12-2023

The Connection Between Correlational Control Rate and Successful Probation Discharge Rates in the United States

Myron Syvelle Hopes
Texas Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/dissertations

Part of the Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN CORRELATIONAL CONTROL RATE AND

SUCCESSFUL PROBATION DISCHARGE RATES IN THE UNITED STATES

Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree, Doctor of Administration of Justice in the Graduate School

of Texas Southern University

by

Myron Hopes

Texas Southern University

2023

Approved by

Dr. Jasmine Drake
Chairperson, Dissertation Committee

Dr. Mahesh Vanjani
Dean, The Graduate School

Approved By

Dr. Jasmine Drake   10/27/23
Chairperson, Dissertation Committee   Date

Dr. Ashraf Mozayani   10/27/23
Committee Member   Date

Dr. Glenn Johnson   10/27/23
Committee Member   Date

Dr. Julian Scott   10/27/23
Committee Member   Date

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN CORRELATIONAL CONTROL RATE AND SUCCESSFUL PROBATION DISCHARGE RATES IN THE UNITED STATES

By

Myron Hopes, Ph.D.

Texas Southern University, 2023

Dr. Jasmine Drake, Advisor

This dissertation analyzes the connection between correctional rates and probation rates to find the harshness of a state's correctional program that evaluates the successful completion of probation. The answer starts with correctional control conversion to a score assigned to each state and compared against their successful probation completion rate. The correctional control rates are the total number of persons within a state's correctional system and from the Prison Policy Initiative. The study will employ Social Control Theory as the underlying theoretical framework in examining the harshness of correctional control rates as it relates to successful probation outcomes. The data evaluation will address whether there are statistically insignificant or significant associations between correctional control rates and the success rate of individuals completing their probation programs. The findings will have implications for statewide correctional programs since the resulting data shows whether harsher correctional approaches are associated with successful completion of probation. The stated goal of correctional programs is to rehabilitate individuals with findings that suggest whether stricter criteria for corrections are conducive to rehabilitation and supply recommendations for states regarding whether they should adjust their programs. Researcher Paternoster (1987) wondered if deterrence worked when committing a new crime or re-offending. The goal of deterrence is to prevent engaging in criminal activity when faced with pleasure over pain. What do we really consider as we engage

1

in activities that threaten our freedom and put us at risk of entering the criminal justice system, whether it is probation, parole, or pretrial?

Keywords: *Incarceration, Parole, Probation*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

VITA

1993.. B.S., Criminal Justice
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX

1996.. M.A., Sociology
University of Houston
Clear Lake, TX

2005-2006 .... United States Army Recruiter
United States Department of Defense
Contractor
Houston, TX

2008-2010 .... Graduate Research Assistant
Texas Southern University
Houston, TX

2016-2017 .... Rehab Clinician
The Harris Center for Mental Health and IDD
Houston, TX

2019-Present .... Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
Texas Workforce Commission
Houston, TX

Major Field.. Administration of Justice

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, I would like to acknowledge my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for allowing me to complete this journey. There were challenging times during this process, but my faith allowed me to stay the course, stay in the race, and have confidence in the process until I reached the finish line. I am not sure how any of this would be possible without your daily doses of grace, new mercies, and loving kindness. Thank you, Lord, for allowing me to look for your hands in guiding and directing my path. Secondly, I would like to acknowledge my wife (Nequiatuia Hopes) my children (Sydney, Darren, Maeghan, and Myan), and the rest of my family for being a great support system to me along the way. I know it took some time to complete but thank you for all the wisdom and words of encouragement that you shared during this journey. I would like to thank my colleague and friend, Dr. Adrienne Nikki Moore for sharing the knowledge that you shared during the latter stages of the process, as well as every professor in the Administration of Justice Department at Texas Southern University who granted me the pleasure of learning by investing in my academic journey. I would like to thank Dr. S. Johnson for your statistical fortitude and for being a vital party to my success. I would like to acknowledge and thank each of my committee members for their tireless efforts and support during this race. Dr. Ashraf Mozayani, thank you for challenging my thought processes and for encouraging me to be a better student. Dr. Glenn Johnson, thank you for your wisdom, insight, and views challenging me to look toward the future in research. Dr. Julian Scott, thank you for being understanding and for guiding me in the right direction about the discipline as a researcher. Dr. Jasmine Drake, thank you kindly for expressing and extending to me those things characterized as needful. You so kindly exhibited and extended wisdom, patience, concern, and care. I thank God for you daily because your strict organization and detail propelled me forward and I am forever grateful to

you. Lastly, I would like to thank my late Pastor Dr. Charles L. Jackson, and my current Pastor

Dr. Sheldon L. Jackson for teaching me the word of God for the past 45 years. Your availability

to God as a mouthpiece has taught me how to trust and believe and that has been the cornerstone

to any success that has become of my life. Thank you all for your love and support.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to the most humbled, sweetest, and loving person I have ever met in my life, (**My Mother- Deloris L. Hopes**). It does not seem real that you are no longer here, but I know you look down and smile at this accomplishment. I will forever carry you in my mind, body, and soul because you were my inspiration.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Probation is an attempt by states to create a rehabilitative environment in which individuals stay in the community rather than be taken into the existing prison population. Existing research showed that the critical goal of probation programs should be to reduce recidivism, which led to the American Justice Center outlining specific improvements to such programs that may help improve recidivism rates (Bureau of Justice Assistance [BJA], 2011). Probation is a means of helping to keep first-time offenders and minor offenders out of the prison system. Research lacks the study of the relationship between the harshness of a prison system and the outcomes of probation. A state's correctional system can use the correctional control rate (Prison Policy, 2019). The current study motivated the researcher through attempts to understand whether the nature of the United States parole and probation system was associated with improved probation outcomes in the form of improved successful discharges from the penal institution. The researcher addresses the Texas prison system as one of the harsher states with correctional control ratings. Chapter 1 reviews the background of the problem and lays out what the research has done. The research question and hypotheses provided findings and reviews of the limitations and assumptions involved with the research. In addition, a conclusion to the research follows.

Background

Probation is a widely used approach to addressing criminal offenders, which intends to help rehabilitate individuals. Research (Kirkwood & Hamad, 2019; Ruhland, 2018) has previously shown that probation can help deter future crime and can serve as an effective means

of promoting public safety. Probation can help keep individuals out of the incarcerated population, which can have the unintended consequence of fostering future recidivism (Klingele, 2013). The literature suggests keeping individuals in the community supplied support for valuable family and friend connections that helped promote positive behaviors.

Probation is conditional. Probation requires various degrees of supervision (United States Code, 2019a). This supervision is valuable because it helps to ensure that probationers are rehabilitating effectively and integrating into society where officers of the courts put together plans designed to help with the reintegration process. Forms of probationary release may also come with specialized conditions that help individuals overcome drug and alcohol abuse (United States Code, 2019c). Conditions of probation may include issues of mental health treatment as well. All conditions of probation relate to treatment and/or rehabilitation. For example, there may be restrictions placed on individuals limiting the types of employment they can pursue, for instance, sex offenders finding it difficult to secure jobs involving at-risk populations with restrictions made based on the nature of the offense (United States Code, 2019g). Probation officers may petition the courts to lift restrictions if they feel the low-level individual can perform the work and thrive within the form of employment.

Probation is therefore a diverse program ideally tailored to the unique needs of each offender and helps to promote their rehabilitation. Probation was consistent with social science research that showed remaining integrated into the community could help reduce recidivism (United States Code, 2019b). However, probation effectiveness varied by individuals. Instead, probation proved to be most effective for low-risk individuals who were not likely to recidivate. However, even among low-risk individuals, the interventions used to prevent future crime

needed specific tailoring to the needs of the individual. Such an approach was associated with reducing recidivism rates.

In the state of Texas, the 71st Texas Legislature changed the term probation to a community supervision program in 2003 (Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 2017). This program is consistent with general definitions of probation and includes supervised release and reintegration into the community (The State of Texas, 2019). This program is available for both misdemeanor and felony offenders (The State of Texas, 2019). The community supervision program includes both direct and indirect supervision approaches, with direct supervision requiring face-to-face meetings. Texas has been effective in preventing recidivism among offenders. Recidivism rates within the state declined slightly between 2013 and 2015 (The State of Texas, 2019). Texas has developed various approaches to criminal offenders. Community supervision is not the only type of non-incarceration response employed by Texas. The courts will often refer drug offenders to substance abuse felony punishment facilities for rehabilitation, for example, in Atascocita, Texas. Parole is a critical approach that allows offenders to adjust to life outside the prison while protecting society from those unsupervised.

Texas has not been the only state that has seen success with its probation program. National data showed that the number of those in the supervised release program declined between 2008 and 2016 (BJS, 2018). As such, probation seems to have been effective at reducing recidivism rates. However, questions remained about the effectiveness of such programs.

Statement of the Problem

The problem that currently exists is unknown how Texas compares against other states concerning the impact of the rate of correctional control on successful discharge. Probation

discharges include incarceration with a new sentence, incarceration under the current sentence, incarceration to receive treatment, incarceration for a different reason, incarceration for unknown reasons, probation absconding, discharge due to completion of the program, or discharge due to unsatisfactory compliance with the program (Spohn & Brennan, 2019). The multiple types of discharge involve successful discharge, unsuccessful discharge due to incarceration, and iii) unsuccessful discharge due to unsatisfactory compliance (Spohn & Brennan, 2019).

Correctional control refers to the total use of correctional methods within a state, including state prison rate, federal prison rate, local jail rate, youth confinement rate, involuntary commitment rate, Indian country jails rate, parole rate, and probation rate. The rate of correctional control is a more robust method of assessing the harshness of a state's correctional system than incarceration rates alone. The current study compared the correctional rate scores of all counties in Texas (with the correctional control rate converted to an assigned score) against the successful discharge rates, with successful discharge estimated from the number of individuals successfully leaving their probation program versus the total number within that probation program (Jones, 2018).

Methodology

Data used in the study consisted of counties within the Texas probation population and successful completion rates from federal information. As such, the study sample included data from the entire U.S. prison population. The correctional rate data converted the recidivism ranking of each state. Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016) produced the ranking. Inferential statistics were used to calculate scores comparing the correctional control rate against the successful discharge rate.

Research Question

The following research question and hypotheses guided the study: Is there an association between correctional control rates and successful discharge rates in state probation programs?

Hypotheses

Ho_1:   There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates.

$H1a$:   There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates.

Ho_2:   There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates by gender.

$H2a$:   There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates gender.

Ho_3:   There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates by race.

$H3a$:   There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates race.

Limitations and Assumptions

A limitation of the study notes that correctional control rates lacked calculations for the entirety of 2023, but only through March of 2023. The researcher, therefore, assumes that correctional control rates remained stable between March 2023 and the present. A second limitation of the study is that it compares similar populations. Regional factors may influence the outcomes of programs rather than the 'harshness that is of the state's justice system.

Conclusion

Concerning correctional control rates, Texas ranks among the top states in terms of the harshness that is of its criminal justice system as shown by the total number of offenders under community supervision within the state. It keeps a successful translation into more successful probation programs. The current study has investigated the relationship between a state's correctional control rate and its successful probation discharge rate. Sanctions play a vital role in deterrence involving social control, but recidivism continues to persist in the criminal justice system. Researcher Paternoster (1995) investigated risks associated with social control and the idea of sanctions as a deterrent; He concluded that sanctions work if properly applied. Chapter 2 examines the existing literature relating to probation showing a connection between correctional rates and probation rates.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Probation demands supervised release for offenders during the time the offender requires monitoring (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2016). This period of supervision may include various forms of interventions to address issues such as substance abuse or include mental health treatment. Probation may also be known under different terms in various parts of the country. Probation stands as a rehabilitative approach to addressing offenders who are first-time offenders and those who have committed a minor offense. The research suggested that an effective probation program could help to reduce recidivism rates (Bureau of Justice Assistance [BJA], 2011). The research examines the relationship between the harshness of a prison system and the outcomes of probation. A state's correctional system rates the terms of harshness using its correctional control rate (Prison Policy, 2019). The current study persisted with an attempt to understand whether harsher approaches to correction were associated with improved probation outcomes, with an original focus on examining Texas and comparing it against other states.

