

67590

April 11, 1979

~~X~~ Misdemeanant Halfway Houses
~~✓~~ Performance Prediction Project

Prepared by:

~~✓~~ The Office of Resource Management
D.C. Department of Corrections
Delbert C. Jackson, Director.

614 H. St. NW
Washington DC 20001

Martin Hamburg
Student Intern
Research Analyst

67590
ACA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Misdemeanant Halfway House Performance Prediction Project is to establish guidelines to assist the decision-making personnel in determining which prospective participant would be more likely to perform successfully and which unsuccessfully in a halfway house.

The sample used in this analysis is a subsample of all court-ordered and Detention Services initiated misdemeanants in 1975 through 1978. The total population of both types of misdemeanants numbered 641. For this analysis, a subsample consists of cases which terminated from a CCC during 1978, which numbered 168. These were chosen as the most recent and the most relevant for prediction. Of these 168 cases, 14 had to be deleted because data was not available. After the deletion of the 14 cases, data was collected and analyzed on 154 cases.

Of the 154 cases in this sample, 64.3%(99) completed Community Correctional Center Programs successfully. 7.8%(12) had neutral terminations (medical, transfer, death). There were 9.1%(14) VHR's and 18.8%(29) who terminated unsuccessfully.

Misdemeanants in this study were, on the average, between 20-29 years of age, had some high school education, were single, and unemployed. The offender did not have a known history of excessive alcohol use or drug abuse. He was most often charged with some type of property offense (petit larceny for example), and had no prior commitments or convictions. However, if he had a prior conviction, it had a high probability of being the same offense.

II

Most misdemeanants were not incarcerated prior to sentencing. Of those that were, the mean length of stay in jail was 75 days. Misdemeanants, on the average in 1978, spent approximately 83 days in a Community Correctional Center.

Of the variables tested, 2 were found to be statistically significant (at the .05 level) in their relationship to performance in the community center. These variables were "length of sentence" and "prior conviction for the same offense."

.67% of misdemeanants participating in a halfway house program could be correctly classified into groups of successes and failures by the use of discriminant analysis. The variable "narcotic use" was found to be the most important variable. The other variables found to be of importance were: number of times institutionalized, employment status, occupational status, and violations of conditions of release while on bond.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Misdemeanant Halfway House Performance Prediction Project is to establish guidelines to assist the decision-making personnel in determining which prospective participant would be more likely to perform successfully and which participant would be more likely to perform unsuccessfully in a halfway house.

These individuals who make up the decision-making personnel are judges, classification and parole officers (C&P's), institutional administrators, and members of the DC Parole Board. Currently each of the individuals has his or her own method of classification. This has led to a lack of consistency in the decision-making process. For this reason, guidelines are essential to bring about a sense of uniformity and equality in the decision-making process.

An important element of this study is the input of staff and management. Prior to the beginning of this study, a questionnaire was sent to the administrators of six Community Correctional Centers (CCC) in the District of Columbia which asked them to identify characteristics of prospective participants which would lead either to successful or unsuccessful termination from a CCC program (results are discussed later). It was felt that the decision-makers should provide their input and guidance before any survey had been implemented.

The guidelines developed through this project could act as a resource that judges, C&P officers, administrators, and members of the Parole Board could use. By securing information

about a few characteristics of a prospective halfway house participant, the decision-maker could determine if that individual fell into either good or poor risk categories.

Finally, we want the decision-makers to be aware of the purpose of this project so that they will view any guidelines that are developed, to be used as a tool which will help make their jobs easier, and to encourage greater consistency among the decision-makers.

B. Background

1. History of the Halfway House Program in the U.S.

Halfway Houses received their first trial in the United States when New York, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts established such facilities in the early part of the nineteenth century. Their purpose was to provide shelter, food, clothing and assist the ex-offender in securing employment after release. Unfortunately, halfway houses provoked a high level of public hostility which forced the closing of these houses.

It was not until the 1950's that the halfway house movement was revived. There were many problems facing the ex-offender just released from a penal institution. So, the halfway house approach was tried again and has remained in operation today. In 1964, the International Halfway House Association was formed, and since then, a multitude of community treatment centers have been established across the nation.

While most halfway houses still serve the ex-offender, some have been developed for treating specific problems such as

about a few characteristics of a prospective halfway house participant, the decision-maker could determine if that individual fell into either good or poor risk categories.

Finally, we want the decision-makers to be aware of the purpose of this project so that they will view any guidelines that are developed, to be used as a tool which will help make their jobs easier, and to encourage greater consistency among the decision-makers.

B. Background

1. History of the Halfway House Program in the U.S.

Halfway Houses received their first trial in the United States when New York, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts established such facilities in the early part of the nineteenth century. Their purpose was to provide shelter, food, clothing and assist the ex-offender in securing employment after release. Unfortunately, halfway houses provoked a high level of public hostility which forced the closing of these houses.

