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Why should we in the compass of a pale
Keep law and form and due proportion,
Showing, as in a model, our firm estate,
When our sea-walled garden, the whole land,
Is full of weeds, her fairest flowers choked up
Her knots disordered, and her wholesome herbs
Swarmed with catepillars?

Richard II, iii, iv
Abstract

The purposes of this study were to determine the effects of participation and completion of the CCSD prison education program by incarcerated male students on subsequent rates of recidivism; and to determine if there were any significant differences at the .05 level between 18 different dependent variables in inmate behavior. It was hypothesized that students who were program persisters/completers would have higher success rates once having achieved parole/expiration, and would have lower rates of recidivism. Students who were noncompleters/nonpersisters would have higher recidivism rates upon achieving parole/expiration. The variables were:

1. Current age
2. Ethnicity
3. Age at first admission
4. Prior number of arrests (Police Contacts)
5. Nevada Department of Prisons admission status
6. Court ordered adjudicated sentence length
7. Juvenile delinquency contact record
8. Number of prior probation failures Rules and Order
9. Number of prior probation failures Rearrest
10. Number of prior parole failures Rules and Order
11. Number of prior parole failures Rearrest
12. Psychological Evaluation: Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) Special Scales range from A A- B+ B- C+ C C- D+ D D- F
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
13. Nevada Department of Prison's Intake Reading Grade Level test scores (WRAT) range 0000

iii
to 1400 (month and year)

14. Highest grade level achieved at time of DOP intake range 00 to 16

15. Drug and Alcohol factor in crime commission range: single usage 01 through 09; multiple usage 10 through 16

16. Total number of cumulative felony convictions

17. Incarcerated with enrollment option

18. Severity of crime

The sample for the study was composed of 1,840 CCSD prison students of various ethnic backgrounds, educational levels and ages, out of which 757 inmates were non-randomly tracked. Recidivism rates were used to gage the success or failure of the students. The data was analyzed to test the following null hypothesis:

There is no significant relationship between recidivism and the above listed variables at the .05 level of significance.

A chi square test of independence was used to test statistical significance of the variables stated above. A "T" test was applied to categories within the variables to test for statistical significance of proportions within different categories of the independent variables.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Prisons and correctional institutions in the United States are operated and financed by federal, state, county, and city governments (Ingalls, 1978; Deighton, 1971). The daily operations of these institutions are funded from the taxpayers' pockets. In the fifty states the taxpayers provide average daily services to approximately 1.3 million imprisoned people. Two and a half million people a year pass through prison bastions at an annual cost of over one billion dollars to the U. S. taxpayer (Deighton, 1971, pg. 216). The total cost of the justice system on the federal, state, and local level for both criminal and civil services in 1985 was 45.6 Billion, or about 3% of all governmental spending for that year (BJS Data Report, 1987, pg. 29). The Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1988, (108th edition, U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census) reveals that as of 1984 state correctional facilities alone housed a yearly stable population of 395,309 inmates at a cost of $4,188,486 annually (pg. 175). Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin
"Tracking Offenders, 1984," reports that of all those arrested nationally for all categories of felonies 86% were male, 63% were white. In the State of Nevada the total number of men currently housed in correctional facilities is 4,500. The ethnic breakdown is: 60.9% white, 29.6% black, 5.6% hispanic, 1.0% asian, 1.1% native American indian, 1.5% cuban, and .2% other (State of Nevada, DOP statistics, 1988). On a national level violent felony arrests were divided racially along fairly equal lines: 51% for whites and 48% for blacks. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report "Profile of State Prison Inmates, 1986" revealed that over 80% of State prison inmates were recidivists who had been previously sentenced to probation or incarceration as a juvenile and as an adult. Sixty percent had been incarcerated or on probation from a conviction at least twice, 45% three times or more, and 20% six or more times. In the December 1987, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, "Time Served in Prison and on Parole, 1984," Stephanie Minor-Harper and Christopher A. Innes report that the median time served for all inmates in 1984 was 17 months (45.5% of court ordered sentences); violent offenders served 28 months, approximately twice the sentence length as that of property or drug offenders. The average time served was 23.4 months for all inmates.

The State of Nevada spends an approximate $9,500.00
per inmate per year for incarceration. Sixty percent of the Nevada Department of Prison inmates are Nevada citizens (State of Nevada DOP Statistics, 1988). Nevada incarcerates 432 per 100,000 population. This establishes the total dollar amount for inmate upkeep at Southern Nevada Correctional Center, based on 600 inmates, at about $5,700,000. per year. Incarcerated Nevadans cost fellow citizens approximately $3,420,000 annually, and the transient population costs $2,280,000 annually. In addition Nevada ranked ninth nationally in 1986 in the amount of money spent for indigent defense. Comparative statistics indicate nationally that of every one hundred adults arrested for felony crimes, fifty will end up being convicted of either a felony or a misdemeanor. At length, forty-seven will be convicted by guilty pleas and three will be found guilty at trial. Furthermore, twenty-six of the fifty will be sentenced to incarceration in county jails or state prisons. Of the twenty-six, exactly half will be sentenced to incarceration for one year or less; and the other half will be sentenced for one year or more (Boland, Logan, Sones and Martin, May 1988, pg. 2).

More than two-thirds of those released, as reported in the Minor-Harper and Innes, 1987 national study, had not completed high school. The average level of schooling attained was 10th grade. Only one in four inmates earned a high school diploma. But it was not stated in the
report whether the diploma was attained while the inmate was incarcerated or if it had been achieved while the individual was not under the jurisdiction of the prison system. The report did state that according to the research evidence parole was successfully completed by 75% of the men and 84.1% of the women. No attempt was made in the study to link educational achievement with successful completion of parole (Harper-Innis).

Moreover most of these adult offenders graduated to state correctional facilities from the Youth Authority Programs. This is indicative of how society fails the younger citizen. The earlier an individual begins to offend society with delinquent behavior, the greater the chances are that the negative behavior will escalate in severity and the individual will end up in prison as an adult. A discussion of youthful offenders for 1987 can be best illustrated in table one:
### Table 1
CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH IN LONG-TERM STATE-OPERATED JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS, YEAR END 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics:Total Years Old</th>
<th>11-14</th>
<th>15-17</th>
<th>18 Years And Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade or less</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th or 8th grade</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of Youth                | 25,024 | 3,096 | 15,130 | 6,798 |

*Includes American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Asians, and Pacific Islanders.*

**Note:** Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding (Beck, Kline, Greenfeld, pg. 1, BJS, Fall 1988). Nearly 40% of these youths are being held for violent offenses, 60% are regular illicit drug users with 40% under the influence of drugs at the time the crime was committed (Beck, Kline, Greenfeld, BJS, Fall 1988, pg. 1).
A discussion of State and Federal Prisons is illustrated by table two:

**Table 2**

Prisoners under the jurisdiction of State and Federal correctional authorities, by sex, year end, 1986 & 1987:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance 1987</td>
<td>552,770</td>
<td>28,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final 1986</td>
<td>518,476</td>
<td>26,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage change 1986-87</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentenced to more than 1 year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance 1987</td>
<td>530,559</td>
<td>26,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final 1986</td>
<td>497,682</td>
<td>24,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent change 1986-87</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incarceration rate 1987</strong>*</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of prisoners sentenced to more than 1 year per 100,000 residents of each sex on December 31, 1987.

(BJS, 1987, pg. 3)

Growth in prison populations is likewise illustrated in table three:

**Table 3**

Change in the State and Federal prison populations, 1980-87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of inmates</th>
<th>Annual percent change</th>
<th>Total percent change since 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>329,821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>369,930</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>413,806</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>437,248</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>464,567</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>502,507</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>545,133</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>581,609</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(BJS, 1987, pg. 1)
Comparison by States is set forth in table four:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>The prison situation among the States at year end, 1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 States with the largest 1987 prison populations</strong></td>
<td><em><em>10 States with the highest per incarceration rates, 1987</em> residents</em>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of inmates</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>66,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>40,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>38,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>32,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>24,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>23,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>19,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>18,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>17,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>16,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(BJS. 1987, pg. 2)

And likewise the percentage increase is shown in table five:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>10 States with the largest percent increases in prison population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1986-87</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percent increase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado</strong></td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona</strong></td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkansas</strong></td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan</strong></td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon</strong></td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Jersey</strong></td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Hampshire</strong></td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massachusetts</strong></td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missouri</strong></td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The District of Columbia as a wholly urban jurisdiction is excluded.

*Prisoners with sentences of more than 1 year. (BJS, 1987, pg. 3)
Notwithstanding the fact that crime is down in the United States to its lowest level in the past 14 years (BJS, pg. 8, April 1988), imprisonment is on the increase (Wilson, 1984, pg. 604; Breed and Krisberg, 1988, pg. 9). Sentencing lengths are on the increase. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, parole boards are becoming more conservative as policymakers and the American public has made it known that incarceration is overwhelmingly supported "as the most appropriate punishment for serious offenders" (BJS, April, 1988, pg. 37). According to George Sumner, this upsurge in the demand for imprisonment imposes the need for judicial and penal reforms on Nevada's prison system. Indeed, Nevada desperately needs judicial and penal reforms. Without the necessary reforms Nevada's prison population will increase to levels which will require the opening of a new prison every four years. This is at best only a temporary and unrealistic solution to a persistent and demanding social problem (Rutherford, 1984, pgs. 23-25). While national parole statistics for 1985 specify that 75% of all men released on parole successfully completed their full term parole program, and that only approximately 21.7 % of the men who were not successful were remanded back to custody for violating the conditions of their parole or for committing new crimes, Nevada's parole statistics do not mirror this trend. A higher figure, 24.6 % for blacks versus 17.6 % for whites
resulted in a higher black population being returned to prison (BJS, 1984, pg. 6). National statistics reflect that "unsuccessful parolees discharged in 1984 had spent a longer time in jail and prison before being granted parole than had the discharged parolees who were successful" (BJS, 1984, pg. 7). Nevada reflects a return rate of over 80% from each parole and expiration group released (State of Nevada, Department of Prisons Statistics, 1988).

Statistics for Nevada indicate an average annual percentage change in inmate population of +5.9% for the period 1925 through 1986; and +16.1% growth for the period 1980-1986 (BJS, 1986, pgs. 11-15). The Western region incarcerated 71,034.95 people in 1986; Nevada's portion was 4,425 (BJS, 1986, pg. 13).

Jacoby and Dunn (BJS, 1988, pg. 36) reported in a survey of community beliefs, that while 79% of their public sample believed in incarceration as an incapacitating deterrence, 72% also felt it was very important to rehabilitate the offender. No suggestions or programs were offered, according to this study, by the community as to how this rehabilitative task was to be accomplished even though education was viewed by the respondents as a major factor in crime reduction. It would appear from the statistics cited in this paper that the sooner an inmate can be prepared to handle a viable parole plan the better off everyone concerned will be.
Incarceration may be viewed as the only physical way to prohibit specific individuals from further damaging themselves and society, but very little in programs is offered nationally, or in Nevada, to address inmate rehabilitation. The Clark County School District (CCSD) vocational and academic High School Diploma (HSD) program is the only major program in the Nevada State Prison system (NSP or DOP) at this time.

The Clark County School District draws its correctional education students from a group similar to that discussed in the preceding paragraphs. An average of 185 inmate students are enrolled at each prison education site every quarter. The 1988 DOP records reflect 53.1% of the entire NSP system inmates are non high school graduates, grades 01 through any portion of grade 12 prior to completion. The exact number of non high school graduates as of 1988 is 1,997 inmates. One thousand four hundred and eighty eight inmates, or 39.5% are high school graduates. Two hundred seventy eight, or 7.4%, have completed two years of college or more. The number of former students who are granted parole from Southern Desert Correctional Center (SDCC) and Southern Nevada Correctional Center (SNCC) and the number of inmates who expire their sentences early, due to good time credits earned while attending the education program at both prisons, is 211 (from Jan. 1986 through June 1988,
Nevada Department of Prisons movement records). These 211 former students were at various times under the supervision of Parole, and in the cases of the expirees, they are free from all administrative and social supervision. The majority are still under sentence even though on parole, and the public coffers still fund their supervision, pay administrative court costs, and support treatment. Two of the former students died during the course of this study. Those two individuals account for the discrepancy in the tables between the 211 figure and the 213 figure. The State of Nevada has barely one million taxpayers to support these great expenditures. Therefore, it is in the best interest of the law abiding citizens of the State of Nevada for these 211 individuals to succeed as law abiding citizens who contribute to, rather than hurt, our society.

**Statement of the Problem**

The main purpose of this study was to identify and examine any relationships, between educational programs, inmate behavioral and conditional traits, and reduced recidivism at the Southern Nevada Correctional Center and the Southern Desert Correctional Center at the .05 level of significance. A total population of 3,000 men initially signed up for educational services with the Clark County School District. One thousand, eight hundred
and forty actually followed through and attended classes. Aggregate data was collected from those cases. Two hundred and eleven inmates from that population who were released to parole or expiration were followed for aggregate data and longitudinal study.

The current rise in criminal recidivism has sparked an interest in prison reform among professionals from a variety of fields. Educators, psychiatrists, sociologists, psychologists, correctional personnel, and justice personnel are asking the following questions: "Who is to blame for America's high levels of recidivism?" "Is it the prison system?" "The social milieus of free society?" "Our schools?" "The breakdown of the family?" "Or the inmate?" "Is it the disappearance and erosion of our sense of community?" "Or could it be the loss of a common national culture and heritage?" (Mitchell, 1988; Michowski, 1985; McCollum, 1984; Sechrest, White and Brown, 1979, p. vii; Radzinowicz and King, 1977, pgs. 74-100; Hardy and Cull, 1975, pgs. 8-12; Martinson, 1974; Menninger, 1963; Godwin, 1957). There are as many diverse answers and philosophies for these questions as there are experts to espouse theories. Indeed the overwhelming recurring question asked by all of the experts is "Who is to blame?" If the blame can be determined, a direction can be given to reform. The issue of prison reform raises a question more important than all of the preceding
questions. It is to find out what can be done to address the high rate of return seen in the inmate population. The hope is for a program or direction that will be able to serve both inmates and society.

Specifically, a need to investigate what can be done to assimilate the convict into society as a free and productive individual, and to determine if correctional education programs contribute to that end exists. Mathis and Rayman compared the public's and the incarcerates' perceptions of what caused crime (Mathis and Rayman, 1972, pgs. 367-368). Inmates surveyed responded by identifying external environmental factors such as basic social conditions, drugs, poverty, and unemployment. Society, however, perceived crime to result from deterioration of the home life and poor parental control over the family. Inmates also gave "greater emphasis to rehabilitation than the public" (Mathis and Rayman, 1972, pg. 369). Inmates saw their rehabilitative needs in the realm of education and job training while incarcerated. The public viewed incarceration as warehousing or life "behind bars" (Mathis and Rayman, 1972, pg. 370). Inmates recognize and support the idea of corrections as having a rehabilitative social role. They also recognized that their needs were far from being identified or addressed either educationally or therapeutically by the current system (Stone, W. G., and G. Hirilman, 1982, pg. 85). This is
important because how a problem is perceived determines the direction society will take in the search for a solution.

The idea of education as a panacea for societies' problems is not new (Mann in Cremin, 1957, pgs. 29-112; Whitehead, 1957; Mann in Filler, pgs. 119-131; Maslow, 1970, pgs. 149-202; Maslow, 1973). In the U. S. prison system education as a treatment method began in the Elmira Reformatory in 1876 (Glaser, 1964, pg. 260; Johnson, 1968, pgs. 582). It is recognized as indisputable today that while there are those who need to be segregated from society, these same individuals also need programs to help them assimilate into society when they are released (Hartinger, Eldefonso, Coffey, 1973, pgs. 222-224).

Society takes upon itself the right to inflict appalling punishment in the individual, but it also has the supreme vice of shallowness, and fails to realize what it has done. When man's punishment is over, it leaves him to himself; that is to say, it abandons him at the very moment when its highest duty towards him begins.

(Aldington, 1946, De Profundis, pg. 522)

It is also important to note that while convicts do recidivate, they do not stay incarcerated forever (Kwartler, 1977, pg. 51; Scudder, 1968, pgs. 281-282). In fact national statistics indicate that approximately 30% recidivate less on each subsequent release. The Bureau of Justice Statistics reports 3.4 million Americans under the supervision of federal, state, and local corrections
departments; and 2.6 million men and women under supervision of parole and probation divisions (2.24 million on probation, .46 million on parole) (BJS, 1987) Less than 4% die in prison (Glazer, 1984). In Nevada approximately 15% to 20% recidivate less on each subsequent release (Nevada DOP statistics).

Prisoner rights movements throughout the prison system have also assured that basic education is a prisoner's right in this country (Jacobs, 1983, pg. 29). In a 1974 research study, the Texas Department of Corrections found that moving the inmate from the lower grade levels of achievement up to the 11th or 12th grade level would seem to reduce his likelihood of returning to prison (Waldron, 1974). Correctional goals without education are not viewed as viable goals (Zimmerman and Miller, 1981, pg. 25). Dr. William Glasser in his reality therapy calls for educative and re-educative or corrective therapy as a part of any total educational enterprise; and he includes those incarcerated in prison (Glasser, 1965, pg. xv). The process of rehabilitation must be initiated within the individual and cannot be truly accomplished through coercion (Scudder, 1968, pg. 280).

The issue of what is to be done to facilitate positive behavioral change in the inmate resides within the realm of education. Chief Justice Warren Burger stated it was his belief that "American prisons must
be utilized to rehabilitate criminals, chiefly through the process of education" (Reffet, 1983, p. 40). He expanded on this theme by recommending that no inmate be released to free society "without at least being able to read, write and do basic arithmetic" (Reffet, 1983, pg. 40). Justice Burger charges educators to "educate them out of prison" (Reffet, 1983, pg. 40). This is quite a challenge when it is considered that 6.0 million people were incarcerated or on parole or probation at the end of 1985.

Our present prison system is in need of extensive reform. Research from the 1970's and 1980's seemed to indicate that "nothing works" (Lipton, Martinson, Wilks; Frank; Wolfgang, Sellin; Secrest; Glaser;). National journals for correction professionals continually cite "inadequate educational opportunities for inmates," and "few incentives for rehabilitation" (Corrections Compendium, Jan. 1987, pg. 15). Our prisons espouse contrary objectives. Crime control and rehabilitation cannot be accomplished together. They are mutually exclusive goals (Gould and Namenwirth). Our prison's current rehabilitative programs are expensive failures. The financial cost to taxpayers in 1983 was more than $8 billion in programs alone (Carnes, Dec. 1985, pg. 120). Construction cost of a single prison cell is $50,000. In 1983 it cost approximately $15,000 to incarcerate an
inmate for one year. Ten percent of that $15,000.00 or $1,500.00 was spent on medical services, and less than one percent was expended on educational opportunities for that inmate. The costly expenditure for internment could be offset by future savings if an inmate could, "learn his way out of prison, out of crime, and into a job" (Carnes, Dec. 1985, pg. 128). Programs should be designed to involve education and training (Ross, Fabiano, and Ross, June 1988, pg. 45).

As early as 1976 approximately 1.8 million persons were under the sanction of a criminal sentence. Unfortunately many of them contributed to the recidivism of the following decade. To begin with, during the period between 1976 and 1980, thirty percent were incarcerated or on parole, and the balance were on supervised probation or under alternative sentencing. By the end of 1983 these figures had changed. Over four million people were serving sentences in various levels of classification in state and federal penal institutions, and on probation or parole. An estimated 212,282 additional people were serving time in city and county jails (Michalowski, 1985, pg. 235). Further, the Bureau of Justice Statistics for 1985 shows that all levels of government spent a total of 45.6 billion dollars for Justice activities. This expenditure represents 2.9% of the 1.58 trillion dollar Federal Budget of 1985. Twenty-two billion dollars went
for police protection, 13 billion for corrections and 10 billion for judicial and legal services (National Institute of Justice Expenditure and Employment-1985-NCT Publication 104060, May/June, 1987, pg. 22). This is clearly a financial burden to society. A significant amount of this money could well have gone to educational institutions and social services to enhance quality of life.

Lack of funding and expenditures on social programs at the grass roots level apparently erodes the social foundations necessary for a crime free society. As a result, crime in the United States is a serious national health problem. The numbers of dysfunctional, delinquent and mentally diseased create an underclass of dependent people who cannot function as contributing citizens (Rubington and Weinberg, 1971, pg. 19). The two most important causes of crime are said to be defective personalities and the effect of defective communities on those personalities (Scudder, 1968, pg. 280). Preventive modes of treatment need to be developed and applied at the onset of the lives of individual citizens, before criminal behavior is developed.

Who gets caught committing crimes? The uneducated, impoverished, illiterate, disenfranchised, and the mentally ill are those who commit crimes (Godwin, 1957; Rubington and Weinberg, 1968; Quinney, 1974). According
to James Payne, a Black court administrator in New York City's Family Court:

Hell, they're standing on the corner of 125th Street and Eighth Avenue right now, blaming the white man for all their problems. But if you go back and look at their individual histories, where they had an opportunity to do something for themselves—they didn't go to school, they didn't want to look for a job, or it wasn't a good enough job—they always had an excuse. And we reinforce it. Academics, sociologists, psychologists, want to blame anything but the individual himself. (Wall Street Journal, Kramer, June 3, 1986, Editorial Page)

Richard Wright profiled a type of violent criminal in his novel Native Son. Retrospectively, he discussed "How 'Bigger' was born," and his discovery "that Bigger Thomas was not Black all the time, he was White, too, and there were literally millions of him everywhere" (Wright, 1966, pg. xiv). Once these 'Biggers' are incarcerated they experience depression, frustration, anger, hate, and are even reluctant to participate in educational and therapeutic offerings. It takes approximately two years for them to "realize that the only way to eventually be released is to get involved in therapy, schools and other programs: They stabilize until their request for "parole is denied and then they begin the cycle again" (Welch, 1987, pg. 7).

Educationally, what do we provide on a national level for all of these incarcerates? According to Degraw in table six, on a national level correctional education programs offer course work in five groups:
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABE/Basic Reading</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED Preparation</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Subjects (math, English)</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All courses</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (non-academic)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs unknown due to nonresponse</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Degraw, 1987, pg. 19)

In addition to the courses from the above list Clark County School District offers vocational courses and an Adult High School Diploma program. However, less than one fourth of the eligible prison population takes advantage of these educational services.

Today the inmate population in Nevada is on the rise. According to George Sumner, Director of the Department of Prisons, "Nevada has the highest ratio of prisoners to population of any state in the nation. We put 380 per 100,000 people in prison" in 1986 (Joyce, 1986, pg. 38). First, current 1988 figures have increased in number to 420 incarcerates per 100,000 (George Sumner quoted in The Nevada Today Section of Las Vegas Review Journal, July 3, 1988, pgs. 3, 4, 5, & 12). Second, the cost of housing, maintaining, and educating inmates is also an economic concern. Equally important, projected financial expenditures for building new prisons in Nevada were made in 1985. The Nevada Legislature appropriated 1.9 million dollars for preliminary planning, 2 million dollars for architecture and 40 to 50 million dollars for construction of two new prisons (Joyce, 1986, pg. 36).
The uniqueness of Nevada's gaming and tourist based economy has a negative societal impact on Nevada's citizens and tourists alike. Underneath the bright lights and glitter of the resorts and hotels lies the reality that tourism costs money. The message from the luxury hotels is one of sanctioning negative social behavior such as illegal drug use, gambling and alcohol consumption. Nevada is a twenty-four hour adult playground. The leisure activities are based on the "adult Disneyland concept." Similarly, the party can last as long as the money and energy of the partygoers is sustained. As a result the 24 hour day encourages excesses in many cases. The quest for this extended leisure often cannot keep up with individual financial resources when the leisure activity involves behavior which interferes with stable routine and employment. At length individuals turn human resourcefulness to prostitution, theft, illicit drug and narcotic trafficking, burglary, and strong arm tactics such as assault, robbery and even murder to meet financial needs and extend leisure time. Unfortunately this behavior results in entanglement with the justice system and in many cases incarceration.