Chapter 2 division revolves around the following sections: First, a search strategy for a review of the literature, and second, the review of the literature. This review includes a discussion of probation, the costs of crime, and recidivism. The connection of the relationship between probation and recidivism, especially probation in Texas, led to the examination. Lastly, a critique of the literature and a summary of the existing research preceded a transition into Chapter 3 Methodology.

Literature Search Strategy

The following search engines guided an adequate body of literature review for the existing subject: Elsevier, Google Scholar, JAMA Network, and Taylor & Francis Online. The keywords and key phrases used to search the literature included the following: the *history of probation, probation, probation in Texas, probation in the United States, recidivism, criminal recidivism, recidivism in the United States,* and *recidivism in Texas.*

The literature selected for inclusion in the study pertained to probation, probation's history and development within the United States, recidivism, and both recidivism and probation as it applied in Texas. Dozens of documents and historical sources used to inform the literature review came from government sources; however, there was also research including studies drawn from peer-reviewed journals.

What is Probation?

The Bureau of Justice Statistics distinguishes probation from parole, as well as their intentions. Whereas parole is a conditional release from prison into the population where an individual can serve out the remaining term of their sentence within the community, probation refers to supervised release, which includes different statuses and forms of supervision (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2016). Whereas not all programs are termed probation, in practice, programs are identical to probation but use another name. However, the name switches interchangeably because of the same meaning. Because of different regions of the country, community supervision has two main parts: probation and parole. For example, in 2003, Texas replaced the term adult probation and started using the term community supervision; The United States Courts terms it as Probation and Pretrial services; The Office of Justice programs defines Community Supervision as having many forms, but three are the most common, which includes

pretrial services, probation and parole ((Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2016). Florida uses the term community supervision, while the states of Alabama and Colorado use the term community corrections. In other words, the terminology of community supervision or community corrections is just terms used to describe pretrial, probation, and parole.

History of Probation

The history of probation dates back more than a century, to Boston, Massachusetts. In 1841, John Augustus, a Boston resident, took custody of a prisoner serving time in the local jail for drunkenness (Labrecque, 2017). Augustus was able to persuade the local judge to release the prisoner into his care. Then, by the time of his sentencing court date, he managed to help the defendant rehabilitate. During his time in custody, the defendant sobered up and improved in appearance. This impressed the court enough that Augustus was able to repeat the process with others. John Augustus, between 1841 and 1851, posted bail for approximately 2,000 individuals charged with drunkenness and other minor offenses who could not pay fines (Griffin, 2018). Over that period, he had an incredible success rate, with only ten individuals not rehabilitating while under his care (Labrecque, 2017). Augustus' approach to treating these individuals was rooted in a firm belief that people deserved another chance. However, he assessed individuals before accepting them into his care. Instead, he chose his offenders based on age, his assessment of their character, and the likeliness that various influences would create positive change for the individuals. At court each month, Augusts would report on those within his care. After a set period, he would bring the defendants to appear before the court to prove their reform and pay their fines. The court, agreeing that the point of the law was to rehabilitate, would declare the defendant free from further obligations. John Augustus' generosity considered him the 'Father of Probation' for his efforts and his historic role in the probationary process.

Following John Augustus' success, the state formally adopted the probationary process. State laws about probation first appeared, unsurprisingly, in John Augustus' home state of Massachusetts, which passed the first probation laws in 1878 (USC, 2019i). Following the passing of the original probation laws, states around Massachusetts also began to adopt similar laws. By 1956, all fifty states and the federal government had adopted probation laws that applied to juveniles and adults (Griffin, 2018). Federal laws about probation continued to evolve. Federal courts had previously used suspended sentences as a means of shortening the term of sentences, but declared illegal by the Supreme Court, which showed that such suspended terms overlapped with the power of the presidential office to pardon prisoners (USC, 2019i). The federal courts legalized probation with the Probation Act of 1925 after the Supreme Court's decision. The Probation Act of 1925 paved the way for the passage of law the Speedy Trial Act of 1974, and the Pretrial Services Act of 1982, which allowed for evaluation periods and pretrial release to the public to prevent recidivism.

Following the move toward increased probation and the increasing emphasis on rehabilitation, the United States entered a period of 'get tough' rhetoric accompanied by less focus on probation. Beginning in the 1970s, public support for prohibition and rehabilitation faltered (Griffin, 2018). As such, efforts to expand rehabilitation stagnated. In the later decades, this 'get tough' approach produced punitive police approaches and sentencing, which led to an explosion in the country's prison population between the 1980s and 1990s. However, because of the sheer number of prisoners entering the court system, there was an accompanying growth in the number of individuals given probation periods. Illustrating this point, the number of probationers grew from one million in 1980 to an estimated four million by the early 2000s, which reflected a 400% increase in probationers in the country during that period.

What is Criminal Recidivism?

Recidivism is one of the core concepts in the United States criminal justice system. Recidivism is an individual's relapse into committing new criminal actions (National Institute of Justice [NJS], 2019). Recidivism occurs even though a person is sanctioned for their behavior, using a variety of interventions to prevent future criminal behavior. Recidivism is measured by assessing the number of criminal arrests that result in a re-arrest, reconviction, or return to prison regardless of whether a person is sentenced again within three years following an offender's release. Recidivism is related to the three criminal justice concepts of incapacitation, specific deterrence, and rehabilitation. Incapacitation refers to the effects of sanctions, which remove a person from the community and therefore end the crime being committed. Specific deterrence refers to whether that sanction prevents a person from committing any further crimes. Finally, rehabilitation refers to the degree to which any program causes a reduction in crimes by addressing the offender's specific needs (Balafoutas et al., 2020).

Cost of Crime and Recidivism

The United States government has previously analyzed the cost of crime and recidivism rates. Estimates showed that in 2016, the United States spent over 427 billion in funding from the criminal justice system (Council of Economic Advisors [CEA], 2019). The amount diverted to the justice system accounted for 1.4% of the national gross domestic product (GDP). This funding went not only to the justice system but also toward supporting prisons. Estimates showed that in the two decades preceding 2018, real spending on prisons grew by 70%. There were also significant costs incurred by victims due to loss of quality of life, medical costs, loss of life, and property loss. Damages to society were so high that they accounted for another 1.5% of

the national GDP. As such, excessive costs were associated with crime and funding efforts to combat crime.

Given the costs associated with criminal behavior, there was a significant incentive in finding means of reducing criminal behavior. Research into various programs found that programs such as mental health and substance abuse programs could reduce crime and incarceration costs, saving up to $3.31 per taxpayer dollar spent on controlling crime (Council of Economic Advisers, 2018). Costs per inmate as of 2012 peaked at $30,000 annually, though this declined slightly by 2016. However, programs that prevented recidivism had the potential to generate significant savings for taxpayers.

Purpose of Probation

There is currently a debate surrounding the role that probation should serve. Ruhland, researching the issues for the University of Minnesota, noted that researchers wondered whether probation was meant to deter crime, ensure public safety, promote rehabilitation, or a combination of the three (Ruhland, 2018). Interviews with probation officers showed that probation officers felt there was a degree of coercion involved with probation. Other officers noted that conditions placed on offenders were conditions that were part of a broader by-the-numbers strategy that was not always beneficial to all participants, bringing up the issue once more of what purpose did probation serve. Probation officers felt these were conditions imposed because they sounded useful to authorities but had little root in what may help the individuals involved in the probation program.

One of the critical goals of any probation program is to reduce recidivism. The Justice Center showed much in a document released for the Council of State Governors, who were understandably concerned about reducing repeat crime within their states (Bureau of Justice

Assistance [BJA], 2011). To that end, the document outlined vital steps that could be taken to promote reduced recidivism among those conditionally released to the public. Steps that are taken to reduce recidivism and the intentions can vary. Probation was initially positioned as a means of keeping first-time offenders and offenders of less serious crimes from jail, which authorities felt could be corrupting to the individual rather than rehabilitative (Klingele, 2013). As such, their roots of probation in rehabilitating individuals were present from the original conception of probation.

However, the intention of probation has not remained static over time. Because the allure of probation time might entice individuals to plead guilty and shorten the trial time, prosecutors began to view probation as a manipulative tool by which to induce guilty pleas (Klingele, 2013). The purpose, for offenders, may be to avoid imprisonment to keep connections with friends, family, and the community. The state itself creates its views on the purpose of probation, which often reflects a desire to connect offenders with services that prevent them from relapsing into habits, such as drug or alcohol abuse, which may promote recidivism.

Despite the diversity of ways that rehabilitation has been used, it remained clear that a rehabilitative element remained consistent in all definitions. The literature reflected a desire for multiple stakeholders to keep individuals out of prison and connect their communities, sometimes with programs that helped further promote productive behavior. As such, the rehabilitative element of probation is still a crucial part of the probationary process.

Conditions of Probation

The United States court system lays out a firm outline of the conditions of probation. Under 18 USC. § 3601, a defendant sentenced to probation or supervised release, must be overseen by a probation officer (United States Courts [USC], 2019a). The degree of supervision

is decided by the courts, after an assessment of the risk posed by the individual and the level of supervision that is called for, based on the offense. The conditions of supervision include behavioral expectations that the individual must meet to remain on probation, and the probation officer is expected to use various tools to keep updates about a defendant's compliance with the parameters set up for their probation. However, a probation officer must collaborate with the defendant to help them better re-socialize and integrate back into the surrounding community, with the expectation that they become a healthy contributor to society. As such, the courts list out the most typical discretionary conditions used to guide the supervised release of individuals to the public (USC, 2019a).

Process of Probation

The probation process is outlined in 18 USC. § 3553(a)(2)(C) and (D). There is a standardized reporting process by which individuals continue from imprisonment to supervised release (USC, 2019c). An individual is expected to report to a probation office within a specific amount of time following release from imprisonment unless otherwise specified. This is needed as the probation officer needs to satisfy statutory requirements in their role overseeing the defendant. Probation officers then coordinate with various organizations to check the release of the defendant. Defendants are instructed about how they can meet the conditions of their probation to the satisfaction of the probation officer. There is a first supervision plan that is put together to oversee the offender that is implemented within a set period following the release of the defendant. The goal is to supply as much of a structured release for the defendant as possible. Should a defendant not report to their probation officer within a specific period, the probation officer must then find the defendant, which requires notifying law enforcement agents and the courts.

There may also be special conditions that apply depending on the nature of the release. Those with substance abuse issues may require treatment, testing, and to prove ongoing abstinence (USC, 2019d). These individuals are expected to take part in substance abuse programs, alcohol abuse programs, or any programs considered necessary to ensure the individual is still clean of any substances that may change their behavior. Individuals are often required not to have alcohol personally and are required not to interact with psychoactive substances knowingly.

In other cases, an individual may have to undergo mental health treatment. When released, an individual will be asked to take part in a mental health treatment program and to adhere to the medication prescribed to them by their treating physician (USC, 2019e). Probation officers coordinate with treatment providers to ensure that the defendant is continuing their treatment, though defendants must pay for those services to the degree that they are able. Because of the unique needs of those with mental health disorders, these individuals often require added supervision on the part of the probation officer.

Outside of the treatment of mental health and substance abuse, those on probation may have other requirements placed upon them. Individuals may have to supply restitution to the victims of their offenses during their probationary period (USC, 2019f). In these cases, the probation officer must coordinate with the defendant to collect financial information that can prove the defendant has compensated the victim. Until this has been completed, financial restrictions may be placed upon the defendant, including limiting their ability to open lines of credit or incur new credit charges, among other restrictions.

Depending on the nature of the offense, restrictions may be placed upon the line of employment the individual can take part in. Defendants may be prevented from becoming

employed in businesses or volunteer activities without approval from a probation officer (USC, 2019g). Besides these conditions, there are up to twenty special conditions that oversee probationary periods (USC, 2019h). These conditions range from community service requirements to requirements for polygraph testing as part of sex offender management or restrictions placed on the internet and computer access. The nature of the special restrictions depends on the type of offense.

