

NCJRS

FEB 1 1977

ACQUISITIONS

KENTUCKY'S ADULT HALF-WAY HOUSES:

SIX MONTH FOLLOW-UP

Data Collected By:
Evaluation Staff

Report Prepared By:
Richard Thompson
Pat Sims
Mary Ellen Curtin

August, 1976

38278 dup

OUTLINE

Introduction	1
Method	
Measures of Reintegration	2
Indicators and Analysis	2
Sample	3
Data Collection	4
Results	
Description of Subjects	
Half-way Houses Separately	4
Half-way Houses Combined	6
Control Group	6
Comparison of Half-way House Residents and Control Group	6
Half-way House Follow-up Status	
Half-way House Residents: Legal Status	8
Half-way House Residents: Employment Status	11
Control Group Follow-up Status	
Overall Comparison of Half-way House Residents and Control Group	13
Comparison of Kentucky and Other Half-way House Programs	14
Summary and Conclusions	15
Appendix	18
References	19

INTRODUCTION

This study is the second phase of an evaluation of three Kentucky half-way houses for ex-offenders, grant number 1829-015-c76. The report of the first phase (May, 1976) concentrated on: 1) description of the three in-house programs, 2) description of the populations of clients served by the programs, and 3) degree of success of the clients while in residence. The report of the second phase focuses on a follow-up of the half-way house residents for their first six months following residential termination. The second report also includes follow-up data on a control group of non-half-way house residents for comparison.

As noted in the first report, adjustment while in residence at a half-way house is only a partial indicator of program impact. Behavior within the limitations of this type of structured environment may or may not be related to post-residence street behavior. For example, a Minnesota study indicated that client success within the half-way house program did not appear related to recidivism following release from the house. It was further noted that no difference in the rates of recidivism was found between direct prison releasees and half-way house residents (Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control, 1975). In the Federal General Accounting Office (GAO) Report to Congress (1975), the recidivism of residents of 15 half-way houses in four states was surveyed. Although a direct comparison between the recidivism of half-way house residents and offenders who experienced other correction methods within these states was not possible, a review of statistics from the Federal Bureau of Prisons led the GAO to conclude "that results from half-way houses were not any worse than for some other forms of rehabilitation" (GAO, 1975, p. iii).

In contrast, however, the Ohio evaluation of half-way houses concluded that reintegration into the community was more successful by half-way house residents (Seiter, Petersilia, and Allen, 1974). The Ohio study did not report on the relationship of program success by the half-way clients to their community reintegration. Such conflicting information regarding rehabilitation effects of half-way house programs per se and of success during residency appears to justify further research into the results of the Kentucky half-way house program.

METHOD

Measures of Reintegration

In the first report on Kentucky half-way houses, two types of measures on outcome/reintegration were intended for follow-up study. Indicators of community reintegration by the half-way house residents and control subjects were to include both recidivism status (i.e. rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration) and measures of positive adjustment as well. The latter indicators were to reflect: 1) consistency and quality of employment, 2) quality of living arrangements, and 3) community involvement.

However, a review of the information on parolees released from the half-way houses and institutions revealed that the intended indicators of the concept of reintegration would need to be narrowed. Although recidivism status (rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration) was available for the half-way house residents, the length and consistency of employment was essentially the only indicator of positive adjustment recorded. Information on the control group's reintegration was limited essentially to one indicator of recidivism--reincarceration.

Indicators and Analysis

As noted, records for the half-way house group were adequate in terms of indicators of recidivism while only minimal information on positive adjustment in terms of social reintegration was available. Thus, the follow-up information on half-way house residents included: 1) rearrest data, 2) reincarceration data, and 3) employment status. In addition, relevant demographic and background information had been collected for the first report and was utilized in the present report.

Demographic and background information obtained for the control group was restricted to a quite basic set of knowledge that included: 1) age, 2) sex, 3) race, 4) crime, 5) length of sentence, 6) county in which convicted, 7) status of the case, and 8) dates relevant to initiation and closure of active supervision. In reference to case status, three categories were used in the classification of these parolees: active, i.e. under supervision, final discharge, and parole revocation (incarceration).

Common to both groups is information on 1) reincarceration status and 2) certain demographic/background factors. Analysis will focus first on the relationship between these sets of factors for the two groups separately; secondly, group comparisons will be made.

