

A PANEL STUDY OF COMMUNITY-BASED OFFENDERS:  
ONE-YEAR AND TWO-YEARS  
RECIDIVISM COMPARED

BY

HMOUD AL-MOSLEH

II

Bachelors

King Abdulaziz University

Jeddah, S. Arabia

1984

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, 1989

Thesis  
1989  
A452D  
cop.2

A PANEL STUDY OF COMMUNITY-BASED OFFENDERS:  
ONE-YEAR AND TWO-YEARS  
RECIDIVISM COMPARED

Thesis Approved:

*Harjib S. Sandhu*

Thesis Adviser

*Richard Dolder*

*Larry M. Perkins*

*Norman N. Dushan*

Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my genuine appreciation to all of those people who assisted me in my studies at Oklahoma State University, without whose help this project would have been much more difficult.

I am particularly grateful to my major advisor and chair of my committee, Dr. Harjit Sandhu, for his sincere guidance and genuine unfailing support throughout my graduate work.

A special acknowledgment and appreciation are due to Dr. Richard Dodder, for his insight, and expertise that made this study possible.

Also I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Larry Perkins, for his encouragement and pleasant assistance.

I wish to offer sincere thanks to the participants of this study and to the Department of Corrections. Without their help and cooperation this study could not have been accomplished.

My appreciation and gratitude are due to my extended family. The support, encouragement, love, and prayers of my parents, brothers, sisters, spouse and children were essential to undertaking and completing this research. A special thank you is also due to my brother, Ahmed, for his distinctive support, and encouragement.

Special acknowledgment is given to my wife, Wafa, for her love, help, and understanding during the completion of this research.

My daughter Razan, and my sons Mutassem and Salem deserve a great deal of love and appreciation for their encouragement, and concern to accelerate the completion of my work, the task which entails sacrificing numerous afternoons and weekends.

And finally, I dedicate this thesis to my parents, Salem and Eida, for their continuing source of love, prayers, concerns, and encouragement, without whose support my goals will not be easily attainable.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
House Arrest Program . . . . .	2
Community Treatment Center program . . . . .	7
The Purpose of the Study . . . . .	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE. . . . .	12
Age. . . . .	12
Criminal Record. . . . .	13
Socioeconomic Background . . . . .	15
Unemployment and Crime . . . . .	16
Predicting Career Criminals. . . . .	17
Anomie Theory. . . . .	19
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	26
Design of the Study. . . . .	26
The Instrument . . . . .	26
Postprogram Success or Failure . . . . .	27
Validity . . . . .	27
Generalizability . . . . .	30
Reliability. . . . .	31
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	32
Statistical Analysis . . . . .	33
Characteristics of the Sample. . . . .	34
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	39
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	50
Summary. . . . .	50
Conclusions. . . . .	52
Recommendations. . . . .	53
REFERENCES . . . . .	54
APPENDIXES . . . . .	57
APPENDIX A -RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE. . . . .	58
APPENDIX B -TERMINATION/TRANSFER REPORT. . . . .	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Frequencies, percentages, and Chi-Squares for each correctional program's categories . . . . .	37
II. Frequencies, percentages, and Chi-Squares in each Sociodemographic Variables on Postprogram Success or Failure Categories. . . . .	44
III. Means and F-Values for Some Sociodemographic Variables on Post-program Success or Failure Categories. . .	46
IV. Means and F-Values for Each Background Variable on Postprogram Success or Failure Categories . . . . .	47
V. Means and F-Values for Each Substance Abuse History Variables on Post-program Success or Failure Categories. . .	48
VI. Means and F-Values for Anomie variables on Postprogram Success or Failure Categories.	49

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The problem of crime concerns everybody in society. All kinds of efforts had been made to protect society from crime and its consequences. Offenders had been dealt with in various ways throughout the history, and different theories had been advanced to explain crime causation and how to combat crime as well as to punish, deter, and rehabilitate criminals. All of these efforts have not been fully successful neither in cutting the crime rate nor in deterring criminals.

Taking offenders back to their communities for their rehabilitation has emerged as a promising idea. In fact, this shift in the correctional systems commensurates with the view that crime is not an individual phenomenon but a creation of the society as well. According to the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Background Informations (1971):

Crime and delinquency are viewed as symptoms of failure and disorganization in the community as well as in the offender himself. A fundamental objective of corrections must be to secure for the offender contacts, experiences and opportunities that provide a mean and a stimulus for pursuing a lawful style of living in the community... thus the reintegration of the offender into the community comes to the fore as a major purpose of corrections (P. 3).



A number of correctional options have been initiated in an attempt to reintegrate offenders into the community, such as half-way houses, boarding houses, community treatment centers, work releases, and house arrest programs.

#### The House Arrest program

In the house arrest program offenders are legally ordered to remain confined in their own residence for a certain period of time. According to Joan Petersilia (1988), House Arrest has several advantages as an alternative to institutional incarceration. These advantages may cover the following:

1. Cost Effectiveness. House Arrest (particularly without electronic monitoring) is thought to be cost effective. The state saves not only the yearly cost of housing the offender (on average about \$10,000 to \$15,000 per person per year) but also saves the cost of building new prisons (\$50,000 - \$80,000 per bed). If electronic monitoring is used the cost will increase, but even then House Arrest costs less than confinement in either state or local facilities.

2. Social benefits. Most advocates believe that House Arrest programs are socially cost effective. A defendant can keep his job, preventing the breakup of the family and family network. House Arrest can also prevent psychological and physical disruptions that may have lasting effects on the offender, the spouse, the children, and may extend even to the next generation. Besides, House Arrest does not have

the corrupting or stigmatizing effects associated with prisons.

3. Responsiveness. House Arrest is flexible; it can be used as a sole sanction or as a part of a package of sentencing conditions. It can be used to cover a particular time of the day or particular types of offenders; also, it has the potential application for offenders with special needs such as the terminally ill and the mentally retarded.

4. Implementation ease and Timeliness. House Arrest sentencing requires no new facilities and can use existing probation personnel. It is one of the easiest programs to implement, particularly if no electronic monitoring devices are used.

Petersilia (1988) also discusses a number of disadvantages of House Arrest program. They are:

1. House Arrest may widen the net of social control. If House Arrest is used as an alternative to jail there is no problem, but if it is used extensively with non-violent and low risk offenders who are normally sentenced to routine probations with nominal supervision, it may widen the net of control without reducing the number in the prison population.

2. House Arrest may narrow the net of social control. Some critics of such a program argue that the sentence of House Arrest is not sufficient as a punishment for many crimes. Such policy may depreciate the seriousness with which crimes are treated and reduce the criminal law's deterrent effects.

3. House Arrest focuses primarily on offender's surveillance, particularly if implemented with electronic monitoring, which will reduce human contacts between offenders and probation officers. It may also hamper the relative rehabilitative ideals of corrections.

4. House Arrest is intrusive and possibly illegal. Some critics object to the state's presence in individual's homes, long regarded as the one place where privacy is guaranteed. Hence, government intrusion is severely restricted by law.

5. House Arrest compromises public safety. Some critics seriously question whether House Arrest programs can adequately protect the public. The question they raise is: Can criminals really be trusted to refrain from future crime if allowed to remain in their homes?

The Oklahoma Department of Corrections began a House Arrest program in 1984 which was in accordance with a law allowing the confinement of a prisoner to a home, halfway house or any other suitable place.

According to the Oklahoma State bill (1985):

House Arrest program is a security level to provide intensive supervision of inmates in the community prior to their eventual release. During the supervision period, the inmate can be linked with support services in the community. This linkage will help the inmate to identify options available in the community. (No. 65, P. 2)

The Bill states the minimum eligibility requirements that a candidate for House Arrest should meet. They are following:

1. Non-violent offenses or within six months projected

release date for violent offenders except those convicted of a sex offense.

2. May not have been denied parole by the Pardon and Parole Board within last six months.
3. Shall serve 15 percent of sentence prior to transfer to House Arrest.
4. Must also have a verified job offer and a verified home offer prior to release to House Arrest.

A group of states has experimented with community control programs allowing low risk offenders to live and work in the community under intense supervision. The States of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, and South Carolina have this type of arrangement (Chi, 1985). In fact, the state of Florida was a pioneer in such an effort, where Florida's House Arrest Program, Known as "Community Control" was established in 1983 with the aim to help alleviate prison crowding in the state. As indicated by Petersilia (1988) it is the most ambitious program of its type in the country, with about 5,000 offenders "locked up" in their homes on any day. According to Petersilia (1988), officials in Florida consider the House Arrest program to be a resounding success. Real cost savings have been realized, and 70% of the population of such a program were believed likely to have been sent to prison otherwise.

As reported by Chi (1986), Florida's community control program has the following goals and objectives:

1. Impose strict noninstitutional sanctions in the local community for those convicted of crime,

2. Provide the courts with a safe alternative to prison,
3. Protect the community through surveillance and control of cases,
- 4 Identify and involve appropriate community resources to accommodate supervisonal objectives,
5. Have offenders participate in self-improvement programs,
6. Establish public service programs in the community.

