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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

National statistics reveal that nearly one-third of all offenders are in institutions, while two-thirds are in community correctional facilities or halfway houses (Snarr and Wolford, 1985). Moreover, "approximately ninety-five percent of all institutionalized offenders are eventually returned to the community" (Killinger and Cromwell, Jr., 1974; Snarr and Wolford, 1985). These figures indicate that a major proponent of the criminal justice system is community corrections.

As an alternative to incarceration, halfway houses are residential facilities that provide services to felons, misdemeanants, ex-offenders, probationers, parolees, pre-sentence and pre-release participants (Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, 1977; Snarr and Wolford, 1985). The focal theme of correctional-based facilities has been one of reintegration. Specifically, clients participate in daily living experiences and community institutions such as "family involvement, attending school, locating or having work, and engaging in recreational activities" (Snarr and Wolford, 1985). Reintegration is based on the premise that when individuals are released from correctional institutions, such as prisons, a period of adjustment to the free society would increase the likelihood of law-abiding behavior (Smykla, 1981).
The development of community-based corrections has been influenced by several factors. Disillusionment with prisons and institutionalization, humanitarianism, cost effectiveness and enhancement of the administration of justice have historically prompted the organization of community corrections.

The origins of halfway houses have been traced to the early eighteenth century (Seiter, 1977; Miller and Montilla, 1977; Killinger, 1974). Generally, the impetus has come from citizen and nongovernmental organizations. According to Seiter, transitional residence homes for criminal offenders first appeared in 1817 (Seiter, 1977). By the 1920s halfway houses were formed in Louisiana, Ohio, Iowa, California, Florida and Texas (Seiter, 1977). Following the depression, "disenchantment with the rehabilitative potential of the prison, and the growing conviction that the rehabilitative process necessitates some communication between the institution and community" launched the halfway house movement in the U.S. (Seiter, 1977). This momentum continued through the 1960s and 1970s. Today, recent changes in correctional strategies and the massive number of ex-offenders being channelled through halfway houses indicate the feasibility of community corrections.

Theoretical Framework: The Social Exchange Perspective

The social exchange perspective was derived from various economic analogies. The development of the perspective has been influenced by the contributions of John Thibaut, Harold Kelley, Richard Emerson, Peter Blau, and the founder, George Homans. Social exchange theory has played a catalytic role in theory and research in such areas as interpersonal bargaining, equity, distribution of rewards, conformity,
and self-presentation (Franklin, 1982).

The central interest of social exchange theorists has been "the interdependence of relationships between persons in the actual process of social behavior" (Chadwick-Jones, 1976). The perspective emphasizes approval or liking, status, esteem or compliance with others (Chadwick-Jones, 1976). According to Vander Zanden, the perspective also, "represents an attempt to integrate the behaviorist theory that learning is brought about through reward and punishment with the theory of classical economics" (Vander Zanden, 1977). Individuals enter into relationships to obtain rewards that include social approval or acceptance, gratitude, recognition, etc. (Vander Zanden, 1977).

Homans (1958) proposed that social interaction was "an exchange of goods, material and nonmaterial, based on behavioral psychological principles" (Homans, 1958; Franklin, 1982). Homans applies his paradigm to the social influence process, group processes, group stability, and group differentiation. Moreover, Homans posits a more formal explanation of behavior: (1) the behavior must be social—it must be rewarded or punished by the behavior of others, (2) a particular person acting in some way toward another must be rewarded or punished by that other and not by a third party, and (3) the behavior must be actual behavior and norm of behavior. He labeled such behavior as "elementary social behavior", characterized by face-to-face contact, mutual and direct influence, and actual behavior (Homans, 1958; Franklin, 1982).

Homans formulated five main propositions regarding behavior:

1. If in the past the occurrence of a particular stimulus situation has been the occasion on which a man's activity has been rewarded, then the more similar the present stimulus situation is to the past one, the
more likely he is to emit the activity, or some similar activity, now.

2. The more often within a given period of time a man's activity rewards the activity of another, the more often the other will emit the activity.

3. The more valuable to a man a unit of the activity another gives him, the more often he will emit activity of the other.

4. The more often a man has in the recent past received a rewarding activity from another, the less valuable any further unit of that activity becomes to him.

5. The more to a man's disadvantage the rule of distributive justice fails of realization, the more likely he is to display the emotional behavior we call anger (Homans, 1958; Franklin, 1982).

In 1959, John Thibaut and Harold Kelley published *The Social Psychology of Groups*. The interdependency of social interaction was seen simultaneously as the problem area for research and the unit of study. Thibaut and Kelley are concerned with how person A affects person B's behavior, and how person B affects person A's behavior in dyadic relationships (Franklin, 1982).

Utilizing the payoff matrix to illustrate social exchange principles, Thibaut and Kelley investigated numerous issues related to group process. Two major questions must be addressed: Why do some persons choose to remain in a relationship where the services being provided seem relatively meager compared with (1) what has been experienced in other relationships, and (2) what the person knows about other relationships? (Franklin, 1982).

Thibaut and Kelley introduce a cognitive variable termed "actor expectations." The outcome value in a social relationship must be measured in terms of actor expectation. This means that the value
of a particular relationship to one or both of the actors involved will be some function of (1) the actor's judgment of the relationship in terms of his or her past experiences in this relationship and/or what he or she knows about other similar relationships (comparison level), and (2) the actor's evaluation of the present relationship, in light of what appears to be available alternatives to current relationships (comparison level for alternatives). Thibaut and Kelley distinguish between attraction and dependence in social relationships. Attraction refers to the level of outcomes received relative to comparison levels. Dependence refers to outcomes received relative to the comparison level for alternatives (Franklin, 1982).

In 1962, Richard Emerson examined power tactics in Power-Dependence Relations. Emerson maintained the existence of an underlying tendency toward balance in social association because of the instability inherent in imbalanced relationships. This equilibrium model was based on the idea that imbalance encourages the use of power which sets balancing mechanisms into operation. Therefore, the power of the actor over another in a dyadic relationship is equal to the dependence of the latter actor on the former actor. The two major elements of dependence are motivational investments and availability of alternatives. For example, if a person is dependent on another in a relationship, he or she has some interest in maintaining the relationship because of services being provided and limited alternatives for goal mediation (Franklin, 1982).
Emerson examines the implications of the imbalanced relationship. An imbalanced relationship occurs when one person has a power advantage over another; thus, one person is less motivationally involved in the relationship for goal mediation. Four alternatives are available to balance the relationship for the dependent party: (1) a decrease in motivational involvement in the relationship by the dependent party, (2) an increase in motivational investment by the powerful actor (this can be induced by the dependent actor), (3) an increase in available alternatives for mediating goals, and (4) a decrease in available alternatives for mediating goals experienced by the powerful actor (this decrease in alternatives also can be manipulated by the dependent party) (Franklin, 1982).

In 1964, Peter Blau published Exchange and Power in Social Life. According to Blau, social exchange is omnipresent and can be observed in all kinds of social relations once one is conceptually sensitized to the framework. Social exchange includes two specifications: (1) behavior which is oriented toward ends that can be achieved only through interaction with other persons, and (2) behavior which seeks to adapt means to further the achievement of these ends (Franklin, 1982). The substantive focus of this research departs from the historical application of the perspective here. Specifically, Blau's theoretical paradigm will be elaborated and concepts from which will be utilized in order to understand ex-offender social relations.
Social Association

According to Simmel, "social association refers to the widely varying forms that are generated as the diverse interest of individuals prompt them to develop social units in which they realize these interests (Simmel, 1908; Blau, 1964). The process that sustain social associations, the forms they attain and the complex social forces and structures to which they give rise is the topic of this study.

According to Blau (1964), the rewards individuals obtain in social associations tend to entail a cost to other individuals. Furthermore, "individuals associate with one another because they all profit from their association. But they do not necessarily profit equally, nor do they share the cost of providing the benefits equally, and even if there are no direct costs to participants, there are often indirect costs born by those excluded by the association" (Blau, 1964). Some associations are intrinsically rewarding. Specifically, participant gratification is inherent in the association. Second, other associations are characterized by individuals deriving specific benefits (extrinsic) from social relations "because their associates deliberately go to some trouble to provide these benefits" (Blau, 1964). Humans, therefore, choose between alternative potential associates by evaluating the "experiences or expected experiences with each in terms of a preference ranking and then selecting the best alternative" (Blau, 1964). Thus, social association is predicated on intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.

The structure of social association is the focal point of Blau's analysis. The scholar maintains that most human pleasures have their beginnings in social life. He states,
Whether we think of love or power, professional recognition or sociable companionship, the comforts of family life or the challenge of competitive sports, the gratifications experienced by individuals are contingent on actions of others (Blau, 1964).

Such is the case, too, for human suffering. Rewards for some are, therefore, a cost for others. Individuals engage in association with others to maximize gratification. This gratification takes the form of extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards or benefits from association.

Extrinsic rewards derived from association are defined as "specific benefits from social relations because...associates deliberately go to some trouble to provide benefits for others" (Blau, 1964). According to Blau,

Most people like helping others and doing favors for them...Favors make us grateful, and our expressions of gratitude are social rewards that tend to make doing favors enjoyable, particularly if we express our appreciation publicly and thereby, help establish a person's reputation as a generous and competent helper. Besides one good deed deserves another (Blau, 1964).

Social associations that produce grateful and obligatory feelings for favors that are received also induce reciprocal exchange. This is described by the scholar as a social bond between associates. If a bond is established and an associate fails to reciprocate favors they are perceived as being ungrateful. Nonetheless, individuals are "anxious to benefit one another and to reciprocate for the benefits they receive" (Blau, 1964).

Associations that are not extrinsically rewarding are characterized by the benefits received by the association itself. For example,

(F)riends find pleasure in associating with one another, and the enjoyment of whatever they do together...is enhanced by the gratification that
Intrinsic rewards received, however, incur cost. Although all associates simultaneously benefit from their relations, the "only cost incurred is an indirect one of giving up alternative opportunities by devoting time to the association" (Blau, 1964).

A basic reward associates seek in relations is social approval. Persons continuously seek the approval of those whose opinions they value, but significance rests on it being genuine. Coerced approval, then, is considered worthless expressions (Blau, 1964). Moreover,

In matters of morality, however, individuals have strong convictions that constrain them to voice their actual judgments more freely. They usually do not hesitate to express disapproval of or, at least, withhold approval from associates who have violated social accepted standards of conduct. Antisocial disregard for the welfare of the ingroup meets universally with approbation regardless of how immoral, in terms of the mores of the wider community. The significance of social approval, therefore, discourages conduct that is utterly and crudely selfish (Blau, 1964).

Accordingly,

Humans tend to be governed in their associations with one another by the desire to obtain social rewards of various sorts, and the resulting exchanges of benefits shape the structure of social relations (Blau, 1964).

Social association is also dependent on basic social processes. One such process has been identified as social attraction; that is,

The force that induces human beings to establish social associations on their own initiative and to expand the scope of their associations once they have been formed (Blau, 1964).
Accordingly, individuals are attracted to others by the way of expected benefits to be derived from others. Social attraction refers to the expectation that the association will be an intrinsically rewarding experience or a way by which to secure extrinsic rewards.

In order to create social bonds, the individual must become an attractive associate. Thus,

A person who is attracted to others is interested in proving himself attractive to them, for his ability to associate with them and reap the benefits expected from the association is contingent on their finding him an attractive associate (Blau, 1964).

To induce anticipation that a possible association would be rewarding the individual tries to impress others or engages in the processes of social attractiveness. Tactics that are used by individuals to impress others as identified by Blau are as follows: taking risks, being entertaining, displaying superior confidence, being supportive of other's opinions, being intellectually stimulating, commanding respect, meeting challenges, being daring, sharing important values and problem solving for others. Such behaviors are also engaged in by others which give rise to mutual attraction. This encourages persons to establish social relations, and if the association is rewarding for all, the relation continues.

**Social Integration**

The formation of groups is determined by the development of integrative bonds which unite individuals. According to Blau,

These are bonds of social attraction. The greater the attraction of individuals to one another and to the group as a whole, particularly if their intrinsic attraction to the association generates
common identification, the more cohesive is the group. For a new member to become integrated into an existing group, similarly, requires that ties of social attraction develop between him and the rest. A person's attraction to a group stimulates his desire to become a member, but only if he proves himself attractive to its other members can he realize this desire and gain social acceptance (Blau, 1964).

Also, "some groups evolve as individuals with opportunities for social contact become increasingly attracted to each other and establish common bonds that stabilize their social association" (Blau, 1964). As a result, "these emergent groups often have diffuse boundaries and constitute, in effect, overlapping circles, with many individuals being peripheral members, and occasionally even core members, of several groupings" (Blau, 1964). Finally,

The initial attraction between individuals rests on the expectation of rewards that are, analytically, extrinsic and that make comparisons between potential associates possible. But once social relations have become established, they often rest primarily on either extrinsic or intrinsic rewards as exemplified by the supportive and the exchange relations (Blau, 1964).

Social attraction underlies the development of integration into a group. Succinctly, social attraction refers to the proclivity to associate with others based on expected rewards to be received from the association. In order to establish interaction the individual must be attractive and thus secure social acceptance among others. If he/she is successful and the association brings both parties rewards, the reciprocal exchanges solidify the mutual attraction. The attractive associate then becomes a member of the group.
Integration into an existing group also poses a paradox for the potential member. Impressive qualities may be deemed as attractive to some and pose a status threat to others. Specifically,

The rewards expected from associating with an impressive person that make him attractive also would make (others) dependent on him and subject to his control. For it is in the nature of rewarding social experiences to produce simultaneously social attraction and social dependence (Blau, 1964; Thibaut and Kelley, 1959).

Succinctly,

The attempts of individuals to prove themselves attractive associates in a newly forming group promote competition for being highly esteemed among them. Their competitive endeavors to impress each other reveal that some have qualities that enable them to make essential contributions to the group, and these abilities to make contributions become the source of superior status in the group. The emergent differentiation of status intensifies the need for social integration, which is met when most group members withdraw from the competition for status and establish mutual ties of fellowship (Blau, 1964).

Social integration and, therefore, social acceptance pose a paradox. According to Blau, "integrative bonds of social cohesion strengthen the group in the pursuit of common goals" (Blau, 1964). Also "group cohesion promotes the development of a consensus on normative standards and the effective enforcement of these shared norms." Cohesion, therefore, increases social control among members. Specifically, all humans seek social approval; that is, the approving agreement of others confirming one's judgments, conduct and beliefs. Second, individuals engage in social attractiveness or those endeavors engaged in for the purpose of impressing others. Thus,
Individuals who share values and interests provide each other with support for their beliefs and have a basis for engaging in common endeavors. Homogenous orientations and attitudes, therefore, draw individuals together, whereas disagreements in important matters make each an unattractive companion for the other (Blau, 1964).

Thus, where bonds of mutual attraction exist, it is typical to find essential agreement on basic issues among associates. In contrast, "(S)erious and persistent conflicts of opinions lead, in corresponding manner, to personal rejections" (Blau, 1964).

Important characteristics are not an unambiguous asset for establishing friendly relations in a group, because they tend to make an individual a status threat and somewhat unapproachable as well as attractive (Blau, 1964). Accordingly, Blau concluded that "members who have positive characteristics on a salient attribute, but negative ones on a less salient attribute, which also make them approachable, have the best chance to win informal acceptance" (Blau, 1960). Also, "members who are negative on a more salient and positive on a less salient attribute should have the least chance" (Blau, 1960). Blau tested this inference and confirmed his prediction. Other scholars, however, took Blau's theory a step further.

In an experiment conducted by Edward Jones, Kenneth Gergen and Robert Jones (1963), the researchers tested the tendency to ingratiate oneself as affected by difference in status and the pressure to socially integrate. Specifically, seventy-nine R.O.T.C. students were solicited and used in pairs characterized by one upperclassman (high status) and one freshman (low status). Freshmen were placed in private booths and given standardized, written communications from upperclassmen.
Each communication presumably described upperclassman written evaluation of himself, opinions on various issues and evaluation of the partner. Freshmen were instructed to send partners like information. The experimental variable introduced by the researchers was a statement informing freshmen that each upperclassman expressed a preference for working with him. The pressure to become socially integrated was established. However, to ascertain the extent of ingratiation the experimenter informed the experimental group: "We want to find out whether the commander (upperclassman) ends up thinking highly of the subordinate (freshman) and whether the subordinate ends up liking and respecting the commander" (Jones, et. al., 1963; Blau, 1964). In contrast, the control group was told: "We are not especially concerned with whether you end up liking each other or not...we are interested only in how well you can do in reaching a clear impression of the other person" (Jones et. al., 1963; Blau, 1964).

To maintain self-presentation and ingratiation, subjects were given a list of twenty-four pairs of antonyms and asked to check their own characteristics. They were also asked to indicate characteristics that they considered most important. The ratings of these attributes were presumably sent to partners (Blau, 1964). The researchers found that many subjects, particularly in the control group, rated themselves more highly on important attributes. This suggests that subjects attempted to impress their partners. Self-ratings of subjects in the experimental group were, in contrast to control group subjects, more modest. Jones et. al. concluded that pressure toward integration promotes self-deprecation (Jones, et. al., 1963; Blau, 1964).
To obtain social acceptance both freshmen and upperclassmen were more modest about qualities they considered outstanding. However, the pressure to integrate had opposite effects on qualities considered unimportant. "Concern with winning social acceptance and approval prompted subjects in inferior positions to depreciate their own important qualities, as a demonstration that they did not seek to challenge their partners superior status; and it led them simultaneously to emphasize that they have some impressive qualities, albeit not in the most important areas, in order to prove themselves sufficiently attractive associates" (Blau, 1964). The experiment conducted by Jones and his colleagues ascertained how ingratiation by agreeing with others opinions was a strategy to integrate or make oneself socially attractive.

Several studies confirmed the hypothesis that individuals with low informal status were more likely to conform to group pressures than high informal status individuals (Kelley and Shapiro, 1954; Blau, 1960; Thibaut and Kelley, 1959; Schelling, 1960; Blau, 1964). Accordingly, "low status in a group constrains an individual to conform lest he antagonize others, whereas the contributions and power high status implies permit a person greater latitude, since the dependence of others on him restrains them from penalizing him for minor deviations" (Blau, 1960).

To integrate into a group, the individual engages in the process of social attraction; that is, he attempts to prove himself attractive to others by engaging in impressive behaviors. According to Blau,
A person is attracted to others if he expects associating with them to be rewarding, specifically, to be more rewarding than alternatives open to him at the given time and place. His attraction to them creates a desire to find social acceptance among them. To be accepted by them, he must prove himself an attractive associate. For this purpose, he will seek to impress them and show that he has qualities that make associating with him rewarding (Blau, 1964).

The proclivity to associate with others, therefore, is contingent on the reciprocal exchange of expected rewards.

**Purpose of Study**

There is a paucity of research in the study of the halfway house as compared to the prison. Moreover, relatively little is known regarding behavioral patterns of the clientele in the halfway house setting. Given the theoretical assumptions of this research, the following objectives were developed to guide the study.

The first objective of this study is to identify extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards that the ex-offender expects to obtain by associating with other ex-offenders. Specifically, the base criterion of an association to further some end (extrinsic) or as an end in itself (intrinsic) was ascertained (Blau, 1964). The rewards, as perceived by the ex-offender, expected by associating with other ex-offenders were identified. Also, the halfway house environment which determined the types of rewards obtained through social association with other ex-offenders was examined.

There are several ways in which individuals who seek to gain social acceptance among others try to prove themselves attractive associates (Blau, 1964). To impress others, individuals engage in
socially attractive behaviors (Blau, 1964). Accordingly, a second research objective was to ascertain if a relationship existed between the race of the ex-offender and sharing important values with other ex-offenders. Specifically, new acquaintances tend to search in their conversations for clues that indicate some shared experiences or characteristics" (Blau, 1964).

The strategies used to impress others vary among groups and individuals: that is, strategies are determined by what group members find impressive and "on the aptitudes that limit how an individual can impress them" (Blau, 1964). To make a good impression, the individual must infer which of his qualities that constitute an impressive response and adapt his conduct accordingly (Blau, 1964). A third research objective was to ascertain if a relationship existed between the race of the ex-offender and displaying superior competence with other ex-offenders.

"Presenting an impressive image of oneself entails some risks: the risk of appearing boastful or conceited, the risk of repelling others with extreme opinions, and generally the risk of incurring their disapproval" (Blau, 1964). Nonetheless, the individual who takes risks and successfully meet challenges command respect. A fourth objective of this study was to ascertain if a relationship existed between the race of an ex-offender and contributing to the group(s) of ex-offenders or to its individual members. Also, the types of contributions the ex-offender made to the group or individual members was identified.
A final research objective of this study was to ascertain if a relationship existed between the race of the ex-offender and supporting others' opinions. Specifically, conformity with the opinions of others is a means of proving oneself attractive and, thus, of gaining social acceptance within a particular group.

The following are the research questions of the study:

1. What are the extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards ex-offenders expect to obtain by association with other ex-offenders?

2. What is the relationship between the race of the ex-offender and sharing important values with other ex-offenders?

3. What is the relationship between the race of the ex-offender and displaying superior competence with other ex-offenders?

4. What is the relationship between the race of the ex-offender and contributing to the ex-offender groups(s) or to its individual members?

5. What is the relationship between the race of the ex-offender and supporting others' opinions?

The focal concern of this research is to gain greater insight into the social psychological dynamics of ex-offender social association. The researcher will explore five research questions derived from the social exchange perspective. The theoretical formulation stresses an explanation of social behavior predicated upon the exchange of rewards and costs occurring during the interaction between individuals. Accordingly, the research questions were operationalized with data obtained from ex-offenders, in a halfway house setting, regarding ex-offender perceptions of their social association with the other ex-offenders. The properties of ex-offender social association is the topic of this dissertation.
Definition of Terms

The following are major concepts consistently utilized throughout this research: race and social attractiveness. For purposes of this study, race is conceived of as "a class or group of human beings' who are regarded and treated in social life as a distinct biological group with a common ancestry" (Blumer, 1955).

The level of measurement to operationalize race is nominal. Race will be measured by dichotomizing the concept by arbitrary division. A classification system will be developed designated by names characterizing groups. Each category is distinct, mutually exclusive and exhaustive as much as possible. According to Bailey,

By exhaustive we mean that there must be an appropriate category (exhaustiveness) for each case we are measuring. By mutually exclusive we mean that each case appropriately fit in only one category (Bailey, 1978).

The two racial categories will consist of white and non-white.

The researcher conceptualizes social attractiveness based on exhibiting one to all of particular behaviors espoused by Peter Blau (1964). The following are those behaviors: sharing important values with others, displaying superior competence, making contributions to others, and conforming with others opinions. Social attractive behavior(s) are engaged in by the individual to impress others and to initiate social association. Blau utilizes implicitly structured theorizing to develop this concept. As a result, the behaviors that define social attraction were derived in an implicit manner. Researchers have concluded however, that these behaviors are exhibited by persons who seek to impress others (Blau, 1960; Jones et. al., 1963; Schelling, 1960;
Blau, 1964). Consequently, the researcher posits that these attributes have been subjected to sufficient empirical analysis. Misinterpretations of Blau's theoretical formulation, then, have been minimized.

The level of measurement to operationalize each of the social attractive behaviors is also nominal. Specifically, the outcome of yes or no compose the two categories that will measure what behaviors are engaged in by the ex-offender. Items to ascertain this concept will be found in the survey instrument.

Significance of Study

Reintegration of the newly released offender into the mainstream of society poses an enormous task for community corrections. Nonetheless, appropriate intervention techniques that promote law-abiding behavior can be developed. This research explores social psychological factors that influence social association among ex-offenders in a halfway house setting. Analysis of such properties that characterize interaction among ex-offenders is purposive to the development of intervention strategies.

Second, a major criticism of halfway houses is that of public safety. "Many critics have been concerned about the potential for continued criminal behavior from a group of ex-offenders living together in a residential area" (Snarr and Wolford, 1985). Consequently, the behavior of residents in halfway houses is closely monitored and controlled. It is posited that an element of strict social control exists and, therefore, that some behavioral patterns that exist in institutions may be projected in the halfway house setting.
In a study of social relations in prison, it was concluded that "other than race, prisoners retreat into small orbits based on social characteristics such as (1) criminal orientation, (2) shared preprison experiences, (3) shared prison interest and (4) forced proximity in cell assignments on work" (Irwin, 1980). This research will explore if these patterns of behavior are applicable to ex-offenders in a halfway house setting.

There is a substantial body of sociological research on prisoner association with an emphasis on how race affects the formation of inmate groups (Irwin, 1980; Carroll, 1974; Jacobs, 1979). Accordingly, the researcher posits that the existence of minority groups in halfway houses increases the salience of racial and ethnic identities. The basic determinant of association in halfway houses, as in prisons, is race within the context of criminal orientation, preprison experience, prison interests and proximity. An analysis of race and its impact on the development of ex-offender association will enhance our understanding of racial polarization among groups.

Finally, this research seeks to add to the scholarly body of literature regarding community corrections. Ex-offender association with counterparts has not been frequently addressed. The nature of this study makes a major departure from contemporary studies in that it explores social psychological factors, rather than recidivism rates, or assessment of reintegration programs of ex-offenders.
Summary

The desire for intrinsic and/or extrinsic rewards induce persons to associate. The establishment and expansion of such relationships are a function of social attraction (Blau, 1964; Franklin, 1982). There must also be an expectation that the association will result in obtaining rewards. The continuation of an association, then rests upon the fulfillment of mutual expectations held by both parties (Franklin, 1982). According to Blau (1964), if the party experiencing "the profit 'needs' the profit (or has a high motivational investment in maintaining it), there are several available alteratives; (1) the party may force others to provide the service; (2) the party may obtain needed services elsewhere; (3) the party may find ways to do without the service; (4) the party may provide needed services to others; or (5) the party may provide more valuable rewards to others" (Franklin, 1982).

"Many groups have emerged because persons have the opportunity to interact or circumstances provide the opportunity to associate" (Franklin, 1982). When mutual attraction emerges, persons begin to expect impending associations to be rewarding and aspire social acceptance. To obtain the approval of others, then, individuals seek to impress others. If the individual has impressive qualities, integrative bonds are likely to develop (Franklin, 1982).

Social exchange, it has been argued, is omnipresent and can be observed in all types of social relations once one is conceptually sensitized to the framework (Blau, 1964; Franklin, 1982). This research seeks to apply social exchange principles and concepts in its
This research does not attempt to challenge the more structured views of the social exchange paradigm. Rather, the study accepts its basic principles of human association. From a priori knowledge of ex-offender relations it is assumed that the correctional environment prompts individuals to solidify according to race and sometimes social orientation among ex-offenders. It has been proposed that social interaction is the exchange of goods, material and non-material for the purpose of achieving some end in itself or to further a particular goal (Homans, 1958, 1961, 1978; Blau, 1964). This perspective appears quite applicable to ex-offender social association.

This research is descriptive by nature. It is the hope of the researcher to go beyond mere exploration and seek to describe how ex-offenders initiate social association. Special attention will be devoted to examining how the client impresses others and, in particular, who the client seeks to impress. The application of the social exchange paradigm to interpret ex-offender social association provides a theoretical framework for the study. It also increases the extent of understanding the dynamics of ex-offender behavior in the halfway house.

There are six chapters in this dissertation. Chapter One consists of the introduction, theoretical framework, purpose, major concepts and significance of this study.
A review of the literature regarding social relations in prisons and halfway houses is included in Chapter Two. Special emphasis is placed on the historical development of the study of prisoner relations.

Chapter Three outlines the methodology utilized in the study. Specifically, the methods to collect data for exploring ex-offender social association is presented.

Chapter Four discusses, in-depth, the facility where this research is conducted. It is posited that the design of the community corrections setting is not known to many sociologists. For this reason, the researcher included a section elaborating the functions and operation of the halfway house.

Chapter Five presents the major findings of this research. This chapter is divided into two parts. Part One presents ex-offenders' perceptions of their social association in a halfway house setting. Part Two discusses descriptive data derived from unstructured interviews of community correction personnel.

Chapter Six summarizes the major findings and derives implications for future research.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Previous lifestyles and the conditions of imprisonment have influenced the development of unique behavioral responses by the ex-offender. Generally, the dynamics that characterize prisoner social association are projected to the ex-offender population—immediately following release from prison. A transitional period via the halfway house attempts to minimize the effects of the inmate subculture.

As a result, the emergence of community-based corrections is contingent on the following propositions: "(1) the treatment of offenders in the community is more humane than traditional methods; (2) gradual reintegration in the realistic setting of the community will be more effective than the prison/rehabilitation ideology; and (3) offender reintegration in the community can be accomplished at a cost less than that of incarceration" (Seiter, 1977). According to Yepsen, "the ex-offender and his needs must be given primary consideration, with particular emphasis placed upon individualized treatment, societal readjustment, the correction of defects, capitalization of assets and retraining of those clients who are nearing release" (Yepsen, 1975).

Community treatment programs have been formed throughout the country, but differ substantially in content and structure. Nonetheless, all offer greater supervision and guidance than traditional probation
and parole programs (Killinger and Cromwell, Jr., 1974).

The correctional philosophy of most halfway houses is based on the reintegrative model. According to O'Leary and Duffee, this model assumes that halfway houses provide alternatives of behavior for the offender while in the community rather than in prison (O'Leary and Duffee, 1971; Seiter, 1976). These facilities create a home-like milieu that makes the gradual adoption of normative behavior less problematic for the offender.

The growing realization by correctional authorities of the "egregious and dysfunctional effects of institutionalization in the rehabilitation of offenders has produced an excrecence of community correctional programs" (Seiter, 1976). The popular belief that being released from a correctional institution means that the inmate has been rehabilitated is often inaccurate. The process of correction, then, extends into the community.

Halfway houses require ex-offenders to meet particular goals necessary for reintegration. Tasks frequently required for successful progress include securing a job, opening a savings account, arranging for a place to reside and fulfilling household and/or maintenance chores (Geoke, 1983; O'Donnell and Stanley, 1974).

To successfully reintegrate into the community most scholars agree that employment is the major issue faced by ex-offenders (Lerman, 1975; Seiter, 1976). According to Reitzes (1965), "ex-convicts chances of successful adjustment can be increased by guidance and help in providing him with work which is related to his capabilities and interests." In a study of high risk offenders, Moran et. al. (1977) found
that seventy-six percent of their sample "had never maintained a single job for a period of one year" (Geoke, 1983).