The question raised is whether or not there are programs beneficial to inmate students on their long road to rehabilitation and assimilation after the entanglement
with the criminal justice system. In searching for a set of standards to answer that question recidivism consistently remains the only appropriate measurement criteria. Response from 47.3 percent of the educational programs surveyed by the Correctional Education Journal (Peak, Sept. 1983, pgs. 79-83) indicate that recidivism was a fair method to use in evaluating the success or failure of their educational programs; 31.2 percent of those responding felt that it was not.

The Clark County School District's education programs include long range ABE, GED, Adult High School Diploma Program, either vocational-technical or academic courses for inmates. The Nevada inmate who successfully completes the program should probably be less likely to return to the prison system than those who do not successfully complete the program. Hopefully, the financial expenditure for inmate educational programs will be offset by the reduction in funds necessary to maintain inmates in prison. If this proves to be the case, the financial savings will be even greater in terms of legitimate monies generated by ex-felons in the form of tax dollars and money spent in the community for law abiding social maintenance.
The Need for the Study

Specifically, a need exists to investigate what can be done to assimilate the convict into society as a free and productive individual. There are differences of opinions and positions concerning the success or failure of different correctional treatments to achieve that end. The consensus runs an entire spectrum from total program failure to much rhetoric over individual programs with positive results. The goal is to reduce recidivism. The literature points to the conclusion that programs have a negative impact or no impact whatsoever on reducing recidivism. A program which has no impact is considered to have a negative impact. Those researchers who believe that all of the current programs are failures are led by Baily (1966), Robinson and Smith (1971), Martinson (1974), Liptson and Wilks (1975), Greenberg (1977), Wright (1973); Sechrest, White and Brown (1979), Mcguire and Priestley (1988). Many of the positive studies were not based on empirical or scientifically valid data. They were subjective case study essays (Lanne, 1935; Glaser, 1974; Palmer, 1973; Lipton, et.al.; Martinson, 1979; Murray, 1979; Gendreau and Ross, 1979; Greenwood, Petersilla and Zimriing, 1980). Overall studies and reports on effectiveness of rehabilitation programs in prison are inconclusive.

Also, Cullen and Gilbert (1982), and Lab and
Whitehead (1988), argue that even though the rehabilitation model may not be very effective, it should be retained because it fosters a more humane correctional environment, and contributes to smoother custodial managements for correctional personnel. The goal of custody is to maintain custody. Correctional personnel are not in the prison system to rehabilitate, or even to help create an environment conducive to positive behavioral change. If custody can be maintained more smoothly due to an education program, then the program will be tolerated. If the program proves to be disruptive to the prison routine, then it will not be tolerated. This dearth of consensus establishes the need for more empirical studies. Daniel Glaser specifies that educational research is of vital importance in prison programs (Roberts, 1973, pg. 360). In addition to the fact that there is a lack of research in the area of prison education as a deterrent to recidivism, there is the concept that education can be a treatment program that will reduce recidivism among prison expirees and parolees. Research in this area can help our state government in making responsible decisions with tax dollar expenditures in our Nevada DOP prison system.

Prison education can help remedy the "narrow range of life's alternatives" which minority groups encounter (Wolfgang, 1964, pg. 9). Minorities are less likely to
have opportunities in education and employment, especially urban minorities and inner city youth (Glaser, 1970, pgs. 113-115). Furthermore, Rubington and Weinberg hold that deviant behavior is socially learned (1971, pg. 128). These three premises support the idea of the creation of a secure institution without the harshness of our existing prisons, and with more emphasis placed on education, schooling, and rehabilitation (Ray and Kilburn, Aug. 1970; Johnson, Aaron and Britton, Winter 1974; Hood, May-June 1980; Paternoster, June 1987; Rosenbaum, 1987; Dugger, June, 1988). This could break the cycle of commitment, punishment, and recidivism. This cycle of embitterment dehumanizes the convicted and the accuser; and has not provided the relief necessary to ensure society of stability and safety (Menninger, 1968).

Definition of Terms

Terms used in Correctional Education are different from terms used in regular public schools. Such terms specific to this proposed research are:

ABE: Adult Basic Education, functional literacy and minimal survival skills

CCSD: Clark County School District

Classification: the degree of security assigned to an inmate by the custodial staff in the prison system. Classification can range from Maximum security status for inmates who are deemed violent, or seen as escape risks; to medium security status for most inmates, to trustee status or honor camp status, which is minimum custody
Clerks: inmates who are employed as clerical help to free staff

Convict: an inmate who has experienced lengthy periods of incarceration time; and who is experiencing diminishing rehabilitative potential

Disciplinary: a committee comprised of custodial staff for the purpose of settling inmate infractions within the prison

DOP or NSP: Department of Prisons or Nevada State Prison system

Expiree: an ex-convict who has served the maximum time on a sentence; this individual is not subject to parole supervision, but still must register in the community as an "Ex-Felon."

Free Status Category: all professional correctional staff, educational staff, and support staff who work in the prison system

FTA: full time students enrolled in the education program for a full day

GED: General Educational Development tests for high school equivalency

HSD: High School Diploma

Incarcerate: to be placed in a secure penal institution setting

Inmate: an individual serving court ordered time in a penal setting under judicial sentencing who has rehabilitative potential

Internment: the length of time an inmate is incarcerated

JTPA: Job Training Partnership Act/Vocational Education

Lock down: custodial procedure for securing the prison for inmate population counts and security situations

Minimum Eligibility Date: The earliest possible release to parole date based on good time and work time. It is approximately 20% of the court appointed sentence, computed on the total number of months of sentence length.
Parole status: an inmate who is adjudicated stable enough to complete the remainder of his sentence in the free community and who is under supervision of the State of Nevada Department of Parole and Probation and the parole and probation departments of other states.

Persisters: an inmate who completes any one of the CCSD education programs.

Probation status: not having to serve a sentence in a penal institution.

Proficiency Test: a compulsory test, that must be passed, for those who are enrolled in the 9th grade (required since 1978 to present) before students can receive a high school diploma.

Recall: daily custody procedure for ordering the inmate population to return to their units, usually for count.

Recidivism: returning to prison either because of violation of parole rules and regulations or rearrest due to returning to crime after release from prison.

Revocation: loss of parole or probation status due to 1) violation of parole or probation rules and order conditions; 2) rearrest.

Roll-up: custodial procedure for moving inmates between or within prison, honor camps, and parole.

SDCC: Southern Desert Correctional Center-Indian Springs, Nevada.

SNCC: Southern Nevada Correctional Center-Jean, Nevada.

Successfully complete: achieve GED or high school diploma status.

Successfully rehabilitated: still free after passage of one year's time from release.

Violator: a convicted person who violated probation or parole status and is remanded into custody of the Nevada Department of Prison system to serve the balance of the court ordered sentence.

Definition of Criminal Complaints
(Johns, 1973, pgs. 289-303)
Adjudicate: to settle a dispute legally as is done by a judge

Aggression: to attack or to engage in an offensive act, such as an encroachment upon the territory of another nation; making war or an assault upon someone

Anomie: inability to identify with society; indifference fostered by alienation from accepted institutions

Bail: a deposit of money or security for the release of a prisoner from custody

Behavioral pattern: a habit or characteristic manner of acting which is adhered to consistently; likes or dislikes being manifested

Citizen: a native or naturalized member of a state where sovereignty is in the people, therefore, where one owes allegiance; originally, an inhabitant of a city who was a freeman

Felony: committing a major crime in violation of law as contrasted to a minor offense called a misdemeanor

Inalienable rights: so basically a part of being human that they are not to be severed, separated, or alienated; the right to life is so basic to human existence that it cannot be separated from the condition of being; liberty and property are also given this status in the U. S. Constitution

Misdemeanor: a misdeed, or commission of a crime less serious than a felony

Prosecute: the institution of legal proceedings against an accused, thereby, pursuing in order to punish for the redress of a crime or violation of a law before a magistrate of the law or a legal tribunal

Society: a group of people such as those of a nation, who have established rules of behavior by which they live together; American society is the total membership of the nation; Nevada society is those residents of this state; communities, such as Las Vegas, Reno, Elko, Ely, are also called societies; Native American and Black communities are societies

Thanatos: the death wish; an instinctive desire for death

Will: the wishes, desires, determination, for or against;
the command of one in authority; to dispose of property at
death by will; also used to express inevitability

**Purpose and Objectives of This Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the numbers of persisters vs. the numbers of dropouts in our prison education program and to determine if there is any relationship between the recidivism experienced by both groups upon their release to free society. The financial impact of this study may suggest retention and expansion of our prison education program in its present form. The research hypothesis is:

Nevada State Prison system inmates who successfully complete the Clark County School District Adult High School Diploma Program will be less likely to return to the prison system when they achieve parole or reach expiration than those who do not successfully complete the program.

Null: There will be no difference in the rate of recidivism, at the .05 level, between inmates who successfully complete the CCSD education program and those who do not.

The following research variables are taken from studies of educational impact on inmates conducted by Daniel Glaser (1964) and Carliss King (1987):

1. Current Age
2. Ethnic
3. Age at First Admission in Prison System
4. County and Court Commitments (Prior Arrests)
5. Prison Admission Status (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, etc.)
6. Sentence Length in DOP System
7. Juvenile Delinquent Contact Record
9. Rules and Order Probation Failures
10. Rearrest Probation Failures
11. Rules and Order Parole Failures
12. Rearrest Parole Failures
13. State of Nevada Psychometric Psychological Evaluation
14. DOP Intake Reading Grade Level Test Score
15. Highest Grade Level Achieved at DOP Intake
16. Drug and Alcohol Factor in Crime Commission
17. Total Number of Felony Convictions
18. Severity of Crime
19. HSD Completer
20. GED Completer
21. ABE Completer
22. Still Attending (Plus Prison Adm. Moves)
23. NonCompleter HSD
24. NonCompleter GED
25. NonCompleter ABE
26. Parolee
27. Expiree
28. Recidivate (Failure)
29. Nonrecidivate (Successful)

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made regarding the research subjects and this research project:

1. All inmates who registered for the CCSD Adult Education Program did so voluntarily.
2. Learning strategies and learning abilities vary widely in adult students.
3. Those who complete or persist in a program are success oriented.
4. Those who were transferred to minimum custody and those who exited the CCSD Adult Education Program for parole or expiration were success oriented.
5. Those who voluntarily withdrew did so because the program was not perceived by them to meet their needs.
6. Those who were requested to withdraw by staff were required to do so because the staff perceived that the program did not and could not meet the inmate's needs at that point.
7. The CCSD education program was effective.
**Design of the Research**

All 3,000 inmates who enrolled in the education program at both institutions between September of 1984 through spring semester of 1988 were identified and codified at both SNCC and SDCC. An actual 1,840 inmates, out of the 3,000 initial enrollees, subsequently attended classes. From that population the following sub groups were established for longitudinal tracking:

(757 Total Group)

1. Persisters--currently enrolled toward ABE, GED, or HSD
2. Persisters--currently achieved GED and still pursuing HSD
3. Persisters Completers of HSD
4. Program Noncompleters

*Note--Those who achieved GED and who declined to work toward HSD and were part of the parole/expiree group are considered completors. They numbered 3. In addition 32 inmates were found to have achieved GED and though still eligible to attend were assigned to other duty stations within the prison. They are not parolees/expirees or honor camp candidates. They may return to the program anytime their schedules allow. They did not leave the program because it did not fit their needs and they were not requested to withdraw. They are statistically included as completers, as are an additional 28 inmates who achieved GED and were transferred to honor camps and other DOP facilities where HSD programs are
unavailable. The option to reenter is still available to these inmates should they transfer back to medium security classification. Also mentioned were the two individuals who died during the course of this study. They account for the discrepancy between the 211 and the 213 figures.

4. Completers: Program interrupted due to movement to
   a. Honor Camp
   b. Other minimum custody situations
5. Dropouts
   a. Voluntary Withdrawals
   b. Administrative Withdrawals

Those who finish the CCSD program will be compared to those who drop out at any point along the way. The question will then be to determine why those students who go through the CCSD program (ABE; GED; HSD) succeed or fail parole/expiration, versus those who do not complete our program. Two groups are the primary focus: those who entered and left, versus those who entered and stayed. The parole board granted parole to 211 people (213 including the two deceased) from both groups, as illustrated in table seven, at the following rate:
Table 7
213 Released
Parolees 124 Total Expirees 79 Total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completers</th>
<th>NonCompleters</th>
<th>Completers</th>
<th>NonCompleters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSD 28</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>19+15</td>
<td>0+0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED 32+13</td>
<td>4+8</td>
<td>16+14</td>
<td>3+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE 9</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>3+ 4</td>
<td>5+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>124 + 89</td>
<td>= 213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delimitations of the Study

This study will deal only with the impact of educational programs on recidivism from the population of inmates who sign up for the CCSD prison education programs at the SNCC facility and at the SDCC facility. The variables involving individual learning disabilities, range and variety of teaching strategies, materials and methodologies among teaching personnel, class size and instructional facilities were not studied. Emotional and psychological variables associated with recidivism will not be considered. Alcohol and drug addiction was considered a factor only in so far as it was a factor in severity of crime, rearrest, or in rules and order violations which resulted in recidivism. Other variables, such as prison routine, where inmates were in and out of the educational setting (i.e., due to having to attend to: laundry, store, selling plasma, or plasmaphereses, disciplinary, bed moves, room repairs, lock downs, and visits, according to DOP custodial personnel routine) were
uncontrollable and were not considered in the limits of this research. It should be noted that it is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether or not an inmate is using the routine of the prison to avoid schoolwork, or if the need to be out of the classroom was valid.

Intelligence and crime are correlated to the degree that inmate students of low ability will experience higher levels of difficulty in school task completion (Glueck, 1966; Wilson and Hernstein, 1985). The desire not to forfeit good time credits which apply to sentence reduction motivate low ability students to create many accepted excuses for school absences. These excuses veritably involve activities governed by prison routine. The question of alternatives to incarceration, work release programs, half-way houses, restitution centers, and educational release furloughs were not explored.

The Department of Prisons, State of Nevada Southern Division, consists of:

1. Jean Facility-SNCC
2. Indian Springs Facility-SDCC
3. Honor Camps
4. Restitution Center
5. Parole and Probation
6. Parole Board

The population studied consists of the 1,840 inmates who enrolled in, and participated in the education program between September of 1984, through June of 1988, at SNCC and SDCC. Inmates were classified to FTA by their
respective prison counselors. They were then either completers/persisters in the educational program, or dropouts/non-completers. Many of the non-completers were subject to movement within the prison system that interrupted their education. This movement created despair and frustration to the point that some inmates gave up the task of seeking betterment through education. Those who were transferred to minimum classification, such as honor camp, and those who were paroled are identified as completers of at least one segment of the program, as are those who graduated. Those who did not compete the program because they elected to dropout are also identified. Those who are currently in the program are identified as current persisting enrollees. Many of the completers are still incarcerated and are also identified as such. The criterion or the purpose of this study is to use recidivism as a measure of success or failure of the educational program. A secondary issue may be that the type of person who gravitates to education may be more amenable to change and that the lessening of crime or type of crime committed occurs when that person gains release from the prison system. Socio-economic status of inmates, quality of educational opportunities, cultural patterns and values of the community are also side issues (Sellin, 1938; Wolfgang, 1968; Laufer and Day, 1983). These side issues will not be considered in this paper. Another
issue not considered is the maturation factor associated with chronological development (Glaser, 1964, p. 37).

Prison program evaluation, program effectiveness, summative and formative educational program evaluation and quality of instructional delivery are not considered in this paper. It may be that recidivism rates are invalid measurements due to the unevenness of program quality at all levels of imprisonment. Elements of these issues are meat for many future research projects. They are not undertaken in this study.

The findings of this study are related to the specific group studied. While the results of this study may have implications for other programs and other parolees/expirees in other prison systems, the results are not generalizable. None of the results should be construed or used to predict characteristics and relationships among other populations.

An Overview:

Correctional Education Programs:

Traditional Education in an Alternative Institutional Setting

CCSD Adult Education Programs

The Clark County School District has long offered
adult and continuing education programs to the Las Vegas community. Education is not a task that needs to arbitrarily stop once adulthood is reached. It is a lifelong task logically extended into adulthood. It is a new phenomenon, however, for the school district to extend services into the State of Nevada Department of Prisons system. This special program, Public Law 97-300, began in 1983 under the Job Training and Partnership Act monies. It has operated at the Southern Desert Correctional facility, primarily an intake institution, at Indian Springs since the fall of 1984 and at the Southern Nevada Correctional Center at Jean, Nevada since 1985. Funds totaling $144,842.59 have been expended for each school year. Each education program consists of an on-site administrator, a counselor, six teachers at SNCC, and six teachers at SDCC. Academic courses are offered in English, mathematics, science and history. General education courses are offered in civics, government, reading, English as a Second Language, psychology, drug rehabilitation classes, and health. Vocational programs are offered in drafting, building construction and maintenance, computer programming, typing, computer literacy, CPR-health, landscaping, and culinary arts. Spanish was added as an additional elective fall of 1988.

The educational building at the Southern Desert Correctional Center is located at the center of the
facility. This would suggest that education as a rehabilitative program comprises the heart of the prison's rehabilitative model. The physical layout is contrary to, and belies the rehabilitative educational model of the prison. In addition to passing through five electronically double locked doors the education personnel must walk up a long outdoor walkway, past many inmate living units before finally arriving at the education building. Again, the positioning of the education building would appear to indicate that education is at the center of institutional emphasis. Nothing could be more contraindicated. The prison system encroaches on the education program (Zilboorg, 1968, pgs. 14, 105-106). To begin with the education facility is designed to house the education office, the prison library, and eight classrooms. The facility in function houses the "Street Readiness Program," classification, parole and probation, search and escort units, inmate mail distribution, the Sergeant's office, and other inmate clerk typists who perform prison duties. The teaching classrooms are allocated to the back section of the building. All classrooms open into a large empty center quad. This area was originally intended as a multipurpose media-movies, assembly room. This area is acoustically very poor when filled with inmates and students. The noise levels penetrate the classroom walls and interfere with learning
activities. Equally important is the composition of the prison population. Only five hundred of the 1,500 inmates are part of a stable inmate population; the other 1,000 inmates are awaiting psychological and medical evaluation for classification to other institutions. Of the 500 inmates who reside at SDCC, approximately 185 attend the CCSD Adult Education Program.

In contrast, the educational building at the Southern Nevada Correctional Center is indistinguishable from the prison administration building and from all of the other buildings at that facility. The physical layout of this prison strongly resembles many western junior college campuses. However, there are signs on the road and in the parking lot that serve as stern reminders that this is in fact a prison. The entire facility is double ringed with twelve foot high chain link fence. This fencing is topped with razor wire and watched over by two guard towers. There is an additional exterior guard tower overlooking the parking lot, a dog kennel, and custodial staff who continually patrol the prison perimeter. The entrance used by free staff, teachers, prison clerical, professional staff, and correctional staff is governed by a double-soldered steel door. Two more doors, in short succession, have to be negotiated to gain admission behind the chain link fence. A buzzer, manned by custodial staff and situated in central control, operates the electric
locks on the doors that let personnel in and out of the institution. Once cleared through the metal detector and the search by custodial staff, the education staff is free to proceed from the administration building out to the main yard. The path to the prison school is rimmed by railroad ties and bordered by a healthy stand of green grass. There are also two flower gardens in front of the school and a third one which borders the building. These courtesies were extended to the prison as a result of the CCSD landscaping class. A gently sloping walkway leads down this area to the education building. All of these efforts are attempts to humanize the trappings of the penal institution and to make the education program attractive to the inmates. "The average inmate finds himself in a harshly Spartan environment which he defines as painfully depriving" (Sykes, 1971, p. 68). This walkway is lined every morning with the usual few inmates who have made it a habit to "watch the women" come into the prison. These inmates have not demonstrated any further interest in the educational program. The walk is short, and therefore the harassment is minimal. It is unfortunate that the attitude espoused by these inmates tends to influence the younger, less stable, more immature inmate. Many students who initially sign up for the program and subsequently drop out end up lining the walkway. The presence of a manned gun in the tower
directly above this walkway is reassuring to the female staff. SNCC has approximately 185 students in the educational program at any given time. The prison houses 592 inmates. SNCC is similar to SDCC in that both facilities have a reception and diagnostic center, or "fish tank," a medical and psychiatric center, a maximum security section, medium security section, and minimum custody known as "the honor camp." Even though SNCC offers these services it is not an intake facility.

Inmates at both institutions generally all wear the same blue prison uniform of jeans and blue shirts. This uniform is where all similarity between inmates ends. However, the U. S. Justice system treats all felonies the same. All inmates are imprisoned and treated the same by custody staff regardless of any individual differences in the nature and extent of their crimes, the amount of time they have to serve, and their individual needs and talents (Sheehan, 1978). The outcome for all prisoners is also the same—the status of "Ex-Con" (Glaser, 1964, p. 42). Moreover, offenders are confined for one year or more in prisons for felony convictions. Felonious behavior encompasses everything from grand larceny, auto theft, burglary, robbery, forgery, various degrees of murder and manslaughter, narcotics sales, possession and manufacture, counterfeiting, fraud, kidnapping, rape, and sexual assault (Glaser, 1964, p. 27). All of these inmates have
the option of volunteering for the education program.

It is because of the fact that inmates are individuals that prison education programs are offered. However, the effectiveness of correctional education is not known (Roberts, 1973, p. 351). Many years after the individual leaves prison may be the time when that individual may demonstrate positive growth and change. In Daniel Glaser's study no more than a third of the men studied recidivated out of each group released (Glaser, 1964, p. 31). According to Stephen Duguid, belief in "education implies a firm belief in our individual and collective ability to act in order to change self and society for the better" (Duguid, Dec. 1988, p. 174). Educational programs and opportunities are the best avenue for upward social mobility and for the promotion and maintenance of social values and standards which will insure the survival of culture and social structure.

Part of the goal of education is to help the criminal to emotionally and intellectually accept his time out from society. This time is hypothetically time which will allow the criminal to metamorphize and reconstruct not only his self esteem, but his ego and superego as well. The production of a new or renewed sense of harmony, both within his sphere and between him and greater society, will be accomplished through time and the "emotional reworking of the various aspects of one's self" (Zilboorg,
p. 92). It is the will of the individual which must be directed toward rehabilitation (Zilboorg, p. 97-98). It is important for free society to keep in mind the fact that inmates are not going to be in prison forever (Kwartler, 1977, p. 51; Tompkins, 1972, pgs. 374-375). Court ordered incarceration periods eventually end. And while individuals who are processed through the justice system are identified as exhibiting criminal behavior, there are many individuals at large in society who are involved in the same negative behavior and are not as yet labeled. Imprisonment is society's treatment of last resort for our prodigals. Once an inmate becomes an "Ex-Convict," the behavior that will surely put him back into prison is economic, addictive, and juvenile. Much of this results from instability of personality (Glaser, 1964). The person suffering from a deficient or weak super ego, or who is narcissistic is also likely to recidivate (Chein, Gerard, Lee and Rosenfeld, 1964). The ex-convict's dilemma remains that of trying to integrate into society after experiencing the long period of confinement and labeling stigma of incarceration. Hopefully those who finish the CCSD program will have a better chance of self help or of coping with society upon release.