The outcome of the House Arrest program is promising. according to Petersilia (1988), both recidivism and escape rates for House Arrest participants are quite low. generally, less than 25 percent of their participants fail to complete the program successfully. These findings are in accordance with the present study, where the cumulative failure rate for the two year period of the study is about 23 percent. However, this low recidivism rate may be attributed in part to a selection bias , because only certain categories of non-violent offenders are eligible for House Arrest.

## Community Treatment Centers

Community Treatment Centers were initiated in Oklahoma in 1970 long before the beginning of the House Arrest Program and have gained some credit over time. These centers operate under the philosophy of reintegrating offenders into their community; therefore, they serve as a step toward the conventional life. The aim is to accustom prisoners to the new life after their release and to enable them to perform normally and adequately in accordance with societal norms and regulations.

These centers, according to Sandhu (1974, p. 279), are commonly designed for the following purposes:

- (1) Assist, through graduated release, the reentry of offenders into the community on their way out from the prison,
- (2) Act as an alternative to imprisonment in large penitentiaries, thus preventing complete isolation from the community,
- (3) Provide in the community study, training, or work which is not available in a correctional institution,
- (4) Make available to the prisoner some special community services which are not easily available in the prison, such as special medical, surgical, dental, or psychiatric care,
- (5) Provide temporary shelter to a probationer or

parolee who has been rendered homeless for some reason.

- (6) Detain temporarily a probationer or parolee whose removal from the community is desirable but whose incarceration in a large prison is not desirable.
- (7) Provide intensive treatment such as individual, group, and family counseling to the offenders, either as an in-patient or an out-patient service.

#### The Purpose of The Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the outcome of the two Community-Based Correctional Programs (House Arrest, and Community Treatment Center) with regard to postprogram success or failure over two time periods: one year and two years after the offender's release from the program.

This study is an extension of an earlier study done by Minu Mathur (1987), which was concerned with in-program and postprogram success or failure, within a time-frame of one year. This study extended the time-frame where both first and second year of release were examined, since at the time of Mathur's research not all inmates were out for one year. But with this study, almost the majority of them were out for two years or more. In her study, Mathur used a sample

---

(1). Mathur, M. 1987 "A Comparison of Success Rates For House arrest Inmates And Community Treatment Center Residents ." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University)

of 168 offenders, while the present study used a larger sample size covering 198 individuals.

The present study is designed to assess and identify the significant factors that have an impact on either post-program success or failure. A two-year follow-up period was chosen as the study time frame, because most of the subjects in the study had completed two years after their release from the program and had started in their third year. Recidivism is measured on the basis of reconviction; therefore only those offenders documented by court decisions as reconvicted are included as recidivists. It is the recommendation of the National Advisory Commission on General Justice Standards and Goals (1973) to use conviction as it is a well-defined event in which a recorded action had been taken by the court. The outcome of the two Community-Based Correctional Programs is analyzed in relation to the following variables: (1) Sociodemographic, (2) legal and criminal background, and (3) substance abuse history. Moreover, in an attempt to gain more insight and an understanding of deviant behavior, the characteristics of the individuals in both success or failure categories were examined from the viewpoint of Anomie theory. This study is presented in two parts:

The first part involves examining a number of research questions concerned with the impact of the following categories of variables on recidivism: (1) sociodemographic; (2) legal and criminal history; and (3) substance abuse variables. In this part the sample of inmates was divided



into three groups according to their postprogram success or failure. these groups are:

- (1) Those who failed in the first year.
- (2) Those who failed in the second year.
- (3) Those who did not fail for two years following their release from the program (succeeded).

To be dealt with are the following:

- (1) What are the characteristics of those who failed within the first year of release?
- (2) What are the characteristics of those who failed during the second year? Do they differ significantly from the first group?
- (3) What are the common denominators between those who recidivate in the first year and those who recidivate the second year ?
- (4) Who are the ones who managed to stay "crime free" for two years and what are their characteristics?

The second part of the study involves the testing of Robert Merton's Anomie theory. For this part of the study, a number of research questions were asked in an attempt to shed more light on Anomie theory and its feasibility in explaining recidivism. How inmates perceived the importance of power, prestige, and wealth as life goals was used to measure their commitment to socially structured goals. And how they perceived their chances of achieving power, prestige, and wealth as important life-goals was used to measure the availability of means.

As the sample is constituted of inmates, it is expected

that most of them will be innovators or retreatists. As indicated by Liska (1988) Anomie conceptualizes deviance as an adaptation to stress caused by a perceived discrepancy between economic aspirations and legitimate opportunities. In the words of Merton (1968)" social structure exerts a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in nonconforming rather than conforming conduct" (P. 132). Therefore, the offenders constituting the sample were expected to respond in a deviant manner to the anomic pressures upon them.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There is an enormous amount of literature on recidivism rates and factors associated with it. Special emphasis here is given to the most recent criminological studies, particularly those studies that examine research on recidivism. Criminological literature has identified a varied group of factors that proved to be significantly correlated with recidivism. The following is a brief discussion of the significant predictors of recidivism.

#### Age

Age has a great influence on recidivism. In a study based on a representative sample of 5 percent of all cases of serious offenses resulting in a conviction, Werff (1981) found that the likelihood of reconviction generally decreases with age. The recidivism rate is highest in the 18 to 25 years category (50 percent); after age thirty, the likelihood of recidivism gradually decreases. In the over-50 age group the general recidivism rate is 17 percent.

Ribner and Steadman (1981) found a consistent relationship between age at prior arrest with recidivism. Higher rates of previous arrests coupled with younger age

at arrest clearly emerged as having significant effect on recidivism.

These findings were in agreement with other studies, such as that of Pritchard's (1979) survey study of research on recidivism. Pritchard reported that a first arrest before age 18 was consistently related to recidivism, and that a first arrest after age 21 was consistently related to nonrecidivism.

#### Criminal Record

Recidivism was found to be related to a number of factors concerning criminal life history, such as conviction by juvenile courts, type of offense, frequency of offenses, and substance use and abuse history. Piper (1985), measuring recidivism as the probability of committing another offense, found that the probability of recidivism among violent offenders was quite high; given that they had committed one (violent) offense, 86% will commit another. And the probability of recidivism for nonviolent offenders was significantly lower, but the likelihood of recidivism increased for nonviolent offenders after the fifth offense (up to 70%). Werff (1981), reported that the highest percentage of reoffending is among persons convicted of burglary. For Ribner and Steadman (1981), prior arrest and age were the most significant impacts on recidivism. A higher proportion of released ex-offenders recidivated when they were young and had multiple prior arrests.

In a sample of 314 parolees chosen from three units in the California Youth Authority, Jackson (1983) randomly assigned these youth to either discharge from parole or retention on regular parole. After a 26 month follow-up period, the parolees were more likely to be charged with serious crimes, and the dischargees were more likely to be charged with drug and alcohol related offenses. In relation to recidivism, Jackson found that 72 percent of the dischargees and 71 percent of the parolees were convicted at least once during the follow-up period.

Pritchard, (1979) in his study viewing 71 studies, focused only on those studies of adult offenders which examined biographical predictors of recidivism; and reported results on 177 independent samples of offenders. Fifty-five studies investigated biographical predictors of recidivism in 138 samples of parolees, and 16 investigated predictors in 39 samples of probationers. Types of instant offense was found to be highly related to recidivism in 118 studies and not related in 27. Pritchard (1979, P. 18) concluded that the type of instant offense is a stable predictor of recidivism, but that the specific offense (with the exception of auto theft) which best predicts recidivism varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and/or from time period to time period. The presence and number of prior adult convictions were related to recidivism in 99 studies and not related in 17. Prior adult incarcerations were related in 45 studies and not related in 13. History of opiate use was related in 9 studies and not related in

one studies. History of alcohol abuse , was related in 9 studies, and not related in 2.

According to Blumstein and Graddy (1981), offenders who commit the more serious crimes display a higher recidivism probability.

#### Socio-economic Background

Piper (1985) reported little difference in recidivism by race, yet nonwhites were more recidivistic than whites. Blumstein and Graddy (1981) reported a high involvement of nonwhites in the population ever arrested for index crimes 51 percent of nonwhite males can be expected to be arrested compared to 14 percent of white males. In a further elaboration on their findings, Blumstein and Graddy noticed that there was a consistency between whites and nonwhites on the rearrest probability for those who did get involved. They suggested that the large differences between races in aggregate arrest statistics was primarily a consequence of differences in participation in criminal acts, rather than differences in recidivism; and probably there was no utilitarian basis for racially based differentiations. Pritchard (1979), in his survey of literature on predictors of recidivism, found that the stability of employment was related to recidivism in 96 samples and not related in 17. Living arrangement was related in 67 studies but not in 12 studies. Type of job was related in 13 studies and not related in 6 studies. Pritchard concluded that an offense of auto-theft, age at first arrest, living arrangement,

current income, history of opiate use, and history of alcohol abuse appear to be the most stable predictors of recidivism.

### Unemployment and Crime

In the criminological literature there exist a number of contrasting views on the relationship between criminal behavior and unemployment. The relationship seems to be very complicated and does not lend itself to an easy explanation. Sviridoff and Thomson (1979) (cited in Orsagh and witte, 1981) suggested four types of such relationship between unemployment and crime, which can be summarized as follows:

1. Crimes Require Employment:

The commission of some types of crime (white-collar crimes, employment theft) requires employment. For these types of crime one would expect a decrease rather than an increase as unemployment arises.