Halfway houses attempt to serve as a forum conducive to changing the lifestyles of ex-offenders. However, many scholars point out the problems in realizing this objective. Vasoli and Fahey (1970) have stated that "many releasees are as ill-suited for halfway houses as they are for society at large." The narrow focus of many community corrections facilities sometimes causes failure to meet the particular needs of each offender. Sullivan et. al. asserts:

One of the major shortcomings of halfway house programs has been their failure to distinguish on a systematic basis types of offenders within their programs for treatment purposes. In many programs attempts have been made to meet the needs of a wide distribution of types of offenders and often a large number of offenders with a wide distribution of needs. Moreover, rarely has any consideration been given to whether the type and level of intervention offered by the program was consistent with the needs of the types of offenders placed in the halfway house or with the needs of at least the largest portion of the halfway house population (Sullivan et. al., 1974; Geoke, 1983).

Accordingly, halfway house residents perceive their particular needs differently than staff. Grygier et. al. conclude that offenders "tend to see their aftercare needs in material terms", while staff "are more likely to stress the importance of changing attitudes and values" (Grygier, Nease and Anderson, 1970). Reintegration of the ex-offender can only occur through negotiation of his needs. Aledort and Jones (1973) state that negotiation is critical "since nearly all ex-offenders have acted out in an effort to communicate with significant others in their lives, instead of expressing their needs more articulately"
and appropriately (Geoke, 1983).

The behavioral patterns of ex-offenders have not been frequently addressed by the scholarly community. However, Aledort and Jones (1973) conducted a study of high risk offenders. The research described the halfway house participants as followed:

The men characteristically have a history of severe emotional, social, and financial deprivation. They usually come from a family where only one parent was present. They have early arrest records, starting in adolescence and multiplying in adulthood, coincident with a poor work record. They have a marked inability to have long-term relationships with women and other significant people in their lives. They also have poor educational histories, marked by feelings of inadequacy, and extremely poor frustration tolerances, usually masked by a facade of bravado and omnipotence. Almost without exception, these men use projection and denial in dealing with their anxieties, which usually center around helplessness and dependency needs (Aledort and Jones, 1973; Geoke, 1983).

Grygier et al. (1970) elaborated on the dependency needs of ex-offenders (Geoke, 1983):

Extreme dependence in both the personalities and situation of most halfway house clients is bound to create ambivalence—being dependent, they feel love and gratitude toward those who help them and on whom they rely for support, but at the same time they hate themselves for their weakness and project their self-hatred onto those whom they have to depend (Grygier et al., 1970; Geoke, 1983).

Given ex-offender ambivalence, "halfway house residency might produce the opposite of its intended purpose—the greater likelihood of interaction with other ex-offenders in a halfway house" (Geoke, 1983). Accordingly, such association "could be more inducive to the favorable perception of illegitimate opportunities" (Shidadeh, 1973; Geoke, 1983).
Factors that have been found to be predictor variables of success or failure in community correctional programs include: "age, intelligence, education, community ties, length of time at the halfway house, number of prior incarcerations, type and length of criminal record, employment skills, and history of psychiatric treatment" (Geoke, 1983; Seiter et. al., 1976; Moran et. al., 1977; Bech, 1977). Nonetheless, much of the data have yielded very little conclusive evidence (Geoke, 1983; Moczydlowski, 1980). This research is purposive to this objective.

Many scholars contend that the offender experiences apprehension, discomfort, self-doubt, and dependency upon release (Lindner, 1946; Seiter, 1977; Glaser, 1970). Accordingly, if the fears and trepidations of the newly released inmates are not addressed by the correctional community, offenders may recidivate. The critical nature of the post-release period is one of minimizing the rush of offenders engaging in patterns of criminal activities.

The use of community corrections has become a routine part of the reintegration process for adult offenders. Specifically, in 1981 there were 18,151 adult male felons residing in community-based facilities (Krajick, 1981). Some contemporary issues in community supervision have emerged because of the phenomenal number of offenders being channelled through halfway houses.

"Despite the widespread popularity of community-based corrections, its potential has not been realized because of fragmentation and lack of continuity" (Callison, 1983). One scholar notes, "the present system is characterized by gaps, duplications and cross-purposes among different services and levels of government" (Callison, 1983).
A second major consideration for community-based correction is resistance from the public. In 1978 the United States Bureau of Prisons conducted a study of 400 private and local government halfway houses. The study revealed that seventy-five percent rated "moderate-to-severe community opposition as their worst problem" (Callison, 1983). Community resistance almost always stemmed from fear of residents and the effect on the neighborhood (Callison, 1983).

A third major consideration of community-based correction, in particular, halfway houses, is that of cost. According to Callison, operating costs may range from $50,000 to $175,000, a year, "depending on the economy near the site location, the type of management selected, and the services provided" (Callison, 1983).

The size of the ex-offender population, affected by the overuse of community-based correction, causes impersonalization. Accordingly, a fourth major concern of community-based operators is that of reducing the supportive environment to that of a prison-like atmosphere (Callison, 1983).

Finally, personnel problems emerge as a major consideration for halfway houses. Employees must be able to work in a nonauthoritarian environment and establish rapport with clients. However, community correctional personnel must feel secure enough to enforce rules and regulations. Halfway houses have considerable problems with rapid turnover of personnel which affects program consistency. According to Miller (1977), burnout among community correction personnel results from close contacts with inmates and the lack of public acceptance of halfway house careers.
The bulk of the literature concerning halfway houses emphasizes:
(1) evaluation of community treatment programs (Seiter, 1977; Seiter, 1976; Cromwell, Jr., 1976; Sparks, 1968; Yepsen, 1975; Smykla, 1981; Eshridge, et. al., 1981); (2) examination of the effectiveness of community corrections on recidivism rates (McSparron, 1980; Hurd, et. al., 1974; Lipton, et. al., 1975; Lerman, 1975; Hoffman and Stone- Meierhoefer, 1979); and (3) community corrections as an alternative to incarceration (Alper, 1974; Brantly, et. al., 1979; Sullivan, 1980; Carter, et. al., 1975). This dissertation explores the social psychological factors that influence the formation of ex-offenders cliques in a halfway house setting.

There is a paucity of literature on ex-offender social association in the halfway house. As a result, the available literature on the behavioral dynamics of offenders while incarcerated will be reviewed. The halfway house setting is one of social control (Senna and Siegel, 1984). Consequently, some of the behavioral patterns of inmates elucidated in the prison literature may be applicable to ex-offenders.

Social Relations in Prison

The total institution, according to Erving Goffman, is:
A place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed formally administered round of life (Goffman, 1961).

American prisons are characteristically total institutions. Specifically,
Inmates locked within their walls are segregated from the outside world, kept under constant scrutiny and surveillance, and forced to obey a strict code of official rules to avoid facing formal sanctions (Senna and Siegel, 1984).
Also,

The entrance of inmate into the institution is marked by a degradation ceremony, which, in the case of prison, includes fingerprinting, taking 'mug shots,' exchanging street clothes for institutional clothing, having an intake interview, and giving up most of one's personal possessions to be locked away until release (Bowker, 1982).

The process of morification or stripping the inmate of identity also entails socialization into the prison subculture as well as an indoctrination in "prison regulations and the many tacit understandings that are enforced by correctional officers and other staff members" (Bowker, 1982).

"In the traditional maximum security prison, the isolation of prisoners from the outside world is almost complete" (Bowker, 1982). As a result, certain kinds of prisoner social relations develop. Inmates establish "common understandings of the rules for behavior, shared definitions of the situation, agreement on the value of certain activities, and many other commonalities" (Bowker, 1982). The form that such association has taken is that of small prison cliques to highly organized prison gangs.

The body of literature on prisoner social relations can be characterized by adherence to two schemes: a deprivation model and an importation model.

The Deprivation Model

According to Carroll, "the major premise of the deprivation model is that inmate subculture and social organization are collective functional responses to the deprivations imposed by incarceration" (Carroll, 1974). Prison is conceived of as a closed system impermeable to outside
influences. Consequently, an inmate subculture emerges,

...through the interaction within the walls and new prisoners are socialized into it. Predisposing inmates to the socialization process is a ritual series of degradations that is part of the formal induction into prison (Carroll, 1974).

One major consideration of the inmate subculture is a unique set of social codes; that is,

...unwritten guidelines that express the values, attitudes, and types of behavior which the older inmates demand of younger inmates. Passed on from one generation of inmates to another, the inmate social code represent the values of interpersonal relations within the prison (Senna and Siegel, 1984).

Moreover,

Life within the institution presents prisoners with a series of deprivations to which they adapt collectively by means of an indigenously developed code of solidarity. This code is articulated in a system of interdependent roles (Carroll, 1974).

The first major study of the inmate social code and prison subculture was conducted by Donald Clemmer. Conducted during the 1930s at Menard, a maximum security prison in Illinois, the research presented a detailed description of prison life. In The Prison Community (1940), Clemmer identified the prisonization process or "the inmates assimilation into the existing prison culture through acceptance of its language (argot), sexual code, and norms of behavior" (Senna and Siegel, 1984).

Analysis of informal prisoner life was based on the concept of the primary group. Specifically, Clemmer indicated that nearly half of the prison population were members of a primary or semi-primary group (Irwin, 1980). He conceptualized the primary group member as:
The man who is one of a group of three or more men who are all very close friends. They share each other's luxuries and secrets and have accepted or are willing to accept, punishment one for the other. The 'clique man' is so closely associated with this group that he thinks in terms of 'we' rather than 'I' and he acts as the group acts. The clique has some permeance (Clemmer, 1940).

The semi-primary group member, (Irwin, 1980)

...is the man who is friendly with a certain small group of men but who does not entirely subject himself to the wishes and acts of the group as a whole. He would share his luxuries, tell some of his secrets, but would not go 'all the way' for those with whom he is friendly. While he is particularly friendly with one group, he also mixes freely with a number of other men and is at least friendly with these others (Clemmer, 1940).

Clemmer described the unique prison subculture which comprised habits, behavior systems, traditions and the laws which guide the inmates and their ideas. He also identified major elements in prison "societies." For instance, Clemmer included a dictionary of 1063 argot terms that referred to sex, crime, individual descriptions, and clothing among others. This ethnography of prison life explored prison hierarchy, sexuality and general patterns of behavior.

Clemmer's study served as an impetus for a second major study conducted by Gresham Sykes. In The Society of Captives (1958), Sykes set out to explore, more fully, the various prison roles that exist because of the deprivations presented by the prison (Senna and Siegel, 1984). Deprivations imposed by incarceration were identified as "loss of freedom, deprivation of material comfort, loss of autonomy, denial of heterosexual contact and physical insecurity" (Sykes, 1958). Later, in The Sociology of Punishment and Corrections (1970), Sykes and Messinger
identified the following as important principles of the prisoner's code:

1. Don't interfere with inmates' interests. Within this area of the code are maxims concerning the serving of the least amount of time in the greatest possible comfort, e.g., grievances must be handled personally.

2. Don't lose your head. Inmates are also cautioned to refrain from arguing or in other emotional displays with fellow inmates.

3. Don't exploit inmates. Prisoners are warned not to take advantage of one another.

4. Inmates are cautioned to be tough and not lose their dignity. While rule two forbids conflict, once it starts an inmate must be prepared to deal with it effectively; and

5. Don't be a sucker. Inmates are cautioned not to make fools...of themselves and support the guards or prison administration over the interests of the inmates (Sykes and Messinger, 1970; Senna and Siegel, 1984).

This system or functional analysis of the prison community further explored the relationship between the inmate social code and the roles which emerged in the correctional institution. Specifically, social codes are "articulated in a system of interdependent though not necessarily cohesive roles" (Carroll, 1974). These roles, such as the "right guy" or "politician," are functionally integrated into a unique social system.

Its uniqueness stems from two separate sets of problems, those of the prisoners and those of the administration. The latter had the primary and difficult problem of maintaining control over a potentially obstreperous and rebellious prisoner population that greatly outnumbered the staff (Irwin, 1980).

The prisoners, on the other hand, are faced with the problems of incarceration. According to Irwin,
The functionally integrated social system that emerged as a response to these special problems was accommodative; certain prison leaders were given special privileges, such as those which accompany key positions in the prison, in return for enforcing a peaceful, informal social order (Irwin, 1980).

Sykes and Messinger's functional analysis identified how the inmate's role reflected his/her status in the social system. Specifically,

A con who cooperates with authorities is labeled a 'rat' or 'squealer; and is treated with universal scorn and disdain; highly aggressive inmates who quarrel and fight easily are called 'toughs'; and those who fail to live up to the maxim 'be tough' are called 'weak sisters' (Senna and Siegel, 1974).

The inmate who adheres to social code habitually is referred to as the "right guy." According to Sykes and Messinger:

A right guy is always loyal to his fellow prisoners. He never lets you down, no matter how rough things get. He keeps his promises. He's dependable and trustworthy...The 'right guy' never interferes with inmates who are conniving against the officials. He doesn't go around looking for a fight, but he never runs away from one when he is in the right...he acts like a man (Sykes and Messinger, 1970).

Four general cultural roles have been repeatedly identified in the prison subculture (Bowker, 1982). These social roles were elaborated by Clarence Shrag in The Prisons: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change (1961). According to the researcher, the four major roles include the "square john," "right guy," "politician," and the "outlaw."

The 'square john' is a prosocial prisoner who conforms to the prison rules, is positively oriented toward a law-abiding life, does not get involved with the prison society, and is friendly with staff members. The 'right guy' is just the opposite, being heavily involved in subcultural activities,
oriented negatively toward society, and having little to do with staff members. 'Square johns' tend to have middle-class origins and to have been convicted of either white-collar crimes or crimes of passion, while 'right guys' come from the lower class and have been convicted of serious crimes of violence. The third role is the 'politician' who attempts to manipulate both staff and prisoners to gain advantages in the struggle for goods and services within the prison. 'Politicians' have often been convicted of economic crimes..., and have no attachment to either the prisoner [sub] culture or legitimate society as represented by staff members. [Last] the prison 'outlaw' is severely violently criminal, uses violence to attain his ends, and victimizes both fellow-prisoner and staff members (Bowker, 1974).

A more recent study by Werner Gruninger found that "approximately half of the prisoners occupied the role of 'outlaw'" (Gruninger, 1974).

In conclusion, these studies, among others, adhere to the deprivation model. The paradigm maintains that the prison is a total institution. Specifically,

Life within the institution presents prisoners with a series of deprivations to which they adapt collectively by means of an indigenously developed code of solidarity (Carroll, 1974). In contrast to the deprivation model, the importation model does not contend that the prison is a closed institution unaffected by outside influences.

The Importation Model

Scholars who adhere to the importation model have criticized the restrictive scope of the deprivation model.

While agreeing that inmate culture and social organization are adaptive responses to the problem of incarceration, these critics attack the conception of the prison as a closed system (Carroll, 1974).
Major proponents of the importation model maintain that inmate adaptation is a consequence of preprison experiences. The prisoner subculture is thought of as a well developed, integrated phenomenon that has its "origins and supports in groups outside the prison" (Carroll, 1974). Specifically, the inmate subculture is "imported into the prison through the interaction of people from similar backgrounds in the face of common problems to which they must adapt" (Carroll, 1974).

The deprivation model was challenged in 1962 when John Irwin and Donald Cressey published an article entitled "Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture." The authors maintained that the inmate subculture was a consequence of newcomers' values. According to Irwin and Cressey, many inmates come to any given prison with a record of many terms in correctional institutions. These men, some of whom have institutional records dating back to early childhood, bring with them a ready made set of patterns which they apply to the new situation, just as is the case with participants in the criminal subculture (Irwin and Cressey, 1962).

The authors advanced that inmate subculture "is an accommodation among three diverse subcultural orientations: 'thief,' 'convict,' and 'do right'" (Carroll, 1974). Each orientation has its origins outside the correctional facility. The thief orientation derives from the professional thief subculture. Inmates who are within this subculture follow the rules extolled by professional thieves. Some of these rules include: loyalty of friends, sharing with other thieves and avoidance with leadership roles or positions in prisons. The second orientation, convict, originated "both in reform schools and the subculture of the 'hard core' lower class. The central value
of this orientation is utilitarianism" (Carroll, 1974; Bowker, 1982). "Convicts" seek to maximize their wealth, power and status, which is achieved by the manipulation of both administration and other inmates. Finally, the "do right" who has not been previously criminalized practice the legitimate culture of the larger society as much as they can within the limitations imposed by prison regulation" (Bowker, 1982). Also, the orientation is characterized by an attempt by the inmate to achieve the goals set by the staff.

Irwin and Cressey hypothesize that,

In the typical prison the subcultural orientation of the 'convict' is dominant, with those of 'thief' and 'do right' adjusting and accommodating to it (Irwin and Cressey, 1962).

Consequently, "the prison population is organized as a congeries of cliques having diverse orientations and existing in some sort of balanced accommodation" (Carroll, 1974). For Irwin,

The convict population in California tends to be splintered. A few convicts orient themselves to the prison social system and assume roles in regard to the prison, and a few others withdraw completely, but the majority confine their association to one or two groups of convicts and attempt to disassociate themselves from the bulk of the population. These groups vary from small, close-knit groups to large casual groups (Irwin and Cressey, 1962).

These types of social relations can be further characterized by racial and cultural orientation. Specifically, minority groups (e.g., blacks, Chicanos, Latinos, native Americans, etc.) are overrepresented in correctional populations. Historically, white immigrants were overrepresented in penal populations during the nineteenth century, but that changed at the end of that period. As immigrant populations
became better established, their members were less likely to be processed by the criminal justice system" (Bowker, 1982). Patterns in minority incarceration, however, were just the reverse. This was the result of a racially biased policing and criminal justice system (Bowker, 1982).

As the racial characteristics changed in prisons, "commonalities of dialect and culture led to the self-segregation of racial and cultural minorities" (Bowker, 1982). This was perpetuated by the physical segregation of the races required by law prior to the 1950s. Prejudice and discriminatory practices directed toward blacks and other minority groups provided the rationale for placing these inmates in the least desirable jobs and imposing harsher punishments than their white counterparts. Injustices and the increase in minority group members in prison, nonetheless, brought significant changes in the dynamics of prison life.

The rise of the "Black Muslims in prisons during the 1960s was initially greeted by the prison administration with repression. Spurred by court decisions supporting the freedom of religion for prisoners, correctional administrators have provided special religious (i.e. dietary customs) and cultural services" (Bowker, 1982). When Black Muslim inmates won compliance from prison administrators, a new trend emerged in race relations in prisons.

According to James B. Jacobs,

Black and Latin inmates are much more cohesively organized than whites. Their groups are sometimes rooted in religious/political affiliations such as the Black Muslims; groups created specifically to combat discrimination in prison, such as the Latin group La Familia; or in re-formulation of
street gangs in prison, such as the Vice Lords, Disciples, or Blackstone Rangers in Illinois (Senna and Siegel, 1984; Jacobs, 1979).

John Irwin elaborates the effects of racial dynamics in prison in *Prisons in Turmoil*. According to the author, the changes in race relations in the prison system up to the 1970s was prompted by the emergence of racially homogeneous groups. "Black prisoners in California began to substitute for their criminal identities those based on racial differences; Chicanos soon emulated this trend" (Bowker, 1982). Furthermore, Irwin found that only in California had white inmates successfully organized and formed a racially homogeneous group – the neo-Nazi Aryan Brotherhood. This group was formulated on the basis of racial symbolism and ideology (Jacobs, 1979).

Black prisoners do not require a numerical majority in order to dominate prison life (Bowker, 1982). Specifically,

If they are as little as a quarter of the prisoner population, their higher degree of social solidarity gives them an advantage over the large number of white prisoners. Chicano prisoners (in the Southwest) and Latino prisoners (in the East and Midwest) enjoy the same organizational advantage. Race and ethnicity have greater salience for minority group members than for whites because of the life-long discrimination that these individuals typically experience in American society. This background of common experience gives minority group prisoners a ready basis for mutual cooperation (Bowker, 1982; Irwin, 1980).

Thus, in-group solidarity reaches an extremely high level in contemporary prison, particularly among minority groups.

Other scholars document the existence of racial cliques—the Black Prisoner's Forum Unlimited, the Confederated Indian Tribes and United Chicanos—in the Washington State prison system (Stastny and
Tyrnauer, 1982). "These groups not only provided protection to their members but also acted as a bloc to make demands on prison administrators" (Stastny and Tyrnauer, 1982; Senna and Siegel, 1984). Although clique members adhere to the traditional prisoner code, allegiance is more typically toward members of one's own group.

One of the most detailed studies of race relations in a maximum security prison was conducted by Leo Carroll in 1970-1971. He found that black and white prisoners were forced, to some degree, to integrate. Both groups expressed "mutual mistrust, suspicion, fear, and hatred" (Bowker, 1982; Carroll, 1974). The researcher found that different sets of social roles existed for "blacks and whites rather than a single integrated system of roles. Within the work details, in which integration was administratively mandated, social interaction was limited and superficial" (Bowker, 1982). However, "in voluntary settings, such as recreational activities, there was much less interracial contact" (Bowker, 1982; Carroll, 1974).

The prison sub rosa (inmate) economic system and activities (primarily a barter system of exchange of goods and services) were also found to be carried out in parallel racial structures.

Neither their rejection by society, nor their proximity within the prison, nor their common subordination to the authority of the custodians, nor the integrationist policies of the Warden, nor the material deprivations they suffer are sufficient to produce a cross-racial solidarity among prisoners (Carroll, 1974).

The races, therefore, primarily existed independently of each other; a characteristic imported into the prison from the larger society.
Additional support for the importation model is found in studies of prisons for women. According to Carroll,

Ward and Kasselbaum characterized the female prisoners at Frontera, California as organized into primary groups and dyadic homosexual alliances, with little collective solidarity existing between groups. At the Federal Reformatory for Women in Alderson, West Virginia, Giallombardo found the cornerstone of inmate organization to be pseudомarriages linked together in an elaborate substitute kinship system. Both studies interpret the form of adaptation as the result of prior socialization into the traditional female roles of wife and mother (Ward and Kasseman, 1965; Giallombardo, 1966; Carroll, 1974).

Also,

It is the dispossession of these roles and the consequent absence of security, intimacy and affection that women experience as the most deprivational aspect of confinement. Organization into dyadic homosexual alliances and close-knit primary groups evolves as a response to these pains. Thus, an ascriptive identity, sex, is viewed as structuring what is defined as deprivational about prison, and structuring the manner in which prisoners organize to alleviate these deprivations (Carroll, 1974).

These studies, among the others, support the basic tenets of the importation model. The model "interprets inmate adaptations to imprisonment as conditioned by factors external to the prison" (Carroll, 1974). In contrast to the deprivation model, the importation model does not view the prison as a closed total institution. Prisoners are organized into small primary groups to large groups with similar social orientations. Little collective solidarity between groups are formed due to preprison experiences and the influence of outside factors.
The climate of the contemporary prison is one of intergroup violence. As a result of demographic changes, the feasibility of the traditional prison, characterized by racial polarization, has been reduced. As minority populations increase, so does conflict with white inmates, guards and the prison administration. According to Conrad,

The new black prison population is aggressive, resentful of the real and painful grievances of blacks everywhere, and often disposed to express accumulated anger in ways that intimidate or harm white inmates. Differences among black prisoners evaporate when they are in confrontation with white—guards or fellow prisoners. Solidarity among white inmates is seldom achieved, even in such confrontations, despite the occasional coalescence of such gangs as the Neo-Nazis or the Aryan Brotherhood (Conrad, 1977).

Characteristics such as the aggressive and resentful inmate may be the characteristics of all inmates, not exclusively blacks (Carroll, 1974; Irwin, 1980). To label blacks as such suggest a very biased assumption by Conrad. This sensationalizes the stereotypical image of minority inmates that is assumed by the criminal justice system and the criminology community (see Coleman, 1982). This image also exonerates white inmates from their criminal behaviors which resulted in their incarceration. Indeed, they are not these fragile, helpless lambs thrown into a den of lions. A second major criticism of Conrad's assertions is his inability to place black inmate behavior within its historical context. Scholars such as Herbert Gutman, Rayna Rapp, and Carol Stack have all contended that a typical response of blacks to the conditions of injustice and scarcity has been one of collaborative effort. For instance, blacks evolved elaborate kinship networks of aid as a response to the economic and social structure. Such networks
were characterized by sharing resources and rewards, pooling resources and establishing a sense of identity (Gutman, 1978; Stack, 1975). What occurs in prison, then, appears to be an extension of the "networking" strategy traditionally used by blacks in an otherwise hostile environment. In the importation model tradition, such a response by the minority inmate is not unusual or mystic, but more consequential for others who do not engage in collaborative effort strategies for survival.

**Recent Studies**

"Imprisonment generates some degree of pressure in each and every inmate" (Parisi, 1982). There are numerous ways in which the inmate alleviates incarceration. Specifically, the factor that contributes continuously to pressure in prison is that of deprivation (Parisi, 1982).

Deprivation of goods and services, liberty, heterosexual relationships, autonomy and security characterize the prison experience. Other environmental concerns were found by Toch which produced variant levels of stress include privacy, support, emotional feedback, and activity (Toch, 1977). "Prison pressures may lead inmates to choose one or more strategies of coping with their environment. The array of interactions in prison are a mixture of both pressures and reactions to pressures" (Parisi, 1982). To secure safety and/or privacy needs, "inmates may choose some form of withdrawal. For those experiencing less acute pressure, some prisoners may seek 'niches'" (Toch, 1977). This strategy may remove the inmate from the "volatile inmate population by a job assignment or by an association with a clique" (Parisi, 1982; Toch, 1977).
Correctional institutions tend to house individuals who are "pre-disposed to violent reactions to stress" (Parisi, 1982). According to Bowker,

"A violent style of coping has the following advantage: increased social status in the prisoner subculture; enhanced masculine self-image; decreased likelihood of being attacked; sexual release without responsibility; economic gain; increased amenities; and manipulation of the release decision. These benefits may reduce the aggressor's tension" (Parisi, 1982; Bowker, 1980).

Aggression as a strategy to decrease pressure is the coping style of some inmates or groups of prisoners.

The bulk of the literature reviewed suggest that one of the major factors that contribute to the rise in prison violence is due to shifts in the demographic characteristics of the inmate population. Specifically, increases in the proportion of racial and ethnic minorities combined with severe overcrowding intensify the threat of violence. "Recent prison literature points to racial conflict as being one of the primary factors in changing the nature of the prisoner social system" (Davidson, 1979). Many scholars agree that racial conflict has "reshaped most prisoner roles and social relationships within the prison community" (Fox, 1982; Irwin, 1980; Carroll, 1974; Jacobs, 1979). Specifically,

Racial stratification appears to have altered the system of norms and values governing behavior within the prisoner community. The convict code especially its proscription against snitching and developing informal relationships with custodians, may not be uniformly held by members of different racial groups. Whites, blacks, Hispanics, and native Americans may have evolved normative systems that are tailored to their respective cultural and social needs and may place substantially different meanings and emphasis on prisoner norms regulating adaptive behavior (Fox, 1982).
Given the racial environment and the relativity of the code, it is posited that race is a basic determinant of prisoner relations and/or association.

A second factor contributing to the shifts in prisoner values is the rise in gang and gang-related activities. According to Irwin, there is a "greater acceptance of interracial victimization and predatory violence, a willingness to use collective action for the resolution of problems stemming from racial stratification, and closer relations with prisoner guards" (Irwin, 1980; Fox, 1982). The degree to which race is a basis for prisoner relationships, again, is unprecedented. The racial differences that govern relations outside the prison are manifested in the correctional institution. However, the prison community has adopted a prisoner code that makes violence toward others conducive to survival in the facility. Prisonization, therefore, occurs differentially. Internalization of specialized social values, attitudes, and normative role expectations are relative to particular racial group interests, needs and concerns (Fox, 1982).

Racial segregation among prison inmates is not always involuntary. As Jacobs (1983) points out, "there are powerful motivations and strong peer pressures among the prisoners to segregate themselves" (Jacobs, 1983). Racial tension in prison exists and manifest itself in several ways. In particular, a study conducted in 1981 of Michigan prisons concluded that there was "pronounced, self-imposed segregation of the races in the dining rooms and other activities" (The Report of the Special Committee appointed by Governor Milliken-Michigan, 1981). Furthermore, prison officials have allowed such segregation to continue.
"Prison officials have been more than happy to accede to prisoner's wishes for self-segregation. In dining rooms, the common pattern is for white, black and Hispanic prisoners to separate themselves in racially homogeneous and carefully demarcated sections and rows" (Jacobs, 1983).

Ethnic stereotypes held by guards is another source of racial tension in the prison environment. Accordingly, in many prisons today guard populations are white, whereas inmate populations overwhelmingly are minority-group members. Several authors have pointed out interesting parallels with these large differences and the occurrence of racial violence.

For example, at Attica Prison in 1971 (the year of the riot), 70% of the inmates were either black or Puerto Rican, while the staff was 100% white...In the Illinois state prison system, 85% of the guards are white, while most inmates are black or Latino (Sommer, 1976; Jacobs, 1978; Greenberg and Ruback, 1982).

Furthermore, Carroll concluded that guards tended to view black inmates as "being innately lazy, ignorant, crude, and hypersexual" (Carroll, 1974). Studies reveal that "people are likely to notice and recall information consistent with their stereotypes and to ignore information inconsistent with these stereotypes" (Synder and Uranowitz, 1978). Attributing such negative stereotypes, particularly in acting out behavior, could solidify minority inmates against white inmates and staff (Greenberg and Ruback, 1982; Carroll, 1974).

The racial dynamics of prisonization cannot be minimized. As this study will explore, the race relations that characterize incarceration may also characterize race relations in a halfway house setting.
These relations may, however, differ substantially from those in prison settings. Specifically, the effect of race on the social attractiveness process was evident in the halfway house.

**Summary**

Conditions of maximum deprivation and control produce social relations among inmates characterized by "high solidarity, interdependence roles and low primary group cohesion" (Carroll, 1974). Such is the case in today's prisons.

There are two schools of thought or models that address prisoner social relations. First, the deprivation model holds that the prison is a total institution. Consequently, a highly developed prisoner subculture has developed. This subculture is characterized by a particular language (argot), social positions of specific status and the prisoner code that perpetuates the types of relations among prisoners and also staff. The importation model, in contrast, does not contend that the prison is a total institution uninfluenced by the dominant social structure. Specifically, inmates bring with them unique values and orientations which govern prison relations. As a result, several prison subcultures have emerged. Studies have also documented and elucidated the dynamics of social relations in prison based on race (Irwin, 1980; Carroll, 1974). Such research has identified that racial polarization has been a consequence of adaptation to prison life.