The Ten-Step Process. In addition to the probation process as outlined by the United States court system, the Justice Center, reporting for the Council of State Governments, also showed that there was a process that could be followed that would help improve probation programs and ensure recidivism was reduced (BJS, 2011). Within the context of this process, the first step in reducing recidivism included engaging stakeholders such as law enforcement officials and social services, to plan a program by which to prevent recidivism. A review should be conducted of existing probation departments to ensure that the practices put into these plans are based on data showing that they reduce recidivism. When steps are not consistent with data showing they reduce recidivism, changes need to be implemented to ensure steps are data-driven. Concerning offenders placed on probation, they should be appropriately screened and assessed to decide the likeliness of recidivism, what social services may be needed, and what treatments may help reduce recidivism. These steps should guide the plan designed for the offender, and the plan that is created should be assigned to someone who can adequately supervise the individual throughout their probation.

There were five other steps outlined that should support an effective probation program. Graduated incentives and sanctions should be distributed to individuals over time in response to their compliance or non-compliance to a probation plan, rather than institute plans in which a

single failure results in a person being referred to prison (BJS, 2011). The probation officers must be trained in methods that motivate adherence to these plans and reduce recidivism. Accountability systems must be in place so that these officers are motivating offenders consistently and addressing probation department targets for reducing recidivism. As such, personnel may need replacement with those who can adequately fulfill the duties of parole officers or other individuals within the department. Finally, a parole program required continuous review to ensure that goals were being met. By adhering to the ten-step process for enacting an effective parole program, the Justice Center showed that rehabilitation could be promoted, and recidivism reduced (BJS, 2011).

Theoretical Framework: Social Control Theory

The underlying theoretical framework for this study is social control theory. Social control theory shows that exploiting the process of social learning and socialization develops self-control as well as decreases the inclination to indulge in behavior known as antisocial. Social Control theory assumes that individuals can perceive the benefits of crime and can execute and invent every sort of criminal act. The social control perspective to understanding crime is a key sociological viewpoint in criminology (Mak, 1990). Social control refers to the techniques and strategies for preventing deviant behavior in any society (Schaefer, 2018). According to Milgram (1963), social control involves two main concepts, and those concepts are used as guides to deviant or criminal behavior. The two concepts are conformity and obedience. Milgram (1963) defined conformity as going along with peers, while obedience was defined as compliance with higher authorities in a hierarchal structure. Social control guided this research because individuals make decisions to engage in behavior that may or may not be criminal. In those instances where the behavior is criminal, one would argue that the influence of factors,

such as peers, played a role in criminal behavior. In that to be accepted, conformity, which is

going along to have a good relationship with your peers, seems to have guided your behavior.

However, obedience, which may tend to administer fear, would have you make better decisions

about involvement in criminal behavior because the pleasure does not outweigh the punishment.

Social control contributed more to the research because the sanctions used to encourage

conformity and obedience and to discourage violation of social norms are conducted through

both informal and formal social controls (Schaefer, 2018). Informal social control is used to

enforce norms, which are the established standards of behavior in any society. These are the

norms that are expected of citizens, but formal social controls are enforced by agents who have

authority and the ability to carry them out. If a citizen decides to disobey the law, then

punishments such as probation may become your fate, and police officers, courts and corrections

system are in place for that matter. This study examined those citizens who chose to disobey the

law and as such, were released to community supervision. While social control, as the leading

theory guiding this research addressed offenders, it did not specifically point to the reason for

recidivism. Once offenders are placed on community supervision, whether it be probation or

parole, the research presents findings of recidivism. Recidivism is simply engaging in behavior

that threatens your liberty while on supervision and another theory, although not evaluated in the

research presented, may have played a part in the recidivism rates. Differential Association

Theory describes the process through which exposure to attitudes favorable to criminal behavior

leads to rule violations (Schaefer, 2018). Since the research did not focus on the environments of

offenders or their associations during supervision, an assumption could be that environments

may have played a part in the recidivism rates. Also, Sutherland (1937), whose ideas have been a

dominating force in criminology, drew on the Cultural Transmission school, which emphasizes

that one learns criminal behavior through social interactions. As offenders begin to associate with other offenders, there may be discussions as to how to commit offenses without the thought of being caught, which could also contribute to the recidivism rates. Researchers such as Nagin and Farrington (1990) investigated criminal potential from childhood to adulthood and concluded that social interactions played a vital role when choosing criminal behavior. Social interactions with other offenders lead to more crime offenses under cultural transmission and environments leading to repeat offenses through differential associations.

The United States court system showed that probation was based on sound principles saying that it may positively affect recidivism. Social science research showed that probation was consistently linked with reducing repeat crime by an individual (USC, 2019b). The reduction of recidivism was based on the three principles of risk, need, and responsibility. The risk principle wrote that among those with a higher risk of recidivism, probation should be accompanied by interventions meant to reduce recidivism. Low-risk individuals, in contrast, may not recidivate regardless of conditions upon release. As such, probation should not be considered a normal process applied across all those released, and risk levels should be assessed before probation.

The need principle showed that interventions introduced should be based on the specific needs of the individual. Different interventions may be useful in meeting the needs of different individuals (USC, 2019b). Correctional interventions should be based on empirical evidence showing that the intervention is effective at reducing recidivism. The need may be based on conditions, including factors such as contact with pro-criminal social networks, the risk-taking nature of the individual, substance abuse problems, lack of education, or reduced ability to find

employment. As such, the need principle refers to interventions that address aspects of the environment that may cause recidivism to occur.

The final principle at play in probation is the responsibility principle. This principle states that interventions should be those that are shown to have the most significant impact on reducing recidivism (USC, 2019b). Approaches such as cognitive-behavioral treatment may help to change an individual's patterns of thinking, for instance. While both the need and responsibility principle show that interventions should be used that are evidence-based, the need principle refers to practices addressing the environment. In contrast, the responsibility principle refers to those interventions that help address the individual's learning styles, abilities, and characteristics.

Probation in Texas

In the state of Texas, probation is now called community supervision. Community supervision in the state aligns with the earlier definitions of probation. As said in Chapter 1 under 'Background' and Chapter 2 under 'What is Probation?', Within the state of Texas, the 71st Texas Legislature changed the term probation to a community supervision program in 2003 (Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 2017). Within this program, offenders are placed under supervision for a court-ordered length of time during which they must follow specific rules and conditions. Community supervision can be ordered for either misdemeanor or felony offenses. Individuals are often considered to be under "direct supervision," meaning that these individuals must receive a minimum of one face-to-face meeting with a Community Supervision Officer every three months. However, there are cases where individuals were under indirect supervision, meaning that an offender must report in person to programs but does not require face-to-face contact with a supervision officer. Should the offender fail to meet the terms of their release, they are referred to an intermediate sanction facility. This is considered an alternative to incarceration

and includes a period of closer oversight, potentially including substance abuse treatment, after which the offender may reenter their community program.

<p style="text-align:center">Probation Programs in Texas</p>

Comprehensive reports are released by the state of Texas detailing crime within the state as well as imprisonment, parole, and recidivism. Within the state of Texas, recidivism declined slightly in 2013 and 2015, depending on the type of release or imprisonment the offender experienced (The State of Texas, 2019). Among the adult population, these types of release included felony community supervision, prison, state jail, substance abuse felony punishment facilities, in-prison therapeutic communities, intermediate sanction facilities, and parole supervision. Further, of all types of responses to offenders, felony community supervision began with the lowest rearrest rate. It continued to be the type of response to prisoners that led to the lowest rate of recidivism, with recidivism in felony community supervision beginning with a 39.2% recidivism rate and dropping to a recidivism rate of 38.8% in 2015.

Felony community supervision is a specific type of response to felony-level offenders who receive sentences of 10 years or less. These individuals are eligible to serve their sentences outside of jail or prison, allowing them to remain integrated into the community (The State of Texas, 2019). These individuals are released based on the condition that they adhere to regulations specified by a judge, such as regularly reporting to a probation officer and committing no new offenses. Failure to comply leads to revocation of their participation in the program and results in incarceration. However, the population of offenders enrolled in this program in Texas in 2015 was identified as drug offenders. Like this program, was the substance abuse felony punishment facility, which allowed participants to enroll in a community

supervision program that included a six-month intensive therapeutic program for substance abuse.

The third form of release was the traditionally conceptualized parole supervision. This approach to releasing offenders was characterized as the conditional release of an individual from prison in which they served out the rest of their sentence within the community (The State of Texas, 2019). This made parole and programs such as the community release programs remarkably like community programs, with the distinction that the intent was to allow individuals the opportunity to serve out the rest of their sentences within the community. However, community supervision fell into the category of a probationary program as it occurred before jail time, while parole was an advance release. In all programs, improvements to recidivism occurred over time.

Probation Data

Data released by the federal government showed a curved trend in the number of people who underwent supervised and probationary programs. In the year 2000, those supervised numbered approximately 450,000 (BJS, 2018). This number increased to over 500,000 in 2008 before declining back to approximately 450,000 in 2016 (Sheil, Doyle & Lowenkamp, 2016). This shift in the supervised population was reflected in the probationary population, among whom there were approximately 390,000 on probation in 2000. The number of probationers increased to over 400,000 in 2008 before declining back to beneath 390,000 by 2016 (BJS, 2018).

Texas refers to its probation programs as community supervision. In total, there were 374,980 individuals on community supervision as of August 31st, 2016 (BJS, 2018). Of these, 241,365 were in a direct supervision program while 114, 456 were in an indirect supervision

program. Remembering that direct supervision required in-person meetings with a community supervision officer, directly supervised offenders fell into the four categories of violent offenses, property offenses, drug offenses, and driving while Intoxicated/Driving Under the Influence of Drugs (DWI/DUI), with a small number sorted into an 'Other' category. Of all those directly supervised, it was those who had DWI/DUI charges against them made up the highest number of individuals in a directly supervised program. The types of offenses committed by those in an indirect supervision program were not documented.

Predicting Recidivism

One means of figuring out the likelihood that a person will recidivate is using a recidivism prediction instrument. The recidivism prediction instrument is a means of assessing the likelihood that an offender will re-offend in the future (Chouldechova, 2017). Recidivism was investigated by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice by conducting a study on sentencing dynamics and discovered that one aspect of the potential of recidivism dealt with the length of sentences of offenders. The longer the received produced likelihood of recidivism due to a lack of socialization skills connected outside of the prison walls. These tools have increased in popularity as a means of informing assessments of whether individuals will recidivate. One example of this tool is Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative (COMPASS), which uses a set of criteria to gauge whether a person will re-offend. However, we continue to look carefully at such tools, with researchers warning that COMPASS tools may fall into that category. For instance, the use of COMPASS linked Black offenders to being twice as likely to be at risk of re-offending than white individuals. As such, researchers warned that attention should focus on the inherent biases that were present in such tools.

Attention to the bias in such tools was noted more than once in the literature. Dressel and Farid (2018) also suggested that recidivism was more likely to occur among certain parts of the population, betraying an inherent bias. Dressel and Farid (2018) noted that COMPAS did not explicitly consider an individual's race. However, the tool often showed that a Black defendant was twice as likely to re-offend than their white counterparts. The tool tended to favor white defendants over Black defendants unfairly and proved inaccuracies in its ability to predict outcomes accurately. Consequently, researchers showed that further research was needed to find the fairness of COMPASS and other prediction tools.

Researchers Johndrow & Lum; Zeng, Ustun, and Rudin (2016) have investigated significant resources to decide the best way of creating predictive models for recidivism. Zeng, Ustun, and Rudin (2016) suggested that there was a need for developing models that guided different decisions about the supervision of offenders. Specifically, researchers noted that there might be different goals present for different offenders. As such, each offender needed a special address in a way that considered the goals that prepared them. The overall literature on predictive recidivism, therefore, pointed to a need to review prediction tools and to tailor the likeliness of whether a person's goals would be met according to the individual and the nature of those goals.

