

A COMPARISON OF SUCCESS RATES FOR HOUSE  
ARREST INMATES AND COMMUNITY  
TREATMENT CENTER RESIDENTS

By

MINU MATHUR

Bachelor of Arts  
Delhi University  
Delhi, India  
1972

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1981

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
December, 1987

Thesis  
1987D  
M432c  
Cop. 2



A COMPARISON OF SUCCESS RATES FOR HOUSE  
ARREST INMATES AND COMMUNITY  
TREATMENT CENTER RESIDENTS

Thesis Approved:

*Harvich S. Sandhu*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Richard Dodder*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Charles R. Green*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Garry M. Perbi*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman N. Durham*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to a number of people for having helped, encouraged, and guided me during the course of my studies at Oklahoma State University.

A great source of encouragement and guidance has been my adviser, Dr. Harjit Sandhu. I gratefully acknowledge the help and support which he provided far beyond the call of duty.

I am also indebted to Dr. Richard Dodder, who has provided hours of help on computer and elsewhere.

I am also grateful to Dr. Larry Perkins and Dr. Robert Greer for their encouragement and willingness to edit this paper.

A special thanks is offered to the Oklahoma Department of Corrections for providing me with the opportunity to study inmates. Thanks to all the inmates who shared sensitive information about themselves with me. And, of course, this study could not have been possible without the help and support of Dr. Steve Davis, Supervisor of Research and Planning, Oklahoma Department of Corrections, who patiently sent me data for well over two years.

I deeply appreciate my family's patience and love as this project was being completed. Thanks go to my husband, Ashok, and sons, Rahul and Nikhil. A very special thank you goes to my mother Madhuri Kishore, and to my mother-in-law Krishna Mathur.

And finally, I dedicate this dissertation to my husband Ashok, who has been a continuing source of inspiration to me and without whose support I could not have attained this goal.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
House Arrest Program. . . . .	5
Community Treatment Center (CTC) Programs . . . . .	6
The Theories. . . . .	8
II. METHODOLOGY. . . . .	12
Characteristics of the Sample . . . . .	13
Success of Failure During the Program and After the Program . . . . .	19
Statistical Measures. . . . .	20
Validity. . . . .	22
Generalizability. . . . .	27
Reliability . . . . .	28
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	28
III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	31
Strain or Motivation Theories . . . . .	32
Culture Conflict, Cultural Transmission Theories, and Differential Association Theories . . . . .	34
Control Theories. . . . .	38
Evaluation Studies of Community Treatment Centers . . . . .	45
IV. RESULTS. . . . .	48
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	68
Summary . . . . .	69
Conclusions . . . . .	71
Recommendations . . . . .	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	74
APPENDIXES. . . . .	78
APPENDIX A - RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE. . . . .	79
APPENDIX B - EVALUATION REPORT . . . . .	90

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Percentages in Each Sociodemographic Variable in Correctional Program Categories. . . . .	15
II. Percentages in Each Sociodemographic Variable on Program and Post-Program Success or Failure Categories . . . . .	49
III. Percentages in Each Criminal Background Variable on Program and Post-Program Success or Failure Categories . . . . .	53
IV. Chi-Square Table of Percentages in Each Substance Abuse History Variable on Program and Post-Program Success or Failure Categories . . . . .	56
V. Unrotated First Factor Loadings for Items on Scales. . . . .	61
VI. Comparisons of Means by Variables on Program and Post-Program Success or Failure Categories. . . . .	66

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In recent years, public and professional expectations of corrections have brought about a transformation in correctional means and ends. These expectations seemed to have revived the awareness that corrections needs to be linked to the community in every phase of its operations. Initially, these links were hard to forge because, traditionally, correctional institutions have maintained a relative isolation from community human service agencies. One of the reasons for the new trend has been the recent change in the philosophy behind punishment. Examining the four phases in the history of punishment (revenge, restraint, reformation, and reintegration), community-based corrections has its rationale in the philosophy of reintegration.

Reintegration is a concept supported by the Corrections Task Force of the U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Task Force Report (1967). The theoretical framework here is that instead of seeking a change in the offender, the correctional system will try to change the nature of the offender's relationship with the community, thus focusing on the interaction between the offenders and their social milieu. The objective is to improve the integration of the offenders in the community. The reintegration theory suggests that offenders, after initial punishment, should be reaccepted and reabsorbed by the society, enabling them to make use of the community agencies. The task of the correctional system, then, is to help the offenders achieve



the level of integration which would enable them to live a law-abiding life. In addition, the broad ideology behind community-based corrections believes that criminals are a product of many differing societal forces and personal inadequacies and aspires for the readmittance of the offender to community institutions and associations.

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (1972) came to the conclusion that, while all efforts should be made to ensure the safety of society, it is imperative that an effort is made to reduce the involvement of the offender with correctional institutions. They believe that jails, workhouses, prisons, and even probation services lead to the alienation and dehumanization of offenders. Thus, a lack of penetration into the institutions of corrections could only be better than institutionalization. The second principle, according to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (1972), was related to the need for extensive involvement with the many aspects of the community, starting with the offenders and their world and extending it to the larger social system. The final principal acknowledges the demand for new roles in community-based programs from inmates, staff, and citizens. This can be made explicit through altered job descriptions, new patterns of training, and different performance expectations for the staff.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973) assessed the significance of community-based corrections from three aspects: humanitarian, restorative, and managerial. Since to subject offenders to custodial coercion is believed to place them in physical jeopardy, reduce their self-esteem, and narrow their access to sources of personal satisfaction, the humanitarian aspect of community-based corrections is obvious. To the extent that the offender is relieved of the burden of custody and relating the proposition that no one

should be subjected to custodial control unnecessarily, a humanitarian objective has been realized. Despite the reintegrative aspects of community-based corrections, the need for public protection looms large. According to the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973), the restorative aspect is concerned with measures which are expected to achieve for offenders a position in the community in which they do not violate laws. These measures can be used either to change, control, or reintegrate the offender. The third aspect of community-based corrections may be managerial and fiscal, since the per capita cost of custody is shown to be much higher than any community program. Financial stringency in many states has proved to be the primary mover behind community-based corrections. Of course, the decisions to use community-based correctional programs cannot be based solely on economics, since a major objective of correctional programs is to protect the public.

According to Sandhu (1981), some additional reasons for the resurgence of community-based corrections are:

1. The failure of the prison system, prisons being a place where compliance is obtained by coercion, and may eventually result in alienation from larger society and greater chemical dependency.

2. Community corrections are considered to be integrative, since the offender can stay in the community and make use of social institutions.

3. Community-based corrections are considered to be as deterrent as any other program with regard to recidivism.

4. Although community-based programs provide service, counseling, and guidance from community agencies, they still maintain some control through surveillance.

It is with this perspective in mind that many states in this country have expanded their community-based correctional programs. These programs can be divided into residential and nonresidential programs. Some of the programs that exist in the community are: halfway houses, community treatment centers, probation, work release, study release, restitution, parole, shock probation, and furloughs.

A recent program entry in this area is related to the concept of home incarceration. This alternative, termed "home detention," came into use initially in Washington, D.C., and more recently in other areas of the United States. According to Ball and Lilly (1985), home incarceration offers several advantages as alternatives to institutional incarceration of certain offenders. These advantages are:

1. Degree of Fit. Ball and Lilly discussed the inherent flexibility of this approach. It could be used alone as the sole response to an offense. It could be used as one component of a tailored package (e.g., a set of "treatment components" could be joined with home incarceration), thus combining the goal of incapacitation with the goal of reformation).

2. Staging. Home incarceration could be employed at any stage of the correctional process. It could be used in pretrial detention, as a diversion tactic, during probation, and parole.

3. Initiation. Home incarceration could be initiated by the court or offender. The court could offer it to offenders by allowing them to work, to obtain an education or a program of treatment. The offender, on the other hand, might petition the court to be incarcerated at home, especially in the case of extenuating circumstances like mental retardation or terminal illness.

4. Expectation of Adoption of the Concept of Home Incarceration. The possibility of actual implementation is desirable because the idea is

easily communicable and not complex: The potential could be relatively easy to measure. It could avoid the labeling process which is certain to result from incarceration in a traditional institution. The cost would be reasonable; and the option is reversible. In addition, it would be both compatible and relevant to organizational goals, since certain offenders would be restricted by being "off the street" thereby avoiding stigma, and society would save correctional dollars as well.

### House Arrest Program

In 1984, the Oklahoma Department of Corrections began a House Arrest Program which was in accordance with a law allowing the confinement of a prisoner to a home, halfway house, or other alternative confinement. During the period of February, 1984 to August, 1984, 1,229 inmates were released directly from correctional facilities to the community without supervision. Therefore, the Department of Corrections began the House Arrest Program at a security level to provide intensive supervision of inmates in the community, prior to their eventual release.

According to the Oklahoma State Bill (1985):

House Arrest is a program whereby persons committed to the Department of Corrections are authorized to be away from a correctional facility and are placed by the department in a community (mostly in their own homes) for the purpose of reintegration of the person into society (No. 65, p. 2).

A candidate for the House Arrest Program should meet the following requirements for eligibility:

1. Should have served at least 15 percent of the sentence and should be within 27 months of discharge for a nonviolent offense and 112 months for a violent offense.
2. May not have been denied parole by the Pardon and Parole within the last six months (Oklahoma State Bill No. 65, 1985, p. 5).

Each inmate on house arrest is jointly supervised by a correctional case manager and a community correctional officer. A house arrestee inmate must report to his/her supervisor at least twice a month for the first two months at a specified correctional facility and once a month after that. In addition, the officers can check their house arrestees any time, either by home visits or telephone contact. There is no electronic surveillance. House arrestees must return to their residences promptly after work and must also carry their itinerary on their persons at all times. There are physical checks at their residences. Therefore, from all accounts, house arrestees were subjected to intensive community supervision.

Also included in the program plan are items such as counseling, education, payment of court costs, victim compensation, restitution, and substance abuse surveillance (Oklahoma Department of Corrections, 1984). During this supervision period, the inmate was to be linked with support services in the community, so that the inmate would be able to identify options available in the community. Those inmates who were within six months of discharge, or who had been recommended for parole and were determined to be a good risk (based on an objective risk assessment instrument) were considered eligible for house arrest. The inmates also needed a verified job offer and a verified home offer prior to release to house arrest status.

#### Community Treatment Center (CTC) Program

Another community-based program (called the "community treatment center") has some years of experience to its credit. A community treatment center (also called a "work release center") may receive the offenders either at the beginning or close to the release points of their

sentences. Some goals of community treatment centers are economic and humanitarian in nature. The former is related to reducing the cost of imprisonment; the latter to limiting the pain of incarceration by bringing the offenders close to their families and the community. The supervision in a community treatment center also helps to prepare the offender for release into the community. Many studies have examined the effectiveness of community treatment centers. One significant evaluative study by Beck (1979) showed that referral through a community treatment center resulted in a better employment record and that offenders most likely to commit a new crime may engage in less criminal activity if they are first referred to a community treatment center.

The purpose of the present study was to examine these two community-based programs with regard to program and post-program success or failure. The study had two parts. The first part focused on three different groups of background variables which were used to analyze and predict program and post-program success or failure. These three groups of variables were: (1) sociodemographic variables, (2) criminal history variables, and (3) substance abuse history variables. Sociodemographical variables and criminal history variables have previously been correlated with recidivism in scores of studies. Similarly, previous research has shown a strong relationship between substance abuse history and the commitment of crime (Forst and Wish, 1983; Fox, 1977; Glaser, 1964; Jacoby, Thornberry, and Marvin, 1973). The present study correlated drug abuse with recidivism. The second part of the study involved the testing of two criminological theories: Hirschi's (1969) Control Theory and Glaser's (1978) Differential Anticipation Theory.

## The Theories

Although Hirschi (1969) used his theory to explain juvenile delinquency, the present study focused on the criminality and recidivism of adult prisoners. Hirschi's Control Theory proposed that delinquency resulted from the failure of the young to form or maintain a bond to society. The four variables that form the bond between the individual and society are: (1) attachment, (2) commitment, (3) involvement, and (4) belief. Attachment corresponds to affective ties which the individual forms with significant others. The three foci of attachments are: (1) parents, (2) peers, and (3) school. Hirschi proposed that the weaker the parental attachment, the greater the chance of delinquency and greater the chance that adolescents would have delinquent friends. The second variable of commitment is the rational component of conformity. Hirschi believed that the organization of society is such that most persons would be in danger of hurting their occupations and careers if they engaged in criminal acts. Involvement or engrossment in conventional activities (e.g., keeping appointments, meeting deadlines) also helps a person conform. The fourth variable of belief is related to Hirschi's assumption that a common value system exists within the society or group whose norms are being violated. He proposed that a person becomes a delinquent when his belief in the conventional order is weakened.

Closely tied to Hirschi's (1969) Control Theory is the Differential Anticipation Theory by Glaser (1978). This theory combines and supplements elements of differential association and control theory and is also compatible with perspectives that emphasize the influence of biological and personality factors as additional influences. According to Glaser:

A person's crime or restraint from crime is determined by the consequences he anticipated from it, and these

anticipations are the result of: (1) Social bonds; (2) Differential learning; and (3) Perceived opportunities (both legitimate and illegitimate). The basic assumption of differential anticipation is that expectations determine conduct (p. 126).

The present longitudinal study combined Hirschi's (1969) control theory variables of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief, along with Glaser's (1978) differential anticipation theory variables of perceived opportunities (both legitimate and illegitimate) in order to conduct an examination of the data regarding success or failure in the above mentioned programs. The study involved a look at program and post-program success or failure, and their relationship with theoretical guidelines. Some of the possible hypotheses generated were:

1. Offenders who are more attached to their parents/families, peers (conventional, as opposed to criminal), and work are more likely to be successful. Since attachment to school (in Hirschi's, 1969 theory) is analogous to attachment to work in the adult world, the latter was chosen for analysis in this study.