It was not until the 1950's that the halfway house movement was revived. There were many problems facing the ex-offender just released from a penal institution. So, the halfway house approach was tried again and has remained in operation today. In 1964, the International Halfway House Association was formed, and since then, a multitude of community treatment centers have been established across the nation.

While most halfway houses still serve the ex-offender, some have been developed for treating specific problems such as

alcoholism, drug abuse, runaway youth, and battered wives.

In the past few years, there has been a growing interest in community-based correctional programs. In these types of programs, offenders can live and work in the community while residing in the house as an alternative to incarceration.

The halfway house of the past helped the ex-con only after being released from the institution, as a bridge from the restrictiveness of institutional life to freedom. With the aid of the halfway house, the offender is reconditioned to enter the "outside world." The offender, who is about to complete serving his sentence is sent to a halfway house for this transition period. It is here where he will terminate his sentence or be paroled.

Corrections is moving increasingly away from traditional methods of confinement, and community-based programs are being utilized in numerous ways as appropriate alternatives. Courts are now using the option to sentence offenders to serve their sentences in a halfway house. Work release programs in which the offender lives in the house but works in the community have escalated across the nation. Today it is felt that "the best opportunity for successful integration or reintegration exists if the offender is able to live in the community."¹

2. Background for this Study

A major goal in conducting this study is to provide court personnel, C&P officers, and other decision-makers with specific information about the types of misdemeanants who succeed or fail in a Community Correctional Center (CCC) setting.

There are two distinct sets of sentenced misdemeanants in halfway houses. The court-ordered misdemeanants (c/m) are those misdemeanants sentenced by a judge into a halfway house. The other type is comprised of jailed-misdemeanants (j/m). This type has been sentenced by a judge into an institution, recommended for work-release by the C&P officer, and approved by the Chief of Community Correctional Centers and a judge. Once approved, the offender is then transferred from the detention institution into a halfway house where he resides until his sentence is terminated or he is paroled.

The addition of specific information on each misdemeanant can be used as an aid to the decision-makers when considering if the offender should be placed into a halfway house. The more information that is utilized by the decision-makers, the more accurate their decision will be concerning which potential halfway house participants will perform best in a halfway house setting.

Table 1: Percent of Unacceptable Terminations of Community Correctional Centers by Source of Referral

| <u>Fiscal Year</u> | <u>c/m</u> | <u>j/m</u> |
|--------------------|------------|------------|
| 1976 | 40% | 51% |
| 1977 | 46% | 25% |
| 1978 | 33.8% | 30% |

As table 1 indicates, j/m did better in 1977 and 1978 but, in 1976, c/m did better (40% compared to 51%). In fact, in 1976, more than half of the j/m failed (51%) either through new arrest, escape, or violation of house rules (VHR). The table also shows

the differences between the two groups for 1976 was 11% and, for 1977, the difference was 21%. Finally, in 1978, the difference between the two was very slight (3.8%). The years of 1976 and 1977 demonstrate the lack of consistency among the decision-makers. Hopefully, with the aid of guidelines developed from this study, the percent of unsuccessful terminations will decrease and a greater uniformity of policy can be reached.

"Classification guidelines" are not new as an effort to guide decision-makers to make classification decisions more easily and consistently. Past studies attempted to classify offenders into categories utilizing statistics from past experiences. With the aid of these statistics, assessments were made to determine characteristics that could be related to successful completion of a correctional program.

A pioneering study of this type was performed by Ernest Burgess in 1928. His goal was to establish criteria for predicting which offenders would be good or bad risks for parole. The scores were based on 20 to 30 variables; the highest success scores might be over 20, the lowest possible score was 0. He then created a range of numbers which would be considered a good risk for participants. In the study, 16-21 was chosen as the good risk range. Those offenders who fell within the 16-21 range had a violation rate of 1.5%.²

Another type of classification technique was an application of discriminant function analysis called the "Base Expectancy Method" developed by Leslie Wilkins in 1958. In this method, information was abstracted from files. This information was used

to categorize parolees "as of the time they began their institutional terms." Using multiple correlational analysis, a scoring system was calculated, and the parole violation rates for each score category were determined. The term "base expectancy" refers to their expected group violation rate when first admitted.³

Both Burgess and Wilkins have shown that scientific analysis of past performance of correctional programs can be useful for establishing new policy or guidelines. Similarly, this study attempts to gather historical data that may be useful for predicting successful and unsuccessful misdemeanor halfway house participants.

Once the predictive variables have been discovered through this research and follow-up studies, guidelines can be formulated that will accurately assist decision-makers in their daily tasks. If all the decision-makers involved in determining who should participate in the Department of Corrections CCC program use the new guidelines, more equitable and consistent decisions will be realized.

PROCEDURE

The study began with a literature review of past studies performed on classification. From these prior studies, the groundwork was laid on how this study would be accomplished.