Probation Outcomes

In the same way that there have previously been race-based differences in estimates of recidivism, researchers also noted that race also changed supervision outcomes during probationary periods. Steinmetz and Henderson (2015) noted that race, gender, offense type, assessment scores, and location might all interact to influence whether a person successfully changed their outcomes. However, an in-depth examination of these factors suggested that African American males were far more likely to perform worse on supervision outcomes.

Researchers showed that further investigation into racial inequalities that occurred during community supervision was necessary in the hope of ending inequality in the criminal justice system.

A second study suggested that probation outcomes were unequal for parts of the population. Steinmetz and Henderson (2015) investigated the influence of race, gender, and offense severity on probation outcomes. The researchers examined established predictors of probation factors among distinct parts of the population and found that probation failure often hinged on demographic factors. Being an African American and male was a significant predictor of the probation factor. Besides, being a Hispanic felon was also statistically significantly associated with probation failure. The findings were consistent with the findings of Steinmetz and Henderson (2015), who suggested ongoing inequalities in probation programs. As such, further research is needed to find ways of reducing outcomes.

Comparisons were also made between traditional probation and specialty mental health probation. Researchers hoped to figure out whether specialty probation yielded better safety outcomes among people with mental illness (Skeem, Manchak, & Montoya, 2017). A longitudinal investigation of 359 mentally ill probationers found that specialty probation did not significantly reduce violence. However, this form of probation did reduce recidivism rates. The findings, therefore, said that there might be a need for specialty mental health probation of law enforcement to help prevent recidivism among the mentally ill.

Enhanced probation programs were also proposed as a means of improving outcomes for offenders. Shannon, Hulbig, Birdwhistell, Newell, and Neal (2015) pointed to the Supervision, Monitoring, Accountability, Responsibility, and Treatment (SMART) program as an example of such an enhanced probation program. The SMART pilot program was developed to decrease

substance use and prevent recidivism. This program relied on an integrated approach to rehabilitation, which included addressing the mental health needs of offenders, treatments for substance abuse, and the development of life skills that could support reintegration into the population. Data from the program showed that participants were less likely to violate their probation, test positive for drugs, or be incarcerated than their peers in a traditional probation program. These findings proved the value of implementing enhanced programs among offenders.

The importance of coordinating with law enforcement officials and its relation to preventing recidivism was also shown in a study of juvenile offenders. NeMoyer, Holiday, Goldstein, and McKitten (2016) noted that research into juvenile probation revocation showed that youth who attended their review hearings were less likely to be rearrested and were more likely to follow their probation requirements. When youth did not attend these hearings, they were more likely to act in ways that led to their probation revocation and having themselves placed in a juvenile jail.

The overall literature on probation, therefore, wrote down that there were differentiated outcomes for individuals. Being an ethnic minority, particularly an African American male, was associated with the increased likeliness of probation failure, as was being Hispanic. However, failure to coordinate with authorities, such as attending probation hearings, was also linked with an increased chance of failure. Besides the potential systemic bias within the probation system, the findings suggested that there was also a need for individuals to take part in the system and be engaged to prevent recidivism.

Correctional Control Rate

The correctional control rate and state recidivism are a means of judging the harshness of a state's correctional system (Jones, 2018). This assessment of the correctional system is made

by considering all aspects of that system, including state prison rate, federal prison rate, local jail rate, youth confinement rate, involuntary commitment rate, Indian country jails rate, parole rate, and probation rate (Prison Policy, 2019). By examining all aspects of the correctional system, a better understanding can be beneficial about the extent to which states use correctional methods within their population. Higher correctional control rates show a harsher approach to corrections, with more arrests and referrals to correctional services applied than in other states with lower correctional control rates.

Critique of the Literature

Statistics used within the literature review came from federal government sources such as the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2011, 2016). As such, the method was typically sound and relied on the conventional means of assessing recidivism and probation success using current statistics. There were degrees of literature drawn from outside government sources, and these studies were also mostly quantitative. These studies again used quantitative approaches to find success rates among probationers.

The existing literature also raised questions about assessing recidivism risks and examined the quantitative outcomes of such assessments, writing down that these assessments are biased against African Americans. Inclusive of the existing literature was, therefore, quantitatively based, with qualitative discussion about the history of probation, its implementation, and how it differs within the state of Texas. Consequently, a few methodological issues were noticed during the development of the literature review.

Conclusion

Probation has a long history in the United States, dating back to the 1800s as an informal practice implemented in Boston. Since it was first conceptualized, probation has evolved, at times,

expanding in scope and practice and at other times falling out of favor with the public and government officials. However, the general data seemed to show that the use of probation could help prevent recidivism. This was desirable given the connection between criminal behavior and the costs to individuals and the public. However, despite the value of probation, there were notable disparities in how individuals were assessed as the risk for re-arrest as well as disparities in probation outcomes. The general findings, therefore, showed that while probation was beneficial, there was the potential for it to uniquely affect individuals, with African American males at the highest risk of seeing the least benefit from probation programs.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this quantitative study is to investigate the relationship between correctional control rates and successful probation outcomes. The state of Texas has one of the highest correctional control rates of any state in the country, and the study was created in the hope of understanding whether such an approach led to improved probation outcomes. Researchers previously typified higher correctional control rates as characteristic of harsher approaches to criminal justice, given the increased degree of money diverted toward incarceration, probation, and other correctional approaches. The research is significant because it generated insights into whether harsher criminal justice systems are conducive to rehabilitating individuals.

This chapter presents a description of the study design, the sampling approach, and the data analysis to take place. This chapter also includes the rationale used for using this specific research design as well as a discussion of the research method and data collection. Because no humans took part in this study, there was no discussion of human subject treatment and ethics, study participants, recruitment, or treatments.

Research Design and Rationale

The study adopted a quantitative research method to explore the phenomenon being investigated. The independent variable is correctional control rates, and the dependent variable is the successful discharge rate as calculated by the researcher. This approach to the study is designed to find the association between the harshness of a state's correctional program and its successful probation outcomes. The study is motivated by an attempt to compare the harsh nature

of the Texas correctional system, as assessed using its correctional control rate, against states with less incompatible systems.

The research design to be employed within this study is proper when variation in one phenomenon; in this case, the correctional control ranking is associated with a change that occurs in another phenomenon, in this case, the successful discharge rate as calculated by the researcher. This research design can be used to examine two variables that occur within similar conditions in a similar period. The design of the research was proper because it used and relied upon secondary data that reduced researcher bias and was made readily available, including numbers of offenders from each state in the United States.

Given the reliance of the study on secondary data, there will be no attempt made to affect the behavior of any participants, considering that no individuals will take part in the study. Consequently, the research study will be non-experimental. This approach to the researcher is proper in this case, given that there are identifiable independent and dependent variables that were constructed from easily collected and reliable data sources.

The hypothesis created for this study was accepted and rejected based on the data generated by the current study. This quantitative approach to the research is proper and valuable for two reasons. First, the independent and dependent variables were easily identifiable, and data related to them was easy to draw. Second, the research problem and related hypothesis were told clearly and evaluated using reliable methods.

The quantitative approach is, therefore, preferable in contrast to the qualitative approach. Quantitative research generated beliefs about correctional systems concerning parole systems and yielded usable aims and quantifiable data. Without such data, it would be difficult to assert

whether the harshness of a state's prison system was objectively related to the outcome of the state's parole system.

Population

The target population for this study was all fifty states within the United States and the respective total probation population. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (2023) estimates that by the end of 2023, there will be 5,492,544 adults under community supervision, which was a decline of 1.1% or 49,800 offenders from January 1st, 2016. The Bureau estimated that 1 in every 55 adults in the United States would enter community supervision before the end of the year 2016.

The adult probation population declined 1.4% from January 1st, 2016, to December 1st, 2016, with the numbers falling by an estimated 52,500 individuals (BJS, 2016). During the same period, the number of individuals exiting probation programs increased from 2,043,200 to 2,071,400. This reflected an overall decline in the probation population while people were completing their programs in more significant numbers.

The Bureau noted that the population in community supervision consisted of both probationers and parolees, though the population kept for this study was derived from only the probationer population (BJS, 2016). There was a corresponding decrease in both populations, however. This may have suggested that attempts to reduce the supervised population were active among both probationers and parolees.

The more significant probation trends suggested that the general trend in probation was for there to be a decline (BJS, 2016). Estimates showed that there was a decrease of an average of 1.7% each year between 2008 and 2015, though there was a rise of 18% between 2015 to 2016. Despite this temporary increase in the probationary population, the general trend was for

there to be a downward shift in the numbers. Exits from the program, as calculated by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016), were counted when there was an exit from the program due to completing the terms of supervision, being moved into a treatment facility, or when individuals were incarcerated. As such, the numbers provided by the Bureau did not distinguish between those leaving the program for desirable reasons versus those who did not. The numbers provided by the Annual Probation Survey (Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, 2015) were therefore useful because they helped to distinguish better the number of people leaving for desirable versus undesirable reasons. As such, a shift of population years were changed from 2015-2018 to 2019-2021 so the researcher could examine the pandemic years and how the numbers differed from pre-pandemic years.

Sampling and Sampling Procedure

All data to be used in the study was secondary data. As such, the study sample will be composed of the entire population. The sample size is the population, as all data statistics are drawn from the entire probation population within a state. The researcher attempted to draw a smaller sample from the broader population.

Typically, in sampling procedures, sampling is a function of a formula used to calculate how large a sample should be used (Gelman & Hill, 2012). However, because this study included the entire probationary population, no such formula is being used in this case. There are diverse types of sampling for use. Unit sampling, or cluster sampling, is typical when researchers are performing a survey. One-stage cluster sampling occurs when researchers want to complete information within each sampled cluster. Two-stage cluster sampling occurs when the researcher wants to take a sample within each sampled cluster. Other more complicated sampling methods fall along with both the one and two-stage cluster approaches.

Finding the sample size falls along with diverse types of power calculations. Sampling does not just fall along with the need for an adequate sample size but also on the need to keep a sample size low under certain conditions (Gelman & Hill, 2012). For example, a sample for a drug study should be kept to a minimum to expose as few individuals as ethically possible to the medical dose. Researchers try to maximize their sample by choosing the individuals who will respond the most strongly to the treatment. In the case of the current study, given that there was no medical treatment given to any participant, there were no ethical concerns about dosage.

In terms of pure numbers, power calculations are performed to arrive at a sample size (Gelman & Hill, 2012). The goal of power calculations is to specify the standard error and probability that the data results will be statistically significant. Various formulas have been developed to help guide the calculation of samples, and so the formula used was, therefore, contingent on the goal of the researcher.

Procedures for Data Collection

There were two sources of data used in the proposed study. The correctional control rate was taken from the Prison Policy Initiative (Prison Policy, 2023). The correctional control rate is a function of all combined forms of control. These forms of control include state prison rate, federal prison rate, local jail rate, youth confinement rate, involuntary commitment rate, Indian country jails rate, parole rate, and probation rate. Inferential statistics were calculated comparing the correctional control rates against the successful discharge rate.

Beyond the correctional control rate ranking, probation statistics were collected to compare the correctional control rates against the percentage of those successfully discharged from a probation program. The Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research

releases an Annual Probation Survey for the United States Department of Justice as part of the

Office of Justice Programs for the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

This report yielded the total number of individuals taking part in each state's probation

program. The report also yielded the total number of offenders who were successfully discharged

from these programs. The rate of successful probation discharge was calculated to create a

successful discharge rate. The correctional control rates were compared against the successful

discharge rate across all fifty states to find whether there was an association between higher

correctional control rates (showing harsher correctional systems) and the successful discharge

rate.

Definition of Terms

The following definition of terms are used to provide clarity and understanding about this

empirical study.

Correctional control rate ranking. The correctional control rate of a state reflects the

total number of people within a state's correctional system, including state prison rate, federal

prison rate, local jail rate, youth confinement rate, involuntary commitment rate, Indian country

jails rate, parole rate, and probation rate. (Prison Policy, 2018).