2. Offenders who are more committed to occupations and work are less likely to be recidivists.

3. Offenders who are more involved in the conventional order are more likely to be successful, both in the program and in the post program adjustment in the community.

4. Offenders who exhibit stronger beliefs in the conventional order are more likely to be successful.

5. Offenders who have stronger social bonds and who perceive more legitimate opportunities in society upon release from programs are more likely to be successful.

This study proposed to construct measures for the three dimensions of attachment, as well as for commitment, involvement, and belief. The



study also examined differences between the relationships of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief for offenders who were successes or failures in the program and in the post-program period.

The present longitudinal study proposed to look at successful and failed offenders one year after they had been released from the programs. The study combined this with program success or failure. Thus, the following combination categories were set up: (1) program success and post-program success, (2) program success but post-program failure, (3) program failure but post-program success, and (4) program failure and post-program failure.

Program success or failure was defined by using the codes from the termination report of the Department of Corrections. Success in the post-program period was defined as the lack of a reconviction record, using the Department of Corrections' records. A failed offender was defined as one who had a reconviction for a new crime. Reconviction as a measure of recidivism, instead of using rearrest as the criteria, was recommended by the National Advisory Commission on General Justice Standards and Goals (1973). According to this Commission, a conviction was a well-defined event in which a recorded action had been taken by the court. Thus, measurement by reconviction has been an established practice in corrections. The second reason was that a person who was arrested may not be proven guilty. With this perspective in mind, the researcher proposed to examine the differences between the categories of the dependent variable (i.e., the above-mentioned groups) by using the theoretical variables from the Control Theory and from the Differential Anticipation Theory.

Frequency distribution of data showed the following number of offenders in the program and post-program success or failure categories.

The first category of program and post-program successes had 133 offenders. The second category program success but post-program failures had 23 offenders, and the third category of program failure but post-program success showed 12 offenders. Release date of inmates from the system was used to calculate the one-year period of post-program success or failure. Since program failures took a longer time to get released from the system, a greater number of them ended up not being qualified to meet the time requirement of this study, resulting in a smaller number of offenders in the third category. The last category of program and post-program failure had only one offender. This last category was considered too small to yield any significant statistical conclusions, and was dropped for the purposes of analysis.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY

Initial data for the present study were collected by a group of researchers from Oklahoma State University in October and November of 1985. Subsequent follow-up data were collected periodically until February, 1987. Full cooperation was received from the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, both in the collection of initial data and in the follow-up information on the offenders. The research instrument was a self-administered questionnaire (Appendix A) with the following segments: sociodemographic data, criminal history, substance abuse history, social bonds, and opportunities.

Data were collected in two community-based programs--the House Arrest Program and the Community Treatment Center Program--in a metropolitan area of north central Oklahoma. The area has a mix of urban and rural populations. Researchers collected data during four consecutive weeks in the House Arrest Program, administering the questionnaire to all available inmates (N=149). They used the meeting time of these offenders. Similarly, the questionnaire was administered to all available residents at the Community Treatment Center in one evening (N=88). The questionnaires were administered in an objective and neutral manner. Assistance by trained researchers was provided for inmates who were unable to read or write. The inmates were asked to write their names and Department of Corrections identification numbers on the questionnaire. This was done in order to facilitate the gathering of information on

program successes or failures, as well as reconviction data at the end of one year. The offenders were assured of confidentiality of the data and were informed that the information would not be used against them. All offenders agreed to participate in the study. They also signed a consent form authorizing the release of Department of Corrections' record information.

Although both the House Arrest Program and the Community Treatment Center Programs are community-based, the following are differences between them:

1. Residents of a community treatment center are in an institutional setting, while those under house arrest lived at home.
2. A community treatment center has a higher security level than does house arrest.
3. The classification criteria for both programs are different.
4. The Community Treatment Center residents are generally placed in the program during the last six months of their sentence, while the house arrest inmate spends about 1/15 of their sentence in the prison.
5. Sex offenders and those with an indeterminate sentence are not eligible for house arrest.

#### Characteristics of the Sample

The following were perceived to be some sociodemographic characteristics of the sample (N=174). About 65% of the total sample were whites; blacks constituted 26% of all offenders, and other minorities represented 9%. Males constituted 74% of the sample, and 26% of the sample were females. Of the sample, 40% had a G.E.D., while 60% did not. A majority of the sample was unskilled (44.2%), 36.5% had some skills, 6% were skilled, and 13% had white collar skills.

Full-time employment was reported by 58% of the sample, part-time by 15%, and 27% were unemployed at the time the questionnaire was administered.

About 40% of the total sample consisted of single offenders, 24% were legally married, 14% had common-law marriages, and 23% were separated or divorced. One-time marriages were reported by 56% of the sample, 27% had been married twice, and 17% had been married three or more times.

The sample reported 21% of the offenders lived with their spouses, 18% lived with a parent, 14% lived independently, 5% lived with a friend, 35% lived at the Community Treatment Center, and 8% had some other living arrangements.

At the time the data were collected, 36% of the sample had no children, 20% had one child, 19% had two children, 14% had three children, and the remaining 12% had four or more children.

The average monthly income for 25% of the sample at the time of data collection was under \$400. The offenders in the study who earned between \$400 to \$800 was reported at 31%, 35% earned between \$801 and \$1200, and about 11% claimed to be making over \$1200 per month.

When asked about the type of community they resided in, 12% reported living in the rural area, 8% in town, 23% in the suburbs of the city, and the greatest percentage of the offenders (58%) lived in the metro area.

Chi-square calculations were used in order to check for differences regarding sociodemographic variables between the house arrest inmates and community treatment center residents. A comparison of the data on both programs can be found in Table I. The chi-square was significant in 5 of the 14 variables. The comparisons not significant were on the variables of race, G.E.D., occupation, previous occupation, marital status, number of children, job history, average monthly income, and type of community

TABLE I  
 PERCENTAGES IN EACH SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLE  
 IN CORRECTIONAL PROGRAM CATEGORIES

Sociodemographic Variable Categories	<u>Correctional Programs</u>		
	House Arrest (N=113)	Community Treat- ment Centers (N=61)	Total Sample (N=174)
<u>Race</u>			
White	62.83	68.85	64.94
Black	25.66	27.87	26.44
Mexican American	.88	0	.57
American Indian	9.73	3.28	7.47
Other	.88	0	.57
<u>Sex*</u>			
Male	83.78	55.74	73.84
Female	16.22	44.26	26.16
<u>G.E.D.</u>			
Yes	39.80	39.58	39.73
No	60.20	60.42	60.27
<u>Occupation</u>			
Unskilled	41.77	52.00	44.23
Semi-skilled	40.51	24.00	36.54
Skilled	7.59	0	5.77
White-collar	10.13	24.00	13.46
<u>Employment*</u>			
Full-time	65.77	43.10	57.99
Part-time	18.92	6.90	14.79
Unemployed	15.32	50.00	27.22
<u>Previous Occupation</u>			
Unskilled	38.14	26.42	34.00
Semi-skilled	25.77	22.64	24.67
Skilled	15.46	13.21	14.67
White-collar	20.62	37.74	26.67

TABLE I (Continued)

Sociodemographic Variable Categories	<u>Correctional Programs</u>		
	House Arrest (N=113)	Community Treat- ment Centers (N=61)	Total Sample (N=174)
<u>Skill*</u>			
Unskilled	30.69	16.33	26.00
Semi-skilled	43.56	32.65	40.00
Skilled	12.87	10.20	12.00
White-collar	12.87	40.82	22.00
<u>Marital Status</u>			
Single	37.84	43.10	39.64
Legally Married	26.13	20.69	24.26
Common Law Marriage	14.41	12.07	13.61
Separated/Divorced	21.62	24.14	22.49
<u>Times Married*</u>			
Once	60.76	47.62	56.20
Twice	20.25	40.48	27.27
Three or More	18.99	11.90	16.53
<u>Living Arrangements*</u>			
Living With Spouse	31.82	1.67	21.18
Living With Parent	27.27	0	17.65
Living Independently	20.00	1.67	13.53
Living With Friend	7.27	0	4.71
C.T.C.	.91	96.67	34.71
Other	12.73	0	8.24
<u>Number of Children</u>			
None	40.19	27.59	35.76
One	16.82	25.86	20.00
Two	14.95	24.14	18.18
Three	14.95	12.07	13.94
Four or More	13.08	10.34	12.12
<u>Job History</u>			
Mostly Employed	82.30	80.33	81.61
Sometimes Employed	15.04	14.75	14.94
Never Employed	2.65	4.92	3.45

TABLE I (Continued)

Sociodemographic Variable Categories	<u>Correctional Programs</u>		
	House Arrest (N=113)	Community Treat- ment Centers (N=61)	Total Sample (N=174)
<u>Average Monthly Income</u>			
Under \$400	23.36	26.42	24.38
\$401 - \$800	30.84	30.19	30.63
\$801 - \$1200	37.38	28.30	34.38
Above \$1200	8.41	15.09	10.63
<u>Type of Resident Community</u>			
Farming (Rural)	9.52	16.67	11.76
Town	7.62	8.33	7.84
Tulsa Suburb	23.81	20.83	22.88
Metro	59.05	54.17	57.52

\*Chi-square is significant at the .05 level.

residence. Significant differences were found in sex, with males more likely to belong to the House Arrest Program than females ( $p < 0.01$ ). The difference was a result of actual differences of house arrest and community treatment center population composition at this time, the consequence of which are unknown. Employment between the groups varied, with a greater proportion of house arrest inmates holding full-time jobs ( $p < 0.01$ ). Two explanations can be suggested for this difference. Since having a job is a prerequisite for being in the House Arrest Program, the researcher expected more house arrestees to be employed full-time. The second explanation was related to the perception of community treatment center residents. Many of these residents help in the upkeep



of the institution (cooking, plumbing, cleaning, etc.) and do not perceive and report that as a job. Significant differences were also found in skill for a job, with a greater proportion of house arrest inmates being in semiskilled, skilled, and white collar categories ( $p < 0.00$ ). A comparison of number of times married showed a greater proportion of house arrestees had been married once, and community treatment center residents were more likely to have been married twice. However, house arrestees were more likely to have been married three times or more ( $p < 0.05$ ). Finally, the variable of living arrangements showed a greater proportion of house arrestees lived with a spouse, parent, friend, or had some other arrangements ( $p < 0.00$ ). Nearly all of the sample of community treatment residents lived at the community treatment center. This difference was to be expected. The researcher concluded that those groups were more equal than different in sociodemographic variables, thus justifying their grouping for the purpose of analysis.

In addition to the use of the detailed questionnaire administered to the offenders, data were also collected through the Maladaptive Behavior Report, filled out by the appropriate case managers of only the house arrestees. The Maladaptive Behavior Report asked the case managers to be objective and consistent in their opinions regarding the inmates' adjustment or maladjustment in the community. They were asked to fill out Part A and Part B of the report six months after the inmate had been in the program, and to fill out the termination report at the time of release of the inmates. Part A of the report asked for information about the inmate's behavior response to employment-related items (income, working conditions, interaction with co-workers, work attendance), addiction (alcohol, drug use, gambling), interpersonal (fighting, verbal abusiveness, maladaptive associates), economics (management of money),

adjustment (responses to physical conditions, psychological adjustment), and legal (behavioral responses to legal processes and other behavioral problems). The Maladaptive Behavior Report was forced choice. If the client had a maladaptive behavior problem, the case manager entered a "1" by the corresponding item. In the case of no maladaptive behavior, a zero was entered by the corresponding item. Part B of the report required the case managers' own feelings about the individual inmate regarding the inmate's social responsiveness and future prospects for crime and drug-free behavior. Here the ratings had three categories: above average, average, and below average. The case managers were also asked to note whether the client fulfilled the conditions and obligations of the program.

#### Success or Failure During the Program and After the Program

Program success (success at the end of each program) was defined by using the codes from the termination report of the Department of Corrections. Offenders who were discharged, paroled, were moved to a lower security level facility, or had their sentence commuted, were considered to be in the category of success. Program failure was also defined by using the codes from the classification sheet of the Department of Corrections. Thus, an offender who had a misconduct, arrest, escape, or who had moved to a higher security level setting was considered to be a program failure. Post program success (success in the community for one year after being released from the program) was defined as the lack of a reconviction record for a new offense in the records of the Department of Corrections. And finally, an offender who had a reconviction within one year after release was considered a post program failure. Most

criminological literature shows that a period of at least one year after release without a reconviction is necessary in order to determine recidivism (Glaser, 1964).

Since the researchers could not obtain Maladaptive Behavior Reports for all inmates (case managers are notorious for having an overabundance of paper work), these were collected only for 83 house arrest inmates. Termination reports were then gathered from the Department of Corrections for the remaining house arrest inmates. These reports provided information on the following items: termination date, reason for termination, whether the inmate had employment at termination, and income at termination. Since the researchers could not obtain detailed information on the Maladaptive Behavior Reports from the community treatment center personnel, the researchers received very basic and meager information on the community treatment center residents' termination dates and reasons for termination.

#### Statistical Measures

A factor analysis using principle components with an orthogonal Varimax rotation from the statistical system (SAS User's Guide, 1985) was used to determine if the items from the questionnaire showing attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief could be scaled together. A separate analysis was made for each of the three types of attachment.

Items from the questionnaire reflecting support from parents, spouse, and boy/girl friend; concern about hurting family; importance of getting affection from family; counting on family for help; respect from family; and independence from family were selected for analysis of attachment to family.

Since previous research has shown that the type of friends (conventional vs. criminal) made a difference in the prediction of recidivism (Myerhoff and Myerhoff, 1964; Mathur and Dodder, 1984), the present study looked separately at attachment to conventional friends vs. criminal friends and program and post program recidivism. Thus, items from the questionnaire reflecting attachment to conventional friends (having friends help out, respect of friends, do things own way with friends) were selected for measuring attachment to conventional friends. And similarly, other items showing attachment to friends involved in trouble (liked by friends involved in trouble, friends involved in trouble help out, do things own way with friends involved in trouble) were selected for construction of a scale of attachment to criminal friends.