2. Mixed, Employment and Crime:

Some individuals who either moonlight in criminal activity or use their legitimate jobs as a front (e.g. fence, drug dealers). For the majority of this group, like the first, employment and crime go hand in hand.

3. Alternation Between Crime and Unemployment:

Some offenders, particularly young offenders, appear to alternate between crime and employment. For these individuals unemployment or dropping out

of the labor force generally indicates a switch from legal to illegal income generating employment, rather than unemployment as we perceive it. For this group we expect either a rise in unemployment or drop in labor force participation to be associated with increased criminal activity. The idea that Unemployment causes crime is most relevant to this group

#### 4. Unemployment as a Way of Life:

A small group of property offenders (5-10 percent) is firmly committed to crime for their primary means of support. For this group unemployment or no participation in the labor market is a way of life and no relationship between unemployment and crime is expected.

According to the authors, decreased employment is associated with increased criminal activity only for individuals in group three, and for some individuals in group two discussed above. About the relationship between gender and crime, Blumstein and Graddy (1981) found that the breadth of males from large U.S. cities who participate in index crimes is quite large. One in every four males living in a large city can expect to be arrested for an index offense in his life-time, with the majority of such first involvement occurring before age 18.

#### Predicting Career Criminals

It is assumed by some researchers that a small



percentage of offenders commit the large bulk of crime; and if this small number of offenders has been correctly identified and incarcerated for a long period of time, it is expected that the crime rate will decrease. That is the promise of selective incapacitation theory. According to Greenwood and Abrahamse (1982), selective incapacitation " is a strategy that attempts to use objective actuarial evidence to improve the ability of the current system to identify and confine offenders who represented the most serious risk to the community." Greenwood and Abrahamse (1982, p. vii-viii) expected that increasing the accuracy with which we can identify high-rate offenders or increasing the selectivity of sentencing policies can lead to a decrease in crime.

In order to accurately identify high-rate offenders, Greenwood and Abrahamse (1982, p. xv- xvi) developed a scale, made up of the following variable categories:

1. Incarcerated more than half of the two year period preceding the most recent arrest.
2. A prior conviction for the crime type that is being predicted.
3. Juvenile conviction prior to age 16.
4. Commitment to a state or juvenile facility.
5. Heroin or barbiturate use as a juvenile.
6. Heroin or barbiturate use in the two-year period preceding the current arrest.
7. Employment less than half of the two-year period preceding the current arrest.

Decker and Salert (1986) tried to empirically test Greenwood scale. They selected a sample of prisoners, including people with varying criminal records. The survey consisted of 11,397 interviews with inmates from 215 state correctional facilities. Some of their findings were:

1. Inmates with higher Greenwood scale scores also had more prior incarcerations,
2. Whether an inmate spent time in prison as a juvenile emerged as the best predictor. Most of the variance in prior incarcerations explained by the scale can be explained by this single item.
3. The scale succeeds in placing inmates in categories that differ according to average number of prior incarcerations
4. It predicts individual cases with a high error rate.

#### Anomie Theory

Anomie is undoubtedly among the most important concepts in the sociological vocabulary, and Anomie, as Durkheim used it, is one of the most important ideas in the history of Western thought ( Mestrovic, 1969). When Anomie was employed by Merton (1938), it has provoked lively discussions in sociology and to a certain extent in social science generally ( Clinard, 1968).

Following is a historical analytic discussion of Anomie theory, how the concept was originally used, and how it was developed into a theory of deviant behavior. In this discussion, special emphasis is given to the main

proponents of this tradition and to their major contributions.

Durkheim first introduced the concept of anomie in his book *The Division of Labor in Society* (1941). In fact, that book has a complete chapter titled "The Anomic Division of Labor". In that chapter Durkheim talks about the deficiency of regulations at some stages of development of societies that fail to keep pace with the developing division of labor.

Durkheim (1949, P. 365) reports that:

whenever organic solidarity is found, we come upon an adequate developed regulations determining the mutual relations of functions. For organic solidarity to exist it is not enough that there be a system of organs necessary to one another, which in a general way feel solidary, but it is also necessary that the way in which they should come together.. be predetermined. In case of Anomic division of labor the regulation either does not exist, or is not in accord with the degree of development of the division of labor.. If the division of labor does not produce solidarity.. it is because the relations of the organs are not regulated, because they are in a state of anomy.

Later in his famous study of suicide, Durkheim (1951) uses the term anomie to describe a state in which society does not exert enough pressure on individuals to put limits on their desires and passions. Society alone can play a moderating role; for it is the only moral power superior to individuals, the authority of which they accept. It alone has the power necessary to stipulate law and to set the point beyond which the passion must not go. Thus, Anomie is the lack of society's moral power which is necessary to limit the passions of the individuals .

Merton (1968) borrows the concept of anomie from Durkheim and extends its meaning and applications. Merton is concerned to discover how some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society in an effort to engage them in non-conforming rather than conforming conduct.

Merton (1968, p. 186-88) reports that:

There are two important elements of social and cultural structure that are of great importance: the first consists of culturally defined goals, purposes and interests, held out as legitimate objectives for all or diversely located members of the society.. the prevailing goals comprise a frame of aspirational reference. They are the things " worth striving for". A second element of the cultural structure defines regulates and controls the acceptable modes of reaching out for these goals.

There should be an effective equilibrium in the social structure to leave no discrepancy between culturally defined goals, and available legitimate means of achieving them. or otherwise a state of anomie will emerged and that may foster or initiate deviant behavior.

Merton asserts that American culture continues to be characterized by a heavy emphasis on wealth as a basic symbol of success, without corresponding emphasis upon the legitimate avenues on which to march toward this goal. The situation which enhance the strain toward anomie . How do individuals living in such society react and respond to this situation? And how does deviant behavior emerge? Merton (1968) gives five types of individual adaptations to the anomic situation in society. These types are:

1. Conformity: This type of adaptation is the most

common and widely diffused phenomena in a stable society. In this category individuals conform to both cultural goals and legitimate means.

2. Innovation: this response occurs whenever the individual has assimilated the cultural emphasis upon the goal without equally internalizing the legitimate means. In fact Theo (1983, P. 31) considers this form of deviant adaptation to be the central subject of Anomie theory.
3. Ritualism: this type of adaptation involves the abandonment or lowering down the cultural goals to the extent that they can be achieved legally.
4. Retreatism: according to Merton this mode of adaptation is probably the least common, since people in this category are "in the society but not part of it". They reject both the cultural goals as well as the legitimate means.
5. Rebellion: this mode of adaptation represents a rejection of the prevailing system. It leads men outside the environing social structure to envisage and seek to bring into being a new modified social structure.

Albert Cohen (1956) furthers the application of Anomie theory. He is concerned with the question of "why is delinquency displayed frequent among lower-class youth and why does so much of it have no manifest point or utility, but seems rather to proceed from a spirit of pure meanness, negativeness, contrariness, and the like?" (P. 65)

Cohen (1955) suggests that delinquent boys suffer from a status problem in society. And the delinquent subculture is a way of dealing with that problem. Lower-class children are denied status in the respectable society because they can not meet the criteria of the respectable status system. The deviant subculture deals with this problem by providing criteria of status which these children can meet.

According to Cohen (1966, p. 65) the school situations are dominated by the middle class people advocating their value system, and the dominant social standards. These standards include such criteria as verbal fluency, academic intelligence, high level of aspiration and others. All people of different social class, race, ethnicity, find themselves competing with one another for status under the same set of rules. However, they are not all equally well-equipped for success in the status game. Lower-class children are more likely to experience failure and humiliation. One way they can deal with this problem is to repudiate and withdraw from the game, and to set up new games with their own rules or criteria of status, rules by which they can perform satisfactorily.

Cloward and Ohlin (1969) accepted Merton's formula of the breakdown in the relationship between goals and legal means, and the assumption that access to conventional means is differentially distributed that some individuals, because of their social class, enjoy certain advantages that are denied to those elsewhere in the class structure.

Cloward and Ohlin (1969) added that there are also

social variations in the availability of illegitimate means as well.

"Roles, whether conforming or deviant in content are not necessarily freely available ; access to them depends upon a variety of factors such as one's socio-economic position, age, sex, ethnic affiliation, personality characteristics, and the like." (P. 147)

Therefore, Cloward and Ohlin (1969, P. 124) view the delinquent subculture as a collective enterprise offering an alternative culture. And delinquent norms are a group product which communicate the allegiance of individuals as members of a group. Three types of delinquent subcultures are identified by Cloward and Ohlin (1969). They are:

1. Criminal Subculture

This type is based upon criminal values where members are organized primarily for the pursuit of material gain by illegal means. In this tradition delinquent and criminal behavior are accepted as a means of achieving success goals.

2. Conflict Subculture

Violence is the keynote where members pursue status "rep" through the manipulation of force or threat of force. Those are the " worrier" groups who attract so much attention in the press.