Community-based correctional institutions generally admit adjudicated and nonadjudicated offenders. The former refers to those individuals who are admitted into diversion programs from the criminal justice system after entry. The latter refers to those who are admitted as
an alternative to entry into prison. For purposes of this research, those who have been incarcerated are the subjects of this study.

The behavioral dynamics that characterize the prison population does not necessarily cease upon release (Glaser, 1970; Lerman, 1975). Consequently, the descriptive nature of this study will explore whether the behavior of ex-offenders in a halfway house setting is similar to that of inmate populations.
This is descriptive survey research. The focal concern here was to gain greater insight into ex-offender social association in a halfway house setting. The researcher ascertained extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards obtained through ex-offender association. Second, the effect of race on the social attractiveness process was examined.

It has been concluded that race, the institutional environment and experiences prior to incarceration have a strong impact on the dynamics of offender relations (Clemmer, 1958; Sykes, 1958; Irwin, 1980; Anderson, 1980; Parisi, 1982). Consequently, social association tends to manifest itself along racial as well as social lines. In order to ascertain if this phenomenon existed in a halfway house setting, the researcher explored ex-offender's perceptions of their association with others.

Setting: The Ralph W. Alvis House

The following is a brief description of the halfway house where this research was conducted. Chapter Four will provide, in detail, the purpose and operating procedures of the facility.

Purpose: The mission of Alvis House is to aid in the reintegration of adult ex-offenders living in the Central Ohio area. Reintegration means being self supporting and law abiding. Alvis House also has
the responsibility to inhibit ex-offenders under its supervision from committing new crimes. Following are descriptions of the Alvis House services.

**Correctional Services:** Probationers from County Clerk of Common Pleas or the U.S. District Court, parolees from the Ohio Adult Parole Authority or the U.S. Parole Commission, and prisoners from the U.S. Bureau of Prisons may be placed at Alvis House by their respective correctional officers. These men are housed in three Bryden Road facilities. The men receive free room, board and bus fare until they begin earning an income; thereafter they pay rent and buy groceries, etc. when they "graduate" from the program. While at Alvis House, they are permitted to go to work, social services, training, etc. and to visit family and friends. Staff monitor their movements in the community by phone and on-site visits. The men are required to return to the facilities at specific times each day and evening. They may earn weekend passes by making satisfactory progress in employment or training and by adhering to program rules.

**Mental Retardation Unit:** Correctional officials, courts and the Ohio Department of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities may place mildly and moderately retarded ex-offenders in the Alvis House. These men are housed in a fifteen-bed facility on South Ohio Avenue. In addition to the same help and supervision provided in the Bryden Road facilities, this program has other services to meet the needs of this special group. Educational, vocational and daily living skills classes are conducted in the facility five days per week. After a month or two in these classes, the men may enroll in
a sheltered workshop (such as Goodwill), or participate in a work experience program in a neighborhood church. The goal for these men is to help them gain impulse control by learning to cope with life's daily frustrations. Upon "graduation" from the MR Unit, these men, depending upon degrees of retardation, may live independently, or with their families, or in a less restrictive group home.

**Employment Services:** A ten person task force provides job-readiness training, job-development and job-placement services to "out-clients" and men who reside at the various Alvis House facilities. Out-clients are referred to this service by their probation or parole officers. The men and women who participate in this program are taught how to interview for a job, how to complete applications, how to write resumes, how to use the newspaper to find prospective employment, and how to obtain an interview appointment over the telephone.

**Landscape and Litter Abatement Project:** The Columbus Health Department contracts with Alvis House to mow and clear vacant lots which have been cited for health hazards. Individuals and organizations also contract with Alvis House for landscaping services. Ex-offenders are employed in this project under the on-site supervision of an Alvis House staff person. The project enables staff to observe and correct clients' work habits while performing a useful service to the community.

**Building Maintenance Training Project:** Ex-offenders are employed in this project under the on-site supervision of a qualified trainer. Staff are able to observe and correct trainees work habits while they are developing skills through hands-on work on the aging Alvis House facilities. The ultimate goal is to place the trainees in private
sector employment (S.O.P., Alvis House, 1982).

Subject Selection

Population

The population under study consisted of male parolees, state furlough and federal pre-released prisoners from the Ohio Adult Authority, the United States Parole Commission and the United States Bureau of Prisons placed at Alvis House, between October 4, 1984 to February 1, 1985. Probationers were excluded from this study since these individuals did not serve time in prison. Similarly, mentally retarded clients, regardless of their incarceration status, were excluded from this study.

State parolees, state furlough and federal pre-released prisoners were the subjects of this study. Parolees were offenders not serving a sentence of confinement, but rather receiving supervision by a state parole officer. A stipulation of parole however, was to be placed at Alvis House. Second, state furlough prisoners were released from the correctional facility on a temporary basis. These offenders participated in Alvis House programs and were returned to prison after a period of time. Federal pre-released prisoners, in contrast, were characterized by various types of commitment.

1. Transfers from federal corrections institutions: these offenders are serving the confinement portion of their sentence in the federal institution and are finishing the last portion of their sentence in the community treatment center.

2. Parolees and Mandatory Releases (19 U.S. Code 4209): this statute provides that the U.S. Parole Commission may, as a condition of research, require a federal parolee or mandatory release to reside in or participate in the program of a residential community treatment
center for all or part of the remainder of his original sentence (see Appendix B, Statement of Work, Alvis House, 1982).

The population under study was also characterized by residential status. Specifically, ex-offenders who participated in the program and resided at one of the residential units are referred to as "resident clients". Second, parolees who were involved in the reintegration program, but did not reside at any of the residential units are referred to as "out-clients". These individuals, however, were under the supervision of a parole officer.

The data for this study were gathered with the cooperation of the Ralph W. Alvis House for ex-offenders in Columbus, Ohio. According to official records at the time of this study, the population consisted of one hundred and one parolees, state furlough and federal pre-released prisoners. Eighty-two percent (N=83) of the population were parolees. Also, three percent (N=3) were state furlough as compared to fifteen percent (N=15) federal pre-released prisoners (see Appendix C, Table 1).

The resident group comprised thirty-five ex-offenders, and represented nearly thirty-five percent of the population. There were approximately seventeen percent (N=17) parolee, three percent (N=3) state furlough and fifteen percent (N=15) federal pre-released prisoners that resided at two of the three residential facilities. In comparison, the out-client group (N=66), without exception, was of parole legal status. The out-client group represented a little over sixty-five percent of the total population (see Appendix C, Table 2).
The racial composition of the total population was nearly equal. Specifically, forty-two percent (N=42) were white and fifty-eight percent (N=59) were non-white ex-offenders. Of the resident group, fifteen percent (N=15) were white: eight parole, one state furlough and six federal pre-released prisoners. In comparison, twenty percent (N=20) were black clients: nine parole, two state furlough and nine federal pre-released prisoners. Finally, the out-client group was composed of twenty-nine percent (N=27) white, as compared, thirty-six percent (N=39) black parolees (see Appendix C, Table 3).

The availability of subjects was predicated on the normal functioning of the facility. To avoid interfering with the mandatory activities of the clients, the researcher selected weekends and evenings to gather data.

The researcher utilized a census approach and requested that each client participate in the study. Consequently, sixty-five percent (N=65) of the ex-offender population was solicited for the study. Approximately, thirty-five percent (N=36) refused to participate; that is, three (two federal pre-released prisoners and one state furlough) residents, and thirty-three out-clients (parole) declined. Of the resident group, almost nine percent did not consent, but missing cases did not affect the data analyzed. These respondents were in no way demographically different than consenting resident clients.

The researcher acknowledged that thirty-three out-clients or fifty percent of that group did not participate in the study. Seventeen of the twenty-seven white parolees, and sixteen of the thirty-nine black parolees did not consent. This may affect the findings. The
researcher, therefore, presented and analyzed data on the resident and out-client respondents separately.

Ex-offender social association in community correctional facilities has been a neglected area of research in criminology. Because the researcher selected the population instead of using a probability sample, and the nature of the data, no attempt was made to make statistical inferences or explanations. Rather, the researcher systematically described and profiled resident and out-client perceptions of ex-offender social association in a halfway house setting.

The profile of the typical adult releasee admitted into community corrections has been characterized as "between eighteen and thirty-five, white (sixty-one percent), has not completed high school; is single, divorced or separated (seventy-two percent), likely to have committed a crime against property, and has been in prison on two separate occasions" (Snarr and Wolford, 1985). Moreover, "approximately seventy percent of all prison inmates are released on parole or some other form of conditional release" (Snarr and Wolford, 1985). Releasees are usually under supervision for two years. Finally, most releasees were incarcerated for burglary and robbery.

The atypical clientele at Alvis House prohibit projections of results to large house populations. In comparison to other community-based facilities, Alvis House residents included many high risk offenders (e.g., sex offenders) from a variety of legal statuses. The heterogeneity of the population, however, may represent a better cross section of criminal types than populations consisting of one legal status.


**Instrumentation**

The instrument utilized to collect data regarding ex-offender social association consisted of five sections. Part One identified demographic characteristics of ex-offenders. Items one through seven ascertained subject age, state of residence, race, marital status, number of dependents, educational level and occupation.

Part Two of the survey instrument identified the psychological/psychiatric history of each subject. Specifically, items eight through eleven ascertained subject impairment, psychological care, and whether subject was currently prescribed medication and/or undergoing treatment.

Part Three consisted of items twelve through twenty-three. Subject legal status, number of days participated and remaining in reintegration program, institution incarcerated in, instant offense, type of offense, number of adult felony convictions, incarcerations, months of incarceration, resident violations, and most frequent violation were ascertained. The data source for items one through twenty-three were ex-offender files.

Part Four of the survey instrument was comprised of items twenty-four through thirty-nine. These items were derived from the prison literature, in particular John Irwin (1980), and the social exchange theory of Peter Blau (1964). Specifically, items twenty-four through thirty-nine explored ex-offender social association in a halfway house setting. These questions examined ex-offender friendship patterns, and sought to identify the extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards obtained through ex-offender social association. Also, the types of programs the ex-offender participated in were ascertained.
Finally, Part Five of the survey instrument explored ex-offender social attractiveness. Questions were derived from Peter Blau's conceptualization of the concept. Items forty through fifty-two identified the types of socially attractive behaviors ex-offenders engaged in during association with other ex-offenders. The data source for items twenty-four through fifty-two were structured interviews of ex-offenders in a halfway house setting.

Validity and Reliability

To ascertain the validity of the instrument two functions were met. First, the validity of the instrument had to measure the concepts. Second, the concepts must be measured accurately. In order to assess validity, the researcher utilized content validation (Selltiz et. al., 1976; Phillips, 1970; Bailey, 1978; Kerlinger, 1964). A panel of experts was formed consisting of a social psychologist, criminal justice researchers, and community correctional professionals. Members of the panel were provided with a copy of the survey instrument and the objectives of the study. The panel was requested to assess the content validity of the instrument. The panel examined and approved the content validity of the survey instrument.

To increase the internal validity of the survey instrument, the researcher utilized a test/retest approach. Specifically, a group of eight ex-offenders in a halfway house setting were requested to complete the survey instrument through the use of face-to-face interviews on October 4, 1984. This provided the researcher with the test data. One week to ten days later, the same individuals were interviewed again to collect the retest data. Correlation coefficients between
the test/retest data were calculated to show the reliability of the instrument. The coefficients ranged from .47 to 1.0. Consequently, test items were concluded to consistently measure the concepts.

**Data Collection**

The methods used to gather data for this research included an examination of ex-offender records and administration of structured interviews.

The researcher examined ex-offender records. This method has been defined as the analysis of any written material that contain information about the phenomenon under study.

Many nonpersonal documents are written continuously by business and organizations to keep a running record of events deemed important but that, because of complexity or quantity, cannot be trusted to memory. Such documents tend to be more structured than personal documents (Bailey, 1982).

This study takes as its data source Alvis House files of its clients (ex-offenders) which contain masses of information compiled by the various correctional agencies and the halfway house facility. Accessibility to each file was contingent on client consent and supervision by Alvis House personnel (see Appendix A).

The advantages of documentary study are several. First, research can be gathered in spite of the inaccessibility or physical access to the subjects. This research was designed in the context of the normal functioning of the facility. Many of the clients worked during the day and left the facility at night and weekends. Examination of records, undoubtedly, saved time. Second, little or no reactivity associated with this method reduced research bias. Specifically,
this technique did little to change the data being collected. Finally, the amount of information derived from the documents could not have been obtained by other methods.

The documents or reports examined were assumed to have validity. This was generally due to the purpose for which they were written. Specifically, authors who tend to write for some purpose other than social research or have ulterior motives (such as prestige or money) can exaggerate phenomenon. This was not the case here. Furthermore, the time lapse between event or behavior and entry was not significant. Data derived from documents or records were assumed to have face validity. Second, instrument reliability was checked by comparing similar documents or reports at two or more points in time.

Documentary analysis was conducted in order to ascertain the following:

1. Demographic or personal background information on subjects
2. Criminal orientation or criminal background of subjects
3. Psychological/psychiatric background of subjects
4. Any information relevant to the investigation unknown to the researcher.

Structured interviews or a list of predetermined questions were administered to clients or ex-offenders. Questions were closed and open-ended. Specifically, closed ended questions constituted fixed-alternative responses that were standard or consistent. This enabled the researcher to compare answers from person to person. Also, it clarified the meaning of some questions, minimized respondent frustration and increased the return rate. Open-ended questions, in contrast, enabled the researcher to explore possible responses which were not
Interviews were conducted to ascertain the following:

1. Ex-offenders perception of social association with other ex-offenders of like and different race.

2. Similarities and/or differences in social association with other ex-offenders of like and different race.

3. Rewards perceived by ex-offenders to be received as a consequence of social association with other ex-offenders of like and different race.

4. Ex-offender type of social attractiveness with other ex-offenders of like and different race; and

5. Identification of the social activities engaged in by ex-offenders.

The interviewing procedure adhered to the following format. The procedure was conducive to the normal functioning of the facility. Respondents were approached during periods when all daily mandatory duties had been fulfilled by the client. A written announcement was read to each available client informing them of the nature of the study. A request was offered for their assistance in the research. Respondents were guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity if they elected to participate. Subjects were also informed that their participation or non-participation will in no way affect their status at the facility. Finally, questions regarding the study were addressed. The following announcement was read to each client:

My name is Sandra Woods. I will be conducting research at this facility.

The purpose of this research is to ascertain information concerning social association in community correctional institutions. I want to find out how you would describe interaction with others in a halfway house setting.
The methods to collect data for this study include an interview and examining records.

The interview will last approximately thirty minutes. I assure you that your responses will be held in the strictest confidence. Anonymity is also guaranteed. Your participation or non-participation will in no way affect your status here at Alvis House. You are free to end the interview at any point. I would also like to secure your permission to examine individual files. Files will be examined in order to ascertain demographic data. A consent form will now be given to you for your perusal.

Please feel free to ask any questions or concerns you have regarding this study. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Those who consented to participate were administered the structured interviews in private, with responses recorded by the researcher. Approximately thirty minutes was allotted for each interview.

The advantages of utilizing the interview were numerous. Specifically, flexibility to probe answers, increase in response rate, observation of respondent nonverbal behavior, research control over environment, question order, spontaneity of response, completeness of questionnaire, specified time, date and place of interview and greater complexity of the question far outweighed the disadvantages of the method for the study (Bailey, 1982).

It has been found that characteristics of the interviewer may affect the quality of the data received (Hyman, 1954; Williams, 1864; Benney et. al., 1956). Two characteristics of the researcher could have affected the data collected: race (black) and sex (female). In a study with 1,000 black respondents conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in Memphis in 1942, researchers found that white interviewers elicited results significantly different from those
obtained by black interviewers (Bailey, 1982; Hyman, 1954). Also, in a later study,

J.A. Williams found that the degree of bias in the data was inversely related to the degree of social distance between respondent and interviewer (Bailey, 1982; Williams, 1964).

Such bias was minimized by the researcher two ways. One specification, required by the facility's administration, for potential researchers is to do volunteer work at Alvis House. This familiarized the researcher with the functioning of the facility as well as with the staff and clients. Furthermore, the researcher made all efforts to interact with all clients on an equal basis. A second characteristic that may have affected the quality of data received was the researcher's sex. Specifically, studies indicated that if a respondent were undecided of a question, he or she would tend to give a response perceived to please the interviewer of the other sex. The researcher could do very little to minimize the possibility of this effect.

To increase the quality of the data, questions were asked as worded and in the same order for each respondent. Because comprehension of the question by the respondent may be problematic, the researcher clarified when needed. The researcher utilized neutral probes in the interview schedule. According to Bailey, this technique includes:

1. Repeating the question. This is done whenever the respondent hesitates or appears not to understand the question.

2. Repeating the answer. This type of neutral probe can be used by the interviewer who is not certain that he or she understood the respondent's question correctly.

3. Indicating understanding and interest. The Interviewer's Manual recommends that the interviewer indicate that he or she has heard the answer and approves of it,
thus stimulating the respondent to continue (University of Michigan, 1969).

4. Pause. The Manual also recommends that the interviewer pause and say nothing if the response is obviously incomplete.

5. A neutral question or comment. 'How do you mean that?' or 'Tell me more' indicate to the respondent that his or her answer is on the right track but more information is desired (Bailey, 1982).

To increase our understanding of ex-offender social association, the researcher conducted unstructured interviews of correctional personnel. Specifically, an Alvis House administrator, employment counselors and staff members were asked broad questions about the phenomenon under investigation. Unstructured interviews of community correctional personnel were conducted to ascertain their perceptions of ex-offenders or client social association. Questions were presented in a manner that was consistent with items in the survey instrument.

The following questions were posed to each informant: (1) How would you describe the social climate among ex-offenders in a halfway house setting?; (2) What are your perceptions of the major factors that influence social association among ex-offenders?; (3) How do ex-offenders establish friendships with other ex-offenders?; and (4) How would you describe race relations among ex-offenders in a halfway house setting?

The researcher-interviewee relationship centered around encouraging the interviewee's definition and structure of the account of ex-offender social association. In addition, interviewees were allowed to express, to a considerable extent, their attitudes on the phenomenon.
Data were derived from twelve interviews consisting of one administrator, two resident managers and nine staff members. The researcher did not assume that persons or categories of persons were equally important. Nonetheless, correctional personnel were extremely cooperative. The data from these interviews supplemented the data from the survey instrument.

Data Analysis

The data collected in this research were analyzed utilizing descriptive statistics. Specifically, a detailed description of the phenomenon under investigation was presented utilizing appropriate statistical procedures.

The data were coded, keypunched onto cards, and analyzed by means of SPSSX available at the Instruction and Research Computer Center at The Ohio State University. This study was descriptive in nature, therefore, only descriptive statistics were utilized to analyze and summarize the data. The following statistics were employed: frequencies, percentages, and measures of central tendency. The Chi Square procedure was also used to compare the resident and out-client groups who participated in the study (Alpha = .05). The degree or magnitude of relationship between the selected characteristics of respondents and their responses to parts four and five of the instrument was described by a correlation coefficient (Kouzekanani, 1983). Finally, the Pearson correlation procedure was used to measure relationship among variables.

There are four sections that characterize the analysis of results. Section one presents demographic data of the resident and out-client groups. Section two and three provide findings of interviews with
residents, as well as, out-client respondents. Finally, section four will compare and contrast results from interviews with community correction personnel with that of the population.

Summary

This was a descriptive study concerned with exploring ex-offender social associations in a halfway house setting. Utilization of two concepts, race and social attractiveness, aided in gaining greater insight into this phenomenon. It also provided consistency in the description of ex-offender social association.

A population of parolees, state furlough and federal pre-released prisoners, who were incarcerated in Ohio, were solicited at a halfway house for this research. Ex-offender perceptions of their social association with other ex-offenders were obtained through a structured interview. Demographic and other information were also gathered by an analysis of ex-offender records. To supplement the survey data, unstructured interviews of community correctional personnel were conducted.

The survey instrument was tested for its content validity and reliability to minimize, as much as possible, measurement errors. Descriptive statistics were employed to summarize, organize, simplify and interpret the data.
CHAPTER IV

THE FACILITY: RALPH W. ALVIS HOUSE

Recent figures indicate that community corrections is a major component of the criminal justice system. According to Snarr and Wolford, "nearly one-third of all offenders are in institutions, while two-thirds are already under supervision in the community, and approximately ninety-five percent of all institutionalized offenders are eventually returned to the community" (Killinger and Cromwell, 1974; Snarr and Wolford, 1985). The reality of this phenomenon has prompted the development of halfway houses. Such facilities, generally, attempt to reintegrate felons, misdemeanants, ex-offenders, probationers, parolees, and pre-released prisoners back into the mainstream of American society. This research was conducted at such an agency.

The Franklin County Halfway House, Inc. or Ralph W. Alvis House was established in 1966. The purpose of the agency was to "provide for the protection of the community and Alvis House residents, while assisting in re-integration—that is, financial stability and law-abiding behavior—of ex-offenders released to the Central Ohio area" (Standard Operating Procedures, Alvis House, 1982). The program designed to accomplish this goal is as follows:

A. **Supervision in the Community:** Alvis House has a responsibility to protect its residents and the general public. To achieve this end the following procedures shall be followed:
1. 24-hour staffing at each facility: Staff are required to be awake, alert and aware, and to conduct periodic room and safety checks.

2. Itineraries shall be completed accurately by the resident whenever he leaves the facility premises. Staff are responsible for ensuring completeness and accuracy of entries on the itinerary before initialing the entry.

3. From time-to-time telephone or on-site monitoring checks of a resident's whereabouts will be initiated by staff.

4. At other times residents will be required to phone in at certain prescribed times, and when changing locations. Staff are required to note these call-ins on the Coverage Log form and/or the resident's itinerary.

B. Shelter: Alvis House provides shelter for its residents either within its own facilities or by lease agreement (such as at the Central YMCA or Bryden Lodge).

C. Food: Alvis House provides three meals per day for its residents either within Alvis House facilities, or by contract with a food-service (such as the Central YMCA cafeteria), or by cash grants directly to each resident.

D. Financial Assistance: Alvis House provides direct financial assistance in the form of weekly cash grants to each resident for personal items. Alvis House will make loans to residents for the purchase of working clothes and equipment. Staff are responsible for assisting aged or disabled residents to obtain Social Security or Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits, and for assisting residents to obtain education or vocational training grants.

E. Individual and Group Counseling: Each staff member of an Alvis House residential program is required to establish at least weekly individual counseling sessions with each resident to whom the staff person is assigned as the case-worker.

F. Transportation: Alvis House provides bus tickets to enable residents to go to employment interviews, or to school or training or to work.

G. Employment and Educational Services: An employment counselor is assigned to work with the residents of each of the facilities. This counselor is responsible for providing employment and education counseling and placement services.
H. Referral for Other Services: Health (dental, medical and mental) vocational rehabilitation and training, and substance abuse services are provided to Alvis House residents through contractual or cooperative agreements with other agencies. (S.O.P., Alvis House, 1984).

Admission

Individuals are admitted into the program several ways. Intake procedures are as follows:

A. Admission Criteria:

1. Residential Program: Preference is given to applicants who are residents of Franklin and the six surrounding counties. The only applicants that may be rejected due to the nature of the offense are arsonists and certain sexual offenders. Applicants with severe mental health and/or retardation problems will not be accepted. Applicants with physical disabilities which would prevent them from using stairs will not be accepted.

2. Out-Client Programs: The only criteria are the applicant must be a former offender, and must be willing to cooperate with the assigned out-client worker.

B. Application Process: Out-clients need only come to the Out-Client office to make application. Applicants for residential services follow one of the two processes outlined below:

1. Inmates: An inmate of a correctional or detention facility, or an employee of the facility, or a friend of the inmate contacts Alvis House by mail or phone or in person, requesting admission for the inmate. If the inmate appears to meet the criteria for admission, the following steps are taken:

   a. A letter stating his application is being considered is sent to the inmate and his caseworker or institutional parole officer. A case file is opened for the applicant.

   b. If the inmate returns a signed Request for Admission form, and if interviews, correspondence and case materials indicate he meets admission criteria, the inmate is admitted to the appropriate facility.

2. Former Inmates: A man already on probation or parole will be admitted only after consultation with his P.O., and if the probationer or parolee meets admission criteria, and if space is available. (S.O.P., Alvis House, 1984)
Case Management

Once an applicant is accepted into the program, an individualized case-management process is initiated by staff. Specifically, "the process is designed to help staff help residents to resolve problems and satisfy needs within the supervision context of the community residential corrections program" (S.O.P., Alvis House, 1984). Four elements characterize this process:

A. **Assessment**: The worker attempts to determine past and present behavioral patterns which are significantly related to the resident's criminal history and other past or present problems in social functioning.

B. **Planning**: At intake, based on a mutual assessment of behavior patterns affecting key problems or needs areas, the resident and the worker develop an initial plan. The plan lists quantifiable goals to be achieved, activities to be carried out by each, and time periods within which these are to be accomplished.

C. **Intervention**: The worker, often after consultation with other staff, must decide on how much he/she will intervene in pushing the resident toward resolution of problems and satisfaction of need. Two principles—enough intervention to promote progress but not enough to promote dependency, and consistent follow-up should govern. The ultimate goal is for the resident to develop his own problem-solving and need-satisfying capabilities.

D. **Evaluation**: This phase of the case-management process monitors the resident's progress in achieving planned goals. Evaluation looks at what the resident is actually doing, not what he says he is doing. Evaluation also measures the worker's actions; that is, determining whether or not he/she has fulfilled intervention commitments, and whether or not those intervention techniques were effective. The evaluation forms the basis for weekly and periodic reassessments (S.O.P., Alvis House, 1984).

The Level System

The success of reintegration into the community is characterized by the program structure. Advancement in the program means effectively meeting the elements of each case management process by the resident.
There are five levels of advancement which provide greater degrees of freedom and responsibility for the resident. The level system is as follows:

A. **Orientation:** During the first seven days clients are in the program, staff have a responsibility to help clients become familiar with program procedures; learn where clients might go to find employment, education, training and social services; help plan daily activities so as to make the greatest possible progress; and establish goals for successful completion of the client time at Alvis House.

1. **Off-Premise Activities:**
   
a. During the first three days of orientation, clients may leave the premises under the following conditions:

   *When accompanied by a staff member,
   *To go to approved employment, education, training, counseling, or medical or dental appointments and interviews,
   *a verifiable emergency (immediate family only),

b. After the third night in Alvis House, clients may request up to 10 hours of "free time" to be taken during the remainder of orientation.

2. **Curfew:** During the first three days of the orientation period, curfew is determined each day on the basis of the reasonable return time from approved activities; usually before 6:00 p.m.

3. **Orientation Pass:** After the seventh night in Alvis House, clients may request, to case managers, an "orientation pass" for up to 40 hours to be taken between 6:00 a.m. on the Saturday and 11:00 p.m. on the Sunday following completion of the orientation period.

B. **First Advancement:** After the orientation period, clients automatically advance. This is the only automatic advancement; all others must be earned.

1. **Off-Premise Activities:**

   a. During normal working hours (6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday) clients may leave to go to approved employment, education, training, counseling or treatment appointments and interviews.
b. Clients may have up to 20 hours of "free time."

2. **Curfew:** 11:00 p.m. (unless on restriction, or prohibited by the releasing authority.)

3. **Passes:** To be eligible for a pass, clients must have no serious, major or chronic violations for a one-week period.

C. **Second Advancement:** Clients achieve minimum eligibility for the second advancement after the first advancement level for at least two weeks. Clients must have been and are employed, or in school, or a combination of work and school for at least 30 hours per week. Clients must not have had major or chronic violations for at least one week prior to the second advancement; and clients must be abiding by conditions imposed by releasing authorities,

1. **Off-Premises Activities:** During regular working hours, clients may be permitted to leave the premises to go to work, school or other program related activities.

2. **Curfew:** Midnight (unless on restriction or prohibited by the releasing authority.)

3. **Passes:** Through continuing progress while in the second advancement, and by avoiding chronic and major violations, clients may earn passes for all or part of each weekend.

D. **Third Advancement:** After having been in the second advancement for two weeks, clients may earn the third advancement by maintaining satisfactory work and/or school performance, stay within approved budget, meeting savings goal, and being free of serious, chronic and major violations for at least one week prior to the third advancement.

1. **Off-Premises Activities:** Same as for second advancement.

2. **Curfew:** 1:00 a.m. (unless on restriction or prohibited by the releasing authority.)

3. **Passes:** Clients may earn weekend passes each week through continuing progress while in the third advancement.

E. **Fourth Advancement:** Clients earn the fourth advancement AFTER completing two weeks in the third advancement, and by not having a serious, chronic or major violation for at least two weeks.

1. **Off-Premises Activities:** Same as second advancement.
2. **Curfew:** 2:00 a.m. (unless on restriction or prohibited by the releasing authority.)

3. **Passes:** Same as the third advancement. In addition, clients may earn a weekly 24-hour pass to be taken during the week, but NOT consecutively with a weekend pass.

F. **Fifth Advancement:** Clients earn the fifth advancement AFTER completing two weeks in the fourth advancement, and by being without a serious, chronic or major violation for at least four weeks.

1. **Off-Premises Activities:** Same as in the second advancement.

2. **Curfew:** 3:00 a.m. (unless on restriction or prohibited by the releasing authority.)

3. **Passes:** Same as the fourth advancement, except the weekly 24-hour pass may be granted consecutively with a weekend pass, unless prohibited by the releasing authority. (Resident's Handbook, 1981)

Finally, the rules that each resident must follow in order to remain in the program are:

A. **Alcohol and Drugs:** Being in the presence of alcohol or hallucinogens on Alvis House premises is a major violation.

B. **Absence Without Leave (AWOL) or Escape:** If the client is not at the prescribed place within two hours after staff attempt to make contact; the client shall be considered to be AWOL or on escape status, unless later information would classify the incident as a curfew or itinerary violation or as no violation. In the case of furlough and prerelease, AWOL is classified as escape. AWOL is a major violation. Escape may be prosecuted.