Items reflecting support from employers, a satisfying and rewarding career, appreciation by the boss, liking by co-workers, and getting respect for job performance were selected for analysis of attachment to work. Items from the questionnaire reflecting commitment to a cause in life, commitment to helping family, and being late or absent from work without following procedures were selected from an analysis of commitment. Similarly, items from the questionnaire reflecting importance of wealth as a life goal, chances of achieving wealth as a life goal, and putting time and effort into something you are involved in were selected for an analysis of the variable of involvement. Items from the questionnaire reflecting the importance of prestige as a life goal and chances of achieving prestige as a life goal were selected for an analysis of belief. Finally, items from the questionnaire reflecting perception of the availability of conventional opportunities after coming out of prison, importance of having control over others, and chances of having control over others were selected for an analysis of the perception of

availability of conventional opportunities. On the other hand, items from the questionnaire that reflected finding criminal opportunities open after coming out of prison or opportunities for making money illegally were selected for the measure of perception of criminal opportunities.

Kuder Richardson coefficients were calculated after the construction of scales through the use of factor analysis. This coefficient determined the internal reliability of the scales.

Chi-square calculations were made in order to examine the relationship between sociodemographic variables, criminal history variables, substance abuse history variables in the three categories of program and post-program success or failure. Using the scales constructed through factor analysis, analysis of variance coefficients were calculated in order to determine significant differences between the dependent variable categories on the variables of attachment, commitment, involvement, belief, perception of conventional opportunities, and perception of criminal opportunities. Since a certain proportion of the comparisons of means determined through analysis of variance coefficients were expected to be different by chance, the conservative multiple comparison tests of Tukey and Scheffe were used.

### Validity

A test is considered to be valid if it measures what it purports to measure. Cook and Campbell (1979, p. 37) defined validity as the "best available approximation to the truth or falsity of propositions." The three basic divisions of validity, according to Cook and Campbell, are internal, external, and statistical conclusion validity. Statistical conclusion validity refers to inferences about whether it is reasonable to presume covariation, given a specified alpha level and the obtained

variances. Problems concerning statistical conclusion validity for this study were addressed by being aware of Type I and Type II errors, looking at the 95% confidence interval, and by being aware of statistically significant findings in small samples. Efforts were made to avoid violating the assumptions of the null hypothesis and the more important assumptions of the other tests being used.

Since the likelihood of falsely concluding that covariation exists when it does not (Type I error), increases when multiple comparisons of mean differences are made, the researcher recognized that a certain proportion of the comparisons would be different by chance. To alleviate this problem, the conservative multiple comparison test of Tukey or Scheff was used.

An examination of the threats to internal validity indicated that selection could be a threat to this study. Selection is a problem when one effect may be due to the difference between kinds of people in one experimental group as opposed to another. This is a pervasive problem in quasi-experimental design research especially, since in this type of research, different groups are receiving different treatments as opposed to probabilistically equivalent groups receiving treatments as in a randomized experiment. This was not a problem in the present study, since there are few significant differences between house arrest inmates and those at community treatment centers regarding sociodemographic variables. The offenders in the house arrest and community treatment center programs were found to have more similarities than differences. They were close to each other in sociodemographic characteristics (race, education, age at first arrest, previous occupation, marital status, number of children, job history, average monthly income, and type of resident community). They were different in a few respects: more house arrestees

were fully employed, stayed with their families (spouse, children, parents), were more likely to be male and to be married three or more times.

The third type of validity (called "construct validity") has to do with the confounding effect. This is related to the possibility that the operations which are meant to represent a particular cause or effect construct can be assembled in terms of more than one construct, each of which is stated at the same level of reduction (Cook and Campbell, 1979). A type of construct validity (called "interaction of different treatments") was solved for this study. This threat occurs if respondents experience more than one treatment. In examining raw data from the two programs, the researcher noted a small number of individuals who crossed from initially being in the community treatment center to house arrest and vice versa. But this did not contaminate the sample. The researcher coded those inmates who were on house arrest and moved to the community treatment centers as failures (since the community treatment center is a higher level of security), and coded the movement from a community treatment center to house arrest as a success.

This study collected data through a self-report questionnaire filled out by the respondents. Different studies have come to different conclusions regarding the validity of self-reported data. Several research projects have shown self-reported data to be accurate. Farrington (1973) believed that, given a choice between group self completion and interview of respondents, the former was more objective and capable of standardization. Also, in a face-to-face interview situation, the respondents were less likely to admit to deviant acts. Farrington believed the concurrent validity of self reports to be problematic, since it is difficult to carry out an exact comparison between self reports and official deviancy

data, due to the inability of police to observe an act which leads to reconviction. Farrington also believed that both self reports and official records are measures of deviant behavior, albeit subject to different biases. Clark and Tifft (cited in Farrington, 1973) used a polygraph criterion and reported that 92% of the answers on self reports were given honestly and that concealment was three times as common as exaggeration among the remainder. Farrington revealed that his questionnaire had a high internal consistency coefficient (.89) and thus showed that his self-report scale was concurrently valid. He concluded that the most accurate measure of deviant behavior could be a combination of official records and a self-report questionnaire.

Several other researchers pointed out the problems with the validity of using official data. Chambliss and Nagasawa (1969), in a comparative study of white, black, and Japanese high school students, concluded that official statistics were virtually useless as indicators of deviance. They suggested that the visibility of the offenses, the bias of the policing agencies, and the demeanor of the youth accounted for the rate and distribution of delinquency among the three groups, and that the official rates were a complete distortion of the actual incidence. They believed the self-report data to be more accurate in depicting the actual behavior of respondents. Short and Nye (1957) suggested using self-report questionnaires by going directly to the population being studied, and preferably seeking information in a noninstitutionalized setting. They acknowledged the problems with official statistics, but understood the necessity of using them. Short and Nye concluded by advocating the evaluation of official data through using data collected by self-reported behavior.



Similarly, Erickson and Empey (1963) acknowledged problems with the ability of official statistics to reveal the actual extent and types of offenses committed. Their research revealed that official records seemed to be more accurate in reflecting an individual's single most serious violation than did the pattern of offenses, either serious or nonserious, that he/she may commit. Erickson and Empey believed that court records, when compared with reported behavior, did distinguish persistent offenders from one-time offenders in terms of both number and seriousness of violation. Furthermore, they seemed quite efficient in indicating the most serious violations which persistent offenders had committed.

Kulik, Stein, and Sarbin (1968) addressed the question of anonymity being a necessary condition for a candid self report of antisocial behavior. They found that although their groups disclosed more under conditions of anonymity, the differences in scores were comparatively small. They also found the subjects to be more candid about commitment of serious offenses versus reporting minor infractions.

Validity of coding of data for this project was conducted in the following manner: the researcher randomly selected the questionnaires of five subjects and checked answers with the computer printout of the data in order to determine if any mistakes had been made. All of the data were found to be accurately coded. Similarly, the researcher verified the validity of the computer analysis by randomly selecting five people from the data set, hand calculating their scores on the variable of attachment to parents, and then checking it against the computer printout scores for these subjects. All of them were found to be accurate. Finally, only one person wrote a fictitious name against the Department of Corrections' identity numbers given on the questionnaire by the

respondents. This further reassured the researcher about the validity of the data collected.

### Generalizability

Bracht and Glass (1968) defined generalizability or external validity as a two-stage process: (1) a target population of persons, settings, or times has first to be defined; and (2) samples are drawn to represent these populations. It is widely recognized in field research that samples cannot be drawn systematically, are drawn because they are convenient, and because they give an initial impression of representativeness. In addition, the financial and logistical problems also play a role in the type of sample collected. Since samples of convenience do not make it easy to infer target populations, the researcher is well aware of the many problems of generalizability this study may have to a target population where similarly appearing treatments are implemented. The study did not try to generalize beyond the groups used to establish initial relationships to other social, racial, geographical, age, or sex groups. The target population here was the inmates and residents of these two programs residing in a north central Oklahoma area during 1985-1986. The study provided a description of the sample, and where appropriate, the reader can generalize to the appropriate population.

Also, there may be some influence due to the interaction between setting and treatment. Although the questionnaires were anonymous and confidential, they were administered in the correctional facility when the administrators of the programs were present. This was due to the fact that the meeting time of the offenders with the case managers of the two programs was used to administer the questionnaires. However, the researcher anticipated no problems, since the questionnaires were

collected after completion by the researcher. The respondents were also reassured about confidentiality of the information given by them.

### Reliability

This study had two aspects:

1. An examination of the sociodemographic substance abuse history, and criminal history variables as predictors of recidivism.

2. Testing theories--Hirschi's (1969) Control Theory and Glaser's (1978) Differential Anticipation Theory--and their relationship to recidivism.

Both aspects of the study become predictors of reliability, since both sections were trying to replicate previous findings in criminological and penological research. In addition, the researcher scaled the internal consistency of the items in order to determine the reliability of the measures. A literature review about information on the test-retest reliability of self reports of deviant behavior showed that, according to some researchers (Farrington, 1973), scales that contain many items and cover several types of deviant behavior were found to be internally consistent to a high degree. Dentler and Monroe (1961) also reported on the reliability of self reports of deviant behavior when they found that each of their five items was given the same response by at least 92% of the subjects in a test-retest given two weeks apart.

### Limitation of the Study

Sutherland and Cressey (1974) believed the statistics about crime and delinquency to be the most unreliable and difficult among all social statistics that are gathered. They pointed to the difficulty in accurately determining the amount of crime in any given jurisdiction. This

may be a special problem in this study where we have determined recidivism in the post-program period in the community by examining the reconviction records with the Department of Corrections. Some problems are:

1. A large proportion of law violators go undetected.
2. Other crimes are detected but not reported; others are reported but not officially recorded.
3. Even within a single police department, many crimes are "lost" between recording and arrest, the exact number being different depending on the honesty and efficiency of the police department and with the policy of handling cases without actual arrest.
4. Many crimes are "lost" between arrest and prosecution; some crimes are more frequently prosecuted than others (e.g., murder, rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary, larceny, and automobile theft).

Thus, the number of crimes known and reported to the police and reported by the police is not an adequate or complete index of all crimes committed. This creates problems for the definition of success in this study, since the group called "successful" may have committed a crime which either was undetected, unreported, or got "lost" between reporting and prosecution. There are additional problems that the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973) discussed as being troublesome in regard to defining the criteria of success in correctional programs. The Commission pointed out that it may not be accurate to presume that the programs succeeded with those offenders who did not fail. Several reasons are given for this statement:

1. Even though no new offense may have been committed, the offender may have become a public dependent of some kind--a client on welfare rolls, an alcoholic on skid row, or a patient in a mental hospital. All

of these ex-offenders, while technically not correctional failures, can hardly be called correctional successes.

2. An offender may be defined as being successful when he/she has endured the program without benefit, but for various reasons has managed to abide by the law or has avoided detection in the commission of new crimes for the follow-up period. These individuals are believed to be self-correcting individuals and may not have needed the program in the first place. It seems easy to claim these individuals as successes, but unless the success can be related to the program in some manner, the claim is not accurate.

Following are several specific problems with the current study:

1. Since no existing instrument was found to be appropriate for collecting these data, the researchers constructed their own instrument. Although several methods were used to make checks on different types of validity issues, this area is always of some concern in most research.

2. The researchers missed administering the instrument to a small number of offenders who were not present at the time, and it is not known if these offenders were different from the offenders who did answer the questionnaire.

The researcher, while being cognizant of these generic and specific problems with the data, attempted to interpret results with appropriate care.

## CHAPTER III

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Criminological and penological literature is replete with information on the theories and interpretations of crime causation. These theories range from biological explanations (Lombroso, 1911; Sheldon, 1949), sociological explanations (Durkheim, 1951; Merton, 1957; Sutherland and Cressey, 1947; Glaser, 1964; Miller, 1958; Hirschi, 1969), psychoanalytical studies (Freud, 1949; Aichhorn, 1963; Erickson, 1963), and conflict theories (Chambliss, 1975; Quinney, 1977) to the labeling approach (Becker, 1963; Schur, 1971; Lemert, 1967). For the purpose of this study, the researcher examined the sociological theories of crime causation relevant for the issues discussed in this project. The development of Hirschi's (1969) Control Theory and Glaser's (1978) Differential Anticipation Theory, tested in the present study, can also be traced to this group of theories. Both of these theories have generated a great deal of interest in the criminological literature. Glaser's (1978) Differential Anticipation Theory is especially relevant if one is examining the factors involved in an offender's successful post-program readjustment into the community.

The three broad divisions of the sociological theories discussed here are the following: (1) strain or motivation theories (anomie); (2) cultural conflict, cultural transmission, and differential association theories; and (3) control theories.

### Strain or Motivation Theories

Strain theories suggest that the organization or disorganization of society causes anomie (normlessness), since it leads to confusion about norms that regulate behavior. According to Durkheim (1951), strain is developed when these norms are ambiguous or in conflict with other norms, or when they fail to provide opportunity for people to meet their needs. Durkheim believed that this led to a sense of frustration, normlessness, rootlessness, and uncertainty, which often produces behavior that violates social norms.

Merton (1957) extended the concept of anomie. His work exemplified the theoretical orientation of the functional analyst who considered socially deviant behavior as much a product of the social structure as conformist behavior. Functional analysts believe the social structure to be active in producing motivation which cannot be predicted on the basis of knowledge about man's natural drives or a pathological personality. These analysts, on the other hand, explain how the social and cultural structure generates pressure for socially deviant behavior upon people variously located in that structure. For example, high rates of departure from institutional requirements are seen as a result of culturally induced deep motivations which cannot be satisfied if one belongs to the social structure where the opportunities are limited.