Outline of the Study

Chapter 1 contains the introduction, the background
surrounding the problem to be investigated, and a statement of the research hypotheses. In addition, the research design, the methodology of data collection and analysis, the assumptions and limitations of the study, and the organization of the study are discussed.

Chapter 2 is a review of the literature regarding the study. Available research studies pertaining to this problem from 1913 to present are included in this section.

Chapter 3 contains the description of the research design, the collection of the data, and the methods of analyzing the data.

Chapter 4 is a discussion of the finding of this research study. It also provides details of the significant differences with the data analysis. A summary of the testing of the hypotheses is also discussed in this section.

Chapter 5 includes a summary of the findings, any conclusions drawn, and discussions and recommendations for further study.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

The idea of governance by men through force has long been supplanted by the concept of behavior being governed by law. Long before society had courts and police forces it had codes of behavior. The rulers of every age have had the duty, not just as lawgivers or legislators, but the duty of dispensing and interpreting the law. In short the purpose of the law was: controlling the behavior of citizens, maintaining social order, and arbitrating grievances by establishing a system of social justice (Zane, pgs. 73, 1927). Furthermore, within the social group any transgression by the part was viewed as being ill for the whole. On the one hand the guilt and innocence of an individual was felt throughout the social group. At the same time, if behavior was destructive to a harmful enough degree, it was viewed as violating the rights of the entire group. Likewise, the punishment of the perpetrator was also a responsibility of the group (Cesare Beccaria cited in Killinger and Cromwell, 1973,
This carries over to the present day. When individuals engage in criminal behavior, the accuser becomes the state rather than the individual victim (MacNamara and Sagarin, 1971, pgs. 98-125). The French sociologist Emile Durkheim said, "Just as ancient peoples needed, above all, a common faith to live by, so we need justice, and we can be sure that this need will become ever more exacting if, as every fact presages, the conditions dominating social evolution remain the same" (Durkheim, 1933, pg. 338).

"Crime is a behavior condemned by society" (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 14). A Criminal is a person who has been convicted and adjudicated of criminal acts through due process of law (Yochelson and Samenow, 1986, pg. viii). In his discussion of criminal complaints Albert C. Johns states:

Cases are also brought to court when someone breaks the law. These are known as disputes between a citizen and society, or criminal complaints. When someone is accused of robbery, burglary, murder or even traffic violations, society becomes the plaintiff. The accused is the defendant. Thus the case would be The People of the State of Nevada vs. whatever the name of the accused may be. (Johns, 1973, p. 165)

"Crime is any act committed in violation of a law that prohibits it and authorizes punishment for its commission" (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 22). Some important facts about crime are: that most serious
criminals begin their criminal careers at a very early age, they are not good performers in school, and they are usually young, male and urban (Glueck and Glueck, 1935, 1952, 1955; Short, 1970, pg. 30; Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pgs. 19-21, Rosenbaum, 1987, pgs. 117-131). Other theories about the causes and roots of crime are derived from the assumption that people act out of free will and choice (Yochelson and Samenow, 1986, pg. 9); that criminal behavior is guided by choices and consequences, and those choices and consequences are in turn influenced by the general trend that criminals are: "atypical in personality", "disproportionately young, male, mesomorphic and nonectomorphic, and from the low normal or borderline region of the distribution of intelligence-test scores" (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 173). Crime is also said to be the result of failed personal evolution (Wilson, 1984, pg. 664). This belief is also expressed by many other researchers (Godwin, 1957, pgs. 3-64). Other characteristics assigned to individuals most likely to commit crimes are those of "psychopathology," an individual's "inner emptiness," or "weak super-ego," which can distance that individual from the consequences of actions and can result in insensitive and extreme antisocial behavior (Chein, et.al.; Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pgs. 198-199). The four aspects of psychopathology according to Wilson and Herrnstein are: arousal or
sensation-seeking level being low or different, susceptibility to learning and conditioning being less socialized, impulsiveness being high, and anxiety level being low. Individuals harboring these characteristics are more likely to be indifferent to punishment and consequences, more apt to exhibit poor judgement and poor risk-taking, and to be unable to delay or defer gratification (Inciardi, 1972, pgs. 217-233; Rosenbaum, 1987, pgs. 117-132; Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pgs. 199-217; McGuire and Priestly, 1985, pg. 14; Short, 1970, pg. 31). Additional theories also encompass the interplay of genes and environment in the creation of the criminal personality. All potential "criminogenic variables are rooted in individual characteristics shaped by both inheritance and experience" (Wilson and Herrstein, 1985, pg. 209). Equally important, the interplay of family, schools, community, age and the labor market also influence the development of the criminal (Mathis and Rayman, Nov. 1972, pgs. 366-373). Young people who exhibit difficulties in some or all of these areas are highly likely to develop delinquent behavior patterns that escalate into criminal behaviors (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 266; Wagatsuma and DeVos, 1984, pgs. 75-250; Gibbons, 1964, pgs. vi-vii). This identification and labeling process is now incorporated into the criminal justice classification and prediction system (Goodman,
The accepted goal of the corrections system after identification is classification for the purposes of retribution, rehabilitation, deterrence, and incapacitation (MacKenzie, Posey and Rapaport, March 1988, pg. 126; Wright and Cingranelli, 1985, pgs. 345-362; Larson, 1984, pgs. 324-356). Very often the negative behaviors are firmly in place when these individuals select and seek each other out to form reinforcing peer groups (Yochelon and Samenow, 1986, pg. 36). It is important to keep these theories and definitions in mind when reading about or working with people who are serving time for felony crimes. While they are individuals they are a very highly self selected group. Most of them suffer from deep anomies, albeit anomies of different kinds.

There are two general categories of crime. The most serious are called felonies. Those found guilty of such crimes are usually committed to the state penitentiary. Less serious crimes are called misdemeanors. Those found guilty of misdemeanors are often sent to the county jail for less than one year. In some cases, for either a felony or misdemeanor, the penalty may be both a fine and a sentence in the appropriate confinement area. (Johns, Albert C., 1973, pg. 165)

Similarly these two general categories are further subdivided in the prison classification process once felons are processed through the criminal justice system.
(McCarthy and Lindquist, Sept., 1985). Classification is designed to function as "the process through which the resources of the correctional institution can be applied effectively to the individual case" (Killinger and Cromwell, Jr. 1973, pg. 276). If the institution is extremely limited in program offerings then classification becomes nothing more than an exercise in labeling, categorizing, segregating and stigmatizing (Killinger and Cromwell, Jr., 1973, pg. 276). Otherwise, classification has the potential for varied rehabilitative purposes (MacKenzie, Layton, Posey and Rapaport, 1968, pgs. 125-136). Using the Utah Study as a model for using risk assessment tests, outcomes and tables to allocate resources, the success of any program can be enhanced by matching offender types and appropriate intervention programs (National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1988). Once inmates are assigned a classification status, trait-treatment matching begins to take place.

Historically, within the trait-treatment format, education, along with other programs and sentencing alternatives, has always been viewed as one of the best ways to rehabilitate and reform offenders (Killinger and Cromwell, Jr., 1973, pg. 242; Pepinsky, 1982, pg. 35, Saney, 1986, pg. 83). Education is society's response to crime (Lewis, 1981, pg. 205).
The Evolution of Our Prison System and Theory of Punishment and Rehabilitation

The history of penal institutions in the United States dates back to when severe colonial criminal codes were brought from England to this continent during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries. Education and rehabilitation for deviants was not transported with the explorers and colonists. Soon after the American Revolution, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Kentucky, Virginia, and Maryland all departed from the punitive practices of public whippings, brandings, and mutilations in favor of the practice of incapacitation through incarceration. A paid police force was established to take the place of the volunteer patrols. Each colony built a penitentiary type institution and incorporated the Quaker's more humane criminal code into prison policy (Killinger and Cromwell, Jr., 1973, pg. 53). The assumptions underscoring the Constitution of the United States of America were extended to include the protection of these rights for prison inmates. "This legal concept finds expression also in our modern belief in individualized treatment of the offender" (Carter and Glaser, 1972, pg. 20).

In America the historical treatment of enslavement, exile, torture, mutilation and execution was put aside in
favor of punishments that would not maim, cripple or deform the inmate. But first, just as in Europe, the evolution of the prison system began with outlawry and banishment, but or compensation for the transgression, gaol (jail), pillory, mutilation and death by hanging, or by drawing and quartering (Reagan and Stoughton; Killinger and Cromwell; Roberts, Sept. 1984, pgs. 80-85; Orland, 1975). The Walnut Street Jail in Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania, put inmates to work in prison and in public service cleaning the streets. By 1829 solitary confinement with labor was used as a method of punishment and deterrence. It was a common belief that "solitude, confinement, sobriety and constant labour" was truly beneficial as a method of rehabilitation (Killinger and Cromwell, Jr., 1973, pgs.12-19). In fact, for many criminals incarceration was more a form of severe mental torture than rehabilitation (Roberts, Sept. 1985, pg. 108).

The present prison system of classification, labor, training, and leisure exercise, and individualized treatment plans based on the nature and severity of the crime was presented to concerned citizens in March of 1787 at Benjamin Franklin's house by Dr. Benjamin Rush. Dr. Rush's proposal resulted in an act of law being passed on April 5, 1790, which established a classification system still in use in our prisons today (Killinger and Cromwell,
Even so, prisons today are still punitive agencies. Probation, parole, education, training, treatment, rehabilitation, deterrence, incapacitation all add up to punishment and retribution for society's progenies. "Even with specific offenders, imprisonment has limited value as a protective device unless they are confined for life" (Carter and Glaser, 1972, pg. 21). It may be that all therapeutic programs, including education, are unable to overcome or reduce the powerful proclivity for offenders to continue in anti-social and criminal behavior (Bailey 1966; David and Seidman 1974; Lipton, Martinson and Wilks, 1975; Brody 1976 (English Study) cited in McGuire and Priestly, pgs. 13-49). The resulting stigma has convinced some officials that imprisonment tends to reduce the number of inmates who become productive citizens and increases the number and severity of crimes they will commit upon release (Carter and Glaser, 1972, pg. 24). Furthermore, through citizens' pressure on government there has been a dramatic change in government's attitude toward those who prey on society. As a result of this pressure longer sentences and stricter punishments are given to convicted felons. This has resulted in more hard core offenders and serious felons in prison and has proven the benefit to society in terms of incapacitation working as a deterrent (McGuigan and Pascale, 1986, pgs. 366-567; Farrington and Gunn,
The evolution of the prison system in this country has been toward the ideal of reformation as well as punishment (Cullen and Gilbert, p. 258, 1982). The medical or reform model encompasses education and counseling as its grid. It is during this century that correctional education is increasingly viewed as a rehabilitative program (Carter, Glaser, and Wilkins, 1972, pg. 30). Schooling is society's response to crime (Lewis, 1981, pgs. 205-226). Lloyd Ohlin concluded that "the central lash of Penal Administration is to effect changes in the criminal value system of the imprisoned inmates" (Johnston, Savitz, and Wolfgang, 1970, pg. 499).

The primary diversification of institutions has been on the basis of degrees of custody. It is now recognized that only a minority of prisoners need to be confined in maximum security prisons, and that even in institutions of this type supervision by qualified personnel is more effective as a custodial measure than the old reliance on heavy stone or concrete and steel. An individual's need of maximum security, moreover, does not negate the need of training and treatment, which have their proper place in even the most secure prison. (Carter, Glaser, and Wilkins, 1972, pg. 33)

**Historical and Philosophical History of Correctional Education**

Historically correctional education has had an unstable and unsteady existence. It has suffered many false starts and much vilification. Throughout all of the confounding and censuring it has endured, it has reemerged
and reestablished itself rather than suffer abandonment. It began in the United States in approximately 1734 when New York used convict labor to build Bellevue, "a Public Workhouse and House of Correction," (Burns, 1983, pg. 403) to move the indigent, mentally ill and insane, and the rest of the country's social problems out of the public view and into the warehouse. This back to back cellular construction was surrounded by eleven foot high walls. The architectural design was for the holding of society's ills, and not rehabilitation. In 1860 it became a source of human specimens for the newly added Bellevue Medical School. Surprisingly Bellevue housed many children. Only because of this fact did the Free Society of New York City provide teachers to teach the young inmates "spelling, reading, writing, and the principles of religion and morality" (Burns, 1983, pg. 407). The curriculum of the Jacksonian Age was grounded philosophically in heavy moralizing about the benefits of being a creditor and the moral impunity being assigned to the status of debtor and pauper. A heavy dose of this morality comprised the daily educational fare which fell on most of these unfortunate children (Reagen and Stoughton, 1976).

In the late eighteenth century the Walnut Street Jail in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania was characterized as "a scene of promiscuous and unrestricted intercourse and universal riot and debauchery" with "no attempt to give
any kind of instruction" (Reagen and Stoughton, 1976, pg. 34). Public outcry expanded interest into prison reform beyond that of the clerics and recruited people from the merchants and the elitist class of Philadelphia and the Federal party to work in the prisons and jails. It was in this way the Society of Friends also became voluntarily involved in the reform movement. However, the motives to help and to rehabilitate were grounded in the protestant work ethic more than in altruistic beliefs. Next, the newly arrived and newly imprisoned Irish Catholic immigrants were lectured on this work ethic by a protestant minister. His charge was to teach them the virtues of industry and sobriety.

During the 1830's Charles Dickens, Alexis de Tocqueville, and Gustave de Beaumont, came over to America from England and France to examine what they believed to be the advanced and enlightened American penitentiary system. Charles Dickens found that there was an appalling system of solitary confinement. Tocqueville and Beaumont likewise found that only Blacks were put in the "bottommost, unhealthy cells in the Tombs of the Bowery Prison" (Burns, 1983, pg. 356). The conditions of American prisons were atrocious because during the nineteenth century most Americans believed that prisons existed solely for punishment. Many still held the belief
that like the prisons of Europe, the sole purpose should be one of holding tanks until punishment (flogging, crucifixion, maiming, castration, tongue cutting, burning, torturing, hanging, banishing, enslaving, and fining) could be decided. Opposite to this, the reform movement established the idea that confinement alone was to serve as punishment, atonement, and revenge of the injured party. Incarceration was also to serve as deterrence and as an example to other miscreants in the free society. At this time there were still no formal educational programs. The curriculum still centered around the cleric teaching from the Bible (Bradley, 1945, pg. 268; Killinger and Cromwell, Jr., 1973; Reagan and Stoughten, 1976).

The first full fledged, formal prison school in the United States was established in Maryland in the 1830's. In 1844, the Eastern Penitentiary of Pennsylvania hired on secular school teachers and established a library. In 1847 the State Legislature of New York passed the first bill funding secular, or "common," teachers for each prison in the state. This was done in proportion to the prison population and to the number of illiterates housed in each institution. The underlying philosophy that "the main cause of crime was ignorance and a lack of education" (Reagen and Stoughton, 1976, pg. 37) began to develop a foothold in society (Killinger and Cromwell, Jr., 1973, pg. 111). Prisons soon became a source of labor for
society. With this advent the prison system began to be self supporting. Goods and services were provided to private industry, agricultural and forestry services. Prison schools began to take on the characteristics of formal education during the 1870's. Curriculum expanded to encompass academic, social and vocational education along with reading and writing. Still, the national pattern was for educational services to reach only 8,000 out of 20,000 illiterate incarcerates in 1870 (Reagen and Stoughton, 1976, pg. 38).

The success of the vocational training programs became a problem when prison labor began to outstrip public labor between 1885 and 1936 (Killinger and Cromwell, Jr., 1973, pgs. 115-118). Public outcry drastically curtailed rehabilitation programs (Reagen and Stoughton, 1976, pg. 42). It wasn't until 1933, again in New York, that prison education was looked toward as a method of rehabilitation. Four thousand Federal prisoners in New York State were enrolled in course work, and sixty percent of all Federal inmates were taking classes. Coursework became compulsory for functional illiterates by 1938. In 1948 the Federal Prison System established programs with state education departments for federal prisons to provide educational services to an estimated one-third of the inmate population (Reagen, and Stoughton, 1976). Inmate law suits have established "that denial of
rehabilitative treatment, including educational and psychological services, is cruel and unusual punishment" (Leeke, 1972, pg. 21).

Actually, New York State began studying the effects of prior educational achievement among inmates in June of 1957. The conclusions published in 1964 found that offenders with normal or better range of intelligence who had a higher level of education at DOP intake exhibited better than average academic progress was the only group profiled to exhibit statistically significant (at the .05 level or below) overall lower recidivism rates. All other groups recidivated at about the same rate with the following exceptions: Normal range I. Q. performance inmates who had lower level educational achievement on admission and lower psychological scores on the MMPI, coupled with severe behavioral problems in adjusting to the prison environment, recidivated at a higher rate than all other groups combined (Oswald & McGinnis, Sept., 1964). Even in view of these findings it was not until the nineteen-sixties and seventies that inmate lawsuits established the right to rehabilitative programs for incarcerates (Jacobs, 1983, pgs. 58-59). It was also during the 1960's and 1970's that most of the research on program effectiveness took place (Kassebaum and Ward 1971; Cohen, 1969; Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin, 1972; Spencer, 1972). Legal challenges, describing prison conditions,
went out to courts throughout the United States citing the eighth and fourteenth amendments:

A warehouse for people that provides no space for an inmate to have recreation, to work off frustration, anger, or simple energy may go a long way toward undermining other efforts at rehabilitation. A newly designed institution providing for four-man cells is building-in a denial of privacy and protection for which no amount of vocational education can compensate. (Leeke, 1972, pg. 143)

In 1971 riots erupted in New York State's Attica Prison. At that time Attica did not have meaningful programs for education or rehabilitation. Idleness was pervasive, and as a result the inmates made their voices heard on a national scale. The Attica Commission produced a critique of the prison system, but the literature did not produce reform. Throughout the 1970's change was accomplished by prisoners filing lawsuits against the system through the court process (Orland, 1975, pgs. 105-108).

In light of the questioning by inmates which occurred during the 1970's the purpose of prisons is again being redefined during the 1980's. The question of privatization of prisons is also an alternative frequently considered but not yet implemented (Stewart in McGuigan and Pascale, 1986, pgs. 365-387). Even though the emphasis is on punishment, custody and rehabilitation the social emphasis of developing the individual as a total personality is the prevalent philosophy today (Bender and Leone, 1985, pgs.
The goal for assimilation purposes in society at large also dominates correctional education today. At length it is the inmate student who has to adjust and assimilate to free society. The offender needs to acquire self-direction and the concept that he, not the system, is responsible for his own behavior. At the same time modern educational methodology, in theory, in prison education concentrated mostly on the social and motivational aspects of educating the individual (Braswell, 1985, pg. 129). The individual is perceived as a student whose self is complete and individualistic within itself. Equally important, the prison school is viewed as a place where some social and emotional skills can be taught and where employable skills can be gained, skills that will enhance the offenders' chances of reintegrating into the community (Scull, 1977, pg. 42; Ramsey, 1986, pgs. 4-6; Michalek, 1988, pgs. 6-10). Inmates exhibit classical behavioral patterns when initially incarcerated (Thomas, Nov. 1970, pgs. 251-261; Clemmer, Sykes in Johnson, Savitz and Wolfgang, 1970, pgs. 383-496; Sykes, 1971, pgs. 63-108). The initial adjustment process encompasses a year or two of depression, frustration, denial and reluctance to participate in available prison programs. The realization that to secure early release an inmate must demonstrate a change in attitude and adjustment to prison life often motivates the inmate to explore program options. When
this process takes place the inmate becomes motivated and involved in therapy, schools, work and whatever other activities are offered. In this manner inmates are able to avoid the "who cares trap," to stabilize and to maintain their personal growth. At this state when inmates run out of programs, they tend to run out of hope (Corrections Compendium, Feb. 1987). Prisoners can become better readers and good writers. But because the public view is that we have only created a smarter criminal, prison education is not viewed as learning being inseparable from virtue and pity. Inmate behavior patterns can be summarized by looking at the State of Virginia's DOP system. Six hundred inmates out of 1,000 who were program eligible took part in a literacy program to earn an early parole release date. From January of 1987 to January of 1988 attrition claimed 185 inmates. Of the 415 remaining inmates in the program only 122 have reached sixth grade reading levels (Michigan Study, March, 1987, p. 5). These attrition rates and achievement levels are typical of prison adult basic education programs. Prisoners end up being viewed as economic means to serve institutional or social objectives, especially with the rise of victims' rights.

By 1984 the educational services provided to penal institutions in Canada and the United States had clearly shifted from cleric volunteers to part time adult high
school to the current fulltime adult high school and to
two year colleges, with some providing four year college
courses. The goal is to provide programs that will meet
the needs of adult students (Cosman, Spring 1980, pgs.
42-47). Over 75% of prison post secondary programs are
being offered by community/vocational technical colleges
today. Eight percent of all inmates nationwide are
enrolled in Post Secondary College education programs
today (Wolford and Littlefield, 1985, pg. 257).
Eighty-four percent of these programs are offered through
state supported colleges and universities (Wolford and
Littlefield, 1985, pg. 260). An example is the University
of Minnesota's Newgate college attendance program for 145
academically qualified incarcerates, which was
implemented during the Winter of 1970. The inmates were
intensively tested and screened prior to admission into
the program. It continued through the Winter of 1974.
One hundred and six inmate students, representing
seventy-three percent of the enrollment, completed the
program and did not subsequently recidivate. There are
strong indications from this program, according to
Wolford, but no statistical proof, that adult education on
an advanced level changes incarcerates' thinking modes to
that of analytic perception and accelerates moral
development. Unfortunately, this has not been
substantiated and the need for follow up evaluation leaves
an open field. In addition to the Newgate study in New York, the Windham School System in Texas provides a comprehensive and vocational education program to intellectually impaired offenders. The Program has a support system which extends from Waco to Huntsville, Texas. Students range from first grade to GED aspirants (McAdams, 1984). Unfortunately no follow up statistics are available to evaluate the recidivism rates of the participants. Similarly the Michigan Department of Corrections examined the relationship between involvement in academic programs, subsequent inmate academic achievement, post release recidivism and employment. Results of this study indicated the inmates who were recommended for the program, but failed to enroll, experienced higher recidivism rates; while those who competed the course of study experienced lower rates (Michigan DOP Report No. 4, March 1987).

Some adult educational programs in institutional settings are labeled more symbol than substance due to the problems in delivering the educational service (Peak, Sept. 1973, pg. 80; Murray, June 1987, pgs. 50-52; Zumpetta, Sept. 1988, pgs. 130-133). Fiscal problems, structural factors, contradictory goals between teachers and the prison administration (Rutherford, 1984, pgs. 64-89), harassment, lack of publicity about courses offered, conflicting activities, poor classroom plant
facilities, prison lockdowns, staff apathy and student attitudinal adjustment problems are just a few of the obstacles facing prison education programs in the 1980's (Goldin and Thomas, 1984, pg. 123). Sam Lovell, vocational training and academic program coordinator for Glades Correctional Institution in Belle Glade Florida, reported that over a two year period in the ABE, GED and HSD prison education program "fewer than a hundred students graduated out of approximately 2,000 served." He reports that the numbers today for HSD, while still discouraging, are not quite so low; and also that the report for the GED completion stands at approximately 75%. Martinson surveyed 231 studies and came to the unfortunate conclusion that rehabilitative education and counseling efforts had no noticeable effect on reducing recidivism (Lipton, Martinson and Wilks, 1975, pgs. 23-26). Other studies show comparable rates of recidivism between all parole and expiration groups (over 12,000 groups of juvenile and adult offenders between 555 different studies) irrespective of whether they received educational program treatments, with one exception, groups receiving education have higher recidivism rates in rules and order violations (Greenberg, 1977, pgs. 111, 120, 121, 122, 123; Geneve, Margolies and Muhlin, 1983, pg. 64). Still further surveys of studies yield even more negative results (McSweeny, Fremouw, and Hawkins, 1982). These
findings are hardly encouraging. Other outcome evaluation studies for academic and vocational education programs list correlations between recidivism rates, achievement scores and academic performance too low to be of any practical interest (Gottfredson, Aug. 1972, pgs. A1-A19; Coombs, June 1965, pg. 57, Ingalls, 1978, pgs. 66-68; Glad, 1983, pgs. 79-80). The scores tended to be uncorrelated or even negatively correlated (Michigan Department of Corrections Report No. 4, pgs. 32-36, March, 1987).