3. Retreatism.

This is a subculture of drugs. Members of this group have become alienated from conventional roles, such as those required in the family or the occupational world. They have

withdrawn into a restricted world. According to Cloward and Ohlin (1969, p. 25) those in a subculture of drug-use in lower-class areas perceive themselves as culturally and socially detached from the life style and every day preoccupation of members of the conventional world.



## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

This study examines data collected on a longitudinal basis from October 1985 to July 1989. Initial data were collected by two Sociology professors and four graduate students from Oklahoma State University in October and November of 1985. Subsequent follow-up data were collected periodically until July, 1989.

#### Design of the Study

The present study is a longitudinal (panel) one. There are three main types of longitudinal studies which are similar in their emphasis upon observing changes over time, but they differ in their unit of analysis. These three types are: (1) trend studies which examine changes within some general population over time, (2) cohort studies which examine more specific subpopulations (cohorts) as they change over time, and (3) panel studies which examine the same set of people each time (Babbie, 1984).

#### The Instrument

A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data from inmates. The instrument contains a large number

of questions that probe the following aspects:

sociodemographic data, criminal and legal history, drug and alcohol use history, and support network and opportunities.

The two Community-based programs ( the House Arrest program and the Community Treatment Center program) were located in a metropolitan area of North Central Oklahoma. The area has both urban and rural populations.

#### Postprogram Success or Failure

Postprogram success or failure is based on inmate's behavior in the Community within two years after they have been released. Postprogram success denotes the absence of a reconviction record for a new offense in the records of the Department of Corrections for a two-year period after release from the System. Postprogram failure is measured by the presence of a reconviction record either in the first or second year of release to the community. The source of these recidivism data is the termination reports supplied by the Department of Corrections and the subsequent sentencing reports by the same department.

#### Validity

According to Babbie (1984, P. 39), " validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration." Cook and Campbell (1979, P. 37) reckon it to be " the best available approximation to the truth or falsity of propositions."

There are four main types of validity according to Cook and Campbell (1979) internal, construct, external, and statistical conclusion validity. Statistical conclusion validity refers to conclusions about covariation made on the basis of statistical evidence. Internal validity refers to the validity with which statements can be made about whether there is a causal relationship from one variable to another in the form in which the variables were manipulated or measured. Construct validity refers to the approximate validity with which we can make generalizations about higher-order constructs from research operations. The last, external validity has to do with generalizability.

The researcher is aware of threats to statistical conclusion validity, and the consequences of faulty decision of accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis when in reality the decision is incorrect. The .05 level is used, and cautious conclusions are made, particularly since the sample is relatively small. In addition, the most appropriate statistical analysis is used and the assumptions of each test are carefully examined. Parametric and nonparametric tests were utilized when appropriate. Every possible effort has been exerted by the present researcher to insure the validity and precision of the data set. All information concerning decision on postprogram success or failure had been reviewed for the total sample (N= 299). The computer printout was scrutinized against the new sentencing reports of the Department of Corrections. Besides, the computer printout was compared with 117

original termination and transfer reports to check for any errors or discrepancies. Any error which has been encountered has been corrected and checked again to insure maximum accuracy in recording data. Those inmates who did not have complete information regarding their date and status of release were excluded from analysis.

The validity of coding data was checked in several ways. A number of 5 randomly selected questionnaire were checked by hand against the computer printout to check for any mistakes. Coding proved to be completely valid. A list of 80 inmates who did not have complete information regarding their date and status of release were sent to the Department of Correction for checking and updating, the Department was prompt in its response and sent back the revised list. Then the researcher revised the data set accordingly.

In the original data set the missing data were represented by dots in every columns assigned for that variable. This caused the computer to print unnecessary informations and messages. In SAS, missing values can be represented either by spaces, or dots, but only one dot is necessary to represent the values of one variable regardless of how many columns it occupies. The present researcher removed all the dots from the data set and used spaces to represent missing values.

The validity of official data is questioned by many researchers, and a self-reported data is one viable alternative to it, but neither of them is adequate by

itself. The validity of self-reported data was examined by a number of researchers. According to Farrington (1973) the group self-completion method is more objective and capable of standardization. Respondents are likely to be less willing to admit deviant acts vocally in face-to-face situations. Farrington concluded that the most accurate measure of deviant behavior may yet prove to be some combination of official records and a self-report questionnaire.

Chambliss and Nagasawa (1984) see official statistics as so misleading that they are virtually useless as indicators of actual deviance in the population.

Short and Nye (1957) suggest going directly to the segment of the population in which the researcher is interested and studying such group by asking questions relative to the behavior under consideration.

### Generalizability

Generalizability is concerned with the extent to which one can generalize the finding of a study to a target

Population. A systematic randomly selected sample is the foremost criterion for generalizability. That is simply not the case in actual research settings, where the researcher is stretched by the scarcity of time and resources. Most of the time convenient samples are selected instead. For this study the researcher is aware of this deficiency and its impact upon inference. The findings may be generalized only to populations analogous to the selected samples, and no

attempt will be made to do so here. But a description of the sample used in the research is provided so anyone can determine its suitability for their purpose. Despite this precocious observation, the findings of this study are similar to those already known nationally, particularly the rate of recidivism.

### Reliability

Reliability has to do with the instrument used for gathering data. Farrington (1973), when reviewing the literature about the reliability of testing and re-testing of self-reported deviant behavior, found that scales containing many items and several types of deviant behavior were found to be internally consistent to a high degree. Cook and Campbell (1979) state that using longer tests for which items or measures are carefully selected for their high intercorrelation can help to counter unreliability. In the present study a detailed multi-item questionnaire was used to gather data from inmates. Items were scaled to check for intercorrelations. In a previous research by (Mathur, 1987), 11 inmates moved from House arrest to CTC or Probation and had been surveyed twice within a two weeks period. Since surveys were not given simultaneously, it was decided that they were appropriate for analyses. Items in the questionnaire were divided into three categories, information (30 items), future expectations (33 items), and present orientations (32 items). For information the average correlation coefficient of 30 items across 11

subjects was .93, for expectations it was 0.69, and for orientations it was 0.68. The information category covered data such as race, sex alcohol/drug involvement. This type of information is not expected to be changed with the course of time. For that we get a high correlation coefficient. But for orientation and expectation it could expected to change with time. This may tell us that the demographic data is very reliable, and orientation and expectation is less reliable, but still the resulting correlations are relatively acceptable.

#### Limitations of The Study

In addition to all inherent limitation of social research in general and criminal research in particular, this study has the following specific limitations.

1. Both Community-Based Correctional Programs (HA and CTC) were combined for analysis. While there were no significant differences between the population of the two programs, still the conditions of supervision were different, and may have different effects on each program.
2. Failure is defined as the presence of a reconviction record in the Department of Corrections reports. But there is no records of those individual who recidivated outside of Oklahoma, and that may affect the real rate of success or failure.
3. The sample is relatively small and generalization to the whole population is not warranted.

## Statistical Analysis

Correlation and Factor analysis were used to determine if the items concerning anomic behavior could be scaled. Items indicating how important wealth, prestige, and power, as life-goals, were selected to measure commitment to these culturally structured goals. Items reflecting inmate's perceptions of their chances of achieving wealth, prestige, and power were selected to measure the availability of means. Since these items do not distinguish between legal and illegal opportunities, further analysis using different items was conducted. How inmates perceived criminal opportunity upon release was selected to measure the availability of illegal means, and how they perceived conventional opportunity was selected to measure the availability of legal means.

In testing Anomie theory, Analysis of Variance was used to determine how the selected items acted independently through the three levels of postprogram outcome categories.

The Chi-square test was used to examine the relationship between sociodemographic variables, criminal history variables, and substance abuse variables in the three categories of postprogram outcome. Chi-Square was used also to compare the two correctional programs (HA and CTC) on a number of sociodemographic variables.



### Characteristics of the Sample

The original sample contains 237 inmates, 149 of them were House Arrestees and 88 were Community Treatment Center's Residents. The total number of inmates included in the study was 198, Since only inmates who had complete termination and sentencing information were included (see Table I). About 65% of the sample were House Arrestees, and the remaining number were residents of a Community Treatment Center. About 65% of the total sample were whites, and 27% were blacks. Other minority groups represented about 8%. Males were highly represented in the sample, constituting 74% of the total number; females were 26%. Forty Three percent of the sample had a (G.E.D.), while 57% did not. In relation to skills, 39% were unskilled, 40% had some skills, 8% were skilled, and 14% had white-collar skills. Fifty-eight of the total sample reported full-time employment, 14% were employed part-time, and 28% were unemployed at the time when they were interviewed.

Sixty-nine of the sample reported that they had a full time job before their recent imprisonment, 15% had part-time employment, and 16% were unemployed. In relation to their skills for employment 26% reported that they were skilled, 41% were semi-skilled, 11% were skilled, and 22% had white-collar skills.

Single offenders constituted 40% of the sample, 22% were legally married, 16% had common law marriages, and 22% were separated or divorced. About 60% of the sample

reported a single marriage, 24% had been married twice, and 16% had been married three or more times. Of the total sample 19% lived with their spouses, 19% lived with their parents, 7% lived independently, 7% lived with a friend, 34% lived at the CTC, and 8% had some other arrangement. When they were interviewed 34% had no children, 20% had one child, 20% had two children, 14% had three children, and 12% had four or more children. Of the total sample 11% reported living in rural area, 9% in town, 22% in the suburban areas, and 59% lived in a metropolitan area.