Merton (1957) further discussed two elements of social and cultural structures. He called the first "culturally defined goals" (legitimate objectives for all things worth striving for), and the second "socially defined means to those goals" (regulations rooted in the mores or institutions of allowable procedures for moving toward those goals). If there is an effective equilibrium between these two phases of the sociological

structure, there is continuing satisfaction. However, anomie and deviant behavior takes place when there is a discrepancy between culturally defined goals and the socially allowable means to those goals. Merton further discussed five types of adaptations that individuals may make within the culture bearing society. He called these conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism, and rebellion. Of these, innovation and rebellion are believed to produce the most strain toward deviant behavior. Merton also emphasized the role played by the family in these patterns of deviant behavior. He projected the family as being a major transmission belt for the diffusion of cultural standards and for disciplining the child in terms of cultural goals. According to Merton, children themselves detect and incorporate cultural uniformities and thus form goals and an explicit cultural orientation.

Cloward (1959) attempted to further consolidate the anomie tradition by combining ideas from the Differential Association Theory and the Cultural Transmission Theory. He incorporated another concept which he called "differentials in access to success goals by illegitimate means" (p. 164). According to Cloward, the notion that innovating behavior may result from a lack of fulfilled aspirations and imperfect socialization regarding conventional norms seems to imply that illegitimate means are freely available. This is not so.

Cloward (1959) further quoted Sutherland and Cressey's (1974) study of the professional thief to say that in order to be a thief, for example, one has to be appreciated by other professional thieves. This tutelage is only given to a few persons. Thus, there is a process of selection, induction, and assumption of full status in the criminal group; motivation or pressure toward deviance alone do not completely seem to account for deviant behavior. This availability of illegitimate



means is limited and differentially available, depending on where the persons are located in the social structure. Cloward then concentrated on the question of whether there are any social structural differentials in access to illegitimate learning environments and also on the differences which may limit the fulfillment of illegitimate roles. He agreed with Kobrin (1951) that there are differentials in access to illegitimate learning opportunities and that leaders of illegal enterprises also may frequently maintain memberships in some conventional institutions.

Parsons (1951) related the concepts of strain, polarization, and criminality. According to Parsons, when people experience frustration in the pursuit of conventional goals they exhibit ambivalence toward authoritarian figures or toward rules and laws that give them trouble, but interaction with others commits them to more definite pro or con attitudes. However, this behavior, which is reflected by these attitudes, may be either active or passive. Parsons used the following dichotomies: pro or con, persons or rules and laws, and active or passive, to identify eight patterns of polarization in attitude and conduct. Thus, Parsons explained how commitments for and against criminal deviance fluctuate with interaction among persons of contrasting attitudes and how most criminality is indicative of a longer period of interaction than that which immediately precedes the offense.

Culture Conflict, Cultural Transmission  
Theories, and Differential  
Association Theories

Cultural transmission theory explained deviant behavior in terms of socialization to norms, motives, and skills that differ from those of the

dominant culture. One of the most influential theories that examined the way that rule breakers learn the motives and skills to violate norms is the Differential Association Theory by Sutherland and Cressey (1974). This theory seeks to explain why individuals become criminal and why crime rates vary from group to group in society. Some propositions made by Sutherland and Cressey are summarized below.

Criminal behavior is primarily a product of learning that occurs in intimate interpersonal relationships and is either supportive of or antagonistic to law breaking. Emphasis is paid to the intensity, priority, frequency, and duration of these relationships as determining their influence on conduct. Thus, offenses are caused by learning "an excess of definitions favorable over excess of definitions unfavorable" to engaging in crime (Sutherland and Cressey, 1974, p. 75). This is the basic principal of differential association, since it refers to both criminal and anti-criminal associations as counter-acting forces. This process of learning criminal behavior by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns includes all mechanisms involved in any other learning, according to Sutherland and Cressey.

As an addition to the culture transmission concept, Miller (1958) emphasized the distinctive culture of the lower classes, which he believed to be crimogenic due to its "focal concerns" (p. 5). This lower class culture, according to Miller, has arisen through conflict with middle-class culture and is oriented to the deliberate violation of middle-class norms. Some "focal concerns" that Miller described are: trouble (getting in and out of trouble), toughness (masculinity, physical prowess), fate (destiny), autonomy (independence from external controls), and excitement (seeking thrills). To Miller, these cultural practices have elements that violate legal norms.

Glaser (1978) combined differential association and control theories and called this theory the Differential Anticipation Theory. He also included biological and personality factors as additional influences. Glaser believed that an individual's crime or restraint from crime is influenced by the consequences he anticipates from it. According to Glaser, expectations determine the conduct of human beings and are influenced by:

1. Social Bonds. These could be both criminal and anti-criminal bonds developed by individuals during their lifetime. Their object is to create a stake in conformity in the conventional society in order to please conventional others rather than alienate them.

2. Differential Learning. This is a process through which tastes, skills, and rationalizations are acquired which determine whether gratification is achieved through criminal or noncriminal activities.

3. Perceived Opportunities. These reflect a person's observation of circumstances and assessments of prospects and risks in criminal or conventional behavior.

According to Glaser (1978):

Differential association theory assumes that a person will try to commit a crime wherever and whenever the expectations of gratification occur from it--as a result of social bonds, differential learning and perceptions of opportunity, exceed the unfavorable anticipations from these sources (p. 127).

Glaser admitted to his theoretical perspective being identical to that developed by Briar and Pilavin (1965) on situational inducements to delinquency.

In addition, Glaser (1987) acknowledged the indirect influence of: (1) biological inheritance or physical abilities or deficiencies that develop later, and (2) capacities that are mental or emotional in nature. Glaser believed that these indirect influences also made an impact on an

individual's social relationships, learning, and prospects for gratification by influencing his/her conduct while they look for both legitimate and illegitimate opportunities. Thus, generally speaking, this theory looked at drift and reinforcement as factors influencing criminal behavior. This theory also agreed with the labeling perspective which contends that sometimes the criminal's social bonds with other criminals increase their chances of remaining in crime. Conversely, if social bonds are strong with conventional friends; the likelihood of being able to lead a crime-free life may increase significantly. The second aspect of compatibility with the labeling perspective is that this theory also believed that criminals will be deterred for fear of being labeled negatively, since it would lead to jeopardization of conventional social bonds and opportunities.

As an idea analogous to the one discussed above, Briar and Pilavin (1965) discussed delinquent behavior as being frequently episodic, confined to certain situations, and oriented to short-term ends. They disagreed with the so-called "subcultural theorists," who argued that the infractions of delinquents are different in origination than those of the nondelinquents. They emphasized the situational factors that confront individuals with conflicts, opportunities, pressures, and temptations. They agreed with other theorists (Gouldner, 1954) that situationally induced stimuli, even of short duration, can change the value and behavior of individuals and are sufficient to influence even deviant behavior. These theorists also discussed the influence of the concept of commitment as a constraint on deviance and as a central process of social control. If a juvenile is committed to conformity and to achieving the desired statuses, he/she is much more likely to respect authority figures and be more fearful, contrite, and repentant when confronted with misdeeds.

Conversely, a juvenile with a low stake in conformity is far less likely to exhibit these attributes. In addition, a stake in or commitment to conformity will also influence the choice of peers. Juveniles with a high stake in conformity are much more likely to engage in social interaction with peers belonging to a similar level. This same is true for juveniles with less at stake.

Briar and Pilavin (1965) shared the basis for commitment to conformity, perhaps with Hirschi's (1969) Control Theory. As with Hirschi's Control Theory, Briar and Pilavin believed that the conditions leading to the development of commitment are affection for conventionally behaved peers, occupational aspirations, ties to parents, desire to do well academically, and fear of problems arising out of arrest. Of these, they believed attachment to parents to be the most important factor in commitment. Their analyses tried to explain the hostile or indifferent attitude that a juvenile with a low stake in conformity may have toward figures in authority by suggesting that the approval of these adult figures holds less significance for them than for a high-stake juvenile.

#### Control Theories

According to Landis (1939, p. 20), "Social control is concerned with an understanding of how society makes its members susceptible to its regulative system and makes them conform to it." Instead of an analysis of society's regulative system, Landis placed emphasis on how social influences operate on the individuals to control them. One observes that nearly every phase of human thought that deals with conduct (philosophy, ethics, religion, law, sociology) is concerned with the problems of order and authority. While examining the root of social harmony, order, and solidarity, Durkheim (1951) conceived of morals as the ties that hold

society together. According to Durkheim, whenever people live together in groups, rules of behavior to which individuals conform will develop. In the course of time, social bonds that unite individuals together and lead to cooperation also develop. To Durkheim, this was the core of positive social philosophy.

Hirschi's (1969) Social Control Theory has been called a benchmark for theory construction and research in the area of the study of delinquent behavior. Hirschi viewed delinquency as persons free of intimate attachments, aspirations, and moral beliefs that bind most people to lawfulness. To Hirschi, delinquency was the norm and conformity the exception that had to be explained. Conformity was learned through the process of socialization. Hirschi's Control Theory assumed that delinquent acts take place when an individual's bonds to society are broken or weak in nature. Hirschi's theory goes back to the Hobbesian idea that human behavior is not inherently conforming, but that we are all animals and thus naturally capable of committing criminal acts. Thus, since delinquency is intrinsic to human nature, it is conformity that must be explained. The four elements of the bond are: attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief. For Hirschi, the concept of attachment corresponded to the affective ties that the youth formed to significant others. Since parents act as role models and teach their children socially acceptable behavior, the family environment is believed to be the source of attachment. The three attachments Hirschi discussed were: attachment to parents, to peers, and to school. On the basis of his research, Hirschi also concluded that adolescents who belong to families of lower socioeconomic status and who have limited intellectual capacity will develop unfavorable attitudes toward school, thus predisposing the juvenile to become delinquent.

Hirschi (1969) also proposed that the weaker the parental attachment, the greater the likelihood of delinquency and greater the chance that adolescents will have delinquent friends. He considered commitment to be an investment in conventional behavior that is related to the aspiration of attending college and attaining a high status job. This would be in jeopardy should a juvenile engage in delinquent behavior. In contrast to youths with a commitment to the conventional order, adolescents who engage in drinking, smoking, dating, and other behavior not oriented toward future goals are much more likely to engage in delinquent behavior.

Involvement or engrossment in conventional activities is the third element of the bond. Here Hirschi (1969) essentially went by the age-old doctrine of "an idle mind is a devil's workshop." He believed that since time and energy in human beings was limited, juveniles who were more involved in conventional activities (homework, sports, recreation, hobbies) do not have time to be idle and thus get involved in delinquent activities. The fourth element of the bond is belief. Hirschi was convinced of a common value system within society. Belief, then, was "the acceptance of the moral validity of the central social-value system" (Hirschi, 1969, p. 26). Variation in the acceptance of social rules was central to the Social Control Theory, since the less rule-bound individuals felt, the more likely they were to break those rules.

Unlike the Cultural Deviance Theory (Miller, 1958), Control Theory does not assume that different social structures have a different value system. In addition, Hirschi did not assume (as did Sykes and Matza, 1957) that adolescents neutralize their acts before engaging in delinquency. In contrast, Hirschi believed that the "Beliefs that free a man to commit deviant acts are unmotivated in the sense that he does not

construct or adopt them in order to facilitate the attainment of illicit ends" (Hirschi, 1969, p. 34). Hirschi also disagreed with Matza, who said that delinquents agree with the conventional assessment of delinquency. He assumed, on the other hand, that there was a difference in the extent to which people bide by the rules of society and people were more likely to violate rules if they did not believe in them. These beliefs were related to values relative to law and the legal system. Thus, high education, high occupational aspirations, and orientation toward high achievement were predictive of nondelinquency.

Hirschi (1969) was in agreement with many of the views propounded earlier by Matza (1964). Matza criticized the positivistic criminological view of the delinquent as someone bereft of freedom and reason. He believed that a search for causal determination deprived human action of freedom. He thus made a case for soft determination. Matza disagreed with the positivistic criminological viewpoint, which pictured the delinquent as being fundamentally different from the law-abiding citizen. He also disagreed with the subcultural theory view that the beliefs of delinquents are fundamentally different from those of conventional youth. To him, delinquency was a status, and delinquents were incumbents who intermittently acted out this role and the role of a "normal" person. Matza believed that most delinquents were perfectly capable of conventional activity, and that they were adrift between freedom and control, transiently existing between convention and crime. Matza recognized the influence of school, family, and peers, and acknowledged the influence of peer culture leading to delinquent acts but was convinced that even in that situation, commitment to delinquency was a misconception.

Nye (1958) agreed with the view that it was conformity and not deviation that must be learned, and that general behavior prescribed as



delinquent or criminal does not need to be explained in the positivistic sense. Social control was supposed to come through the processes, agencies, and relationships that prevented deviant behavior. To Nye (1958):

Social control embraces the following attitude and behavioral patterns: (1) direct control imposed from without by means of restriction and punishment, (2) internalized control exercised from within through conscience, (3) indirect control related to affectional identification with parents and other noncriminal persons, and (4) availability of alternative means to goals and values (p. 5).

The third variable of indirect control only has meaning when there is an affectionate relationship between parents and children. Here Nye (1958) agreed with Landis (1939) that affection for parents and other conforming persons makes a major contribution toward the control of deviant behavior. Nye believed that a parent may be completely accepted, partially rejected (e.g., if the parent belongs to a lower class than the children, is rurally located, or is an immigrant with "old world" values), or completely rejected, and that indirect control will decrease as negative feelings towards the parents increase. Conclusions from Nye's data showed a significant relationship between delinquent behavior and the attitudes of juveniles toward each parent. In addition, mutual acceptance or rejection of parent and child was more closely related to delinquent behavior. Nye measured adolescent value agreement to delinquent behavior by using a composite score and engaged in individual analyses of various value items. His analyses supported the hypothesis that parent-child value agreement was in itself negatively related to delinquency. Nye also found a general sex difference on control. He found that although some of the controls over both girls and boys were exercised by institutions like schools, peers, churches, and law enforcement agencies, the proportion of control exercised by the family was

greater for girls than boys, and the role of parents was more significant for girls.