Another overwhelmingly negative problem is that of inmate attitude, which can vary from apathetic to hostile (George and Krist, July/Aug. 1980, pgs 56-65). Charlette Low Allen reports in the Feb 13, 1989 issue *Insight on the News: How to Punish:*

Academic classes are the one place where one sees torpor in a federal prison: a sign on a Lewisburg bulletin board promises $25 to all inmates enrolled in the Adult Basic Education course who pass the final examination that shows their skills are at the eighth-grade level. But the prison law library is packed of an afternoon with "writ writers" clacking away on typed legal petitions. (Allen, Feb. 1989, pgs. 13-14)

Pauline MacNeil, in her study of correctional education in New Jersey, discusses organizational barriers to the administration of correctional education in much the same terms as Martinson, and Goldin and Thomas (MacNeil, 1980, pg. 211). The main barrier is the
administrative dictate: custody before education (Rutherford, 1984). Most of the barriers can be overcome by establishing strong communication lines between the teachers and the prison staff. In the area of custodial goals versus educational goals, the safety of the educational staff is an important administrative prison concern. Safety concerns necessarily create delays in program delivery because all items brought into the prison have to be searched. This procedure is for the safety and well being of not only all prison and school employees but also for that of the inmates as well. Prison officials are charged with knowing where all of the inmates are all of the time. Therefore classroom activities are frequently interrupted by custodial staff for the purpose of taking actual head counts.

Current prison educational programs are far from uniform. All programs are set up for voluntary participation. But because prisoners earn good time for attending classes there is already a form of built in coercion. According to Peter Jennings of ABC News, one out of 27 men is incarcerated in the United States today. This was stated on June 9, 1986 during his evening broadcast. According to Warden Deeds of SDCC, recidivism stands at 85% nationwide and 95% in the State of Nevada. The implications from these statistics are clear. When coupled with the fact that 27 million adults in the United
States today are functional illiterates we clearly have a society in crisis. Education was an answer in the past. Hopefully education in our humanitarian society will steer the prison population in the opposite direction from incarceration.

**Costs, Causes and Recommended Cures**

In 1983, $6.6 billion yearly was the minimal cost of prison maintenance for an estimated 260,000 inmates, out of a total state and federal prison population of about 440,000, whose imprisonment had been directly linked to functional illiteracy (Kozol, pg. 13, 1985). According to other sources the 1983 National expenditure was $8 billion to taxpayers (Carnes, pg. 128, 1985). Regardless of the exact dollar amount spent, the prison population represents the single highest concentration of adult illiterates. While criminal conviction of illiterate men and women cannot be identified exclusively with inability to read and write (Glad, 1983), the fact that 60 percent of prison inmates cannot read above the sixth grade level provides some indication of one major reason for their criminal activity (Gentil and McMillan, 1979). In fact Glad found in her study of Nevada felons that as the length of a court imposed sentence increased, reading scores also increased (Glad, 1983, pgs. 75-79). Swollen court costs, strained law-enforcement budgets, especially
in those urban areas in which two fifths of all adults are unemployable for lack of literacy skills; and the high cost of crime to those who are its victims, cannot be guessed, but must be many times the price of prison maintenance (Kozol, 1985, pgs. 13-14). The American public may view rehabilitation as the purpose of corrections, but less than 5 cents of every dollar allocated to prisons goes toward any type of treatment program (Smith and Fontana, 1981, pg. 71).

Many factors contribute to the commissions of crime (Glueck, 1952, pgs. 1-23; Lunden, 1967, pgs. 1-23; Wolfgang, 1968, pgs.1-133; Johnson, Savitz and Wolfgang, 1970; Winslow, 1973, pgs. 109-115; Laufer and Day, 1983; Wilson and Herrnstein 1985). Some factors are said to be inherited, (Godwin, 1957; Glueck, 1966; Lunden, 1967; Wolfgang, 1968; Conrad and Dinitz, 1977; Laufer and Day 1983), others environmental (Wright, 1973, pg. 26). The best predictor of who will commit crimes is also said to be an individual's index of past criminal behavior (Cartwright, 1972; Gottfredson, 1987, pg. 23). On the one hand, inherited factors encompass some aspects of intelligence, race, ethnic orientation and body types. On the other hand, environmental factors which contribute to crime are: place of residence, neighborhood, school, socio-economic status of family, number of siblings and other relatives living in the household, whether the
household is headed by two parents, whether the household has been subjected to incapacitation, physical illness, mental illness, and whether or not there is a pattern of criminal behavior in the life style of the responsible adults of the household. Other factors such as birth order, peer groups, school performance, drug and alcohol consumption, availability of opportunity to commit crimes, and prior criminal behavior are also said to have a determining impact on crime rates (Glueck, 1952, 1966; Rubington and Weinberg, 1971, pgs. 19, 41, 44-45, 47-48, 139-144; Wolfgang, Figlio, Sellin, 1972; Guenther, 1976, pgs. 57-58; Watasuma and DeVos, 1984). The end result in every case, irrespective of the reason, is: Society reacts to deviant behavior (Rubington and Weinberg, 1968; Inciardi, Aug. 1972, pgs. 217-233; Rosenbaum, March 1987, pgs. 117-132).

Charles Goring published *The English Convict: A Statistical Study*, in 1913. He gathered data beginning in 1901 from over three thousand male prisoners and nonprisoners in London. The study analysis included information on eight variables: occupation, family situation, ethnic, age, education levels, subjective measurements of intelligence levels, frequency of occurrence of criminal behavior in a convict's family and environment, and marriage rates. He used Karl Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient to try to quantify
the degree of association between variables. Goring concluded that crime rates were not dependent on a person's physical characteristics, but were dependent on socio-economic and environmental conditions (Godwin, 1957, pgs. 18-27). Daniel Glaser, Carliss King, Marvin Wolfgang and a host of other researchers into the causes of crime support research into the impact of psychological, environmental and hereditary variables and crime.

By comparison Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin compiled a longitudinal study of birth cohort on 10,000 boys born in 1945 in the city of Philadelphia from their tenth birthday until eighteen years of age, or early adulthood. Many agencies, both public and private cooperated with the researchers to make the study possible. The demographics of the group crossed ethnic and racial lines as well as socio-economic, school achievement, neighborhood, emotional stability, physical status and a host of other variables. Each offense committed was scored as to the seriousness of the crime, and the individuals were followed from the time adjudicated delinquents, convicted, committed to and released from correctional facilities. The principal purpose of the study was to ascertain if personality traits exhibited by the subjects between kindergarten through the completion of ninth grade were factors in future delinquent behavior; and if the relationships varied depending on the variables of
intelligence and social class (Wolfgang, Figlio, Sellin, 1972, pgs. 3-12). The study was concerned with the following variables: Age, delinquency and nondelinquency status, I. Q. scores, school achievement records, number of police contacts, number of arrests, seriousness of the crime, socio-economic data, household composition, race, types of schools and neighborhoods, and highest grade level attained (Wolfgang, Figlio, Sellin, 1972, pgs. 39-64). The results of the study supported evidence that the variables of race and socio-economic status were related to achievement and delinquency status. To be nonwhite almost assured low achievement, low socio-economic status, and delinquency. This relationship was also found between race and the other variables. In addition, it is asserted in the summary section of the study that once delinquent behavior is embarked upon there is a high probability that the behavior will continue and escalate (Wolfgang, Figlio, Sellin, 1972, pgs. 244-255). An extremely disheartening commentary is the finding that the nonwhite group compared to the white group, on socio-economic levels for infractions, had an alarmingly high propensity for escalating violence and bodily injury of victims (Wolfgang, Figlio, Sellin, 1972, pg. 302).

Wilson and Herrnstein concluded, as did Gibbons, that circumstances, whether hereditary or environmental, which activate crime in one person will not necessarily do so
in another, but that people who break the law are usually "Psychologically atypical" (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pgs. 103 & 173; Gibbons, 1981, pgs. 20-35). They also state that constitutional and social factors interact to cause criminal behavior (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 511). Social factors in the home and personality factors in the individual are also predictors of criminal behavior (Cartwright, 1972, pg. 145). Equally of note Yochelson and Samenow (1976) espouse that all criminals are aware, in control and purposeful in the pursuit of crime.

Alcohol and other drugs such as methamphetamines, cocaine, heroin, LSD and cannibas act as reinforcers to crime. Disinhibition, the weakening of internalized restraints, eventually increases aggressiveness and impulsiveness (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 372). In fact, much research into drug and alcohol factors find that increased sentence length, for drug and narcotic related activities, does not have a deterrent effect in reducing delinquent and criminal behavior in that population (Singh and Adams, 1981, pg. 53 in Zimmerman and Miller). Inmates with the poorest job stability record and the highest drinking habits also had the highest prior felony convictions and the highest recidivism rates (Babst and Chambers, Nov. 1972, pg. 369).

Age is said to directly effect crime rates (Lunden, 1967, pgs. 116-126; Hippchen, Flynn, Owens, and Schnur,
1978). Paul Marsh conducted a cohort study for the Arizona Department of Corrections. He tracked 332 individuals from 1970 to 1976, and used all of the traditional variables: age, ethnicity, age at first admission, prior juvenile and adult arrest and rearrest rates, probation and parole failures, educational achievement, intelligence, reading grade level scores, socio-economic status, psychological test scores, severity of crime, and sentence lengths, and concluded that it was age alone which is responsible for the decline in criminal behavior (Marsh, 1976). The young commit more crime (Glazer, 1984). Age and gender "are powerful contributors to criminality" and also individuals who perform on the lower end of intelligence tests are those with less talents or less intellectual capacity (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 148; Glueck, 1952). It may be the goal of rehabilitation "programs to offer educational and vocational training; increase social, professional, and labor skills; alter attitudes, abilities and values; and, ultimately, bring about changes in the offender, as well as in his environment," (Hippchen, Flynn, Owens, and Schnur, 1978, pg. 89). Crime and delinquency are also directly linked to values (Christiansen; Reiss and Rhodes; Gordon, pgs. 41-123 in Glaser, 1970), but the normal process of maturation which occurs with aging may be the only factor which really works. However, age is not
considered a treatment option. If it were, society might repressively and selectively begin to lock up all young men (urban, poor and unemployed), between the ages of 16 to 35.

Clark and Wenninger found that their study showed that "patterns of illegal behavior among juveniles is dramatically different" between different juvenile socio-economic groups. These groups had different social "focal concerns" or values. Their 1961 study was of 1154 public school students from the sixth through the twelfth grades in four different communities. All students who could not read were removed from the sample. The findings indicated that deviant behavior escalated from obnoxious behavior that was still socially tolerable, to extremely negative and violent behavior as the study sample shifted from the middle class students to the urban poor. Degree and severity of crimes committed were enhanced within the lower class students (Clark and Wenninger, pgs. 71-89, in Glaser, 1970).

Intelligence develops chronologically. However, people who are advanced, average or retarded at an early age tend to exhibit that same performance throughout life (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 150). "A person's level of moral reasoning is correlated with intelligence, particularly verbal intelligence" (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 169). Even though the socio-economic status
sorting also explains the association between crime and low I. Q., the I. Q. remains a higher correlate than does the socio-economic status (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 156). Psychopathic adolescents score significantly lower on Wechler's full scale I. Q. and on the Verbal and Performance subsets. They are a high risk group for offending. Potential delinquent groups can be identified by lower performance on the verbal portion (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 160; Greenwood, 1986). This early detection, early program intervention, and family counseling can help the delinquent before the criminal stage is reached (Gendreau and Ross, 1987). "Sheer youth, low verbal I. Q., and a substantial gap between performance and verbal scores all converge more or less together on a low level of moral development or interpersonal maturity and a tendency to break the law" (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1986, pg. 162). I. Q. was found to have significant differences in mean scores among the social classes (Bodmer in Richardson, Spears and Richards, 1972, pg. 99).

Any group of people who experience a narrow range of choices, opportunities and alternatives will result to asocial means to meet their needs (Wolfgang 1964; Rubington and Weinberg, 1971, pg. 128). Wilson and Herrnstein list abusive families, blocked opportunities, wanton selfishness and moral bankruptcy as factors
contributing to narrow range of choices (Sutherland and Cressey in Rubington and Weingerg, 1971, pgs. 139-140). Marvin Wolfgang reported the rate to be as high as 10.42 to 1 (White =1) between black and white criminals (Wolfgang, 1964, pg. 33). Wolfgang also found in his study that blacks are incarcerated for longer periods of time for the same category of crimes than whites (Wolfgang, 1964, pg. 39). The counterpart to this is better educational opportunities which produce a higher probability of success in society (Albanese, 1981, pg. 45). Inmates who benefit from programs and incarceration are more prone to succeed in the first place (Allen and Beran, 1977, pg. 15). This is followed by studies which show there is a positive correlation between education and parole success. Lower recidivism rates reflect employment success, and education, training and work programs offer avenues for inmates who are success oriented. Some noticable behaviors are: "responsibility, self discipline, appropriate work habits, and positive changes in self-concept" (Anderson, 1981, pgs. 12, 22).

The mean difference in I. Q. reported in Wallace A. Kennedy's study between blacks and whites is 21.1. The standard deviation was reported to be 12.4 versus 16.4, or some 25% less among blacks than among whites. The Mean I. Q. of 80.7 was reported for blacks versus a mean of 101.3 for whites (Richardson, Spears, and Richards, 1972, pgs.
103-104). Any discussion of I. Q. and I. Q. differences is always a touchy and dangerous bombshell. It is both a racial and social danger zone. Careful and thoughtful consideration must always be used whenever race and intelligence are discussed. It is important to remember "Deficiencies in sensory input or motor output will affect performance. So will factors relating to attention and alertness" (Richardson, Spears, and Richards, 1972, pg. 130). Socio-economic sorting also explains the association between crime and low I. Q. It is unfortunate that I. Q. remains a higher correlate than socio-economic status.

Nevertheless, it is equally important to take a second look at the economic view of recidivism. "If it is valid, the economic explanation" of criminal behavior has important bearings for correctional facilities, society and potential employers (Kaplan and Kessler, 1976, pg. 21). First, employers are reluctant to hire ex-cons because of the high recidivism rate. Second, the economic view of crime reinforces the prison reform movement especially in support of "drastic reform of prison education programs" (Kaplan and Kessler, 1976, pg. 22). At length, the economist believes, like Yochelson and Samenow, that criminals are rational people who make rational choices and chose crime to meet their economic needs. To alter a criminal's rational calculation and
propensity for crime, his opportunities and attitudes toward the future must be changed. "Consequently, any "rehabilitative" program that assumes the criminal is abnormal, deviant, inadequate, irrational, or characterized by anomie is doomed to failure" (Kaplan and Kessler, 1976, pgs. 21-22). Other studies reinforce a variety of other causes of criminality.

Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck's extensive study of delinquent boys disclosed the interaction between body type, personality, attitude toward authority, family adjustment, history of alcoholism and mental disease; and sex, age, I. Q. and socio-economic status (Glueck and Glueck, 1935, 1952, 1955, 1966).

Frances Smart examined the role of inner sources of social control and how those sources work on individuals or unadapted persons to conform (Smart, 1970, pgs. 50-51). Smart concluded that there is a link between maladapted individuals and criminal behavior. The weak superego (Smart, 1970, pg. 63) is also mentioned as a reason for deviance. This is consistent with the findings of other psychiatrists who have criminology practices (Chein, et. al., 1964; Cohen, 1966, Smart, 1970). Smart's study also supports the theory that deprivation, rejection, and desertion are linked to criminal behavior (Smart, 1970, pg. 60-61).

Jackson Toby found that "People are more prone to act
upon their anti-social impulses when external controls
over them are weak," (Glaser, 1970, pg. 129) as did
Guenther. Social vigilance and social values are stronger
in the middle and upper classes. Predatory crime occurs
when the restraint of social vigilance is reduced and the
criminal personality is allowed to come into play (Toby, in
Glaser, 1970; Goodman, 1983). It is reduced in the
beginning acculturation process of the lower classes.

Toby's survey of hoodlum-type thieves found that parental
control was ineffectual, the families were generally
overwhelmed by their own difficulties as evidenced by
chaotic households, death, desertion, deprivation,
disease, alcoholism, gambling, promiscuity, and too many
children in the house to support or supervise (Toby in
Glaser, 1970, pg. 130). Incapacitating problems and
problems of parental manipulative dependence are
concentrated in this lower socio-economic class. The Toby
study points to the importance in the family background in
providing the prerequisites for further education (Toby in
Glaser, 1970, pg. 133). However, in the face of
negativism and incapacitation the findings emphasized that
success in school helped to strengthen the link between
the student and external social controls which gave the
student a strong stake in conformity and assured the
individual a spot in the accepted social way of life
(Glaser, 1970, pgs. 129-137).
In the same manner, educational information is an important component in program planning for offenders (Fejes-Mendoza and Rutherford, Dec. 1987, pg. 148).

Wilson and Hernstein found performance deficiency in the realm of internal speech, the ability to use language constructively in problem solving; compared with family background, I. Q., socio-economic situation was seen as a predisposing factor which identifies the tendency for aggressive behavior in elementary school children (Hartinger, Eldefonso and Coffey, 1973, pgs. 222-227).

The strength of an individual's internal monologue is composed of intellectual capacity and personality or temperament. If an individual has strong tendencies toward verbal thinking, impulse control, and cognitive levels of thinking, then the individual will probably contribute to society. If however, the tendencies are temperamental, nonverbal and impulsive, this will determine whether that individual will be a risk to society over a very long time span. Low rating scores on measurements of interpersonal maturity are also associated with a proclivity for the criminal pattern of behavior. The interpersonal maturity scale of moral development attempts to classify people into thanatotic categories of rampant egotism and dionysian hedonism. The scale also identifies individuals ruled by principles and those individuals who operate with a large capacity for delayed

Quinney found "To be of the working class, black," immigrants to the United States from "the third world, with little education, and without the "proper respect" for the law, or some combination of these, increases the likelihood that you will be processed in the criminal justice system--and more severely than others in the society" (Quinney, 1979, pg. 333). The less education and the more menial the job, the greater the chance of serving prison time (Johnson, 1957; Wright, 1973; Fejes-Mendoza & Rutherford Jr., 1987). The deviant was thus labeled early as being well on the way to an anti-social life of crime (Goodman, 1983). Daniel Glaser sees the role of the prison being that of evoking "in offenders an enduring identification of themselves with anti-criminal persons," and education "To enhance the prospects that released prisoners will achieve satisfaction in legitimate post-release activities." (Glaser, 1970, pg. 261)

David Abrahamsen concluded in his treatment studies research that "socially ill" people can be taught to adapt successfully to society. The goal is, of course, to reduce recidivism. In his research the educational team successfully offered rewards to inmates to facilitate change. "The offender evaluated the advantages of belonging to his old group, so he will have to be
stimulated to work in the new one and estimate the advantages present in it" (Abrahamsen, 1969, pg. 193). The criminal is identified by Emile Durkheim as one who "seeks to live at the expense of" the social organization without doing its fair share. Criminals are in a state of anomie (Durkheim, 1933, pg. 368) against the rest of society in their unwillingness to participate and do their share in the division of labor. It has been suggested that criminals be incarcerated for a maximum of four years. While the British system believes in classification and programming, empirical evidence from their system supports the idea that if inmates can't be fixed within a four year time module, they will never be cured. However, implementation of the four year limit on incarceration time would do little to provide respite for the law abiding balance of society.

Elmer Johnson (1968) recommended reducing recidivism by providing the inmate with time for reflection, moral training for developing inhibitions, postponement of immediate desires for achievement of long term goals and the opportunity to learn from experience (Johnson, 1968, pg. 648). In spite of the volume of studies supporting programs, many others have suggested from the results of their studies that nothing helps the sociopathic prodigal. The growing belief is that rehabilitation is dead (Kwarthler, 1977, pg. 124). "It may be, on the other
hand, that there is a more radical flaw in our present strategies that education at its best, or that psychotherapy at its best, cannot overcome, or even appreciably reduce, the powerful tendency for offenders to continue in criminal behavior" (Robert Martinson, pg. 325 from Skolnick, Jerome; Martin Frost, and Jane L. Scheeber, Crime and Justice in America., 1977). "Programs designed to rehabilitate high-rate offenders have not been shown to have much success; and those programs that do manage to reduce criminality among certain kinds of offenders often increase it among others" (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985, pg. 19). This was also supported in the Donald MacDonald and Gerald Bala 1986 study of New York State inmates who earned high school equivalency diplomas while incarcerated (MacDonald and Bala, 1986, p. 8).

Conrad and Dinitz found in their study that the effectiveness of incapacitation in preventing further crime, using a fixed sentence treatment stands at 4%; for crimes cleared and persons charged, the rate stands at 18%. They conclude that incapacitation is an ineffective option for reducing recidivism (Conrad and Dinitz, 1977, pg. xii). Recidivism rates and education, either vocational or academic, are unrelated in the Debors study. There was no discernable effects on recidivism between participants of either program (Debors, 1984). However, in California the probation versus prison research
established that while probation proved viable for low risk individuals it had negative results for high risk offenders, and there was virtually no difference between probation or imprisonment in reducing recidivism. Each group committed new crimes at approximately the same rate (Robison and Smith's Community Treatment Project, 1961, in Conrad and Dinitz, pg. 122). The Northern California Service League study measured variables of age, sex, race, type of offense and length of time served, number of prior arrests and type of crime. The findings were considered tentative due to faulty evaluative techniques. Again, each group did just as well as the other. The study therefore did not support any claims that community supervision, either parole or probation, was more effective than confinement (Conrad and Dinitz, pg. 122-123). In spite of these findings, parole expectancy research statistics on classification procedures are valid for selecting and predicting post incarceration behavior (Babst, Chambers, Nov. 1972, p.367). A ridiculous and sad commentary is that the only sure cure is the death penalty; because when executed prevention is "completely effective" (Johnston, Savitz, and Wolfgang, 1970, pg. 370). The public is increasingly in favor of more punitive and extreme measures toward criminals (Cheatwood, 1988, pg. 45). Court sentences are supposed to punish and deter, not corrections. The province of corrections is to
enable the individual to stabilize, and acquire the characteristics which will enable them to become law abiding citizens (Hippchen, Flynn, Owens, and Schnur, 1978, pg. 89).

Historically, education has been looked toward as the best way to rehabilitate and reform offenders. This is so even though the rates of success with education as a treatment program are unknown and are not included in most treatment taxonomies for control of social deviates (Cohen, 1966, pg. 39). This was established after the implementation of the Bridwell program in sixteenth century England. The mission of the Bridwell House of Correction was to teach inmates a vocation and to instill in them positive work habits (Roberts, 1984, pg. 83).

Wilbert Rideau and Billy Sinclair wrote "The Incompatibility of Prison Life and Society," originally printed in the 1981 November-December issue of The Angloite. "Men leaving prison today have little, if any, formal education; they do not have marketable skills: and they have poor work habits because prison has instilled that dependency complex in their characters."

