimes committed by the ex-offenders and their spouses are still within the time limits of the state and federal statute of limitations. In other words if for any reason their crime partner would be arrested and convicted for crimes committed, the ex-offender would be in jeopardy likewise.

Residence

Prior to incarceration 23 of the 30 surveyed lived the majority of their lives up until the time of their incarceration in small towns or rural areas. Whereas afterwards 26 of the 30 lived in the city (Table III).

Question 114 addressed why so many individuals left small towns and the rural areas to find living arrangements in the large cities after incarceration. The responses varied as follows: being able to hide one's past; it was easy to start a new life; because my job was there; because I was run out of my small town; it was where my wife was when I got out of prison. Most of the responses indicate that living in the city was the easiest place to make a new beginning. Anonymity and the sheer fact that there are so many people providing the means by which one can hide one's past. Also, the number of support systems is greater in the city. Cities provide federal, state and private support systems whose funding enables them to deliver a

greater amount of support to individuals. Additionally, an individual can go from organization to organization and have a continual support system without being identified as a support-system abuser. This would not be possible in a rural setting. According to the Salvation Army a food voucher in St. Louis, Missouri is \$150 every three weeks, while only 68 miles away in rural Sullivan, Missouri a food voucher for three weeks from the same agency is only \$75. In St. Louis there are approximately 60 agencies from which an individual can seek assistance, but in Sullivan there are only five. Some agencies offer networking in behalf of the individual requesting services in an effort to meet a variety of needs with minimal effort on the part of the requestor of services. Such agencies include the Red Cross, Neighbor for Neighbor, Salvation Army, Goodwill, Catholic charities, public and private shelters, state agencies, local animal clubs, and women's groups.

Religion

Question 5 asks about religious involvement prior to incarceration. Four of the 30 answered that there was none. The remaining 26 covered an array of denominations. These denominations were without exception all mainline religions. Methodist topped the list followed by Baptist and the remainder fell into the categories of Catholic, Presbyterian, Lutheran and Pentecostal churches (Table IV). What is interesting is that many expressed the experience

of guilt concerning their religious affiliation. Jeffery who is Catholic conveyed that being a Catholic provided him a relief of anxiety about his criminal involvements. At times he would feel depressed and remorseful for the sexual molestations of children. He personifies the attitude of the others surveyed in that their religious ties were not superficial and would eventually become their strongest support in rehabilitation and resocialization. This is especially true in the resocialization area. Jeffery had deep feelings about the harm he had inflicted mentally on the young innocent boys he had molested. Because of his obvious needs to hide his crimes, the only avenue left to him to deal with this guilt was the church.

Additionally he asserted that so disturbing were his sexual crimes that forgiveness had to be offered by an entity much greater than humanity. He fathomed that humanity had already condemned him by the very fact that his activities were known illegal acts. It became clear after discussing this matter with the 26 respondents, that their religious involvement was functional (Ritzer, 1988). There is reason to believe that far beyond liturgical concerns that from the functional perspective religions offer indirect psychiatric care. The majority of the respondents freely admitted that their religious involvement deterred the volume and the depths of their criminal activities. Of the four that did not identify a religious involvement, they too related the need for some

sense of forgiveness.

The continual return to the church for assistance is evident when reviewing question 56 where 18 identified the church as one of the programs they participated in during their incarceration. The responses to question 55 identify church involvement as a program that the incarcerated found supportive and helpful. Twenty of the respondents identified this. All of the respondents clearly stated in their answer to question 56 (the question asks how much of a help) that religion was of much help. The majority of the responses were in the areas of dealing with emotional concerns, chief of these were guilt and shame.

According to Kohlberg (Fong & Resnick, 1980) the surveyed population may have progressed in moral development toward the postconventional morality stage. In this stage moral judgments are independent of personal consequences and social convention. And there is a belief in higher principles of justice. In order to determine this more research in this area would be needed.

Government Assistance

Queried about receiving state assistance in question 17, 18 respondents said they had and 12 said they had not. Of those who had received welfare all of them rescinded the use of the services as soon as they were able to care for themselves. They reported that they were appreciative of such services and felt that quite possibly this was

society's way of indirectly supporting them in their rehabilitation and resocialization.

Family

In looking at family relationships before and after incarceration, there was an equal balance between support and non-support. There seems to be no distinction made between those who had previously incarcerated nuclear family members and those who did not. Question 9 shows that 14 had families with no convictions and 16 with convictions. The only notable finding was that those surveyed with families that had prior convictions seemed to be more understanding. One of the respondents who was convicted of assault and battery explained that his father, who had been also arrested for assault and battery, was the first to be willing to provide assistance. His mother, who was the victim of the father's assault and battery charges, was not at all sympathetic and their relationship ultimately ended in the severing of ties. This same situation was prevalent in the majority of cases where respondents had family members with convictions and/or imprisonments.

Twenty-six of those surveyed identified their family life (prior to 18) as unhappy or so-so. Nineteen described having unfavorable influences from their fathers. Hagan (1987, pg. 84) stated, "Parental transmission of criminogenic attitudes or failure to train the children may

influence delinquency. Similarly, a poor home environment may force the youth into streets seeking peer primary group support.

The family environment has been shown by the majority of theories to have a direct link with juvenile offenders. Juvenile delinquency is accepted in the fields of criminology and sociology as being precursor to adult criminality. Sandhu (1977) supports that those with juvenile records have a greater propensity to criminal activity as adults. Pfuhl (1980) goes one step further in his book The Deviance Process to say that juvenile delinquency is most likely a precursor to adult criminal activity. Fifteen of those surveyed had juvenile records. Out of the remaining 15, eleven admitted to committing crimes and being arrested, but because of family involvement they were able to escape court involvement. The respondent Tracy told of 6 arrests, two of which were car thefts. Because his uncle, who was a well-known attorney in the small town where they lived, the most severe action ever taken was that he was detained.

The sample of 30 followed this pattern of first being a juvenile delinquent prior to adult criminal activity. It is an obvious statement that all 30 were incarcerated. Their average incarceration was 3 years and one month. Nineteen spent time in maximum security, 28 spent time in medium security, and 25 spent time in minimum security. Ten spent time in a federal institution, 19 spent time in a

state institution, 14 spent time in county jails, and 11 in local facilities. These numbers reflect time served in different institutions by the same individual in some cases. In other words one individual may have spent time in a county jail, then transferred to a minimum security, and then after conviction moved to a maximum security facility. Out of all surveyed, 12 had two convictions, three had three convictions and one had four convictions. The types of crimes committed vary as much as the amount of time spent and the types of institution in which the individuals were incarcerated (Table V).