Probation. The Bureau of Justice Statistics distinguishes probation from parole and

characterizes probation as a conditional release from prison into the population where an

individual can serve out the remaining term of their sentence within the community; probation

refers to supervised release that includes several different statuses and forms of supervision

(Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2016). Whereas not all programs use the same name as

probation, in practice, programs are identical to probation and use other names.

Successful probation discharge. The number of individuals who are successfully discharged from a probation program within a state.

Unsuccessful probation discharge. The number of individuals who are unsuccessfully discharged from a probation program within a state, whether due to incarceration, failure to meet the terms of the probation program, or absconding from the program.

The correctional control rate ranking was drawn from all fifty states and developed from all the state's correctional efforts, including its state prison rate, federal prison rate, local jail rate, youth confinement rate, involuntary commitment rate, Indian country jails rate, parole rate, and probation rate.

Data Analysis

The inferential statistic was calculated using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Data about the successful probation discharge rate was obtained from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (2023). This information was entered into an Excel spreadsheet and uploaded to SPSS. The correctional control rates were captured in the current correctional control rate ranking presented by Prison Policy (2023) and transferred to the SPSS spreadsheet for analysis. Dependent and independent variable data was present on the Excel spreadsheet and transferred to SPSS for data analysis.

Threats to Validity

External validity is characterized by the generalizability of the findings to other settings (Leedy & Ormrod, 2012). Given the use of public data, it is hoped that the findings will have minimal restrictions on generalizability. The findings may be used as a basis for understanding the relationship of correctional control rates to other correctional outcomes, such as general recidivism rates.

The internal validity of the study is threatened slightly. The first threat to internal validity is the threat of history. There will be a gap in time between the probation data drawn from the 2023 data and the first compilation of correctional control rates of 2023 (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2023). There may, therefore, be other factors that confounded the relationship between state correctional control rates and successful discharge probation rates.

The researcher assumes that the data collected is correct. The data is taken from Prison Policy and the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. The researcher assumes that this data was collected correctly and that the reporting is correct both on the part of the original data source and in the presentation made by both organizations.

Ethics

The fact that the proposed study did not involve the use of participants means that there was no need to protect individuals. The secondary data was drawn from existing sources. This data does not hold personally identifiable data. All the data is already anonymized, meaning that all probationers had their names kept out of any data reporting.

There is no potential risk of harm to any individual subjects. There is no potential for either physical or psychological harm to individuals whose data is captured in the study. All the data collected is freely available on the internet. The data presented by both Prison Policy and the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research is made publicly available, and therefore permission to reuse the data is implied (Tripathy, 2013). Ownership of the original data was acknowledged by the researcher in the presentation of the data and fully cited. Given the above conditions, there was a limited need for a review of the study.

Outside of the ethics surrounding the treatment of the data, there is also the ethical issue of minimizing the researcher's bias. The use of quantitative research, in this case, helps to

minimize the researcher's bias. Qualitative data requires an interpretive process that occurs in reviewing the interview data that is generated.

Quantitative research eliminates and minimizes the potential for the researcher to influence the data. So long as the researcher does not alter the quantitative data presented by Prison Policy and the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, the results generated by the quantitative analysis are reflective of the relationship between the two data sets.

Summary

This study uses quantitative methods and causal research design to understand better the relationship between correctional control rates and successful probation discharge rates. The study was initially motivated to understand whether the more punitive correctional approaches adopted by the state of Texas were associated with corresponding increases in successful probation programs when compared to other states.

The proposed study evaluated an association between correctional control rate and successful probation discharge rates. The study relied upon inferential statistics to evaluate the hypotheses and help the researcher arrive at their findings. Data drawn is entirely secondary and, therefore, does not involve the use of any individual participants in the study. Due to the nature of the study, there is little chance for ethical violations concerning physical and psychological harm as the data has already been entirely anonymized in the first report.

The research design itself is proper for testing empirical relationships between the independent variable, correctional control rates, and the dependent variable, successful probation discharge rates. The research offered flexibility to capture a holistic view of community supervision in the United States which was possible due to the collection and analysis of secondary data. The disadvantage of secondary data causes the researcher to be dependent on the

available data, but it allows the researcher autonomy to trust that data. Selection bias, according to Hagan (2005), occurs when the researcher chooses nonequivalent groups for comparison, but the data used in the research removed researcher bias because of secondary data. There is a threat to internal validity arising from the fact that the probationary data derived from March of 2021(Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2023), and the original conceptualization and reporting on correctional control rates occurred in. As such, there was the potential for confounding variables to influence the dependent variable of successful probationary discharge rates.

Chapter 3 presented the research design and method, along with related sampling, data collection, and data analysis procedures. A discussion of existing threats to validity and the ethical principle underpinning the study also occurred. Chapter 4 presented the findings of the study and discussed any methodological issues that might have arisen during the study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the differences between the state of Texas correctional control and the rest of United States correctional control with recidivism rates of former inmates who successfully mastered probation and parole. This study adds to the body of research on the viability of correctional control and the success of release programs. The findings of this study focused on the assumption that an association exists between correctional control rate rankings and successful probation discharge rates.

The independent variable will be correctional control rates, and the dependent variable will be the successful discharge rate under the Bureau of Justice, 2023 according to race and gender. This approach to the study is designed to find the association between the harshness of a state's correctional program and its successful parole and probation outcomes. The study is motivated by an attempt to understand the outcomes of the harsh nature of the Texas correctional system, as assessed using its correctional control rate, against states with less incompatible systems. An analysis of data answered the following hypotheses:

Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were formulated for this empirical study:

Ho1: There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates.

H1a: There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates.

Ho2: There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates by gender.

H2a: There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates gender.

Ho3: There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates by race.

H3a: There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates race.

As this research proposes to compare the phenomena of Texas state prisons to other prisons in the United States and their correctional methods for successful completion of parole and probation programs, there was no potential risk of harm to any individual subjects. The data captured is public information that has all subject identities removed and disassociated. Therefore, no inmate or former inmate had any physical or psychological harm resulting from this study. All the data collected is freely available on the internet. The data presented by both Prison Policy and the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research is made publicly available, and therefore permission to reuse the data is implied (Tripathy, 2013).

Variables

The independent variable is correctional control rates which includes those incarcerated in federal prisons, state prisons, local jails, youth confinement, Indian County jails, involuntary commitment, parole, and probation. Dependent variables are the recidivism rate under the Bureau of Justice, 2023 by total population, gender, and race, which are based on criminal history records. The Bureau of Justice collected administrative data that examines the rate at

which offenders are at risk of being incarcerated for a new offense or for violating the conditions of their parole or probation.

Participant Demographic Information

The population for this study is all incarcerated persons within the United States, state, federal, local, and Indian Country Jails, youth, and involuntary control penal system (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2023). The recidivism percentage for each state is listed. For this study, the recidivism rates stand for those who were reincarcerated during the three years they were on probation or parole following their first incarceration. There were more men (975,608) than women (72,400) who were under correctional control. Additionally, there are more persons of color under correctional control than those who identify as white. The population for this study is shown in Table 1, Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4. Table 1 gives details about the entire population of persons under correctional control in the United States and compares those under the authority of state, federal, and local jails, Indian country jails, youth facilities, and involuntary commitment. In this table, all numbers are listed as an aggregate of gender and ethnicity.

As noted in Table 1, there are more people in state prisons than in federal prisons. Moreover, there are more people in prison under the age of eighteen than are in Indian Country jails in the United States.

Table 1

Incarceration Rates for Prisoners in the United States 2019- 2021

States	State Prisons	Federal Prisons	Local Jails	Indian Country Jails	Youth Facilities	Involuntary Commitment
Alabama	25,032	3,361	13,760	-	798	
Alaska	4,639	420	80	1	255	
Arizona	33,914	3,361	12,980	701	606	
Arkansas	17,022	2,521	6,870	-	465	146
California	101,441	11,764	78,220	-	4,131	3,571
Colorado	15,865	1,681	12,710	49	753	314
Connect	9,889	840	-	-	96	170
Delaware	4,810	420	-	-	129	27
District of Columbia		3,361	1,330	-	117	184
Florida	80,417	12,814	60,210	-	2,001	2,054
Georgia	47,010	6,512	39,740	-	1,119	403
Hawaii	4,102	840	-	-	63	133
Idaho	8,907	840	4,380	50	342	15
Illinois	28,475	6,092	16,700	-	834	1,185
Indiana	24,716	3,361	19,340	-	1,155	149
Iowa	8,562	3,571	4,100	-	441	156
Kansas	8,521	1,471	6,600	-	360	350
Kentucky	18,560	3,151	14,500	-	588	52
Louisiana	26,074	2,521	20,690	-	693	-
Maine	1,577	420	1,430	-	60	53
Maryland	15,134	3,991	11,610	-	495	715
Massachusetts	6,148	1,260	8,310	-	288	263
Michigan	32,186	4,201	15,510	12	1,353	209
Minnesota	8,003	1,891	5,910	53	948	870
Mississippi	17,332	1,891	7,540	52	198	30

Table 1 Continued

Missouri	23,422	6,512	9,810	-	588	673
Montana	4,313	1,260	1,670	221	138	59
Nebraska	5,600	1,260	3,560	14	309	194
Nevada	10,202	1,260	7,930	17	546	58
New Ham	2,127	420	1,630	-	24	1
New Jersey	12,506	2,311	7,860	-	513	803
New Mexico	5,154	1,681	6,070	128	270	37
New York	30,338	8,403	17,930	-	837	1,161
North Carolina	28,995	8,823	18,370	-	744	207
North Dakota	1,689	840	1,250	149	78	28
Ohio	45,029	4,622	19,090	-	1,746	472
Oklahoma	22,391	2,311	9,210	12	345	170
Oregon	13,198	1,050	6,530	30	651	424
Pennsylvania	37,194	5,462	28,550	-	1,566	285
Rhode Island	2,238	210	-	-	108	-
South Carolina	15,759	3,571	11,760	-	633	432
South Dakota	3,353	1,260	1,520	219	171	6
Tennessee	21,995	6,722	25,870	-	345	107
Texas	133,772	22,267	58,190	-	3,699	1,527
Utah	5,907	1,260	5,420	-	246	97
Vermont	1,287	210	-	-	18	-
Virginia	30,357	4,622	23,920	-	918	809
Washington	13,674	2,311	10,200	391	693	523
West Virginia	5,847	1,260	3,290	-	483	132
Wisconsin	20,202	1,471	12,470	42	477	434
Wyoming	2,123	630	1,410	41	147	26
Total	1,047,008	174,565	656,030	2,182	34,581	20,112

Table 2 describes the population by state of those under correctional control who are on probation and parole in the United States for this period. Table 2 shows the combined population under the penal system in America which includes all persons under correctional control including those on probation and parole. Consequently, the data shows that the state of Texas has one of the lowest recidivism rates in the county, 20.3%; while its neighboring state of Mississippi has the highest, 77.0%.