Reiss (1950, p. 196) defined delinquency as "The behavior consequent to the failure of personal and social controls to produce behavior in conformity with the norms of the social system to which legal penalties are attached." He defined social control as "The ability of social groups or institutions to make norms or rules effective" (p. 196). According to Reiss, delinquent activity is likely to take place when there is a situation which has a relative absence of norms and rules that are internalized which conform to the norms of the social system and also to which legal penalties are attached. Delinquent activity is also more likely when there is a breakdown in controls previously established, or when there is a relative absence of conflict in social rules. Therefore, Reiss saw delinquency as a consequence of the type of relationship established among personal and social controls.

Reiss (1950) also believed that personal and social controls were less effective in governing the behavior of delinquent recidivists than nonrecidivists. He tried to isolate a set of personal and social controls using delinquent recidivism as a predictor of delinquency. He also measured personal controls and social control in primary groups and social control by community and institutions. To him, control in primary groups came through providing the child with nondelinquent social rules and by employing techniques which made nondelinquent norms and rules effective. Reiss believed that the structure of a family milieu helps a child develop appropriate social controls so that the child identifies with family members who represent roles of conformity in comparison to nondelinquent norms and rules. To Reiss, another major factor in the development of personal controls was related to the moral ideal that

parents represented (i.e., if they represented social roles congruent with the nondelinquent norms and rules of society and exercised control so the child also accepted these social definitions). His analysis showed that delinquents from families with unfavorable moral ideals or techniques of control were more likely to be recidivists than were delinquents from families with favorable moral ideals.

Reiss (1950) also discussed the social controls of the community and its institutions. His analysis showed a significant positive relationship between acceptance to control of school and nondelinquency. This outcome was related to the control of behavior that took place in conformity with conventional norms. Reiss thus believed that internalized controls of social groups governing behavior in conformity with nondelinquent group expectations were likely to keep adolescents nondelinquent.

Toby (1958) explained the delinquency and crime of young hoodlums by emphasizing: (1) the lack of external controls over them which led to their acting out their antisocial impulses, and (2) the likelihood that they were not under the influence of the family unit. He used the theoretical perspective of "social disorganization" to explain predatory crime. To Toby, the parents exercise ineffective control over hoodlums and so do the community organizations. Young hoodlums also steal because this is the expected behavior in their peer group, according to Toby. They are hostile to conventional values and, in fact, reject conventional values because in terms of conventional values they may be considered failures (here Toby took a different perspective from Hirschi, 1969). Toby traced the basis for school adjustment to the home and community and believed that the young hoodlums were more likely to be failures at school. Unfortunately, educational failure was also predictive of occupational failure, which created further problems for them. Toby further

believed in the universality of impulses to violate the rules of society, both among middle and lower classes. But the reason lower class boys were more likely to yield to these temptations was because the middle class boys had more to lose by engaging in deviancy in terms of future prospects for bright and successful lives. To Toby, adolescents vary in deviant activity to the extent of their stake in conformity.

Finally, Zucker (1943), in a research project conducted two decades before Hirschi's (1969), came to the following conclusions:

1. Fewer delinquents seemed to show affectional attachment to their parents than did nondelinquents.
2. Delinquents were more likely to exhibit a lack of regard for the welfare of their parents than were nondelinquents.
3. Delinquents were less inclined to identify with their parents on occasions than nondelinquents, including personality characteristics.

#### Evaluation Studies of Community Treatment Centers

A host of evaluation studies of community treatment centers have taken place in the last 30 years. Some of these are summarized below.

The Federal prison system studied the effectiveness of 14 community treatment centers in 1976. They came to the conclusion that a large proportion of the community treatment center population seemed to have a substance abuse history, but that did not result in a significant threat to the community. They found that residents who did not have a previous criminal history, no parole revocation, had never made an escape attempt or tried to engage in auto theft, were more likely to be successful in the program. The study also showed that residents released through a community treatment center when compared with those released directly from a prison were more likely to work longer and earn more income during

the first six months. The community treatment center residents still showed better employment after one year; however, the difference between these groups at this stage was not statistically significant.

In 1975, the Oklahoma Crime Commission conducted a study of five community treatment centers in this state. They compared recidivism rates for those residents who were released between 1971 to 1975 to those offenders who were released from other correctional institutions in the same time period in Oklahoma. Their findings were that a stay in a community treatment center did not reduce chances of recidivism. They also did not find the community treatment centers to be more cost effective than traditional prisons. However, this may have been due to the fact that the centers had been recently constructed and became cost effective only after a period of time.

The Pennsylvania Bureau of Corrections also conducted a study of the community service centers in their state in 1972. The evaluation study consisted of a comparison of recidivism rates of offenders released to community treatment services to those offenders released immediately on parole. This study found that the parolees were three times as likely to be recidivists than were the community services group.

Finally, Jenkins et al. (1975) conducted a follow-up study of the Alabama Work Release Program. This program was assessed by examining its effects on the ex-offenders' post-release behavioral adjustment over 12 to 18 months. This study compared male residents of a work release program to two other groups--one group composed of those offenders who met the selection standards but did not participate in the program, and another group of offenders who were neither selected nor participated in the work release program. Their study found that participation in the work release program significantly reduced post-program encounters with

the law. Adjustment to work was significantly better for this group. They adjusted better to the community and adapted more easily to the post-prison life in the community.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

The first part of the present study consisted of determining differences by background variables regarding program and post-program success or failure. Following are three categories on which the sample was compared, in order to determine significant differences regarding recidivism: (1) sociodemographic variables, (2) criminal background variables, and (3) substance abuse history variables.

Table II shows the percentages in each sociodemographic variable on the dependent variable categories. Fourteen variables were analyzed for this purpose. These were: race, sex, G.E.D., occupation, employment, previous occupation, skill, marital status, times married, living arrangements, number of children, job history, average monthly income, and type of resident community. Chi-square calculations showed significant variation in two of the comparisons. The likelihood of program and post-program success or failure varied with race ( $p < 0.04$ ). Whites showed a higher proportion in the category of program and post success, while blacks were more likely to be program successes and post-program failures. American Indians showed a higher proportion in the category of program failure, post-program success. In general, minorities seemed to have greater difficulty in making adjustments, either to the program or to the community.

Significant variation was also found in the variable of living arrangements ( $p < 0.05$ ). Those persons who lived with their spouses were

TABLE II  
 PERCENTAGES IN EACH SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLE  
 ON PROGRAM AND POST-PROGRAM SUCCESS OR  
 FAILURE CATEGORIES

Sociodemographic Variable Categories	Program and Post-Program Success or Failure			
	Program/ Post Program Success (N=133)	Program Success/ Post Program Failure (N=23)	Program Failure/ Post Program Success (N=12)	Total Sample (N=168)
<u>Race*</u>				
White	69.17	47.83	50.00	64.88
Black	21.80	52.17	25.00	26.19
Mexican American	.75	0	0	.60
American Indian	7.52	0	25.00	7.74
Other	.75	0	0	.60
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	73.28	73.91	91.67	74.70
Female	26.72	26.09	8.33	25.30
<u>G.E.D.</u>				
Yes	41.96	36.36	16.67	40.00
No	58.04	63.64	83.33	60.00
<u>Occupation</u>				
Unskilled	42.70	40.00	60.00	43.43
Semi-skilled	38.20	20.00	20.00	36.36
Skilled	6.74	0	0	6.06
White-collar	12.36	40.00	20.00	14.14
<u>Employment</u>				
Full-time	61.54	36.36	45.45	57.06
Part-time	15.38	13.64	18.18	15.34
Unemployed	23.08	50.00	36.36	27.61
<u>Previous Occupation</u>				
Unskilled	30.43	35.00	70.00	33.79
Semi-skilled	26.96	15.00	10.00	24.14
Skilled	13.91	20.00	10.00	14.48
White-collar	28.70	30.00	10.00	27.59



TABLE II (Continued)

Sociodemographic Variable Categories	Program and Post-Program Success or Failure			
	Program/ Post Program Success (N=133)	Program Success/ Post Program Failure (N=23)	Program Failure/ Post Program Success (N=12)	Total Sample (N=168)
<u>Skill</u>				
Unskilled	23.68	23.81	50.00	25.52
Semi-skilled	40.35	42.86	30.00	40.00
Skilled	12.28	14.29	10.00	12.41
White-collar	23.68	19.05	10.00	22.07
<u>Marital Status</u>				
Single	40.77	27.27	50.00	39.63
Legally Married	24.62	22.73	33.33	25.00
Common Law Marriage	10.00	27.27	16.67	12.80
Separated/Divorced	24.62	22.73	0	22.56
<u>Times Married</u>				
Once	50.00	80.00	83.33	55.56
Twice	31.25	13.33	16.67	28.21
Three or More	18.75	6.67	0	16.24
<u>Living Arrangements*</u>				
Living With Spouse	22.14	13.04	40.00	21.95
Living With Parent	19.08	13.04	0	17.07
Living Independently	15.27	0	20.00	13.41
Living With Friend	5.34	0	10.00	4.88
C.T.C.	29.77	65.22	20.00	34.15
Other	8.40	8.70	10.00	8.54
<u>Number of Children</u>				
None	33.33	40.91	58.33	36.25
One	19.05	18.18	25.00	19.38
Two	19.05	18.18	16.67	18.75
Three	15.08	18.18	0	14.38
Four or More	13.49	4.55	0	11.25

TABLE II (Continued)

Sociodemographic Variable Categories	Program and Post-Program Success or Failure			
	Program Post Program Success (N=133)	Program Success/ Post Program Failure (N=23)	Program Failure/ Post Program Success (N=12)	Total Sample (N=168)
<u>Job History</u>				
Mostly Employed	82.71	82.61	66.67	81.55
Sometimes Employed	13.53	13.04	33.33	14.88
Never Employed	3.76	4.35	0	3.57
<u>Average Monthly Income</u>				
Under \$400	25.81	20.00	10.00	24.03
\$401 - \$800	29.84	35.00	40.00	31.17
\$801 - \$1200	31.45	40.00	50.00	33.77
Above \$1200	12.90	5.00	0	11.04
<u>Type of Resident Community</u>				
Farming (Rural)	12.61	11.11	10.00	12.24
Town	5.88	22.22	10.00	8.16
Tulsa Suburb	24.37	16.67	30.00	23.81
Metro	57.14	50.00	50.00	55.78

\*Chi-square is significant at the .05 level.

more likely to be program failures but post-program successes. Persons living with parents showed a higher proportion in the category of program, post-program success. Those living independently showed a greater proportion in the category of program failure and post-program success. Persons living with a friend were more likely to be program failures and post-program successes. Finally, community treatment center residents showed a higher percentage in the category of program success and

post-program failure. The above indicators point out that sociodemographically, the minority status acts as a disadvantage for reintegration into the community, and support from close family members comes as a help for readjustment.

Table III shows the percentages in each criminal background variable on program and post-program success or failure categories. Fifteen variables were analyzed for this purpose. 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, juvenile probation, adult probation, time spent in juvenile correctional institutions, time spent in adult institutions, time spent outside between incarcerations, current offense, and previous offenses with incarcerations. Chi-square calculations found significant differences in the following variable: conviction by juvenile court ( $p < 0.02$ ). A greater proportion of those individuals who had no convictions, or only one conviction, by juvenile court were found in the category of program and post-program success. Individuals with two convictions were more likely to be program failures but post-program successes, and individuals with three or four convictions were more likely to be program successes but post-program failures. Therefore, repeated convictions tend to impair ex-prisoners' success in the community more so than juvenile convictions.

Table IV shows percentages in each substance abuse history variable on program and post-program success or failure categories. Thirteen variables were analyzed for this purpose. They were: beer drinking, wine drinking, liquor drinking, smoking marijuana, other drug use, number of beers consumed at one time, glasses of wine consumed at one time, number of liquor drinks consumed at one time, kinds of drugs used, crimes

TABLE III  
 PERCENTAGES IN EACH CRIMINAL BACKGROUND VARIABLE  
 ON PROGRAM AND POST-PROGRAM SUCCESS OR  
 FAILURE CATEGORIES

Criminal Background Variable Categories	Program and Post-Program Success or Failure			
	Program/ Post Program Success (N=133)	Program Success/ Post Program Failure (N=23)	Program Failure/ Post Program Success (N=12)	Total Sample (N=168)
<u>Age at First Arrest</u>				
20 years & below	57.14	78.26	58.33	60.12
20 - 40 years	37.59	13.04	33.33	33.93
More than 40 years	5.26	8.70	8.33	5.95
<u>Age at First Con- viction</u>				
20 years & below	42.11	60.87	50.00	45.24
20 - 40 years	51.13	30.43	41.67	47.62
More than 40 years	6.77	8.70	8.33	7.14
<u>Conviction by Juvenile Court*</u>				
None	68.25	47.62	58.33	64.78
One	19.05	14.29	16.67	18.24
Two	4.76	9.52	25.00	6.92
Three	1.59	9.52	0	2.52
Four or More	6.35	19.05	0	7.55
<u>Conviction as an Adult</u>				
None	4.62	0	8.33	4.24
One	37.69	56.52	33.33	40.00
Two	30.00	17.39	33.33	28.48
Three	17.69	0	8.33	14.55
Four or More	10.00	26.09	16.67	12.73
<u>Juvenile Probation</u>				
None	72.44	60.87	66.67	70.37
One	18.11	21.74	33.33	19.75
Two	4.72	4.35	0	4.32
Three	2.36	4.35	0	2.47
Four or More	2.36	8.70	0	3.09

TABLE III (Continued)