Sample

The follow-up study included 130 half-way house residents who entered and terminated from the three Louisville half-way houses (Blitz, Dismas, and Ervin) during calendar year 1975. Half of the residents were Louisvillians; however, some were from out-of-state and some were from other parts of the Commonwealth. Excluded from the half-way house follow-up sample were persons who were transferred from Louisville either during their residency or during the six-months follow-up period. The numbers for the half-way house follow-up sample were: Blitz-4, Dismas-87 males, and Ervin-39 males.

The control group numbered 298 (271 males, 27 females) and consisted of all parolees from the state corrections system who became active parole supervision cases of the Louisville office at some time during 1975. As with the half-way house residents, some of these parolees were transferred into the Louisville area either from different states or from other parts of the state but all had their initial parole date during 1975.

The purpose of choosing this control group was to provide a comparison sample of parolees released during the same period of time and to the same location as half-way house clients. Thus it would be possible to rule out the influence of extraneous variables such as the labor market and political and social attitudes toward crime and former offenders. Therefore, as well as examining the success of the half-way house residents according to house, reintegration of the residents may be compared to that of a similar group of parolees who had not participated in the half-way house program.

Selection of a control group from the same geographic location and with the same time reference as the experimental group minimizes the disparity between the two groups; however, certain differences may arise from the inherent nature of these two kinds of clients. Perhaps the most important difference is that receptive and supportive community elements are lacking for the half-way house group (by definition) but are supposedly present for the control group who had been released directly to the community (a prerequisite to this type of release). Another potential for difference between the two groups is that the pre-institution residence of approximately half of the half-way house residents was not Louisville, whereas very few of the direct releases were non-Louisvillians. However, with these possible intervening influences in mind, this control group serves as the best available reference point when reviewing the half-way house data.

Adequate statistical information was not available on all Kentucky offenders released during 1975, thus precluding a comparison between the half-way group and all institutionalized offenders. However, comparisons with other half-way house and corrections studies will be presented.

Data Collection

Follow-up data on the half-way residents and direct releasee control group were obtained from the Louisville State Probation and Parole office. Members of the Evaluation staff recorded information on the half-way house residents directly from case records maintained by the parole officers. All relevant notes and reports were reviewed. Assistance in providing additional information and in locating files was provided by the Parole Office supervisors, officers, and clerical staff. The follow-up status of the control group was obtained from the index card-file system.

Relevant information on background characteristics of the half-way house clients as well as other house-related data had been obtained earlier from the half-way house project records and Bureau of Corrections files. Whereas observations based on these data were presented for the entire group in the first report, only those observations for the follow-up sample are included in the present report.

Information pertaining to background characteristics of the control group is not as complete as that for the half-way house clients. While much of these data are included in the folders of the parole officer, the number for the control group (298) precluded in-depth review of all records. Instead, summary information was recorded by the Evaluation staff from the parolee's index card in the Parole Office card-file system. Although not as extensive, this source provided certain useful background information.

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

Half-Way Houses Separately

As well as providing a general indication of the half-way house clientele, it was hoped that descriptive and background information would be a useful reference when examining the reintegration of these parolees (particularly in

relation to the control group of direct releasees). A profile of demographic and background characteristics of the residents of Blitz House, Dismas House and Ervin House, as well as the control group, is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Profile of Subjects

Background Characteristics	Blitz	Dismas	Ervin	Control
Race	W	W	B	W
Age	Mixed	<30	<30	≥30
Sex	F	M	M	M
Education	9-11 yr.	9-11 yr.	9-11 yr.	NA
Marital Status	S	S	S	NA
Residence	Ky.	Jeff. Co.	Jeff. Co.	NA
Offense	Property	Property	Property	Property
Sentence	3-9 yr.	1-2 yr.	Mixed	3-9 yr.

NA/Not Available

An analysis of the separate houses reveals several relevant points of information. Specifically, it was found that four women had left the program in 1975. These women constitute a distinct minority (3 percent) of the total half-way releasees and, thus, comparison between this house and the two male houses does not appear appropriate. However, it can be noted that Blitz House graduates are primarily white, unmarried, with less than 12 years of school. Half of these graduates are over 30; half had committed property offenses; and 3 of the 4 had been sentenced for 3-9 years (Table 2).