Furthermore, "Between 20 and 50 Percent of all inmates cannot read or write" (Jengeleski, Sept., 1984, pg. 90; Ricki Pollock, 1979). Many of today's ex-offenders cannot even read a job application form, they do not know how to dress for job interviews; and do not have the appropriate
attitude to even secure a job. Prison has not taught them any of these basic survival skills. Prison only teaches them that it's "count-time," "chow-time," or "no stopping on the walk" (Bender and Leone, 1984, pg. 97; Ray and Kilburn, 1970, pg. 176).

George Bernard Shaw observed: "Thus we see that of the three official objects of our prison system: vengeance, deterrence, and reformation of the criminal, only one is achieved; and that is the one that is nakedly abominable." "The term 'corrections' is a euphemism for putting people in jails and prisons" (Smith and Fontana, 1981, pg. 70). Corrections implies change, rectification, remedy and reform. But, people are not warehoused and incarcerated for the purpose of positive behavioral change, even though the Handbook on Correctional Classification lists education as "The primary programming area" for rehabilitation (Hippchen, Flynn, Owens, and Schnur, 1978, pg. 104). Regardless of the specific causes of crime the system of punishments is designed to be a harsh deterrent among those who are less affluent and least likely to benefit from the existing socio-economic structures (Michalowski, 1985, pg. 227).

During an inmate's incarceration period, emphasis needs to be given to educational and treatment programs rather than custody alone (Smith, Christopher E., 1987, pg. 134). Education and therapy may be separate in
theory, but if education is a part of rehabilitation then it can not be separate from therapy but must be an extension of it. For education to be an effective treatment program in subsequent reductions of recidivism an inmate must be enrolled for no less than six months (Schnur, 1948, pg. 142-147). In the same spirit teachers should join prison staff members in rehabilitation work and should help create a therapeutic atmosphere (Sturup, 1968, pg. 53-54). It is unfortunate that custodial control, according to Vernon Fox, can be motivated by institutional programs (Johnson, Savitz, and Wolfgang, 1970). Programming means state custodial personnel have less inmates to supervise. To begin with the emphasis should be on using education to maintain discipline, avoid anxiety, and promote tranquility. This is accomplished by channeling aggression and maintaining group order through the use of class attendance (Cosman, 1980, pgs. 42-47). As an aid to this end class attendance should not used in the education process as a resource for growth (Vernon Fox in Johnson, Savitz and Wolfgang, 1970, pg. 396). To conclude, vocational and educational programs should play a more dominant role in the prison routine. If inmates do not have the opportunity to acquire marketable skills through educational programs while incarcerated, they will surely, upon release, return to crime to meet their needs (Smith and Fontana, 1981, pg. 73; Smith, Christopher E.,
Most day-to-day work assignments in the Nevada State Prison system are assignments in boredom, i.e. menial and janitorial in nature. Intelligently administered self improvement programs would accomplish more in terms of human growth and development than the custodial warehousing currently practiced in our state system (Frank, 1973, pg. 125). In 1984 Thomas Thorpe, Donald MacDonald, and Gerald Bala conducted a follow up study on 276 inmates in the New York State Prison System who earned degrees and certificates while incarcerated. They were looking for evidence that completion of a degree program might make the offender a better parole risk. They found that the recidivism rate was lower among those who completed educational programs. Evidence specifically supporting the idea of self improvement for Nevada's inmates can be found in the Thorp study. Their findings are summarized in tables eight, nine and ten:
Table eight shows the lower recidivism rate among inmates who earned college degrees or certificates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Completion</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduates</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table nine depicts the percentage returned over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release Year (as of 6/30/83)</th>
<th>Projected Release</th>
<th>Projected Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>43-54 Months</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>31-42 Months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>19-30 Months</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>7-18 Months</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983 (Jan.-June)</td>
<td>1-6 Months</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table ten compares the actual rate of return with the projected rate of return.

### Table 10
Comparison of Actual and Projected Return Rates of Offenders Who Completed College Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release Year</th>
<th>Projected Return Rate</th>
<th>Actual Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.-June</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Thorpe, MacDonald, Bala, Sept. 1984, pgs. 86-88)
Louis Richman reports in "The Skilled and Unskilled: Jobs of the Future," that "a dishearteningly large number of workers lack the basic skills the job market increasingly requires" and "while the pool of black male workers will grow by 29% to the end of the century, fewer are going to work" (Richman, April, 1988, pgs. 22-23).

Though the urban hard-core unemployed suffer from unique problems, the failures of the educational system are distributed far more widely. Public high school dropout rates have been edging upward for years. These days, almost 29% of each entering class do not graduate (Richman, 1988, pg. 23). Also the problem of social promotion in schools produces cumulative failures. Academic failure produces lowered self esteem. The result is self selection out of course work and academic classes (Smith, 1987, pg. 135). Nicholas Katzenbach points out that "the high degree of correlation between delinquency and failure in school is more than accidental" (Katzenbach, 1967, pg. 71). These failures are then transferred to the workforce. The failure recurs because employers are after workers who have generic skills. They need employees who work more productively with less supervision, and they traditionally look to our educational institutions to provide people who are "marketable products" (Richman, 1988 pg. 24). "A most notable characteristic of adult prisoners is their lack of
education and job skills. If education: academic, social, and vocational, is an essential element of succeeding in today's world, then the increasing attention and concern aimed toward the field of correctional education is readily understandable" (Degraw, 1987, pg. 18).

Scudder, in his Chino California study, recommends more education for "life" rather than for college (Scudder, 1968). The State of Texas Waldron Study (1974) concluded that moving an inmate academically to 11th or 12th grade level attainment seemed to reduce the likelihood of returning to prison. The average educational level of the typical Texas citizen 20 years of age and older in 1974 was grade 10.7 (Waldron, 1974, pg. 1). For the incarcerated over 20 years of age the grade level attainment was eighth grade, fourth month. Inmates who did not achieve 11th or 12th grade performance were more likely to recidivate (Waldron, 1974). Equally important were the prior findings of the Camp Hill study. The Camp Hill study indicated that humanities programs did not reduce recidivism (Lewis, 1973, pg. 127). As early as 1962 it was recognized that our schools are as much a part of the criminal problem as the breakdown of the family and the cultural environment. "Our education is geared for all our kids and that's the heart of the problem. We need some kind of program for the kids who don't fit into our school picture," those who reject the
middle class educational standards (Tunley, 1964, pg. 172). Seventy percent of California's inmates were found to be one to six years behind in school performance before they dropped out of public school programs (Scudder, 1968, pgs. 280-281). The statistics on the drop out rates of the early sixties mirror the current drop out rate experienced in Clark County School District high schools today. "Indications are that the holding power of the public schools, presently graduating sixty out of a hundred persons, seventeen years of age, has probably reached its peak" (Tunley, 1964, pg. 179). The Las Vegas Review Journal contained a news item (Thursday, February 25, 1988) that Clark County School District graduates 64% of its high school students, and experiences a 36% drop out rate. Many of these drop outs end up without resources and the competitive skills necessary to survive in today's job market. Without society's safety nets these individuals become dependent and desperate.

Even in the "enthusiastic condemnation of the penal system" by inmates themselves there is a plea for help and rehabilitation through education. "A person who commits a crime should be punished but" that "person should be helped or rehabilitated and shown the right way so that when returned to free society he can become a good citizen and a benefit to his community" (Minton, 1971, pg. 121). Over 80% of the inmates and 100% of the correctional staff
surveyed by Cullen and Gilbert reaffirmed their belief in the treatment model where programs are a part of rehabilitation (Cullen and Gilbert, 1982, pgs. 258-259). Educational programs are the only answer to the larger question as to how we are going to redeem errant souls and protect society at the same time. This is true in spite of claims that too much is expected of corrections and that programs tend to be oversold of "curative possibilities of the different treatment methods" just to have programs funded, people hired, and the programs implemented (Prisons and Punishment, pg. 347, Crime Justice and Society). The only alternative to education is to "allow our prisons to serve in the manufacture of a perpetuating and expanding" criminal "system" (Minton, 1971, pg. 229). Father Hilton L. Rivet, prison apostolate director from the New Orleans Archdiocese, advocates training programs to "prepare men and women for businesses in which they can find a place;" and "training that allows "for the expression of various levels of intellectual and vocational skills" (Bender and Leone, 1984, pg. 97).

At the Draper Correctional Center in Elmore, Alabama, the warden set up an educational program to train the prisoner for personal restructuring and "education for a better life" (Menninger, 1968, pg. 233). The results over a five year period, from 1968 to 1973, were: "Seventy-five inmates obtained high school diplomas;
thirteen paroled inmates entered college, and twenty-five percent voluntarily postponed parole to finish their education program" (Menninger, 1968, pg. 233). The dropout rate was only seven per cent of the prison school enrollment. "About sixty-five per cent achieved early parole dates" (Menninger, 1968, pg. 233). The State of Nevada also adopted the Draper educational techniques for its penal institutions.

Another example of the benefits of prison education programs is told in the testimonial story of Jerry King, a youthful eighth grade drop out and criminal offender, who was sentenced to education in 1968; and by 1974 was a proven success (May, 1974, pg. 42). Any offender's records which show regular school attendance, will positively influence the court's decision to grant probation, as it did in the Jerry King case (May, 1974, pg. 67). According to Pauline Morris (1965) and John Wideman (1985) the family is in the best position to help rehabilitate the offender, but there is not much that the family ultimately accomplishes in that direction. A similar but opposing view of the family clearly assigns the blame for criminal behavior on the home (Taft and England, 1964). How effective is correctional intervention as a rehabilitative effort? The question is rhetorical. According to Genevie, Margolies, and Muhlin it has been the strong point in the delivery system of
rehabilitative programs. According to the Rand study it is not (Petersilla, 1985; Greenwood, 1985). According to Bonhoeffer (Bethge, 1970) prison is a totally useless experience, one where society's punishment is so unredeeming and punitive that it only fosters resentment, discontent and dissipation in the inmates. Yet, billions of dollars are spent on innovative programs and still no clear direction has emerged for correctional programs. In addition their survey found that "Programs aimed at the long-term rehabilitation of offenders were consistently associated with higher rates of recidivism" (Genevie, Margolies, and Muhlin, 1986, pg. 53).

The idea of rehabilitative efficacy underscores all justification for rehabilitative correctional programs and classification taxonomies for inmates. Even though none of the research to date supports any program as having a positive impact on reducing recidivism the Rand study of the California Department of Prisons, Parole and Probation found that while recidivism rates were generally less for paroled inmates as opposed to the higher risk group, parole and probation failures were high enough to invalidate almost all prediction and classification tables (Petersillia, 1985, pgs. 37; Michalowski, 1985, pgs. 246-250). Correctional studies consistently support five methods for processing and categorizing offenders:

1. imprisonment/probation
2. length of imprisonment  
3. treatment in prison  
4. intensity of supervision while on parole or probation  
5. expiration of sentence  
   a) outright discharge from prison  
   b) successful completion of parole

Each of these categories has varying rates of recidivism. But, the fact is that the inmates in each category do recidivate. While recidivism rates are attributed to individual differences and characteristics of inmates (Robison and Smith, in Benjamin Frank, 1973, pg. 120), so far no evidence has been found to substantiate claims of one program being better than another. Another view is that recidivism is the inmate's reaction to treatment (Dembo, 1971, pg. 347-352) and it is the accumulated difficulties and frustrations which determine the parolee's or expiree's decision to reform or to revert. The California Department of Corrections Parole study of 1954-59 showed no difference in recidivism rates between high risk versus low risk on early release (Frank, 1973, pg. 123). On the other hand, the Jaman study of California's first and second degree robbers with a cohort follow up of 6, 12, and 24 months, between 1957 to 1968, favored inmates who were given early release (Frank, 1973, pg. 124). This supported evidence for a favorable outcome for inmates who were paroled after serving less than their median months. The report states that "almost half of the testable comparisons showed
statistically significant differences", but did not state at what level. Another post release status study, 36 months after release, evaluated program effectiveness and again found "contrary to the expectations of the treatment theory, there were no significant differences in outcome for those in the various treatment programs or between the treatment groups and the control groups" (Frank, 1973, pg. 125-126).

In like manner Walter Baily researched one hundred reports on correctional programs, as did Robert Martinson, and concluded "there are still no treatment techniques which have unequivocally demonstrated themselves capable of reducing recidivism" (Frank, 1973, pg. 127). There is no useful reason for classifying an inmate as "ill" in the medical model, or as "evil" in the moral model. "Neither formulation has much relevance in prison, since the inmate's primary status is that of a warehoused object" (Frank, 1973, pg. 127). Specifically, changing nomenclature, upgrading labels and enhancing the correctional image will probably result in spiraling costs, but it is unlikely to improve performance (Frank, 1973, pg. 127). Equally important is the fact that ex-convicts who recidivate perform even more poorly on their subsequent, or next, release (Frank, 1973, pg. 128). A demonstration of program effectiveness at the Nevada Department of Prisons can be said to be "a token promise
rather than a consequential issue" (Frank, 1973, pg. 132) We are now "supporting the ailment or convict and supporting a costly treatment program with less than cost effective results" (Frank, 1973, pg. 132) We are operating in the humanitarian treatment realm of philosophy rather than the pragmatic realm (Frank, 1973, pg. 132). It is reasonable for the citizens of Nevada to desire reasonable expectations rather than conjecture and hope from our expensive prison system.

Summary

A grim future is in store for our justice system (Michalowski, 1985, pg. 402). It is bulging with overcrowding from probation to prison to parole. The justice system is moving away from the prospects of rehabilitation toward those of restrictive supervision (Orland, 1875, pgs. 43-48). Community safety is in jeopardy. Lack of proper supervision and the development of internal restraints means failed probation, increased victimization and pain, and contributes to the rise in prison populations. Delinquent behavior escalates into criminal behavior with the chronology of the offender. Because of the deterioration of the family as a protective institution for grooming and training of our young, it will be in and through other social institutions that that behavior can and must be changed through treatment.
The effects of a criminal act go on in perpetuity. Our system of criminal warehousing is humiliating for the criminal and unfulfilling for the victim. If we are to treat crime with institutional programs then we should view crime as a public health problem, one that is easily identified in our young, and traced back to the youthful age of our adult offenders. All of the literature in this search in one manner or another points to failed nature and failed nurture. This undeniably points first to the family and home; and second to society and the frailty of its safety nets. Delinquency and crime are a product of failed nature in the genetic aspect, failed nurture in the close family arena, and society's failure to construct a safety net flexible and strong enough to catch all of the failures as they are pushed out of our social system (Irwin and Austin, 1987, pgs. 12-13; Currie, July 1987, pg. 11). Society through its institutions has the resources to identify adverse pathological conditions. Adverse pathological conditions of mind and body can be treated in the early stages before extensive damage occurs in the individual; and before it extends to the smaller social unit which surrounds the individual and society (Scudder, 1968). Education, once again, can provide the forum for identification and for resocialization and training.
Significance of the Proposed Research

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if our in-prison educational programs significantly reduce recidivism and positively contribute to alleviation of repeat offenses by the ex-convict. It is shocking to read that psychotherapeutic assistance programs and formal education programs were the least promising in terms of intervention success rates. Both groups were associated with higher rates of recidivism when compared to groups which did not receive psychotherapeutic or education program treatment (Genevie, Margolies, and Muhlin, 1986, pg. 54). The figures on recidivism rates cited point to our failures and reinforce the belief that "criminal behavior patterns have developed over many years and are firmly embedded in the offender's life style" (Genevie, Margolies, and Muhlin, 1986, pg. 56). The paucity of willing education program participants produces a dearth of success stories. If, however, the policy of deterrence through selective incapacitation is to become the practice for crime control in the late 1980's and 1990's, then education programs within the prison must expand (Gottfredson and Hirschi in Scott and Herschi, 1988, pgs. 199-209). The reactive posture of our correctional system is a waste of human potential as well as a waste of money (Currie, 1987). Successes are assimilated into the
outside world and very few statistics on them are kept. Those statistics are important in planning future educational programs. It has been stated by Dr. Victor Gennari, Clark County School District Alternative Education Programs, that "Clark County's high school drop outs go from our schools to the streets and then into our prison system." The current drop out statistics for the Clark County School District's regular Secondary Education Program indicate that any successes identified from this study would have potential application for the at risk student in the regular high school program, and thereby through implementation of the prevention model interrupt criminal careers before they start. Unfortunately "a number of writers have argued that rehabilitation-reform is an impossible dream; the public would be better served by an honest policy of incapacitation" (Conrad and Dinitz, 1977, p. xii). On the one hand, individual and neighborhood reactions to crime, studied by Skogan and Maxfield, support the contention that rather than spend any money on crime prevention programs targeting people who might commit crimes, the money is spent on protection of property and security systems which insure personal and property safety through precautionary measures (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). But on the contrary, if people are to be salvaged, programs must be expanded with the expansion of the prison system. This will be the only way to prevent
the criminal from expanding further into society
(Farrington and Gunn, 1985, pgs. 73-157).
Chapter 3

Design and Procedure

Introduction

The main purpose of this study was to identify and examine any relationships between CCSD adult education program completion, variables of inmate personality and condition, and recidivism at SDCC and SNCC Department of Prisons facilities. The research design was an explanatory ex post facto research tabulation of eighteen dependent variables and their relationship to the independent program completion variable. The data search was limited to existing records and existing data. The sample population began with 2,849 inmates between two correctional facility sites. This represented the total number of inmates who could choose adult education programs as an initial rehabilitative treatment plan for the period they were to remain incarcerated. One thousand and nine inmates declined to select education as a classification option. Through the self selection process one thousand eight hundred and forty initial total eligible cases were identified from enrollment sheets
between SDCC's and SNCC's education programs. Therefore the initial survey population was limited to the 1,840 inmates who were incarcerated between September 1984, though June 1988, who were eligible to participate in the CCSD Adult education program and who chose to voluntarily sign up for the program. This number was further reduced through attrition to 757 inmates whose files were locatable. Data were collected from those cases.

Moreover, there are 4,500 incarcerates at various prisons and honor camps throughout Nevada. The prison system has the option of changing an inmate's classification and moving inmates on immediate notice throughout the DOP system. When inmates are moved within the system their files are also moved. It is not known why such a large number of inmates deenrolled. It can be postulated that some of them were released to honor camps, moved to more secure internments, decided that the education program did not meet their needs, or decided to obtain what limited employment there was within the prison. Whatever the reason for deenrollment their files were not available for research purposes during the course of this study and they cannot be included in this research project. For those inmates who enrolled and left because they perceived that the program did not meet their needs, further research needs to be done to determine what those needs are and how they can be met. The average tenure in
the education programs was 18 months. Of the 757 inmates in the program for that time period and within a four year time span, 211 (two inmates died, 213–2=211) inmates were released to parole or expiration of sentence. They were tracked through the Department of Parole and Probation and the Nevada Department of Prisons as to classification status, through July 3, 1988. The following data was collected from the 757 case studies:

V1. Current age
V2. Ethnic
V3. Age at first admission
V4. Prior number of arrests (Police Contacts)
V5. Nevada Department of Prisons Admission Status
V6. Court ordered adjudicated sentence length
V7. Juvenile delinquency contact record
V8. Number of prior probation failure–Rules and Order
V9. Number of prior probation failure–Rearrest
V10. Number of parole failure–Rules and Order
V11. Number of parole failure–Rearrest
V12. Psychological Evaluation: Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) Special Scales range from:

A A+ B+ B B+ C+ C C+ D+ D D+ E F
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

V13. Nevada Department of Prison's Intake Reading Grade Level test scores (WRAT) range 0000 to 1400 (month and year)
V14. Highest grade level achieved at time of DOP intake range 00 to 16
V15. Drug and alcohol factor in crime commission range: single usage 01 through 09; multiple usage 10 through 16
1–alcohol, 2–marijuana, cannabis, hashish, 3–barbituates and depressents, 4–stimulants–methylp., crank, amphetamines, etc.
5–methamphetamines
6–qualudes–valiums, librums, etc.
7–heroin, opiates, narcotics, codeines, etc.
8-PCP, LSD, mescalines, peyote, psilocybin
9-cocaine, crack, 10-combination 1 & 2,
11-combination 1 thru 4
12-combination 1 thru 5, 13-combination
1 thru 6
14-combination 1 thru 7, 15-combination
1 thru 8,
16-combination 1 thru 9

V16. Total number of cumulative felony convictions
V17. Incarcerated with enrollment option
V18. Severity of Crime

It is interesting to note that these variables are found in almost all prison prediction and research studies (Gottfredson, 1978; Glaser, 1964; 1965; 1970; 1974; King, March/April, 1987) to various degrees and inclusions. These eighteen dependent variables were further subdivided according to whether an inmate achieved a parole or expired the sentence; and whether the parole or expiration participation was successful. Additional categories were also applied to the variables: Whether the inmate was enrolled in HSD, GED, ABE programs; whether the inmate was a completer or noncompleter of the designated program; and whether the inmate was a completer or noncompleter of the program due to administrative recommendations or to lack of interest on the inmate's part.

Intelligence scores were not included due to the uneven nature of reporting and the inconsistency of test instruments. While reading scores and highest grade level achievement at time of DOP intake are not intended as a substitute for intelligence scores, they were also readily
available and are included as research variables because of their possible relationship with school achievement and social adjustment. Drugs and alcohol have become a serious problem in our society. Any combination of drug and alcohol usage, which is done to excess, can be said to be self induced dysfunctionality. Because of the frequency of occurrence in inmate behavior, and the impact that behavior has on the rest of society, they are important research variables.

In addition socio-economic data and family composition were also discarded due to the subjective and uneven nature of the reporting system. There were also extreme problems in identifying and researching a control group. It was impossible to quantify the 1,840 from the prison classification system because that system itself does not allow for finding and quantifying a control group. The high level of administrative change and movement drift created an unrealistic and untenable research environment. The prison is a real life setting as opposed to an experimental one. The State of Nevada, which over 60% of the incarcerates are from, has its own unique flavor, interpretation and application of the law. For these and a host of other reasons, it is very difficult to generalize from one group of inmates to another. It would be necessary to repeat this study in every prison education program in the country, in programs
which are also non-uniform in quality, course offerings and quantity; and to control for the specific education variables which make up the internal conditions of my sample (Campbell and Stanley, pg. 188, in N. L. Gage, 1963). This is an impossible task. The methods of my study are repeatable, but the conditions under which the study was conducted are not.

In relation to the adjustment needs of each inmate the MMPI is widely used by the psychometricians in the DOP system. Unlike intelligence test data and socio-economic data MMPI was consistently found in each case file. According to Getzels and Jackson (Gage, 1963, pgs. 534-545) the MMPI is a prominent inventory among personality projective techniques and is widely used among researchers. It is used by the DOP system to predict personal adjustment and behavior; and to determine if an inmate can function satisfactorially in maximum, medium, or minimum custody status. The Wide Range Achievement Test, or WRAT test, was also consistent in each case studied. It is used to determine reading grade level performance at intake. In some cases the opportunity to administer CCSD reading tests was available. The comparison of CCSD sanctioned tests to DOP tests resulted in approximately the same rounded out reading scores. The seriousness of crime category results from legislative formulating of penal codes. The formulation of penal
codes orders criminal offenses from least to most serious. Correlation of seriousness of crime to length of time served in prison has been a standard practice for over the past one hundred years (Orland, 1975, pgs. 111-115). The dispositions criminals receive are generally associated with the severity of crime committed. If there is variance in disposition it is due to the plea bargaining procedure and it is almost always to a lesser classification of severity (McCarthy and Linquist, Sept. 1985, p. 375). The risk assessment scores for crime severity levels are tabulated from histories and reports from various law enforcement agencies and the Department of Parole and Probation. Inmates are given the following crime severity levels list:

**CRIME SEVERITY LEVELS**

Your crime level is selected from the table of offenses listed below. If your offense is not listed, the severity level containing the most similar listed offense is chosen. The level also may be increased because of aggravating circumstances. If the Board determines that you are serving for an "attempted" offense, your offense will be rated one severity level less than the level where the actual offense is listed. If you are serving for multiple offenses, the most serious offense will determine you crime severity level.