Drug Use

Question 37 concerned illegal drug use and its relation to criminal acts. Twenty-three of the sample population stated that drug use was a major part of the criminal activity. Question 38 asked in what way was drug use responsible for their criminal behavior. Three major types of responses were given. Either crimes were committed to create revenue for the drug habit, crimes were committed while on drugs, or crimes were committed to make large sums of money. It was a standard response that criminal behavior would have been avoided if it were not for drug abuse. In other words self-control was adequate during drug-free times to keep criminal behavior in check. Although five of the more trusting respondents stated that many times the use of drugs was merely a technique for by-

passing social responsibility, guilt and self-control. All 23 who admitted to drug use identified their spouses as drug users. When asked the question did they feel that friends influenced their drug use (including spouse), five said, "fully," 18 said, "partially," and 7 said, "not at all." Clearly the introduction of drugs has some causal effect. There is no reported use of drugs during or after terminating a criminal career. This leads to the belief that drug use at the very least creates an environment that is not conducive to deterring from a life of crime. The range of drugs used were intermixed and oftentimes the use of one drug led to the use of a more powerful drug. The choice of drug depended on the required effect and funds available. For instance the majority of the sex offenders were more interested in drugs that produced a heightened sense of sexuality as well as elongating the time of the heightened state of sexuality. Those who were involved in theft or robberies were more prone to use amphetamines. The survey revealed that 19 had used cocaine, all 30 used pot, 11 had used uppers, 7 had used downers, 6 had used crack, 7 had used heroin, 3 had used LSD, all had used alcohol (excessively), and that all but two used some combination of drugs periodically. Only five of the sample population were willing to identify themselves as having had a drug problem. Twenty of the 30 surveyed admitted to drug use during imprisonment. Their denial of having a drug problem may be indicative of their ability to quit the

use of drugs which supports their inner acquisition of a new self-esteem.

Prison Programs

Prison programs are an issue from the standpoint of time and money. In studying a group of individuals, who by all requirements of this investigation have terminated their criminal life, the programs they identify as beneficial are important. The top two are education and religion. These two have been previously discussed. The program "Seven Steps" was pictorialized as being childish and without substance. Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) received a favorable review but was generally seen as a passing interest. The majority of respondents questioned the worth of continuously reliving their past. They did not see this program as a forward self-perpetuating program. All 30 conveyed an emphatic desire to leave their past behind them. The AA program responds to a social ill that is easily forgiven by society or at worst tolerated by overlooking it. An alcohol addiction is not illegal and only becomes legally problematic when statutes are violated. Being an ex-offender is not socially forgiven, especially when crimes are victim oriented. It is easy for an alcoholic to openly speak about his past, but it is not for the ex-offender. Additionally the AA program is a group effort that relies on group support. It appears that those who self-correct prefer individual self-administered

programs.

Work appeared to be the number one therapeutic program. Work provided an escape to immediate reality as it provided the inmate something positive to look forward to on a day-to-day basis. Additionally it helped the time to pass quickly.

Drug counseling was considered the worst program as was sex-offense counseling. John who had committed sex offenses was required to go to sex therapy. He recalled his first session as an extremely frustrating event. Having been without access to sexual involvement for a period of one year, John was placed in a room with a 22 year old sex therapist who had blue eyes, blond hair and was wearing a skirt that revealed her long sensuous legs. When the therapist asked John what was it he was feeling at the moment, he said, "I feel like I want to fuck you." Honest as his response was, John was placed in a cell for one week without recreation or the freedom to go to work. Obviously to place a sex offender in the midst of the object of his desire is not a well thought out program. It is this type of mentality that makes the majority of prison programs ineffective and sometimes harmful.

Group therapy was not seen to be any more helpful. There seems to be an interest in prison programs which emphasize the maximum responsibility on the individual rather than the group. Group programs or programs that emphasize direct outside involvement were not identified as

helpful. Therefore it appears that self-correction stipulates the emphasis on self-reliance and independence. The sample population in their searching for individual truths elected a taylor-made rather than a generic rehabilitation. Question 89 identifies that taking responsibility for being incarcerated is an important step toward self-correction. Along with identifying personal responsibility by choice of programs which rely on the individual rather than the group, an emphasis on self-reliance throughout the whole process of change seems to emerge. What is interesting is that the programs which offer this opportunity are the traditional legitimate social institutions that exist outside the prison system for mainstream society (i.e. religious, educational and employment). Of particular interest is that these institutions were available prior to incarceration. However, the ex-offenders not only returned to these institutions but desired to acquire the element of individuality/independence which each of these institutions promote. Accountability for one's success or failure is dependent on the individual's actions in each of these institutions.

Support Systems

Question 59 begins the portion of the survey that deals with the after-incarceration period of the sample population. This question requests information concerning

what help was most important upon release. All but four responded with the need for a job. The immediate need for shelter and food is innate to our species. What is key to this research is the issue of how these individuals were able to continue their direction in changing their lives while at the same time realizing their goals and dreams. A series of questions were asked of the sample group regarding what helps and supports they received (questions 59-67, Appendix A). All stated that obtaining employment was by and large the greatest milestone to overcome. They quickly discovered that acquiring a position as a hamburger flipper created a momentous dilemma. Applications for even a dishwasher position required a disclosure of criminal offenses. Although this has been a requirement for many years, within the last 15 years a new statement has been attached to the disclosure request. It appears as following on the majority of applications reviewed to understand this dilemma: "Failure to disclose criminal record can and will subsequently result in immediate dismissal or criminal charges." Additionally the majority of applications to those positions that pay reasonable salary specifically require a release from the applicant so that the employer can conduct a records check. Being in the state of paranoia, having just been released from prison, statements such as these create tremendous obstacles and generally led to applications not being submitted. The sample population revealed that seeking

alternative employment opportunities required either being self-employed or relying on alternative support systems for the acquisition of employment. Both of these avenues have their own problems because they too require a certain amount of disclosure.

Religious organizations act as alternative support systems. This was supported specifically by the responses to question 66, that asked who helped the most with your problems. The responses from the research population indicated that religious organizations have very little concern about one's past and focus toward the future. They concern themselves with one's spirituality and sincerity instead of one's failures. By nature religious organizations are supportive in dealing with crises. Employment was surprisingly one of their most helpful areas, as indicated by question 67 which makes inquiry about how people helped. If you are a member of a religious organization and another member owns a business, you can receive employment and by-pass the application dilemma. Religious organizations also provide one of the things that help reduce the levels of paranoia. They are accepting and trustworthy. Frank, who had committed murder, was put in charge of teaching adolescent Sunday School within one month after joining the church. Tom, who was convicted of financial fraud, was given the duties of overseeing church finances one year after joining his church. Churches very rarely ask for credentials or have

applications one fills out. They judge an individual by how they presently conduct their life and their dedication to the religious group. In turn, according to those surveyed, churches provided acceptance, respect, caring and a host of other personal benefits that open doors for the ex-offender. During their in-depth response to question 57, half of the respondents revealed that over a period of time they were able to tell at least the pastor about their past. Surprisingly all reported that it had no effect on their standing in the religious organization. This is not to say that this is true with all religious organizations, or that all ex-offenders would have the same experience. What can be said is that religious organizations are viable existing possible avenues for ex-offenders in finding support for resocialization and rehabilitation.