One major aspect of this study is the utilization of staff and management from the department. As a first step in this study, CCC administrators were sent a questionnaire which asked (in their opinion) for six characteristics that lead to a successful completion of a CCC program and, for six characteristics that lead to an unsuccessful completion of a CCC program. The results of the questionnaires were tabulated and are presented in tables 1A and 1B. From their input and the prior studies, the variables (31 in all) were selected.

TABLE 1A: Characteristics of misdemeanants which he/she possessed before entering a CCC program that are likely to lead to a successful termination.

| <u>TRAIT</u> | <u>RATING</u> |
|--|---------------|
| a. strong family / community ties | 25 |
| b. good job skills | 25 |
| c. no prior / current drug history | 24 |
| d. positive attitude | 23 |
| e. no prior / current alcohol history | 22 |
| f. no indication of mental illness or severe physical problems | 22 |
| g. no prior criminal record or few arrests | 20 |
| h. no prior parole or probation violations | 18 |
| i. education level | 17 |
| j. no record of past institutional escapes | 17 |
| k. good program performance at Lorton | 16 |

TABLE 1B: Characteristics of misdemeanants which he/she possessed before entering a CCC program that are likely to lead to an unsuccessful termination.

| <u>TRAIT</u> | <u>RATING</u> |
|---|---------------|
| a. prior / current drug history | 25 |
| b. poor job skills | 24 |
| c. prior / current alcohol history | 23 |
| d. prior criminal record | 23 |
| e. bad attitude | 22 |
| f. poor family / community ties | 22 |
| g. record of past institutional escapes | 22 |
| h. indication of mental illness | 21 |
| i. physical / medical problems | 21 |
| j. prior probation or parole violation | 20 |

The sample used in this analysis is a subsample of all court-ordered and Detention Services initiated misdemeanants in 1975 through 1978. The total population of both types of misdemeanants numbered 641. For this analysis a subsample was selected from the sample population. The subsample consists of cases which terminated from a CCC during 1978, which numbered 168. These were chosen as the most recent and the most relevant for prediction. Of these 168 cases, 14 had to be deleted because data was not available. After the deletion of the 14 cases, data was collected and analyzed on 154 cases.

There are a couple of reasons why a subsample was selected for this analysis. First, because of the lack of staff availability, a time limitation had to be imposed in order to complete

the preliminary project. The reason for selecting only the 1978 cases was to cut down the sample size so that a preliminary analysis could be performed within a reasonable time frame. Also, the 1978 cases are the most recent cases; hence, these cases take into consideration any judicial or departmental policies that had been changed which would effect the composition of the population.

The sample was obtained by using the inactive cases on file from the D.C. Department of Corrections Record Office of Community Services. Manually, each case (1975 to 1978) was recorded in alphabetical order from the Record Office files.

The third aspect of this study was the data collection. The data was collected in three different places. First, the initial search began collecting the sample from the Records Office of Community Service. From their files, data was collected for some of the variables. The second place that data was collected from was the Correctional Record Information System (CRISYS) which is the District of Columbia's computerized system of correctional information. From this computer system, historical data was collected on each case. The last source of information was Pretrial Services. By going through their manual files, more data was collected.

The data was then keypunched and analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) programs, to obtain crosstabulations and discriminant analysis from an IBM 360/370 computer system of the Metropolitan Police Department.

FINDINGS

A. Characteristics of the Participants

Some descriptive characteristics of the sampled misdemeanants are presented below.

TABLE 2: Education Levels of Misdemeanants

| <u>Elem.</u> | <u>Jr.High</u> | <u>Sr.High</u> | <u>H.S.Grad</u> | <u>Some College</u> | <u>Col. Grad</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 3.9(6) | 16.3(25) | 37.2 (57) | 34.6(53) | 6.5(10) | 1.3(2) | 100.0(153) |
| *missing observations-1 | | | | | | |

As table 2 indicates, the majority are in the high school range (37.2% and 34.6%) and, almost half of the sample graduated high school or completed General Educational Development (G.E.D.) requirements (42.4%).

TABLE 3: Age Distribution of Misdemeanants

| <u>20-24</u> | <u>25-29</u> | <u>30-34</u> | <u>35-39</u> | <u>40-44</u> | <u>45-53</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| 26.3 (40) | 26.3 (40) | 23.7 (36) | 15.1 (23) | 4.6 (7) | 3.9 (6) | 100.0 (152) |
| *missing observations-2 | | | | | | |

As table 3 indicates, most of the misdemeanants are 29 years old or younger (52.6%).

TABLE 4: Drug History of Misdemeanants

| <u>nonuser</u> | <u>user</u> | <u>other</u> | <u>total</u> |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| 57.2 (88) | 29.2 (45) | 13.6 (21) | 100.0 (154) |

As table 4 indicates, most of the misdemeanants in this study

are non-users of drugs (57.1%). The number of non-users is about twice that of the users.