C. **Curfew:** It should be noted that the case manager may impose a curfew hour earlier than that permitted in the advancement level. Failure to meet curfew requirements is a serious violation. The second curfew infraction within two weeks is a chronic violation.

D. **Destruction of Property:** Willful destruction of property is a major violation.

E. **Disturbances:** Playing radios and record players loudly, loud and abusive language, and other disruptive behavior are minor violations.

F. **Fighting:** Fighting is a major violation.
G. **Housekeeping Assignments:** Assigned duties must be completed satisfactorily within time limits established by each facility.

H. **Itineraries:** Itineraries must contain accurate information, be approved by an appropriate staff member, and be adhered to as to times and destinations unless changes are approved by appropriate staff through phone or personal contact.

I. **Personal Hygiene:** Clients are expected to keep person and sleeping area clean and free of offensive odors.

J. **Phone Usage:** Clients may use the pay phones nearest to the facility for person calls.

K. **Program Performance:** Clients must meet with assigned case-workers and case managers at least once a week—often clients may be asked to meet more frequently—to review progress and to plan for the future. Clients are also required to attend at least one group meeting each week. Clients are expected to keep all program-related (employment interviews, psychological counseling sessions, alcohol or drug abuse treatment, etc.) appointments. And, clients are expected to establish a personal budget and savings account and to meet budget and savings goals. Failure to meet these program performance expectations are serious violations.

L. **Smoking:** To prevent fires smoking and burning of any material (such as incense) are not permitted in the sleeping rooms.

M. **Theft:** Stealing is a major violation.

N. **Threatening:** Threatening bodily harm, either verbally or by posturing, is a serious violation.

O. **Visitors:** Clients are encouraged to have friends and relatives visit you. Clients may visit with guests only in designated areas of the facility.

P. **Penalties:**

1. **Minor Violations:** Two hours of extra house duties, or forfeiture of up to two hours of "free time," or one day restriction, or 50¢ to $1.00 fine.

2. **Serious Violations:** Four hours of extra house duties, or forfeiture of two to four hours of "free time," or up to three days restriction, or $1.00 to $2.00 fine.

3. **Chronic Violations:** Six hours of extra house duties, or forfeiture of four to six hours of "free time," or $3.00 to $4.00 fine, or a combination of any two of the above penalties, or up to four days restriction.
4. **Major Violations:** Restriction for five to seven days with one hour of extra house duty each day, or a fine up to $10.00, or a combination of restriction and fine, or unsatisfactory termination (S.O.P., Alvis House, 1984).

The rules, regulations and procedures of Alvis House are applicable to all participants in the program. However, in the case of pre-released federal prisoners who must serve the remainder of their sentences at the facility, additional rules and procedures apply (see Appendix B). The facility must closely monitor the activities of federal clients. To expand the scope of coverage, each participant is required to sign a statement of work. Succinctly, the federal government secures a contractor or community treatment center. Centers with the necessary facilities, equipment and personnel provide for the safekeeping, care and assistance of federal clients in the reintegration process (see Appendix B). Finally, clients are terminated from the program when their sentences are expired, and if they have successfully completed the program.

---

**NOTE:** The basic procedures of Alvis House was obtained from the Standard Operating Procedure Manual. This booklet summarizes the general purpose, procedure and process of the reintegration program.
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS

The results obtained through the various types of data are the topic of this chapter. The presentation of results is divided into four sections. Section one provides demographic data of the population, in particular, the resident and out-client groups. Section two presents resident ex-offender perceptions of their social association in a halfway house setting. Section three also presents similar findings in regards to the out-client group. Finally, section four provides supplementary data derived from unstructured interviews with community correction personnel. The perceptions of halfway house staff regarding ex-offender social association is discussed. The researcher will compare and contrast the major findings to enhance our understanding of the phenomenon under investigation.

A total of sixty-five ex-offenders, which comprised nearly sixty-five percent of the study population, were solicited for research. Of the total number of ex-offenders (N=36) that were not included in the study, thirty-three were parolees, one was a state furlough releasee and two were federal pre-released prisoners (see Note). The majority were non-person offenders. The racial composition of non-respondents consisted of nineteen white and seventeen non-white individuals.

NOTE: The researcher obtained demographic data on non-respondents by comparing population descriptions to the official population records. Also, the researcher attended mandatory, weekly meetings with staff where individual client program success was discussed.
For those who consented to participate, confidentiality was protected by assigning a three digit identification number.

The population comprised seventy-seven percent (N=50) parolees, three percent (N=2) state furlough, and twenty percent (N=13) federal pre-released prisoners. The resident groups (N=32), however, was composed of fifty-three percent (N=17) parolees, six percent (N=2) state furlough and forty-one percent (N=13) federal pre-released prisoners. Finally, the out-client group consisted of thirty-three parolees. The racial composition of the population consisted of thirty-five percent (N=23) white and sixty-five percent (N=42) non-white ex-offenders. Finally, the resident group (N=32) represented forty-nine percent of the population as compared to the out-client group (N=33) which represented fifty-one percent of the population.

**Population Characteristics**

The following data were obtained through documentary analysis of ex-offender files.

**Legal Status.** The total number of respondents were from three legal status or types of commitment: parole, state furlough and federal pre-released prisoners. Of the sixty-five subjects, seventy-seven percent (N=50) were parolees. Of this category, seventeen were residents and thirty-three were out-clients. Three percent (N=3) were state furlough clients. Finally, twenty percent (N=13) were federal pre-released prisoners. The resident group comprised fifty-three percent (N=17), six percent (N=2) state furlough and forty-one percent (N=13) federal pre-released prisoners. The out-client group consisted exclusively of thirty-three parolees (see Table 4).
TABLE 4
Legal Status by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>18 (28)</td>
<td>32 (49)</td>
<td>50 (77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State furlough</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal pre-released</td>
<td>5 (7)</td>
<td>8 (13)</td>
<td>13 (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 (35)</strong></td>
<td><strong>42 (65)</strong></td>
<td><strong>65 (100)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Race.** The population consisted of thirty-five percent (N=23) whites and sixty-five percent (N=42) non-whites. Of the non-white group, two were hispanic and forty were black. The resident group (N=32) comprised forty-one percent whites (N=13): eight parole, and five federal pre-released prisoners. Also, fifty-nine percent (N=19) were non-whites: nine parole, two state furlough and eight federal pre-released prisoners. The out-client group (N=33) consisted of thirty percent (N=10) white and seventy percent (N=23) non-white respondents (see Table 5).

**Sex.** All respondents solicited for the research were male.

**Age.** The age range of the population of ex-offenders was eighteen to sixty-one years. The mean age for the population was thirty-two. The resident group was characterized by age ranging from eighteen to sixty-one with a mean of thirty-four years. Federal pre-released prisoners, as a group, were slightly older (mean of 35.2) as compared to parolees (mean of 28.1). The mean of the state furlough clients, however, was found to be forty-one. The out-client group was found
TABLE 5

Legal Status by Race: Residents/Out-Clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>TOTAL (N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>8 (25)</td>
<td>9 (28)</td>
<td>17 (53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State furlough</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal pre-released</td>
<td>5 (16)</td>
<td>8 (25)</td>
<td>13 (41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 (41)</strong></td>
<td><strong>19 (59)</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 (100)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Out-Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>10 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State furlough</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal pre-released</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 (30)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to have a mean of thirty, with ages ranging between twenty-one and fifty-five (see Appendix C, Tables 6,7).

State of Residence. The overwhelming majority of respondents; that is, ninety-seven percent (N=63) were permanent resident in the state of Ohio. Only two respondents from the resident and out-client groups, respectively, were from the states of New York and Texas.

Marital Status. Sixty-six percent (N=43) of the population had never been married at the time of this research. The remainder of respondents was characterized by: nine percent (N=6) married, five percent (N=5) had common law marriages, ten percent (N=7) were divorced, seven percent (N=5) were separated and three percent (N=1) were widowed. Of the resident group, sixty-seven percent (N=21) were never married, nine percent (N=3) married, six percent (N=2) married by common law,
nine percent (N=3) divorced and nine percent (N=3) were separated.

In comparison, the out-client group was characterized by sixty-six percent (N=22) never married, nine percent (N=3) married, three percent (N=1) married by common law, twelve percent (N=4) divorced, six percent (N=2) separated and three percent (N=1) widowed.

**Number of Dependents.** The number of dependents for the population averaged one with a range of zero to six. Specifically, of the respondents, fifty-two percent (N=34) had no dependents, twenty-nine percent (N=19) had one, eleven percent (N=7) had two, five percent (N=3) had three, three percent (N=1) had four and three percent (N=1) had six.

There was a slight difference in the number of dependents between the resident and out-client respondents. Sixty-three percent (N=20) of the residents as compared to forty-three percent (N=14) of the out-client group had no dependents. Also, thirty-seven percent (N=12) of the resident group as compared to fifty-seven percent (N=19) of the out-client group had one or more dependents.

**Education.** Thirty-six percent (N=23) of the respondents had not obtained a high school diploma or G.E.D. Sixty-four percent (N=42) had graduated from high school and attended college or trade school.

The resident group was characterized by forty-seven percent (N=15) attending school from zero to eleven years. Forty-four percent (N=14) of the residents were high school graduates/G.E.D. and nine percent (N=3) had attended college or trade school. In contrast, twenty-four percent (N=8) of the out-client group had not finished high school, fifty-five (N=18) were high school graduates/G.E.D. and twenty-one percent (N=7) had attended college or trade school (see Appendix C,
Impairment. The majority of the respondents did not suffer from physical, age-debilitation, and personality impairments. Eighty-nine percent (N=58) had no impairment, five percent (N=3) were physically handicapped and five percent (N=3) had been diagnosed as having a personality defect. Finally, one percent (N=1) was impaired by the debilitation effects of aging.

Psychological Care. Eighty-seven percent (N=56) of the respondents did not have a history of psychological treatment. In contrast, thirteen percent (N=9) had undergone psychological counseling while incarcerated.

Medication. The population was characterized by eighteen percent (N=13) of the respondents were receiving medication as residents and out-clients. The medication prescribed was generally offered for those with drug or alcohol addiction. Specifically, antabuse was prescribed more than any other drug.

Treatment. There was a significant number of respondents who were not participating in the various types of treatment programs (e.g., alcohol, drug). Specifically, sixty-eight percent (N=44) were not involved in counseling, a little over eleven percent (N=8) were in drug rehabilitation programs, ten percent (N=6) were in alcohol related programs and eleven percent (N=7) were undergoing psychological counseling.

Days in Program. The number of days at Alvis House ranged between zero (intake) to one hundred and sixty. The mean stay at the facility was thirty-three. A major difference in the number of days in the program was found between groups. Specifically, residents who lived
at the facility had a mean of forty-six days with a range of two to one hundred sixty days in the program. Fifty percent (N=16) of the resident group had lived at Alvis House for thirty or less days. Nineteen percent (N=6) had resided in the halfway house thirty-one to sixty days, and thirty-one percent (N=10) were there sixty-one or more days. Of the legal statuses, federal pre-released prisoners were in the program longer than other ex-offenders. Specifically, a mean of fifty-three characterized the number of days at the facility. In contrast, the range of days in the program for the out-client group was zero to one hundred twenty days, with a mean of twenty days. Seventy-nine percent (N=26) had been in the program thirty or less number of days whereas twelve percent (N=4) were there thirty-one to sixty days. Finally, nine percent (N=3) were at the facility sixty-one days and over. It should be noted, however, that the majority of the out-clients discontinue the program at a higher rate than residents (see Appendix C, Table 10).

Days Left in Program. Fifty-seven percent (N=37) of the population had completed or just began the program at the time of the study. Slightly over twenty-one percent (N=14) had one to thirty days left, and slightly over twenty-one percent (N=14) had over thirty days left in the program. The mean number of days for all respondents was twenty-four, with the resident group having thirty-six days and the out-client group eleven days. Out-clients were overrepresented in the zero category (N=26), seventy-nine percent) as compared to the resident group (N=11, thirty-four percent) (see Appendix C, Table 11).
Instant Offense. The crime for which each client was last incarcerated for is referred to as the instant offense. Of the respondents, thirty-four percent (N=24) had committed person related offenses, whereas fifty-seven percent (N=37) had committed non-person related offenses. The resident group comprised forty-one percent (N=13) person related ex-offenders, forty-seven percent (N=15) non-person related ex-offenders and twelve percent (N=4) who committed both. In contrast, of the out-client group, thirty-three percent (N=11) committed person related offenses and sixty-seven percent (N=22) committed non-person related offenses (see Table 4). The resident group was further characterized by legal status. Specifically, of those residents who committed person related offenses, twenty-eight percent (N=9) were parole clients, and six percent (N=2) were of state furlough and federal pre-released statuses respectively. Residents who committed non-person offenses comprised twenty-five percent (N=8) parole and twenty-two percent (N=7) federal pre-released clients. The out-client group, however, were of one legal status – parole (see Tables 12,13).

TABLE 12

Instant Offense: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instant Offense</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Out-Client</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-related</td>
<td>13 (20)</td>
<td>11 (17)</td>
<td>24 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-person related</td>
<td>15 (23)</td>
<td>22 (34)</td>
<td>37 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>32 (49)</td>
<td>33 (51)</td>
<td>65 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13
Resident Instant Offense by Legal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>Parole</th>
<th>State Furlough</th>
<th>Pre-Released</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instant Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-related</td>
<td>9 (28.2)</td>
<td>2 (6.2)</td>
<td>2 (6.2)</td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-person related</td>
<td>8 (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (21.9)</td>
<td>15 (46.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (12.5)</td>
<td>4 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17 (53.2)</td>
<td>2 (6.2)</td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Instant Offense. The population was comprised of a variety of offenses committed by respondents. To simplify the interpretation of data, the researcher grouped offenses according to the nature of the crime. For example, drug related offenses were coded as either drug trafficking—possession of drug documents, and create—manufacturer of narcotics. Table 14 lists the frequencies and percentages of instant offenses. Of the population, federal pre-released prisoners categorically committed more non-person offenses (see Note).

Number of Felony Convictions. The mean number of felony convictions for both the resident and out-client groups was two. Specifically, eighty-five percent (N=55) of the population had been convicted of a felony crime three times or less. Also, fifteen percent (N=10) were convicted of a felony four or more times.

NOTE: For more information refer to Tables 15,16, Appendix C, for resident type of instant offense by legal status, and out-client type of instant offenses.
### TABLE 14

Type of Instant Offense: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instant Offense</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Grand Theft</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rape</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Forgery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Embezzlement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Robbery</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gross Sexual Imposition (child)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aggravated/Armed Robbery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Breaking and Entering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Homicide/Manslaughter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Possession-Criminal Tool</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Drug Trafficking/Possession-Drug Document</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Possession-Weapon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Bank Robbery (armed or unarmed)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gross Sexual Imposition (adult)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mail Theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mail Fraud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Theft-Interstate Shipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Aggravated Burglary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Burglary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Criminal Mischief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Create-Manufacture Narcotics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Percentages are rounded figures.

**Number of Felony Incarcerations.** The number of felony incarcerations excluded jail time. Nonetheless, the mean number of incarcerations was two for both groups. Fifty-seven percent (N=37) of the respondents had been incarcerated once, whereas, twenty-three percent (N=15) twice, twelve percent (N=8) three, three percent (N=2) four, and six percent were incarcerated over five times (see Note).

**NOTE:** A list of the names of institutions for state furlough, parole and federal pre-released prisoners can be found in Appendix C, Tables 17,18.
Number of Months Incarcerated. Resident adjudicated clients were found to have been incarcerated longer than out-clients. This was due to the large number of federal pre-released prisoners who committed offenses that usually require longer prison terms (e.g. armed bank robbery). Of the resident group, twenty-eight percent (N=9) were incarcerated for two years or less. Also, thirty-eight percent (N=12) were incarcerated between two and five years, whereas, thirty-four percent (N=11) were incarcerated for over sixty months. The out-client group, in comparison, was found to have fifty-eight percent (N=19) incarcerated for two years or less. Also, fifteen percent (N=5) of the respondents were incarcerated between two and five years with twenty-seven percent (N=9) incarcerated over sixty months.

Client Violations. The Alvis House staff cite clients with violations if they fail to perform mandatory requirements, and/or in case of disciplinary problems. It was found among violators, a mean of two violations characterized the resident group, in comparison to a mean of one for the out-client group. It should be noted, however, interaction with staff is increased tremendously for residents. The higher number of violations for this group may be a consequence of living at the facility. Of the resident group, sixty-nine percent (N=22) had received zero to three violations whereas, thirty-one percent (N=10) received four or more violations. The most frequent violation for residents was found to be problems stemming from the itinerary (daily schedule that attempts to guide client in order to successfully complete the program, e.g. job interview, tutoring, etc). Second, returning after curfew and failure to perform mandatory household
tasks were identified as frequent violations. It was found that the out-client group, also, had a majority of clients who had few violations. Specifically, eighty-five percent (N=28) had no violations. Only fifteen percent (N=5) of those out-clients that had violations received from four to fifteen violations with itinerary problems as the most frequent problem.

Twenty-four social association and social attractiveness variables were analyzed in terms of the major demographic characteristics of the resident and out-client groups. Structured interviews were conducted in order to ascertain resident and out-client perceptions of:

1. Social association with other ex-offenders of like and different race
2. Extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards obtained through association with other ex-offenders
3. The various types of social attractiveness behaviors engaged in by ex-offenders; and,
4. Other factors not known to the researcher that influence social association among ex-offenders in a halfway house setting.

The following is a discussion of the results from the structured interviews.

Ex-Offenders' Perceptions of Their Social Association in a Halfway House Setting

Resident and out-client perceptions of their social association will be presented following a brief description of the entire population results.
Social Association

Twelve variables were employed in the study in order to ascertain social association among ex-offenders. The concept has been defined as "the widely varying forms that are generated as the diverse interests of individuals prompt them to develop social units in which they realize these interests" (Simmel, 1908; Blau, 1964).

It was found that seventy-four percent (N=48) of the population indicated that they had friends in the halfway house. In comparison, twenty-six percent (N=17) of the respondents reported that they did not have friends at the facility. Upon closer examination of the item, it was revealed that seventy-six percent (N=32) of the non-white group, as compared to sixty-nine percent (N=16) of the white group reported that they had friends or "associates" at Alvis House. The race of the closest friend, however, was overwhelmingly identified as non-white (black) by all respondents. Interestingly, no relationship was found between the number of days a respondent had been at the facility and acknowledging friendships (see Appendix C, Table 19).

Of the population, only seven percent (N=5) indicated that they had become friends with others based on the types of crimes they committed. Contrary to the literature regarding prisoner relations, the majority of ex-offenders, ninety-three percent (N=60) did not associate with other ex-offenders on the basis of criminal orientation (see Irwin, 1980). Moreover, of those who did associate with criminal types, all were property offenders (see Appendix C, Table 20).
Eighty-three percent (N=54) of the population reported that they did not establish or initiate friendships on the basis of shared past prison interests. In comparison, seventeen percent (N=11) revealed that the institution (e.g. environment, incarcerated friends, relatives) where the associate served time was the only common interest. Eight of the eleven respondents who indicated this had five or less number of days in the program (see Appendix C, Table 21).

Prison inmates tend to establish friendships with others contingent on cell and/or work assignment (Irwin, 1980). It was found that ex-offenders in a halfway house setting somewhat follow this pattern. Nearly sixty percent (N=38) as compared to over forty percent (N=27) of the population associated with men who were assigned the same room or work detail. Interestingly, federal pre-released prisoners (eighty-five percent) as compared to parolees (fifty-seven percent) did not initiate friendships because of placement in rooms or work (see Appendix C, Table 22).

The halfway house environment is theoretically predicated on a home-like, non-hostile milieu, as opposed to the impersonal, violent prison environment. Yet, the researcher sought to ascertain if ex-offender association occurred contingent on perceptions of personal safety. It was found that ninety-five percent (N=62) of the population indicated that personal safety or protection from others was not a concern. However, five percent (N=3) of the respondents revealed that personal safety did influence their social association. The three respondents were white parolees, two of which were sex offenders. Also, these respondents had been in the program over thirty days.
Ex-offenders, generally, did not participate in the various social activities at the facility. However, it was found that most clients identified playing cards and lifting weights as a favorite pasttime. Thirty percent (N=7) of the white subjects in comparison to fourteen percent (N=6) of the non-white subjects participated in these activities. However, no federal pre-released prisoner was involved in these activities. Finally, active participants (N=9) were in the program less than thirty days (see Appendix C, Table 23).

Political and religious affiliation with respective groups were found to be minimal. Specifically, eighty percent (N=52) of the population was not affiliated with a political or religious group. However, it was revealed that three respondents were affiliated with a Black Muslim prison group referred to as Juma. Interestingly, the respondents were of parole legal status (see Appendix C, Table 24).

Social Attractiveness

To explore ex-offender perceptions of the type(s) of social attractiveness behaviors they engage in to impress others, the researcher employed twelve variables. Each social attractiveness item was designed to determine the relationship between race and ex-offender behavior. Accordingly, respondents were asked if their association was based on securing rewards (e.g. material and/or non-material items); sharing important values (e.g. job lead); displaying superior competence (e.g. physical, intellectual); taking risks (e.g. appearing boastful or conceited); making contributions (e.g. material and/or material); and supporting others' opinions (e.g. ingratiating oneself).
It was found that twenty percent (N=13) of the total number of respondents indicated that they associated with others of like race in order to obtain rewards. Of the white subjects, seventeen percent (N=4) as compared to twenty-one percent (N=9) of the non-white subjects sought to obtain rewards through association. Engaging in this social attractiveness behavior with ex-offenders of different race was also found to be characterized by seventeen percent (N=11) of the population associating to secure rewards (see Appendix C, Tables 25, 26).

Sharing important values with others of like and different race was found to be a frequent social attractiveness behavior for the population. Specifically, fifty-five percent (N=36) of the respondents indicated that they shared their values — "broad principles embodying ideas about what most people in a society consider to be desirable" (Shepard, 1981) — with ex-offenders of like race. Similarly, forty-nine percent (N=32) of the respondents shared important values with ex-offenders of different race. It should be noted, however, that while the percentage of white subjects sharing values with like and different race remained relatively equal, non-white subjects shared values with like and different race differently. Fifty-five percent of the non-white subjects associated with others of same race, as compared to, forty-three percent who engaged in the behavior with others of different race (see Appendix C, Tables 27, 28).

Displaying superior competence with others was frequently identified by ex-offenders as extensive knowledge in regards to the criminal justice system (e.g. "jail house lawyer") and playing sports (e.g. "dunking" a basketball). Accordingly, sixty-six percent (N=43) of
the population admitted that they displayed their abilities to other ex-offenders of like race. Sixty and seventy percent of the white and non-white subjects, respectively indicated this finding. Similarly, displaying superior abilities or competence with ex-offenders of different race, it was reported that sixty-one percent \( (N=40) \) of the respondents engaged in the behavior. There were no significant differences in the responses of white and non-white, as well as, legal statuses for this item (see Appendix C, Tables 29,30).

To take risk or appear conceited or boastful with others was perceived, generally, as an unacceptable behavior among ex-offenders. Only thirty-five percent \( (N=23) \) of the study population presented an impressive image entailing some risks: appearing conceited, repelling others with extreme opinions and others' disapproval with those of like race. Similarly, twenty-seven percent \( (N=18) \) emitted the behavior with ex-offenders of different race. The number of days left in program appeared to influence ex-offender risk behavior. Specifically, it was found that ex-offenders who took risk with others were near termination in the program.

Contributions to groups of ex-offenders of the same and different race were found to characterize forty percent \( (N=26) \) as compared to thirty-two percent \( (N=21) \) of the respondents. Thirty-five percent \( (N=8) \) of the white subjects indicated they contributed materially as well as non-materially (e.g. information) to white ex-offenders. Forty-two percent \( (N=18) \) of the non-white subjects contributed to non-white ex-offenders. Similarly, among white ex-offenders, thirty percent \( (N=7) \), as compared to, and a slightly lower thirty-three
percent (N=14) of non-white offenders contributed to groups of different race respectively. Respondents, overwhelmingly, identified lending money as a principle way they contributed to others. It would appear, then, that these individuals made contributions to others to become a socially attractive associate (see Appendix C, Tables 31,32).

Many scholars agree that supporting the opinions of others increases solidarity, provides social approval, and promotes social integration (Blau, 1964; Jones et. al., 1963). It was found that fifty-five percent (N=36) of the respondents reported that they supported the opinions of other ex-offenders of like race. In addition, the majority of these respondents identified that they did so in the weekly group meetings (see Note). Upon closer examination of this item it was revealed that forty-nine percent (N=32) of the respondents supported the opinions of ex-offenders of different race. Federal pre-released prisoners, in comparison to other legal statuses, more frequently supported others opinions of like and different race (see Appendix C, Tables 33,34).

Resident Perceptions of Ex-Offender Social Association

The resident group (N=32) comprised fifty-three percent (N=17) parole, six percent (N=2) state furlough and forty-one percent (N=13) federal pre-released prisoners. Parole and state furlough clients resided at one unit which housed a maximum of twenty-four clients. Federal pre-released prisoners, similarly, resided at another unit.

NOTE: Each Thursday clients would meet and discuss a variety of issues ranging from procedures of Alvis House to their incarceration experiences.
which housed a maximum of twenty-one clients. The two units operated independently.

**Social Association: Residents**

To explore resident ex-offender social association, clients were asked several questions. These items were derived from the social exchange and prison literature. According to Blau (1964), individuals are attracted to others by the way of expected benefits to be derived from others. These benefits are referred to as extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. Also, according to prison researchers, offenders tend to associate based on various social characteristics (e.g. prison interest, criminal orientation) (Irwin, 1980; Jacobs, 1983; Carroll, 1974).

It was found that eighty-one percent (N=26) of the resident group had associates in the halfway house. Sixty-six percent (N=21) identified the race of their closest friend as non-white whereas thirty-four percent (N=11) acknowledged a white client as a friend. Interestingly, ninety-one percent (N=29) indicated that they did not establish friendships based on the type of crime they committed. The study population also reported (eighty-four percent, N=27) that their associates did not share the same prison interests. Placement in room and/or work assignments, however, did influence association patterns. Forty-four percent (N=14) of the resident group established associations with clients who shared rooms or work details. Respondents who had associations based on proximity were found to be, overwhelmingly, parole status (seventy-eight percent, N=11) as compared to the federal status clients (fourteen percent, N=2).
Association with others to minimize the threat of personal harm was found to be a major factor in the formation of prison gangs and/or cliques (Toch, 1977). It was found, however, that concern for ex-offender safety was not a determinant of ex-offenders relations. Ninety-seven percent (N=31) of the resident group perceived no pressure to associate with others to insure personal safety. Affiliation with others for this purpose, therefore, was minimized. Seventy-two percent (N=23) of the residents did not participate in the various social programs with the exception of nine (twenty-eight percent), generally white, newly arrived clients.

Affiliation with political and religious groups was reported as low. Specifically, eighty-one percent (N=26) and sixty-five percent (N=21) of the resident group associated with political or religious group respectively. Of the resident clients who did affiliate with political and religious groups, two identified ethnic oriented organizations - Juma and the Ansaru Allah Community. Also, one white parole respondent identified association with a street gang, but refused to identify it to the researcher.

The findings suggest that social association among ex-offenders is determined by factors not cited in the prison literature.

**Expectations of Extrinsic and/or Intrinsic Rewards**

A major objective of this study was to identify the extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards ex-offenders expected by associating with others of like and different race. Parolees' expectations of rewards by association with clients of the same race included none, respect, trust, companionship, understanding, help, honesty, money and cigarettes.
Three respondents stated:

"I don't expect nothing from people who don't have nothing."

"I think mutual respect is the most important thing. I had a cellmate for a year and didn't say nothing to him because he had no respect for anyone - me, him, nobody...So, I need respect from others 'specially blacks."

And,

"Guys should be willing to help each other out."

A state furlough respondent, however, concluded that the expectations of rewards is also based on, other than race, one's demeanor. He states:

"...it depends on values and how they conduct in the halfway house. Somebody who ain't about nothing - I don't care what race he is - I don't mess with him."

Federal pre-released prisoners, on the other hand, identified the following rewards: "good" conversation, friendship, "good times", meeting other women, respect and revealing information in regards to staff. However, one respondent indicated,

"I don't look at people. I deal with men for their minds, not their race."

The rewards although minimal that the resident group expected from members of different races were also extrinsic and/or intrinsic in nature: respect, "what bar to go to", and friendship. Respondents of parole status, however, overwhelmingly indicated that they had no expectations of benefits received from association with clients of different races than respondents. Specifically, one parole client stated:
"I don't expect nothing from white guys, but one white guy I knew acted like a black dude. I don't like white folks; they put on airs - a front, so I limit my contact with them."

The interaction among white and non-white clients was described by respondents as superficial. Moreover, there was a tendency for clients to expect benefits from clients of their same race as opposed to clients of different race.

Federal and state furlough clients indicated two benefits derived from association with clients of different races: friendship and respect.

Extrinsic rewards derived from association have been defined as specific benefits from social relations because associates deliberately go to some trouble to provide these benefits (Blau, 1964). Ex-offenders who expect that association with others will yield information in regard to staff members obtain extrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards, however, refer to participant gratification inherent in the association. The findings suggest that association among ex-offenders of like race is intrinsically rewarding. As one parolee respondent puts it,

"I relate and feel more comfortable with blacks than whites."

Few respondents reported that they associated with others of like and different race for material gain.

Social Attractiveness: Residents

To induce anticipation that a possible association would be rewarding the individual attempts to impress others by engaging in one to all of the social attractiveness behaviors. However, impressing others to incur an image poses a paradox. An attractive associate can pose a status
threat (Blau, 1964). Accordingly, persons emit social attractiveness behaviors according to their perceptions of what is impressive or unimpressive for the group.

It was found that seventy-five percent (N=24) of the resident group did not associate with others of the same race to obtain desired rewards. Of those who sought to obtain rewards (twenty-five percent, N=8), cigarettes, money, sexual relations, and advice pertaining to the reintegration program were identified. Also, one parole client reported association with other black clients insured power. He states

"We can watch anything we want on T.V. when a bunch of us are in there [television lounge]."

Rewards obtained through association with federal pre-released prisoners of same race were identified as meeting others and financial gain. One subject stated,

"I'll meet a fellow resident's sister or someone else he feels is important."