From the profile outlined above and information in Table 2, it can be seen that the Dismas and Ervin House residents are young, unmarried, with less than twelfth-grade education. Half of the Dismas and Ervin House graduates are originally from Jefferson County.

In terms of offense history, the Dismas House group had a slightly larger proportion (10 percent more) of property offenders than Ervin House. As the table shows, however, this was the most common offense for both houses. One further point of contrast is that Ervin House had twice as many drug offenders as Dismas House (16 percent for Ervin, 7 percent for Dismas).

The Dismas House parolees also tended to have less lengthy sentences than the Ervin House group. Among the Dismas House group, approximately half had a two year sentence or less, and 10 percent received ten years or more.

In contrast, Ervin House residents were rather evenly distributed among the three sentencing categories.

Half-Way Houses Combined

In Table 2, the data indicate that of the 130 half-way house residents released in the Louisville area, 47 percent are black and 53 percent white. Ninety-seven percent are male and two-thirds are less than 30 years of age. Only 13 percent of this group have a twelfth grade education or higher. In other words, half-way house residents are most likely to be males under 30 with less than a high school education but equally divided black or white.

One-third of the half-way house group had committed property offenses, while one-fourth of the group were sentenced for a mixed category of offenses. Except for the sex offenses (which 3 percent of the half-way group had committed), person/property, fraud/forgery, and drug-related offenses were about 10 percent each for the group.

When sentencing is considered, one finds that 47 percent of the half-way group received no more than a two-year sentence. On the other hand, 16 percent had been sentenced to ten years or more.

The Control Group: Direct Releasees

Again referring to Table 2, one can see that 91 percent of the direct releasees are male, 60 percent are 30 or more years of age, and approximately half the group are white. Information on education and other background variables was not available.

The most frequent offense for which the control group had been convicted was property crimes (33 percent). Twenty-one percent of the control group fell into the mixed category of offenses. One-third had received ten years or more as a sentence; one-fourth had been sentenced for two years or less; and the remaining 42 percent had between three and nine years as a sentence.

Comparison of the Half-Way House Residents and Control Group

In general, background characteristics of the two groups are quite similar. For example, over 90 percent of both groups are male and there is almost an equal racial balance. In terms of age, however, the half-way house group tends to be younger (under 30) than the direct releasees: 64 percent to 40 percent, respectively.

Table 2

Background Characteristics of the Half-Way House Graduates and Direct Releasees

	<u>Half-Way House Population</u>				<u>Control Group</u>	
	<u>Blitz</u>	<u>Dismas</u>	<u>Ervin*</u>	<u>Total</u>		
Race:						
Black	1 (25%)	32 (37%)	27 (71%)	60 (47%)	139	(47%)
White	3 (75%)	55 (63%)	11 (29%)	69 (53%)	159	(53%)
	<u>4 (100)</u>	<u>87 (100)</u>	<u>38 (100)</u>	<u>129 (100)</u>	<u>298</u>	<u>(100)</u>
Age:						
29 & Below	2 (50%)	54 (62%)	27 (71%)	83 (64%)	114	(40%)
30 & Above	2 (50%)	33 (38%)	11 (29%)	46 (36%)	174	(60%)
	<u>2 (50%)</u>	<u>33 (38%)</u>	<u>11 (29%)</u>	<u>46 (36%)</u>	<u>174</u>	<u>(60%)</u>
Sex:						
Male		87 (100%)	38 (100%)	125 (97%)	271	(91%)
Female	4 (100%)			4 (3%)	27	(9%)
	<u>4 (100%)</u>			<u>4 (3%)</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(9%)</u>
Marital Stat:						
Single	1 (25%)	39 (45%)	21 (55%)	61 (47%)	NA	
Separated	2 (50%)	26 (30%)	11 (29%)	39 (30%)		
Divorced/ Widowed					NA	
Married	1 (25%)	22 (25%)	6 (16%)	29 (23%)	NA	
	<u>1 (25%)</u>	<u>22 (25%)</u>	<u>6 (16%)</u>	<u>29 (23%)</u>		
Education:						
8th or less	-	30 (34%)	15 (39%)	45 (35%)	NA	
9-11	3 (75%)	45 (52%)	19 (50%)	67 (52%)	NA	
12th or More	1 (25%)	12 (14%)	4 (11%)	17 (13%)	NA	
	<u>1 (25%)</u>	<u>12 (14%)</u>	<u>4 (11%)</u>	<u>17 (13%)</u>		
Residence:						
Jefferson County	1 (25%)	46 (53%)	21 (55%)	68 (53%)	NA	
Kentucky	3 (75%)	27 (31%)	15 (39%)	45 (35%)	NA	
Out-of-St.	0	14 (16%)	2 (5%)	16 (12%)	NA	
	<u>0</u>	<u>14 (16%)</u>	<u>2 (5%)</u>	<u>16 (12%)</u>		
Nature of Offense:						
Person	0	7 (8%)	5 (13%)	12 (9%)	33	(11%)
Property	2 (50%)	31 (36%)	10 (26%)	43 (33%)	97	(33%)
Per/Prop.	0	11 (13%)	4 (11%)	15 (12%)	31	(10%)
Fraud/Forg.	1 (25%)	6 (7%)	3 (8%)	10 (8%)	17	(6%)
Drug	0	6 (7%)	6 (16%)	12 (9%)	11	(4%)
Sex	0	3 (3%)	1 (3%)	4 (3%)	45	(15%)
Mixed	1 (25%)	23 (26%)	9 (24%)	33 (26%)	64	(21%)
	<u>1 (25%)</u>	<u>23 (26%)</u>	<u>9 (24%)</u>	<u>33 (26%)</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>(21%)</u>
Length of Sen:						
1-2 yr.	1 (25%)	46 (53%)	13 (34%)	60 (47%)	74	(25%)
3-9 yr.	3 (75%)	31 (36%)	14 (37%)	48 (37%)	124	(42%)
10/or More	0	10 (11%)	11 (29%)	21 (16%)	100	(33%)
	<u>0</u>	<u>10 (11%)</u>	<u>11 (29%)</u>	<u>21 (16%)</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>(33%)</u>