TABLE 5: Charge Distribution of Misdemeanants

| <u>crimes against persons</u> | <u>crimes against property</u> | <u>morals & decency offenses</u> | <u>public order offenses</u> | <u>neutral</u> | <u>total</u> |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 5.8 (9) | 46.1 (71) | 22.9 (35) | 23.3 (36) | 1.9 (3) | 100.0 (154) |

Table 5 indicates that the largest category of crimes committed by misdemeanants are crimes against property (46.1%). In the study, it was found that the most common conviction was for a charge of petit larceny (28.6% or 44/154).

TABLE 6: Alcohol History of Misdemeanants

| <u>nonuser</u> | <u>user</u> | <u>Alcoholic</u> | <u>unknown</u> | <u>total</u> |
|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 52.7 (81) | 32.4 (50) | 1.9 (3) | 13.0 (20) | 100.0 (154) |

Table 6 indicates that the majority of misdemeanants in this sample were non-users of alcohol (52.7%). The table also shows that for 13.0% of the sample, nothing was known as to alcohol history.

TABLE 7: Marital Status of Misdemeanants

| <u>single</u> | <u>married</u> | <u>divorced</u> | <u>separated</u> | <u>widow</u> | <u>unknown</u> | <u>total</u> |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 63.1 (97) | 22.0 (34) | 4.6 (7) | 8.4 (13) | 1.3 (2) | 0.6 (1) | 100.0 (154) |

Table 7 indicates that the vast majority of the misdemeanants

in this analysis are single (63.1%). The next largest category is the married group (22.0%).

TABLE 8: Prior Jail Commitments of Misdemeanants

| <u>0</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>8orMore</u> | <u>total</u> |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|--------------|
| 14.9 | 15.6 | 7.1 | 9.1 | 7.8 | 4.5 | 5.8 | 3.9 | 31.2 | 100.0 |
| (23) | (24) | (11) | (14) | (12) | (7) | (9) | (6) | (48) | (154) |

Table 8 indicates that, of the misdemeanants in this analysis, 31.2% had 8 or more prior jail commitments. The next two largest groups are zero priors (14.9%), and one prior (15.6%). There tends to be a drop after the first commitment until one reaches eight or more.

TABLE 9: Prior Convictions of Misdemeanants

| <u>0</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>8orMore</u> | <u>total</u> |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|--------------|
| 28.6 | 24.0 | 15.6 | 9.1 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 5.2 | 100.0 |
| (44) | (37) | (24) | (14) | (10) | (10) | (3) | (4) | (8) | (154) |

As table 9 indicates, most of the misdemeanants had either zero convictions (28.6%) or only one prior conviction (24.0%).

TABLE 10: Prior Sentences to Incarceration of Misdemeanants

| <u>0</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>8orMore</u> | <u>total</u> |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|--------------|
| 48.1 | 22.7 | 12.3 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| (74) | (35) | (19) | (7) | (6) | (6) | (4) | (0) | (3) | (154) |

Table 10 indicates that almost half of the misdemeanants had no prior prison sentence (48.1%). From 2 through 8 or more, there is a steady decrease in prior prison sentences.

TABLE 11: Percent of Misdemeanants with
Prior Conviction for Same Offense

| <u>yes</u> | <u>no</u> | <u>total</u> |
|------------|-----------|--------------|
| 37.0 | 63.0 | 100.0 |
| (57) | (97) | (154) |

Table 11 shows that the majority of misdemeanants in this study had not been convicted of the same offense before (63.0%). Of the 71.1% of misdemeanants who had a prior conviction, 49% had been convicted of the same offense.

TABLE 12: Living Arrangements of Misdemeanants

| <u>parents</u> | <u>spouse</u> | <u>other family</u> | <u>alone</u> | <u>friend</u> | <u>total</u> |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 32.5 | 14.3 | 22.1 | 13.6 | 17.5 | 100.0 |
| (50) | (22) | (34) | (21) | (27) | (154) |

Table 12 indicates that 32.5% lived with their parents. Included in this category are those offenders who were married but, lived in a parent's home. The next highest category is living with "other family" (22.1%). "Living with spouse" (14.3%) and "living alone" (13.6%) were the two smallest categories.

TABLE 13: Time Spent Incarcerated Prior to Sentencing
(in months)

| <u>0</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>8orMore</u> | <u>total</u> |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|--------------|
| 57.1 | 8.4 | 11.0 | 13.6 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| (88) | (13) | (17) | (21) | (5) | (4) | (2) | (2) | (2) | (154) |

Table 13 indicates that the majority of misdemeanants in this study had no incarceration time prior to sentencing (57.1%).

Of the 32.9% that were incarcerated prior to sentencing, the average length of stay was 75 days.