**Level I**
- Possession Controlled Substance—first offense, not for purpose of sale, Schedule I-IV.
- Possession/Passing Forged Prescriptions.
- Burglary—first offense, single count, non-residential.
- Possession of Burglary Tools.
- Possession of Stolen Property—first offense.

**LEVEL II**

Possession Controlled Substance—second offense, not for purpose of sale, Schedules I-IV. Possession/Passing Forged Prescriptions—second offense. Possession Controlled Substance—sale/intent to sell/distribute. Possession Stolen Property—second offense. Burglary—second offense/one-two multiple counts, non-residential. Unlawful Taking of Motor Vehicle—second offense/multiple counts, not for sale. Larceny over $100.00. Credit Card Fraud—10 or fewer counts or less than $1,000.00. Forgery—10 or fewer count/less than $1,000.00. Fraudulent/Bad Checks—Over $100.00. Arson—third/fourth degree.

**LEVEL III**

Racketeering. Burglary—residential, or 3 to 5 counts. Arson—second degree. Unlawful Taking of Motor Vehicle—for sale or 2-3 counts without intent to sell/third offense. Forgery—more than 10 counts—$1,000.00 or more. Possession of Contraband—sale/intent to sell. Possession Stolen Property—3 or more offenses. Possession Controlled Substance—sale/intent to sell/second offense. Credit Card Fraud—more than 10 counts or $1,000.00 or more. Reckless Driving. Ex-Felon Possession of Firearm. Discharge of Firearm.

**Level IV**

Felony DUI/first offense, no injury.
Burglary-6-10 counts, third or subsequent offense, or occupied dwelling.
Possession Contraband-sale/intent to sell/third or subsequent offense.
Possession Controlled Substance-sale/intent to sell/third or subsequent offense.
Larceny-over $10,000.
Cheating at Gambling-first offense.
Indecent Exposure.
Larceny from the Person.

LEVEL V
Assault With Deadly Weapon
Sale Controlled Substance, first offense.
Coercion.
Explosives-use or possession during commission of crime.
Bomb Threat.
Arson-first & second degree.
Battery With Intent to Commit Crime.
Burglary-residential, second offense/11 or more counts.
Trafficking in Controlled Substance-
(Schedule I) except marijuana – 4-14 grams.
Trafficking in Controlled Substance-28-200 grams.
Trafficking in Controlled Substance-marijuana, over 100 lbs, under 2,000 lbs.
Involuntary Manslaughter-other than vehicular.
Child Abuse.
Cheating at Gambling-second or subsequent offense.

LEVEL VI
Attempted Murder.
Battery With Use of Deadly Weapon.
Burglary (assault/injury).
Coercion (sexual assault).
Robbery.
Voluntary Manslaughter.
Kidnapping-Second Degree-not for ransom, no injury.
Incest.
Statutory Rape.
Sale of Controlled Substance, second offense.
Trafficking in Controlled Substance-
-Schedule I except marijuana-14-28 grams.
Trafficking in Controlled Substance-
-Schedule II 200-400 grams.
Trafficking in Marijuana-2,000-10,000 lbs.
Trafficking in Controlled Substance-second
offense.
Sexual Abuse of Child.
Child Molestation.
Habitual Criminal-less than Life.
Infamous Crime Against Nature-less than life.
Felony DUI with injury or repeat offense.

LEVEL VII
Felony DUI Resulting in Death.
Armed Robbery.
Kidnapping for Ransom-first degree-less than Life.
Sexual Assault-substantial bodily harm-less than Life.
Sale Controlled Substance, third or subsequent offense.
Trafficking in Controlled Substance-3 or more offenses.
Trafficking in Controlled Substance-Schedule I, except marijuana-over 28 grams.
Trafficking in Controlled Substance-Schedule II over 400 grams.
Trafficking Marijuana-over 10,000 lbs.
Murder (less than life).

LEVEL VIII
Murder-second Degree-Life.
Kidnapping for Ransom-Second Degree-Life.
Sexual Assault-substantial bodily harm-Life.
Habitual Criminal-Life.
Infamous Crime Against Nature-Life.

LEVEL IX
Murder-First Degree-Life.
Kidnapping-First Degree-for ransom or with bodily harm-Life.
(State of Nevada, DOP Administrative Manual)

Current Age, ethnicity (white, black, hispanic, asian, indian, cuban, other, and unknown), and age at first admission; as well as prior number of arrests (police contacts), Nevada DOP admission status and juvenile delinquency contact record and total number of cumulative felony convictions are all considered valuable
information in any prison study. Each category has been widely used by many researchers in prison studies. Probation and Parole studies couple the number of prior probation and parole failures, either through rules and order violations or rearrest, in each instance. Recidivism rate studies show recidivism rates for parolees are lower than for expirees (Orland, 1975, pgs. 114-115). This is important information in predicting parole or expiration success. Also this information was consistently and readily available in Nevada DOP inmate files.

Collection of Data

The State of Nevada Department of Prisons supervised the collection of the data. No inmates were identified by name. Files were researched according to inmate identification numbers which were separated from the inmate back number. Subsequent to the completion of the data collection those numbers were then removed from the statistical information and turned over to the records division for verification, shredding and destruction. This procedure was followed to maintain the confidentiality of the inmates' files. All data from the inmate files is governed by a strict need for confidentiality.
Instrumentation

Experimental Procedure and Data Collection

The first procedure for this study was to secure approval and permission from the State of Nevada Department of Prisons to conduct this study. This was accomplished by providing a copy of the proposal and the guidelines of the study to the appropriate administrative prison personnel. Security clearance was obtained from both prisons and access to "the vault" at each respective prison was gained. Initial data collection began March 23, 1988. Final data were received July 3, 1988.

Two inmates were deceased and were therefore not included in the data analysis. An additional two inmates who had been program participants were assigned to minimum custody status and subsequently escaped. They were both later recaptured and returned to the Maximum Security Prison in Carson city.

Hypotheses

This study was an ex post facto empirical investigation to determine whether education programs, inmate personality variables, and inmate conditional situations, had any impact on subsequent recidivism rates from that population. The hypotheses were stated and reported at the .05 level of significance as reported in the Statistics Program for the Social Sciences (1970), or the SPSS system.
The general hypothesis was that there would be no difference in recidivism rates between inmates who completed the education program and those who did not. The assumption which underlies this hypothesis was drawn from research studies which indicate that education is a viable treatment variable which will influence inmates to change in their criminal proclivity once they achieve parole or expiration of sentence. Each individual research hypothesis tested the following personality and conditional variables:

V1. It was hypothesized that for parole and expired male felons, current age and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V2. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons, ethnicity and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V3. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons, age at first admission and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V4. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons prior number of arrests (Police Contacts) and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.
V5. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons Nevada Department of Prisons Admission Status, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, etc., and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V6. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons court ordered adjudicated sentence length and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V7. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons juvenile delinquency contact record and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V8. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons number of prior probation failures due to rules and order and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V9. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons number of prior probation failures due to rearrest and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V10. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons prior parole failure due to rules and order and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.
V11. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons prior parole failure due to rearrest and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V12. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons psychological evaluation scoring through the use of the MMPI and the CPI, and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V13. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons Nevada Department of Prison's intake reading grade level test scores (WRAT) and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V14. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons the highest grade level achieved at time of DOP intake and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V15. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons the drug and alcohol factor in crime commission and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.

V16. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons the total number of cumulative felony convictions and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration.
V17. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons and those who are still incarcerated, the attendance factor was not a factor in successful parole or expiration or in prediction of parole success. Program status range: 01 drop-out—student apathy; 02 drop-out—DOP movement; 03 drop-out administrative request—behavior problem; 00 still incarcerated, still attending.

V18. It was hypothesized that for paroled and expired male felons the severity of the crime and completion of the education program were not factors in successful parole or expiration. The range was from 01 to 10.

Analysis

The data gathered relating education to recidivism among parolees and expirers from SNCC and SDCC education programs from 9/1984 through 6/1989, and subsequent recidivism performance were used to test the following null hypotheses: There is no significant relationship at the .05 level between recidivism and the above listed variables.

Treatment of the Data

1. Chi square on the list of variables
2. Cramer's V
3. Contingency Coefficient
4. Lambda Asymmetric
5. Lambda Symmetric
6. Uncertainty Coefficient, Asymmetric
7. Uncertainty Coefficient, Symmetric
8. Kendall's Tab B  
9. Kendall's Tab A  
10. Gamma  
11. Sommer's D Asymmetric  
12. Sommer's D Symmetric  
13. ETA With VO2 Dependent  
14. ETA With Status Dependent  
15. Pearson's R  
16. T test of significance between variables  
17. Percentages and numbers are presented in tabular form in order to present categories within variables.
Chapter 4

Results and Discussion

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to establish if relationships existed between education programs, program completion, inmate personality and conditional variables and recidivism. Toward those ends data were collected from the total available case studies of inmates who signed up for the Clark County School District's Adult Education Program at Jean and Indian Springs prisons during the calendar years 1984 through 1988. Of a total of 1,840 persons, information was gathered on 757 people. Statistical computations on the collected data were performed in the Center for Survey Research at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada by Dr. Donald Carns. The results of the collection are presented in tabular form by frequencies and percentages.

Data were organized into contingency tables. From these contingency tables chi square tests were computed to test for statistical significance. A .05 level of confidence was accepted as evidence that a relationship
did exist between variables. The indication of the degree of the relationship was established by a contingency coefficient computation (complex chi sq. test). Significance of relationships were calculated by using a T test between the variables (Anderson and Zelditch, Jr., 1968).

For the variables related to participation/completion or nonparticipation/noncompletion of the education programs, a T test was also used to detect any proportional significance of differences.

Discussion of the finding is presented by analysis of the independent variables stated in the hypothesis as being related to recidivism. Table eleven represents a breakdown of the classification categories of the total group respective to program categories, program completion/noncompletion, and parole/expiration outcome categories. Table Twelve represents recidivism rates by numbers and percentages in each category. Table thirteen represents recidivism rates according to parole or expiration categories. Table fourteen represents the nonrecidivates in parole and expiration categories according to whether they were program completers or noncompleters. Table fifteen represents the recidivates in parole and expiration categories according to whether they were program completers or noncompleters. Table sixteen determines recidivism rates by the type of program
attended. Table seventeen exhibits the breakdown of recidivism rates by program and parole/expiration status, both in tabular form and percentages. Table eighteen represents the total released group in terms of parolees and expirees; and in terms of numbers and percentages who are still free and who have recidivated. Table nineteen lists the levels of statistical significance by variables for the total group. Table twenty represents the statistically significant crosstabulation of means by variables comparing those who successfully paroled/expirated with those parolees and expirees who recidivated. Table thirty-one distinguishes between the four categories of crime commission frequency by age groups for total (757 inmates) population studied.
Table eleven represents the categories, and the numbers of inmates in each category used to classify the inmates for research purposes.

**Table 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group I INCLUSIVE:</th>
<th>(0001-1504) Total Group Incarcerates, parolees and expirees = 757</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP II PAROLEES AND EXPIREES (211 + 2 = 213)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0601-1504) Total Parolees and Expirees = 213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0601-0617) HSD Completers Parolees Recidivated 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0651-0617) HSD Completers Parolees Successful 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0701-0712) GED Completers Parolees Recidivate 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0751-0782) GED Completers Parolees Successful 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0801-0804) GED Noncompleters Parolees Successful 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0851-0858) GED Noncompleters Parolees Recidivated 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0901-0907) ABE Noncompleters Parolees Successful 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0951-0959) ABE Completer Parolees Successful 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1001-1006) ABE Completer Parolees Recidivated 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1051-1069) HSD Completers Expirees Successful 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1101-1116) HSD Completers Expirees Recidivated 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1151-1164) GED Completers Expirees Recidivated 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1201-1216) GED Completers Expirees Successful 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1251-1254) ABE Completers Expirees Recidivated 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1301-1303) ABE Completers Expirees Successful 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1351-1355) GED Noncompleters Expirees Recidivated 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1401-1403) GED Noncompleters Expirees Successful 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1451-1455) ABE Noncompleters Expirees Successful 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1501-1504) ABE Noncompleters Expirees Recidivated 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100% (213)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Two inmates died during the course of this study. The corrected figures read 213 - 2 = 211*
Table twelve represents the number and percent of inmates in each individual segment of the Clark County School District Education program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories: Parolees</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Recidivated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD Completers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD Noncompleters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED Completers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED Noncompleters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE Completers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE Noncompleters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories: Expireses</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Recidivated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSD Completers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD NonCompleters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED Completers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED Noncompleters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE Completers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE Noncompleters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals (124) 59.25% (87) 40.75% = (211)
Table thirteen illustrates by number and percentage the parolees and expirees who are successful (still free) and those who have recidivated (failed).

Table 13
Recidivism Rates: Parolees versus Expirees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parolees - Success</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expirees - Success</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>21.6 59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parolees-Recidivated</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expirees-Recidivated</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>20.2 40.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals = (211) 100% = 100.0%
Table fourteen represents the total completers compared with the total noncompleters by successful (still free) parole and expiration categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliers</th>
<th>Noncompliers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P number</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P percentage</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex number</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex percentage</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P number</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P percentage</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex number</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex percentage</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P number</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P percentage</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex number</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex percentage</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (107) 50.3% (19) 8.9% = (126) 59.2% (*126 - 2 deceased = 124)
Table fifteen represents the total completers compared to the noncompleters by recidivation (failure) of parole or expiration classifications.

**Table 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole/Expiration Failures</th>
<th>Recidivism Rates: Total Completers/Total Noncompleters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completers</td>
<td>Noncompleters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals (69) 32.4% (18) 8.4% = (87) 40.8%
Table sixteen depicts success (still free) and recidivism (failure) rates by program classification only. This is irrespective of whether the releasee achieved parole or expiration status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Recidivate</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSD</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 126 59.2 % 87 40.8 %
Table seventeen differentiates parolees and expirees by the three CCSD education programs, by parole or expiration status, and by successful (still free) or recidivate (failure) status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Recidivate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSD</td>
<td>P = (28) 13.2</td>
<td>P = (17) 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex= (19) 9.0</td>
<td>Ex= (15) 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>P = (32) 15.0</td>
<td>P = (13) 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = (4) 1.9</td>
<td>P = (8) 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex= (16) 7.5</td>
<td>Ex= (14) 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex= (3) 1.4</td>
<td>Ex= (5) 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>P = (9) 4.2</td>
<td>P = (6) 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = (7) 3.3</td>
<td>Ex= (5) 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex= (5) 2.3</td>
<td>Ex= (4) 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex= (3) 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126 = 59.20 %  
87 = 40.8 %  

Totals  (213 - 2 deceased)  211 = 100.0 %
Table eighteen depicts the total number released by how many are successful (still free) and by the number who have recidivated (failed); and the parole or expiration category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18 by Number and Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Released (213) = 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still free (124) = 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivated (87) = 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parolees (124) = 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expirees (87) = 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expirees still free (44) = 21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parolees still free (80) = 37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expirees Recidivated (43) = 20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parolees Recidivated (44) = 20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table nineteen is a comparison of the research variables (V1 thru V18), by mean scores.

### Table 19
Levels of Statistical Significance by variables for: total group with probability factor for Group I (757)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1. Current Age</td>
<td>0.0690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Age at First Admission</td>
<td>0.0191 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Prior Police Contact</td>
<td>0.3591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>0.3387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>0.0993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7. Juvenile Delinq. Contacts</td>
<td>0.0287 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Prob. Rules</td>
<td>0.0003 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Prob. Rearrests</td>
<td>0.4675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Parole Rules</td>
<td>0.0026 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>0.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>0.1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Reading Score</td>
<td>0.3274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14. Intake Education Level</td>
<td>0.0897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Drug and Alcohol Factor</td>
<td>0.1528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Reason for Leaving/Staying</td>
<td>0.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. No. of Felony Conviction</td>
<td>0.1070 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Severity of Crime</td>
<td>0.0282 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level or below
Table twenty is a comparison of the mean scores for the total parole and expiration group. The comparison is according to whether the individuals were program completers or program noncompleters (dropouts).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 20</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Comparison</td>
<td>V1 thru V18; Program Completers/Noncompleters for Total Group/Released Group – T Test of Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1. Current Age</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Age at First Admission</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Prior Police Contacts</td>
<td>.05 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>.028 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>.4552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7. Juvenile Delinq. Contacts</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Probation Rules</td>
<td>.1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>.006 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Parole Rules</td>
<td>.3685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>.003 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>.0595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Reading Score</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14. Intake Education Level</td>
<td>.00105 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>.0006 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Severity of Crime</td>
<td>.0035 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below
Table twenty-one is a comparison of the means for the total parole and expiration release group by research variables (V1 thru V18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1. Current Age</td>
<td>.1425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Age at First Admission</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Prior Police Contacts</td>
<td>.2245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7. Juvenile Delinq. Contacts</td>
<td>.0785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Probation Rules</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>.3805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Parole Rules</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Reading Score</td>
<td>.1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14. Intake Education Level</td>
<td>.2065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Severity of Crime</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below
Table twenty-two is a comparison of the means by research variables (VI thru V18) for those released and still free (successful parolees/expirees) and those parolees and expirees who have recidivated (failed).

### Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>T Test of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1. Current Age</td>
<td>.14895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>.3615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Age at First Admission</td>
<td>.1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Prior Police Contacts</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>.3855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Probation Rules</td>
<td>.2715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Parole Rules</td>
<td>.4145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>.0045 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Reading Score</td>
<td>.0045 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14. Intake Education Level</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>.4545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Severity of Crime</td>
<td>.0115 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below*
Table twenty-three illustrates the comparison of the means for the high school diploma program participants who were classified to parole or expiration; respective to whether they have succeeded (still free) or recidivated (failed).

**Table 23**

V1 thru V 18; HSD Successes on Parole/Expiration; HSD Recidivates for total Group Released - T Test of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>T Test Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1. Current Age</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>.3835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Age at First Admission</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Prior Police Contacts</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>.3355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7. Juvenile Delinqu. Contacts</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Probation Rules</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>.4665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Parole Rules</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>.4705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>.4115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Reading Score</td>
<td>.0165 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14. Intake Education Level</td>
<td>.2185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>.043 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>.1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Severity of Crime</td>
<td>.2105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below
Table twenty-four illustrates the comparison of the means for the HSD parolees and HSD expirees who are still free (successful).

**Table 24**

**Group Comparison**

V1 thru V18; Successful HSD Parolees and HSD Expirees for Total Group Released - T Test of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1. Current Age</td>
<td>0.0215 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Age at First Admission</td>
<td>0.3355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Prior Police Contacts</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>0.4545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>0.004 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7. Juvenile Delinq. Contacts</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Probation Rules</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>0.3295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Parole Rules</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>0.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Reading Score</td>
<td>0.015 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14. Intake Education Level</td>
<td>0.2135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>0.044 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>0.1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>0.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Severity of Crime</td>
<td>0.0001 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below*
Table twenty-five is a comparison of the means (V1 thru V18) for the ABE program participants who have experienced success parole or expiration (still free), and those who have recidivated (failed).

**Table 25**  
Group Comparison  
V1 thru 18; ABE Success/ABE Recidivates  
for Total Group Released - T Test of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>T Test Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1. Current Age</td>
<td>.3615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Age at First Admission</td>
<td>.0805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Prior Police Contact</td>
<td>.1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>.0315 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7. Juvenile Delinquency Contacts</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Probation Rules</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Parole Rules</td>
<td>.0905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Reading Score</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14. Intake Education level</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>.37105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>.019 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>.47905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Severity of Crime</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below*
Table 26 is a comparison of the means for the ABE completers and the ABE noncompleters (V1 thru V18) irrespective of parole or expiration success or failure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V1</th>
<th>Current Age</th>
<th>.315</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>.1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>Age at First Admission</td>
<td>.3315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Prior Police Contacts</td>
<td>.047 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>.0455 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>Juvenile Delinq. Contacts</td>
<td>.1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>Probation Rules</td>
<td>.4985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>.1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>Parole Rules</td>
<td>.4985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11</td>
<td>Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>.0315 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>Reading Score</td>
<td>.2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>Intake Education Level</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15</td>
<td>Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>.4525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16</td>
<td>Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>.050 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17</td>
<td>Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18</td>
<td>Severity of Crime</td>
<td>.2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below
Table twenty-seven is a comparison of means (VI thru V18) for the ABE program parolees and the ABE program expirees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>T Test of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>Current Age</td>
<td>.3955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>Age at First Admission</td>
<td>.2825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Prior Police Contacts</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>.3215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>Juvenile Delinquency Contacts</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>Probation Rules</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>Parole Rules</td>
<td>.027 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11</td>
<td>Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>Reading Score</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>Intake Education Level</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15</td>
<td>Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>.0385 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16</td>
<td>Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>.4015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17</td>
<td>Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>.1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18</td>
<td>Severity of Crime</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below
Table twenty-eight is a comparison of the means (V1 thru V18) for the GED parolee and expiree group who experienced success (still free), and the GED parolee and expiree group who recidivated (failed).

Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparison - V1 thru V18</th>
<th>GED Parole/Expiree Success; GED Parole/Expiree Recidivate for Total Group Released - T Test of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1. Current Age</td>
<td>.2075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>.3885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Age at First Admission</td>
<td>.049 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Prior Police Contacts</td>
<td>.1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7. Juvenile Delinq. Contacts</td>
<td>.1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Probation Rules</td>
<td>.0825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Parole Rules</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>.034 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>.031 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Reading Score</td>
<td>.3975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14. Intake Education Level</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>.3315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Severity of Crime</td>
<td>.1735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below
Table twenty-nine illustrates the comparison of the means (V1 thru V18) by GED program completion and GED program noncompletion for total parolees and expirees. This comparison is irrespective of whether those released were successful (still free) or recidivated (failed).

Table 29
Group Comparison V1 thru V18:
GED Completers/NonCompleters Total Parolees and Expirees for Total Group Released - T Test of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1. Current Age</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Age at First Admission</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Prior Police Contacts</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>0.3785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>0.2515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7. Juvenile Delinquency Contacts</td>
<td>0.1945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Probation Rules</td>
<td>0.2505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>0.1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Parole Rules</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>0.1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Reading Score</td>
<td>0.2765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14. Intake Education Level</td>
<td>0.1765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>0.4705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Severity of Crime</td>
<td>0.4305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below
Table thirty is a comparison of the means (V1 thru V18) for GED parolees and GED expirees. This comparison is irrespective of whether those released are successful (still free) or recidivated (failed).