Criminal Background Variable Categories	Program and Post-Program Success or Failure			
	Program/ Post Program Success (N=133)	Program Success/ Post Program Failure (N=23)	Program Failure/ Post Program Success (N=12)	Total Sample (N=168)
<u>Adult Probation</u>				
None	29.46	31.82	33.33	30.06
One	44.96	59.09	41.67	46.63
Two	22.48	4.55	25.00	20.25
Three	1.55	4.55	0	1.84
Four or More	1.55	0	0	1.23
<u>Commitment to Juvenile Institutions</u>				
None	79.23	59.09	75.00	76.22
One	13.08	31.82	16.67	15.85
Two	4.62	4.55	0	4.27
Three	1.54	0	8.33	1.83
Four or More	1.54	4.55	0	1.83
<u>Adult Incarcerations</u>				
None	8.40	8.70	16.67	9.04
One	60.31	69.57	58.33	61.45
Two	21.37	13.04	16.67	19.88
Three	7.63	4.35	0	6.63
Four or More	2.29	4.35	8.33	3.01
<u>Juvenile Probation (in Years)</u>				
None	59.65	38.10	33.33	54.86
Less Than One Year	10.53	14.29	33.33	12.50
More Than One Year	29.82	47.62	33.33	32.64
<u>Adult Probation</u>				
None	25.22	31.82	10.00	25.17
Less Than One Year	7.83	9.09	20.00	8.84
More Than One Year	66.96	59.09	70.00	65.99

TABLE III (Continued)

Criminal Background Variable Categories	Program and Post-Program Success or Failure			
	Program/ Post Program Success (N=133)	Program Success/ Post Program Failure (N=23)	Program Failure/ Post Program Success (N=12)	Total Sample (N=168)
<u>Time Spent in Juvenile Correctional Institu- tions</u>				
None	80.34	59.09	63.64	76.00
Less Than One Year	7.69	9.09	9.09	8.00
More Than One Year	11.97	31.82	27.27	16.00
<u>Time Spent in Adult Institutions</u>				
None	10.48	18.18	18.18	12.10
Less Than One Year	22.58	22.73	27.27	22.93
One Year	21.77	27.27	18.18	22.29
Two Years	14.52	9.09	27.27	14.65
More Than Two Years	30.65	22.73	9.09	28.03
<u>Time Spent Outside Between Incarcerations</u>				
None	36.62	30.77	0	34.09
One Year	12.68	15.38	0	12.50
More Than One Year	50.70	53.85	100.00	53.41
<u>Current Offense</u>				
Violent	11.48	5.00	0	9.80
Theft	24.59	50.00	36.36	28.76
Fraud	20.49	15.00	9.09	18.96
Drug Possession	29.51	25.00	45.45	30.07
Drug Distribution	9.84	0	9.09	8.50
Sexual Offense	4.10	5.00	0	3.92
<u>Previous Offenses With Incarceration</u>				
Violent	19.23	30.00	20.00	20.90
Theft	28.85	30.00	40.00	29.85
Fraud	23.08	20.00	0	20.90
Drug Possession	21.15	20.00	40.00	22.39
Drug Distribution	7.69	0	0	5.97

TABLE IV

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF PERCENTAGES IN EACH SUBSTANCE  
ABUSE HISTORY VARIABLE ON PROGRAM AND POST-  
PROGRAM SUCCESS OR FAILURE CATEGORIES

Variable Categories	Program and Post-Program Success or Failure			
	Program/ Post Program Success (N=133)	Program Success/ Post Program Failure (N=23)	Program Failure/ Post Program Success (N=12)	Total Sample (N=168)
<u>Beer Drinking*</u>				
Rarely	51.88	56.52	8.33	49.40
Occasionally	36.84	26.09	75.00	38.10
Daily	11.28	17.39	16.67	12.50
<u>Wine Drinking</u>				
Rarely	90.23	91.30	100.00	91.07
Occasionally	9.77	8.70	0	8.93
Daily	--	--	--	--
<u>Liquor Drinking</u>				
Rarely	64.66	69.57	41.67	63.69
Occasionally	27.82	17.39	58.33	28.57
Daily	7.52	13.04	0	7.74
<u>Smoking Marijuana*</u>				
Rarely	70.68	56.52	25.00	65.48
Occasionally	13.53	30.43	41.67	17.86
Daily	15.79	13.04	33.33	16.67
<u>Other Drug Use</u>				
Rarely	80.45	78.26	83.33	80.36
Occasionally	8.27	17.39	8.33	9.52
Daily	11.28	4.35	8.33	10.12
<u>No. of Beers Con- sumed at One Time</u>				
None	33.86	30.43	0	30.86
Less Than Four	33.86	26.09	50.00	33.95
More Than Four	32.28	43.48	50.00	35.19

TABLE IV (Continued)

Variable Categories	<u>Program and Post-Program Success or Failure</u>			
	Program/ Post Program Success (N=133)	Program Success/ Post Program Failure (N=23)	Program Failure/ Post Program Success (N=12)	Total Sample (N=168)
<u>Glasses of Wine Con-</u> <u>sumed at One Time</u>				
None	71.67	61.90	66.67	69.93
Less Than Four	17.50	33.33	33.33	20.92
More Than Four	10.83	4.76	0	9.15
<u>No. of Liquor</u> <u>Drinks Consumed at</u> <u>One Time</u>				
None	43.20	40.91	8.33	40.25
Less Than Four	28.80	36.36	41.67	30.82
More Than Four	28.00	22.73	50.00	28.93
<u>Kinds of Drugs Used*</u>				
None	53.13	34.78	16.67	47.85
Marijuana Only	21.88	43.48	58.33	27.61
Hard Drugs	25.00	21.74	25.00	24.54
<u>Crimes Committed</u> <u>Under Influence of</u> <u>Alcohol*</u>				
None	80.83	71.43	63.64	78.29
Some	15.00	9.52	0	13.16
All	4.17	19.05	36.36	8.55
<u>Crimes Committed</u> <u>Under Influence of</u> <u>Drugs*</u>				
None	--	--	--	--
Some	93.89	78.26	75.00	90.36
All	6.11	21.74	25.00	9.64



TABLE IV (Continued)

Variable Categories	Program and Post-Program Success or Failure			
	Program/ Post Program Success (N=133)	Program Success/ Post Program Failure (N=28)	Program Failure/ Post Program Success (N=12)	Total Sample (N=168)
<u>Meetings of A.A. Attended</u>				
None	84.17	78.26	75.00	82.58
Some	4.17	0	16.67	4.52
All	11.67	21.74	8.33	12.90
<u>Meetings of N.A. Attended</u>				
None	91.45	85.71	100.00	91.28
Some	5.13	0	0	4.03
All	3.42	14.29	0	4.70

\*Chi-square is significant at the .05 level.

committed under the influence of alcohol, crimes committed under influence of drugs, meetings of Alcoholics Anonymous attended, and meetings of Narcotics Anonymous attended.

Significant differences were found in drinking beer and the chances of program and post-program success or failure ( $p < 0.03$ ). Individuals who rarely drank beer were more likely to be program successes but post-program failures. Those who drank occasionally were more likely to be program failures and post-program successes. Those who drank daily showed a greater proportion in the category of program success but post-program failure.

The kinds of drugs used also showed a significant difference on the dependent variable ( $p < 0.01$ ). Individuals who did not use any drug had the highest proportion of all three groups in the category of both program and post-program success, while the smallest proportion of all three groups was seen in the category of program failure but post-program success. Individuals who rarely smoked marijuana showed the highest proportion in the category of program and post-program success. Both categories (program and post-program success as well as program failures but post-program success) showed a similar proportion in the use of hard drugs, while individuals who were internal successes and external failures were seen to be least likely to use hard drugs. Significant differences were also found in the number of crimes committed under the influence of alcohol ( $p < 0.01$ ). Individuals who were both program and post-program successes showed the greatest proportion in the categories where no crimes or some crimes were engaged in under the influence of alcohol. Those who committed all their crimes under the influence of alcohol showed the greatest proportion in the category of program failure/post-program success.

Significant difference was found in the number of crimes committed under the influence of drugs ( $p < 0.01$ ). Those who were program and post-program successes showed the greatest proportion of having committed some crimes under the influence of drugs and showed the smallest proportion in the category of all crimes committed under the influence of drugs. Individuals who were program failures but post-program successes were most likely to have committed all their crimes under the influence of drugs.

The second part of the study constituted testing two theoretical perspectives: Hirschi's (1969) Control Theory and Glaser's (1978)

Differential Anticipation Theory and their relationship to recidivism. A factor analysis using principal components with an orthogonal varimax rotation from the statistical system (SAS User's Guide, 1985) was used to determine if the items from attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief could be scaled together. Similarly, a factor analysis using principal components with an orthogonal Varimax rotation from the statistical system (SAS User's Guide, 1985) was used to determine if the items on perception of conventional opportunities and perception of criminal opportunities could be scaled together. Each set of items was factor-analyzed separately. Table V shows the unrotated first factor loadings for items on different scales. Factor analysis of the attachment to family items revealed significant loadings on this factor. Out of the 10 items chosen for analysis, 9 items displayed a loading of .30 and above. One item (do things own way with family) did not display an adequately high loading and was thus discarded from the analysis. This factor explained 33% of the item variance. Five items were selected to measure attachment to conventional friends. Three items displayed loadings of 4.30 and above. Two items (do things own way with friends and support from friends) did not show loadings and were thus dropped from analysis. Therefore, three items were summed up to measure attachment to conventional friends. This factor explained 68% of the item variance. Four items were selected to determine attachment to criminal friends. All four items displayed loadings of .30 and above, and were retained for the scale. This factor explained 58% of the variance of these items.

For attachment to work, eight items were selected to measure this scale. Five of these displayed significant loadings of .30 and above. Three items (support from employers; its hard for a person like me to get a good paying, honest job; and I am late or absent from work without

TABLE V  
UNROTATED FIRST FACTOR LOADINGS FOR  
ITEMS ON SCALES

Item	Unrotated Factor Loadings
<u>Attachment to Family</u>	
Support from parents	.53
Support from spouse	.48
Support from boy friend/girl friend	.39
Worried about criminal activity hurting family	.54
Importance of affection as life goal	.44
Chance of achieving affection as life goal	.33
Importance of getting affection from family	.81
Counting on family for help	.65
Respected by family	.78
Do things own way with family	
<u>Attachment to Conventional Friends</u>	
Respect of friends	.86
Liked by friends	.89
Friends help out	.70
Do things own way with friends	
Support from friends	
<u>Attachment to Criminal Friends</u>	
Support from friends involved in trouble	.41
Liked by friends involved in trouble	.90
Do things own way with friends involved in trouble	.74
Friends involved in trouble help out	.90
<u>Attachment to Work</u>	
Importance of having rewarding and satisfying career	.55
Chance of achieving rewarding and satisfying career	.54
Appreciation from boss for job	.77
Liked by co-workers	.77
Respect for job performance	.85

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Unrotated Factor Loadings
<u>Attachment to Work (cont.)</u>	
Support from employers	
Its hard for a person like me to get a good paying, honest job	
I am late or absent from work without following procedures acceptable to my employer	
<u>Involvement</u>	
Time and effort into something you are involved in	.41
Importance of wealth as life goal	.84
Chance of achieving wealth as life goal	.83
<u>Perception of Conventional Opportunities</u>	
Finding conventional opportunities open after coming out of prison	.44
Importance of having control over others	.85
Chances of having control over others	.86
<u>Perception of Criminal Opportunities*</u>	
Finding criminal opportunities open after coming out of prison	.79
Opportunities for making good money illegally	.79
<u>Belief*</u>	
Importance of prestige as life goal	.92
Chances of achieving prestige as life goal	.92

\*Since this scale has only two items, the correlation coefficient between these two items is presented.

following procedures acceptable to my employer) did not display significant loadings and were dropped from analysis. This factor explained 51% of the variance of these items.

For the scale for involvement, three items were selected for analysis. All three items displayed significant loadings and were retained for analysis, explaining 52% of the variance of the three involvement items. To determine perception of conventional opportunities, three items were selected, all of which loaded significantly on the unrotated factor that was extracted. This factor explained 56% of the variance of these three items. Two items were selected to determine perception of criminal opportunities, both of which displayed significant loadings and thus were retained for analysis. This factor explained 63% of the variance of these items. Two items were selected for measuring belief, both of which showed loadings that were significant and were kept as part of the scale for belief. This factor explained 84% of the variance of these two items.

The researcher found only one item that would make an appropriate measure for commitment. Since no scale can be constructed with one item, this variable was dropped from analysis.

After the scales were constructed using factor analysis, Kuder Richardson coefficients were calculated for each scale. Kuder Richardson or coefficient alpha is a measure of internal consistency and provides a good estimate of reliability. Since a major source of measurement error may be due to the sampling of content, this reliability coefficient summarizes the amount of measurement error expected from using the instrument. According to Nunnally (1978), this estimate of reliability is based on the average correlation among items. A coefficient of .7 or higher is considered to show greater reliability. For the scale on

attachment to family, the Kuder Richardson coefficient was .73. For attachment to conventional friends, the coefficient was .76. For the scale of attachment to criminal friends, the coefficient was .73. The attachment to work scale showed a Kuder Richardson coefficient of .75. For the scale of involvement, the Kuder Richardson coefficient showed a low .51. Since the coefficient was weighted by sample size, this low coefficient may have been a consequence of the fact that the scale of involvement consisted of only three items. For the scale of belief, the Kuder Richardson coefficient showed a high .82, signifying a great deal of internal consistency. For the scale of the variable perception of conventional opportunities, the coefficient was a low .57. However, since the average correlation among items was .31, this scale was retained for the purpose of analysis of data. Finally, the scale for the variable attachment to criminal opportunities also showed a low coefficient of .42. Although the scale was retained, the results from the use of this scale were viewed with reservation.

After the construction of scales, comparisons of means by all the variables were calculated on program and post-program success or failure categories. Table VI shows the mean scores by variables for the three categories of program and post-program success or failure. Although none of the differences was found to be significant, a comparison of figures on the table does give some information about the theoretical variables and their relationship with success or failure.