Both Programs (HA & CTC) were compared using the Chi-squares. Of the 13 sociodemographic variables, only four showed significant differences (see Table I). These differences were mostly artifacts of the two programs. Significant difference were found, for example, in gender wither males being more likely to be included in the house arrest program than females ( $p < 0.05$ ). This is likely to be due to the actual composition of the populations of both programs, since more males are assigned to House Arrest. There is also a significant difference in employment, with a greater proportion of House Arrestees holding full-time jobs ( $P < 0.05$ ). This difference, again, can be attributed to the requirements of the House Arrest program, since only inmates with full-time jobs are eligible for that program. A greater proportion of House Arrestees lived with a spouse, parent, a friend, or had some other living arrangement ( $P < 0.05$ ). But C.T.C residents are required to live at the center. There was a significant difference in skill for a

job level, the House Arrestees being more unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled, ( $P < 0.05$ ). But CTC's residents reported more white-collar skills. There were no significant differences in the remaining sociodemographic variables.

TABLE I  
 FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES, AND CHI-SQUARES FOR  
 EACH CORRECTIONAL PROGRAM'S CATEGORIES

Sociodemographic Variables Categ.	<u>Correctional Programs</u>		Chi- Square
	House Arrest (N=129)	Community Treat- ment Center (N=68)	
<u>Race</u>			
White	84 (65.12)	45 (34.88)	3.60
Blacks	32 (24.81)	21 (30.88)	
Others	13 (10.08)	2 (02.94)	
<u>Sex</u>			
Male	104 (81.25)	42 (61.76)	8.87*
Female	24 (08.75)	26 (38.24)	
<u>G.E.D</u>			
Yes	49 (44.14)	22 (40.00)	0.26
No	62 (55.86)	33 (60.00)	
<u>Occupation</u>			
Unskilled	33 (37.50)	12 (42.86)	3.08
Semi-skilled	37 (42.05)	9 (32.14)	
Skilled	8 (09.09)	1 (03.57)	
White-Collar	10 (11.36)	6 (21.43)	
<u>Employment</u>			
Full-Time	85 (61.93)	26 (39.39)	29.9*
Part-Time	22 (17.32)	5 (07.58)	
Unemployed	20 (15.75)	35 (53.03)	
<u>Previous Occupation</u>			
Unskilled	92 (71.88)	43 (64.18)	6.80
Semi-Skilled	15 (11.72)	14 (20.90)	
Skilled	21 (16.41)	10 (14.93)	
<u>Skill</u>			
Unskilled	34 (29.57)	10 (17.54)	14.32*
Semi-skilled	50 (43.48)	21 (36.84)	
Skilled	15 (13.04)	4 (07.02)	
White-collar	16 (13.91)	22 (38.60)	

TABLE I (Continued)

Sociodemographic Variables Categ.	<u>Correctional Programs</u>		Chi- Square
	House Arrest (N=129)	Community Treat- ment Center (N=68)	
<u>Marital status</u>			
Single	48 (37.80)	28 (43.08)	1.01
Legally Married	31 (24.41)	12 (18.46)	
Common Law Marriage	20 (15.75)	10 (15.38)	
Separated/Divorced	28 (22.05)	15 (23.08)	
<u>Time Married</u>			
once	54 (61.36)	24 (55.81)	2.66
Twice	18 (20.54)	14 (32.56)	
Three or More	16 (18.18)	5 (11.63)	
<u>Number of Children</u>			
None	47 (37.90)	18 (27.69)	7.37
One	22 (17.74)	15 (23.08)	
Two	19 (15.32)	19 (29.23)	
Three	20 (16.13)	7 (10.77)	
Four or More	16 (12.90)	6 (09.32)	
<u>Living Arrangements</u>			
Living With Spouse	36 (28.57)	1 (01.49)	84.46*
Living With Parent	36 (28.57)	0 (00.00)	
Living Independently	26 (20.63)	01 (01.49)	
Living With Friend	13 (10.32)	00 (00.00)	
C.T.C.	00 (00.00)	65 (97.00)	
Other	15 (11.90)	0 (00.00)	
<u>Type of Resident</u>			
Community			4.16
Farming	10 (08.40)	9 (15.79)	
Town	8 (06.72)	7 (12.28)	
Tulsa Suburb	28 (23.53)	11 (19.30)	
Metro	73 (61.34)	30 (52.63)	
<u>Job History</u>			
Mostly Employed	92 (71.88)	43 (64.18)	2.93
Sometimes Employed	15 (11.72)	14 (20.90)	
Never Employed	21 (16.41)	10 (14.93)	

\* Significant (0.05) Chi-Square.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

The first part of the study was involved with the impact of background characteristics on postprogram success or failure. The sample was compared on the following categories of variables, (1) sociodemographic variables, (2) criminal behavior variables, and (3) substance abuse history variables.

Table II shows frequencies, percentages and chi-squares in each sociodemographic variable on the categories of the dependent variable. Eleven variables were analyzed to determine if there were any differences in the proportions of background variables within the levels of the dependent variable. These variables were race, sex, (G.E.D), occupation, employment, previous occupation, skill, marital status, living arrangement, job history, and types of residential communities. Chi-square calculations showed no significant differences in any of these variables. Based on these data none of the sociodemographic variables used in the analysis showed any significant impact on the rate of recidivism.

Table III shows means and F-values for some sociodemographic variables on each category of postprogram success

or failure. Of the five variables examined only one showed significant difference ( $P > 0.05$ ). Those who recidivated in the first year, missed more days of work on the average than the other two groups of postprogram success or failure; the success group missed fewer days on the average than the other two groups. This finding tells us that the first year failure group was not consistent in their commitment to work, missing one and one third of a day per week. During this free time inmates may have been drunk, using drugs, or commit their crimes.

Table IV shows means and F-values for each legal background variable on postprogram success or failure categories. Thirteen criminal background behavior variables were analyzed to determine if there were any differences on postprogram success or failure categories. These variables were: age at first arrest, age at first conviction, conviction by juvenile court, conviction as an adult, juvenile probation, adult probation, commitment to juvenile institutions, adult incarcerations, length of juvenile probation, length of adult probation, time spent in juvenile correctional institutions, time spent in adult institutions, time spent outside between incarcerations, and current offense. Previous offense with incarceration was excluded from analysis because only 76 inmates gave adequate information for this variable. Analysis of Variance showed significant differences on only two variables ( $P < 0.05$ ). There was a difference among the three groups of postprogram success or failure in relation

to conviction by juvenile courts. Those who had been convicted by juvenile courts are more likely to recidivate in the first year, then also in the second year. Time spent in juvenile correctional institutions also turned out to be significant ( $P > 0.05$ ). Those who spent more time in juvenile correctional institutions are more likely to recidivate than those who spent lesser time, or did not spend any time.

Table IV shows means and F-values for alcohol and substance use variables. Twelve variables were analyzed for the purpose of determining if these variables behave differently in each category of the dependent variable. These variables were: beer drinking, wine drinking, liquor drinking, smoking marijuana, other drugs used, number of beers consumed at one time, glasses of wine consumed at one time, number of drinks (liquor) consumed at one time, kinds of drug used, crimes committed under the influence of alcohol, crimes committed under the influence of drugs, meetings of Alcohol Anonymous attended, and meetings of Narcotics Anonymous attended. Significant differences were found in crimes committed under the influence of alcohol ( $P < 0.05$ ). High proportion of those who recidivate in the first year committed crimes under the influence of alcohol. Significant difference was found also in the number of crime committed under the influence of drugs ( $P < 0.05$ ). Individuals who recidivated in the first year were more likely to commit crimes while they were under the influence of drugs. Both alcohol consumption, and drug use were



associated with crime commission. In addition, a significant difference was found in the number of meetings of Narcotic Anonymous attended ( $P < 0.05$ ). Those who recidivated in the first year attended more meetings on the average than those who recidivated in the second year or those who did not recidivate in two years. That may tell us that the first group was mostly drug addicts; and despite attending N.A., they recidivated. They also had the history of committing crimes under the influence of drugs.

The second part of the study involved the testing of Merton's Anomie theory, and its relation to recidivism. A series of calculations using Analyses of Variance were made to determine if there were any differences in the three groups of postprogram outcomes. Tables VI shows mean comparisons and F-values for these calculations. Significant differences were found in orientation toward wealth as an important life-goal ( $P < 0.05$ ). Those who recidivated in the second year revealed more orientation toward wealth as a life-goal than the other two groups. When totaling scores on wealth, prestige, and power, the F-value result was significant ( $P < 0.05$ ). Still those who recidivated in the second year were more oriented toward these three life-goals. It may be reasonable to assume that this group of individuals are more oriented toward these social goals and that they had tried their best to achieve them legally in the first year; but when they failed legally, they turned to the other alternative going back to

the criminal life.

A number of calculations were made to further elaborate in testing Anomie theory. For example, how inmates perceived their legal opportunity in achieving these life-goals was tested using a series of one-way Analysis of Variance. How they perceived their illegal opportunities for each life-goal was tested separately, and how they perceived their legal and illegal chances of achieving these goals combined was tested also. None of these calculations showed significant differences. In sum, Anomie theory was not very helpful in differentiating between recidivists and nonrecidivists.