**Table 30**

**Group Comparison**

V1 thru V18; GED Parolees/GED Expirees for Total Group Released – T Test of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>T Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1. Current Age</td>
<td>.2825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>.1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Age at First Admission</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Prior Police Contact</td>
<td>.031 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. DOP Admission Status</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. DOP Sentence Length</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7. Juvenile Delinq. Contacts</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Probation Rules</td>
<td>.006 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Probation Rearrests</td>
<td>.1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Parole Rules</td>
<td>.0235 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Parole Rearrests</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Psych Evaluation</td>
<td>.012 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Reading Score</td>
<td>.1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14. Intake Education Level</td>
<td>.1645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Drugs and Alcohol</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Reason for Leaving Program</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. Total Felony Convictions</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Severity of Crime</td>
<td>.2925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 Level or Below
Table thirty-one illustrates the comparison of the means by group pairs and crosstabulation by the four major age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16-26 Most Active</th>
<th>36-48 Significantly Less Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27-35 Second Most</td>
<td>49-66 Least Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 1</td>
<td>P &gt; .05 = .4530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 2</td>
<td>P &lt; .05 = .0005 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 3</td>
<td>P &gt; .05 = .0547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 4</td>
<td>P &gt; .05 = .2304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 5</td>
<td>P &gt; .05 = .2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 6</td>
<td>P &gt; .05 = .1687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 7</td>
<td>P &gt; .05 = .1816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 8</td>
<td>P &gt; .05 = .1760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 9</td>
<td>P &lt; .05 = .0447 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 10</td>
<td>P &lt; .05 = .0004 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 11</td>
<td>P &lt; .05 = .0005 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Group 12</td>
<td>P &lt; .05 = .0005 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level
Results and Discussion of Statistically Significant Variables Related to Recidivism From Table 31: Statistically Significant Pair Groups at the .05 Level for Crosstabulation Table by Four Major Age Groups

1. Program Completers versus Noncompleters by the Four Major Age Groups and Recidivism for Male Felons:

\[ P > .05 = .4530 \]

Results: No significant relationship at the .05 level or below for:
(1) Program Completers/Noncompleters
(2) Four Major Age Groups
(3) Recidivism

2. Total Parolees Versus Total Expirees by the Four Major Age Groups and Program Completion/Noncompletion and Recidivism for Male Felons:

\[ P \leq .05 = .0428 \]

Results: A significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) Parolees/Expirees
(2) Program Completers/Noncompleters
(3) Four Major Age Groups
(4) Recidivism

When separated into the above four listed categories the older parolees and expirees have a better success rate on either parole or expiration.

3. Total Parolees versus Total Expirees and Success/Failure on Parole or Expiration by the Four Major Age Groups and Recidivism for Male Felons:

\[ P > .05 = .0547 \]

Results: No significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) Parolee/Expiree
(2) Four Major Age Groups
(3) Recidivism

Note: While the null is retained it is worth mention that
the trend is for the older releases, ages 36 and older, to stay free longer.

4. Total HSD Program Completers/Noncompleters who Paroled or Expired by the Four Major Age Groups and Recidivism for Male Felons:

\[ P > .05 = .2304 \]

Results: No significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) Parolees and Expirees
(2) HSD program completers
(3) Four Major Age Groups
(4) Recidivism

5. Total HSD Parolees/Expirees, Irrespective of Program Completion/Noncompletion, by the Four Major Age Groups and Recidivism for Male Felons:

\[ P > .05 = .2010 \]

Results: No significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) HSD Parolees/Expirees
(2) Four Major Age Groups
(3) Recidivism

6. Total ABE Parolees/Expirees, Irrespective of Program Completion/Noncompletion, and who were successful Parolees/Expirees, by the Four Major Age Groups and Recidivism for Male Felons:

\[ P > .05 = .1687 \]

Results: No significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) ABE Parolees/Expirees
(2) Successful Parolees/Expirees
(3) Four Major Age Groups

7. Total ABE Completer versus ABE Noncompleter, by the Four Major Age Groups and Recidivism for Male Felons:

\[ P > .05 = .1816 \]

Results: No significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) Parolees/Expirees
(2) ABE Completer/Noncompleter
(3) Four Major Age Groups
(4) Recidivism (Failure)

8. ABE Parolees/Expirees, irrespective of whether they successfully completed the ABE program, Four Major age Groups and Recidivism for Male Felons:

\[ P > .05 = .1760 \]

Results: No significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
- (1) Parolees/Expirees
- (2) ABE program *
- (3) Four Major Age Groups
- (4) Recidivism (Failure)

*Note: All ABE participants from the two most criminally active age groups failed Parole/Expiration at approximately the same rate, irrespective of program completion/noncompletion. It was not until the ABE program completer was age 36 and older that age became a factor.

9. GED Program Group, Parolees/Expirees, who are Successful Releases, by the Four Major Age Groups and recidivism for Male Felons:

\[ P < .05 = .0447 \]

Results: A significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
- (1) Parolees/Expirees
- (2) GED Program Group
- (3) Successful Releases
- (4) Four Major Age Groups

*Note: The GED program completion factor was a common denominator across all four age groups in determining successful parole/expiration status.

10. GED Program Completers versus GED Program Noncompleters, who are Successful Releases, by the Four Major Age groups and Recidivism for Male Felons:

\[ P < .05 = .0004 \]

Results: A significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
- (1) GED Completers Versus GED Noncompleters
- (2) Parolees/Expirees
- (3) Four Major Age Groups
- (4) Successful Releases
11. GED Program Completers versus GED Program Noncompleters, who Failed (Recidivated) Parole or Expiration, by the Four Major Age Groups for Male Felons:

\[ P < .05 = .0005 \]

Results: A significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) GED Completers Versus Noncompleters
(2) Parolees/Expirees
(3) Four Major Age Groups
(4) Recidivism (Failure)

12. GED Program Completers versus GED Program Noncompleters, who Succeeded on Parole or Expiration, by the Four Major Age Groups for Male Felons:

\[ P < .05 = .0005 \]

Results: A significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) GED Completers Versus GED Noncompleters
(2) Parolees/Expirees
(3) Four Major Age Groups
(4) Successful Releases

*Note: In this cross tabulation by the four age groups, the GED program completers were more successful at remaining free than the noncompleters irrespective of parolee/expiree status. The GED factor and the GED completion factor serves as a strong predictor of parole/expiration success.

Results and Discussion of Variables Related to Recidivism

(Hypothesis by Hypothesis)

VI. Recidivism and Current Age

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between current age, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant
relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) current age
(2) education program completion
(3) successful parole/expiration
(a) HSD completers: P< .05 = .0215
   See Table 24
(b) GED completers: P< .05 = .022
   See Table 29

The parolees and expirees who were in the 36 years of age and older group and who were high school diploma (HSD) and general education development (GED) program completers experienced the greatest success on parole and expiration.

The chi square test of independence applied to current age indicated that for the total group (757) age is not statistically significant as related to recidivism. P = .0690 < .05.

There was a positive, but not significant relationship between date of birth and recidivism, higher for the young and decreasing with age. The inmates between 16 and 26 years of age were the most active in crime commission categories I through V; and were also the most likely to be released on parole due to the lesser severity level of crimes committed. They exhibited the highest reincarceration rates due to rearrest and convictions on new felony charges. This is logical because they were released more frequently than nonproperty and more violent offenders from categories VI through XI. However, this 16 to 26 year old age group was also more likely to escalate
the severity level of crimes when recidivating and to be given longer sentences on subsequent return to prison. There was a negative correlation between age and program completion among the younger age group, ages 16 to 26. Those inmates who tended to drop out of the program were the ones who generally scored unsatisfactorily on the MMPI, and the CPI, tended to have reading scores below the ninth grade level, had lower levels of educational achievement at DOP intake and were multiple drug use abusers. The HSD category which included the GED background, and the GED group itself served as an identifier for possibly predicting parole/expiration success. The null hypothesis is rejected.

V2. Recidivism and Ethnicity

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between ethnicity and education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: No statistically significant relationship exists between ethnicity and education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below. See tables 19 thru 31. P > .05 in all cases.

While the ethnicity variable depicted the black inmate to be one and a half times more likely to drop out of the adult basic education program (ABE) or GED program than the white inmate during periods of incarceration.
there was no significant difference in the completion/noncompletion rates for black or white inmates in the HSD program. The noncompletion rate for ethnicity categories 3 through 8 tended to be higher than that for blacks and whites combined. However, none of the relationships was statistically significant at or below the .05 level for this study. The null hypothesis is retained.

V3. Recidivism and Age at First Admission

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between age at first admission and education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:

(1) age at first admission: P< .05 = .0191
See Table 19

(2) Successful HSD Parolees/Expirees
P< .05 = .0215
See Table 24

(3) GED education program completion: P< .05 = .049
See Table 28

(4) successful parole/expiration:
P< .05 = .0045
See Table 28

Age at first admission was a factor in education program completion. Inmates who were admitted at a very young age, who had extensive juvenile delinquency contacts, low reading scores, low grade attainment and behavioral problems dropped out of all programs at the same rate and recidivated at a statistically significant
rate. Older inmates, who had higher reading scores tended to be GED/HSD program completers, and those GED/HSD completers (with GED skill levels) experienced statistically significant levels of success on parole and expiration. The null hypothesis is rejected.

V4. Recidivism and Prior Number of Police Arrests

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between prior number of police arrests, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) prior number of police arrests
(2) program completers
(for all education programs)
(3) parole/expiration success:
  P < .05 = .028
  See Table 20;
(a) ABE program completers: P < .05 = .047
  See Table 26
(b) GED program completers: P < .05 = .031
  See Table 30

A relationship exists between the prior number of arrests in county and city jurisdictions before imprisonment at the state level and education program completion (ABE, HSD/GED - but not HSD program alone; GED) and success on parole or expiration. Education program completers experience statistically significant levels of success on parole and expiration. The null is rejected.

V5. Recidivism and DOP Admission Status
Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between the Nevada Department of Prisons Admission Status, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, etc., education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) Nevada DOP admission status
(2) education program completion
(a) parole/expiration success:
P< .05 = .028
See Table 20
Parolees and expirees who completed any of the education programs, and who had a lower frequency of admission status, experienced statistically significant parole and expiration success rates than those who had high levels of readmissions and who were not education program completers. The null hypothesis is rejected.

V6. DOP Sentence Length

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between DOP sentence length, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(1) DOP Sentence Length
(2) education program completion
(3) parole/expiration success: Between
(a) parolees and expirees
P< .05 = .004
See Table 24
(b) ABE parole/expiration success
P< .05 = .0315
See Table 25
(c) ABE program completion
P< .05 = .0455
See Table 26
A statistically significant relationship exists
between DOP sentence length in that the longer the sentence the more likely inmate students are to complete ABE education programs. In the case of the ABE student, if that student is able to complete the program then the chances of successful participation in parole or expiration are enhanced. The other statistically significant relationship is that the longer the sentence, the older the parolee or expiree is likely to be and older parolees and expirees experience higher success rates on parole and expiration. The null is rejected.

V7. **Juvenile Delinquency Contact Record**

**Hypothesis.** No statistically significant relationship exists between juvenile delinquency contact record, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

**Results:** A statistically significant relationship exists between juvenile delinquency contact record, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for the total group of incarcerated male felons at the .05 level or below (P< .05 = 0287; See Table 19), but not for any of the paroled or expired male felons (P> .05 in Tables 20 thru 30).

There was a significant relationship at the P < .05 = .0287 level between juvenile delinquency contact record and completion/noncompletion of the education program and recidivism for incarcerated male felons. Those who had extensive juvenile records tended to remain incarcerated for longer periods of time regardless of the amounts of education attained. Because there is no statistically
significant relationship for the paroled and expired group the null is retained.

V8. **Probation Failure Rules and Order**

**Hypothesis.** No statistically significant relationship exists between probation rules and order violations, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

**Results:** A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
1. probation rules and order
2. education program completion
3. parole/expiration success
   (a) For Total Group: P< .05 = .0003  
   See Table 19
   (b) Between Parolees and Expirees:
   P< .05 = .0005  
   See Table 21
   (c) GED program parolees/expirees:
   P< .05 = .00006  
   See Table 30

There was a statistically significant relationship for parolees and expirees who had experienced incarceration due to probation rules and order violations, as opposed to probation rearrest, and GED program participation. Parolees and expirees in this category tended to experience successful parole and expiration. The null is rejected.
V9. Probation Failure Rearrest

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between probation failure due to rearrest, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level and below for:

1. Probation rearrest
2. Education program completion
3. Parole/expiration success:
   \[ P < .05 = .006 \]
   See Table 20

Probation failure due to rearrest was statistically significant for all paroled and expired male felons who were program completers. The null hypothesis is rejected.

V10. Parole Failure Rules and Order

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between parole failure due to rules and order, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below. The incidence of reincarceration was extensive and high. This factor probably contributed to extending the time spent in prison, which in turn allows the inmate ample time to complete programs.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:

1. Parole rules and order
2. Education program completion
3. Parole/expiration success
   a. For total group (757):
      \[ P < .05 = .0026 \]
      See Table 19
   b. For parolees/expirees:
      \[ P < .05 = .002 \]
      See Table 21
   c. For ABE parolees/expirees:
      \[ P < .05 = .027 \]
Parole failure due to rules and order was statistically significant for the total incarcerate group, for the total parolee/expiree group, for the ABE parolee/expiree group and for the GED parolee/expiree group. This seems to reflect the policies of parole and probation. Parolees and expirees are violated for rules and orders when negative behavior begins to escalate. This usually happens prior to the commission or detection of a new crime (which usually results in rearrest). The null hypothesis is rejected.

VII. Parole Rearrest

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between parole failure due to rearrest, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exits at the .05 level or below for:
(1) parole rearrest
(2) education program completion
(3) parole/expiration success
(a) all incarcerated:
P< .05 = .0001
See Table 19
(b) all parolees/expirees who are program completers:
P< .05 = .003
See Table 20
(c) all parolees/expirees:
P< .05 = .002
See Table 21
(d) all parolees/expirees who recidivated
P<.05 = .0045
See Table 22
(e) ABE completers vs. ABE noncompleters:
P<.05 = .0315
See Table 26
(f) GED successful parolee/expiree:
P<.05 = .034
See Table 28

Again this analysis would seem to reflect the extensive proclivity our inmate education population has for participating in criminal behavior. The noncompleters in the ABE category tend to be rearrested more than any other group (see table 26). The GED successful parolee/expiree category is the largest group not to recidivate. The GED achievement seems to reflect a possible pattern of success. The null is rejected.

VI2. Psychological Evaluation

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between psychological evaluation, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(a) GED program parolee/expiree vs. success/recidivate
P<.05 = .031
See Table 28
(b) GED program parolees/expirees
P<.05 = .012
See Table 30
The GED factor again emerges as a possible identifier of potential successes. In addition, the more positive the psychological behavior, attitude and performance, the more likely the success. The GED group consistently performed in the A, B and C range. The null is rejected.

V13. Reading Score Performance at Intake

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between reading score performance at intake, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results. A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:
(a) Total Group Released success/recidivate:
P< .05 = .0045
See Table 22
(b) HSD Group Released success/recidivate:
P< .05 = .0165
See Table 23
(c) Successful HSD Parolees/expirees:
P< .05 = .015
See Table 24

A relationship exists between reading score performance at intake, completion/noncompletion of education programs and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons below the .05 level of significance. The higher the reading score, the more likely the inmate student is to achieve GED and HSD. In addition, once GED/HSD has been achieved the tendency is for success on parole or expiration. The null is rejected.
V14. Intake Education Level

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between the education level attained at time of DOP intake, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for:

(1) Program Completers
Noncompleters
P < .05 = .00105
See Table 20

There was a correlation between grade level achievement at time of intake and education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at P < .05 = .00105 level of significance. The higher the education achievement level attained prior to incarceration, the more likely the inmate was to be a program completer and a good candidate of parole or expiration success. The null hypothesis is rejected.

V15. Drug and Alcohol Factors in Crime Commission

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between drug and alcohol use during the commission of crime, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled and expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exists between drug and alcohol use during the commission of crime for:

(1) Successful HSD Parolees and Expirees
P < .05' = .044
A relationship exists between drug and alcohol factors in crime commission. The usage of drugs and alcohol is highly prevalent and visible in the prison community. It is so pervasive that it almost had to play a part in parole or expiration success. It is interesting to note that for parolees and expirees it is a factor in the ABE and the HSD categories. The null is rejected.

Drug and Alcohol factors in criminal behavior were universally related to recidivism, but were not positively or negatively related to education.

VI6. Program Status

Hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship exists between the reason for program change, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled or expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

Results: A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level and below for:

1. ABE Parolee and Expiree Success
   \[ P < .05 = .019 \]
   See Table 25

2. GED Program Completers
   \[ P < .05 = .0001 \]
   See Table 29
No measurement was found to be significant until parole or expiration of sentence for the ABE and the GED groups. The null is rejected.

V17. Number of Felony Convictions

**Hypothesis.** No statistically significant relationship exists between the total number of felony convictions, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled or expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

**Results:** A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below for parolees or expirees by total felony convictions, but not in respect to educational programs:

(1) $P < .05 = .0006$  
See Table 20

The null is retained.

Number of Felony convictions was significant at $P < .05 = .0006$ level of significance between educational program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled or expired male felons. The null is retained.

V18. Severity of Crime

**Hypothesis.** No statistically significant relationship exists between the severity of crime, education program completion/noncompletion and recidivism for paroled or expired male felons at the .05 level or below.

**Results:** A statistically significant relationship exists at the .05 level or below:

(1) Total Parolee/Expiree  
Program Completers  
Program Noncompleters  
Group
The more severe the crime, the longer the time served incarcerated. This could be the factor which enabled the parolee and expiree groups to complete education programs. Also time equals chronological maturation and again age appears to be a significant factor in successful parole and expiration experiences for paroled or expired male felons. The null is rejected.
Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

A study of a number of variables as related to program completion and recidivism was conducted to determine the relationship of education programs, if any, as a viable rehabilitation program in the process of incarceration. Major demographic characteristics were also considered in terms of having any relationships to school completion and recidivism.

The primary objective of this study was to determine if possible relationships existed between prison education programs and the rate of successful participation in parole or expiration among cases in two state medium security institutions in the State of Nevada. This explanation of relationships is hopefully a valuable and enlightening tool for teachers and other professionals in the field of correctional education (Greer, 1969, p. 124). The case study investigation was limited to the relationship between recidivism, defined as
parole-expiration success/failure, and educational program completion/noncompletion; and each of the following variables: V1. age; V2. ethnicity; V3. age at first admission; V4. prior number of arrests (police contacts); V5. DOP admission status; V6. sentence length in DOP system; V7. juvenile delinquency contact record; V8. probation violation, rules and order; V9. probation violation, rearrest; V10 parole violation, rules an order; V11 parole violation, rearrest; V12. psychological evaluation; V13. DOP reading grade level test scores; V14. highest grade level achieved at DOP intake; V15. drug and alcohol factor in crime commission; V16. reason for leaving program; V17. total number of prior felony convictions; V18. severity of crime.

The data for this study were obtained in March, April, May, June, and July 1988; and were taken from inmate prison records on file at SNCC and SDCC institutions in Clark County, Nevada. The study group was a total of 757 inmates of which: 28 released inmates who completed the high school diploma program were successful parolees; 17 paroled inmates who completed the HSD program and recidivated; 32 parolees who completed the GED program who were successful parolees; 12 GED completer parolees who recidivated; 4 GED program non-completers who were successful parolees; 8 GED program non-completer parolees who recidivated; 8 ABE program completers who were
successful parolees; 6 ABE program completers who paroled and recidivated; 7 ABE program non-completers who paroled and were successful parolees; And 19 expirees who completed the HSD program and were successful expirees; 15 expirees who completed the HSD program and recidivated; 16 expirees who were GED program completers and who were successful expirees; 14 expirees who were GED non-completers who recidivated; 3 expirees who were ABE program completers who were successful expirees; 4 expirees who were ABE program noncompleters who recidivated; 3 ABE program noncompleters who were successful expirees; 5 expirees who were ABE program completers who recidivated; 5 expirees who were ABE program noncompleters who were successful expirees; 5 expirees who were ABE program noncompleters who recidivated.

Data were analyzed to test the null hypothesis to determine if there was no significant relationship between recidivism and the identified variables between the different groups. A T-Test between means was used to test for significant differences between variables. A chi square test of independence was used to test statistical significance of the variables stated above. A contingency coefficient was computed where a complex chi square was use and a phi coefficient was computed where a simple chi square was used. These coefficients were used to indicate
the degree of the relationship. In some cases a further analysis of categories within the variables was conducted by using a T test to test statistical significance of proportions within categories of the independent variables. A complete list of the treatment of the data is located in chapter three. Percentages and frequencies were presented in tabular form in order to present categories with variables.

Conclusions and General Discussion of Findings

The conclusions of this study are that skills levels in all inmates must be identified; that competency levels must be established, and that inmates, ages 27 and over, must be helped to achieve 11th grade level or better performance in skills and knowledge for education to have any impact whatsoever as a program which would reduce recidivism. Intake grade level achievement was an important variable in predicting program completion, as was sentence length and GED attainment. Inmates need to be identified and classified for educational programs at time of intake into the prison system. This would require an administrator or counselor to search inmate records to identify inmates who dropped out of high school at the 10th or 11th grade level. It would also require extensive screening using a device such as the Pre-GED Test. Sentence length computations should be performed to
determine approximate time each inmate will serve prior to enrollment into the education program. Inmates between the ages of 16 and 26 recidivate faster than any other age group regardless of educational achievement, positive psychological adjustment, and all of the other variables combined. In fact, this age group between SDCC and SNCC had nearly a 100 percent recidivism rate. The second most active group of offenders is composed of ages 27 to 35. The 36-48 age group is significantly less active than the first two, and the least active age group is 49 to 66. The indications from this study are for general education classes to be directed to those between the ages of 27 to 35 in need of GED program training. The longer period of time a former inmate can maintain himself in the community the stronger his prospects become of not returning to prison. Employers continually look to hire people with academic skills because those people have demonstrated that they have mastered more than the basics. This obviously entails a break in the criminal life style and a change in thinking patterns for parolees and expirees. If the education process can identify those inmates with the help of classification, who can be moved from 8th, 9th, and 10th level status prior to parole or expiration, then the process can work to enhance their successful parole or expiration chances.

Education underlies everyone's ability to move up the
ladder and fit into society (Horace Mann, 1957; Filler, 1965). It has its place in the rehabilitation model of corrections where the theory of the cycle of crime is: poverty, deprivation, lack of educational opportunities and lack of marketable skills. It has been said, "where crime is the chain, education is the chain cutter." If an inmate can be upgraded through education the likelihood of recidivation is greatly reduced (Galley and Parsons, 1976). Unfortunately, the data presented in this study indicates that there is a large number of available potential students and a disproportionately low number of students in attendance and program completion. This clearly suggests that further program evaluation is needed. Programs need to meet inmate needs if they are to be continued. The low numbers in this study due to attrition would seem to indicate that those needs have yet to be identified or met. Furthermore, it may well be that without legislative mandates neither the prison administration nor the school district personnel will be effective in bolstering inmate induction rates into the education program. Rehabilitative programs also must meet the needs of society to be cost effective. The small number of successful performers from the parolee and expiree pool would imply that this is not the case.

ABE, GED and HSD programs are not enough alone to overcome recidivism. Applicants for educational programs
should be screened thoroughly during the classification process. The State of Nevada, Department of Prisons Counselor recommendations and the statistics found in the inmate's file should be accepted as valid and should be used as planning tools by the Clark County School District Personnel. Unfortunately, they aren't. As it stands now, those who want to attend may do so with no other eligibility requirements other than the desire to do so. Unlike the high school program, college programs do require screening (Galley and Parsons, 1976, pg. 1). The fatal flaw in quality of educational programs lies in the inability of the program to meet adult special education needs (Gally and Parsons, 1972, pg. 5) and still function as an adult high school diploma program. The risk of any prison education program is that the program, over time, looks like a school, has certified teachers just like a real school, but is mismatched with students, ability levels and curriculum. The result of this mismatching is relabeling. An inmate is relabeled a high school graduate through social promotion through the educational program. Unfortunately, often the substance is not in place to venerate the new label. This serves to denigrate the achievements of inmate students who do demonstrate competency. Individual learning differences are enhanced with age, rather than equalized. The reading test score results gathered at intake are valuable tools for
educators to use to develop programs and strategies for individual inmate educational needs. If the reading test scores are not used as guidelines in individual program planning, then additional diagnostic reading tests, and even the GED pre-test, should be administered to help identify student needs.