Similarly, the majority of residents who associated with others of different race than themselves sought to obtain the aforementioned benefits. However, two black federal pre-released prisoners associated with clients of different races in order to obtain rewards (e.g. money). The respondents stated,

"I'll trick and sometimes use white guys for what I want. They don't know nothing."

And,

"They [whites] have better access to means of support, so I try to keep at least one white friend."
Subjects were asked if they shared important values with others. It was found that approximately forty percent (N=18) of the resident group discussed relevant issues with ex-offenders of like and different race. Important values were described as and shared only among non-white clients included the following:

"...our position in the joint, and here at Alvis House - particularly if we're having a problem with a staff person."

"...things like dealing with freedom. In other words - how to 'make it'."

"...being black in the US of A."

"We rap about life, and the 'political' system. Particularly how it affects black men. For example, black men have been stigmatized - we're poor providers. Tell me, how am I suppose to provide for anyone if I'm in prison, and I'm there on a 'fluke'."

Non-white clients who also shared important values with white clients identified family ties and future goals as criteria for discussion.

White residents who shared important values with others, regardless of race, indicated that they discussed future plans and goals. One respondent, however, commented,

"We're all residents and you might as well say we're still in the joint. We all have a common bond - we are ex-convicts - so we talk about that a lot, being at Alvis House."

Fifty-six percent (N=18) of the respondents reported that they display superior competence in areas with clients of same race. In comparison, fifty-three percent (N=17) indicated that they did the same with clients of different race than themselves. Respondents tended to display identical characteristic behavior for others,
regardless of race. Specifically, federal pre-released prisoners identified revealing "trade" or criminal secrets, physical superiority (e.g. sports), knowledge of cars (e.g. mechanical operation), and intellectual superiority (e.g. articulation) among others. Parole and state furlough clients indicated they displayed their knowledge of: cars, dress, leadership, women, the criminal justice system, how to cope with stress, and geographical area (Columbus).

It was found that thirty-four percent (N=11) as compared to twenty-eight percent (N=9) of the subjects risked establishing an impressive image by making contributions to others of like and different race respectively. Also, non-white respondents (forty-two percent) were found to take risk with others, regardless of race, more often than white clients (twenty-three percent). The following are the types of contributions identified by resident subjects:

"If I see a group of guys, especially if they're new, and they need some advice about job leads... yeah, I'll tell 'em."

"I tell the new residents how to get through the program... who gives and why people get 'shots'" (see Note).

And,

"I'll help guys with advice about the program, if I'm approached."

NOTE: The term "shot" refers to a violation form.
According to Peter Blau, "individuals who share values and interests provide each other with support for their beliefs and have a basis for engaging in common endeavors" (Blau, 1964). To support the opinions of others generates social approval among associates as well as homogenous orientations. It was found that sixty-six percent of the resident group supported the opinions, particularly during group meetings of ex-offenders of like race. Sixty-three percent of the total number of non-white subjects and sixty-nine percent of the white subjects indicated this finding. However, supporting others opinions was contingent on the following conditions as expressed by respondents:

"I'll agree with anything if its against staff because usually the residents are right. What we say or feel about things don't count."

"...I'll support my main associate. We feel the same about most things."

And,

"If it is beneficial to the race [non-white] as a whole, I make my feelings known."

The above comments typify responses of federal pre-released prisoners. Parolees reflected similar views. They stated,

"I'll support a guy if I think he's right and I believe what he's saying is true."

Or

"If a resident says something and if the rest of the group gangs up on him, I might."

Residents (fifty-nine percent, N=19) also supported the opinions of clients of different races. The frequency of the behavior was equal among white and non-white clients. However, it was found that state furlough and federal pre-released prisoners as compared to parolees
were more likely to emit the behavior. Also, fifty-eight percent (N=11) of the clients who responded in this manner had thirty days or less remaining in the program. Resident clients also indicated factors that influenced their social association not identified in the survey items. Specifically, the responses included factors such as age, legal status (e.g. parole or probationer), type of correctional facility (e.g. prison farm, maximum security, etc.), drug use, sexual preference and demeanor. The following statements exemplify the effect of perceived factors on ex-offender social association. A white parole subject commented:

"I usually want to know if you ever went to the 'hole'. Also, if you're gay."

Similarly, a black parole respondent reported:

"The sexual preference of staff as well as residents affects association. For example, if you don't bother me, and you're gay - maybe my roommate - then everything's cool. But, as for staff - it's hard to take advice from someone you don't respect."

Other clients indicated the halfway house environment as a determinant of relations.

"The rules, themselves, tend to affect behavior. Monitoring us like kids makes us come together to fight the rules."

And,

"The awkward rules here tends to bring communication between residents; especially at group meetings."

A white respondent indicated:

"Group gatherings find residents opening up to one another. They tell each other about problems - it brings us - the residents - together. Hell, we got the same problems - no job."

In comparison, a state furlough resident responded:
"Being able to get away with things without the staff knowing forms close associations."

Finally, resident demeanor influenced ex-offender social association. Two respondents commented:

"I think who is the 'coolest' is important. In other words, if you're cool and probably older you get more respect."

And,

"Coping with the stress you're under here determines your friends. If you fly off the handle over nothing most guys leave you alone."

The perceptions of the resident group in regards to their social association indicated expected as well as unexpected findings.

Out-Client Perceptions of Ex-Offender Social Association

The out-client group (N=33) comprised fifty-one percent of the study population. The group consisted of, exclusively, parole clients. The racial composition was thirty percent (N=10) white and seventy percent (N=23) non-white respondents. Out-clients did not reside at any one of the units at Alvis House. However, respondents did frequent the employment unit during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. consistently throughout the time frame of the study.

Social Association: Out-Clients

Sixty-seven percent (N=22) of the out-client group identified that they established friendships with other clients. Sixty-nine percent (N=16) of the non-white clients as compared to sixty percent (N=6) of the white clients responded in this manner. Interestingly, eighty-two percent (N=27) did not establish association on the basis of past prison interests. However, sixty-one percent (N=20) did indicate
that they initiated association because of proximity in work assignments. Alvis House contracts with several Columbus area businesses. Consequently, a significant number of ex-offenders from the facility work together.

As in the case of the resident group, ninety-four percent (N=31) of the out-client group did not associate with others to insure personal safety. It is posited that the transitory nature of the group has an influence on this perception. Nonetheless, two white parole out-clients indicated that association with others was influenced by their perception of danger. Generally, affiliation with others by the out-clients was found to be minimal. Eighty-five percent (N=28) of the out-client group did not participate in social programs offered at the facility. In contrast, fifteen percent (N=5) identified activity in athletics and "bitch" sessions (see Note). It was not mandatory for out-clients to meet, as a group, on a weekly basis. Also, ninety-four percent (N=31) and ninety-seven percent (N=32) were not affiliated with a political group and gang. One non-white parolee, however, identified that he "ran with my partners", who he considered a street gang. Finally, seventy-six percent (N=25) were affiliated with various religious groups. The type of religious association, however, was identified as the major denominations (e.g. Protestant, Catholic, etc.).

NOTE: A "bitch" session refers to an informal, spontaneous group discussion.
Out-Client Expectations of Extrinsic and/or Intrinsic Rewards

The extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards that out-clients expected to obtain by association with other out-clients was ascertained. Specifically, the base criterion of an association to further some end (extrinsic), or as an end in itself (intrinsic) is the topic of this section.

The types of rewards or benefits expected by out-clients through association with clients of the same race included none, drugs, cigarettes, friendship, respect, money, fairness and a respect for heterosexual orientation. Specifically, respondents noted:

"I expect information about drugs — who got it, cigarettes and mutual respect."

And,

"I think a straight forwardness character is what I look for — is this guy 'real'."

Non-white respondents indicated the importance of sexual preference.

"If the guy has a manly character, you know, not a wimp or a fag, then I get along fine."

Or,

"The guy has to show responsibility of a man. He should be into women. Plus, if he ain't got his head on straight he don't associate with me."

Interestingly, the two respondents who made these comments indicated that they would, however, associate with out-clients who had homosexual orientations in order to secure what they desired (e.g. money, information regarding rules of Alvis House, etc.).

White respondents, overwhelmingly, sought friendship as a benefit of association with other white out-clients.
"Friendship is something I expect from white guys, or anybody else for that matter. But, you see, it's harder to become friends with blacks. They don't have a lot in common with me. I was a major drug dealer, you see."

Also,

"I just want to be treated fairly. There should be an understanding among ex-offenders, black or white, that we're in this place together. We're all friendly because we got to be."

"Being by yourself gets lonely. I think talking to your friends helps you get through things better."

Out-clients indicated that association with others of different races could yield the same results.

"I deal with guys for what they are - I'm always looking for a friend."

"Well, I don't really expect anything from these guys because they don't expect anything from me."

However, non-white client indicated:

"I don't have many white friends. I don't associate with them a lot. I'm black."

It was found that respondents more often expected rewards or benefits from ex-offenders of the same race as opposed to those of different race than themselves. Moreover, obtaining extrinsic rewards as compared to intrinsic rewards was evident among out-clients.

Social Attractiveness: Out- Clients

Given the findings that a majority of out-clients did expect extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards from others of like and different race, it was interesting to find that eighty-five percent (N=28) of the out-client group and eighty-eight percent (N=29) of the resident group reported that they did not associate with others to obtain rewards
as benefits. Only five and four parolees identified that securing rewards was a basis of their relations with other ex-offenders of same and different race. Of these respondents, four were non-white and one was white respondents. The types of rewards to be obtained included borrowing clothes, money, and friendship. Other benefits, as commented by subjects were:

"I think most guys will let you in on a job lead. That's real important. They [Alvis House] don't consider you a real success, and I do too, unless you got a job."

And,

"You see, I'm a thief - just a thief - but, I'm a good one. There's always somebody who can let you in on something new."

There was no difference, categorically, in the types of rewards obtained through association among ex-offenders of like and different race.

It was found that the types of important values shared among out-clients were contingent on race. White and non-white respondents emitted the behavior on an equal basis. However, white clients tended to share their future plans, the importance of friendship, business interests, criminal secrets, and family concerns with other white clients. Non-white clients, however, tended to discuss racial and political issues, their status as ex-offenders, religion and future with non-white clients.

Out-client behavior that displayed superior competence with others was found to be contrary to the resident group. Seventy-five percent (N=25) of the out-client group indicated that they displayed intellectual and physical superiority to clients of like and different races.
Examples of the comments regarding this social attractiveness variable are below.

"I try to show guys easier and faster methods of completing tests - like a job application."

"Helping other clients with their writing skills by giving them constructive criticism is the way I usually show my better abilities."

And,

"I'm into a lot of sports, but when I was in prison I got into weights. I teach some of the guys how to build themselves up."

"When I'm mad, I'll show people I don't play. Like you can stand a particular way, you know, and get the message across."

Again, clients emitted such behavior regardless of the race of the associate.

In order to ascertain out-client perceptions of their behavior regarding risking presenting an impressive image by contributing to others, respondents were asked to indicate if they did engage in the behavior. Accordingly, thirty-six percent (N=12) emitted the behavior with clients of the same race, and twenty-seven percent (N=9) engaged in the behavior with those of different races. White respondents indicated that such behavior took the form of acknowledging one's extensive knowledge of the program and thereby providing information to new clients, as well as, contributing money, clothes and cigarettes to others. However, one white respondent added:

"You don't do this often, or you will be looked at as a chump - someone who you can get over easy."

Similarly, non-white clients reported:
"I'll do almost anything for a 'brother' as long as we understand each other. I can give money, clothes for an interview, etc."

"I'll let anyone in on a job lead. I don't think that's done to impress anybody—just because you try to help one another."

It was found that the percentage of non-white respondents who contributed to others of like race decreased from thirty-five (N=8) to twenty-two percent (N=5) for contributing to other clients of different race. The percentage of white respondents, however, remained the same regardless of the race of the associate.

The out-client group was also characterized by forty-five percent (N=15) reporting that they supported the opinions of associates of like race. In comparison, thirty-nine percent (N=13) supported the opinions of other clients of different races. It was noted by the subjects, however, that such behavior was contingent on who the associate is (e.g. someone they know) and the type situation (e.g. argument, group discussion). The percentage of non-whites that responded in this manner, again, decreased in relation to supporting the opinions of clients of different races. The frequency of white out-clients who responded to this item remained identical for white and non-white clients.

Factors that influence social association among the out-clients, not included in the survey instrument, were identified by respondents as age, client demeanor, demeanor of staff, drug or alcohol use, prisoner status, social class, length of incarceration (prison), jobs held, and hometown. Clients also reported the following:
"The place sucks. Most of the staff have 'uppedity ass' attitudes, so you got to play a mind game everytime you open your mouth. That's one reason why we [client's] get along - we talk about staff."

"Older guys show newer guys the ropes."

Also, a black respondent indicated:

"You can't 'kick' [talk] with staff about you or about what's going on in your 'hood' [neighborhood]. You see what I mean - do you know what I just said? That's why clients get along better - we can communicate."

"Younger guys model the older ones, especially if they did hard time. So I guess they're looking for 'father figures'."

The perceptions of out-clients regarding their social association were as diverse as the resident group. Finally, the interviewer-interviewee relationship for both the resident and out-client groups was excellent.

The researcher utilized Pearson correlation to measure relationship among variables. The following scale suggested by Davis (1971) was used to describe the magnitude of relationship between variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>very strong relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 - .69</td>
<td>substantial relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 - .49</td>
<td>moderate relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 - .29</td>
<td>low relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 - .09</td>
<td>negligible relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low to negligible relationships characterized the findings. However, qualitative differences did exist among the variables.
A Comparison of Results: Resident and Out-Client Responses

The Chi Square statistical procedure was utilized to compare the two groups who participated in the study (Alpha = .05). The degree or magnitude of difference between the selected characteristics of respondents and their responses to parts four and five of the instrument was ascertained by a correlation coefficient. It was found that there was no significant difference between the pattern of responses reported by the resident and out-client groups (see Appendix C, Table 38).

Community Correction Personnel Perceptions of Ex-Offender Social Association

To enhance our understanding of ex-offender social association, the researcher conducted unstructured interviews of community correction personnel. Interviews of line staff, counselors and administrators were tape recorded and later transcribed by the researcher. The time frame of the interviews ranged between seven and twenty-two minutes. Rapport with all informants was excellent.

Each respondent was asked four broad questions regarding ex-offender behavior or social association patterns in a halfway house setting. Questions were not standardized, but were consistent with items in the survey instrument. Moreover, the researcher-interviewee relationship centered around encouraging the interviewee's definition and account of ex-offender social association (see Note).

The twelve respondents comprised one administrator, two counselors and nine line staff employees. The researcher did not assume that persons or categories of persons were equally important. Of the subjects, seven were male as compared to five female personnel. Also, the informant
group consisted of eight white and four black individuals. The researcher conducted interviews with community correction personnel at the three resident units. Specifically, data were gathered at the parolee-probationer, federal pre-released and employment counseling facilities.

The following questions or variations of questions were posed:

1. How would you describe the social climate among ex-offenders in a halfway house setting?

2. What are the major factors that influence social association among ex-offenders?

3. How do ex-offenders establish friendships with other ex-offenders?

4. How would you describe race relations among ex-offenders in a halfway house setting?

Accordingly, data results will be presented in four sections.

**Social Climate in a Halfway House Setting**

Perceptions regarding the social climate, or as one respondent defines it, "the interaction between residents, and also between residents and staff -- an overall aural feel that you get when you walk into the house," were discrepant. Specifically, some of the respondents described the climate as calm:

"They [clients] seem to adjust well on their arrival here. Since I've been here, I've only had one [client] take off on me, but I heard that he was under an extreme amount of pressure and stress at the time he arrived."

Also, according to a line staff member:

"The majority of the time I would say that...I don't know how to word that...its mild...passive... They stay away from one another, they go their own ways and do their own things, but when they're in the house, they stick together if they need to, but if they don't, then they stay to themselves basically."
In comparison, one respondent reported:

"I would describe it [social climate] as ever-changing, I mean that your atmosphere is often dictated by a certain feel, whether I'll be staff or clients, and depending on where those people, whether its consciously or not, want to take it - that's where it seems to go...Let's say we have a group of clients who come in, and are leaders and they're having a hard time - they're coming in and catching violations, and the program isn't going well - the social climate, then, takes a nose dive, things get bad, and the opposite happens when things are going well."

An administrator mirrors the above perception, but takes it a step further. Of the two residential housing units where the majority of this research takes place, a distinction was made between the parolee-probationer and federal pre-released facilities. The respondent stated:

"I don't think there's a persuasive climate as such in any particular facility. I think, first of all, each facility has by the nature of its clients' legal status, for instance, the Federal Pre-Release Program, by and large a group of older individuals, both older in terms of their chronological ages, as well as, their attitude-more mature. 'Feds' are basically institutionalized to that type of environment which treats the inmate a little more individualized, a mature basis than the state system. There's an expectation by those clients that we have in that system [federal] to be treated more mature than those paroled from state institutions."

In comparison, the same individual viewed the parole-probation unit as more problematic:

"We have a combination of younger probationers, young men who are 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 years old. Many of them have never been in prison [pause]...and parolees from 21 to God knows, whatever. There is constant friction in communicating with staff and other residents. Some of the older residents want to be left alone,...don't want to be bothered with what they call 'J.D.s'."
When asked to define "J.D.s", the respondent elaborated:

"That's a general prison term for a younger offender, ...well, you're not a juvenile, but you're younger than me, and that's pretty much a label for probationer's and younger parolees... You've got a group of probationers who aren't attuned to or institutionalized to prison life — institutional life where you learn certain etiquette. You learn certain life styles, such as, if you're going to survive in here you don't jump up and down and cause everybody trouble because when you go off and get drunk in your room, or do something stupid, it comes back to us. We learned a long time ago, doing time in prison means that, 'you don't mess with me, I don't mess with you.' Also, 'you do something to get me in trouble, you're going to be in trouble.' There's constant friction, primarily between younger offenders and the staff which causes friction for everybody."

Interestingly, a manager perceived the social climate as "dynamic and on a continuum" relative to each of the residential units.

Community correction personnel all agreed that the social climate or atmosphere at the two residential facilities, as well as, the employment counseling unit where out-clients visited, was contingent on the clientele. The parole-probationer unit was generally perceived of as more dynamic, more prone to change and hostility given the (1) age of the clients; (2) diversity of legal statuses; (3) extent of exposure to the corrections systems and (4) level of incarceration (e.g. state). In contrast, the social climate of the federal pre-released residential unit was overwhelmingly described as relaxed, mature and calm. It should be noted, however, that the researcher found that federal pre-released prisoners resided at the facility for a significant longer period of time than parole or state furlough clients.
Major Factors That Influence Ex-Offender Social Association

The major factors that influence social association, or the motivations to interact with other ex-offenders were perceived quite differentially by halfway house staff. Specifically, several respondents reported discrepant views describing what factors affect client relations with others.

One staff member concluded:

"...they develop stereotypic views of themselves, like there's your slick felon, there's your dumb felon, there's your smart felon, there's guys who can make it and guys who can't. They make quick judgements, they eliminate one another and that's who they choose to socialize with, if they socialize at all. Usually, the slick guys will socialize with the slick guys...so they fall into categories that are already here when they arrive."

Another subject reported:

"A lot of them [ex-offenders] came from the institution and race is a major factor...they stick together because of race. Age is a major factor, they seem to stick together in the same age range."

Staff, also identified drug use and criminal orientation as factors influencing association.

"It's like the story - birds of a feather, flock together, that's the basic reason. Those who enjoy the same thing - if you find two guys who are pot smokers they'll...[pause]. You know...smoke a joint...this will tend to be the bond between them, and their friendship will grow out of that. Or if two of them happen to do the same sort of work, such as cook or mechanic, their friendship will stem from their job experience...guys who have committed the same crime tend to stick together. And likewise, you find two guys who are really trying to straighten their life out, and so to speak, to kick their old habits, would tend to bond together for the same reason."
The criminal orientation of the ex-offender was overwhelmingly perceived as the major factor affecting social association. Second, one's status in the prison hierarchy determined association among ex-offenders. In the parole-probation unit, staff members acknowledged the following:

"Status as ex-offenders would be first - probation versus parolee. Also, their status within the correction system before they got us - sex offenders versus somebody who does B & E's [breaking and entering], property offenses or somebody who did street sales or drugs...So depending on the social structure they were in before, and inclusive in this is, I think, the intelligence factor - was this person a 'jailhouse lawyer' or how well does this person read or write."

Also, a staff member reported:

"I've seen some of the residents associate just because they've been in the same institution."

The extent of social association among ex-offenders was perceived by respondents as superficial to organized clique behavior. The following excerpts of result represent the variant views.

"There's an overall association of offenders. Whether or not under any other circumstances these people would associate simply in and of itself them being offenders - they would band together to some degree. Whether you have a white collar and a blue collar criminal, and violent criminal, those three put together are going to be criminals and they'll see themselves as an entity, and for their own protection, for their own well being, and to meet all their different needs -- social needs as well as personal, i.e. protective needs, they will band together whether it be within an institution or halfway house setting..., to fight the administration...I use the word fight simply to connotate a conflict."

"...their relationships are usually divided into two groups of employed residents and unemployed residents..., guys who seem to have no place to go tend to do it alone...The guys who are better off, usually have good family ties."
"I don't think there's any one specific thing, or any group of things; it would just be that individual, that resident if he chooses to become another resident's friend...I'll take that back... most of the time if they're roommates, they become closer."

Respondents also identified personal safety, socioeconomic background, client personality, geographic area (rural vs urban) and hobbies as factors affecting social association. Finally, a staff member reveals:

"If they were a leader in the institution, they're going to be a leader here. They tend to hang with peers. Somebody who did street sales of, say, heavy duty narcotics, made a lot of money and they're not going to hang with property offense people, petty ante criminals because they're not in the same structure, they don't belong, they don't 'know' one another. Very few will hang with sex offenders. So they've already segregated themselves before they got here and I believe segregation continues once they're here."

The extent of association, however, is perceived by one staff member as contingent on days in the program. Specifically,

"These men, most of them, when they come here they tend to be like the scared little child going into a strange environment. So the first three or four days, until they begin to feel a little more at ease and talk with other residents,...then once they get talking, they relate to one another - what you can do, what you can't do, which staff members are the sternest, etc...It tends to make a much tighter bond."

The behavior of ex-offenders that manifest itself in clique-type association is also perceived as a consequence of a "we versus them" attitude.

"I think it is, when they first arrive here, they begin to get that feeling that you're the power structure - I'm the victim-attitude."

And,
"By and large, all people who have been within a criminal justice system, whether it be on a federal level, state, county level, they are going to view the administration, perhaps the 'hacks', guards, the 'turnkeys', whatever terms they use for those people who are caring for them, who have forced them into that society, that institution, they're going to be the bad guys. And the inmates, the residents who come to us, are going to view the administration from line staff up to our level or above as their enemies."

Finally, respondents described how ex-offenders initiate social association. Staff members concluded:

"I think being in a prison environment, cigarettes are just like gold, so you just don't give them up that freely. So, I mean more or less, breaking the ice starts with asking for, or giving a cigarette."

Also,

"Well, in this place we have a coffee pot and usually staff and everybody who drinks coffee rally around that pot. A lot of times when we get a new guy and we do an intake on him, we're going to take him out and introduce him to the residents, and take him to his room. He comes downstairs and either T.V. is the socializing agent or the coffee pot. They either meet there or in the television room and they'll say, 'Hey, you're a new resident.' And the guy will say, 'Yeah'. 'Where you from man?' You understand, but this is not the development of permanent friendship, it's just how they meet one another, you know."

The major factors that influence ex-offender social association appear, on the basis of respondent perceptions, to be a consequence of past experiences as well as, the halfway house social climate. The factors identified by the respondents, however, did not stress the effect of race on ex-offender association.
Race Relations in a Halfway House Setting

The prison literature, generally, contends that race is one of the most basic determinants of inmate social relations (Irwin, 1980; Jacobs, 1981). This factor was not perceived by community correction personnel as a major concern of ex-offenders. Race relations in the halfway house was described as the opposite than what occurs in prison.

The following statements are reflective of this perception:

"Well, it's a real cool environment. Forty percent of the people in prison are black and blacks are the dominant group here and that eliminates tension. As blacks dominate here, and you'll catch a lot of whites acting black, using black terms, black slang, referring to situations in a black way. I imagine if we were predominantly white, and blacks had to be reactionaries, then we would have more of a race problem."

Many of the respondents felt there were no race problems.

"I would describe race relations as very good. You don't find a lot of prejudice among them. If they had it, they keep it strictly to themselves, seldom show it. They won't show it to one another, they won't show it to staff...in institutions race is a major factor, that's the reason it is fine here, plus, they know that from either side the showing of prejudice can cause you bodily harm."

Another reported:

"If there is a problem you don't know it until later...We have one resident and he makes statements, like he rubbed one staff member [hand] and he said 'It doesn't rub off'. But, since I've been here I've never had any but one resident that didn't like blacks and we didn't know it until he 'clocked off [verbally attacked] on two of us...He had a problem pertaining to black women...nonetheless, they all communicate well, they don't segregate themselves."

And,
"I've never seen or heard anything arise because, you know, one person is black and the other person is white."

These views were not supported by several of the informants. They felt much of the dynamics that describe race relations in the prison, also, describe association among ex-offenders in the halfway house. Although few racial incidents occurred at the facilities, it was concluded that race relations were in a strained state.

"...the tension, I don't think there's too much in the house itself, but a lot of it derives from the institution. I guess blacks are separated and you can get separated if you want to, just like when you sit at an eating table, you can either eat with a white or Mexican here, even you can eat separate, a few blacks here, a Mexican here, a white here. So when you move into this setting, the older ones [ex-offenders] have a tendency to go their separate ways...the older ones, I would say thirty and over."

One respondent revealed that patterns of race relations existed in the halfway house.

"There are a couple of different patterns which come into play: number one, they are coming out of that closed society [prison] where race was important because of their sense of protection. They needed to identify with some sort of group for the protection from the other groups. At the same time, if there was a predisposition in the individual to be prejudiced or have a strong dislike about or against a particular type of race, then when they come out of the institution, they are going to feel much freer in voicing that, because they're not in that closed society anymore. If before you got locked up you used the word 'nigger', but you went into the institution and you saw a great many people who would take very serious offense to that term, and you decided for your safety that it would probably truly be best not to use that word and you come out and you see where there are no more followers, if someone chases you, you can run away or you call in support systems from the community - your buddies - to help you with a problem,...you are much, more free with that word, and we see it sometimes."
Yet, the respondent concludes:

"I don't see any set patterns being established as racial preferences. I don't see anything specific."

Finally, a respondent viewed the institutional environment as a direct influence on the race relations at the halfway house:

"I'm amazed constantly that they don't rip one another's heads off because of the tension they are forced to live under being with our restrictive rules...I would say that there is a lot of racial tension. It is like an elevator, it is up and down depending on what kind of house we have, who we have in the house, and it's very important who your leaders are. But I would say that they hide it so well, primarily whites, that most of the time I don't know we have bigots in the house until they come into my office and say something to me and I'll go 'What did you just say?' They try not to display it, again primarily the whites, because they learn in an institution that's a good way to get hurt...I believe a lot of the behavior, a lot of the racial bigotry we see here, may it begin before they were incarcerated, but I think it was certainly exacerbated when they were incarcerated. I think that because they see blacks running an institution, that's how they're going to judge every black from then on."

Race relations in the halfway house, as perceived by community correction personnel are accommodative rather than conflictive.

A Comparison of Results: Staff and Ex-Offenders

Perceptions of ex-offender social association in a halfway house setting significantly differed between staff and clientele.

Community correctional personnel discussed the major determinants of association among resident and out-client ex-offenders. The staff identified criminal orientation, past prison interests (e.g. institution where incarcerated), drug use, status in the prison hierarchy, number of days in the reintegration program, age, legal status (e.g.
parole, federal pre-released), socioeconomic background, infrequently race and the lack of power in the correctional structure (e.g. "clique" behavior to challenge halfway house staff). Similarly, a small number of clients reflected these views. However, an overwhelming majority did not indicate that criminal orientation influenced association with other ex-offenders. The number of days in the program was also found not to be a major determinant of ex-offender relations. Factors that impact on halfway house relations indicated by ex-offenders and not reported by staff included demeanor (e.g. coolness), sexual preference, and race.

It was found that race had an effect on exhibiting social attractiveness behaviors. Specifically, although the frequency of the behaviors were, generally, not significant, the quality of the association differed among the races of respondents. Findings suggest that ex-offenders perceive expectations of rewards through association with others of same race to be intrinsic and extrinsic in nature. In contrast, expectations of rewards through association with different races appear to be, categorically, based on extrinsic benefits. The exception, however, was found to be a common attitude by ex-offenders that they were a group, a cohesive unit determined by their past incarceration. Consequently, respondents identified mutual respect (e.g. not to 'snitch') and that a sense of "we-ness" perpetuated against staff dominated ex-offender relations. Several staff members also indicated social association characterized by this attitude.
A profile emerged of social attractiveness behaviors engaged in by ex-offenders. Findings suggest that subjects do not associate to obtain rewards, although respondents indicated expectations of benefits obtained through social association with others. Sharing important values with others, displaying superior competence, and supporting others opinions were found to be frequently exhibited by ex-offenders. In contrast, risking presentation of an impressive image contingent on contributing to others was not frequently engaged in by ex-offenders.

Finally, the halfway house social structure was found to be a major determinant of relations. Both staff and clientele indicated that the power dimension between staff and client, and the sets of predetermined norms and roles (e.g. client, staff member) influenced ex-offender behavior. Also, the unit in which the client resided, and the legal status of the client (e.g. parole, federal pre-released) reflected the quality of interaction. Although ex-offender solidarity exists to some extent, there were differences among various groups (e.g. age, race, legal status). The data gathered confirmed staff perceptions of ex-offender solidarity, but did not account for the subtle differences that disappear when ex-offenders confront halfway house personnel.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The interface between social psychology and the criminal justice system has enormous potential. According to Greenberg and Ruback "probably the most important criterion for future work in the criminal justice system by social psychologists is that the work be relevant and useful to decision makers in the system" (Greenberg and Ruback, 1982). The present research directed attention to the social psychological dynamics of ex-offender social association in a halfway house setting. The findings, therefore, were relevant to the development of intervention strategies purposive to reintegration of the newly released prisoner.