TABLE 14: Percent of Misdemeanants by Type of Original Commitment

| <u>CCC</u> | <u>jailed</u> | <u>total</u> |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| 81.8 (126) | 18.2 (28) | 100.0 (154) |

As table 14 indicates, the vast majority of misdemeanants in this study were court-ordered directly into a CCC (81.8%). There were four times as many court-ordered misdemeanants as misdemeanants first sentenced to jail and then released to a CCC.

TABLE 15: Sentence Length of Misdemeanants

| <u>less 90</u> | <u>90-180</u> | <u>180-270</u> | <u>270-365</u> | <u>over lyr</u> | <u>total</u> |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 26.6 (41) | 14.3 (22) | 29.2 (45) | 8.4 (13) | 21.4 (33) | 100.0 (154) |

Table 15 indicates that the typical misdemeanant from this study is sentenced 180-270 days (29.2%). The next most common category is for those sentenced 90 days or less (26.6%).

TABLE 16: Time Spent in a CCC Program by Misdemeanants

| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>total</u> |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------|----------------|
| 20.8 (32) | 22.1 (34) | 21.4 (33) | 11.7 (18) | 11.7 (18) | 6.5 (10) | 5.8 (9) | 100.0 (154) |

Table 16 indicates that the majority of misdemeanants spend approximately 1 to 3 months in a CCC program (64.3%). After the third month there is a gradual decrease. The average length of stay in a CCC program was 83 days.

TABLE 17: Length of Employment Prior to Arrest of Misdemeanants

| <u>unknown</u> | <u>not employed 3 mons or more</u> | <u>not employed less 3 mons</u> | <u>employed less 1 mon</u> | <u>employed 1-6 mons</u> | <u>employed 6-12 mons</u> | <u>employed 1-2 yrs</u> | <u>employed 2 yrs and more</u> | <u>total</u> |
|----------------|--|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------|
| 0.6 (1) | 42.2 (65) | 14.3 (22) | 6.5 (10) | 4.5 (7) | 6.5 (10) | 8.4 (13) | 16.9 (26) | 100.0 (154) |

The results from table 17 indicate that the majority of misdemeanants in this study were unemployed (56.5%) and only 16.9% had been employed for 2 years or more.

In summary, one could describe a typical misdemeanant from the above analysis as follows:

1. He would be between the ages of 20-29, have some high school education, be unemployed, single, and living with his parents. He would not have a known history of either drugs or alcohol abuse.
2. He would most likely be charged with some type of property offense, for example, petit larceny.
3. There were no particular characteristic number of prior commitments. He would have had few if any prior convictions (0 or 1) or, if he had been convicted, there was a high probability that it was for the same offense. He would not previously have spent any time in prison under a sentence of incarceration.
4. From the period of arrest to sentence, he could expect not to be incarcerated but, if he was, he would spend, on the average, 75 days in jail. He could expect to spend approximately 83 days in a CCC program.

B. CCC MISDEMEANANT PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

As mentioned in the Procedure section of this analysis, two different approaches were used to test the variables statistically; crosstabulation and discriminant analysis. In this section of "findings," these two statistical functions will be discussed.

A. Crosstabulation

The crosstabulations were derived by using termination reason as the dependent variable, and testing it against twenty-seven independent variables. The categories for termination reason are:

1. paroled
2. expiration
3. neutral (transfer, medical, death)
4. VHR (violation of house rules)
5. escape
6. arrest on new charge

These six categories were recoded into four categories:

1. success (paroled and expiration)
2. neutral
3. VHR
4. failures (escape and arrest)

The decision rule chosen for this analysis was the significance level of .05. Presented below are the two crosstabulations that met the qualification of the decision rule.

TABLE 18: Termination Reason by Length of Sentence

| | <u>success</u> | | <u>neutral</u> | | <u>VHR</u> | | <u>failures</u> | | <u>total</u> | |
|--------------|----------------|------|----------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|
| | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# |
| less 90 days | 68.3 | 28 | 0.0 | 0 | 12.2 | 5 | 19.5 | 8 | 100.0 | 41 |
| 90-180 | 72.7 | 16 | 9.1 | 2 | 9.1 | 2 | 9.1 | 2 | 100.0 | 22 |
| 180-270 | 64.4 | 29 | 2.2 | 1 | 6.7 | 3 | 26.7 | 12 | 100.0 | 45 |
| 270-365 | 46.2 | 6 | 23.1 | 3 | 23.1 | 3 | 7.7 | 1 | 100.0 | 13 |
| over 365 | 60.6 | 20 | 18.2 | 6 | 3.0 | 1 | 18.2 | 6 | 100.0 | 33 |

Chi Square=22.889

significance=0.028

Table 18 indicates that those misdemeanants who are sentenced. 90-180 days have a better success rate than any other group (72.7%). Those sentenced to less than 90 days had a success rate of 68.3%. The misdemeanants in the 180-270 day category had the highest proportion of failures (26.7%). Overall, all the categories of sentences were in a narrow range (+/- 12%) except for those in the 270-365 days group. This group had the lowest success rate (46.2%) but, it also had the lowest failure rate (7.7%). This was the smallest group (13 members) and had the highest proportion of neutral terminations (23.1%).

