

2022

## Society's Perception of Former Offender's Impact on Housing Accommodation Options

Fealita Kimbre Prunty  
*Walden University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#)

---

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu](mailto:ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu).

# Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Fealita Prunty

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by  
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Anthony Fleming, Committee Chairperson,  
Criminal Justice Faculty

Dr. Michael Klemp-North, Committee Member,  
Criminal Justice Faculty

Dr. Tony Gaskew, University Reviewer,  
Criminal Justice Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost  
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University  
2022

Abstract

Society's Perception of Former Offender's Impact on Housing Accommodation Options

by

Fealita Prunty

MA, Liberty University, 2014

BS, The University of Virginia College at Wise, 2010

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Criminal Justice

Walden University

May 2022

## Abstract

This study was designed to explore United States societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States. Housing is an essential need for offenders re-entering society and can contribute to recidivism rates. The purpose of this study was to explore United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States. This study included a parallel mixed-method design inspired by Teddlie and Tashakkori. The theoretical framework incorporated Becker's labeling theory. This study examined United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States. Quantitative and qualitative data collection methods included secondary data from two Department of Corrections, virtual interview survey, interview, and online publicly available data, which were analyzed separately and interpreted together. One key result was that over 40 participants felt a former offender should still receive post-incarceration housing assistance. Interpreted data led to retaining the null hypothesis. One future study recommendation was to condense survey questions and decrease the number of open-ended questions. The information derived from this study may impact positive social change by assisting society members in becoming more knowledgeable about the labels they hold against someone who was convicted of a crime.

Society's Perception of Former Offenders Impacts on Housing Accommodation Options?

by

Fealita Prunty

MA, Liberty University, 2014

BS, The University of Virginia College at Wise, 2010

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Criminal Justice

Walden University

May 2022

## Dedication

My educational journey has been long, and the want to learn more will remain never ended. I first would like to dedicate my dissertation journey to God. I am not a perfect Christian and make mistakes daily; however, the Lord has brought people and things in my life that has shined on me when I am covered in gray clouds. As of 2021, my daughter turned 10, but she is by far the most understanding person in my life, and I dedicate my dissertation journey to her. I express thanks to Isabella for understanding that when working on schoolwork, I need complete quiet and that our time together has been split between mother-daughter time, school, and work. I dedicate and appreciate Deborah McGhee for being there whenever I needed a shoulder to cry on, providing guidance when I needed help, being a voice when I set unrealistic goals, and being a motivator when I could not encourage myself. I recognize Deloris Browning, who reminded me to focus on schoolwork and not on my worries when I felt like I was drowning. Deloris gave me ideas to overcome the feelings of drowning. I dedicate this process to all my family and friends who have supported, encouraged, and loved me through everything.

## Acknowledgments

I acknowledge my chairman Anthony Fleming, who responded promptly to my early, late, and random emails whenever I reached out. I thank Mr. Fleming for helping me put the jumbled-up words and ideas I expressed into the sentences that made sense. I express gratitude to all the individuals who offered prayer and understanding during my journey. I am also grateful for people's patience when I could not go to the movies, dinner, or church because I needed to work. Thank you to everyone, and those I did not even realize were helping me.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background.....	1
Research Gap .....	4
Importance of Research .....	5
Problem Statement.....	5
Research Purpose .....	7
Research Question and Hypothesis.....	8
Theoretical Framework.....	8
Nature of the Study .....	9
Definitions.....	11
Assumptions.....	13
Scope and Delimitations .....	14
Limitations .....	15
Significance.....	15
Summary .....	16
Chapter 2: Literature Review .....	17
Research Problem .....	17
Research Purpose .....	17
Overview.....	17
Research Search Strategy.....	23



Mental Health.....	24
Reducing Mental Health Recidivism .....	25
Diversion and Treatment Programs .....	26
Mental Health Court .....	27
Mental Health Diagnoses.....	29
Substance Abuse .....	31
Reducing Substance Abuse Recidivism.....	33
Drug court .....	39
Mental Health and Substance Abuse are Intertwined.....	41
Recidivism Factor Predictors.....	45
Perception .....	47
Home .....	50
Recovery and Treatment Homes.....	52
Programs .....	53
Halfway and Transitional Housing.....	54
Housing Challenges and Benefits .....	55
Theoretical Foundation .....	62
Labeling Theory, Offenders, and Crime .....	63
Labeling Rationale .....	65
Summary .....	66
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	66
Research Purpose .....	66