It would seem that religious organizations would be especially supportive and important to rehabilitation and resocialization during incarceration. This does not seem to be the case at all. During incarceration there is no diversity in the congregation. The congregation consists of all inmates. There is no opportunity to conduct legitimate networking that would be beneficial upon the inmates' release. The importance of religious organizations apparently finds its strength in being in the community where the ex-offender decides to start his new life. Of most importance is the fact that religious organizations inside the prison still see the self-

corrector as an offender. There is no opportunity for the offender to hide his past. In the community the ex-offender is seen as a member of a congregation until, when and if, he reveals his past.

Process of Self-identification,
Internalization and Redirection

Another concern of the research was the personal decisions that these surveyed individuals did or did not make about their criminality as evidenced by question 70. Question 71 queried the surveyed about when they made their decision to terminate their criminal activities. The number one response was, "while in prison," the second was, "when I was reborn" (with connotations to a religious experience), and the third most often given was, "shortly after I was out of prison." These responses along with the answers from question 72 (Under what circumstances did you make this decision?) clearly supports Cusson and Pinsonneault's (1986) theory on shock. "The decision to give up crime is generally triggered by a shock of some sort, by a delayed deterrence process or both" (pg. 73). Sutherland (1937, pg. 182), who was also cited by Cusson and Pinsonneault, clearly noted this phenomenon when he quoted Cromwell's remarks out of his work The Professional Thief, "It is generally necessary for the thief to suffer some shock or jolt before he will face the future seriously." The sample population talks about divorce,

loss of goods, guilt and depression over the destruction they have caused and that they suffer in their own lives. This information came from question 88 where respondents were requested to identify things that would make them want to change.

The answers to the qualitative survey questions show an effort of the respondents to be introspective, some to a greater degree than others (questions 84-85). Respondents began to search for answers either because of a catastrophe or a slow awareness that they were in a desperate situation (questions 86-88). Billy best indicated this phenomena at work when he related the following experience. He had stolen a car and then was pursued by the police in a high speed chase. Because of wet and slippery roads he lost control of the car and wrecked it. In the course of the accident four of his fingers were partially severed and later reattached. Billy was incarcerated for grand theft auto and during his imprisonment his reattached fingers had to be surgically removed. Billy said that if he would have had access to medical treatment outside of the prison system, he would have been able to keep his fingers. Because Billy was willing to admit to himself that being in prison was his sole responsibility, the loss of his fingers was also his responsibility. The shock of losing his fingers, coupled with the acceptance of the responsibility for his incarceration, brought him to the decision to change his life.

Another ex-offender said that his obsession with discovering what had led to his being incarcerated resulted in five days without sleep or rest. Others described similar but not so severe occurrences of seeking answers for themselves about their lives. All spoke of desperate moments and frustration over the fact that they could not comprehend why they had done what they had done. Guilt resulted in physical ailments and shame brought thoughts of suicide. While in the state of contemplating suicide, Ron said he had been given a book by a preacher. The book, written by Kierkegaard (Sontag, 1979), had dispelled his intentions of his own demise. The passage was as follows, "Inwardness involves dread due to the isolation it induces. The concept of dread explores the source of dread, and dread is fear of the truth" (pg. 64). Kierkegaard went on to say that inwardness produces the truth about oneself; knowing oneself produces pain but also brings about change. The respondents all experienced degrees of or total awareness of being responsible for their own plight. What psychological and emotional transformations took place is a question that cannot be appropriately addressed here. It suffices to say that there is adequate confirmation from the respondents to indicate that introspection did take place and that it produced change.

There are many in prisons who appear to have accepted incarceration as an occupational hazard. They displayed a sense of well-being and spent their time talking about the

perfect crime they can commit when released. This was revealed by 20 of those interviewed when making inquiries about how they saw themselves different from the rest of the prison populations. This was a follow-up question. Those surveyed had dreams of a better life, which they had plans to go after. This showed a determination and a self-discipline for separation from past criminal activity which resulted in incarceration. A sense of relief from frustration and depression accompanied by a sense of well-being was expressed after the personal decision was made to turn one's life around. Changing one's outward identity also became important according to the ex-offenders. Dwelling on the past was replaced with pondering on the future. There was a certain urgency to hide and cover-up one's criminal past.

Sandhu in his seminar in the fall of 1989 presented the possibility that "going straight" is a result of introspection which produces new motivations for conformity to that which is deemed socially good and acceptable. Conformity he explained produces legitimate access to those substances and relationships that appropriately and subsequently produce fulfillment in life. In order to substantiate the bringing about of the decision-making ordeal concerning either "going straight" or staying criminal, he made references to Reckless's work in Containment Theory.

Reckless (1967; Reckless et. al., 1956, 1957, 1957a;

and Reckless & Dinitz, 1967) provided the only consistent and theoretically based explanation for a grounded research with the concern of why particular individuals turn away from a life of crime. Although he does not specifically address the issue of why an individual would "go straight," he does create a theoretical structure that is helpful and insightful in addressing possible explanations. Reckless's research into criminality is based upon the foundation of the social control theory. He deals primarily with socialization, learning processes, and the ability to internalize social norms as they are effected by internal and external influences. Reckless, much like his contemporary Sutherland, held that each individual is subject to numerous social controls (containments) which provide the ability to resist the propensity in committing acts that are antisocial or legally unacceptable based upon the consensus of society at large. His theory takes under consideration the forces of society which quite possibly may lead to an inclination toward crime. It addresses individual characteristics that should deter them from a life of crime, but under given circumstances could enhance criminality. Utilizing some of deterministic theory, Reckless incorporates exerted pushes and pulls placed on the individual in conjunction with containment concepts, while incorporating the understanding of free will in individual decision-making processes of choosing between a life of social conformity or criminality. To be more

specific, Reckless simply states that external pressures push an individual in the direction of criminality. Such pressures could be identified as poverty, class position, the lack of legitimate opportunities in the areas of education, employment, shelter, etc. External pulls attract individuals away from social norms and manifest themselves in the environment in such ways as to be identified as bad company, sub-cultures that are deviant, and most recently by the influence of media. They oftentimes become foster caretakers to those individuals who find themselves in a dysfunctional family, community, culture or society.