TABLE II

FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES, AND CHI-SQUARES IN EACH  
 SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLE ON POSTPROGRAM  
 SUCCESS OR FAILURE CATEGORIES

Socio- demographic Variables	First Year Failure (N=21)	Second Year Failure (N=23)	Two Years Success (N=154)	Chi- Square
<u>Race</u>				
White	11 (52.38)	13 (59.09)	105 (68.18)	
Blacks	10 (47.62)	8 (36.36)	35 (22.73)	
Others	00 (00.00)	1 (04.55)	14 (09.09)	8.25
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	14 (66.67)	9 (82.61)	113 (74.34)	
Female	7 (33.33)	4 (17.39)	39 (25.66)	1.48
<u>G.E.D</u>				
Yes	8 (40.00)	7 (36.84)	56 (44.09)	
No	12 (60.00)	12 (63.16)	71 (55.91)	0.43
<u>Occupation</u>				
Unskilled	3 (33.33)	1 (10.00)	41 (42.27)	
Semi- skilled	3 (33.33)	7 (70.00)	36 (37.11)	
Skilled	0 (00.00)	1 (10.00)	8 (08.25)	
White- Collar	3 (33.33)	1 (10.00)	12 (12.37)	8.61
<u>Employment</u>				
Full-Time	9 (42.86)	1 (47.83)	91 (61.07)	
Part-Time	3 (14.29)	4 (17.39)	20 (13.42)	
Unemployed	9 (42.86)	8 (34.78)	38 (25.50)	0.40
<u>Preoccupation</u>				
Unskilled	6 (31.58)	7 (38.89)	42 (31.58)	
Semi-Skilled	4 (21.05)	7 (38.89)	33 (24.81)	
Skilled	5 (26.32)	2 (11.11)	20 (15.04)	
White-collar	4 (21.05)	2 (11.11)	38 (28.57)	0.50
<u>Skill</u>				
Unskilled	4 (22.22)	6 (30.00)	34 (25.37)	
Semi-skilled	9 (50.00)	10 (50.00)	52 (38.81)	
Skilled	2 (11.11)	1 (05.00)	16 (11.94)	
White-collar	3 (16.67)	3 (15.00)	32 (23.88)	0.84

TABLE II (Continued)

Socio-demographic Variables	First Year Failure (N=21)	Second Year Failure (N=23)	Two Years Success (N=154)	Chi-Square
<u>Marital status</u>				
Single Legally Married	6 (30.00)	10 (43.48)	60 (40.27)	
Common Law Marriage	6 (30.00)	4 (17.39)	33 (22.15)	
Separated /Divorced	5 (25.00)	5 (21.74)	20 (13.42)	
	3 (15.00)	4 (17.39)	36 (24.16)	0.62
<u>Living Arrangements</u>				
With Spouse	4 (19.05)	4 (17.39)	29 (19.46)	
With Parent	3 (14.29)	4 (17.39)	29 (19.46)	
Independently	1 (04.76)	3 (13.04)	23 (15.44)	
With Friend	0 (00.00)	1 (04.35)	12 (08.05)	
C.T.C.	2 (57.14)	10 (43.48)	43 (28.86)	
Other	1 (04.76)	1 (04.35)	13 (08.76)	9.72
<u>Type of Resident</u>				
Community Farming	1 (05.56)	0 (00.00)	18 (13.04)	
Town	4 (22.22)	1 (05.00)	10 (07.25)	
Tulsa Suburb	6 (33.33)	3 (15.00)	30 (21.74)	
Metro	7 (38.89)	16 (80.00)	80 (57.97)	12.04
<u>Job History</u>				
Mostly Employed	16 (76.19)	15 (65.22)	104 (68.87)	
Sometimes Employed	3 (14.29)	3 (13.04)	23 (15.23)	
Never Employed	2 (09.52)	5 (21.74)	24 (15.89)	1.30

\* Significant (0.05) Chi-Square.

TABLE III  
 MEANS, AND F-VALUES FOR SOME SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC  
 VARIABLES ON POSTPROGRAM SUCCESS  
 OR FAILURE CATEGORIES

Variable Categories	First Year Failure (N=21)	Second Year Failure (N=23)	Two Years Success (N=154)	F- Values
Age	30.1	30.78	32.43	0.64
Times Missed Work	01.31	00.95	00.63	3.21*
Education	11.29	10.80	11.45	0.93
Time Married	01.36	01.40	01.60	0.94
Number of Children	01.24	01.76	01.50	0.74

\* Significant (0.05) F-Value.

TABLE IV

MEANS AND F-VALUES FOR EACH LEGAL BACKGROUND VARIABLE ON  
POSTPROGRAM SUCCESS OR FAILURE CATEGORIES

Legal Back Ground Vari- able Categ.	First Year Failure (N=21)	Second Year Failure (N=23)	Two Years Success (N=154)	F- Values
Age at first Arrest	20.14	21.87	22.54	0.58
Age at first conviction	22.65	24.91	25.41	0.65
Juvenile conviction	1.53	0.65	0.5	6.01*
Adult con- viction	2.14	1.78	1.96	0.59
Juvenile probation	0.86	0.39	0.45	1.98
Adult probation	1.05	1.30	0.99	1.19
Commitment to juvenile institutions	0.70	0.26	0.32	2.21
Adult incar- ceration	1.29	1.10	1.34	0.98
Time spent under juv. probation	21.21	5.19	14.02	1.14
Time spent under adult probation	0.67	0.67	0.73	0.17
Time spent in juv. corr. institutions	0.45	0.21	0.16	3.57*
Time spent in adult ins- titutions	1.37	1.05	1.60	2.34
Time spent out- side between incarceration	2.20	1.10	1.74	1.60

\* Significant (0.05) F-Value.

TABLE V

MEANS AND F-VALUES FOR EACH SUBSTANCE ABUSE HISTORY VARIABLES  
ON POSTPROGRAM SUCCESS OR FAILURE CATEGORIES

Substance Abuse Variables	First Year Failure (N=21)	Second Year Failure (N=23)	Two Years Success (N=154)	F-Values
Beer Drinking	2.57	2.83	2.77	0.21
Wine Drinking	1.45	1.52	1.45	0.09
Liquor Drinking	2.33	2.45	2.25	0.24
Smoking Marijuana	2.40	1.89	2.35	0.97
Other Drugs Use	2.25	1.50	1.79	1.34
NO. of Beers Consumed at one Time	3.19	2.55	2.77	0.95
Glasses of Wine Consumed at one Time	2.50	2.48	2.60	0.06
NO. of Liquor Drinks Consumed at One Time	2.50	2.48	2.58	0.06
Crime Committed Under the Influence of Alcohol	2.21	1.85	1.35	6.36*
Crimes Committed Under the Influence of Drugs	2.20	1.52	1.39	4.00*
Meetings of A.A.	1.95	1.48	1.47	1.38
Meetings of N.A.	1.63	1.00	1.20	3.20*

\* Significant (0.05) F-Value.

TABLES VI  
 MEANS AND F-VALUES FOR ITEMS ON ANOMIE VARIABLES  
 ON POSTPROGRAM SUCCESS OR FAILURE CATEGORIES

Anomie Items	First Year Failure (N=21)	Second Year Failure (N=23)	Two Years Success (N=154)	F-Values
Conventional Opportunity	3.23	3.52	3.25	0.31
Criminal Opportunity	2.70	1.73	2.16	1.89
<u>Goals</u>				
Power	1.86	2.30	2.17	0.63
Prestige	2.42	3.34	2.89	2.05
Wealth	3.14	4.21	3.33	4.65*
Total Goals	2.48	2.30	2.80	3.01*
<u>Norms</u>				
Chances of Power	2.33	2.45	2.33	0.08
Chances of Prestige	2.95	3.14	3.01	0.09
Chances of Wealth	3.28	3.48	3.16	0.48
<u>Disparity</u>				
Wealth: (goal-norm)	-0.14	0.66	0.17	0.17
Power: (goal-norm)	2.33	2.45	2.33	0.91
Prestige: (goal-norm)	-0.52	0.23	-0.10	0.10
Total: (goal-norm)	2.48	3.30	2.80	0.05

\* Significant (0.05) F-Value.



## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

Data for this research were analyzed, using Chi-square to compare House Arrestees and Community-Treatment Center residents on 11 sociodemographic variables. The two groups differed only in four out of the 11 variables used in the analysis; and these differences were thought to be the result of classification procedures of the two programs. The populations of the two programs were grouped for the purpose of analysis. Since there were no intrinsic differences between them.

The study was concerned with postprogram success or failure for two years of release into the community. The sample was divided into three subgroups, i.e., first year failures, second year failures, and two years with no failure. A Chi-Square test showed no significant differences between the three groups on sociodemographic variables. Only one significant difference was revealed by the Analysis of Variance, and that was on "numbers of times missed work". Those who failed in the first year on the average missed more days of work than the other two groups. They missed twice as much as those who failed in the second

year and three times more than those who did not fail after two years. This highlights the importance of "regularity" of work or "attitude to work" as a contributing factor to recidivism. It is well known that ex-offenders do not often get the "right" kind of jobs, yet their poor "attitude to work" or "lack of regularity" may be reflective of their total life-style.