Table 2

Probation and Parole Rates for Prisoners in the United States from 2019-2023

States	Probation Rates	Parole Rates	Total Under Correctional Control	Recidivism Percent
Alabama	41,942	7,518	92,582	28.7%
Alaska	2,505	832	8,742	61.6%
Arizona	68,027	6,755	126,561	36.3%
Arkansas	40,859	22,923	90,806	47.5%
California	153,910	104,937	457,973	44.7%
Colorado	70,819	10,139	112,330	44.9%
Connecticut	29,065	2,711	42,771	49.0%
Delaware	9,321	311	15,038	60.2%
District of Columbia	3,417	2,251	10,660	
Florida	178,541	3,819	339,856	25.4%
Georgia	339,659	16,414	450,857	50.0%
Hawaii	17,356	1,343	23,837	48.9%
Idaho	26,194	6,659	47,387	36.3%
Illinois	85,168	21,164	159,618	38.5%
Indiana	96,073	5,519	150,313	38.2%
Iowa	24,600	6,167	47,597	38.7%
Kansas	13,694	4,866	35,861	34.7%

Table 2 Continued

States	Probation Rates	Parole Rates	Total Under Correctional Control	Recidivism Percent
Kentucky	53,686	12,767	103,304	46.4%
Louisiana	25,727	18,362	94,067	29.6%
Maine	5,186	16	8,743	26.3%
Maryland	54,010	8,467	94,422	40.5%
Massachusetts	37,801	1,388	55,458	33.0%
Michigan	111,385	10,920	175,776	26.6%
Minnesota	82,302	6,714	106,690	25.0%
Mississippi	28,802	10,556	66,401	77.0%
Missouri	36,758	17,545	95,308	37.2%
Montana	9,262	1,382	18,305	38.6%
Nebraska	11,497	899	23,334	30.2%
Nevada	8,731	4,681	33,425	24.6%
New Hampshire	3,641	2,049	9,892	41.5%
New Jersey	119,707	14,812	158,512	30.4%
New Mexico	10,401	2,401	26,142	49.1%
New York	67,835	38,290	164,793	43.0%
North Carolina	59,295	9,005	125,439	21.0%
North Dakota	5,879	622	10,535	41.2%
Ohio	190,835	21,822	283,616	32.7%
Oklahoma	16,866	1,749	53,053	22.6%
Oregon	29,162	21,672	72,717	13.1%
Pennsylvania	93,626	77,578	244,260	47.1%
Rhode Island	17,971	441	20,967	50.0%
South Carolina	24,232	3,866	60,253	21.0%
South Dakota	5,559	3,474	15,562	44.0%

Table 2 Continued

States	Probation Rates	Parole Rates	Total Under Correctional Control	Recidivism Percent
Tennessee	54,697	12,329	122,065	47.2%
Texas	336,883	100,314	656,652	20.3%
Utah	10,094	3,711	26,736	46.0%
Vermont	2,625	797	4,938	43.8%
Virginia	60,106	1,844	122,576	23.3%
Washington	61,561	11,372	100,725	30.7%
West Virginia	6,070	3,085	20,168	29.3%
Wisconsin	37,574	22,092	94,762	38.1%
Wyoming	4,944	835	10,156	33.8%
Total	2,885,860	672,205	5,492,541	

Table 3 describes the number of persons under correctional control by gender. The information presented in Table 3 denotes that women make up 14.76% of the entire state prison population or persons under correctional control in the United States. Moreover, Vermont only has eighty-three female persons under correctional control.

Table 3

Incarceration of Prisoners in the United States 2019- 2023 by Gender

States	State Prison Populations	Male Inmate Population	Female Inmate Population
Alabama	25,032	22,915	2,117
Alaska	4,639	4,197	442
Arizona	33,914	30,794	3,120
Arkansas	17,022	15,592	1,430
California	101,441	97,525	3,916
Colorado	15,865	14,599	1,266
Connect	9,889	9,254	635
Delaware	4,810	4,568	242
Florida	80,417	75,404	5,013
Georgia	47,010	43,942	3,068
Hawaii	4,102	3,669	433
Idaho	8,907	7,668	1,239
Illinois	28,475	27,165	1,310
Indiana	24,716	22,397	2,319
Iowa	8,562	7,859	703
Kansas	8,521	7,793	728
Kentucky	18,560	16,493	2,067
Louisiana	26,074	24,849	1,225
Maine	1,577	1,466	111
Maryland	15,134	14,616	518
Massachusetts	6,148	5,949	199
Michigan	32,186	30,621	1,565
Minnesota	8,003	7,546	457
Mississippi	17,332	16,116	1,216
Missouri	23,422	21,370	2,052
Montana	4,313	3,702	611
Nebraska	5,600	5,200	400

Table 3 Continued

States	State Prison Populations	Male Intimate Population	Female Population
Nevada	10,202	9,418	784
New Ham	2,127	1,979	148
New Jersey	12,506	12,052	454
New Mexico	5,154	4,635	519
New York	30,338	29,233	1,105
North Carolina	28,995	26,871	2,124
North Dakota	1,689	1,489	200
Ohio	45,029	41,443	3,586
Oklahoma	22,391	20,216	2,175
Oregon	13,198	12,252	946
Pennsylvania	37,194	35,182	2,012
Rhode Island	2,238	2,115	123
South Dakota	3,353	2,892	461
Tennessee	21,995	19,903	2,092
Texas	133,772	123,263	10,509
Utah	5,907	5,426	481
Vermont	1,287	1,204	83
Virginia	30,357	28,119	2,238
Washington	13,674	12,888	786
West Virginia	5,847	5,227	620
Wisconsin	20,202	18,953	1,249
Wyoming	2,123	1,858	265
Total	1,047,008	974, 608	72,400

Based on the information presented in Table 4, there were a total of 426,111 white persons under correctional control and 407,107 Black persons under correction control in the United States. The state of Texas has a fair representation of white (45, 229), black (43,485), and Hispanic (44,284) persons under correctional control.

Table 4

Incarceration of Prisoners in the United States 2019- 2023 by Race

States	White	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	Asian/ Pacific Islander
Alabama	11,470	13,353	0	3	4
Alaska	1,895	465	125	1,855	253
Arizona	12,960	5,087	13,131	1,880	157
Arkansas	9,547	6,771	563	49	67
California	20,137	28,710	45,999	1,161	1483
Colorado	6,520	2,769	4,722	542	194
Connect	2,778	4,208	2,824	34	43
Delaware	1,551	2,952	299	1	6
Florida	31,599	38,266	10,174	88	25
Georgia	17,159	27,715	1,945	22	157
Hawaii	915	185	98	21	2,499
Idaho	6,419	258	1,288	329	43
Illinois	8,849	15,204	3,671	42	104
Indiana	14,292	7,547	992	50	64
Iowa	5,492	2,173	605	195	0
Kansas	4,781	2,335	1,118	201	75
Kentucky	14,102	3,879	296	18	0
Louisiana	8,863	17,097	66	21	25
Maine	1,261	175	~	43	8
Maryland	3,414	10,730	713	76	65

Table 4 Continued

States	White	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	Asian/ Pacific Islander
Michigan	13,746	16,278	632	287	101
Minnesota	3,732	2,834	471	756	197
Mississippi	6,419	10,649	181	35	39
Missouri	14,606	7,843	494	97	61
Montana	3,000	116	133	1,049	0
Nebraska	2,829	1,551	824	287	48
Nevada	3,730	3,100	2,764	233	319
New Ham	1,752	152	125	11	7
New Jersey	2,771	7,662	1,941	13	97
New Mexico	1,385	380	3,194	455	34
New York	7,056	14,930	7,290	289	190
North Carolina	11,776	14,620	1,725	576	94
North Dakota	982	181	99	418	9
Ohio	22,368	19,305	1,156	83	72
Oklahoma	11,109	6,087	1,871	2,099	119
Oregon	9,566	1,236	1,757	411	219
Pennsylvania	16,427	17,125	3,333	37	114
Rhode Island	887	643	614	21	30
South Carolina	5,894	9,285	427	25	22
South Dakota	1,730	262	134	1,189	28
Tennessee	12,047	9,295	560	36	57
Texas	45,229	43,485	44,284	63	522
Utah	3,487	450	1,219	333	194

Table 4 Continued

States	White	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	Asian/ Pacific Islander
Vermont	1,104	124	0	25	10
Virginia	12,863	16,326	988	32	124
Washington	7,555	2,419	2,286	682	590
West Virginia	4,956	797	43	5	5
Wisconsin	8,947	8,200	1,918	886	244
Wyoming	1,593	101	248	159	14
Total	426,111	407, 107	170,907	17,259	8,934

The data presented shows that racial disparities exist in the penal system, where there are a total of 426,111 persons who identify as white in prison and a total of 604,207 persons of color under correctional control. The Bureau of Justice did not explore sentencing guidelines and judicial discretion when presenting these figures. Moreover, the number of women under correctional control as compared to the number of males depicts a country where women do not commit the same punishable crimes as men or the lack of sentencing for those same crimes. Consequently, those in Indian County jails are federal offenders and segregated in their number as those facilities are on Indian tribal lands. Reading the statistics without putting them in context may lead to skewed ideology about the penal system in the United States.

Data Analysis

For this study, there were three hypotheses evaluated to examine the difference between correctional control and the rate of recidivism of former inmates who completed a parole or probation program. All variables were numerical variables with the only nominal variable being

the individual state names. The researcher used the Analysis of Variance or one-way ANOVA to evaluate whether any differences existed between the total correctional control variable and the 3-year re-incarceration rate data. The use of the ANOVA statistical test is when a researcher evaluates a hypothesis to find if there is a statistically significant difference between two or more categorical groups by testing for differences of means. This test splits the independent variable into two or more groups. A Pearson correlation coefficient analysis was completed to assess the linear relationship between Correctional Control and Recidivism rates for inmates. The Pearson correlation coefficient summarizes the characteristics of the dataset, which makes it a descriptive statistic that explains the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two quantitative variables.

Each analysis was conducted at the $p < .05$ level of significance which means that statistically there is more than a 95% chance that the hypothesis test would not result in a Type I error. Therefore, all aspects of the tested null hypothesis evaluated could be rejected. For this study, the researcher used IBM SPSS Statistics ver. 29 to complete the statistical analysis and the next tables.

Hypotheses

An analysis of data answered the following hypotheses:

H_{01}: ` There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates.

$H1a$: There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates.

H_{02}: There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates by gender.

H2a: There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge

rates from probation programs and correctional control rates gender.

Ho3: There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge

rates from probation programs and correctional control rates by race.

H3a: There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge

rates from probation programs and correctional control rates race.

As shown in Table 5, there were no statistically significant differences between state

successful discharge rates from probation and parole programs and overall correctional control

rates at the p<.05 level of significance [F (3,46) = .484, p = .882]. However, when the different

subcategories of correctional control rates and 3-year recidivism rates were analyzed using the

ANOVA, there were differences in recidivism rates and inmate incarceration facilities at the

state, federal, local, youth, and Indian Country prison facilities. This data is presented in Table 5

Table 5

Analysis of Variance Results: Differences Between State Successful Discharge Rates

from Probation and Parole Programs and overall Correctional Control Rates

	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
Total Under Correctional Control Between Groups	1.241 E+11	46	15741896912	.484	.882
Within Groups	97661574486	3	32553858162		
Total	8.218 E+11	49			

The data presented in Table 6 displays the Analysis of Variance results for successful discharge rates from probation and parole programs analyzing individual methods of incarceration of inmates. At the p.<.05 level of significance, there is a statistical difference between those who are involuntarily committed to a penal facility and the 3-year recidivism rate [F (3,46) = 9.758, p = .042]. The results of this table show that although more people are incarcerated in state and local jails, there is not a significant difference that occurs within the recidivism rates. Moreover, data analysis shows that the age or ethnicity of the inmate does not dictate differences in recidivism rates for those who successfully complete a parole or probation program. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected as there is a statistical difference in the part involuntary commitment of correctional control and recidivism rates.

Table 6

Analysis of Variance Results: Differences Between State Successful Discharge Rates from Probation and Parole Programs and Individual Correctional Control Rates

	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
State Prisons Between Groups	29434373466.220	46	639877684.048	1.369	.461
Within Groups	1402536864.500	3	467512288.167		
Total	30836910330.720	49			
Federal Prisons Between Groups	728482439.180	46	15836574.765	1.290	.486
Within Groups	36827074.500	3	12275691.500		
Total	765309513.680	49			
Local Jails Between Groups	11690584550.000	46	254143142.391	.899	.646
Within Groups	848459850.000	3	282819950.000		
Total	12539044400.000	49			
Indian Country Jails Between Groups	488079.020	46	10610.413	.150	.999
Within Groups	211900.500	3	70633.500		
Total	699979.520	49			
Youth Facilities Between Groups	30801115.080	46	669589.458	3.639	.157
Within Groups	552069.000	3	184023.000		
Total	31353184.080	49			
Involuntary Commitment Between Groups	18990019.320	46	412826.507	9.758	.042
Within Groups	126919.000	3	42306.333	1.369	.461
Total	19116938.320	49			

Table 7 shows the results of Pearson correlation coefficient analysis to assess the linear relationship between correctional control rates and the 3-year incarceration rates of inmates. There was a negative correlation between the two variables, r (49) = -.038, p = .793. As correctional control increases the number of inmates failing to successfully complete parole or probation decreases. The results of this analysis show that correctional control may play a role in the successful outcome of inmates from parole and/or probation.