Table VI shows mean scores by Hirschi's (1969) Control Theory and Glaser's (1978) Differential Anticipation Theory variables in the categories of the dependent variable. Hirschi believed that the greater the attachment to parents, the less likely is the juvenile to become delinquent. Applying this theory to the present study, one would expect those

offenders who showed a greater attachment to family to be program and post-program successes. An examination of the mean scores showed that this hypothesis was not supported. The highest mean score was for offenders who were successful in the program but failed in the post-program period in the community (3.99). This was closely followed by the mean score of those offenders who were successful, both in the program and the post-program period (3.95). The lowest score was for offenders who succeeded in the program but failed in the post-program period (3.75). Although the present study did not validate Hirschi's ideas on the attachment, two explanations can be given for this result. First, Hirschi correlated attachment to parents, while the present study changed the variable to attachment to family, thereby including other relationships with spouses and children as well. It may be that this changed the nature of the variable. Secondly, Hirschi formulated his variable to study causes of delinquency, while the present study concentrated on adult offenders.

Hirschi (1969) believed that attachment to peers was negatively related to delinquency. The present study dichotomized the variable into attachment to conventional versus criminal friends. The expectation here was that attachment to conventional friends would be positively related to success, both during the program and in the post-program period. On the other hand, attachment to criminal friends was expected to be related to failure. Mean scores on both these variables supported these contentions. Offenders who were both program and post-program successes showed the highest mean score (4.18), followed by those offenders who failed in the program but were successful in the post-program period (4.06). The lowest mean score remained for those offenders who succeeded in the program, but were reconvicted within one year (3.93).



TABLE VI  
 COMPARISONS OF MEANS BY VARIABLES ON PROGRAM  
 AND POST-PROGRAM SUCCESS OR  
 FAILURE CATEGORIES

	Program/ Post Program Success (N=132)	Program Success/ Post Program Failure (N=23)	Program Failure/ Post Program Success (N=12)
Attachment to family*	3.95	3.99	3.75
Attachment to conventional friends	4.18	3.93	4.06
Attachment to criminal friends	1.95	2.26	1.63
Attachment to work	4.61	4.48	4.52
Involvement	3.83	3.83	3.92
Belief	3.00	2.98	3.58
Perception of conventional opportunities	2.64	2.86	2.81
Perception of criminal opportunities	2.38	2.61	2.54

\*None of the variables displayed statistically significant differences.

In keeping with the assumptions of the study, offenders who were program successes but failed in the post-program period, showed the highest mean score on the variable of attachment to criminal friends, followed by those successful both in the program and the post-program period (1.95), while program failures and post-program successes displayed the lowest mean (1.63).

Hirschi's (1969) ideas regarding the negative relationship between attachment to friends and delinquency have been a subject of debate. Some previous literature and research supported the present findings. Hindelang's (1973) study, which tested and extended Hirschi's study, displayed a positive relationship between peer attachment and delinquency. Conger (1976) found a negative correlation between attachment to conventional peers and delinquency and a positive relationship between attachment to deviant peers and delinquency. Similarly, Linden and Hackler (1973), while testing the propositions of control theory, found that attachment to delinquent peers made involvement in delinquent activities more likely, especially among those who exhibited weak ties to conventional society. Poole and Regoli (1979) examined the relationship between having delinquent peers and delinquency. They came to the conclusion that juveniles who had delinquent peers engaging in frequent, varied, and severe delinquent activities, were more likely to commit similar acts. Finally, Mathur and Dodder (1987) found attachment to conventional peers to be the best single and positive predictor for their dimension of conventional delinquency.

The variable of attachment to work is considered important since regularity at the work place and commitment to work are necessary components of making a living and performing adult roles. This study showed the highest mean scores for those offenders who were successful, both in the program and in the post-program period (4.61). The next lower score was for those offenders who failed in the program but remained crime-free in the community (4.52). The lowest attachment to work was exhibited by those offenders who succeeded in the program, but failed in the post-program period of one year.

To Hirschi (1969), involvement as a concept meant engrossment in conventional activities, which he related to leading a crime-free life. The present study did not display great differences on the mean scores. Offenders who failed in the program, but succeeded in the post-program period, showed a slightly higher mean score (3.92) than did those offenders in both the other categories (3.83). The same pattern held for the concept of belief. The highest mean score belonged to those offenders who failed in the post-program period. Those who were successful both in the program and the post-program period scored 3.00, while program successes but post-program failures scored the lowest mean (2.98).

Glaser's (1978) Differential Anticipation Theory expressed the notion that expectations of individuals determined their conduct. Thus, if offenders perceived the availability of conventional opportunities (e.g., the ability to obtain a job), they were more likely to remain crime-free and be successful in their period of post-program community life. The present study did not prove Glaser's belief on this variable. Those offenders who succeeded in the program, but failed in the post-program period, showed the highest mean score (2.86), while offenders who succeeded both in the program and the post-program period showed the lowest mean score (2.64). Program successes and post-program failures scored between the other two categories (2.81). In their perception of the availability of illegitimate opportunities, however, the results of the study leaned toward Glaser's propositions. Thus, the highest mean was calculated for those individuals who succeeded in the program but failed in the community (2.61) versus offenders who were successful both during the program and afterwards (2.38). Since this group of offenders perceived the least criminal opportunity, it resulted in their engaging in less crime than other groups of offenders.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

Analysis of data in the present study produced several interesting results. In order to look for differences on sociodemographic variables between the house arrest inmates and community treatment center residents, chi-square calculations were made. These groups were found to be significantly different from each other in 5 out of 14 variables. This led to a conclusion about combining these groups together for the purposes of analysis.

Chi-square calculations on sociodemographic, criminal history, and drug abuse history variables produced several statistically significant differences between those who were program and post-program successes, those offenders who succeeded in the program but failed in the post-program period, and those who failed in the program but succeeded in the community.

A significantly greater proportion of whites were seen to be successful, both in the program and post-program period. On the other hand, blacks were seen to be succeeding in the program but failing in the post-program period. This finding manifested the disadvantage of a minority offender in the period of post-program reintegration into the community.

Living arrangements as a variable also proved to be statistically significant. A greater proportion of those inmates who lived with a

spouse were seen to fail in the program; however, they succeeded in the post-program period. Similarly, those offenders who lived with a parent were seen to be more likely to be successful, both in the program and the post-program period.

Among the criminal history variables, conviction by juvenile court proved to be a statistically significant variable. Results showed that repeated convictions seemed to impair the chances of the ex-offender's success in the community. This was especially true in the case of convictions as a juvenile.

Drug abuse history variables produced several interesting results. Hard substance abuse has been significantly correlated with recidivism in the criminological literature. Contrary to expectations, the present study found that those offenders who reported to be rarely drinking showed a greater proportion in the category of program success, but post-program failure. When questions were asked about marijuana use, those offenders who reported smoking it daily turned out to be more likely to be program failures, but post-program successes. This pattern also held when offenders were asked questions about crimes that were committed by them under the influence of alcohol. These offenders failed in the program but managed to be post-program successes. The same results were seen when questions were asked about how many crimes were committed under the influence of drugs. Those offenders who failed in the program but succeeded in the post-program period were most likely to commit all of their crimes under the influence of drugs. A study conducted by Schilitt (1979) produced similar results in the pattern of drug abuse and crime. His study compared the successful releases with those who failed at three adult male offender halfway houses. Schilitt found that hard drug abu-

sers fared much better at one halfway house than those who did not abuse drugs, or who engaged in only marijuana smoking.

A factor analysis of the questionnaire items produced significant factor loadings for most of the items chosen. The variable of commitment was dropped from analysis, since the loadings on the chosen items were very low (below .30). The variables of perception of criminal opportunities and belief had only two items in their scales; therefore, results using these must be viewed with caution. Kuder-Richardson coefficient calculations to assess the reliability of the scales were high enough for most scales. The coefficient for the scale on involvement and perception of conventional opportunities showed the coefficient to be lower than .7. Results from the use of this scale may not be valid.

Although none of the mean scores were significantly different statistically, some variables followed the direction of the assumptions of the control and differential anticipation theories. Those offenders who were more attached to conventional friends versus criminal friends, and who were more attached to work, showed a greater involvement in conventional activities and exhibited a stronger belief in the conventional value system were seen to be more likely to be both program and post-program successes. Interestingly, those who succeeded in the program but failed outside the community showed higher means on both the perception of availability of conventional as well as criminal activity. Only the latter perception abides by the dictums of the differential anticipation theory.

### Conclusions

Smallness of sample size is one reason the results of the present study must be viewed with caution. Although the study began with a

reasonable sample size, at the time of analysis of data many offenders could not be included in the study for the purpose of analysis. Since this study followed offenders for up to one year after their release from each of the programs, 39 offenders who had been released from the program for less than one year could not be included in the analysis. Seventeen offenders were found to have failed in the program and were still in the correctional system. Three offenders were successful in their program termination, but were still in the system. One offender who was both a program and post-program failure had to be dropped from analysis, since the number was not adequate for statistical purposes. These factors considerably reduced the sample size. This was especially true for the category of offenders who failed in the program but succeeded in the post-program period.

Following are percentages from this study on program successes and failures and post-program successes and failures: 92.8% of the sample succeeded in the program, while 7.2% failed. Out of those studied upon release, 86.3% succeeded in the post-program period, while 13.7% failed. The Oklahoma Department of Corrections also conducted a study on the percentages of success/failure in the house arrest program. Their figures showed a 40% failure rate in the program, while a 6% post-program failure rate was seen for those who were terminated from the program. The reason for discrepancy between the figures is due to different bases being used for calculation of success/failure percentages. Their study found that the program success or failure rate was not significantly associated with the rate of recidivism in the community.

#### Recommendations

The present study was a study of short-term recidivism. Although a

period of one year post-program follow-up is considered useful, a longer follow-up period may shed more light on the factors behind recidivism.

More attention may be needed in the design of questionnaire items. Some variable scales resulted in only two or three items which were relevant to the concepts. A larger number of items under each scale may have produced more valid results.

The language of the questionnaire items could have been simpler. For example, many of the respondents did not know the meaning of the word "beneficial," which necessitated a change in wording.

And finally, the results from this study supported the concept of community-based corrections. The results showed a high success rate for offenders, both in the program and the post-program periods. These community-based programs have proven to be more economical, restorative, and less recidivistic than the traditional institutions. A major shift of policy in this direction may be a plausible solution to the problems in the correctional field.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aichorn, A. Wayward Youth. New York: Viking Press, 1963.
- Ball, R. and Lilly, R. J. "Home Incarceration: An International Alternative to Institutional Incarceration." International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 9(2), Winter, 1985, pp. 85-97.
- Beck, J. L. "Evaluation of Federal Community Treatment Centers." Federal Probation, 43, 1979, pp. 36-39.
- Becker, H. W. Outsiders. New York: Free Press, 1963.
- Bracht, G. H. and Glass, G. V. "The External Validity of Experiments." American Educational Research Journal, 5, 1968, pp. 437-474.
- Briar, S. and Pilavin, I. "Delinquency, Situation Inducements and Commitment to Conformity." Social Problems, 13(45), 1965, pp. 34-45.
- Carter, R. M. and Wilkins, L. T. (Eds.). Probation, Parole, and Community Corrections. New York: John Wiley, 1976.
- Carter, R. M.; Glaser, D.; and Wilkins, L. T. Correctional Institutions. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1977.
- Chambliss, W. J. Criminal Law in Action. New York: John Wiley, 1975.
- Chambliss, W. J. and Nagasawa, R. H. "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, 1969, pp. 71-77.
- Cloward, R. A. "Illegitimate Means, Anomie and Deviant Behavior." American Sociological Review, 24(2), 1959, pp. 489-504.
- Conger, R. D. "Social Control and Social Learning Models of Delinquent Behavior." Criminology, 14, 1976, pp. 17-41.
- Cook, T. D. and Campbell, D. T. Quasi Experimentation. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.
- Dentler, R. A. and Monroe, L. J. "Social Correlates of Early Adolescent Theft." American Sociological Review, 26, 1961, p. 735.
- Durkheim, E. Suicide: A Study in Sociology. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1951.

- Erickson, E. Childhood and Society. New York: Norton Press, 1963.
- Erickson, M. L. and Empey, L. T. "Court Records, Undetected Delinquency and Decision Making." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 54, 1963, pp. 456-469.
- Farrington, D. P. "Self-Reports of Deviant Behavior: Predictive and Stable?" Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 64(1), 1973, pp. 99-110.
- Forst, B. and Wish, E. "Drug Use and Crime: Providing a Missing Link." In: National Policy Exchange Violent Crime in America, K. R. Feinberg (Ed.), 1983, pp. 84-95.
- Fox, V. Community Based Corrections. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Freud, S. An Outline of Psychoanalysis. New York: W. W. Norton, 1949.
- Glaser, D. Crime in our Changing Society. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1978.
- Glaser, D. The Effectiveness of a Probation and Parole System. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964.
- Gouldner, A. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1954.
- Hindelang, M. J. "Causes of Delinquency: A Partial Replication and Extension." Social Problems, 20, 1973, pp. 471-487.
- Hirschi, T. Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1969.
- Jacoby, W.; Thornberry, W.; and Marvin, M. "Drug Use and Criminality in a Birth Cohort." Drug Use in America, 300. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, 1973.
- Jenkins, W. O.; Witherspoon, A. D.; Nichols, W. L.; Lawrence, F.; and McKee, J. M. Post-Prison Follow-Up. (An Evaluative Study of the Alabama Work Release Program.) University, Alabama: University of Alabama Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1975, 150 pp.
- Kobrin, S. "The Conflict of Values in Delinquency Areas." American Sociological Review, 16, October, 1951, pp. 653-661.
- Kulik, J. A.; Stein, K. B.; and Sarbin, T. R. "Disclosure of Delinquent Behavior Under Conditions of Anonymity and Nonanonymity." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 1968, pp. 506-509.
- Landis, P. H. Social Control. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott, 1939.
- Lemert, E. M. Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

- Linden, E. and Hackler, J. C. "Affective Ties and Delinquency." Pacific Sociological Review, 16, 1973, pp. 27-47.
- Lombroso, C. Crime, Its Causes and Remedies. (Translated by H. P. Horton.) Boston: Little, Brown, 1911.
- Mathur, M. and Dodder, R. A. "An Extension of Control Theory by Types of Attachments and Types of Delinquency." (Unpublished paper, 1987.)
- Mathur, M. and Dodder, R. A. "Attachment and Delinquency: An Elaboration of Hirschi's Control Theory." (Unpublished paper, 1984.)
- Matza, D. Delinquency and Drift. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.
- Miller, W. B. "Lower Class Culture As a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency." Journal of Social Issues, 14(3), 1958, pp. 5-6.
- Myerhoff, M. L. and Myerhoff, B. G. "Field Observations of Middle-Class Gangs." Social Forces, 42, 1964, pp. 328-336.
- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Corrections. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.
- National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Policies and Background Information. Hackensack, New Jersey: NCCD, 1972.
- Nunnally, J. C. Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Nye, F. I. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley, 1958.
- Oklahoma Crime Commission. "Community Treatment Centers." (Evaluation Report, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1977, 178 pp.)
- Parsons, T. The Social System. New York: Free Press, 1951.
- Pennsylvania Community Treatment Service. "An Evaluation and Proposed Evaluation Information System." (Final Report, Pennsylvania Bureau of Corrections, 1972, 150 pp.)
- Poole, E. D. and Regoli, R. M. "Parental Support, Delinquent Friends, and Delinquency: A Test of Interaction Effects." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 70, 1979, pp. 188-193.
- Quinney, R. Class, State and Crime. New York: McKay, 1977.
- Reiss, A. J., Jr. "Delinquency as a Failure of Personal and Social Controls." American Sociological Review, April 16, 1950, pp. 196-207.
- Sandhu, H. Community Corrections. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1981.