Analysis of Variance of criminal history variables showed some statistically significant results, such as the number of convictions by juvenile courts. Those who had been convicted as juveniles, were more likely to recidivate in the first year, than those who did not. This finding is in accordance with past literature on recidivism. In addition, the groups were significantly different in time spent in juvenile correctional institutions those who recidivated in the first year spent more time on the average than the other two groups. Alcohol and drug use revealed an important or significant impact on the behavior of subjects in the study. Crime was significantly related with drug and alcohol use for those who have failed in the first year. This failure group on the average commit more crimes under the influence of a drug or alcohol than the other two groups. A significant and an interesting finding was in the number of Narcotic Anonymous meetings attended. The first year failures attended on the average more meetings than the other two groups, or perhaps they were made to attend as a requirement of the program. This result may indicate that the first year failures were more of drug addicts than the

rest of the sample.

Analysis of Variance for Anomie theory variables showed some significant differences in the orientation toward wealth as a life-goal. The second year failures were significantly different from the other two groups in their orientation. This group may be more adherent to social goals, which generated conditions for their failure in the second year. When comparing the means of the three groups of postprogram success or failure, the second year failure group scored high on the three life-goals. The first year failure scored the least, and the two years success group scored in-between the other two groups. The three groups were only significantly different in their orientation toward wealth as a life-goal. This finding is may be due to the fact that wealth or the material gain is the most important social goal, the acquisition of it subsumed the acquisition of power and prestige. And Merton himself (1968) placed too much emphasis upon wealth as an important goal in the American Culture.

#### Conclusions

This panel study used a larger sample than the one used by Mathur's 1987 study. For this research 198 subjects were included in the analysis, while in Mathur's study only 168 subjects were included. Some of the previous results have changed, while others still hold. Though the sample size is relatively small to generalize, most of the results are in agreement with what has been documented in the literature.

Out of the 198 individuals included in this study 21 (10.6%) failed in the first year, and 23 (13%) failed in the second year. The total failure percentage of 22% in two years is reasonably low, which may give some credit and support to Community-Based Corrections. Some efforts are needed to see if some inmates were convicted out of the state of Oklahoma. This, in fact may be one of the limitations of our research.

#### Recommendations

This study examined recidivism rates within two years of release from the correctional system, which is relatively better than a one-year follow-up study. The significant findings of the study draw a picture of individuals who failed to stay crime-free in the community. The early onset of delinquency, abuse of alcohol and drugs and poor work attitude loom very large in the recidivism studies. In prevention of crime and reducing recidivism, the Society should try to divert young offenders to more constructive arenas of life. Also the researcher would like to recommend the use of more indepth interviews with those who stayed crime free in both years in order to shed more light on their inner feelings and thought.

## REFERENCES

- Babie, E. (1983). The Practice of Social Research, Belmont, Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Blumstein, Alfred. and Grady, Elizabeth.(1982). Prevalence and Recidivism in Index Arrests: A feedback Model. Law and Society Review 16:236-265.
- Chambliss, W. J. and Nagasawa, R. H. (1969). On the Validity of Official Statistics: A comparative study of White, Black, and Japanese High School Boys. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 6: 71-77.
- Chi, Keons. (1986). House Arrest: Florida's Community Control Program. Lexington, KY: The Council of State Governments.
- Clinard, Marshal B. (ed). (1964). Anomie and Deviant Behavior: A discussion and Critique. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Cloward, Richard A. and Ohlin, Lloyd E. (1969). Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. New York: The Free Press.
- Cohen, Albert K. (1966). Deviance and Control. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1955). Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Cook, T. D. and Campbell, D. T. (1979). Quasi Experimentation. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Decker, Scott H. and Salert, Brbara. (1986). Predicting the Career Criminal: An Empirical Test of The Greenwood Scale. The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 77:215-236.
- Durkheim, Emile. (1949). The Division of Labor in Society. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1951). Suicide: A Study in Sociology. Glencoe: The Free Press.

- Farrington, D. P. (1973). Self- Reports of Deviant Behavior: Predictive and Stable? Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 64:99-110.
- Greenwood, Peter W. and Abrahamse, Allan. (1982). Selective Incapacitation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Jackson, Patrick C. (1983). Some Effects of Parole Supervision on Recidivism. British Journal of Criminology 23:17-31.
- Liska Allen E. (1971). Aspiration, Expectations, and Delinquency: Stress and Additive Models. The Sociological Quarterly 12:99-107.
- Mathur, M. (1987). "A Comparison Of Success Rate For House Arrest Inmates And Community Treatment Center Residents." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.)
- Merton, Robert K. (1968). Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.
- Mestrovic, S. and Brown, H. M. (1985). Durkheim's Concept of Anomie As Dereglement. Social Problems 33:81-95.
- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. (1973). Corrections. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Oklahoma Senate. (1985). Senate Bill 65. os 510.1, June 18. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
- Olsen, Marven E. (1965). Durkheim's Two Concepts of Anomie. The Sociological Quarterly 6:37-44.
- Orsagh, Thomas. and Witte, D., (1981). Economic Status and Crime: Implications for Offenders Rehabilitation. The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 72:1055-71
- Petersilia, Joan. (1988). House Arrest (Crime File Study Guide). Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Piper, Elizabeth S. (1985). Violent Recidivism and Chronicity in the 1958 Philadelphia Cohort. Journal of Quantitative Criminology 1:319-344.
- Pritchard, David A. (1979). Stable Predictors of Recidivism: A summary. Criminology 17:15-21.
- Ribner, Stephen A. and Steadman, Henry J. (1981). Recidivism Among Offenders And Ex-Mental Patients. Criminology 19:411-420.

- Short, J. F. and Nye, I. F. (1958). Reported Behavior as a Criterion of Deviant Behavior. Social Problems 5: 207-213.
- Thio, Alex. 1983. Deviant Behavior. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Werff, C. Van Der. (1981). Recidivism and Special Deterrence. British Journal of Criminology 21:357-360

**APPENDIX**



**Research Questionnaire**  
(for House Arrestees)

The following questionnaire is designed by the OSU Sociology Department and 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. We hope we will be able to use the information you give us to help you. You may or may not associate your name with this information. In any case, you should sign your willingness to participate in this research on a separate sheet provided to you.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Inmate Number \_\_\_\_\_

**A. Personal History**

1. Race & Ethnicity: 1 \_\_\_ White    2 \_\_\_ Black    3 \_\_\_ Mexican American  
4 \_\_\_ American Indian    5 \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_
2. Gender            1 \_\_\_ Male    2 \_\_\_ Female
- 3,4. Present Age:    \_\_\_ Years            \_\_\_ Year of Birth
- 5,6. Education:      \_\_\_ School Years
7. Have you completed A GED?    1 \_\_\_ yes            2 \_\_\_ no
- 8,9. What is your current occupation during house arrest/parole/split sentence/CTC?  
\_\_\_\_\_
10. Are you now employed?    1 \_\_\_ full-time    2 \_\_\_ part-time    3 \_\_\_ unemployed
- 11,12. What was your occupation before your recent imprisonment?  
\_\_\_\_\_
13. Before your recent imprisonment, were you employed?  
1 \_\_\_ full-time    2 \_\_\_ part-time    3 \_\_\_ unemployed
- 14,15. What's your trade or skill for employment? \_\_\_\_\_
16. Marital Status: 1 \_\_\_ single            2 \_\_\_ legally married  
1 \_\_\_ common-law marriage    4 \_\_\_ separated or divorced    5 \_\_\_ remarried
17. Number of times married: 1 \_\_\_ once            2 \_\_\_ twice  
3 \_\_\_ three times or more
18. Number of children (if any)    0        1        2        3        4+
19. Number of children living with you    0        1        2        3        4+
20. Present living arrangements during house arrest/parole/split sentence/CTC:  
1 \_\_\_ living with spouse            4 \_\_\_ living with a friend  
2 \_\_\_ living with parent            5 \_\_\_ CTC  
3 \_\_\_ living independently        6 \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

## B. Legal Background

- 22-23. What was your age at first arrest? \_\_\_ years
- 24-25. What was your age at first conviction? \_\_\_ years
26. How many times were you convicted by the Juvenile Court?  
 0      1      2      3      4+
27. How many times have you been convicted as an adult?  
 0      1      2      3      4+
28. How many times were you placed on probation, as a juvenile?  
 0      1      2      3      4+
29. How many times were you placed on probation, as an adult?  
 0      1      2      3      4+
30. How many times were you committed to juvenile institutions?  
 0      1      2      3      4+
31. How many times were you incarcerated in a prison as an adult?  
 0      1      2      3      4+
- 32-33. For how long did you remain under probation supervision? <sup>AS A JUVENILE</sup> \_\_\_ years
- 34-35. For how long did you remain under probation as an adult? \_\_\_ years
- 36-37. How much time did you do in juvenile correctional institutions in total?  
 years \_\_\_
- 38-39. How much time have you done in adult correctional facilities in total?  
 years \_\_\_
- 40-43. If you were incarcerated more than once, how much time did you stay out  
 on the street between the last two incarcerations? \_\_\_ years \_\_\_ months
- 44-45. What was the offense for which you are doing time now? \_\_\_\_\_
- How many times have you been sentenced?
46. for property offenses                      Number \_\_\_
47. for violent offenses                      Number \_\_\_
48. for drugs only                              Number \_\_\_
49. List previous offenses, if any, for which you have done time
50. What kind of community are you living in?  
 1 - farming or rural                      3 - suburb of Tulsa  
 2 - town (under 5,000 pop.)              4 - Tulsa proper

Now, think about the 2 years when you were out on the street before you started serving your current term.