* One Ervin House case omitted due to lack of demographic information
NA/Not Available

Property offense and mixed crime offenses were the most frequent crime categories for both groups. Further, there were very similar results in all categories except for sex offenses where this rate for the direct releasees was five times that for the half-way house group. The direct releasees had, however, received more lengthy sentences than the half-way house group. Twice as many direct releasees had a sentence of 10 years or longer (33 percent to 16 percent). Concomitantly, while almost half of the half-way house group had two years or less, only 25 percent of the direct releasees had received such a sentence.

Thus, for the variables of age and length of sentence, the prognosis for successful reintegration by direct releasees appears somewhat less favorable. However, as a whole the two groups seem quite comparable. An examination of the reintegration of half-way house graduates and direct releasees is discussed in the next section.

Half-Way House Follow-up Status*

Half-way House Residents: Legal Status

Legal status by house. In the first report on half-way houses, a resident's termination was categorized as follows: successful, neutral, and unsuccessful.** In this follow-up study, data pertaining to the resident's follow-up legal status are likewise grouped into distinct categories: thus, a resident is defined as being in-community, pending, or reincarcerated.

If, at the end of six months, a half-way house resident had either no contacts or minor contacts with the criminal justice system, the resident is defined as in-community. This status represents a positive indicator of reintegration. The second category labelled pending refers to ex-residents who either absconded from parole supervision or were rearrested with trial judgement pending. Finally, those in the reincarcerated category had been returned to a state institution for either a technical violation of their parole stipulation (e.g., drinking or leaving the parole district) or conviction for new offenses(s).

*As mentioned, a group of residents were excluded from this analysis since follow-up information was not available. There were 20 individuals in this group; 18 transferred from Louisville and two died during the period of study.

**Successful graduates were those who terminated the program having completed the criteria defined for them by the house staff. Neutral graduates had stayed the agreed amount of time in the house but evidenced no improvement in attitude and/or condition. Unsuccessful graduates terminated the program in an unsatisfactory manner (e.g. evicted, absconded, or rearrested).

In Table 3, legal status of Dismas and Ervin half-way house residents is presented according to termination status. Termination data in this report differ slightly from those presented in the first report due to discrepancies discovered in the review of Parole Office records. For instance, some cases who left the houses classified as successes were not officially terminated as such until 1976. Therefore, changes have been made to keep the follow-up data consistent with Parole Office records.