Social exchange theories, in particular Peter Blau's paradigm, are based on the assumption that individuals are hedonists; "that is, they seek to maximize their pleasures and minimize their pains - and that they are dependent on others for accomplishing this" (Greenberg and Ruback, 1982). Social relations are, therefore, predicated on (1) behavior oriented toward ends achieved through interaction with others, and (2) behavior which seeks to adapt means to further the achievement of these ends (Franklin, 1982). The researcher explored ex-offender social relations within this theoretical framework. The process, forms, social forces and structures to which social association give rise among ex-offenders were the topic areas of this dissertation.
The focal concern of this research was to gain greater insight into the social psychological dynamics of ex-offender social association. The researcher explored five research questions derived from the social exchange perspective; and in particular, the theoretical paradigm advanced by Peter Blau. The formulation stressed an explanation of social behavior based on the exchange of rewards and costs occurring during interaction between ex-offenders. The research questions were operationalized with data obtained from ex-offenders and community correction personnel in a halfway house setting.

The researcher utilized a census approach, and solicited sixty-five ex-offenders as subjects for the study. To supplement the data gathered from ex-offenders, twelve halfway house staff and administration personnel were interviewed. The findings were compared and contrasted to enhance our understanding of the phenomenon under investigation.

The following were the research objectives and questions that guided the study:

The first objective of this study was to identify extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards that the ex-offender expects to obtain by associating with other ex-offenders. Specifically, the base criterion of an association to further some end (extrinsic) or as an end in itself (intrinsic) was ascertained (Blau, 1964). The rewards, as perceived by the ex-offender, expected by associating with other ex-offenders was identified. Also, the halfway house environment which determined the types of rewards obtained through social association with other ex-offenders were examined.
There are several ways in which individuals who seek to gain social acceptance among others try to prove themselves attractive associates (Blau, 1964). To impress others, individuals engage in socially attractive behaviors (Blau, 1964). A second research objective was to ascertain if a relationship existed between the race of the ex-offender and sharing important values with other ex-offenders. Specifically, new acquaintances tend to search in their conversations for clues that indicate some shared experiences or characteristics" (Blau, 1964).

The strategies used to impress others varies among groups and individuals: that is, strategies are determined by what group members find impressive and "on the aptitudes that limit how an individual can impress them" (Blau, 1964). To make a good impression, the individual must infer which of his qualities that constitute an impressive response and adapt his conduct accordingly (Blau, 1964). A third research objective was to ascertain if a relationship existed between the race of the ex-offender and displaying superior competence with other ex-offenders.

"Presenting an impressive image of oneself entails some risks: the risk of appearing boastful or conceited, the risk of repelling others with extreme opinions, and generally the risk of incurring their disapproval" (Blau, 1964). Nonetheless, the individual who takes risks and successfully meet challenges command respect. A fourth objective of this study was to ascertain if a relationship existed between the race of an ex-offender and contributing to the group(s) of ex-offenders or to its individual members. Also, the types of
contributions the ex-offender made to the group or individual members were identified.

A final research objective of this study was to ascertain if a relationship existed between the race of the ex-offender and supporting others' opinions. Specifically, conformity with the opinions of others is a means for proving oneself attractive, and thus, of gaining social acceptance from a particular group.

The following were the research questions of the study:

1. What are the extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards ex-offenders expect to obtain by association with other ex-offenders?
2. What is the relationship between the race of the ex-offender and sharing important values with other ex-offenders?
3. What is the relationship between the race of the ex-offender and displaying superior competence with other ex-offenders?
4. What is the relationship between the race of the ex-offender and contributing to the ex-offender groups(s) or to its individual members?
5. What is the relationship between the race of the ex-offender and supporting others' opinions?

**Social Association**

It was found that ex-offenders choose between alternative associates by evaluation of the "experiences or expected experiences with each in terms of a preference ranking and then selecting the best alternative" (Blau, 1964). The proclivity to associate with others, therefore, was contingent on the reciprocal exchange of expected rewards. This is referred to as the social attraction process. A major finding
of the research was that although ex-offenders had expectations of reciprocal exchange with others, few actually participated in the exchange of rewards. Of those that did, findings suggest the following:

1. Association with others of was contingent on the types of rewards obtained. Specifically, white and non-white ex-offenders had expectations that precipitated their association with other white and non-white ex-offenders, and they received expected rewards respectively.

2. Association among ex-offenders produce obligatory feelings for favors that are received among ex-offenders - across racial lines. For example, there appeared to be an ex-offender code that clients were a cohesive unit, usually in opposition to staff.

3. A majority of ex-offenders did not associate with others to obtain rewards and sought not to produce obligatory feelings with others by not engaging in reciprocal exchange. However, these individuals adhered to the ex-offender social code which guaranteed social approval among the clients.

4. The majority of ex-offenders did not perceive other ex-offenders as mutually attractive. Therefore, the structure of most social association or relations manifested itself in dyadic relationships. And,

5. Ex-offenders ranked potential associates on the basis of various attributes, such as drug use, race, and client demeanor among others.
The recent review of prisoner relations assumes that race is one of the dominant factors affecting relationships among inmates (Irwin, 1970; Carroll, 1974; Jacobs, 1979, 1983). The research findings support this assumption, only for the few ex-offenders who were mutually attracted to others due to race and expected specialized rewards from associates.

Nonetheless, race as a dominant factor affecting relations among ex-offenders in a halfway house setting was not the case. Ex-offenders were found to associate with others predicated in the expectations of rewards. Although the rewards received were qualitatively different among races, the frequency of association was constant across racial lines. The racial segregation that is evident in the prison, characterized by the existence of two independent social structures (e.g. codes, roles, etc.) was not existent in the halfway house. It appears, then, that each client relates to others on the basis of race, within the context of expected rewards. When an ex-offender perceives that rewards can be obtained, he interacts with those who can provide particular benefits, regardless of the race of the associate. However, the types of the rewards expected and received is contingent on the race of both parties.

Other factors that ex-offenders considered before initiating and establishing association with other ex-offenders were drug use, age, legal status, socioeconomic background, client demeanor, sexual preference, status in the prison hierarchy, number of days in the reintegration program, institution where incarcerated, criminal orientation, family background, placement in room and/or work assignment, hobbies, past jobs held, safety, residential status, and the halfway
house environment. It was found, however, that these factors have little importance if rewards could be obtained from individuals with least desirable attributes. Again, the expectation of rewards were determined by associate characteristics. However, as in the case of race, ex-offenders were found to associate with those who can provide intrinsic and/or extrinsic benefits, regardless of these attributes.

The development of integrative bonds which unite individuals characterized ex-offender social association. According to Blau,

"...these are bonds of social attraction. The greater the attraction of individuals to one another and to the group as a whole, particularly if their intrinsic attraction to the association generates common identification, the more cohesive is the group" (Blau, 1964).

As Blau further concluded,

"...some groups evolve as individual with opportunities for social contact become increasingly attracted to each other and establish common bonds that stabilize their social association" (Blau, 1964).

A social bond among the subjects of the research was found to be that they were ex-offenders. Accordingly, ex-offender relations were based on less powerful client status in the halfway house structure. As one staff member asserted, "they [clients] will band together, whether it be within an institution or halfway house setting" to confront the authority of the staff. Confrontation with halfway house personnel, then, increased social attraction among ex-offenders.

The ex-offender group was also found to have diffused boundaries which constituted, in effect, overlapping circles. Some ex-offenders were peripheral members, and occasionally, core members of several groupings were found to be the case. The resident group was found
to be more cohesive than the out-client group. For example, higher status was attributed to older clients, and in particular, those who served long prison sentences. Second, residents had increased exposure to other clients at their respective units. Out-clients, however, had little interaction with Alvis House clients outside the facility. Also, it was found that non-white ex-offenders dominated halfway house life. As Jacobs (1979) reported, "...black inmates tend to dominate prison life...this dominance results from their superior numbers in prison and the fact that they, in contrast to whites, are used to facing the larger society in terms of their racial identity" (Greenberg and Ruback, 1982). Given the types of rewards expected from others of same race as reported by non-white ex-offenders, the existence of minority groups in the halfway house increases the salience of racial identities.

The desire for social reward leads ex-offenders into exchange relationship with others. And, social exchange relationship create social bonds between ex-offenders. These assumptions are principle conclusions of the research. In contrast, ex-offenders who did not associate with others perceived that they would not profit from the association. The motivating, as well as, sustaining force behind ex-offender relations surrounds such feelings as social attraction and desires for extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards (Blau, 1964; Franklin, 1982).
Social Integration: Social Attractiveness Behaviors

In order to create social bonds, the ex-offender must become an attractive associate. To induce anticipation that a possible association would be rewarding, it was found that some ex-offenders sought to impress others. This was accomplished by engaging in the various types of social attractiveness behaviors. What was perceived as attractive or acceptable behavior, however, was contingent on the social structure - the halfway house. According to Blau,

The initial attraction between individuals rests on the expectation of rewards that are, analytically, extrinsic and that make comparisons between potential associates possible. But once social relations have become established, they often rest primarily on either extrinsic or intrinsic rewards as exemplified by the supportive and the exchange relations (Blau, 1964).

Ex-offenders identified various expectations of rewards, and a significant number of them engaged in social attractiveness behaviors to secure those benefits. Specifically, there were several ways in which the ex-offender exhibited impressive qualities to create social bonds (mutual attraction).

Sharing Important Values. According to Blau, "individuals who share values and interests provide each other with support for their beliefs and have a basis for engaging in common endeavors" (Blau, 1964). It was found that ex-offenders were drawn together by homogeneous orientations. Specifically, the types of values or interests shared among ex-offenders centered around race, status in society as ex-convicts, and issues on morality (e.g. sexual preference). It would seem, then, that the development of a consensus on normative standards promotes social approval. Ex-offenders sought social approval from others
to confirm their judgements, conduct and beliefs. Furthermore, the
social approval granted by ex-offenders to potential associates insured
acceptance in the group, as well as, perceiving the potential associate
as mutually attractive. There was a relationship between the race of
the ex-offender and sharing important values with other ex-offenders.
Specifically, the race of the potential associate determined the types
of rewards expected and received.

**Displaying Superior Competence.** The types of strategies used
to impress others did not vary significantly among the resident and
out-client, racial, or legal status groups. Also, ex-offenders indicated
that such behavior was acceptable, particularly in the case of exhibiting
extensive knowledge of the criminal justice system. There was no
relationship between the race of the ex-offender and displaying superior
competence with other ex-offenders of like and different races. However,
it should be noted that the social attractiveness behavior was, generally,
exhibited when the ex-offender was approached.

**Making Contributions to Others.** Important characteristics are
not an unambiguous asset for establishing friendly relations in a
group, because they tend to make an individual a status threat and
somewhat unapproachable, as well as, attractive (Blau, 1964). Accordingly,
it was not surprising to find that few ex-offenders would not risk
presenting an impressive image by contributing, material or non-material,
to others. Undoubtedly, the normative consensus that the ex-offender
should not go out of his way to contribute to clients is transient
from the inmate code. The findings suggest, ex-offenders who have
positive characteristics on a salient attribute (e.g. race, age, legal
status), but negative ones on a less salient attribute (e.g. criminal orientation) makes the individual approachable. In contrast, ex-offenders who are negative on a more salient and positive on a less salient attribute have the least chance of acceptance. To take risk to establish an impressive image by appearing boastful or conceited and repelling others with extreme opinions through contributions was perceived as unacceptable behavior.

Of those subjects that exhibited the behavior, there was a relationship between contributing to others — and risking social unattractiveness — and the race of the ex-offender. Specifically, non-white ex-offenders were found to make contributions to others, regardless of race, more often than white subjects. The findings suggest that white ex-offenders seek to impress, generally, other white clients.

**Supporting Others Opinions.** The tendency to ingratiate oneself as affected by the pressure to socially integrate was evident in the study population. Supporting the opinions of other ex-offenders were found to increase ex-offender solidarity, and provide social approval and integration for newly arrived offenders. Clients who were in the program thirty days or less sought to impress ex-offenders who were at the facility over a length of time. There was a relationship between supporting the opinions of other ex-offenders of like and different races and the race of the potential associate. Specifically, non-white ex-offenders were more likely to support the opinions of non-white ex-offenders who they attributed status (e.g. older clients).
The overwhelming majority of ex-offenders in a halfway house setting did not indicate that they engaged in the social attractiveness behaviors delineated by Blau. It was posited that this was a result of (1) there were no expectations that association with other ex-offenders, regardless of race would be rewarding, (2) mutual attraction did not exist because past association was not rewarding and (3) the social attractiveness behaviors identified by Blau, were, contrary to the inmate and ex-offender codes of social relations.

Policy Recommendations

The relationships that characterize the halfway house, in particular, between staff and clientele appear to be an extension of relations from prisons. According to Hylton (1982), residential facilities and halfway houses represent alternative institutions rather than vehicles of decarceration. He concludes these facilities are "prisonlike" institutions:

...residential treatment centers in which offenders eat, sleep, often work, may receive educational instruction and other "betterment" lessons (from grooming to encounter therapies), and so on. Control mechanisms may include curfew and ground restrictions, daily schedules, and behavior modification procedures with specific rewards for approved behaviors and negative sanctions for disapproved behaviors (Kleen, et.al., 1976; Hylton, 1982; Eitzen and Timmer, 1985; Greenberg and Rubak, 1982).

The patterns and operating procedures differ tremendously among halfway houses. However, an element of strict social control characterized the facility where the research was conducted. The patterns of relations among staff and ex-offender population were similar to that of the correctional institution.
There are several social exchange considerations applicable to the halfway house. First, ex-offenders have social exchange relationships with community correction personnel, as well as, fellow clients. The relationship that offers the most reward is often clear for ex-offenders. Specifically, ex-offenders identified extrinsic and intrinsic rewards expected from their counterparts (e.g. friendship, respect, clothing). At other times, however, extrinsic and/or intrinsic rewards are offered by staff, as well as, clients. The ex-offender must, therefore, weigh the costs and benefits of both relationships. The costs of associating with staff in order to obtain benefits are, more often than not, higher than costs from association with ex-offenders. It is posited that the social structure of relations in the halfway house is conducive to reciprocal exchange among the clientele, rather than between clients and staff. In addition, when rewards are not provided to ex-offenders by clients, the costs of association with staff, still, outweigh the benefits of the association (see Greenberg and Ruback, 1982).

A second social exchange consideration is that staff must engage in social exchange relationships with clients, fellow staff members and the halfway house administration. Staff obtain rewards (e.g. salary raises, promotions) from the halfway house administration by maintaining an undisruptive environment. To minimize the occurrence of unacceptable behavior, staff rely exclusively on the use of formally approved punishment or rewards (e.g. violation citation). Utilization of formal sanctions, often, do not promote a stable environment. Consequently, staff must engage in social exchange relationships with clients; that is, informal
mechanisms (e.g., special privileges) are introduced to increase control over clients. The forces that lead staff to enter into these relationships result in a system of accommodation; that is, rules are selectively implemented among clients. As a result of privileged status, elite clients benefit from the status quo, and are more likely to maintain the existing structure (see Greenberg and Ruback, 1982).

Given the structure of social relations among community correction staff and ex-offenders, the researcher proposes the following recommendations.

Treatment of the ex-offender in the halfway house setting is predicated on the assumption that individualized treatment promotes better communication between staff and client, as well as, success in the program. The researcher acknowledges the merit of this practice, however, treatment can be implemented within a social exchange framework:

1. **Autonomy.** To raise the expectations of the ex-offender so that staff becomes the principle provider of perceived rewards, allow clients to suggest their case managers. Second, staff can assess the selection and approve or disapprove client suggestions. Finally, this technique may influence client perception of powerlessness by giving some control and autonomy over his rehabilitation effort, thus discouraging ex-offender solidarity.

2. **Client Perception of Needs.** Aftercare should be geared toward material needs rather than changing client attitudes and/or values. Specifically, "encounter therapies" do little to discourage inmate subcultural influences. Rather, group meetings tend to be characterized by a power dimension between staff and client. These therapies tend to promote rather than eliminate client cohesion.

3. **Rule Infractions.** It is imperative that violators be sanctioned, regardless of their status in the program. However, staff must implement control through legitimate mechanisms and refrain from informal social controls. The imposition of punishment tends to make potential associates (staff) unapproachable.
4. **Staff Incentive.** The allocation of rewards to staff by administration should not be contingent on the performance of each staff member, but rather the staff unit.

These recommendations are based on social psychological principles. Moreover, they are quite applicable to problems faced by community correction operators.

The unprecedented use of community corrections by the criminal justice systems has created a series of problems. The incredible size of the halfway house (ex-offender) population tends to influence the residential facility atmosphere. Overpopulation causes impersonalization, which in turn reduces the supportive environment to that of the prison. Community correction facilities, therefore should be restricted to a suitable number of clients conducive to individualized treatment.

Residential facilities, particularly larger agencies, should be characterized by specialized programs that segregate clients. The facility where this research was conducted had several units that diminished client diversity by housing federal and state clients separately. If economically feasible, other units should be developed to house probationers, and older clients.

Finally, employee burnout among halfway house staff is a major concern of the community correction subsystem. The increased interaction with ex-offenders and the lack of public acceptance of halfway house careers have been identified as factors that contribute to rapid employee turnover. Possible resolutions to alleviate the effects of these problems are as follows:

1. **New Personnel.** Potential staff members should have an educational background in corrections or related fields, and, if possible, past experience in working with offenders or ex-offenders. Exposure to the halfway house population without extensive
knowledge of the group may accelerate the "burn-out" process for ill-qualified employees.

2. Restricted Exposure to Clients. High risk offenders (e.g. rapists) interaction with female staff members should be minimized. It was found in the study that female personnel were more likely to attribute negative characteristics to high risk clients, the likelihood of social exchange relations between the two are diminished.

Implications for Future Research

The present study explored social association among ex-offenders in a halfway house setting. Findings provided considerable insight regarding the social psychological dynamics that influence and characterize client behavior. Several policy recommendations were advanced purposive to the development and maintenance of reintegrative programs.

The impact of social psychological research on community corrections is profound. In the analysis of ex-offender social association, it was found that social relations in the halfway house were contingent on social exchange relationships, as well as, the social structure. Future research should explore the variant forms of association among staff, administration and clientele.

The examination of ex-offender social association was partially devoted to ascertaining the similarities and differences between the ex-offender and inmate groups. Specifically, the behavioral patterns that characterize the prisoner population were found, to some extent, to characterize ex-offenders in a residential facility. Future studies should focus on the attributes of both populations. These studies would undoubtedly yield information that can be utilized in reintegration programs. Specifically, the types of behaviors that are retained
by newly released prisoners would be identified, and more adequately addressed by community correction personnel.

The present study found that halfway house staff and ex-offenders were experiencing conflicting perceptions of client social association. Accordingly, interaction between the staff and ex-offenders tend to be influenced by the characteristics attributed to each by the other. Utilization of social exchange principles would enhance our understanding of the association process. In addition, prospective studies should compare and contrast perceptions of halfway house with prison personnel.

There is a paucity of social psychological research on ex-offenders. The scarcity of studies may be a consequence of numerous factors. Major research has focused on the cost effectiveness and feasibility of community corrections. In addition, evaluation of community based correctional programs by scholars has occupied the research community. Data suggest these topic areas can be analyzed within the framework of existing and modified social psychological theories.

During the initial stages of the study it was concluded that the emergent properties of social association could not be examined given the selected methodology. Future studies should employ methods that are conducive to investigating the process of social attraction. Specifically, frequencies of socially attractive behaviors could be recorded and compared to survey results. This could be accomplished by use of participant observation rather than survey.
The present study sought to provide data applicable to research of race relations. Accordingly, the patterns of social association were found to focus on the expectations and reception of rewards from others. Implicit in this finding, however, is that individuals interact on the basis of evaluating potential associates on the basis of providing benefits to the individual. Prospective studies may build on this finding and begin to analyze race relations within the social exchange framework.

Finally, the research findings have implications for research on differences in same sex friendships. Scholars conclude that women are significantly more likely than men to mention honesty as an attribute of friends (Rose and Serafica, 1979); report intimacy as a function of best and close friendships (Rose and Serafica, 1979); take longer to establish their friendships (Booth, 1972); have more close friends (Crawford, 1977); self-disclose (Jourard, 1964); Lewis, 1978; Morgan, 1976; Rubin, 1973); and describe same sex friendship as approximating the 'ideal friendship' (Marks and Giordano, 1978). These studies lend credence to the existence of psuedo marriages and "families" in prisons for women. In contrast, men were significantly more likely to cite identity as a function of best friends, and have more casual relations (Rose and Serafica, 1979). The characteristics of male friendships discussed by the scholars were also found in the present study. In particular, given the types of rewards obtained through association (e.g. information, drugs) male ex-offenders followed this pattern. Analysis of ex-offender social association can expand our understanding of gender differences in friendship.
The justification of this research lies in the valuable data describing social association patterns among ex-offenders. The patterns of relations of ex-offenders is an important area of study in order to increase the likelihood of reintegration. Specifically, quality interpersonal relationships with others is crucial for the newly released inmate. Future studies could focus on social association between ex-offenders and others in the community (e.g. employers). Such research could identify indicators that expedite the social integration process.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW

The following are instructions to be read to correctional personnel. Informants will be approached and asked to participate in the study. Those who consent will be administered the unstructured interview in private with the length of the interview contingent on subject availability. Confidentiality is guaranteed by the researcher.

Hello, my name is Sandra Woods and I am conducting a study concerning ex-offender social association in a halfway house setting. Accordingly, unstructured interviews with community-based correctional personnel will enhance our understanding of the phenomenon under investigation.

Please feel free to raise any concerns and indicate if there are any questions you do not wish to answer. You are free to terminate the interview at any point. Finally, your answers will be held in the strictest confidence.

Thank you for your time and cooperation in this endeavor.

Questions

1. How would you describe the social climate among ex-offenders in a halfway house setting?

2. What are your perceptions of the major factors that influence social association among ex-offenders?

3. How do ex-offenders establish friendships with other ex-offenders?

4. How would you describe race relations among ex-offenders in a halfway house setting?

Interviewer: ____________________________

Time: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________

Rapport: ____________________________
ANNOUNCEMENT

Clients of Alvis House

My name is Sandra Woods. I will be conducting research at this facility.

The purpose of this research is to ascertain information concerning social association in community correctional institutions. I want to find out how you would describe interaction with others in a halfway house setting.

The methods to collect data for this study include an interview and examining records.

The interview will last approximately thirty minutes. I assure you that your responses will be held in the strictest confidence. Anonymity is also guaranteed. Your participation or non-participation will in no way affect your status here at Alvis House. You are free to end the interview at any point. I would also like to secure your permission to examine individual files. Files will be examined in order to ascertain demographic data. A consent form will now be given to you for your persual.

Please feel free to ask any questions or concerns you have regarding this study. Thank you for your time and cooperation.
I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

(Principal Investigator) or his/her authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child). The information obtained from me (my child) will remain confidential unless I specifically agree otherwise by placing my initials here _________.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date:______________________ Signed: __________________ (Participant)

Signed: ____________________________ Signed:__________________________
(Principal Investigator or (Person Authorized to Consent his/her Authorized Representative for Participant - If Required)

Witness:__________________________

HS-027 (Rev. 12-81)—To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.
DATA SHEET

ID Number ____________________________

Part I: Demographic Characteristics

1. Age:

____________________

2. State of residence

____________________

3. Race:

__________ (1) white

__________ (2) non-white, specify ______________________

4. Current marital status:

__________ (1) never married

__________ (2) married

__________ (3) common law

__________ (4) divorced

__________ (5) separated

__________ (6) widowed

5. Number of dependents:

________

6. Education:

__________ (1) 0-7 years

__________ (2) 8-11 years

__________ (3) HS Graduate - GED

__________ (4) 13-up
7. Occupation:

__________________________________________

Part II: Psychological/Psychiatric History

8. Impairment:

________ (1) physical
________ (2) age (debilitation effects)
________ (3) personality disorder
________ (4) none

9. History of psychological are?

________ (1) yes
________ (2) no

10. Medication prescribed?

________ (1) yes
________ (2) no

11. Currently undergoing treatment?

________ (1) drug
________ (2) alcohol
________ (3) psychological
________ (4) none

Part III: Criminal Background

12. Legal Status:

________ (1) parole
________ (2) federal pre-released
________ (3) furlough (state)

13. Number of days in reintegration program:

__________________________________________
14. Days left in reintegration program:


15. Institution:


16. Instant offense:

______ (1) person related offense

______ (2) non-person related offense

______ (3) both

17. Type of offense:


18. Number of adult felony convictions:

______ (1) 1

______ (2) 2

______ (3) 3

______ (4) 4

______ (5) 5

______ (6) over 5

______ (7) none

19. Number of adult felony incarcerations (penal institutions):

______ (1) 1

______ (2) 2

______ (3) 3

______ (4) 4

______ (5) 5

______ (6) over 5

______ (7) none
20. Number of months incarcerated in adult penal system (excluding jail time):

- ________ (1) under 12 months
- ________ (2) 13–14 months
- ________ (3) 15–24 months
- ________ (4) 25–36 months
- ________ (5) 37–48 months
- ________ (6) 49–60 months
- ________ (7) over 60 months

21. Number of resident violations (reintegration program):

- ________ (1) 0–3
- ________ (2) 4–7
- ________ (3) 8–11
- ________ (4) 10–15
- ________ (5) over 15

22. Most frequent violation:

- ________ (1) drinking
- ________ (2) failure to turn in employment check
- ________ (3) curfew violation
- ________ (4) itinerary violation
- ________ (5) driving a motor vehicle without permission
- ________ (6) physical assault on resident or staff
- ________ (7) possession of a weapon
- ________ (8) failure to attend mandatory group meetings
- ________ (9) failure to perform mandatory housework
- ________ (10) other, specify _______________________________
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Part IV: Social Association

24. Do you have friend(s) at the halfway house?
   ________ yes
   ________ no

25. What is the race of your closest friend(s)?
   ________ white
   ________ non-white, specify _______________________

26. Do you become friend(s) based on the types of crimes you committed?
   ________ yes
   ________ no
   If yes, can you give examples?
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________

28. Do you make friend(s) based on shared prison interests?
   ________ yes
   ________ no
   If yes, can you give examples?
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________

29. Do you make friend(s) based on placement in room assignments or work?
   ________ yes
   ________ no
30. Do you become friends with others for safety or protection from others?
   _______ yes
   _______ no
   _______ other, specify ________________________________

31. Do you become friends with others for material gain?
   _______ yes
   _______ no

32. What things do you expect from association with guys of your race?
   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________

33. What things do you expect from association with guys of different races?
   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________

34. What race are you?
   _______ white
   _______ non-white, specify ______________________________

35. Do you take part in any of the facility's social programs?
   _______ yes
   _______ no
   If yes, specify social program(s)
   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________
36. Are you politically affiliated with any group?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, specify group(s)

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

37. Are you a member of any social club or gang?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, specify club(s) or gang

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

38. Are you affiliated with any religious group(s)?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, specify group(s)

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

39. What are some of your hobbies?

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________
Part V: Social Attractiveness

40. Do you associate with guys of your race to obtain things you want or need?

_______ yes

_______ no

If yes, can you give examples?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

41. Do you associate with guys of different races to obtain things you need or want?

_______ yes

_______ no

If yes, can you give examples?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

42. Do you share important values with guys of your race?

_______ yes

_______ no

If yes, what are some of those things you share?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
43. Do you share important values with guys of different race?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, what are some of those things you share?

44. Do you show your abilities with guys of your race?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, can you give examples?

45. Do you show your abilities with guys of different races?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, can you give examples?
46. Do you take risks with guys of your own race?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, what kind of risks?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

47. Do you take risks with guys of different races?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, what kind of risks?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

48. Do you make contributions to groups of guys of your race?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, can you give examples?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
49. Do you make contributions to groups of guys of different races?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, can you give examples?

________________________________________________________________________

50. Do you support the opinions of guys of your race?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, can you give examples (who do you support)?

________________________________________________________________________

51. Do you support the opinions of guys of different races?

________ yes

________ no

If yes, can you give examples?

________________________________________________________________________

52. What are some factors that you believe influence how guys associate with others in a halfway house?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

STATEMENT OF WORK: FEDERAL PRE-RELEASED PRISONER FACILITIES
CONTRACT COMMUNITY TREATMENT CENTERS

I. INTRODUCTION

i. BACKGROUND

The U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Prison System, provides funds - under contracts to State and local governments and to private organizations - for the provision of residential care for Federal offenders in Community Treatment Centers (sometimes referred to as halfway houses). Under the provisions of Title 18, U.S Code, Sections 4002, 4082, 5013 and 5040, these centers are responsible for ensuring control and accountability of residents and providing or making arrangements for custody, subsistence, medical care, education, and training opportunities to those persons in the centers.

Community Treatment Centers provide:

A. Flexibility in programs which can be geared to the specific needs of each individual in residence.

B. Expertise and capability in assisting the offender to find employment, a place to live, to develop resources on his own and to develop self-confidence.

C. Integration and transition of residents into productive community living.

The transitional period of residence in the halfway house program has proven cost-beneficial to the taxpayer in that the resident is not a total burden to the government. During residency, the resident becomes a wage earner and taxpayer and defrays some of his support costs.

ii. OBJECTIVE

The objective of this contract is to provide community based services for Federal offenders. These services shall include programs designed to assist offenders in becoming law-abiding, self-sufficient, contributing members of the community, as specifically set forth in this Statement of Work.

iii. EXPLANATION OF TERMS

A. Community Treatment Center (CTC): The facility in which the Contractor's programs are operated also referred to as "facility", center, halfway house or CTC.

B. Contractor: The entity which provides the services described in this Statement of Work.

C. Community Programs Manager (CPM): An employee of the Federal Prison System responsible for developing contract resources and monitoring contract compliance.

D. U.S. Probation Officer (USPO): An officer of the Federal Court System who is responsible for supervising Federal offenders placed on probation by the Federal courts. These officers also supervise mandatory releasees and those released on parole by the U.S. Parole Commission.
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E. Types of Commitments:

1. Transfers from Federal Correctional Institutions. These offenders are serving the confinement portion of their sentence in the Federal Institution and are finishing the last portion of this sentence in the Community Treatment Center.

2. Direct Court Commitments. These offenders are sentenced and sent directly from court to the CTC to serve all of the confinement portion of their sentence.