TABLE 19: Termination Reason by Prior Conviction for the Same Offense

| | <u>success</u> | | <u>neutral</u> | | <u>VHR</u> | | <u>failures</u> | | <u>total</u> | |
|-----|----------------|------|----------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|
| | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# |
| yes | 49.1 | 28 | 12.3 | 7 | 10.5 | 6 | 28.1 | 16 | 100.0 | 57 |
| no | 73.2 | 71 | 5.2 | 5 | 8.2 | 8 | 13.4 | 13 | 100.0 | 97 |

Chi Square=9.883

significance=0.020

Table 19 indicates that those misdemeanants, who had no prior convictions for the same offense, had the better success rate

(73.2%). Also, those in this category had the lower failure rate (13.4%). Misdemeanants who had a prior conviction for the same offense had a proportion of failures twice that of those with no similar prior convictions (28.1% compared to 13.4%).

The crosstabulations which follow include variables which were selected by the administrators of the Community Correctional Centers to characterize a successful or unsuccessful participant in a CCC program. The factors most commonly cited by the administrators were:

1. successful terminations
 - a. nonuse of narcotics
 - b. good family ties
 - c. good employment
2. unsuccessful terminations
 - a. prior history of drugs
 - b. poor job skills
 - c. prior / current alcohol history

TABLE 20: Termination Reason by Narcotic Use

| | <u>success</u> | | <u>neutral</u> | | <u>VHR</u> | | <u>failures</u> | | <u>total</u> | |
|---------|----------------|------|----------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|
| | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# |
| nonuser | 70.5 | 62 | 8.0 | 7 | 8.0 | 7 | 13.6 | 12 | 100.0 | 88 |
| user | 58.2 | 32 | 7.3 | 4 | 10.9 | 6 | 23.6 | 13 | 100.0 | 55 |
| unknown | 71.4 | 15 | 4.8 | 1 | 4.8 | 1 | 19.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 21 |

Chi Square=6.1

significance=0.5

Table 20 indicates that the unknown and nonusers perform well in a CCC program (71.4% and 70.5%). Those with the highest proportion of failures were the known user group, with a percentage of 23.6%. The nonuser category had the lowest proportion of failures with a percentage of 13.6%. In general, the administrators'

expected pattern was found. It just didn't reach statistical significance.

TABLE 21: Termination Reason by Living Arrangements

| | <u>success</u> | | <u>neutral</u> | | <u>VHR</u> | | <u>failures</u> | | <u>total</u> | |
|--------------|----------------|------|----------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|
| | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# |
| parents | 64.0 | 1 | 12.0 | 6 | 8.0 | 4 | 16.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 50 |
| spouse | 63.6 | 14 | 4.5 | 1 | 9.1 | 2 | 22.7 | 5 | 100.0 | 22 |
| other family | 67.6 | 23 | 0.0 | 0 | 14.7 | 5 | 17.6 | 6 | 100.0 | 34 |
| alone | 57.1 | 12 | 19.0 | 4 | 4.8 | 1 | 19.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 21 |
| friend | 66.7 | 18 | 3.7 | 1 | 7.4 | 2 | 22.2 | 6 | 100.0 | 27 |

Chi Square=10.671

significance=0.557

Table 21 indicates that all groups succeed about the same (only 10% difference from the highest to lowest group). The group that had the best success rate was made up of those living with other family (67.6%). Living alone was found to be the least likely to result in a successful termination (57.1%). When discussing the failures, all the groups did about the same (within a 6% margin). The groups which had the higher proportion failing included those that lived with their spouses or with a friend (22.7% and 22.2% respectively). The administrators' suggestions was not very clearly born out here. Perhaps, "prior living arrangements" is not a suitable measure of strength of family ties.

TABLE 22: Termination Reason by Length of Employment Prior to Arrest

| | <u>success</u> | | <u>neutral</u> | | <u>VHR</u> | | <u>failures</u> | | <u>total</u> | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------|----------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|
| | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# |
| unknown | 100.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 1 |
| unemployed less 3 mons and more | 61.5 | 40 | 12.3 | 8 | 9.2 | 6 | 16.9 | 11 | 100.0 | 65 |
| unemployed less 3 mons | 63.6 | 14 | 9.1 | 2 | 13.6 | 3 | 13.6 | 3 | 100.0 | 22 |
| employed less 1 mon | 50.0 | 5 | 0.0 | 0 | 20.0 | 2 | 30.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 10 |
| employed 1-6 mons | 42.9 | 3 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 57.1 | 4 | 100.0 | 7 |
| employed 6-12 mons | 60.0 | 6 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 40.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 10 |
| employed 1-2 yrs | 76.9 | 10 | 0.0 | 0 | 7.7 | 1 | 15.4 | 2 | 100.0 | 13 |
| employed 2 yrs & more | 76.9 | 20 | 7.7 | 2 | 7.7 | 2 | 7.7 | 2 | 100.0 | 26 |

Chi Square=21.488

significance=0.429

Table 22 indicates that those who had employment for one year or more had the best success rate (76.9%). All the groups reached a success rate of at least 50%. The group which had the highest unsuccessful rate were those employed 1-6 months (57.1%) followed by those employed 6-12 months (40.0%). Employment, or the lack thereof, seems to have little impact unless the person was continuously employed for at least one year.