Table 3
Legal Status and House Termination Status
By House

Termination Status	Dismas House				Ervin House			
	In Community *	Pending	Reincarcerated	Total	In Community	Pending	Reincarcerated	Total
Successful	27 (79%)	6 (18%)	1 (3%)	34 (100%)	19 (79%)	3 (13%)	2 (8%)	24 (100%)
Neutral	9 (60%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	15 (100%)	4 (67%)	0	2 (33%)	6 (100%)
Unsuccessful	4 (11%)	17 (46%)	16 (43%)	37 (100%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	6 (66%)	9 (100%)
	40 (47%)	27 (31%)	19 (22%)	86 (100%)	24 (62%)	5 (13%)	10 (26%)	39 (100%)

*One Dismas in-community case was not included since half-way house termination status had not been determined during the first phase of data gathering.

There were 47 percent of Dismas House residents in-community at the end of the six-month follow-up. Although five of this group had been arrested, these individuals had been in the community with no significant legal difficulties. Among those not faring as successfully were the 27 residents (31 percent) who were classified as pending. One-half of the pending cases had absconded while the remainder had been rearrested for new offenses. Finally, 19 Dismas House residents (22 percent) had been reincarcerated during this six-month period; the majority of these recidivists (14) had been reinstitutionalized for technical violations.

Among Ervin House graduates, 62 percent (24) were in-community at the end of the six month follow-up period. With two absconders and three rearrests, 13 percent were in the pending category. Also unsuccessful were the 10 Ervin House residents (26 percent) who were reincarcerated during this period, again mostly for technical violations.

Thus, while the proportion reincarcerated for both Ervin and Dismas House is quite similar, Ervin House had 15 percent more graduates successfully remaining in-community than did Dismas House (62 percent to 47 percent, respectively). Another difference is that Dismas House had more than twice that of Ervin House in the pending category (31 percent to 13 percent, respectively).

It would seem that the difference in the "in-community" outcome between the two houses could be related to differences in services provided during residency. Ervin House appeared to emphasize general counseling and personal services more strongly than Dismas House. In addition, Ervin House maintained follow-up services for their graduates. Thus, the difference in outcome for these two houses could reflect the differences in implementation.

As noted Blitz House had only four graduates in 1975. Three of the four women were in the pending category at the end of six months; the remaining one had no legal problems during this time. Because of the small number of graduates, Blitz House results are not presented separately in table form but are presented in the text for information purposes and are included in tables of results for the houses combined.

Legal status of entire half-way house group. Analysis of the data in Table 4 indicates that half of the half-way house group remained in-community with no significant legal problems at the end of six months. Approximately one-fourth of this group were in either the pending or reincarcerated category.

Table 4

Legal Status and House Termination Status
3 Half-Way Houses Combined

Termination Status	<u>Legal Status</u>			Total
	In Community*	Pending	Reincarcerated	
Successful	47 (77%)	11 (18%)	3 (5%)	61 (100%)
Neutral	13 (62%)	4 (19%)	4 (19%)	21 (100%)
Unsuccessful	5 (11%)	20 (43%)	22 (47%)	47 (100%)
	65 (50%)	35 (27%)	29 (23%)	129 (100%)

*One Dismas in-community case was not included since half-way house termination status had not been determined during the first phase of data gathering.

Legal status by house termination status. In Table 3, information is presented for the neutral termination status and for the pending legal follow-up status as well as for the successful and unsuccessful categories of both variables. Since the intermediate categories include mixed and uncertain outcomes, their data are presented primarily for information. Considering then the extreme categories, there is a positive relation between successfulness of termination status and of legal follow-up status for both houses, i.e., the successful terminators tend to be in-community 27 to 1 and 19 to 2 and the unsuccessful terminators tend to be reincarcerated 16 to 4 and 6 to 1.

It appears that house termination status is a strong predictor of the subsequent legal status of both Ervin and Dismas House graduates.

As previously noted, three of the four Blitz House graduates were in the pending category with one living successfully in the community. Of the three successful terminators, one was in-community at the six-months follow-up.

Legal status of entire half-way house group by half-way house termination status. As previously found with the houses separately, house termination status is very much related to subsequent legal status. Table 4 shows that the successful program graduates for the combined group are much more likely to be in-community than reincarcerated--47 to 3. At the same time, unsuccessful graduates are much more likely to be reincarcerated than in-community--22 to 5. Further, the neutral terminators are more likely to be in-community than pending or reincarcerated.