According to Reckless, external pressures push individuals toward a life of crime, and external pulls cause the individuals to gravitate away from the influence of a social awareness of social norms, values and laws. Internal pushes drive an individual to find solutions to inner tensions and to promote resolution to psychological, organic or social inadequacies. Reckless in his containment theory put forth the concept of "inner containment." Inner containments are explained as a process of internalizing appropriate behavioral values along with the development of personality characteristics which empowers one to withstand pressures that would otherwise press the individual to criminality. He speaks of outer containments which are those personal relationships, social institutions, and social awareness

which provide support systems that give assistance to reinforcing the ability to deter a life of criminality. He becomes insulated from the frustration and aggravation of outside pressures.

If this theory can be applied to identifying the central dilemma that confronts pre or existing offenders, it seems logical that application of this theory in the rehabilitation and resocialization of the ex-offender would be beneficial. If it were possible to resocialize ex-offenders in such a way as to empower them to deal with external pressures, external pulls and internal pressures, then there would be effective implementation of inner and outer containment capabilities with regards to the ex-offender.

It appears that much of this has taken place with the 30 ex-offenders (in some form or fashion) who were surveyed. Notably though these individuals have displayed an ability to obtain education (Table I). They also have demonstrated a ability to think their way through difficult and complex introspective concepts. The question arises does intellect play a decisive part in terminating the criminal career. It very well may be that a program needs to be devised specifically for those who have the aptitude and the ability for this path of self-correction. At present programs that would support individualized self-correction do exist through prison educational programs that are provided by educational institutions outside the

prison. In providing courses such as intro sociology, intro to psychology, and self-awareness courses they begin to provide individualized instruction that leads to awareness of oneself in society. Programs that address individualism and provide techniques which offer information about social structure and social awareness would be of importance and interest to the self-correcting. If programs structured in this manner were offered, those who successfully participated could preliminarily be identified as self-correcting.

What begins to evolve is the individual motivation toward maturity in the sense of being responsible for one's own future and behavior. This does not necessarily coincide with any particular age or life cycle. This very much supports the Gluecks' (1945) findings as reported in the Literature Review. Self-control in achieving one's goals and the completion of individual steps to achieve those goals is imperative for growth.

The respondents were asked question 73 on what motivated them to terminate their criminal career. One third responded that they did not want to go back to prison, one third responded in a manner which was indicative to wanting a better life, and the remaining third identified the need for a less complicated and more meaningful life. As earlier discussed this indicates a formidable growth when applying Kohlberg's theory of moral development (Fong & Resnick, 1980). Those who gave answers

concerning having a meaningful life are typified by Terrance. Having been a drug dealer to inner city youths, he had dedicated himself to trying to undo all the harm he had caused. Terrance had not only sold drugs but had placed many young females unwillingly into prostitution through drug addiction.

In determining what efforts were put forth by the sample population to maintain their crime-free life (question 79), a variety of actions were given. The most important was the response received from all but one of the respondent, starting a new life. When inquiring what this meant, Paul said, "It means getting rid of old friends, old habits and staying clear of old haunts." Each individual that mentioned this in their own way was very adamant about the importance of such action. Question 79 also indicated that this may even ensue divorce. This effort to make physical separation from one's past again demonstrates self-discipline and taking on the responsibility to secure a sound future. As was discussed in suggested prison programs in this section, maturity produces action based upon a realization of a need for a sound future.

Question 80 clearly demonstrates that for this population prison is a deterrent to crime. All 30 with great attitudes of resolution felt that prison for them was a deterrent to their criminal activity.

Questions 84 and 127 specifically request information in the form of advice to others who are juvenile

delinquents, adult offenders or are experiencing the dilemmas of being an ex-offender. All agreed that a person who is experiencing criminal activities has a problem. Drugs and alcohol only make the problem worse. The advice given was to seek help for problems and stay away from alcohol and drugs as well as from people who do drugs and alcohol. The second most offered recommendation was to get the best education available. The third was to learn who you are. The fourth was to work for what you get. It was generally concluded from all the interviews that all 30 had had points in time during their criminal career that alternative choices could have been made. This was regardless of the types of crime they had committed. What was not clear was why alternative choices were not taken. All of those surveyed were recontacted and asked why these alternative choices were not taken. The consensus was that low self-esteem prevented walking away from predatory associates and friends. When looking at the fact that all 30 considered prison a deterrent to a future life of crime, this becomes a clear issue. Incarceration provided them with a point of demarcation from the old to the new. It is interesting to note that the concept of prison prior to incarceration had no deterrence capability.

Question 87 asked if the decision to stop their criminal lifestyle was a snap decision or a gradual decision. Twenty-five responded "gradual" and five responded "snap." The difference seems to revolve around

individual perception of their predicament and the seriousness of what a life of crime would mean. For some it became crystal clear the minute they entered prison. Kevin, who experienced a snap decision, did so while watching a life-term inmate sodomize a 19 year old first-terminer. He said that the experience was so devastating to his personal sense of worth that he knew at that instant he did not wish to end up like the lifer. With great sorrow and deep conviction to be a youth counselor, Kevin two days later after this episode awoke to find his roommate dead with a slashed wrist. His roommate was the 19 year old first-terminer. Each of the 30 respondents had similar distasteful and horrible stories to relate.

In reviewing the responses of the ex-offenders concerning the prison system, all held the belief that incarceration was a formidable deterrent to future criminality. The question arises as to why imprisonment is an effective deterrent for these 30 and not for so many others. It is to be noted that the thought of incarceration, if there was any, did not display itself as a formidable cause to prevent their criminal activities prior to incarceration.

Historically in America penal institutions were of two kinds (Sandhu, 1981). The first were identified as following the Pennsylvania system, which was contrived by the Quakers. The second was the Auburn system. Although they had many things in common as well as differences, one

central common theme was that inmates were provided with a lot of solitude which was to be specifically utilized for the incarcerated to contemplate his wrongdoing. His contemplation was to incorporate thoughts about what self-corrective measures were necessary to curb his criminal behavior. Self-discipline was indirectly encouraged in the Pennsylvania system and directly ardently insisted upon in the Auburn system. The importance of this is that the foundation of the American penal system was founded upon an understanding that inward self-correction was the best form of rehabilitation. Those incarcerated were not merely punished but encouraged to identify their fault and take responsibility for their lives. According to Beccaria (1963, pg. 62), "There must be a proper proportion between crime and punishment." He goes on to assert that proper punishment means that we must first identify the capability of the individual to comprehend the punishment. Great crime should have great punishment, small crime should have small punishment. Yet if the individual is not capable of understanding his offense is great, then not even can greater punishment produce change. Penal institutions were designed for those who have the capability to comprehend the punishment and the ability to change. All 30 individuals surveyed demonstrated the mental capacity to understand their situation and an ability to seek out support for change, activate change and adapt to change. This is an indication that the correctional institutions do

in fact work when applied to those for whom it was intended. The majority of studies on recidivism may be not be indicating that the system is bad, but rather that the clientele researched are in need of a different approach to rehabilitation and resocialization.