Table 7

Pearson Correlation Analysis: Correctional Control and 3-year Re-incarceration Rate

		Correctional Control	3-Year Re-incarceration Rate
Correctional Control	Pearson Correlation	1	-.038
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.793
	N	50	49
3-Year Re-incarceration Rate	Pearson Correlation	-.038	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.793	
	N	49	49

The results of the ANOVA test of the data in Table 8 present the successful discharge rates from probation and parole and correctional control methods based on gender. According to data analysis, there is no significant difference between males and females who successfully completed parole and/or probation programs in the United States. At the p.<.05 level of significance, no statistical difference between male and female inmates and the 3-year recidivism rate in males, [F (3,46) = 1.386, p = .456] and females, [F (3,46) = 1.316, p = .478]. The

demographic population, women are less than 15% of the entire state prison population,

however, their rates of success from correctional control are like that of their male counterparts.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 8

Analysis of Variance Results: Differences Between State Successful Discharge Rates

from Probation and Parole Programs and overall Correctional Control Rates by

Gender

	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
Male Prisoners					
Between Groups	584442486820	46	561835323	1.386	.456
Within Groups	121596615200	3	405322050		
Total	27060391020	49			
Female Prisoners					
Between Groups	135100509	46	2936967	1.316	.478
Within Groups	6695291	3	2231763		
Total	141795800	49			

Table 9 displays ANOVA data results on recidivism rates and correctional control rates

of individuals based on race. Analysis of data shows that no statistical differences exist between

Black and white prisoners in the rates of recidivism based on correctional control rates.

However, at the $p<.05$ level of significance, there is a significant difference between correctional

control rates and those of Asian/Pacific Islander descent, [$F (3,46) = 30.641$, p = .008].

Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected as there is a significant difference.

Table 9

Analysis of Variance Results: Differences Between State Successful Discharge Rates

from Probation and Parole Programs and overall Correctional Control Rates by Race

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Asian/Pacific Islander Prisoners					
Between Groups	8059590	46	175208	30.641	.008
Within Groups	17154	3	5718		
Total	8076744	49			
Black Prisoners					
Between Groups	4422627109	46	96144067	.735	.733
Within Groups	392337325	3	130779108		
Total	4814964434	49			
Hispanic Prisoners					
Between Groups	3850931787	46	85576261	3.576	.160
Within Groups	71856507	3	23952169		
Total	3922788294	49			
White Prisoners					
Between Groups	3265568978	46	70990629	1.245	.502
Within Groups	171080294	3	57026764		
Total	3436649272	49			

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine whether correctional control of a penal institution affected an inmate's successful outcome of a probation or parole program in the United States. Descriptive data was gathered and displayed to depict the demographic variables of inmates. Data used for this analysis was obtained from published secondary sources. Of the overarching hypothesis evaluated, there was not a statistically significant difference in correctional control and rates of recidivism between the fifty states; however, components of correctional control rates revealed differences between those inmates who were involuntarily detained and rates of recidivism. However, there was a statistical difference in the race of individuals who were under correctional control and the rates of recidivism. Van Den Haag (1982) argued that criminal law lacks validity when the rules are not applied uniformly as blacks were twice as likely to receive some form of community supervision than their white counterparts. However, data revealed no significant difference in recidivism. Data analysis results were displayed in nine tables in this chapter.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this quantitative study was to evaluate the differences between correctional control with recidivism rates of former inmates who successfully mastered probation and parole programs within the United States. The correctional control rate and state recidivism are a means of judging the harshness of a state's correctional system (Jones, 2018). The variables that find the harshness of a correctional system include state prison rate, federal prison rate, local jail rate, youth confinement rate, involuntary commitment rate, Indian country jails rate, parole rate, and probation rate (Prison Policy, 2019). States are continually seeking means to lower costs to taxpayers through controlling crime and housing inmates (Council of Economic Advisers, 2018).

This study addressed the following research question:

Is there an association between correctional control rates and successful discharge rates in state probation programs?

Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were formulated for this empirical study:

H_{01}: There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates.

H1a: There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates.

Ho2:   There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates by gender.

H2a: There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates gender.

Ho3:   There is no statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates by race.

H3a: There is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates race.

The rest of this chapter includes implications for practice, education, and policy, limitations of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for the future.

Discussion of Results

As noted in the literature, there are varying types of delivery for probation and parole persons under the control of state and federal penal systems. For this study, correctional control data and recidivism rates were supplied as secondary data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2023. Although the subjects involved in this study are in a protected class, there are no identifying characteristics of individuals. As this is a completed set of data for the given population, there are generalizing characteristics of the penal population that can be used for future reference.

The researcher analyzed differences in the overall correctional control rate of the populations of prisoners in state and federal penal systems and the rates of recidivism. At the $p < .05$ level of significance which means that there is more than a 95% chance that the null hypotheses could be rejected. Of the three hypotheses evaluated, two were rejected as statistical differences existed and one accepted in that no statistical difference existed. As the data

presented could not show a one-to-one analysis of men to women who were under correctional control as there are over four times as many men in prison as there are women; it is interesting to note that women were more likely to complete the terms of their probation or parole than men. The researcher also performed a Pearson Correlation to see what direction the relation existed between correctional control rates and recidivism rates by individual state in the United States. The results of the Pearson Correlation showed that an inverse relationship existed. This inverse relationship showed that as correctional control increases, recidivism rates decrease; and more inmates have successfully completed probation and parole programs. Correctional control has long been thought of as not having a positive impact on recidivism. However, the results of this study show that as correctional control rates increase recidivism rates decrease, which contrasts the literature and popular ideology about the penal system. The following is a discussion on the connectivity of relative research to the findings of this study.

This study did not address the factors that lead youth and adults to commit crimes or the sentencing practices of each of the fifty states. Data analysis showed that overall correctional control rates did not have a significant difference in recidivism rates in the United States. As presented in Table 6, analysis of individual components of correctional control rates did reveal significant differences at the $p<.05$ level of significance with involuntary commitment. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected as there is a statistically significant difference between state successful discharge rates from probation programs and correctional control rates.

The second null hypothesis was accepted as data analysis did not show a statistical difference between male and female persons under correctional control and recidivism rates within a state as noted in Table 8. Although the data in Table 3 showed that 85% of the prison

population was men, both populations behaved similarly when allowed to successfully complete

probation and parole.

As shown by data analysis in Table 9, there exists a significant difference by race of

successful discharge rates and overall correctional control rates when analyzed at the $p < .05$

level of significance. In America where most races are viewed in terms of black and white, there

were no significant differences in the successful completion of parole and probation programs

based on correctional control rates. However, persons of Asian/Pacific Island descent showed

significant differences between correctional control and recidivism rates.

Implications for Practice, Education, and Policy

The implications for this study are plentiful in that educators, parents, and lawmakers

need to understand the impact that preconceived ideas of what data looks like and what the

numbers are, that influence racial conversations of discrimination and impartiality. Bayley

(1978) offered three suggestions for improving criminal justice research; 1. Research needs

interdisciplinary efforts as well as the tackling of field-oriented, practical problems, 2.

Researchers should cease giving speeches to practitioners about the value of research and attack

their practical concerns with a realistic appraisal of error proneness of any research endeavor and

3. It is time to be done with "methodological narcissism," methods for method's sake. As the

conversation around the population of those under penal control evolves, people should note that

prison populations resemble the general population of American society. The use of jail as a

deterrent to crime must become grounded in decreasing recidivism rates as opposed to simply

punishing the offender. The data suggests that racial and gender disparities exist in sentencing,

however; recidivism rates are not biased. The data does not explore the type of crime and the

support that persons on probation or parole receive after they leave a correctional facility. Those

programs in place need to become fortified so they can adequately aid those on parole or

probation instead of allowing persons to return to their criminal behaviors. Moreover, those parole and probation officers need help and/or training to ensure they properly supervise and encourage those on probation and parole. Furthermore, inmates are individuals with differing sets of underlying stressors that cause them to commit crimes.

Women make up less than 15% of the total inmate population; however, they are just as likely to pass or fail parole and probation obstacles as their male counterparts. In summary, the research results presented in this study were consistent with the body of literature that suggested correctional control does affect probation and parole success; just not in the way typified by the American media. Funding for parole and probation programs is vital for the necessary training and adjustment of persons who were under correctional control to prove and keep a positive life after their incarceration. In states where recidivism is high, there should be more review of the parole and probation guidelines so that former inmates can rehabilitate instead of returning to correctional control. One way to ensure rehabilitation is being measured effectively is to have a federal mandate set up that uniformly applies to all states.

Limitations

This study was limited to a specific population of incarcerated persons in the United States from 2019-2021 as reported in 2023 by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Moreover, parole and probation data were supplied for those who were under probation and parole beginning in 2019 -2021 and did not consider that those on probation in 2019 may or may not have been incarcerated during the same time. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the U.S. Department of Justice governs the guidelines by which the information is given to the public. Another limitation of secondary data is that it is quantitative and does not address the actual feelings, ideas, and thoughts of those taking part in the research. A qualitative study may be able to address more concrete reasons why offenders engage in or recidivate in criminal behavior.

Hagan (2005), notes that a limitation of secondary data may contain any or most of the same shortcomings; The investigator must remember that the data has been gathered for agency purposes and therefore may not contain the degree of accuracy or operationalization the researcher desires. The Bureau of Justice Statistics Guidelines for Content and Verification are as follows:

Guideline 5.1 The objectivity of BJS statistics must be vigilantly always protected by BJS staff.

Guideline 5.2 All BJS reports, and other statistical products must be subject to an objective and verification process conducted by qualified BJS staff other than the author of the report.

Guideline 5.3 BJS staff must be available to discuss the content of a BJS report and the method used.

Guideline 5.4 The public must have direct access to BJS staff members so that the public may obtain answers to specific questions about the content of BJS reports.

Guideline 5.5 Presentation of all BJS statistics must be guided by a BJS Style Guide which is available to the public.

However, the Bureau oversees the collection, analysis, and publication of statistical information on crime, criminal offenders, and the operations of justice statistics at all levels of government. The data gathered is secondhand data that is available using the public domain, as the researcher did not go to every penal institution and count the number of inmates. The researcher had to assume all data was valid as this is the source provided by the United States government.

Conclusions

A review of penal populations, recidivism rates, and political climate has forced states to re-evaluate their correctional control rates and the success of their probation and parole

programs. Informal social control by family may present more of a deterrent for offenders than the authorities because family members can influence behavior. Researcher Braithwaite (1989) proclaimed that there is a good deal of evidence accumulating that the threat of formal punishments may pose less pressure for criminal behavior for fear of scolding by family, friends, and peers. Arguments are made by researcher Hinzman (2000) that criminal justice in America embodies conceptually, broken windows and broken buckets. He presents evidence that corrections need safer communities through more criminal justice programs with rehabilitation efforts over punishment. Punishment is needed, but rehabilitation is equally important. Hagan (2005), states that The Minneapolis experiment has been both the most widely accepted and the most influential policy experiment of recent years: no other policy experiment has had quite the same impact on criminal justice policy. Its effect may be explained in part by the conservative tenor of the times, which emphasizes a law enforcement orientation for solving social problems; it may also be explained by the very aggressive dissemination of the study's findings (Binder and Meeker, 1991).