Half-Way House Residents: Employment Status

Employment status and house termination status by house. In this follow-up study, as well as using legal status as an indicator of community reintegration, the employment status of the half-way house residents is examined. In Table 5, the employment status of Dismas and Ervin House residents is indicated.

Examining Table 5, one notes that an almost equal proportion of Dismas House (43%) and Ervin House (44%) residents were employed at the end of the six-month follow-up period. And similar to the comparison between termination status and legal follow-up status, there is generally a positive relation between successfulness of termination status and of follow-up

employment status for both houses. Successful Dismas clients tend to be employed 25 to 9 but successful Ervin clients are not differentiated in this respect, 13 employed and 11 unemployed. Unsuccessful terminations for both houses, however, tend to be unemployed 31 to 6 and 8 to 1. Neutral termination status for both houses shows no relation to employment status.

Table 5
Employment and House Termination Status:
By House and Combined

Termination Status	Dismas House			Ervin House			3 Combined Houses		
	Empl.	Unempl.*	Total	Empl.	Unempl.	Total	Empl.	Unempl.	Total
Successful	25(74%)	9(26%)	34(100%)	13(54%)	11(46%)	24(100%)	40(66%)	21(34%)	61(100%)
Neutral	6(40%)	9(60%)	15(100%)	3(50%)	3(50%)	6(100%)	9(43%)	12(57%)	21(100%)
Unsuccessful	<u>6(16%)</u>	<u>31(84%)</u>	<u>37(100%)</u>	<u>1(11%)</u>	<u>8(89%)</u>	<u>9(100%)</u>	<u>7(15%)</u>	<u>40(85%)</u>	<u>47(100%)</u>
	37(43%)	49(57%)	*86(100%)	17(44%)	22(56%)	39(100%)	56(43%)	73(57%)	129(100%)

*One Dismas unemployed case was not included since half-way house termination status had not been determined during the first phase of data gathering.

Considering Blitz House separately again, one finds that two of its four graduates were employed and these were two of the three successful terminators.

Employment status and house termination status for the combined group. Combining results of the three houses, one finds that 43 percent of this group had consistent and/or current employment. Table 5 shows that successful terminators are more likely to be employed than unemployed--40 to 21. At the same time, unsuccessful terminators are more likely to be unemployed than employed--40 to 7.

Employment status and legal status by house. Employment appears to be related to legal status of the half-way house residents (Table 6). For the employed from both houses, this relation is strong: the employed tending to be in-community rather than incarcerated 31 to 2 and 16 to 0. However, for the unemployed from both houses, this relation is weak: the unemployed tending to be reincarcerated rather than in-community 17 to 10 and 10 to 8.

One of the two Blitz House employed graduates was in-community; both unemployed graduates were in the pending category.

Table 6
Employment and Legal Status:
By House and Combined

	Dennis House				Ervin House				3 Houses Combined			
	In Community	Pending	Reincarcerated	Total	In Community	Pending	Reincarcerated	Total	In Community	Pending	Reincarcerated	Total
Employed	31 (84%)	4 (11%)	2 (5%)	37 (100%)	16 (94%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	17 (100%)	48 (86%)	6 (11%)	2 (4%)	56 (100%)
Unemployed	10 (20%)	23 (46%)	17 (34%)	50 (100%)	8 (16%)	4 (13%)	19 (46%)	22 (100%)	18 (24%)	29 (37%)	27 (36%)	74 (100%)
	41 (47%)	27 (31%)	19 (22%)	87 (100%)	24 (62%)	5 (13%)	10 (26%)	39 (100%)	66 (51%)	35 (27%)	29 (22%)	130 (100%)

Employment status and legal status for the combined group. The importance of employment status is apparent when Table 6 is examined. The employed are more likely to be in-community than reincarcerated--48 to 2 whereas the unemployed were more likely to be reincarcerated than in-community--27 to 18. Employment, then, appears to be a critical variable in the half-way house resident's attempt at reintegration.