TABLE 23: Termination Reason by Occupation

| | <u>success</u> | | <u>neutral</u> | | <u>VHR</u> | | <u>failures</u> | | <u>total</u> | |
|--------------|----------------|------|----------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|
| | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# |
| unemployed | 63.1 | 41 | 10.8 | 7 | 10.8 | 7 | 15.4 | 10 | 100.0 | 65 |
| professional | 75.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 25.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 4 |
| clerical | 55.6 | 5 | 11.1 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 33.3 | 3 | 100.0 | 9 |
| service | 65.1 | 28 | 4.7 | 2 | 11.6 | 5 | 18.6 | 8 | 100.0 | 43 |
| benchwork | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 1 |
| structure | 45.5 | 5 | 9.1 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 45.5 | 5 | 100.0 | 11 |
| misc. | 81.0 | 17 | 4.8 | 1 | 9.5 | 2 | 4.8 | 1 | 100.0 | 21 |

Chi Square=18.552

significance=0.419

Table 23 indicates that the group with the highest proportion of successes is the miscellaneous group (81.0%). Those few in professional jobs (4) had a success rate of 75.0%. Structural workers had the lowest success rate (45.5%), and had the highest proportion of unsuccessful terminations (45.5%). The unemployed had an unsuccessful rate of 15.4%. This would suggest that the administrators were, at best, partially correct. However, the results here suggest that unemployment (prior to conviction) is more conducive to success than employment in construction (structural) or clerical jobs. Similar kinds of results have been found in the Department's routine monitoring of CCC terminations.

TABLE 23: Termination Reason by Alcohol Use

| | <u>success</u> | | <u>neutral</u> | | <u>VHR</u> | | <u>failures</u> | | <u>total</u> | |
|---------------|----------------|------|----------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|
| | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# |
| nonuser | 63.0 | 51 | 11.1 | 9 | 6.2 | 5 | 19.8 | 16 | 100.0 | 81 |
| moderate user | 63.4 | 26 | 4.9 | 2 | 12.2 | 5 | 19.5 | 8 | 100.0 | 41 |
| frequent user | 55.6 | 5 | 0.0 | 0 | 33.3 | 3 | 11.1 | 1 | 100.0 | 9 |
| alcoholic | 66.7 | 2 | 0.0 | 0 | 33.3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 3 |
| unknown | 75.0 | 15 | 5.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 20.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 20 |

Table 23 indicates that the "unknown" group had the best success rate (75.0%). Unfortunately, we had no way to find out the status of these individuals. The known alcoholics were the next best group, with a success rate of 66.7% but, the small size of this group precludes any firm conclusions. It should be noted that all of the groups had a success rate over 55.0%. Alcohol use then, was of little use by itself as a performance predictor.

Presented below is a crosstabulation to see if court initiated or corrections initiated misdemeanants performed any better.

TABLE 24: Termination Reason by Referral Source

| | <u>success</u> | | <u>neutral</u> | | <u>VHR</u> | | <u>failures</u> | | <u>total</u> | |
|-------------|----------------|------|----------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|
| | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# | % | Raw# |
| court | 64.3 | 81 | 8.7 | 11 | 8.7 | 11 | 18.3 | 23 | 100.0 | 126 |
| corrections | 64.3 | 18 | 3.6 | 1 | 10.7 | 3 | 21.4 | 6 | 100.0 | 28 |

Table 24 indicates that the success rate is the same for both types (64.3%). The failure rate is also about the same (only a 3.1% difference). Note that the Department of Corrections can only initiate a CCC placement after the courts have rejected that alternative. The courts have presumably taken the best risks already.

B. Predicting In-Program Performance of Misdemeanants Using Discriminant Analysis

Discriminant analysis is a process that distinguishes between two or more groups mathematically. For distinguishing purposes, the researcher selects a number of discriminating variables that measure characteristics on which the groups differ. The objective is to discriminate between the groups (tell them apart) using statistical analysis. By taking each of these variables and mathematically combining them, we hope to find a single dimension on which one group (successes) is at one end, and the other group (failures) is at the other. Once knowing how each variable corresponds to each group, one is then able to predict performance using the variables as the tool.

For purposes of this phase of analysis, each variable was dichotomized. Termination reasons were recoded as follows:

- a. paroled and expiration=success
- b. VHR, escape, new arrest=failures
- c. neutrals were left out of the analysis or considered the "ungrouped cases."