States like Texas have harsh correctional control rates, as well as terms of probation and parole. Researchers like McKenzie and Parent (1991) argued the effects of the prison experience and the negative effects placed on inmates. However, those harsh conditions do not make a significant difference between recidivism rates between Texas and other states in the United States. However, Makenzie (1990) further expounded on boot camp programs and the effectiveness weighed on the offender. Bootcamp offered a way to stay connected to the family and community because the stay was short, and the locations of the boot camps compassed about the cities. Therefore, families could easily remain connected to their loved ones without the hassle of distance visits. Based on data analysis, there were no significant differences between

recidivism rates between Black, white, and Hispanic inmates based on the state of their incarceration and correctional control. There were differences for the Asian and /or Pacific Islander populations. Moreover, there were no differences between genders. These findings lead to the exploration into the causes of crime the individuals who commit them and their likelihood of successful completion of parole and probation.

The key finding of this study is that having the harshest control rates does not equate to lower recidivism rates. Punishment is not the deterrent to recidivism; it is the circumstances that occur during parole and probation that help deter former inmates from returning to prison. Recidivism happens regardless of color, gender, and age without something in place to impede the return to prison. This is the research that should happen in America and the world to find and duplicate parole and probation programs and procedures that work for the individual. Sentencing practices should be reviewed as there are no differences in the recidivism rates between whites and persons of color.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research is needed in this area as the expansion of the discussion around corrections and their effectiveness is permeating American Society. Researchers should examine probation violations to study future research. The design will require qualitative methods because a sample size of offenders who violated their conditions could point researchers in the direction of why these violations exist. Gray, Fields, and Maxwell (2001) explored who, what, and when, but left open the possibility of examining which violations are most common. With the emergence of artificial intelligence, future probation programs would focus on the impact of such research. Another possibility for future research is electronic monitoring of offenders placed on community supervision about cost-effectiveness. Title (1973) said that future research should focus on outcomes as sanctions left remaining questions about deviance. It could be

argued that future research should look to address reasons why deviance and recidivism consume so much of our criminal justice system. Current research shows continuous recidivism rates and future research should focus on reasons for continuous recidivism while exploring options to reduce recidivism. Instead of investing more money to build more prisons, federal, state, and local governments should invest more money into programs that aid former inmates with successful re-entry into society. More research is needed to explore how to create and/or duplicate successful parole and probation opportunities. The time spent during probation and parole is vital to both the parole /probation officer and their charge as this time is critical to prevent recidivism. As the data shows correctional control includes time spent on probation or parole following incarceration, this time is as important as time spent in a facility. Therefore, similar funding for in-depth programs following incarcerations is just as important as building a new super-max prison facility. Participant Observation would offer very detailed experiments about recidivism but access to jails, prisons, and data on individual offenders on community supervision is limited due to privacy rights.

Demonstration cries for police and criminal justice reform make research on correctional control vital to the future of this country. Race relations and political divides are at the heart of an America that is torn on how to spend resources and reduce the rates of incarceration. Programs that explore the mental health of former inmates and their relationship to crime could help deter recidivism rates. The increase in the study of the mental health of those persons incarcerated and released from correctional control should be studied so that state officials can fully understand the needs of those persons with mental issues.

Consequently, race and gender variables need more exploration to find out why those who are incarcerated resemble more of an American population than previously noted in the

media. As noted in the literature and the data analysis; there were no significant differences in gender and race of recidivism rates. However, research is needed to decipher the differences in sentencing guidelines between the race and gender of individuals, which begins the path to correctional control. The United States can look to borrow models from the UK as to how offenders should be treated once they have paid their debt to society. A fresh start with no condemnation once a citizen is released from probation or parole may prove good and should be worthy of at least, a pilot.

REFERENCES

Aldemir, E., Berk, G., & Coşkunol, H. (2018). The effects of the addiction programme of probation on treatment motivation, abstinence, and quality of life: A comparative study with motivational interviewing and individual intervention. *Archives of Neuropsychiatry*, *55*(3), 261. (Vol. 1). New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Balafoutas, L., García-Gallego, A., Georgantzis, N., Jaber-Lopez, T., & Mitrokostas, E. (2020). Rehabilitation and social behavior: Experiments in prison. *Games and Economic Behavior*, *119*, 148-171.

Bayley, D. (1978). "Comment: Perspectives on Criminal Justice Research." <u>*Journal of Criminal Justice, 6*</u>, 287-298

Binder, A., & Meeker, J. (1988). "Experiments as Reforms." <u>*Journal of Criminal Justice 16*</u>, 347-358

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame, and reintegration*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016). Probation and Parole in the United States, 2016. Retrieved from https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus16_sum.pdf.

Bureau of Justice Statistics (2019). FAQ detail. Office of Justice Program. Retrieved September 11th, 2019, from https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=qa&iid=324.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2011). *US Department of Justice, Parents in Prison and Their Minor Children, at*, *4*.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2016). *US Dep't of Justice, Parents in Prison and Their Minor Children, at*, *4*.

Chouldechova. (2017). Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big Data, 5*(2), 153-163.

Cochise County Arizona (2019). What is Probation? Retrieved from https://www.cochise.az.gov/sites/default/files/adult_probation/APOVolume1.pdf.

Council of Economic Advisers. (2019). *Council of Economic Advisers: Biased Per Capita Consumption Comparison of the US with Europe* (No. disbei257). Universitätsbibliothek Wuppertal, University Library.

Council of State Governments Justice Center Council of State Governments Justice Center (2011). A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism. Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved September 11th, 2019, from https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/Publications/CSG_10Step_Guide_Probation.pdf

Dressel, J., & Farid, H. (2018). The accuracy, fairness, and limits of predicting recidivism. *Science Advances, 4*(1), eaao5580. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao5580

Gelman, A., & Hill, J. (2012). *Data analysis using regression and multilevel hierarchical models.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511790942

Gray, M.K., Fields, M., & Maxwell, S.R. (2001). Examining Probation Violations: Who, What and When. *Crime and Delinquency*, 47(4), 537-557.

Griffin, O. H. (2018). *Routledge Handbook of corrections in the United States*. New York: Routledge.

Hagan, F. (2005). *Research Methods in Criminal Justice and Criminology, 7th ed*. Allyn & Bacon.

Hinzman, G.R. (2000). Broken windows, broken buckets: Solutions for safer communities. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 4(2), 23-33.

Johndrow, J. E., & Lum, K. (2019). An algorithm for removing sensitive information: application to race-independent recidivism prediction. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, *13*(1), 189-220. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1703.04957

Jones, A. (2023, March). Correctional control 2018: Incarceration and supervision by state. *Prison Policy Initiative. Last modified March 2023*.

Jones, A., (2023). Correctional control 2023: Incarceration and supervision by state. Prison Policy Initiative Retrieved April 16th, 2023, from https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/correctionalcontrol2023_data_appendix.html

Kirkwood, S., & Hamad, R. (2019). Restorative justice informed criminal justice social work and probation services. *Probation Journal*, *66*(4), 398-415.

Klingele, C. M. (2013). Rethinking the use of community supervision. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 103*(4), 1015-1070. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2232078

Kratcoski, P. C., & Kratcoski, P. C. (2017). *Correctional counseling and treatment*. (pp.135) Cham: Springer.

Labrecque, R. M. (2017). Probation in the United States: A historical and modern perspective. In, Handbook of Corrections in the United States. Griffin III, O. H., & Woodward, V. H. (Eds.).

Leedy, P. D. & Ormrod, J. E. (2012). *Practical research: Planning and design (*10th ed.). Pearson.

Legislative Budget Board Staff. (2019). Statewide Criminal and Juvenile Justice Recidivism and

Revocation Rates. The States of Texas. Retrieved from

https://www.lbb.state.tx.us/Documents/Publications/Policy_Report/4914_Recividism_Re

vocation_Rates_Jan2019.pdf.

MacKenzie, D. (1990). "Boot Camp Programs Grow in Number and Scope." *NIJ Reports, U.S.

Department of Justice* (November/December) 221

MacKenzie, D., & Parent D. (1991). Shock Incarceration and Prison Crowding in Louisiana.

Journal of Criminal Justice,*19*(3), 225-237.

Mak, A. S. (1990). Testing a psychosocial control theory of delinquency. *Criminal Justice and

Behavior*, *17*(2), 215-230.

Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral Study of Obedience, *Journal of Abnormal and Social

Psychology, 67(10). 371-378.*

Nagin, D. & Farrington, D. (1990). The Stability of Criminal Potential from Childhood to

Adulthood. *Criminology, 30,* 235-260.

National Institute of Justice (2019). Recidivism. Retrieved from

https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/corrections/recidivism.

Nemoyer, A., Holliday, S. B., Goldstein, N. E., & Mckitten, R. L. (2016). Predicting probation

revocation and residential facility placement at juvenile probation review hearings:

Youth-specific and hearing-specific factors. *Law and Human Behavior, 40*(1), 97-105.

https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000162

Paternoster, R. (1987). The Deterrent effect of the perceived certainty and severity of

punishment: A Review of the evidence and issues. *Justice Quarterly, 4,* 173-217.

Paternoster, R., Saltzman, L.E., Waldo, G.P., & Chiricos, T.G. (1983). Perceived risk of social control: Do sanctions really deter? *Law and Society Review, 17*, 457-479

Recidivism in the Texas Criminal Justice System: Sentencing Dynamics Study, Report 5. (1992). Criminal Justice Policy Council. Austin, Texas

Ruhland, E. (2018, January 31st). What purpose should probation serve? Looking at other alternatives. Retrieved from https://robinainstitute.umn.edu/news-views/what-purpose-should-probation-serve-looking-other-alternatives

Schaefer, R. (2018). *Sociology Matters*. 8th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Shannon, L. M., Hulbig, S. K., Birdwhistell, S., Newell, J., & Neal, C. (2015). Implementation of an enhanced probation program: Evaluating process and preliminary outcomes. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 49*, 50-62.

Sheil, J., Doyle, J., & Lowenkamp, C. T. (2016). Imagining Sentinel Event Reviews in the US Probation and Pretrial Services System. *Fed. Probation*, *80*, 33.

Skeem, J. L., Manchak, S., & Montoya, L. (2017). Comparing public safety outcomes for traditional probation vs. specialty mental health probation. *JAMA Psychiatry, 74*(9), 942. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.1384

Spohn, C., & Brennan, P. K. (2019). Sentencing Policies and Practices in the 21st Century: An Introduction. In *Handbook on Sentencing Policies and Practices in the 21st Century* (pp. 1-16). Routledge.

Steinmetz, K. F., & Henderson, H. (2015). Inequality on probation: An examination of differential probation outcomes. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 14*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/15377938.2015.1030527

Sutherland, E. (1937). *The Professional Thief.* Chicago. University of Chicago Press

Texas Department of Criminal Justice. (2016, April). The State of Texas. Retrieved from

https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/General_Information_Guide_for_Families_of_Off

enders.pdf

Title, C.R., & Logan C.H. (1973). Sanctions and Deviance: Evidence and remaining questions.

Law and Society Review, 7. 371-392.

Tripathy, J. P. (2013). Secondary data analysis: Ethical issues and challenges. *Iranian Journal of

Public Health, 42*(12), 1478–1479.

United States Court. (2019). Probation and pretrial services history. Retrieved September from

https://www.uscourts.gov/services-forms/probation-and-pretrial-services/probation-and-

pretrial-services-history

United States Courts. (2019). Overview of probation and supervised release conditions.

Retrieved from https://www.uscourts.gov/services-forms/overview-probation-supervised-

release-conditions

Vance, S. E. (2017). Conditions of supervision in federal criminal sentencing: A review of recent

changes. *Federal. Probation*, *81*, 3.

Van Den Haag, E. (1982). The criminal law as a threat system. *Journal of Criminal Law and

Criminology, 73*, 709-785.

Wainwright, D., McCombs, T., Gambrell, E., Miles, L., D., Fordyce. T., Perryman, D., Gist, J.,

L., & Wingate, T., (2016). Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Retrieved from

https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/Statistical_Report_FY2016.pdf

Zeng, J., Ustun, B., & Rudin, C. (2016). Interpretable classification models for recidivism

prediction. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society),*

180(3), 689-722.

https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1503.07810