Control Group Follow-Up Status

Background characteristics of the 293 direct releasees who constituted the control group are presented in Table 2. As with the half-way house group, those parolees who were transferred from Louisville were excluded from this analysis since follow-up information was not available. Legal status of the control group at the end of six months is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Six Month Follow-Up on Legal Status of Control Group

<u>Active</u>	<u>Final Discharge</u>	<u>Reincarcerated</u>	<u>Total</u>
280 (94%)	10 (3%)	8 (3%)	298 (100%)

Comparison of Half-Way House Residents and Control Group

Follow-up status. A direct comparison between these two groups appears to be legitimate only in terms of the reincarceration category. The remaining two categories are not "pure," so to speak, in terms of indicating a parolee's legal status. The active category includes any parolee whose file is still open whether because the parolee is doing well or has absconded or been rearrested: the primary criteria are that the parolee has not been reinstationalized or discharged. In addition, the final discharge category would not include all those who should be defined as successfully reintegrated.

However, comparison in terms of reincarceration is certainly relevant. In this study, marked differences in recidivism during this six month period are revealed between these two groups. Of the 130 half-way house residents in this study, 22 percent (29) had been reincarcerated during this six month period; in contrast, 3 percent (8) of the 298 direct releasees had been re-institutionalized. Thus, overall the half-way house residents have a much higher reincarceration rate than the direct releasees. In this connection, it should be mentioned that performance within the half-way house program is a variable influencing recidivism: the reincarceration rate for successful program terminators is 5 percent while this rate for the unsuccessful terminators is 47 percent.

Follow-up status and background characteristics. The question arises -- Are there variables in background characteristics of the direct releasees and half-way house group that might be explanatory for the differential reincarceration outcome? The two groups were found to be quite similar on a variety of relevant background characteristics (Table 2). Further, for the variables on which the groups differed, the half-way house residents seemed to have the more favorable prognosis, i.e., being younger and having less lengthy sentences. This, however, was not reflected in lower reincarceration rates for the half-way house residents. Looking only at the reincarcerated, there are no distinct differences in terms of race, age, sex, or nature of last offense; however, direct releasees with the longest sentences were more likely to be reincarcerated than the comparable half-way house group (Appendix 1).

There is one differentiating variable that may be related to the direction of the reincarceration outcome, i.e., location of prior residence. It is a fairly safe assumption that most direct releasees are and should be paroled to their home towns. Since half of the half-way house residents are not paroled to their place of residence and would consequently be lacking in terms of family and community support, this may be a deterrent to their reintegration.

Comparison of Kentucky and Other Half-Way House Programs

Two studies on half-way house programs in other states were found to have data comparable to that collected for this study of Kentucky Half-Way Houses. In a study conducted on 15 houses in four states by the Federal

General Accounting Office, it was estimated that approximately 50 percent of the half-way house participants would eventually remain in the community. At the end of six months, the Kentucky half-way houses with an overall reincarceration rate of 22 percent compares favorably with the projected GAO rate; however, 27 percent of the Kentucky groups did have pending charges against them. Further, the GAO conclusions were based on data collected for up to five years whereas the Kentucky group has been released a relatively short period of time. Already 49 percent have had some reinvolvement with the criminal justice system. This comparison suggests that the Kentucky half-way house program may eventually have a higher reincarceration/recidivism rate than that projected in the GAO study.

When comparing the Kentucky program to a Minnesota study on six half-way houses, the rates for reincarceration and pending charges were higher for the Kentucky houses. During a six month period, the Minnesota half-way house residents had an 11 percent reincarceration rate with 5 percent having pending charges. Further, unlike the Kentucky program, performance within the Minnesota houses did not appear related to the later recidivism. A review of Minnesota's selection criteria, clientele characteristics, and program did not appear to reveal any significant differences from the Kentucky program that might explain the difference in outcomes.

In summary, the Kentucky half-way house program's effect on recidivism appears somewhat comparable to that found in the Federal GAO study although it was suggested that Kentucky's recidivism rate may be higher as release time increases. When comparing Kentucky results to those of Minnesota, the latter program had a reincarceration rate half that of Kentucky during a six month period.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Although a variety of relevant information has been presented on the Kentucky half-way house program, several points now seem worthy of review. In this study, the target population of this follow-up study was 130 parolees who entered and terminated from the Kentucky Half-Way House Program during 1975. As well as reviewing this group's reintegration into the community in terms of recidivism and employment, half-way house participants were compared with other Louisville parolees and half-way house parolees in other states.