Question 89 indicated that 15 finally realized that their incarceration was 100% their fault. The remaining 15 accepted 90% of the blame. Of those 15 who did not accept full blame, all displaced the remaining percent of the responsibility on three main areas: environment, society, and others. The key in understanding their displacement of responsibility is comprehensible when reviewing the stories that were told of them being molested, beaten and neglected as children.

Another question of interest to the overall picture of why a life of crime and then a decision to put closure on a life of crime is Question 115. The question asks if the respondents have any disabilities. Fourteen had diagnosed disabilities and ten of the remaining 16 expressed a concern about learning disabilities that had been identified while in elementary school. Disabilities ranged from reading to the loss of one eye. All that were identified as having some kind of learning problem expressed frustration they experienced while obtaining part or all of their general education. Of all the disabilities mentioned, the inability to read was the most severe. Education being identified as a critical support system

with regards to an ex-offender's future is imperative.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Discussions have been held with murderers, rapists, child-molesters, petty thieves and individuals whose previous lives are marred with every type of addiction known. It comes as no surprise that many of these individuals have gone to such great lengths to hide their pasts. They do not only hide their pasts from their loved ones and significant others in their environment, but most importantly they hide their past from society. It is a unique technique to maintain some new found sanity by which to foster a new identity. All of the surveyed population live on the edge of darkness and light with a marginal status. Their maintaining a state of terminating a life of crime is a day-to-day decision. This finding accentuates the results of this research. If the many obstacles that the sample population had to overcome were so immense, then the techniques and supports they utilized to overcome their criminality are of tremendous interest.

The most obvious self-evident finding is that this group of 30 individuals is truly different from those in most previously reviewed studies. They have stopped their criminal activity. A break from the traditional practice of studying sample populations that are identifiably still

in the criminal cycle produces evidence that shows what criminals do. This study produces information that characterizes what ex-offenders, who are no longer in the criminal cycle, do. Additionally it gives an indication as to how these individuals broke from their criminal past and successfully started a new life. In order to further support the findings of this study all 30 of the sample population were contacted were during the fall of 1993 by phone. There was verbal verification that the entire sample population is still crime-free, except for the death of one respondent, two traffic warrants and one drunk driving charge. Age does not seem to be as important a criterion as is maturity. Age may eventually deter some types of criminal activity due to physical restraints, but there is no evidence to support that age alone stops criminality completely. However, this research does identify that maturity is a part of the process of self-correction in that it produces motivation for being responsible for one's future. This was discussed in the Literature Review with references to the Gluecks' study and in Chapter IV under the subtitle of, "Process of self-identification, internalization and redirection."

The sample population identifies itself through the data as possessing or cultivating a mature realization of their existence. Introspection, philosophically and intellectually, gave rise to the decision to change their lives. The chief component in making this change is

supported by the willingness of the sample population to accept responsibility for their lives. This decision is sustained by an internal motivation to create a new identity that will provide the avenue for rehabilitation and resocialization.

The support systems utilized to bring termination to criminal careers appeared to be religious organizations, education and finances. Religious organizations or organizations that provide unconditional acceptance and networking capability, which can facilitate problems that ex-offenders are confronted with, are key elements to success. Educational institutions essentially provide the same type of networking that religious organizations provide. Finance is also a key element. Legitimate access to wage-earning is a must. Positive reinforcement that supports the ex-offender's attempt to resocialize and rehabilitate is vital to success. Anything that confounds the growth process must be avoided at all costs. Therefore a networking system that addresses these issues on a non-limiting continuum appears to be efficacious to termination of a criminal career.

The implication derived from the data that best addresses the concerns of society is that hope exists in terminating at least some criminal careers. This implies that the correctional institutions do have a positive effect on some individuals where deterrence from crime is of importance. Additionally this type of information would

be used in providing guidance to parole boards when determining which individuals are good candidates for parole.

Furthermore the identification of what steps these individuals took and by what avenues they traveled on to achieve their goals is of interest for creating new programs and systems for other ex-offenders to follow. In streamlining individual ex-offender's attempts to right-justify, the number of success rates could very well increase. There is reason to believe that such programs could be adjusted to address other populations in the prison system. Other portions of the prison population may require greater explanation in order to grasp the concepts that produce self-correction.

Based upon this research it can be said that an individual who has successfully terminated a criminal career was someone who had introspectively identified areas of his life that required change in order to rehabilitate and resocialize into mainstream society. Initially by way of philosophical discernment, he began steps toward maturity by accepting the responsibility for his life and imprisonment. Either as a gradual or through shock realization, he made the determination for a definite change in his attitude toward maintaining a realistic lifestyle. As this maturity grew, self-discipline, personal and outward responsibility became observable characteristics. Motivation evolved into a reconstruction

of a life that was socially and personally acceptable. A responsible effort was made to utilize systems that supported the effort toward life change. The most important of these support systems appear to be religious organizations, education, and employment.

Proposed areas for future studies would be to research female populations and juvenile populations to ascertain if the same indications are present and why. Once again the key is to research a population that gives evidence to a termination of criminal activities.

Beccaria (1963) issues caution to our necessity to seek answers to the dilemma of crime:

From simple consideration of the truths thus far presented it is evident that the purpose of punishment is neither to torment and afflict a sensitive being, nor to undo a crime already committed.... The purpose can only be to prevent the criminal from inflicting new injuries on its citizens and to deter others from similar acts. Always keeping due proportions, such punishments and such method of inflicting them ought to be chosen, therefore, which will make the strongest and most lasting impression on the minds of men, and inflict the least torment on the body of the criminal. (pg. 42)

It should be the responsibility of this era of humanity to transcend from the quagmire of warehousing our problems in state institutions and find solutions that

benefit the individual as well as the whole of society.
The present technology and intellect along with finances
exist to have major impact to bring about the deterrence of
crime from its conception rather than from its decaying
carcass.

LITERATURE CITED

- Babbie, E. (1986). The practice of social research. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Inc.
- Beccaria, C. (1963). On crimes and punishments. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Clark, A. L. & Gibbs, F. P. (1965). Social control: A reformation. Social Problems, 13, 399-415.
- Clear, R. R. & Cole, G. F. (1986). American corrections. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Cusson, M. & Pinsonneault, P. (1986). The decision to give up crime. 72-92. In Cornish, D. D., & Clarke, R. V. (Eds.), The reasoning criminal: Rational choice perspectives on offending.
- Fong, B. C., & Resnick, M. R. (1980). The Child: Development through adolescence. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings.
- Fox, V. (1976). Introduction to criminology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Goldfarb, R. L. & Singer, L. R. (1973). After conviction. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Gibbons, D. C. (1979). The criminological enterprise: Theories and Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. T. (1930). Five hundred criminal careers. New York: Knopf.

- Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. T. (1945). After-conduct of discharged offenders. London: Macmillan.
- Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. T. (1950). Unraveling juvenile delinquency. New York: Commonwealth Fund.
- Hagan, F. E. (1986). Introduction to criminology: Theories, methods, and criminal behavior. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, T. & Gottfredson, M. (1983). Age and the explanation of crime. American Journal of Sociology, 89, 552-584.
- Hume, D. (1902). Enquiries (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Jolin, A. & Gibbons, D. C. (1987). Age patterns in criminal involvement. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 31, 237-260.
- Light, D., Jr., & Keller, S. (1982). Sociology (3rd ed.) . New York: Knopf.
- Nisbet, R. (1983). Crime and punishment. Across the Board.
- Perry, L. (1986). Going Straight: factors influencing the decision to cease criminal activity. Master's Thesis.
- Pfuhl, E. H. (1980). The deviance process. New York: Van Nostrand.

- Reckless, W. C. (1967). The crime problem. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Reckless, W. C. & Dinitz, S. (1967). Pioneering with self-concept as a vulnerability factor in delinquency. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 58, 515-523.
- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S. & Kay, B. (1957). The self-component in potential delinquency and potential nondelinquency. American Sociological Review, 22, 566-570.
- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S. & Murray, E. (1956). Self-concept as an insulator against delinquency. American Sociological Review, 21, 744-756.
- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S. & Murray, E. (1957). The 'good boy' in a high delinquency area. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 48, 18-25.
- Ritzer, G. (1988). Sociological theory (2nd ed.). New York: Knopf.
- Sandhu, H. (1981). Community corrections new horizons. Springfield, IL: C. C. Thomas.
- Sandhu, H. (1974). Modern corrections. Springfield, IL: C. C. Thomas.
- Shover, N. (1983). The later stages of ordinary property offender careers. Social Problems, 31, 209-218.

Sontag, F. (1979). A Kierkegaard handbook. Atlanta:
Knox press.

Sutherland, E. H. (1937). The professional chief.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

The Wilson Quarterly, (1983, Spring). Coping with
justice.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Date _____

Research Questionnaire

(This is to be read to the person being interviewed.)

The following questionnaire is designed for research in determining why some ex-offenders do not return to the correctional systems. The information you give will be used for research only. You are requested to be truthful in your answers, as the information you volunteer will not be used against you under any circumstances. Total anonymity will be provided to all who participate in this study. We hope we will be able to use the information you give us to help contribute to general research knowledge about criminology.

You are going to be asked a series of questions with responses provided to choose from. You may give any response you like as these are guidelines only. Please feel free to request to review the survey itself in part or in whole at any time. You may also change any answer during the taking of the survey. If you feel at any point in time that you wish to terminate the filling out of the survey, do not hesitate to do so. It is understandable that there are some questions you may wish not to answer. In order to ensure correct responses, please feel free to ask for clarification of words or questions as a whole. It is your privilege to request a copy of your answered survey and to review the final findings of this study. There are some questions that require specific dates which may be answered with information to the best of your knowledge.

A. SOCIAL BACKGROUND PRIOR TO INCARCERATION

	<u>Results</u>
1. You have lived most of your life in:	
_____A large city	7
_____A small town	9
_____Rural area	14
2. Years of school attended:	
_____Years	see Table I
3. Did you ever drop out of school:	
_____Yes	17
_____No	13

4. What was your best skill or traded prior to incarceration:
-
5. Prior to incarceration did you have any religious involvement (i.e. attend church, etc.):
-
6. What was your yearly legal income prior to your first incarceration:
- | | |
|----------------------------|----|
| _____ Below \$10,000 | 6 |
| _____ \$10,000 to \$20,000 | 13 |
| _____ \$20,000 to \$30,000 | 10 |
| _____ \$30,000 to \$40,000 | 1 |
| _____ \$40,000 and above | 0 |
7. How long did you receive welfare before your first incarceration, if any:
- | | |
|-------------|----|
| _____ Never | 24 |
| _____ Years | 6 |
8. Up to age 15 were you raised in a home with:
- | | |
|---|----|
| _____ Both parents | 18 |
| _____ Single parent (which parent: _____) | 5 |
| _____ Foster parent | 7 |
| _____ Institution | 0 |
9. Was anyone ever convicted of a crime in your family (Parent/brother/sister):
- | | |
|----------------|----|
| _____ No, none | 14 |
| _____ Yes | 16 |
10. In what kind of home atmosphere were you raised:
- | | |
|--------------------|----|
| _____ Happy | 4 |
| _____ Mixed, so-so | 8 |
| _____ Unhappy | 18 |

11. Do you think any family member influenced your outlook on life:
- ____ Yes, favorably. Relationship to you: ____ 11
- ____ Yes, unfavorably. Relationship to you: ____ 19
- ____ Neither 0
12. Marital status prior to incarceration:
- ____ Single 6
- ____ Legally married 13
- ____ Common law married 4
- ____ Separated or divorced 6
- ____ Widowed 1
13. Number of times married prior to incarceration:
(Circle answer)
- 0 1 2 3 4 0=9 1=17 2=4 3=0
14. Number of children prior to incarceration:
(Circle answer)
- 0 1 2 3 4+ 0=10 1=13 2=5 3=2
15. Before incarceration, if you were married, what kind of married life were you living:
- ____ Happy 0
- ____ Unhappy 16
- ____ Mixed, or so-so 8
16. Number of children you were supporting prior to incarceration:
- ____ 0=10 1=13 2=5 3=2
17. Has your wife\wives ever been arrested prior to your incarceration:
- ____ Yes 13
- ____ No 11

18. Had any child of yours ever been arrested prior to your incarceration:

_____ Yes 11

_____ No 19

19. How long did you serve with the armed forces: (put a 0 if none)

_____ Number of years

20. Your last discharge was of what type prior to incarceration:

21. Did you receive any type of military benefits prior to incarceration: (Such as the GI Bill)

_____ Yes 2

_____ No 28

B. Legal Background

22. What was your age at first arrest:

_____ Years

23. What was your age at first conviction:

_____ Years

24. How many times were you convicted by the Juvenile Court:

0 1 2 3 4+ 0=15 1=9 2=4 3=2

25. How many times were you committed to juvenile institutions:

0 1 2 3 4+ 0=24 1=5 2=1

26. How many times were you placed on probation as a juvenile:

0 1 2 3 4+ 0=15 1=11 2=4

27. How long did you remain under juvenile probation:
 _____Months _____Years
28. How much time did you do in juvenile correctional institutions in total:
 _____Months _____Years
29. How many times have you been convicted as an adult:
 0 1 2 3 4+ 1=14 2=12 3=3 4=1
30. How many times were you placed on probation as an adult before you were incarcerated:
 0 1 2 3 4+ 0=11 1=16 2=3
31. How many times were you incarcerated in a prison as an adult:
 0 1 2 3 4+ 1=26 2=4
32. How much time have you done in adult correctional facilities in total:

33. Which of the following institutions did you spend time in:
- | | |
|-----------------------|----|
| _____Maximum security | 19 |
| _____Medium security | 28 |
| _____Minimum security | 25 |
34. Mark the type(s) of institutions in which you did time:
- | | |
|---------------|----|
| _____ Federal | 10 |
| _____ State | 19 |
| _____ County | 14 |
| _____ Local | 11 |
35. What was the last offense for which you were convicted:

36. How many **times** have you been sentenced for:
- | | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| _____Property related offenses | 28 |
| _____Violent offenses | 11 |
37. Were any of your crimes drug related (illegal drugs):
- | | |
|----------|----|
| _____Yes | 23 |
| _____No | 7 |
38. In what way, if at all, were drugs responsible for your trouble with the law: _____

39. Do you think any of your friends influenced your involvement in criminal activities:
- | | |
|---------------------|----|
| _____Yes, fully | 5 |
| _____Yes, partially | 18 |
| _____No, not at all | 7 |
40. Were most of your crimes of the same kind:
- | | |
|----------|----|
| _____Yes | 29 |
| _____No | 1 |

C. Alcohol and Drug Use

41. What kind(s) of alcohol have you used:
- | | |
|---------------------|----|
| _____Beer | 24 |
| _____Wine | 9 |
| _____Hard liquor | 20 |
| _____Not applicable | 1 |

42. How would you classify yourself as a drinker:
- | | |
|-------------------|----|
| ___Not applicable | 1 |
| ___Occasional | 2 |
| ___Moderate | 16 |
| ___Heavy | 7 |
| ___Excessive | 4 |
43. Do you drink to the point of intoxication:
- | | |
|-------------------|----|
| ___Not applicable | 1 |
| ___Yes | 21 |
| ___No | 8 |
44. In your own opinion do you think that you ever developed an addiction to alcohol:
- | | |
|-------------------|----|
| ___Not applicable | 2 |
| ___Yes | 6 |
| ___No | 22 |
45. What kind(s) of drugs have you used:
-
- ___Not applicable
46. How would you classify yourself when you were using drugs:
- | | |
|-------------------|----|
| ___Not applicable | 8 |
| ___Occasional | 4 |
| ___Moderate | 1 |
| ___Heavy | 15 |
| ___Excessive | 2 |

47. Did you use drugs to the point of being "spaced-out":

<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	7
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	16
<input type="checkbox"/> No	2

48. In your own opinion do you think that you ever developed addiction to drugs:

<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	7
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	15
<input type="checkbox"/> No	8

D. Last Prison Sentence

49. What was the length of your last sentence:

Years Months

50. When did your last sentence end:

Year

51. While you were in your last imprisonment, how often were you visited by your family members:

<input type="checkbox"/> Weekly	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Monthly	18
<input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly	3
<input type="checkbox"/> Once a year	2
<input type="checkbox"/> Never	2

52. How many prison violations did you have during your last imprisonment:

53. Did you use drugs or alcohol during imprisonment:

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	20
<input type="checkbox"/> No	10

54. In what prison programs did you participate during your last prison term: (AA, 7 Steps, Education, etc.)

_____ AA	14
_____ 7 steps	4
_____ Education	28
_____ Vo-Tech	6
_____ Work	29
_____ Other Explain: _____	

55. Which of these programs affected you the most while incarcerated:

56. How much did these programs help you to go straight after your release:

_____ Much	21
_____ Some	6
_____ None	3

E. Community-based Program

If you were released from incarceration as a final step of your sentence (you did flat time) skip over this section.

57. Under what correctional program were you being supervised:

_____ House arrest	1
_____ Community treatment center	2
_____ Probation	2
_____ Parole	21
_____ Split sentence	4
_____ Other _____ Flat time	4

58. How do you think this program affected you. _____

F. On Reentry to the Community
(Totally out of the control of any agency)

59. What kind of help did you need most when you were released:

Upon release from incarceration, we all expect some measure of support from family, friends, work world and other sources. Did you get the expected support:

60. From parents:

_____None	8
_____Only partial	8
_____Yes, fully	14

61. From spouse:

_____None	2
_____Only partial	3
_____Yes, fully	16
_____Not applicable	9

62. From boy friend/girl friend:

_____None	2
_____Only partial	1
_____Yes, fully	5
_____Not applicable	22

63. From other friends:

___None	12
___Only partial	16
___Yes, fully	2

64. From employers:

___None	26
___Only partial	0
___Yes, fully	4
___Not applicable	0

65. What were the major problems you had to face on your transfer from incarceration to your present situation:

66. Who helped you the most with your problems:

67. How did these people help you:

68. Did you have any trouble with the law once released:

___Yes	12
___No	18

69. If yes, what was the nature of the trouble:

G. Your Decision and Your Efforts

70. Did you ever make a deliberate, firm decision in your life to stay away from "trouble with the law" (if you check no go to question 80):

- | | |
|--|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, many times, but I still got into trouble | 2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, but once I made it, I stuck to it | 27 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, I never made that decision | 1 |

71. At what time in life did you make this decision:

72. Under what circumstances did you make the decision to stay away from trouble with the law:

73. What motivated you to make the choice you made:

74. At the same age, did some other changes take place in your life:

- | | |
|---|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, <u>many</u> other changes | 2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, <u>some</u> other changes | 27 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, no other changes came into my life | 1 |

75. What were those other changes in your life which accompanied your successful decision to stay away from criminal activities:

- | | |
|---|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable | 1 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gave up alcohol/drugs | 22 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improved my family relationships | 18 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Stayed away from those friends who were involved in trouble with the law | 21 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Got a better job | 0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other, explain | |

76. Think hard and check if any of the following considerations entered into your decision making:

- ____(1) I got tired of getting into trouble 17
- ____(2) I felt I was wasting my life 22
- ____(3) I wanted to stop the shame and humiliation to myself and my family 15
- ____(4) Fear and pain of punishment deterred me 29
- ____(5) I had a religious experience 20
- ____(6) Out of respect for someone for whom I have great regards. 22

This person was a :

- ____Friend 5
- ____Relative 15
- ____(7) Any other consideration which was important to you: _____