3. Persons Under Supervision (Public Law Cases). These offenders are not serving a sentence of confinement but rather are receiving supervision by a U.S. Probation Officer.

   a. Probationers (18 U.S. Code 3651). A statute which allows a Federal judge to order that a convicted Federal offender be placed on probation with the condition that he reside in or participate in the program of a residential community treatment center, provided that the U.S. Attorney General certifies that adequate treatment facilities, personnel and programs are available.

   b. Parolees and Mandatory Releasees (18 U.S. Code 4209). This statute provides that the U.S. Parole Commission may, as a condition of release, require a Federal parolee or mandatory releasee to reside in or participate in the program of a residential community treatment center for all or part of the remainder of his original sentence.

   c. Offenders sentenced under Sections 3651 and 4209 are under the direct supervision of the U.S. Probation Officer. The Federal Prison System assumes payment for board and room for these residents in contract facilities.

4. Pre-Trial Services (18 U.S. Code 3146). A Federal statute providing for the release of defendants, prior to trial, except for those charged with certain serious offenses. Included is the option for the court to designate a contract community residential center for the programming and housing of these cases. The U.S. Probation Office retains supervisory authority, and payment for such housing and programming is assumed by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

iv. SCOPE OF WORK

The Contractor shall furnish the necessary facilities, equipment and personnel to provide for the safekeeping, care and assistance of persons residing in centers as required below. This Contract requires the Contractors to operate a system of records as identified elsewhere in the Statement of Work.
II. REQUIREMENTS

Chapter 1. ADMINISTRATION

A. It is the Contractor's responsibility to maintain documentation proving that provisions in this Statement of Work are being met.

B. The Contractor shall have an up-to-date written manual which shall be available to, and reviewed by, staff and which describes the purpose, philosophy, programs, services and policy of the facility for all elements of work contained herein. The Contractor must operate according to this manual.

C. The Contractor shall attend and participate in meetings sponsored by Bureau of Prisons staff and other Contractors for the purpose of technical overview of performance under contract, including programs performed under contract, problems encountered and recommendations for contract performance improvement.

D. No resident shall have the authority to supervise other residents.

E. The use of physical force shall be resorted to only in instances of justifiable self-defense, prevention of loss or damage to property, or the prevention of self-inflicted harm, and only to the degree necessary. Safety of residents and staff will be given highest priority in such policy.

F. The Contractor shall conduct searches of the facility, and personal belongings of the resident as needed but at a minimum of once a month. The resident may be pat searched or strip searched by a staff member of the same sex for good cause.

G. The Contractor shall ensure that when co-correctational facilities are provided under this contract, sleeping areas shall be appropriately separated by sex. Also appropriate procedures shall be established for use of toilet facilities if separate facilities are not available.
Chapter 2. PERSONNEL

A. The Contractor shall have adequately trained and physically able, paid staff on the premises to provide twenty-four hour coverage, seven days a week. The number of staff will depend on physical plant and population. Volunteers may be used at the discretion of the Government.

B. The Contractor shall maintain written job descriptions which accurately describe current duties for all positions performing services under this contract. The job descriptions shall be given to each employee.

C. The Contractor shall identify and establish minimum employment qualifications for all staff performing services under this contract.

D. The staffing pattern of the facility shall concentrate counseling staff when most residents are available at the facility.

E. Standards of Employee Conduct. Standards shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

   (1) Contractor staff shall not display favoritism or preferential treatment of one resident, or group of residents, over another.

   (2) No Contractor employee may deal with any resident except in a relationship that will support the approved goals of the center program. Specifically, staff members must never accept for themselves or any member of their family, any personal (tangible or non-tangible) gift, favor or service, from a resident or from any resident's family or close associate, no matter how trivial the gift or service may seem. All staff are required to report to the center director any violation or attempted violation of these restrictions. In addition, no staff shall give any gifts, favors or services to residents, their families or close associates.

   (3) No Contractor employee shall enter into any business relationship with Federal residents or their families (e.g., selling, buying or trading personal property).

   (4) No Contractor employee shall have any outside contact (other than incidental contact) with a resident, his family or close associates, except for those activities which are an approved, integral part of the center program and a part of the employee's job description.

   (5) Contractor employees are forbidden to engage in any conduct which is criminal in nature or which would bring discredit upon the Contractor.

   (6) Any violation or attempted violation of the restrictions referred to in this section on Employee Conduct will be closely scrutinized. Any failure to report a violation or take appropriate disciplinary action against the offending party or parties may subject the Contractor to appropriate action, up to and including termination of the contract.

   (7) The Contractor shall notify his employees of the Standards of Employee Conduct and document this notification.
Chapter 3. FACILITY

A. The Contractor shall conform to all applicable zoning ordinances, laws and codes; and local building, sanitation, health, and fire codes.

B. The Contractor shall have documentation confirming adherence to local laws, ordinances, and codes, where applicable; or shall document non-applicability.

C. The facility shall be located in an area where the distance to the general area of work is less than one and a half hours each way from center to place of employment/education. The facility shall also be located within one mile of public transportation, or the Contractor shall provide other means of transportation to and from resident's place of employment/education.

D. Sleeping quarters shall be well-lighted and ventilated.
   (1) Each resident shall be supplied with bed, mattress and space for storage of personal articles. (See Chapter 4, Section F)
   (2) Upon arrival, each resident shall be supplied with at least one complete set of appropriate bed linen and towels. The Contractor shall ensure that these items are exchanged or washed at least weekly.

E. The Contractor shall provide and designate space to meet program requirements.

F. The Contractor shall provide toilets, wash basins and bathing facilities within the facility.
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Chapter 4. SAFETY AND SANITATION

A. The Contractor shall have written emergency and evacuation plans, including
  diagrammed plans for evacuation, covering such emergencies as fire, natural
  disaster or severe weather. The plans shall be communicated to each new
  resident upon arrival. The plans also shall be posted in conspicuous locations
  in the facility. Evacuation drills will be conducted and documented at least
  quarterly when a representative number of residents are available. All
  agency personnel are to be trained in the implementation of the emergency
  plans. These plans shall be reviewed at least annually, and updated if
  needed.

B. The Contractor is required to meet fire safety requirements as defined by a
  representative of the Federal Prison System or their consultant in addition to
  local fire codes.

C. The Contractor's facility shall have:

(1) At least two means of exit from every floor level.
(2) Smoke detectors on every floor, located so as to provide complete,
    prompt coverage.
(3) Illuminated exit signs and egress route with electric power and battery-
    powered stand-by emergency lighting.
(4) Portable fire extinguishers, appropriately classed and rated and located
    throughout the facility (i.e., rule of thumb is 2A rated, Class A
    extinguisher per 6,000 square feet for light hazard occupancy with a
    maximum travel distance of 75 feet to an extinguisher).

D. Hazardous materials such as paint, adhesives, thinners, etc., shall be stored
  in metal containers away from sleeping areas, stairwells, exits, kitchens
  furnaces, etc.

E. The Contractor shall arrange for fire inspections and testing of equipment by
  a fire equipment representative at least semi-annually.

F. Mattresses and pillows acquired after the inception of the contract may not
  contain polyurethane or polystrene.

G. The Contractor shall ensure that the facility and surrounding outside areas
  are kept in a clean and sanitary condition at all times. Hallways, stairs, and
  exits shall be kept clear at all times.
Chapter 5. PROGRAMS

A. Resources

(1) The Contractor shall develop and utilize a network of community resources and services, including referrals to other Federal, state and community agencies in an attempt to fulfill each resident's specific needs and goals.

(2) The Contractor's programs shall include individual counseling relative to the search for gainful employment, job training, academic and vocational opportunities, adjustment on the job, money management skills, re-establishment of family ties, center behavior, substance abuse, and community adjustment. The Contractor shall provide opportunities for resident participation in recreational, religious and other programs.

(3) As indicated by the individual's need(s), the Contractor shall provide or arrange for employment assistance, maintenance of employment, savings program, group counseling, carefully planned community living arrangements which will meet the needs of the individual and his/her family after release, access to and use of supportive community resources which can be utilized after release, and placement in educational and/or training programs.

(4) When the Contractor uses citizen volunteers in the programs, they shall be screened as to their background suitability for such work and shall receive orientation, training and supervision from the Contractor. The CPM will approve the procedure used to select and train volunteers.

B. Intake

There are several sources of referrals. They are: transfer from a Federal Institution; direct commitment from Court; U.S. Probation Officer referrals (probationer, mandatory releasee or paroled); and Pre-Trial Agency referral. All sources must go through the Community Programs Manager, and the Contractor shall consider Federal referrals only from the Community Programs Manager.

(1) Contract centers shall specify their criteria for accepting/rejecting the referral. Should the referral be unacceptable, notification shall be made in writing to the CPM citing the specific reasons for the denial.

(2) Contractor and/or the CPM shall establish the transfer reporting date on which the individual is to report to the center. Notification shall be in writing to the CPM, with a copy to the referring institution if the potential resident is in a Federal Institution.
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(3) The Contractor shall have explicit, typed center rules and regulations which shall be sent directly to an accepted resident prior to his transfer from a Federal Institution. The Contractor shall give the center rules to the offender committed directly, at the time of intake, and the latter shall sign a form indicating receipt.

(4) As soon as the individual arrives, the Contractor shall notify the referring institution, CPM and appropriate USPO. The Contractor shall sign and return the Transfer Order (Return of Service) to the CPM. For persons under the supervision of the U.S. Probation Officer, notification shall be sent to the CPM, USPO, and appropriate regional office of the U.S. Parole Commission.

(5) Judgment and Commitment: The Contractor must execute the Judgment and Commitment for inmates committed directly from court to serve a sentence, when the inmate voluntarily surrenders. Staff must sign the original and return it to the U.S. Marshal of the sentencing district; plus sign and send a copy to the CPM, with the date the original was forwarded to the USMS.

(6) Failure to Arrive - See Escapes (Chapter 9, p. 1) in this Scope of Work.

(7) The Contractor shall photograph each offender admitted to the center and retain the photograph in the resident file.

(8) Fingerprints: Fingerprints are required for identification purposes. Instructions vary according to type of commitment, as follows:

(a) Transfers from Federal Institutions: Upon arrival, have right thumb print taken, entering the print on BP-Record-73 if available from the institution and send to the CPM.

(b) Direct Court Commitments and Persons Under Supervision: Upon arrival, have a full set of prints taken and keep at center. Compare Direct Court Commitment prints with one on U.S. Marshals Form 73, if available.

Centers operated by state correctional or parole agencies should forward FD-249 to the FBI in accordance with their own practices.

(c) Contractor staff must accompany residents when prints are taken. Contractor staff shall contact the CPM to assist in arranging for fingerprints.

(9) The Contractor shall gather the following information on each resident at intake: name, home address; date of birth; race; sex; whom to notify in case of emergency; special medication problems or needs; personal physician, if any; and legal status including jurisdiction, length and conditions of commitment. This information shall be placed in the front of the resident's file to facilitate easy access by staff.
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(10) If the Contractor requires that all residents pay appropriate and reasonable costs incident to confinement, and the Contractor is authorized by the Government to collect subsistence, agreement forms shall be forwarded to the prospective resident prior to his transfer.

The offender must sign the agreement prior to the transfer from the institution, or if he is committed directly to the facility, the Contractor shall obtain the resident's signature on the form during intake. Any waivers for individual residents in such a program must be documented and justified.

(11) Demonstration of confidentiality of case records is essential. Applicable state and Federal procedures and guidelines must be adhered to. In order to release information to employers, etc., a release must be obtained from the resident. A standard release form is shown below. If the offender is transferred from a Federal institution, a release form should already be in the file, signed by the inmate. If a form is not on file, one shall be obtained by center staff.

Contractors may use their own form as long as it meets the basic requirements.

CONSENT TO RELEASE OF INFORMATION

[Signature]

Register Number

Department of Justice and employees of any facility contracting with the Department of Justice to release any or all of the contents of information in my Inmate Central File to educational facilities, social agencies, prospective employers, etc., for the purpose of assisting in all phases of community programming and release planning. I also authorize the above persons to advise prospective employers that I am currently in the custody of the U.S. Attorney General serving sentence / under supervision of U.S. Parole Commission or U.S. Probation Office /.

This consent will remain in effect until my release from supervision or until revoked in writing by me.

Witness' Signature

Resident's Signature

Date

Date

C. Individual Program Planning and Progress

(1) During the first week the Contractor shall design an Individual program plan with/and for each resident which includes performance of expected behavior and accomplishments, and a time schedule for achievement. The plan shall include increasing opportunities and privileges with family and in community activities, emphasizing decreasing levels of supervision and increasing levels of resident responsibility. The program plan shall be signed by staff and resident.
(2) Resident progress shall be reviewed weekly by the Contractor, either through staff meetings or by individual staff. The outcome of each review will be documented in the resident's file and signed by staff and resident.
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D. Employment

(1) The Contractor shall develop meaningful resident employment opportunities by staff contact with prospective employers, liaison with community placement services and development of related supportive resources. Meaningful employment means the matching of jobs to resident needs, aptitudes, desires and capabilities.

(2) Contractor staff shall prepare the resident for job hunting. This shall include counseling on how to conduct themselves in an interview, exploration and assessments of the individual resident's skills, and interests and economic needs that will influence the type of employment that will be suitable.

(3) Contractor staff shall assist each resident in job placement to the extent needed. This may include helping him search for a job, going with him to the interview, etc.

(4) The Contractor shall approve each resident's employment and will ensure that all employers are aware of the resident's legal status.

(5) The Contractor shall contact each resident's employer a minimum of once per week the first 30 days of employment, and thereafter no less than once a month depending on need. The Contractor will discuss the resident's job performance. A staff member shall visit the resident at his job site at least once. These contacts will be documented and placed in the inmate's file. The Contractor shall require the resident to obtain permission from the staff of the facility prior to making any changes in employment.

(6) Certain major sanctions will initially have impact on the resident's ability to perform his work, but restriction from work, in and of itself, may not be used as a punishment.
E. Residence Development. The Contractor shall provide assistance to residents in obtaining housing/residence suitable for release purposes. Residence suitability is to be verified by the Contractor through an on-site visit and the address is to be submitted to the USPO for approval as a release residence. (See Chapter 8, p. 1.)

F. Drugs/Alcohol

(1) The Contractor staff shall contact the U.S. Probation Officer, or designee, at least two weeks prior to the resident's arrival from an institution, to set up a program planning conference concerning drug counseling for sentenced residents with a condition of drug aftercare upon release. That conference shall be held within a week of the inmate's arrival and the client will be a part of the conference.

At that time, plans will be made for counseling services. All of the residents with a condition of drug aftercare will receive drug aftercare services from the U.S. Probation Service once they are released from the center. Therefore, if at all possible, the resident should receive counseling from the same agency and individual while the resident is in the center as will be provided upon release under supervision. An exception will be when specialized drug counseling services are a part of the CTC program.

(2) If the Contractor has specialized counseling as an integral part of his/her program at least thirty minutes counseling shall be provided weekly to sentenced residents who have alcohol or drug aftercare as a condition of their release. This shall be in lieu of a above.

(3) Counseling shall be provided by a professional counselor, having an advanced degree in behavioral sciences, preferably in the area of psychology or social work or rehabilitative counseling, or a person with a Bachelor's degree and at least two years of drug treatment experience or training. Paraprofessionals with appropriate training and experience may be utilized, provided they are under the direct supervision of a professional counselor.

(4) When such counseling is to be conducted by someone other than the Contractor, center staff shall contact the CPM for approval of the plan, including the number and length of counseling sessions per month.

(5) Center staff shall document the date and time of each counseling session for the resident's file. If counseling is conducted by the Contractor, the counselor shall keep notes of the sessions and summarize them each month for inclusion in resident's file.

(6) The Contractor shall specify the method of urine collection and make arrangements to obtain urine samples as follows:

NOTE: The government has a contract for urine testing.
(a) All sentenced residents with a condition of drug aftercare, known history of drug abuse, or suspected of illegal use of drugs, shall provide urine samples at a minimum of six times per month, three of which will be on an unscheduled basis.

(b) The Contractor shall establish a schedule for random urine collection for all other sentenced residents (those not included in (1) above). Samples shall be collected from at least one of every ten residents. Testing in greater numbers must be approved by the CPM. The resident(s) selected for random testing shall be tested only once in that particular month. These tests shall always be conducted on a "surprise", unscheduled basis.

(c) Urine samples shall be collected in an approved container. Collection must be witnessed by Contractor-authorized personnel, who must be of the same sex as the resident contributing the sample. As soon as the sample has been collected, the witness shall secure the specimen for drug testing, placing it in a locked container. The Contractor shall establish a procedure for chain of custody from the point of collection until it is mailed to the lab. Residents will not be involved in collecting, recording, mailing or processing the test results under any circumstances, nor shall any unauthorized persons have access to the specimens.

(d) Stalls. A stall is the failure of any resident to produce a urine sample for testing within two hours of a request. A stall may be a basis for a disciplinary report. To eliminate the possibility of diluted or adulterated samples, staff shall keep the resident under direct supervision during the two-hour period. Drinking and ingestion of medication should be limited to essentials during that period.

(e) Positive Tests. A sample is positive when a urinalysis shows the presence of a controlled substance or its metabolite. Conversely, a sample is negative when a urinalysis shows the absence of controlled substances or metabolites.

CTC staff shall thoroughly investigate each positive urine test result to validate the positive finding. The Contractor shall immediately report all unauthorized positive test results to the CPM. Positive tests without sufficient justification shall be the basis for a disciplinary hearing, see Chapter 5, Section K.

(7) When persons under supervision of the U.S. Probation System, (probationers, parolees, mandatory releases) or pre-trial individuals are placed in a center, and are required to participate in drug aftercare, these services will be the administrative and fiscal responsibility of the local U.S. Probation Office.
Authorized Absences. The Contractor shall only authorize a resident to leave the facility on pass as provided in Section H; on a furlough, as provided in Section I; on live-out as provided in Section J; or the resident may be at his place of employment/education or seeking employment/education; or in transit between the center and employment/education.

H. Passes

(1) A pass is a type of furlough authorized by Title 18, U.S. Code Section 4082, and is granted on a less formal basis than outlined in Section I. The Contractor shall grant passes as a viable part of the total reintegration process of the resident. A pass is limited to the local community (up to 50 mile radius).

(2) Approved passes shall begin only after the resident's return to the center after work on Friday and may extend to curfew on Sunday. However, an extended pass may be approved for a long weekend where a legal holiday falls on the preceding Friday or the following Monday. *

(3) The Contractor shall ensure that the pass (See Attachment G) is completed and signed by the resident. *

(4) Passes, if recommended, must be recommended by a paid staff member and must be signed by the Center Director. *

(5) A record must be maintained of who approved/denied the pass and justification for the action must be documented. *

I. Furloughs

(1) A furlough is an authorized absence from the facility for a sentenced offender (18 U.S. Code 4082). Furloughs generally range from three (3) to seven (7) days in length and may be to the immediate area or outside the area (within the U.S.). The Contractor shall consider each furlough request in light of the following reasons, specified by Federal statutes:

(a) To respond to specific family crisis/emergencies, and/or urgent offender needs;

(b) To obtain necessary medical/dental treatment which is not otherwise available;

(c) To participate in completion of release plans, including interviews with prospective employers, school enrollment and obtaining housing;
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(d) To participate in special courses of training of thirty (30) calendar days or less when daily commuting from the facility is not feasible;

(e) To participate in family and selected community educational, social, civic, and religious activities or to reestablish family or community ties;

(f) For transfer to another correctional facility; and

(g) To comply with the legal process of a court or competent jurisdiction, whether state or Federal.

(2) The Contractor shall contact the U.S. Probation Officer(s) in the appropriate jurisdiction(s) to determine if there are any objections to the furlough.

(3) The Contractor will ensure that the Furlough Application Approval and Record Form is completed and signed by the resident. He shall forward the form along with details on the furlough and his recommendation for furlough to the CPM for approval. Forms shall be obtained from the CPM.

(4) Failure of the resident to remain within the extended limits of the authorized furlough or to return to the center within the time prescribed shall be deemed an escape. The Contractor shall report the escape as indicated in the Section on Escapes (Chapter 9, p. 1).

(5) The Contractor shall reserve a bed for any resident on furlough.
Live-Out

(1) Live-out is a selective procedure which is used discriminately according to an individual resident's program needs. It is a time of testing and improving the abilities of residents to assume their post release responsibilities. Live-out is a type of furlough whereby the sentenced resident is authorized to live in his approved release residence. Live-out shall not begin prior to the last thirty days of the resident's formal release date.

(2) Since live-out represents the final step of release planning, it is essential that the USPO be involved in the live-out decisions regarding residents who will be released under supervision.

As soon as the Contractor makes a preliminary determination that live-out may be in order for the resident, the Contractor shall contact the U.S. Probation Officer (if the resident is a prospective parolee or mandatory releasee) to discuss the plan developed by staff and resident together. The Contractor shall commit the final detailed plan in writing.

(3) The Contractor shall verify the suitability of the live-out residence including the resident's ability to pay costs attendant to said residence.

(4) The Contractor shall write the CPM detailing the plan and the reasons for it, and requesting approval of the plan. Any change in the plan shall also be approved by the CPM.

(5) Each resident approved for live-out (prior to entering live-out status) shall be instructed by the Contractor regarding his obligations and responsibilities. In addition, each resident shall sign a statement which includes the following:

"I have been informed that live-out is an extension of confinement. I am aware that I am still under the custody of the U.S. Attorney General, and failure to report as required will be considered a violation of this agreement."

(6) The Contractor shall establish a definite written contact with the live-out resident. It must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

(a) The live-out resident shall telephone the facility on each day (before or after work). He is not scheduled to report physically to the center.

(b) A staff member shall visit the live-out resident in his or her home or at the job site once every two weeks.
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(c) The live-out resident shall return to the center at least twice weekly for one or more of the following scheduled programs; group/individual counseling, problem solving, and special conferences scheduled with the resident.

(d) The Contractor shall further verify that the resident is following the program specified in the approved detailed plan via telephone calls each week.

(7) The Contractor shall maintain a log of all staff contacts with each resident on live-out status. The log shall contain a separate sheet for each resident and shall include the following: (1) Name of resident; (2) Name and title of staff who made the contact; (3) Date and time of contact, and whether the contact was made by phone or in person; and (4) A short narrative report on the contact.

(8) Misconduct or failure to comply with the rules established for live-out may result in disciplinary action and/or removal from live-out status. The Contractor shall notify the CPM immediately of any misconduct or failure of a resident to comply with live-out conditions.

(9) Any individual who absconds from live-out status shall be reported in the manner prescribed by the procedures established under Escapes (Chapter 9, p. 1).

(10) The Contractor shall not reserve a bed for residents on live-out.
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K. Discipline

(1) Procedures Upon Admission to Center. The Contractor shall furnish each new resident upon arrival with a copy of Prohibited Acts imposed by the Federal Prison System, (Attachment A, Prohibited Acts); those imposed by the center itself; types of disciplinary action which may be taken; and the disciplinary system within the center and time limits thereof. The Contractor shall also provide each new resident a copy of the established rules of the facility. Copies of these documents shall be posted at a prominent location, accessible to all residents. The resident file shall contain a signed receipt stating that the resident has received a copy of, and understands, the contents of said documents.

(2) Types of Disciplinary Actions. There is a wide range of sanctions that a Contractor may impose for violation of center rules. The majority of these are minor in nature, such as reprimand, loss of T.V., or other privileges, or restriction to quarters. They require no special due process and shall be handled according to Contractor policy. The Contractor shall provide the CPM with a list of agreed upon minor sanctions that the Contractor may impose. Any changes in this list shall be approved by the CPM.

A recommendation for one or more of the major sanctions listed below requires a formal disciplinary hearing before the Center Disciplinary Committee (CDC) which follows the procedures described in this section. It also requires that one of the major prohibited acts, listed in "Prohibited Acts" (Attachment A) has been alleged to have been committed. Not all prohibited acts in Attachment A are sufficiently serious to support a major sanction. Those acts marked with an asterisk are considered so minor in nature that they will not support recommending a major sanction.

(a) Parole date revision or retardation. The center may make recommendations for parole revision or retardation.

(b) Forfeiture of Good Time (FGT). The center may make recommendations to the CPM for forfeiture of good time. Call the CPM regarding FGT available for forfeiture for the specified violation.

(c) Disciplinary Transfer. The center may make a recommendation to the CPM for transfer of a resident (See Para. 3 (b) & (c)).

(3) Procedures Related to Recommending Disciplinary Action where Major Sanctions are Involved.

(a) Informal resolution of incidents involving an infraction is preferred and shall always be considered prior to taking formal disciplinary action. Informal resolution may involve imposition of any sanction except major sanctions.
(b) Persons under supervision (i.e., probationers, parolees, and mandatory releasees) and pre-trial residents are subject to center rules and minor sanctions. However, if an act is alleged to have been committed by a resident under supervision which would require a recommendation of a major sanction, a formal disciplinary hearing is not required. Rather, center staff shall forward reports of such misconduct to the appropriate agency (U.S. Probation Office or U.S. Parole Commission) for disposition which that agency considers appropriate. The original of the disciplinary hearing materials shall be forwarded to the USPO. A copy of the report shall also be forwarded to the CPM.

(c) When informal resolution is not possible and disciplinary action is required, the center staff must decide whether the resident can remain at the center pending the hearing. If the center staff believes the resident (other than a person under supervision) may abscond prior to the hearing, or if he is thought to constitute a threat to himself, staff or center residents, the center may request the U.S. Marshal to escort the resident to the local detention center (jail) pending the hearing. The hearing shall be held in the detention center. The CPM shall be advised of any transfer immediately, and whenever possible, in advance of the move. This does not apply to persons under supervision. In emergency situations, the USPO and/or local law enforcement personnel may be contacted.

(d) A formal hearing will be held where informal resolution is not considered appropriate or adequate. The resident has a right to be present at the hearing except during deliberations of the Committee or when security would be jeopardized. Reasons for the exclusion of the resident must be documented. When a resident escapes or is otherwise absent from the center without staff permission (e.g., when resident is arrested by local authorities), the Committee shall conduct a hearing, in the resident’s absence. If the resident is held locally by state or local authorities, the hearing may be held at that facility. In the case of an absentia hearing, the charges will be reheard at the facility to which the inmate is designated after return to custody.

(e) The incident with which the resident is charged must be one of the prohibited acts listed in Attachment A. The Center employee shall immediately complete Part I of the Incident Report (Attachment B). The description of the incident shall contain the details of the activity being reported. Relevant facts about the incident which are known shall be recorded. An example of information which may not be recorded on the incident report nor given to the inmate, but which may be provided to the discipline committee in the form of a confidential memorandum, is
"Informant" information that if released could result in harm. If there is anything unusual about the resident's behavior, this shall be noted. The reporting employee will list any staff, resident, or other witnesses to the incident, and the disposition of any physical evidence (e.g., weapon or property) which the employee may have personally handled.

The reporting employee will sign the report and indicate his title in the appropriate blocks. The date and time of the report being signed is also to be entered.

(f) The Incident Report shall ordinarily be completed by the staff member who witnessed the incident, or who first came on the scene. However, the charge may also be taken from a police report, FBI report, DEA report, etc., in which case, the relevant information shall be transferred to the Incident Report Form. When this occurs, the charge may be translated into terms of the center's "Prohibited Acts" (e.g., No. 15 - Possession or Use of Narcotics), or the resident may be charged with Prohibited Act 8/41 - "Violation of a law while in the Community."

(g) The completed Part I of the Incident Report shall be delivered to the resident involved within 24 hours of the time staff becomes aware of the resident's involvement in the incident. The staff member delivering the Incident Report shall note on the report the date and time the resident received the report. The investigation shall be ordinarily completed within 24 hours from the time Part I is delivered to the resident. Time limits here as elsewhere may be extended for good cause, such as absences of the resident or medical condition, but reasons must be documented.

(h) A copy of the statement "Resident Rights At Center Discipline Committee Hearing" (Attachment C) shall be presented to the resident at the time he is given a copy of Incident Report. The Rights form shall be signed and dated by both the resident and the employee and the date of delivery to the resident recorded.

(i) The Incident Report shall also be delivered to the head of the center who shall appoint an investigator. The reporting of the offense and the investigation of the offense must be independent. Therefore, the investigating staff member shall ordinarily be someone other than the reporting staff member. The only exception is when the incident is simply "lifted" from a police report; in such cases the reporting officer only exercises a clerical function in transcribing the incident, and therefore may also be the investigating officer.

(j) The Investigator shall complete Part II of Incident Report (Attachment B), recording all steps and actions taken. This is not given to the resident.
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(k) The resident, witnesses, and members of the committee shall be advised of the date, time and place of hearing at least 24 hours in advance of the hearing, via Attachment D, "Notice of Center Disciplinary Committee Hearing," which shall be completed by staff and resident. The 24 hour notice may be waived by the resident. In such a case, Attachment C shall be completed.

(l) The disciplinary hearing shall ordinarily be held within 48 hours after the investigation is completed, excluding weekends and holidays.

(m) Each center shall establish a single Center Discipline Committee (CDC). The committee may be composed of one or more individuals, appointed by the Director of the center. Committee member(s) may include center staff (including part-time staff), a U.S. Probation Officer, a Deputy U.S. Marshal, or any other appropriate official (e.g., state or local law enforcement officer). No member of the committee shall have been involved in any significant way in the alleged infraction. The committee shall not include the reporting officer or investigating officer.

(n) The resident shall be permitted to have a staff representative at the disciplinary hearing. The staff representative shall be given a copy of Attachment F, "Duties of Staff Representatives." The resident does not have a right to a lawyer at the hearing.

(o) The resident or his representative shall be permitted to call witnesses from inside or outside the center, where their presence at the hearing would not pose a serious threat to the security of the center. The resident shall not be permitted to question a witness. This is to be done by the staff representative or the Committee. The reporting officer and other adverse witnesses need not be called if their knowledge of the incident is adequately summarized in the Incident Report or other material supplied to the Committee. Witnesses whose testimony would be repetitious or irrelevant need not be called; written statements of unavailable witnesses will be accepted in place of "live" testimony. However, there must be good reason for failure to call a witness in person, and the reason shall be documented.

(p) The resident has the right to make a statement and present documentary evidence in his own behalf.

(q) The Committee shall review the evidence and (a) find that the resident either did or did not commit the prohibited act(s) charged in the Incident Report, or a similar act for which the resident has received adequate notice; and (b) shall determine what sanction(s), if any, is to be recommended to the CPM.
If it is determined after a hearing that only a minor sanction is appropriate, this shall be imposed by center staff and materials forwarded to the CPM for information purposes.