The Kentucky half-way house group was generally a young group, unmarried, having less than a twelfth grade education. Property offenses were the most frequent crime of this group. On the whole, these parolees appeared similar in background characteristics to the other parolees surveyed.

This study focused primarily upon the recidivism of the half-way house group during the six months following their release from the house. It was found that 51 percent of the half-way house group had remained in the community with no significant contact with the criminal justice system; 27 percent had pending charges and 22 percent had been reincarcerated.

Considering the houses separately, Ervin House had a higher proportion (62 percent) in-community than Dismas House (47 percent). The reincarceration rates for both houses were similar, 26 and 22 percent, respectively. Blitz House for female offenders had one ex-resident in-community and three with pending charges. It appeared that success of performance within the house was directly and strongly related to the resident's subsequent legal status. In general, differences in recidivism were not found related significantly to background characteristics of the group.

An additional factor that was noteworthy concerned the second indicator of community reintegration--employment. Half-way house participants who were employed were more likely to be in the community with no serious legal problems than were the unemployed, and the unemployed were more likely to be reincarcerated. Of interest, however, is that less than half of the half-way house group (43 percent) had current or consistent employment during this follow-up period.

When the reincarceration rate of the half-way house group was compared to that of the control group, the former evidenced a much higher rate, 22 versus 3 percent. The only discernable difference appears to be that the half-way house group does lack the initial family or community support that the direct releasees presumably have.

Presently, the Kentucky program compares favorably with the Federal GAO study. However, the GAO reincarceration rate was suggested on the basis of a much longer time span, thus the Kentucky program might not result in the overall projected effectiveness of having 50 percent in the community trouble-free as release time lengthens. Further, when comparing Kentucky results to those of Minnesota, Kentucky half-way houses have a reincarceration rate twice as high (22 percent to 11 percent). Also, unlike Minnesota, the

Kentucky study found that successful program graduates were much more likely to be non-recidivists than program neutrals or failures.

In summary, it appears that the Kentucky Half-Way House Program evidenced a relatively high rate of reincarceration during the first six months of follow-up compared with similar data from other Kentucky parolees, a Minnesota half-way house group, and the GAO half-way house participants. There are, however, factors that seem relevant when considering causes and remedies. First, program successes had fewer reintegration problems than others in the half-way house group. Second, employment was indicated as a deterrent to reincarceration. Third, location of prior residence and, hence, the factor of community support may have been related to reintegration. These factors suggest that selection criteria and programming in the houses might be reviewed in efforts to reduce the reincarceration rate.

Appendix 1

A Comparison of Background Characteristics of the Reincarcerated
Half-Way House Graduates and Control Group

	<u>Half-Way House Graduates*</u>	<u>Control Group</u>
	N=29	N=8
Race		
Black	9 (32%)	0 -
White	<u>19</u> (68%)	<u>8</u> (100%)
	28	8
Age		
29 & below	18 (64%)	5 (63%)
30 & above	<u>10</u> (36%)	<u>3</u> (36%)
	28	8
Sex		
Male	29 (100%)	8 (100%)
Female	<u>0</u> -	<u>0</u> -
	29	8
Nature of Current Offense		
Person	3 (11%)	- -
Property	13 (46%)	3 (38%)
Person/Property	2 (7%)	- -
Fraud/Forgery	1 (4%)	1 (12%)
Drug	2 (7%)	- -
Sex	1 (4%)	1 (12%)
Mixed	<u>6</u> (21%)	<u>3</u> (38%)
	28	8
Length of Sentence		
1 to 2 years	10 (36%)	3 (38%)
3 to 9 years	11 (39%)	1 (12%)
10 years or more	<u>7</u> (25%)	<u>4</u> (50%)
	28	8

*One reincarcerated Ervin House resident was excluded since background information was not available.

REFERENCES

- The Comptroller General of the United States Report to the Congress. Federal Guidance Needed If Half-way Houses are to be a Viable Alternative to Prison. Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1975.
- The Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control, Evaluation Unit. Residential Community Corrections Program --A Preliminary Report. Minnesota, 1975.
- Seiter, Richard P., Joan R. Petersilia, and Harry E. Allen, Evaluation of Adult Halfway Houses in Ohio (Volumes I & II). Columbus: Ohio State University, The Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, 1974-75.

END

7 11/23/11