By using the discriminant formula, we were able to come up with the five most important variables to be used for predicting success and failures. These variables are:

1. narcotic use
2. employment status
3. occupational status
4. number of times institutionalized
5. violations of conditions of release while on bond

As far as importance is concerned, narcotic use was found statistically to be more important than the others, in fact, twice as important as the least important variable of violations of conditions of release while on bond. The other three variables were relatively equivalent to each other in importance.

Presented in table 25 are the results of the attempt to predicting successes and/or failures using the discriminant function developed here.

TABLE 25: Results of Predicting Successes and Failures using Discriminant Analysis

| <u>predicted group membership</u> | <u>failures</u> | | <u>Actual Group</u> | | <u>ungrouped</u> | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|
| | <u>%</u> | <u>Raw#</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Raw#</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Raw#</u> |
| Predicted Failures | 67.4 | 29 | 33.3 | 33 | 41.7 | 5 |
| Predicted Successes | 32.6 | 14 | 66.7 | 66 | 58.3 | 7 |

PERCENT OF "GROUPED" CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 66.9%

Table 25 shows that using the five variables discussed, there is a 67.4% probability of correctly predicting failures and, there is a 66.7% probability of correctly predicting successes. The table also indicates an overall 66.9% probability of correctly classifying the offenders.

DISCUSSION

The creation of a clear and effective set of criteria for decision-makers to utilize in deciding on placement of misdemeanants for CCC programs, has not been satisfactorily accomplished. Of the different variables that were tested, only two (length of sentence and prior conviction for the same offense) turned out to be statistically significant at the .05 level in their relationship to program outcome.

The findings of this study did, however, result in some relevant conclusions. One major finding is that the variables, which were selected by the administrators as leading to successful or unsuccessful terminations, were found to have a notably stronger predictive ability than many other variables tested. Four of the five variables that came out of the discriminant function analysis were those suggested by operation's staff.

The discriminant analysis technique was able to correctly predict an individual's CCC performance only 67% of the time. It is hoped that with the addition of the rest of the sample, the predictability of the discriminating variables will increase.

The problems which may have resulted in the less than satisfactory results include: 1) The sample size. Individual cells in the crosstabulations often contained categories with only a few cases. One cannot come up with concrete conclusions on analysis performed on a small number of cases. This study is a preliminary study of the total population which will consist of 641 cases. With the addition of 487 cases, it is felt that the results will

be more effective in creating criteria for predicting participants performance in the CCC programs.

2) Another problem with the findings was the failure to introduce control variables. Usually, there exists an indirect causal relationship among different variables. By using control variables, one could be able to determine if there are other factors that lead to the dependent variable (termination reason).

3) To determine the causal relationships (direct or indirect), it is suggested that path analysis may be useful in providing further insights into the relationships between the variables. However, in this data, first order correlations among the variables were nearly non-existent hence, path analysis could be noneffective. With the addition of the other cases, the correlations should improve. This would allow the application of path analysis.

4) A fourth problem that could be a factor which led to the results is the inadequate representation of concepts by the measures used here. An example of this is: The Community Correctional Center Administrators rated "strong family ties" as the most important characteristic leading to a successful completion of a CCC program. In this study, family ties were measured by the "Living Arrangements" of the misdemeanants. This variable may not be a good indicator of "family ties" as defined by the Administrators.

5) A fifth problem that was found was inconsistencies in the data. The way that the coding scheme, used by the Department of Corrections in their CRYISIS system, is set up, presented some problems. An example of this is the high percentages of "unknowns" for the

variables of drug and alcohol use. Another example is the categories that are used for occupation. The distinctions between them are not always clear to those doing the coding. This results in miscodings and heavy utilization of the "miscellaneous" code.

Burgess's study, in 1928, found that with 21 variables, those with success scores of 16-21 had a violation rate of only 1.5 percent, while those with scores of four or less had a violation rate of 76%. When he did the study using many different variables in scoring, most cases fell into score groups near the violation rate. This is similar to what happened in this study. A blind guess that a misdemeanant will succeed in the CCC program will be right 64% of the time. The discriminant function developed here would only improve that result by two percentage points. Of course a blind guess that a participant would fail would be correct only 36% of the time; whereas, using the method developed here, one would be correct over 67% of the time. Of course, no experienced decision maker is making "blind guesses."

To conclude, this author wishes to point out that although there were problems which arose during the performance of this study, more work should be done for the purpose of setting up criteria which could be used as guidelines for release decisions. The idea of using background characteristics is an old idea, but still effective. Work is needed to find out which variables are most effective as predictive aids.

It should also be stressed that statistical classification techniques should never be thought of as a "cure-all" way for deciding who shall enter a CCC program. This decision must always

rest in the hands of the decision-makers. What is suggested is that with statistical guidelines for classification, decision-makers can have a resource which would aid them in arriving at the best decision.

END