77. Go over the considerations in the previous question and tell us which was the major factor in your decision: (Please circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1=1 2=2 3=1 4=19 5=5 6=0 7=2

Other _____

78. Which was the second major consideration: (Please circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1=2 2=0 3=2 4=6 5=9 6=9 7=2

Other _____

79. What were the major efforts you made to keep yourself free from trouble with the law:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

80. Do you feel that prison acted as a deterrent to future crime in your life:

____ Yes 30

____ No 0

81. Check if you have made any efforts given below to enhance your life chances:

____ (1) Going back to school 27

____ (2) Learned a new trade 4

____ (3) Attended support groups (i.e. AA, church, etc.) 22

____ (4) Straightened out my life 16

____ (5) Other _____

82. Which one of the above efforts was most helpful:
(circle)

1 2 3 4 5 1=4 2=1 3=17 4=2

83. What is your occupation now:

84. What is your advice to those offenders who want to go straight:

85. How can a violent offender, after physical or sexual assault on their victim, get rid of violent thoughts and behavior:

____ (1) By learning to respect his likely victim and showing compassion 1

____ (2) By learning to identify his violent behavior and by learning to deal with his anger/temper 27

____ (3) By both 1 and 2 3

____ (4) Any other: _____

86. My decision to stay away from trouble was motivated by:

____Discovery of a new light (reborn) 17

____Compassion for the victim or victim's family 3

____Remorse for the suffering caused to my family 18

____Others Explain_____

87. The decision to get out of criminal life-style was a:

____Snap decision 5

____Gradual decision which took a long time in the making 25

____Others Explain_____

88. What made you want to change:

89. For the period that you continued in criminal life, whom do you blame and how much:

____Self ____%

____Environment ____%

____Society ____%

____Others ____%

90. Did you ever feel that you:

____Were not getting anywhere in life 10

____Were wasting your life 21

____Were burdened with wrong decisions of life 10

____Had done enough damage to self and others and felt guilty 23

____All of the above 4

____None of the above 0

H. Self-image

I see myself as follows: (check the appropriate number. Number 3 is the mid-point of the scale).

- | | |
|---|---|
| 91. As a law-breaking individual | As a law-abiding individual |
| 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | |
| 92. Easily influenced by criminal peers | Always staying away from the criminal peers |
| 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | |
| 93. Risk-taking person in crime | Not taking any risk in crime |
| 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | |
| 94. Having good self-control | Having no self-control at all |
| 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | |
| 95. Well-skilled in dealing with people | Not skilled in dealing with people |
| 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | |

96. Name one activity in which you are very much involved:

97. What do you do in your leisure time:

98. What is your attitude toward the law:

99. What is your attitude toward the correctional system:

100. What was your greatest expectation upon release:

101. What was your greatest fear about being released:

102. Since your release, what good things have happened to you:

103. Since your release, what bad things have happened to you:

104. What programs during incarceration were not beneficial:

Present Situation

105. Education completed:

___Elementary	0
___Junior High	0
___High School	1
___Vo-Tech	3
___Associates Degree	11
___Bachelors Degree	11
___Masters Degree	4
___Doctorate Degree	

106. Are you working:

___No	0
___Part-time	5
___Full-time	25

115. Do you have any disabilities now: (Explain)

116. When did you find out about your disability:

117. Are you receiving any type of benefits: (such as GI Bill, Welfare, etc.):

118. Did you receive welfare as a part of your reentry into society:

Yes 18

No 12

119. Have any of your children been arrested since your release:

Yes 3

No 22

120. Has your spouse been arrested since your release:

Yes 3

No 22

121. For what was your spouse arrested:

Not applicable

122. What is your present living arrangement:

With spouse 25

With parent(s) 0

With friend(s) 0

Independently 5

Other _____

123. What is your occupation:

The following questions are designed to determine your knowledge of your situation in regard to your status as an ex-offender.

124. Are you aware of your rights under the Governor's Pardon Program:

_____Yes 5

_____No 25

125. Are you aware of your restrictions to owning firearms:

_____Yes 20

_____NO 10

126. Are you aware of your rights to vote:

_____Yes 8

_____No 22

127. Please provide any advice for those who are now leaving the correctional institution in order to help their chances of going straight:

TABLES

TABLE I
EDUCATION

Years attended	Before	Percent	After	Percent
9	1	3.3		
10	3	10.0		
11	1	3.3		
12				
High school degree	17	56.7	1	3.3
Vo tech			3	10.0
13	3	10.0		
14	3	10.0		
Associates degree			11	36.7
Bachelor degree			11	36.7
Master's degree	1	3.3	4	13.3
Doctorate degree				

TABLE II

INCOME

Level of income*	Before	Percent	After	Percent
Below 10	6	20.0	1	3.3
10 to 20	13	43.3	2	6.7
20 to 30	10	33.3	12	40.0
30 to 40	1	3.3	11	36.7
40 and above	0	0	4	13.3

* in \$10,000 increments

TABLE III
RESIDENCE

Place of residence	Before	Percent	After	Percent
Rural	14	46.7	1	3.3
Small town	9	30.0	3	10.0
City	7	23.3	26	86.7

TABLE IV
RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	Number	Percent
Methodist	6	20.0
Baptist	5	16.7
Assembly of God	3	10.0
Catholic	3	10.0
Lutheran	2	6.7
Presbyterian	2	6.7
Church of Christ	2	6.7
Apostolic	1	3.3
Church of God in Christ	1	3.3
Protestant	1	3.3
No religious involvement	4	13.3

Note: Organizational titles appear as they were given by the respondents.

TABLE V
REASONS FOR LAST INCARCERATION

Offense	Number	Percent
Drugs	5	16.7
Robbery	4	13.3
Rape	2	6.7
Fraud	3	10.0
Child molestation	2	6.7
Theft	3	10.0
Burglary	1	3.3
Aggravated assault	4	13.3
Second degree murder	1	3.3
Illegal gambling	1	3.3
Transport of illegal goods	1	3.3
Drunken driving with injuries	1	3.3
Kidnapping	1	3.3
First degree murder	1	3.3

VITA

Agustin Torres

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: TERMINATING THE CRIMINAL CAREER

Major Field: Natural & Applied Sciences

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Cleveland, Ohio, November 27,
1951, the son of Agustin and Edith Torres.

Education: Graduated from Mehlville High School, St.
Louis, Missouri, in May, 1971; received Bachelor of
Arts Degree in Liberal Arts from Oral Roberts
University in Tulsa, Oklahoma in May, 1988;
completed requirements for the Master of Science
degree at Oklahoma State University in December,
1993.

Professional Experience: Social Worker II for the State
of Oklahoma Department of Human Services, Child
Welfare Division in 1989.

Presently a Program Supervisor for Life Skills
Foundation in St. Louis, Missouri.