To avoid recidivism the inmate must have goals and plans for when he attains release. He must understand the need to conform, the need to secure immediate employment in the workforce. These needs underscore the importance of realistic vocational, job and basic learning skills training (Gally and Parson, 1972, pgs. 3-6). Society has the right to protect itself. In the existing prison system with the lack of accountability on the part of the Clark County School District and the State of Nevada Department of Prison personnel, society can only accomplish the goal of protection through warehousing and custodial management. This is not to say that there is no hope in breaking the cycle of recidivism; but what is necessary, more than hope, is to have a reasonable expectation. Without any reasonable expectation for success from expensive treatment programs, we must continue to build more prisons, more holding tanks, until chronological maturity and positive change overtakes the various age groups.

Those students who are functioning below the general
education level, the ABE students and the intellectually impaired, will need intensive remedial education over a long period of time. Several other state prison programs have successfully implemented the mentally retarded offenders program. In addition to that specific program those states have also implemented a non-graded system for literacy and remedial work. This is much needed in the Nevada DOP system. With it the regular high school diploma and the general education development programs can expand. With out it the adult basic education group and those who function below the ABE level of performance will continue to inhibit the productive achievement of the GED and HSD level performers. Networking with the DOP system can help with group identification and formation, decision making regarding placement of students in the groups and instructional planning for the groups.

**Recommendations**

This study of the possible relationships between prison education programs and recidivism was limited to two groups of parolees and expirees from two Nevada DOP prisons, both located in Clark County, Nevada. The findings should be interpreted as tentative and all due caution must be used in interpreting the data and the recommendations based on the results of this study. All findings from this study point to the necessity for
further study in the field of prison education as it currently exists in the southern portion of the State of Nevada. Education performance should help in the decision making process in validating prediction and classification models used by corrections and parole authorities. Some specific recommendations are:

1. Better communication between education staff and prison counselors in making inmate classification and placement decisions based on the information, tests and procedures used by the State of Nevada Department of Prisons system, which is found in inmate files, and gathered at intake.

2. Identification of inmates according to projected sentence lengths, or minimum eligibility dates.

3. Grouping of inmates for testing and instruction by DOP intake reading test scores and last grade completed.

4. Expansion of pre-testing, diagnostic and evaluation testing within the CCSD education program prior to course enrollment.

5. Expansion of the ABE program for long range educational goals for illiterate inmates.

6. Implementation of a Retarded Offender Program to meet the needs of inmates who are unable to participate in the ABE program due to intellectual impairment.

7. Identification of 10th grade level performing inmates for the purpose of skills and academic enhancement.

8. Pre-GED and GED test screening at time of DOP intake.

9. Assessment of current programs should be conducted to allow for formative and summative evaluations of program quality and effectiveness in the following areas:
   a. Program comprehensiveness
   b. Quality of instruction
c. Identification of inmate needs
d. Determination if program comprehensiveness meets inmate needs
e. Evaluation of comprehensiveness of prison counseling programs, job placement, work and life skills identification and development, and effectiveness of job placement programs.
f. Program effectiveness and quality of inmate instructors
g. Effectiveness of mandatory attendance requirement to earn good time credits for early release and participation in prison education programs.

10. Follow up studies on ex-convicts who are successful parolees and expirees for the purpose of compiling and developing typological profiles of the offenders who are most likely to benefit from educational rehabilitative programs:
   a. Demographic information
   b. Personal information
   c. Attitudinal characteristics

11. Teacher education training and teacher effectiveness training in the prison setting.

12. Counselor training and networking with the prison counselors and administration.

13. Secondary, Post Secondary, Vocational and Adult education course work for teacher preparation at the university level for correctional educators.

14. Accountability and articulation between and among CCSD personnel and DOP personnel.

15. Establishment of effective leadership, authority and chain of command for CCSD administrators on equal levels with DOP administrative personnel.

16. College career track preparation requirements for DOP administrative personnel at the university level.

17. Pre-screening and treatment contract between inmates and CCSD education department, completion of which may possibly be a factor in parole consideration.
In addition to these specific recommendations Sylvia McCollum (1983) submits the following four objectives as mandatory for a comprehensive ABE (adult basic education) program:

1. Ninety day mandatory ABE enrollment required of all inmates who function at less than a 6th grade reading and writing level of comprehension and performance.

2. Meaningful disciplinary action in cases where inmates refused to enroll, such as culinary duty. Specific sanctions should be left to the local institutions.

3. Thirty day review of all enrolled inmates or those identified by need in order to access status, identify problems and provide for counseling or other indicated interventions.

4. Required completion of ABE programs before any inmate can be considered for employment in prison jobs. A requirement that more education is needed for position upgrades within paid prison inmate employment categories should also be stipulated.

The numbers of students who initially sign up for the program and the large numbers who drop out prior to completion suggest that the program is not meeting the needs of the majority of inmates who sign on in the beginning. Perhaps an exit questionnaire or follow-up survey would be appropriate with that population. In relationship to the small numbers who do attend, due to the expense involved in program delivery, it is imperative that cost effectiveness of programs be determined. Currently accountability is fraught with confused and overlapping layers of authority to the point where it is almost absent. It may well be that legislative directives
will be necessary to ensure a viable prison education program in the Nevada DOP system. There is no justification to maintain or continue programs which do not enhance rehabilitative potential in the incarcerated population. There is also no valid reason to indiscretionately provide program services to inmates without a screening process. Perhaps only those inmates who can be identified as benefiting from educational programs should be allowed to participate (Ingalls, 1978, pg. 71). Open enrollment, open entry and open exit policies, only serve to create chaos. The program may have numbers, but the numbers are not consistent and stable enough to produce positive educational outcomes.

Most law givers and many of their constituents view prison as a solution to crime (Guenther, 1976, pgs. 149-165). While this is tempered with judges discretion to impose lower sentences, our sentencing system still results in a "pronounced tendency to overpunish" (Orland, 1975, pgs. 111-115). It still remains to be determined whether prisons are for rehabilitation or punishment. Further, when given the increased statistics of reported incidences of crime and the growth in court workloads the inevitable conclusion is that the prison system must expand (Rutherford, 1984, pg. 171). If prisons are to expand in the State of Nevada, it is necessary to build schools within the walls of each new prison. It is
hopeful that the findings of this study will be useful in decision making sessions regarding the future of correctional education in the Nevada DOP system.
Appendices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1984-85</th>
<th>1985-86</th>
<th>1986-87</th>
<th>1987-88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEAN (SNCC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGS (SDCC)</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INMATES RECEIVING HSD 1984-1988</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEAN (SNCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGS (SDCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INMATES RECEIVING GED 1984-1988</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEAN (SNCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGS (SDCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Clark County School District Alternative Program Records, SDCC and SNCC: State of Nevada, Classification to Education Records, 1984 thru 1988)
Attrition Chart
SNCC & SDCC

TOTAL PRISON POPULATION STATEWIDE POTENTIAL
ENROLLMENT 4,500

Initial Enrollment
2849

Initial Dropout
1009

Beginning Population
1840

(Arrival & movement)
Unavailable Files
1083

Available Files = 100%
757
+ 2 deceased

Incarcerated Population
546 = 72.1%

27.9% 211 Paroled/Expired (Released)
Completers = Program 16.4% 124 Successful Paroled/Expired
Noncompleters = Dropouts 11.5% 27.9% Recidivated

S = Successful Parole/Expire
R = Recidivated

Total Paroled & Expired 211 = 100%

124 = 58.77% Successful
87 = 41.23% Recidivated

Completers Noncompleters
HSD 28 17 0 0 Parolees
GED 32 12 4 8
ABE 8 6 7 0

Completers Noncompleters
HSD 19 15 0 0 Expirees
GED 16 14 3 5
ABE 4 3 5 5

HSD = High School Diploma  GED = General Education Development
ABE = Adult Basic Education

(Clarke County School District Alternative Program
Records, SDCC and SNCC; State of Nevada, Classification
Records and Inmate files, 1984 thru 1988)
Statewide - Males

Age Distribution
Total Incarcerated Male Felons
(State of Nevada, DOP Statistics, 1986)
RECIDIVISM BY CURRENT AGE AND AGE AT FIRST ADMISSION

TOTAL NUMBER = 757

**Age at First Admission**
- Mean: 26.138
- Median: 24.333
- Standard Error: 0.833
- Mode: 18.000
- Standard Deviation: 7.767

**Current Age**
- Mean: 33.713
- Median: 31.875
- Standard Error: 0.904
- Mode: 29.000
- Standard Deviation: 8.433
Current Age
757 Cases

Total Group - 757
Mean 32.514  Standard Error .300
Median 30.903
Mode 27.000  Standard Deviation 8.243
Pearson's R .05395  Significance .0690
Current Age
546 Cases

PROFILE
CURRENT AGE
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivism by Current Age
87 Cases

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean 33.713  Standard Error  .904
Median 31.875  Standard Deviation  8.433
Mode 29.00
Successful Parole/Expirees Still Free, 124 Cases by Current Age

CURRENT AGE

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 134
Mean 32.444 Standard Error .758
Median 32.000
Mode 27.000 Standard Deviation 8.438
Total Prison Population
(Males) Statewide

- White = 61%
- Black = 31%
- Hispanic = 5%
- Asian = 1%
- Indian = 1%
- Cuban = 1%

Ethnicity of Male Incarcerates
Based on in House Population
(State of Nevada, DOP Statistics, 1986)
Total Study Population
Ethnicity of Prisoners
Major Races, 757 Cases

![Bar Chart: Major Races]

- WHITE: 53.9%
- BLACK: 36.7%
- HISPANIC: 4.9%
- CUBAN: 3.6%

Ethnicity of Prisoners
Minor Races 757 Cases

![Bar Chart: Minor Races]

- AMERICAN INDIANS: 0.7%
- ASIANS: 0.1%
- PACIFIC ISLANDERS: 0.1%

Total Group - 757
Mean 1.761
Median 1.428
Mode 1.000
Standard Error .042
Standard Deviation 1.161
Ethnicity of Prisoners

Major Races  546 Cases

PERCENT

WHITE-54.4%  BLACK-35.9%  HISPANIC-5.1%  CUBAN-3.7%

Ethnicity of Prisoners

Minor Races  546 Cases

PERCENT

AMERICAN INDIANS-.5%  ASIAN-.2%  PACIFIC ISLANDERS-.2%
Recidivism by Ethnicity

87 Cases

Number (47) (29) (5) (6)

Ethnic Codes:
1 = White
2 = Black
3 = Hispanic
4 = Asian
5 = American Indian
6 = Cuban
7 = Other
8 = Unknown

Mean 1.793  Standard Error .139
Median 1.426
Mode 1.000  Standard Deviation 1.295
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Ethnicity

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean 1.545 Standard Error .006
Median 1.141
Mode 1.000 Standard Deviation 1.063
Solid Line - Age at First Admission

Total Group - 757
Mean 27.773 Standard Error .290
Median 25.894
Mode 20.000 Standard Deviation 7.982
Pearson's R -.07537 Significance .0191
### Age First Admission

**546 Cases**

**Profile**

**Age at First Admission**

**Still Incarcerated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total Male Population by Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 or Less</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Age = 33

(Nevada DOP Statistics, Dec. 31, 1986, Total State Male Inmates)
Age First Admission

546 Cases

PROFILE

AGE AT FIRST ADMISSION
STILL INCARCERATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total Male Population by Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 or Less</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Age = 33
(Nevada DOC Statistics, Dec. 31, 1988, Total State Male Inmates)
Recidivism by Age of First Admission
87 Cases

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean 26.138
Median 24.333
Mode 18.00
Standard Error .833
Standard Deviation 7.767
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Age of First Admission

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean 27.250  Standard Error .735
Median 25.894
Mode 20.000  Standard Deviation 8.184
Prior Police Contacts
757 Cases

Total Group - 757
Mean 12.083
Median 6.750
Mode 0
Pearson's R -0.01313

Standard Error .593
Standard Deviation 16.303
Significance .3591
Prior Police Contacts

546 CASES

PROFILE
PRIOR POLICE CONTACTS
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivation by Prior Police Contacts

Total Number of Prior Police Contacts Per Case
Total Number of Cases = 87

Mean 12.023
Median 8.143
Mode 3.000

Standard Error 1.365
Standard Deviation 12.732
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Prior Police Contacts

PRIOR POLICE CONTACTS
Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean 10.597  Standard Error 1.291
Median 5.429
Mode 0  Standard Deviation 14.379
Recidivism Rates by Admission Status
State of Nevada, Department of Prisons

Total Group - 757
Mean 1.625 Standard Error .038
Median 1.276 Standard Deviation 1.042
Mode 1.000
DOP Admission Status
546 Cases

PROFILE
DOP ADMISSION STATUS
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivism by DOP Admission Status
87 Cases

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean 1.678
Median 1.287
Mode 1.000
Standard Error .123
Standard Deviation 1.46
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by DOP Admission Status

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean 1.629
Median 1.282
Mode 1.000
Standard Error 0.095
Standard Deviation 1.055
Percentage of Population
SENTENCE LENGTH

Total Male Population by Percentages
DOP Sentence Length
757 Cases

Number of Years

Total Group - 757
Mean  12.629
Median  7.950
Mode  5.000
Pearson's R -.0477

Standard Error  .569
Standard Deviation  15.663
Significance  .0993
DOP Sentence Length
546 Cases

PROFILE
DOP SENTENCE LENGTH
STILL INCARERATED
Recidivation by DOP Sentence Length

Total Cases = 87

Mean 12.759
Median 8.375
Mode 7.000

Standard Error 1.664
Standard Deviation 15.519
Successful Parole/Expiree Group - 124
Mean 7.885  Standard Error .727
Median 5.1000
Mode 5.000  Standard Deviation 8.905
Juvenile Delinquent Contacts
757 Cases

Total Group - 757
Mean 1.081
Median .408
Mode 0
Pearson's R -.06910

Standard Error .112
Standard Deviation 3.071
Significance .0287
Juvenile Delinquent Contacts
546 Cases

Profile
Juvenile Delinquent Contacts
Still Incarcerated
Successful Parole/Expirees
124 Cases by Juvenile Delinquent Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successful Paroles/Expirees Group - 124
Mean 1.777
Median .309
Mode 0
Standard Error .472
Standard Deviation 4.793
Recidivation by Juvenile Delinquent Contacts

Total Cases = 87

Recidivate Group - 87

Mean .552
Median .388
Mode 0

Standard Error .123
Standaard Deviation 1.149
Probation Rules
757 Cases

Total Group - 757
Mean .486
Median .428
Mode 0
Pearson's R -.12514

Standard Error .020
Standard Deviation .548
Significance .0003
Probation Rules
546 Cases

Frequency 0 1 2

PROFILE
PROBATION RULES
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivism by Probation Rules
87 Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency 1

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean .299
Median .213
Mode 0

Standard Error .049
Standard Deviation .460
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Probation Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
- Mean: 0.516
- Median: 0.531
- Mode: 1.000
- Standard Error: 0.045
- Standard Deviation: 0.502
Probation Rearrests
757 Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Group - 757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson's R</td>
<td>.00296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.4676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Probation Rearrests
546 Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFILE
PROBATION REARRESTS
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivism by Probation Rearrests

Total Cases = 87

Mean .621
Median .406
Mode 0

Standard Error .088
Standard Deviation .825
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Probation Rearrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean \( .653 \)  
Median \( .621 \)  
Mode \( 1.000 \)  
Standard Error \( .060 \)  
Standard Deviation \( .663 \)
Parole Rules
757

Total Group - 757
Mean .449
Median .380
Mode 0
Pearson's R -.10137
Standard Error .019
Standard Deviation .531
Significance .0026
Parole Rules
546

PROFILE
PAROLE RULES
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivism by Parole Rules

87 CASES

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean .299
Median .213
Mode 0

Standard Error .049
Standard Deviation .460
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Parole Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean 0.492  Standard Error 0.045
Median 0.484  Standard Deviation 0.502
Parole Rearrests
747

Total Group - 757
Mean .622
Median .541
Mode 0
Pearson's R .13698

Standard Error .026
Standard Deviation .705
Significance .0001
Parole Rearrests

546

PROFILE
PAROLE REARREST
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivation by Parole Rearrests

Number of Times
First Second Third Fourth Fifth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number = 87

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean .920  Standard Error .109
Median .742  Standard Deviation 1.014
Mode 0
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Parole Rearrests

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean .556
Median .454
Mode 0
Standard Error .059
Standard Deviation .654
Psychological Evaluation

Total Group - 757
Mean 7.007
Median 7.032
Mode 7.000
Pearson's R .03090

Standard Error .065
Standard Deviation 1.786
Significance .1980
Psychological Evaluation

Score A  A-  B+  B  B-  C+  C  C-  D+  D  D-  F

PROFILE
PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivation by Psychological Evaluation

Total Number = 87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D-</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivate Group - 87

Mean 7.172  Standard Error .200
Median 7.170  Standard Deviation 1.869
Mode 7.000
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Psychological Evaluation

Score A  A-  B+  B  B-  C=  C  C-  D=  D  D-  F

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean 6.758
Median 6.980
Mode 7.000
Standard Error .172
Standard Deviation 1.914
Reading Level

Total Group - 757
Mean 7.0
Median 7.0
Mode 10.0
Pearson's R .01620

Intake Reading Grade Level Scores

Total Group (757)

Intake Reading Grade Level Scores (113)

Reading Level: Range - Non-reader to Grade thirteen

Total Group - 757
Mean 7.0
Median 7.0
Mode 10.0
Pearson's R .01620

Standard Error 11.00
Standard Deviation 3.0
Significance .3274
Intake Reading Grade Level

Still Incarcerated - 546
- Mean 6.9
- Median 7.1
- Mode 10.00

Standard Error 1.34
Standard Deviation 3.13
Recidivism Rates by Intake Grade Level Reading Test Scores

Total Cases = 87

Grade Level Reading Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Reading Performance</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean 747.145</td>
<td>31.895</td>
<td>297.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median 801.750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 1000.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 7th grade-half year</td>
<td>Standard Error = 3 grade levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median = 8th grade</td>
<td>Standard Deviation = 3 grade levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode = 10th grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Intake Grade Level

Grade Level Reading Performance

Successful Group - 124
Mean 7.0
Median 7.0
Mode 10.0
Standard Error 2.6
Standard Deviation 2.86
### Education Level of Male Inmates

#### Statewide Incarcerates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Completed</th>
<th>Number of Inmates</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>6.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>12.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>18.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>33.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>17.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>4489</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(State of Nevada, DOP Statistics, 1986)
Intake Education Level
757 Cases

Total Group - 757
Mean  10.47  Standard Error  .071
Median 10.692  Standard Deviation 1.966
Mode  11.000  Significance  .0897
Pearson's R -.04886
Intake Education Level
546 Cases

PROFILE
INTAKE EDUCATION LEVEL
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivation by Intake Education Level
Grade Achievement - Last Grade Completed

Total Number = 87

Second  Third  Fourth  Sixth  Eighth  Ninth  Tenth  Eleventh  Twelfth  Thirteenth  Fourteenth and Above
(1)    (1)    (1)    (1)    (3)    (7)    (25)    (23)    (21)    (1)    (1)

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean 10.460
Median 10.714
Mode 10.000

Standard Error .204
Standard Deviation 1.904
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Intake Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean 10.669
Median 10.700
Mode 11.00
Standard Error .154
Standard Deviation 1.714
### Frequency of Alcohol Abuse

**Male Inmate Population**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>2146</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4489</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency of Alcohol as a Factor in Crime Commission

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>2979</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4489</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(State of Nevada, DOP Statistics, 1986)
Drugs, Alcohol Involved
757 Cases

Total Group -747
Mean 9.332
Median 11.966
Mode 16.000
Pearson's R -.0372

Standard Error .1528
Standard Deviation 6.585
Significance .239
Drugs, Alcohol Involved
546 Cases

PROFILE
DRUGS, ALCOHOL INVOLVED
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivism by Drugs, Alcohol Involved
87 Cases

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean 9.184
Median 11.667
Mode 12.000

Standard Error .627
Standard Deviation 5.844
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Drugs, Alcohol Involved

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean  8.210  Standard Error  .581
Median 11.333  
Mode 16.00  Standard Deviation 6.169
Reason for Leaving
757 Cases

Total Group - 757
Mean 1.886
Median 1.392
Mode 1.000
Pearson's R .42846

Standard Error .051
Standard Deviation 1.393
Significance .000
Reason for Leaving
546 Cases

Still Attending
Prison Movement to Other Areas
Student Voluntary Withdraw
Ed. Admin. Request to Withdraw

PROFILE
REASON FOR LEAVING
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivation by Reason for Leaving

Total Cases = 87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Completers</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Administrative</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Decision</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Department Request</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean .333
Median .113
Mode 0

Standard Error .084
Standard Deviation .787
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Reason for Leaving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Leaving</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still Attending at Time of Release</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Movement to Other Areas prior to Release</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Voluntary Withdraw</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Admin. Request to Withdraw</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean: .258
Median: .096
Mode: 0
Standard Error: .058
Standard Deviation: .649
Prior Felonies
Frequency Count and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Prior Felonies</th>
<th>Number of Inmates</th>
<th>Percentages of Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>54 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior felony convictions are defined as being each instance where an offender is found guilty of a felony crime through the court process, as an adult, irrespective of whether the offender was sentenced to probation or to prison. The current felony conviction presently being served is not counted. (State of Nevada, DOP Statistics, 1986)
Total Felony Convictions
757 Cases

Total Group - 757
Mean 1.886
Median 1.392
Mode 1.000
Pearson's R .04521

Standard Error .1070
Standard Deviation 1.393
Significance .1070
Total Felony Convictions
546 Cases

PROFILE
TOTAL FELONY CONVICTIONS
STILL INCARCERATED
### National Crime Severity Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Offenders</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Offenders</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offenders</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order Offenders</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986)
Recidivation by Total Felony Convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conviction Rates</th>
<th>87 Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number = 87

Frequency 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean 2.034
Median 1.446
Mode 1.000

Standard Error 0.155
Standard Deviation 1.450
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Total Felony Convictions

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean 1.984
Median 1.439
Mode 1.000
Standard Error .115
Standard Deviation 1.281
Severity of Crime

49%  
Non-Violent Crimes

51%  
Violent Crimes

Total Nevada State Prison Population  
(State of Nevada, DOP Statistics, 1986)
Severity of Crime
757 Cases

Total Group - 757
Mean 5.293
Median 5.753
Mode 7.000
Pearson's R -.06938

Standard Error .086
Standard Deviation 2.378
Significance .0282
Severity of Crime
546 Cases

Classification Status

PROFILE
SEVERITY OF CRIME
STILL INCARCERATED
Recidivation by Severity of Crime

87 Cases

Classification Status:
I  II  III  IV  V  VI  VII  VIII  IX

Recidivate Group - 87
Mean  5.540
Median  5.471
Mode  7.000

Standard Error  .232
Standard Deviation  2.166
Successful Parole/Expirees
Still Free, 124 Cases by Severity of Crime

Classification Status:
I  II  III  IV  V  VI  VII  VIII  IX

Successful Parolee/Expiree Group - 124
Mean  3.540
Median 2.667
Mode  1.000
Standard Error .232
Standard Deviation 2.520
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