Please circle the number that best describes your drinking habit during those 2 years on the street.

- |   | Never | a few<br>times<br>a year | 1-2<br>times<br>a month | 1-2<br>times<br>a week | 1-2<br>times<br>a day |
|---|-------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. How often, on the average, did you usually drink beer?   | 1     | 2                        | 3                       | 4                      | 5                     |
| 2. How often, on the average, did you usually drink wine?   | 1     | 2                        | 3                       | 4                      | 5                     |
| 3. How often, on the average, did you usually drink liquor? | 1     | 2                        | 3                       | 4                      | 5                     |
| How often did you use drugs?                                |       |                          |                         |                        |                       |
| 4.                    Marijuana                             | 1     | 2                        | 3                       | 4                      | 5                     |
| 5.                    other drugs                           | 1     | 2                        | 3                       | 4                      | 5                     |
- 
- |   | None | 1-2<br>Drinks | 3-4<br>Drinks | 5-6<br>Drinks | Over 6<br>Drinks |
|---|------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| 6. When you drank beer, how many drinks, on the average, did you usually have at any one time?  | 1    | 2             | 3             | 4             | 5                |
| 7. When you drank wine, how many drinks, on the average, did you usually have at any one time?  | 1    | 2             | 3             | 4             | 5                |
| 8. When you drank liquor, how many drinks, on the average, did you usually have at any one time?  | 1    | 2             | 3             | 4             | 5                |
| 9. What drugs did you use during those 2 years?<br>1 ___ none            2 ___ only marijuana    3 ___ hard drugs<br>4 ___ combination: (name the drugs used):  |      |               |               |               |                  |
| 10. During that 2 year period when you were on the street, how much of the time did you have a job?<br><br>1 ___ 100% of the time            4 ___ Less than half of the time<br>2 ___ Most of the time            5 ___ Never employed<br>3 ___ About half of the time |      |               |               |               |                  |
| 11. During that period, about how much was your average <u>monthly</u> income from work?<br>\$ _____  |      |               |               |               |                  |





- 32-34. What were the major problems you had to face on your transfer from the prison to your present program?
- a. During the 1st month \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b. During the 2nd - 3rd month \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c. Later on \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
35. Who helped you the most with your problems? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
36. How did these people help you? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
37. Do you feel committed to some cause in life? 1 \_\_\_\_\_ yes 2 \_\_\_\_\_ no
38. Name one activity which you are very much involved in. \_\_\_\_\_
39. What do you do in your leisure time? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
40. Did you have any trouble with the law or with technical violation of your program rules (house arrest, parole, split-sentence, CTC)?
- 1 \_\_\_\_\_ yes 2 \_\_\_\_\_ no
41. If yes, what was the nature of the trouble? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
42. What's your attitude toward the supervision given to you under house arrest/parole/split-sentence/CTC?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
43. What was your greatest fear about being released from prison to house arrest/split sentence/parole/CTC?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

44-45. Ever since your placement on house arrest/parole/split-sentence/CTC what good things have happened to you? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

what awful things have happened to you? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

46-47. What programs on your house arrest/parole/split-sentence/CTC plan were the most beneficial? FOR EXAMPLE: ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS (HELPFUL)

\_\_\_\_\_

Which were not beneficial? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

E. Present Situation

	None at all				Completely
1. When you get into trouble with the law, how much does it bother you to think that this would hurt your family?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How strongly are you committed to helping your family?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How much time and effort do you put into something that you are involved in?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Do you find conventional opportunities open to you when coming out of prison?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Do you find criminal opportunities open to you when coming out of prison?	1	2	3	4	5

Please circle the number which you feel best represents your position

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>				<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
6. It's hard for a person like me to get a good paying, honest job.	1	2	3	4	5
7. There are opportunities where I live for a person like me to make good money illegally.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I keep trying when things don't work out.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I do not get depressed by setbacks.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I tend to drink (liquor) too much.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I tend to try to sidestep my problems.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I can pretty much determine what happens to my life.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I have difficulty managing my money (spending for nonessentials, too much buying on installment, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
14. I am late or absent from work without following procedures acceptable to my employer.	1	2	3	4	5

Please indicate how important the following life goals are to you.

	Not at all Important				Very Important
15. Expertness: to acquire special skill or knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Power: to have control of others.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Affection: to share love.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Prestige: to become well known.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Self realization: to optimize personal development.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Service: to contribute to the satisfaction of others.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Wealth: to have lots of money.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Work: to have a career that is satisfying and rewarding.	1	2	3	4	5



Realistically, how do you see your chances of achieving these goals?

	Not at all Likely				Very Likely
	1	2	3	4	5
23. Expertness: to acquire special skill or knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Power: to have control of others.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Affection: to share love.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Prestige: to become well known.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Self realization: to optimize personal development.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Service: to contribute to the satisfaction of others.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Wealth: to have lots of money.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Work: to have a career that is satisfying and rewarding.	1	2	3	4	5

	How <u>important</u> is each to you?					How <u>satisfied</u> with each are you <u>now</u> ?				
	<u>Not at all</u> <u>Important</u>		<u>Extremely</u> <u>Important</u>			<u>Not</u> <u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Completely</u> <u>Satisfied</u>		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
31. To get affection from your family.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
32. To count on your family for help.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
33. To be respected by your family.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
34. For your family to let you do things your own way.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
35. To be appreciated by your boss for the job you do.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
36. To be liked by those you work with.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
37. To be respected for the way you do your job.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
38. To do things on the job the way you want.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
39. To be liked by friends involved in trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
40. To have friends involved in trouble who will help you out.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
41. That friends involved in trouble let you do things your own way.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
42. To be liked by friends involved in trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
43. That other friends respect you.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
44. To be liked by other friends.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
45. To have other friends to help you out.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
46. To have other friends who let you do things your own way.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Part C

HOUSE ARREST

TERMINATION/TRANSFER REPORT

Case Manager \_\_\_\_\_

Facility/Agency \_\_\_\_\_

NAME	NUMBER	D I S T R I B U T I O N	A C T I O N	A C T I O N	R E A S O N	E M P L O Y M E N T	M O N E T A R Y	P O I N T S	F A C I L I T Y	C O M M E N T S

Termination/Transfer Codes

Employment Codes

Monthly Income

- |  |                               |                    |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Discharge   | 0. Unemployed and not seeking | 1. None            |
| 2. Discharge to Community Supervision                | 1. Unemployed and seeking     | 2. \$1 - \$199     |
| 3. Commuted  | 2. Full-time (35-40 hrs)      | 3. \$200 - \$399   |
| 4. Paroled   | 3. Full-time but seasonal     | 4. \$400 - \$599   |
| 5. Deceased  | 4. Part-time                  | 5. \$600 - \$799   |
| 6. Employment  | 5. Student                    | 6. \$800 - \$999   |
| 7. Housing   | 6. Homemaker                  | 7. \$1,000 or more |
| 8. Misconduct  | 7. Not Applicable             | 8. Not Reported    |
| 9. Arrest (No Charges)                               | 8. Not Reported               |                    |
| 10. Arrested (Charges)                               |                               |                    |
| 11. Escaped (No Charges)                             |                               |                    |
| 12. Escaped (Charges for Escape Only)                |                               |                    |
| 13. Escaped (Multiple Charges)                       |                               |                    |
| 14. Other  |                               |                    |
| 15. Go to a higher level security                    |                               |                    |
| 16. To House Arrest from Community Treatment Center  |                               |                    |
| 17. To jail  |                               |                    |
| 18. To general population Community Treatment Center |                               |                    |

1  
VITA

Hmoud S. AL-MOSLEH

Candidate for the Degree of  
Master of Science

Thesis: A PANEL STUDY OF COMMUNITY-BASED OFFENDERS: ONE-  
YEAR AND TWO-YEARS RECIDIVISM COMPARED

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Zniah, Jordan, on December 24,  
1954, the son of Salem Olimat, and Eida Abulmuhti.

Education: Passed the Jordanian General Secondary  
Examination (Tawjihi), in June, 1974; received  
Diploma of Radiologic Technology from the  
Paramedical Institute of Amman, Jordan in July  
1976; received Bachelor of Arts degree in  
Sociology from King Abulaziz University, Jeddah,  
Saudi Arabia in June 1984; completed requirements  
for the Master of Science degree from Oklahoma  
State University in December, 1989.

Professional Experience: Working as a Radiologic  
Technologist in Jordan, Saudi Arabia, 1976-1986;  
Research Assistance, Department of Sociology,  
Oklahoma State University, August, 1989 to  
present.