(r) If the committee finds that a prohibited act was committed, the committee chairman shall complete the CDC Report, Attachment E. A verbatim record is not required. The evidence relied upon, the decision, and the reasons for the recommendations shall be written out in specific terms, unless doing so would jeopardize center or individual security. Under "evidence relied upon," there must be reference to the specific facts the CDC relied upon and not mere reference to the report that contains those facts. These are essential items required by the Supreme Court in Wolff v. McDonnell. A copy of the CDC Report (Attachment E) shall be given to the inmate. (Part II of the Incident Report will not be given to inmate.)

(s) Immediately after the hearing, center staff shall forward all original documentation related to the proceedings to the CPM. In the case of recommended parole sanctions, the CPM, after review, shall immediately forward the copy of the materials to the Regional U.S. Parole Commission. IDC materials on any resident with a parole must be forwarded by the CPM to the U.S. Parole Commission.

(t) In the event the Committee finds that no prohibited act was committed, or if the finding that the resident committed the act is overturned on appeal, the material shall be expunged by staff. The requirement for expunging the disciplinary hearing material does not preclude maintaining for research purposes copies of disciplinary actions resulting in "not guilty" findings in a master file separate from the resident's central file. However, this material may not be used in a manner which would adversely affect the resident.

(u) At the time the resident is advised of the disciplinary action, he shall also be advised that he may contest the decision by writing to the Regional Director within 30 calendar days from the date the disciplinary action is imposed. If the resident is to be transferred to a federal institution, then the staff should advise the resident to use the Administrative Remedy procedure and file his complaint with the warden.
L. Driving

(1) If the Contractor wishes to approve driving privileges for the resident, he shall seek authorization from the CPM, subject to the following conditions:

(a) That the driving privilege is needed by the resident to go to and from work, training, school or staff approved social or family activities. The resident may not drive for any other purpose.

(b) That other transportation is unavailable or, in the judgment of the Contractor, is unsuitable.

(c) That the resident has provided proof of valid insurance, driver's license, vehicle licensing and registration to the CPM via the Contractor. The Contractor shall maintain copies of these documents except for the driver's license, which may not be copied. The Contractor shall record the driver's license number and expiration date in the client's file. If the Contractor sees a need to check the resident's driving record, he should contact the CPM for assistance.

(d) If the vehicle to be used is the property of some person other than the resident, Contractor must have verified proof (e.g., copy of documents) of valid insurance, vehicle licensing and registration for the car and a signed authorization to use the vehicle must be obtained from the legal owner.

(2) The Contractor shall maintain the license number and a description of the vehicle on file.

M. Marriage

The Contractor shall refer a resident's request for marriage to the CPM, with Contractor's recommendations, for residents serving sentence. All other marriage requests shall be forwarded to the USPO.
Chapter 6. SERVICES

A. Food Services

The Contractor shall provide for the feeding of residents either by Contractor preparation and serving in the facility; resident preparation of food provided by Contractor, or through arrangements with a local restaurant. When food service is provided at the Contractor facility, the Contractor shall make arrangements for diets required by a physician and provisions for meals for those residents who work odd hours and are not available at meal time.

(1) Contractor prepared meals shall include reasonable selection of items from the five basic food groups per day, which are: milk; meat; vegetable and fruit; bread and cereal; and fats and sweets. When the resident's program requires a sack lunch, these lunches shall be nutritious and have variety and balance. The Contractor shall prepare menus at least a week in advance. The Contractor shall provide that a registered dietitian or physician annually approves the nutritional value of a fixed menu and semi-annually if menu is not fixed. This shall be documented. Copies of menus shall be maintained by the Contractor for three months.

(2) When the Contractor provides food services in the facility, all persons preparing food shall comply with applicable Federal, state and/or local health laws and regulations.

(3) At a minimum, the Contractor shall comply with the following standards as taken from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) Publication #FDA 78-2081 of 1976 and entitled, "Food Service Sanitation Manual."

- (a) Food shall be in sound condition, free from spoilage, filth, or other contamination and shall be safe for human consumption. Food shall be obtained from sources that comply with all laws relating to food and food labeling.

- (b) Food containers shall not be stored under exposed or unprotected sewer lines or water lines, except automatic fire protection sprinkler heads that may be required by law. The storage of food in toilet rooms or vestibules is prohibited.

- (c) Potentially hazardous food shall be kept at an internal temperature of 45°F or below or at an internal temperature of 140°F or above during display and service, except that rare roast beef shall be held for service at a temperature of at least 130°F.
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(d) No person, while infected with a disease in a communicable form that can be transmitted by foods or who is a carrier of organisms that cause such a disease or while afflicted with a boil, an infected wound, or an acute respiratory infection, shall work in a food service establishment in any capacity in which there is a likelihood of such person contaminating food or food-contact surfaces with pathogenic organisms or transmitting disease to other persons.

(e) Employees shall thoroughly wash their hands and the exposed portions of their arms with soap and warm water before starting work, during work as often as is necessary to keep them clean, and after smoking, eating, drinking, or using the toilet. Employees shall keep their fingernails clean and trimmed. Long hair or beards must be tied up or put in a hairnet.

(f) Tableware shall be washed, rinsed, and sanitized after each use.

(g) Cleaned and sanitized equipment and utensils shall be handled in a way that protects them from contamination. Spoons, knives, and forks shall be touched only by their handles. Cups, glasses, bowls, plates and similar items shall be handled without contact with inside surfaces or surfaces that contact the user's mouth.

(h) Garbage and refuse shall be kept in durable, easily cleanable, insect-proof and rodent-proof containers that do not leak and do not absorb liquids.

(i) Effective measures intended to minimize the presence of rodents, flies, cockroaches, and other insects on the premises shall be utilized. The premises shall be kept in such condition as to prevent the harboring or feeding of insects or rodents.

(4) The Contractor providing meals to residents through arrangements with a local restaurant shall ensure the following:

(a) That the establishment is a full-service restaurant, and

(b) That the establishment has a valid state or local license, certificate or permit, as applicable, to operate, prepare and/or serve food, and meet all state and/or local sanitation and health codes.
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B. Medical Services

(1) The Contractor shall have basic first aid supplies, as provided in the American Red Cross First Aid Manual, on-site at all times.

(2) One staff member on each shift of the center shall be trained in emergency first aid.

(3) Written arrangements shall be made with a licensed general hospital, private physician or clinic to ensure that emergency medical service is available twenty-four (24) hours a day.

(4) Only medical and dental personnel who are appropriately licensed or certified shall prescribe or administer medical and dental care for residents.

(5) The Contractor shall request CPM approval prior to non-emergency medical treatment. In an emergency, the Contractor shall obtain the necessary medical treatment required to conserve the resident's health. The Contractor shall notify the CPM of such treatment as soon as possible.**

(6) In the event an offender is committed to the center via direct court commitment, the Contractor shall ensure that a physical examination of the individual is accomplished within five (5) working days of his arrival at the center. The examination should be a general office physical (comparable to an insurance type physical, i.e., routine laboratory studies - CBC, urinalysis, serological tests for syphilis, chest X-Ray and Tine Test) and shall not require hospitalization to complete the exam. The results of the evaluation shall be appropriately documented and made a part of the resident file, plus a copy shall be sent to the CPM.**

(7) If communicable or debilitating physical problems are suspected, the Contractor will make arrangements for an examination of the resident within twenty-four (24) hours.**

* (8) Medical expenses for persons under supervision of a U.S. Probation Officer shall be the responsibility of the resident. Staff shall assist the resident by identifying available community resources. *

** Contact CPM for billing procedures for medical expenses.
Chapter 7. RECORDS AND REPORTS

PRIVACY ACT NOTIFICATION

This procurement action requires the Contractor to do one or more of the following: design, develop, or operate a system of records on individuals to accomplish an agency function in accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974, Public Law 93-579, December 31, 1974 (5 USC 552a) and applicable agency regulations. Violation of the Act may involve the imposition of criminal penalties.

The above notification applies to the records described in this Section.

A. Procedures for locating and verifying the whereabouts of residents at all times shall be instituted. These procedures shall include separate formal sign in and out log sheets for each resident. Each log sheet shall contain (a) resident's full name and register number, (b) present legal status, (c) time out, destination, purpose and authorized return time, and (d) time in - certified by staffs' signature or initials, with a section for special comments.

B. The Contractor shall maintain a case record for all residents. This record shall include all significant decisions and events relating to that resident, and at a minimum, the following information:

1. Initial intake information form.
2. Case information from referral source, if available.
3. Case history/social history.
4. Medical record, when available.
5. Individual plan or program.
7. Evaluation and progress reports.
9. Rules of residence and disciplinary policy, signed by the resident.
10. Copy of any disciplinary action.
11. Documented legal authority to accept the resident.
12. Referrals to other agencies.
13. Final terminal report.

C. Since resident records are exempt from the disclosure requirements of the Privacy Act, the Contractor shall not release any information other than Contractor generated information from the resident's file to the resident without approval by the CPM. Information shall not be released to any other individual(s) unless a "Consent to Release Information" has been executed (see Chapter 5, Sections A, B, C - p. 3).

1. Upon termination of the resident's program the Contractor shall forward the resident file record to the CPM via certified mail. The Contractor may retain public information which can identify the former resident, copies of research data which have been depersonalized and copies of reports generated by the Contractor.
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(2) The Contractor shall provide appropriate safeguards to minimize the possibility of theft, loss or destruction of resident file records.
- Contractor shall identify staff who have authorized access to resident records.

D. The Urine Sampling Program Report (provided by the CPM) shall be completed and forwarded to the CPM each month, with the monthly billing. A copy shall also be sent to the U.S. Probation Office. Note on the form, that the column "Community Programs" is to be used when reporting on residents with the condition of drug aftercare or those with a history of drug abuse. The other two categories are self-explanatory. Names of residents shall be placed in the left hand column which is labeled "institution". The Urine Sampling Program Reports shall be kept in a separate secure file folder.

E. The Contractor shall keep a separate chronological log for each resident tested under the urine testing program. The log shall include specimen number, resident's name and number, date, staff member, reason for test, results and any extenuating circumstances. These individual logs shall be placed in the resident's file.

F. The Contractor shall maintain a record of the following resident finances: wages and salaries; amount of Federal, local and state tax withheld, and savings.

G. The Contractor shall establish and maintain a system of accountability and method of disposition of resident's personal property to be implemented in the event of a resident's death, escape or transfer. Inventory of resident property must be accomplished by no less than two (2) staff, each of whom must sign the completed inventory list.
Chapter 8. RELEASE PREPARATION

A. Release Plan

For sentenced residents scheduled for release, the Contractor, in concert with the resident, shall establish a formal release plan and execute release certificates as appropriate. Therefore, four to six weeks prior to the release date, the Contractor shall present a release plan for approval as follows:

1. In parole cases - to USPO, with a copy to CPM.
2. In mandatory release cases - to USPO, with copy to CPM.
3. In expiration cases - (although a release plan shall be developed, no government approval is necessary).

This plan shall include the verified specifics of the proposed residence, employment or training program and family situation.

B. If an approved plan cannot be developed by the date of parole, the Contractor must notify the U.S. Parole Commission of the delay immediately. It is probable the date will be advanced. The resident shall not be released until a plan is approved. In the case of Mandatory Release, the resident must be released on that date.

C. See Chapter 11, p. 1, for instructions on releasing persons already under supervision (probationers, etc.).

D. Contractor shall verify the correctness of each resident's release date with the CPM prior to each resident's release. No release date of any federal prisoner shall be retarded, advanced or otherwise changed without approval of a CPM or U.S. Parole Commissioner.

E. Release Certificates

1. In mandatory release cases, the Contractor will execute Mandatory Release Certificates (which will be partially completed by the referring institution).
2. In parole cases, after the USPO has formally accepted the proposed release plan, the Contractor shall request parole certificates from the appropriate regional office of the U.S. Parole Commission, with a carbon copy of the request to the CPM. The request shall be made at least two weeks in advance of the parole date. The Contractor shall obtain the signature of the parolee on the certificate and execute formal discharge procedures at the direction of the CPM.
3. There are no release certificates on expiration cases, unless there is a special parole term to follow release.

F. At release, staff shall make sure the individual understands his status, the condition of any supervision required, and that the resident who will be under supervision of a USPO must report to that office within seventy-two hours after release. The contractor must insure that residents take all their personal property.
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* If there is no period of supervision, the resident of course does not report to the USPO. *

G. Terminal Report

The terminal report shall be completed within two working days of the resident's release and shall include, in addition to the identifying data, a description of the resident's adjustment while under the care of the Contractor, a prognosis for future adjustment, the amount of money in savings and/or contributions to dependents, and his/her release plans, including residence, employment and salary.

H. The Contractor shall complete the following documents and distribute them within two working days of resident's release:

1. Certificates (Parole, Special Parole Term, Mandatory Release):
   Signature of releasee and staff and date.

   Distribution: Original to releasee, copy to appropriate Regional U.S. Parole Commission, appropriate USPO and CPM.


   Distribution: Original to releasee, copy to appropriate U.S. Parole Commission, appropriate USPO, and CPM.

3. Terminal Report

   Distribution: Original to CPM, copy to appropriate U.S. Parole Commission, and appropriate USPO.

4. FBI Wanted-Flash-Cancellation Notice (I-12)

   Distribution: Original to FBI, Washington, D.C., appropriate USPO and CPM.

5. FBI Final Disposition Report (R-84) - on Expiration cases only.

   Distribution: Original to FBI, Washington, D.C., copy to CPM.
Chapter 9. ESCAPES

A. Any center resident who fails to report to the center for admission or willfully absconds, fails to remain at the approved place of employment or training during the hours specified by the terms of the employment or training program, fails to return to center at the time prescribed, or who fails to return from an authorized furlough or pass at the time and place stipulated shall be placed on escape status. In addition, any resident who is arrested while in the center program (or on furlough) for violation of local, county, or state laws may be considered to have escaped, depending on the circumstances.

B. The Contractor shall notify the CPM and the U.S. Marshal’s Office immediately upon identifying a resident as an escapee.

C. If the resident who has absconded is a parolee, mandatory releasee, probationer or pre-trial detainee, see Chapter 11, p. 1.

D. Personal property left behind by an escaped resident shall be considered voluntarily abandoned. Staff shall contact the CPM for instructions. If an inmate is being held in a local jail, however, staff should try and determine the likelihood of early release and be guided accordingly.
Chapter 10. DEATH OF AN OFFENDER

In the event of the death of a resident, the Contractor shall immediately notify the CPM and the USPO and the resident’s family. The center staff shall arrange for a finger-print (right thumb or right index) to be taken, and staff shall date and sign the fingerprint card to ensure that positive identification has been made. The fingerprint card shall then be sent by certified mail to the CPM for inclusion in the Judgment and Commitment file.

If death is due to violence, accident surrounded by unusual or questionable circumstances, or if death is sudden and the deceased has not been under immediate medical supervision, center staff shall call the coroner of the local jurisdiction to review the case, and examine the body if necessary. After autopsy, the body will be turned over to family members or processed for burial in accordance with local law or practice.

Personal property of a deceased resident will be inventoried and forwarded to the person to be notified in case of emergency or to the nearest of kin.
Chapter II
PROBATIONERS, PAROLEES, MANDATORY RELEASEES, AND PRE-TRIAL SERVICES DEFENDANTS

A. U.S. Probation Officers, acting as representatives of the U.S. Parole Commission, are responsible for residents assigned to the Contractor under Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 3651 (Probationers) and Title 18, U.S Code, Section 4209 (Parolees and Mandatory Releasees). Pre-Trial Service Officers, acting as representatives of the U.S. District Courts, are responsible for residents committed under Title 18 U.S. Code Section 3146 (Pre-Trial service defendants).

B. All referrals for CTC placement of the persons described in this Section shall be processed through the CPM.

C. Contractor is responsible for providing all services cited in the Scope of Work, except as follows:

1. Intake. Center staff in cooperation with the USPO or Pre-Trial Services Officer shall develop an individual program plan for each resident.

2. Medical Services. The Contractor shall notify the USPO of medical problems of probationers, parolees, and mandatory releasees. The Contractor shall notify the Pre-Trial Services Officer for pre-trial residents. Medical expenses for persons under supervision of a U.S. Probation Officer or Pre-Trial Services Officer are the responsibility of the resident. Staff should assist the resident in finding appropriate community resources.

3. Unauthorized Absence. The failure of a resident to be at an assigned place at a specific time shall be reported immediately to the USPO or Pre-Trial Services Officer as appropriate, and the CPM.

4. Good Time. Good time is not earned nor forfeited for these residents, as they are not serving a sentence.

5. Driving. Permission to drive must be requested from and approved by the USPO or Pre-Trial Services Officer as appropriate.

6. Release. When the center determines that the resident's program is completed or that participation in the center's program will produce no further significant benefits, the staff shall notify the USPO or the Pre-Trial Services Officer as appropriate, (with a copy to the CPM) who will then make other arrangements for the residence, program and welfare of the releasee. A Terminal Report shall be completed by the Contractor and forwarded to the USPO or Pre-Trial agency, as appropriate, and to the CPM.
APPENDIX C

TABLES
## TABLE 1

**Population Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>White (N)</th>
<th>Non-White (N)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>35 (35)</td>
<td>48 (47)</td>
<td>83 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State furlough</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal pre-released</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>15 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>42 (42)</strong></td>
<td><strong>59 (58)</strong></td>
<td><strong>101 (100)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Non-white clients consisted of fifty-seven black and two hispanic ex-offenders.
TABLE 2

Characteristics of Population Resident Ex-Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>8 (8)</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>17 (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State furlough</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal pre-released</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>15 (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15 (15)</td>
<td>20 (20)</td>
<td>35 (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Resident group comprised thirty-five percent of the total population under study.
TABLE 3

Population - Out-Client Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>29 (29)</td>
<td>37 (36)</td>
<td>66 (65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29 (29)</td>
<td>37 (36)</td>
<td>66 (65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The out-client group comprised sixty-five percent of the population under study.
TABLE 6
Age by Legal Status: Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Parole</th>
<th>State Furlough</th>
<th>Federal Pre-Released</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 (15.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 17 (53) 2 (6) 13 (41) 32 (100)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequencies/%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4 (12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8

Legal Status by Education: Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>0-7 yrs.</th>
<th>8-11 yrs.</th>
<th>GED</th>
<th>13-Up</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
<td>10 (31.25)</td>
<td>4 (12.55)</td>
<td>2 (6.25)</td>
<td>17 (53.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State furlough</td>
<td>1 (3.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.15)</td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal pre-released</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
<td>10 (31.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
<td>14 (43.8)</td>
<td>14 (43.8)</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9

Education - Out-Clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequencies/ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-11 years</td>
<td>8 (24.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate/GED</td>
<td>18 (54.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Up</td>
<td>7 (21.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>33 (100)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10
Days in Program by Resident, Out-Client Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Days in Program</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>31-60</td>
<td>Over 61</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>16 (24.61)</td>
<td>6 (9.23)</td>
<td>10 (15.38)</td>
<td>32 (49.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-clients</td>
<td>26 (40.0)</td>
<td>4 (6.15)</td>
<td>3 (4.62)</td>
<td>33 (50.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42 (64.61)</td>
<td>10 (15.38)</td>
<td>13 (20.0)</td>
<td>65 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 11

**Days Left in Program by Resident, Out-Client Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Days Left In Program</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>31-60</td>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>21 (32.31)</td>
<td>3 (4.61)</td>
<td>8 (12.31)</td>
<td>32 (49.23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-client</td>
<td>30 (46.15)</td>
<td>1 (1.54)</td>
<td>2 (3.08)</td>
<td>33 (50.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>51 (78.46)</td>
<td>4 (6.15)</td>
<td>10 (15.39)</td>
<td>65 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Offense</td>
<td>Legal Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Furlough</td>
<td>Pre-Released</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Forgery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Embezzlement of Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Robbery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gross Sexual Imposition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Child)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Aggravated Robbery/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Breaking and Entering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Homicide/Murder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Possession - Criminal Tool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Drug Trafficking/Pos-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>session Drug Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Possession - Weapon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bank Robbery (Armed or</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (15.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unarmed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gross Sexual Imposition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adult)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mail Theft</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mail Fraud</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Theft - Interstate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Create/Manufacture Narcotics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. TOTAL</td>
<td>17 (53)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>13 (41)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Offense</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Grand Theft</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Forgery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Robbery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aggravated Robbery/ Armed Robbery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Breaking and Entering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Possession - Criminal Tool</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Drug Trafficking/ Possession Drug Documents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Bank Robbery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gross Sexual Imposition (Adult)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Aggravated Burglary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Burglary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Criminal Mischief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 17

**Incarcerations in Correctional Institutions: Parole, State Furlough**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution: Correctional Facility</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orient (state furlough)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ohio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Ohio Training Center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern New Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCI, Asheville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chillicothe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ohio Training Center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCI, Oxford, Wisconsin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGrange, Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 18

Incarcerations in Correctional Institutions:
Federal Pre-Released Prisoners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Correctional Institution</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexington, Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talladega, Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Reno,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terre Haute, Indiana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan, Michigan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantown, West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland, Kentucky</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 (31.2)</td>
<td>16 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 (31.1)</td>
<td>1 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 (37.5)</td>
<td>17 (53.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100) (49.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Race Out-Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 (31.2)</td>
<td>17 (53.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 21
Prison Interests by Race
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Out-Clients</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7 (21.9)</td>
<td>7 (21.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (12.1)</td>
<td>9 (27.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (17.0)</td>
<td>16 (24.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 (18.7)</td>
<td>12 (37.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (18.2)</td>
<td>14 (42.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (18.4)</td>
<td>26 (40.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
<td>23 (69.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 (35.4)</td>
<td>42 (64.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>49.2 (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td>50.8 (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>65 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 23

Participation in Social Programs by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Race Out-Clients</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 (18.7)</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 (21.9)</td>
<td>16 (50.0)</td>
<td>8 (24.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>(49.2)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Out- Clients</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
<td>9 (28.2)</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11 (34.3)</td>
<td>10 (31.2)</td>
<td>8 (24.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>49.2)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 25

Rewards (Same Race) by Race

<p>| Race | Residents | | Out-Clients | | TOTAL | |
|------|-----------| |-----------| |-------| |
|      | White     | Non-White | White     | Non-White | White | Non-White |
| Yes  | 3 (9.4)   | 5 (15.6)  | 1 (3.0)   | 4 (12.1)  | 4 (6.2) | 9 (13.8) |
| No   | 10 (31.2) | 14 (43.8) | 9 (27.3)  | 19 (57.6) | 19 (29.2) | 33 (50.8) |
|      | 13 (40.6) | 19 (59.4) | 10 (30.3) | 23 (69.7) | 23 (35.4) | 42 (64.6) |
| TOTAL| 32 (100)  | (49.2)    | 33 (100)  | (50.8)    | 65 (100) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Out-Clients</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 (6.2)</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>5 (16.6)</td>
<td>3 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 (34.4)</td>
<td>9 (27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (43.8)</td>
<td>20 (60.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>23 (69.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100) (49.2)</td>
<td>33 (100) (50.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 27

Values (Same Race) by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 (28.1)</td>
<td>10 (31.3)</td>
<td>4 (12.1)</td>
<td>13 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (39.4)</td>
<td>23 (35.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 (12.5)</td>
<td>9 (28.1)</td>
<td>6 (18.2)</td>
<td>10 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
<td>19 (29.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
<td>23 (69.7)</td>
<td>23 (35.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42 (64.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>(49.2)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td>(50.8)</td>
<td>65 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Out-Clients</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 (28.1)</td>
<td>9 (28.1)</td>
<td>14 (21.5) 18 (27.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 (12.5)</td>
<td>10 (31.3)</td>
<td>9 (13.9)  24 (36.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>23 (35.4) 42 (64.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td>65 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 29
Superior Competence (Same Race) by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Out-Clients</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 (18.7)</td>
<td>12 (37.5)</td>
<td>8 (24.2)</td>
<td>17 (51.5)</td>
<td>14 (21.5)</td>
<td>29 (44.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 (21.9)</td>
<td>7 (21.9)</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
<td>6 (18.2)</td>
<td>9 (13.9)</td>
<td>13 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
<td>23 (69.7)</td>
<td>23 (35.4)</td>
<td>42 (64.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100) (49.2)</td>
<td>33 (100) (50.8)</td>
<td>65 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 30
Superior Competence (Different Race) by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Out-Clients</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (18.8)</td>
<td>11 (34.4)</td>
<td>8 (24.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 (21.9)</td>
<td>8 (25.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>(49.2)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Out-Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
<td>8 (25.0)</td>
<td>4 (12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 (31.2)</td>
<td>11 (34.4)</td>
<td>6 (18.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td>55 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 32

Contributions (Different Race) by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Out-Clients</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 (6.2%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
<td>4 (12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
<td>6 (18.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 32 (100) (49.2) 33 (100) (50.8) 65 (100)
TABLE 33

Support Opinions (Same Race) by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Out-Clients</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 (28.1)</td>
<td>12 (37.5)</td>
<td>4 (12.1)</td>
<td>11 (33.3)</td>
<td>13 (20.0)</td>
<td>23 (35.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 (12.5)</td>
<td>7 (21.9)</td>
<td>6 (18.2)</td>
<td>12 (36.4)</td>
<td>10 (15.4)</td>
<td>19 (29.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
<td>23 (69.7)</td>
<td>23 (35.4)</td>
<td>42 (64.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL | 32 (100) (49.2) | 33 (100) (50.8) | 65 (100) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Out-Clients</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8 (25.0)</td>
<td>11 (34.4)</td>
<td>4 (12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 (15.6)</td>
<td>8 (25.0)</td>
<td>6 (18.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>19 (59.4)</td>
<td>10 (30.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>49.2)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 35
### Codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>code as is</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>code as is</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State of residence</td>
<td>code (see Table 36)</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Race</td>
<td>(1) white</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Current marital status</td>
<td>(1) never married</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) common law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) divorced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) separated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) widowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of dependents</td>
<td>code as is</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Education</td>
<td>years of education completed</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Occupation</td>
<td>DO NOT CODE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Impairment</td>
<td>(1) physical</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) age (debilitation effects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) personality disorder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Psychological care</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Medication prescribed</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Current treatments</td>
<td>(1) drug</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) alcohol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) psychological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Legal status</td>
<td>(1) parole</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) federal pre-released</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) state furlough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Days in program</td>
<td>code as is</td>
<td>18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Days left in program</td>
<td>code as is</td>
<td>21-23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 35 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Institution</td>
<td>DO NOT CODE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Instant offense(s)</td>
<td>(1) person related</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) non-person related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Type of instant offense(s)</td>
<td>code as is (see Table 37)</td>
<td>25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Number of adult felony</td>
<td>(1) 1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convictions</td>
<td>(2) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) over 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Number of adult felony</td>
<td>(1) 1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incarcerations</td>
<td>(2) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) over 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Number of months incarcerated</td>
<td>(1) under 12 months</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in adult penal system</td>
<td>(2) 13-14 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 15-24 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) 25-36 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) 37-48 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) 49-60 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) over 60 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Number of resident violations</td>
<td>(1) 0-3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 4-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 8-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) 10-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) over 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Most frequent violation</td>
<td>(1) drinking</td>
<td>31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) failure to turn in employment check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) curfew violation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) itinerary violation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) driving motor vehicle without permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) physical assault on resident or staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 35 (cont.)

**Codebook**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7) possession of a weapon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) failure to attend mandatory group meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) failure to perform mandatory housework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) other, specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Notes                                       | DO NOT CODE |

24. Friend(s) at halfway house                   | (1) yes   |
|                                               | (2) no    |

25. Race closest friend                          | (1) white |
|                                               | (2) black |
|                                               | (3) other |

26. Criminal orientation                        | (1) yes   |
|                                               | (2) no    |

27. Shared prison interests                      | (1) yes   |
|                                               | (2) no    |

28. Proximity in room/work assignments           | (1) yes   |
|                                               | (2) no    |

29. Protection from others/safety                | (1) yes   |
|                                               | (2) no    |

30. Material gain                                | (1) yes   |
|                                               | (2) no    |

31. Expected rewards from same race              | DO NOT CODE |

32. Expected rewards from different races        | DO NOT CODE |

33. Race                                        | (1) white |
|                                               | (2) black |
|                                               | (3) other |

34. Participation in special programs            | (1) yes   |
|                                               | (2) no    |

35. Political affiliation                        | (1) yes   |
<p>|                                               | (2) no    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. Social club</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Hobbies</td>
<td>DO NOT CODE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Associate with same race to obtain rewards</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Associate with different races to obtain</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rewards</td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Share important values same race</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Share important values different races</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Display superior competence same race</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Display superior competence different</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>races</td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Risks with same race</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Risks with different races</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Contributions to groups: same race</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Contributions to groups: different races</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Support others' opinions: same race</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Support others' opinions: different races</td>
<td>(1) yes</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Other factors influencing ex-offender</td>
<td>DO NOT CODE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 36

State of Residence - Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 37**

Type of Instant Offense - Codes
(Person/Non-Person Offenses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Grand Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Forgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Embezzlement of Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Gross Sexual Imposition (Child)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Aggravated Robbery/Armed Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Breaking and Entering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Homicide/Murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Possession - Criminal Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Drug Trafficking/Possession Drug Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Possession - Weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bank Robbery (Armed or Unarmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gross Sexual Imposition (Adult)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mail Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mail Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Theft - Interstate Shipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Aggravated Burglary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Burglary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Criminal Mischief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Create/Manufacture Narcotics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 38
Chi Square: Resident and Out-Client Responses to Parts Four and Five of the Survey Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends at halfway house</td>
<td>2.62372</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race - closest associate</td>
<td>1.44697</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal orientation</td>
<td>.00128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison interest</td>
<td>.07554</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement - room, work</td>
<td>.01026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety</td>
<td>.31802</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material gain</td>
<td>.00216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation - social program</td>
<td>1.69656</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political affiliation</td>
<td>.71138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation - club, gang</td>
<td>.00049</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation</td>
<td>.39089</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs - same race</td>
<td>.46549</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs - different races</td>
<td>.51504</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values - same race</td>
<td>.78654</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values - different races</td>
<td>1.85721</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior competence - same race</td>
<td>1.27581</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior competence - different races</td>
<td>.74120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - same race</td>
<td>.36970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05


-------------------------
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