- Sandhu, H. Modern Corrections. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.
- SAS User's Guide. (Basic Version Five Edition.) Cary, North Carolina: SAS Institute, Inc., 1985.
- Schilitt, R. E. "Developing Prediction Equations to Increase Success at Three Adult Male Offender Halfway Houses." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1979.)
- Schur, E. M. Labeling Deviant Behavior. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Sheldon, W. H. Varieties of Delinquent Youth. New York: Harper and Row, 1949.
- Short, J. F. and Nye, I. F. "Reported Behavior as a Criterion of Deviant Behavior." Social Problems, 5, 1958, pp. 207-213.
- Sutherland, E. H. and Cressey, D. C. Criminology. Santa Barbara, California: University of Southern California, 1974.
- Sykes, G. M. and Matza, D. "Technique of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." American Sociological Review, 22, 1957, pp. 664-670.
- Toby, J. "Social Disorganization and Stake in Conformity: Complementary Factors in the Predatory Behavior of Hoodlums." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 48, May-June, 1957, pp. 12-17.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Community Treatment Center Field Study. Washington, D.C.: Federal Prison System, Office of Research, 1978.
- U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Task Force Report. Corrections. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Wiatrowski, M. D.; Grisvold, D. B.; and Roberts, M. K. "Social Control Theory and Delinquency." American Sociological Review, 46, October, 1981, pp. 524-541.
- Zucker, H. J. "Affectional Identification and Delinquency." Archives of Psychology, (286), May, 1943, pp. 56-57.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A  
RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

## 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?  |      |                                    |               |               |                  |
| 1   ___ 100% of the time   |      | 4   ___ Less than half of the time |               |               |                  |
| 2   ___ Most of the time   |      | 5   ___ Never employed             |               |               |                  |
| 3   ___ About half of the time   |      |                                    |               |               |                  |
| 11. During that period, about how much was your average <u>monthly</u> income from work?   |      |                                    |               |               |                  |
|  |      | \$ _____                           |               |               |                  |

12. During that 2 year period, how many days in a week normally did you miss work?  1    2    3    4    5 days
13. During that 2 year period, how many months did you spend in a prison, jail or hospital? Months \_\_\_\_\_
- |       |                 |   |   |   |                |
|-------|-----------------|---|---|---|----------------|
|       | None<br>of them |   |   |   | All of<br>them |
| <hr/> |                 |   |   |   |                |
| 1     | 2               | 3 | 4 | 5 |                |
| 1     | 2               | 3 | 4 | 5 |                |
| 1     | 2               | 3 | 4 | 5 |                |
| 1     | 2               | 3 | 4 | 5 |                |

C. Current Sentence

- 18-21. What is the length of your present sentence? \_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months
- 22-27. When did your present sentence start? \_\_\_\_\_  
day    month    year
28. While you were in prison during your latest imprisonment, how often were you visited by your family members?  
 1 \_\_\_\_\_ weekly    2 \_\_\_\_\_ monthly    3 \_\_\_\_\_ quarterly    4 \_\_\_\_\_ once a year    5 \_\_\_\_\_ never
29. How many prison violations did you have during your latest imprisonment?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
30. In what prison programs did you participate during your last prison term?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
31. How much did these programs help you to go straight on the street?  
 1 \_\_\_\_\_ much    2 \_\_\_\_\_ some    3 \_\_\_\_\_ none

## D. After Prison

1. Under what correctional program are you being supervised now?

- 1  house arrest  
 2  community treatment center  
 3  probation  
 4  parole  
 5  split sentence  
 6  other \_\_\_\_\_

2-7. When did you begin in this program? \_\_\_\_\_ day \_\_\_\_\_ month \_\_\_\_\_ year

8. How do you think this program will end for you?

- 1  on discharge 2  on parole 3  CTC 4  other \_\_\_\_\_

9-16. Circle all the correctional settings through which you have passed during your current sentence.

- 1  maximum security institution  
 2  medium security institution  
 3  minimum security institution  
 4  split sentenced  
 5  parole  
 6  CTC  
 7  house arrest  
 8  other \_\_\_\_\_

17-24. Indicate the order which you passed through these settings giving a 1 to the first one.

- 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 \_\_\_\_\_  
 3 \_\_\_\_\_  
 4 \_\_\_\_\_  
 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
 6 \_\_\_\_\_  
 7 \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 \_\_\_\_\_

25. What kind of help have you needed most when you came out of the prison or house arrest/split sentence/parole/CTC?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

26-31. Upon release from prison to your present program we all expect some measure of support from family, friends, work-world and other sources. Did you get the expected support:

	<u>yes, fully</u>	<u>only partial</u>	<u>none</u>
(i) from parents	1	2	3
(ii) from spouse	1	2	3
(iii) from boy friend/girl friend	1	2	3
(iv) from friends involved in trouble	1	2	3
(v) from other friends	1	2	3
(vi) from employers	1	2	3

- 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

\_\_\_\_\_

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
	_____				
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



APPENDIX B  
EVALUATION REPORT

EVALUATION REPORT

Dear Case Manager/Probation Officer:

As you know, we have been collecting research data on several clients who are doing time under different forms of community-based corrections. We now request your critical opinion in regards to their adjustment or maladjustment in the community. Please try to be very objective and consistent in your evaluation, as objectivity is the essence of any research. It would be more helpful if you send us your report on Part A and Part B after an inmate has done 6 months under your supervision, and Part C (the termination report) be sent at the time when the inmate/client is terminated or transferred from your program.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

*Harjit Sandhu*

Harjit Sandhu, Ph.D.

*Richard Dodder*

Richard Dodder, Ph.D.

Part A

MALADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR RECORD

**To the Interviewer:** The Maladaptive Behavior Record (MBR) is to be used to assess the client's behavior output in the community environment, either currently or immediately prior to being incarcerated in a institution. You should obtain sufficient behavioral information from the client to score each item. The client's opinions or judgments should not be allowed to confuse or interfere with the obtaining of behavioral information and the rating of the items on the basis of actual behavior.

Some items of the MBR require only the specification of the client's behavior. Other items require, in addition to specific behavior, the specification of features of the environment in order to pinpoint the client's behavior in response to certain conditions.

The MBR is forced choice. If the client has a maladaptive behavior problem, the interviewer enters a "1" by the corresponding item. If there is no maladaptive behavior a "0" is entered by the corresponding item. In either case, the interviewer specifies under each item the environmental condition(s) and the client's response(s) which served as the basis for rating the item. Enter the total score on the top of the first page of the MBR.

Date of Report \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Inmate \_\_\_\_\_ Inmate's Number \_\_\_\_\_

Please explain (specify) your scores.

## EMPLOYMENT

SCORE

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Behavior Response to Income. Rate "1" if client's employment income, pay schedule, or commission arrangement fails to meet his basic needs and client is not responding to this problem appropriately by actively seeking other employment or a solution through his employer.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Behavioral Response to Working Conditions. Rate "1" if client's working conditions, such as heating, cooling, schedule, breaks and safety, are associated with significant anxiety, discomfort, or inconvenience and the client is not actively seeking a solution to this problem.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Interaction with Co-workers. Rate "1" if client has significant or continuing problems in his interactions with co-workers either by virtue of his behavior or by his failure to respond appropriately to problems generated by their behavior.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ 4. Interactions with Employer. Rate "1" if client has significant or continuing problems in his interaction with his employer either by virtue of his behavior or by his failure to respond appropriately to problems generated by his employer's behavior.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ 5. Work Attendance. Rate "1" if client has been late or absent without following procedures acceptable to his employer.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

ADDICTION

\_\_\_\_ 6. Alcohol Use. Rate "1" if client uses alcohol to the extent that it interferes with his interpersonal relationships or employment or results in financial difficulty for him or his family.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ 7. Drug Use. Rate "1" if client uses drugs to the extent that it interferes with his interpersonal relationships or employment or results in financial difficulty for him or his family.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ 8. Gambling. Rate "1" if client loses money excessively, i.e., to the extent that it interferes with his interpersonal relationships or results in financial difficulty for him or his family.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

#### INTERPERSONAL

\_\_\_\_\_ 9. Fighting. Rate "1" if client engages in (physical) fighting precipitated either by his inappropriate behavior or by his failure to respond to the behavior of others in such a manner as to avoid fights.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ 10. Verbal Abusiveness. Rate "1" if client's verbal behavior towards others is abusive, or if client is the recipient of verbal abuse, or if there is reciprocal verbal abuse, between client and others, such as intense arguments.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ 11. Maladaptive Associates. Rate "1" if client spends time with persons who exhibit maladaptive behavior in such areas as crime, drugs, alcohol, sex, money management, and employment.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## ECONOMICS

- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Management of Money. Rate "1" if client has difficulty in managing his money, i.e., spending for nonessentials, overextended installment purchasing to the extent that client is unable to purchase sufficient essentials, meet financial obligations, etc.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## ADJUSTMENT

- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Responses to Physical Conditions. Rate "1" if client has physical problems to which his responses are maladaptive, such as failing to secure and follow treatment or by failure to arrange his activities in accordance in accordance with his physical condition.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Psychological Adjustment

(a) Rate "1" if client's verbal accounts of his behavior indicate unrealistic or excessive responses of withdrawal, avoidance, dependency on others, self-criticism, overcompensatory behavior, denial of behavioral problems, etc.

(b) Rate "1" if client's verbal behavior indicates that fear, anxiety, or behavioral deficits significantly interfere with meeting people or with instituting and maintaining supportive interpersonal relationships.

(c) Rate "1" if client's behavior during the interview indicates marked fear, anxiety, or inadequacy as characterized by lack of eye contact, difficulty in speaking, trembling, excessive perspiring, etc., or if the client's behavior is excessively aggressive.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**LEGAL**

\_\_\_\_\_ 15. Behavioral Responses to Legal Processes. Rate "1" if client's behavior has resulted in minor legal problems or processes not involving arrest, such as ignoring reprimands for minor technical parole violations, repeated involvement with legal authorities, legal proceedings against him by virtue of his failure to abide by contractual agreements, etc. Also rate "1" if client is responding inappropriately to legal processes such as divorce or child custody litigation by avoiding subpoena, failing to appear in court, etc.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ 16. Other Behavioral Problems. Rate "1" if client has behavioral problems which are not covered in the preceding items. This item may include less frequently reported instances, such as sexual deviance (e.g., homosexuality, relations with prepubertal females, etc.) and a wide range of other behaviors such as maladaptive dress, hygiene, or residence maintenance, etc.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Add all scores in part A and give total \_\_\_\_\_

**Part B****WORKER'S GUT FEELINGS**

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Could you both reflect and then rate his/her social responsiveness to the family (Parents, Spouse, Children)

Reflection: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Rate: "1" above average/ "2" average/ "3" below average



\_\_\_\_\_ 2. What are your final impressions of this client? How do you rate his/her future prospects for crime free behavior.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Rate: "1" above average/ "2" average/ "3" below average

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. What are your final impressions of this client? How do you rate his/her future prospects for drug free behavior.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Rate: "1" above average/ "2" average/ "3" below average

\_\_\_\_\_ 4. How adequately did this client fulfill the conditions and obligations of his program.

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Rate: "1" above average/ "2" average/ "3" below average

5. Anything else that you want to say about this inmate.  
Response: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Part C

HOUSE ARREST

TERMINATION/TRANSFER REPORT

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

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

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

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 |                               |                    |

VITA

Minu Mathur

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: A COMPARISON OF SUCCESS RATES FOR HOUSE ARREST INMATES AND  
COMMUNITY TREATMENT CENTER RESIDENTS

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in New Delhi, India, on November 5, 1952, the  
daughter of Madhuri and Brij Raj Kishore.

Education: Passed Indian School Certificate Examination of the  
University of Cambridge from St. Theresa's Convent, Karnal,  
India, in December, 1968; received Bachelor of Arts (Honors)  
degree in Political Science from the University of Delhi,  
Delhi, India in April, 1972; received Master of Science degree  
from Oklahoma State University in December, 1981; completed  
requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree from Oklahoma  
State University in December, 1987.

Professional Experience: Teaching Associate, Department of Soci-  
ology, Oklahoma State University, 1983-86; Part-Time Lecturer,  
Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State University, 1986-87;  
Full-Time Lecturer, Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State  
University, 1987 to present.

Professional Organization: Alpha Kappa Delta.