Chapter Overview .....	67
Setting .....	67
Research Design and Rationale .....	68
Research Question .....	68
Research Phenomenon .....	68
Mixed-Method Justification.....	68
Quantitative and Qualitative Importance .....	69
Data Collection Analysis and Interpretation Rationale .....	69
Researcher’s Role .....	70
Methodology .....	71
Participants.....	71
Instrumentation Data.....	73
Data Analysis Plan .....	74
Threats to Validity .....	75
External Validity Threats .....	75
Internal Validity Threats .....	76
Construct, Content Validity, Predictive .....	77
Issues of Trustworthiness.....	78
Ethical procedures.....	79
Summary .....	81
Chapter 4: Results .....	82
Introduction.....	82

Setting .....	82
Demographics .....	83
Secondary Data .....	83
Interview Data.....	83
Public Housing Data .....	83
Data Collection .....	84
Department of Corrections Secondary Data .....	84
Interview Data.....	85
Public Housing Data .....	85
Society Survey Data.....	87
Data Collection Variation .....	87
Data Analysis .....	88
Results.....	93
Quantitative Component .....	94
Qualitative Component .....	110
Evidence of Trustworthiness.....	123
Summary .....	124
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	127
Introduction.....	127
Interpretation of the Findings.....	127
Limitations of the Study.....	129
Recommendations.....	130

Implications.....	130
Conclusions.....	132
References.....	133
Appendix A: Keyword Search Inquiry .....	182
Appendix B: Online Survey Interview Questions .....	183
Appendix C: In-person, E-mail, or Phone Interview Questions .....	189
Appendix D: Department of Correction United States Census Region South	
ANOVA .....	190
Appendix E: Department of Correction United States Census Region South	
Multiple Regression .....	233
Appendix F: Department of Correction United States Census Region South	
Pearson Correlation.....	235
Appendix G: Public Housing - Housing Types .....	236
Appendix H: Public Housing - United States Census Regions.....	247
Appendix I: Public Housing Multiple Regression .....	256
Appendix J: Public Housing: T Test.....	266
Appendix K: Society Survey Monkey Audience Frequency Test Results .....	285
Appendix L: Society Survey Monkey Audience One-way ANOVA Results .....	302
Appendix M: Society Survey Monkey Audience Multiple Regression.....	322
Appendix N: Society Survey Online Newspaper Publication Frequency Table .....	333
Appendix O: Society Survey Online Newspaper Publication One-way ANOVA	
Results.....	340

Appendix P: Society Survey Online Newspaper Publication Multiple Regression .....	366
Appendix Q: Society Survey Questions and Codes.....	383
Appendix R: Themes and Corresponding Survey Questions .....	424
Appendix S: Department of Corrections Southern Criminal Offense Codes and Number of Offenders .....	427
Appendix T: Final Keyword Search Inquiry .....	439

List of Tables

<b>Table 1</b>	Coding Society Virtual Survey Responses .....	90
<b>Table 2</b>	Continued Coding Society Virtual Survey Responses 1 .....	91
<b>Table 3</b>	Continued Coding Society Virtual Survey Responses 2.....	91
<b>Table 4</b>	Continued Coding Society Virtual Survey Responses 3.....	92
<b>Table 5</b>	Midwest Department of Corrections Descriptive .....	94
<b>Table 6</b>	Midwest Department of Corrections Frequency .....	95
<b>Table 7</b>	South United States Census Region Descriptive Statistics .....	95
<b>Table 8</b>	Housing Plan and Primary Offense.....	97
<b>Table 9</b>	Public Housing Descriptive Statistics .....	97
<b>Table 10</b>	Public Housing: Housing Type ANOVA.....	99
<b>Table 11</b>	Public Housing: United States Census Regions ANOVA .....	100
<b>Table 12</b>	Public Housing Pearson Correlation .....	102
<b>Table 13</b>	Society Survey Monkey Audience Survey Data .....	103
<b>Table 14</b>	Society Survey Online Newspaper Publication .....	107
<b>Table 15</b>	Using your own words, how would you define former offender? .....	113
<b>Table 16</b>	What are your thoughts on people who have been convicted of a crime?.....	114
<b>Table 17</b>	What circumstances do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance?.....	117
<b>Table 18</b>	Would you recommend other people opening their place of residence to previous offenders in order to provide housing assistance? .....	121

## Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Housing accommodation options are a barrier to former offenders' successful reentry back into society post incarceration (Barrenger et al., 2017; Kendall et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2016; Morenoff & Harding, 2014; Pleggenkuhle et al., 2016; Rydberg et al., 2017). The label offender and their crime type can limit available housing options (Decoteau, 2019; Dong et al., 2018; Evans & Porter, 2015; Rolfe et al., 2017; Rydberg et al., 2017; Socia et al., 2015). Unstable housing can lead an offender on a path of reoffending (Connolly & Granfield, 2017; Johnson et al., 2016b; Morenoff & Harding, 2014; Willging et al., 2016). The research was conducted due to the dearth of information available regarding United States societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type potential impact on offender post-incarceration housing options. This research indicated that the United States adult societal member perception of the term offender and crime type bias will not influence post-incarcerated housing accommodations. Housing accommodations options were available; however, depending on the criminal offense, some members of society, apartments, halfway houses, or rehabilitation housing facilities may reject residents who are prior offenders. This introduction chapter includes the following: background, problem statement, purpose of the study, research question and hypothesis, theoretical framework, nature of the study, scope and delimitations, limitations, significance, and a summary.

### **Background**

The United States restructuring of the economic system intersects with United States debt and the justice system (Wamsley, 2019). The criminal justice debt continues

to grow due to the lack of means to pay back funds borrowed (Wamsley, 2019). In the year 2013, 50 billion dollars owed to the United States derived from approximately 10 million societal members who had not paid their debts to the criminal justice system (Wamsley, 2019). There are thousands of people incarcerated. Frequently, people who have been incarcerated need assistance with reintegrating back into society. Lack of planning and resources to assist individuals at risk of re-offending are limited (Clark, 2015). Reentry assistance can decrease offender recidivism (Clark, 2015). Harmon-Darrow's (2022) data examination implied that conflict resolution on a personal level could reduce recidivism of a criminal nature. Reichert et al. (2015) evaluated adult programs in Illinois and found that sometimes former offenders are not aware of the resources they can use. Probation officers are community resource informants that can help an offender's reintegration success (Reichert et al., 2015). The effectiveness of supervised parole or lack thereof is dependent on how recidivism is defined (Ostermann et al., 2015). Parole and Probation officers' empathic treatment towards supervised offenders can discourage the offender from reoffending behavior and decrease recidivism (Okonofua et al., 2021). Moore and Eikenberry (2021) used data from the Iowa Department of Corrections and found that offenders not released on supervision recidivate less than those that were. There are some male offenders who can possibly get out on parole; however, several individuals studied by Best et al. (2014) waived their hearing. Fear of a negative experience; likelihood of obtaining a job; lack of supportive ties to provided housing; and lack of supportive family, friends, and or community resources were reasons why parole hearing was waived in Best et al.'s research. There are



many factors and challenges that an offender must overcome when released from incarceration status.

Community support can positively impact the successful reentry of former offenders; however, the use of substances can negatively impact successful reentry (Berghuis, 2018). Mowen and Bowman (2019) found that family support does not decrease reoffending, but support from peers could (Kenemore & In, 2020). Hlavka et al.'s (2015) investigation clarified that repairing and establishing family, friend, and religious ties is a key factor of a felon's reentry back into society. Lee et al. (2017) researched community neighborhoods that a former offender resides in post-incarceration. Lee et al. found conditions of areas and prior offenders' first residences were mainly stable. The community quality that an offender lives in before becoming incarcerated correlated with the offender's first disadvantaged neighborhood post-release (Lee et al., 2017). Conditions of an offender's neighborhood attenuate between before and after incarceration (Lee et al., 2017). Mitchell et al.'s (2017a) quantitative study suggested that homelessness can increase the chance of re-offending (Reich et al., 2015); moreover, the results explained the impact of an offender's housing, the likelihood the offender will re-offend, and their impact on recidivism. The crime type sex offenses determined if prior offenders could stay at a homeless shelter (Rolfe et al., 2017). Some former offenders in Velasquez et al.'s (2019) study unexpectedly discovered after their release from incarceration that their family and their friends no longer could offer them housing. The unexpected housing loss caused the former offender emotional distress,

which lead to homelessness and heroin use (Velasquez et al., 2019). Thus, housing accommodation is a factor that impacts a former offender's reentry into society.

Garland et al.'s (2017) research revealed ties between the correctional system and transitional offender housing needed a more in-depth exploration of theological factors. The ties Garland et al. found appeared after they explored public perception, problems in the community, views of both corrections and politicians, considerations of the offender's family, and demographics regarding transitional housing support for others needed more understanding. Hyatt and Han's (2018) research provided information on transitional type housing for former offenders and discovered that corrections and criminology evaluations were rarely incorporated into halfway housing assessments. Halfway housing has a positive effect on former offenders' re-offend rate but not on the overall health of the public (Hyatt & Han, 2018). McGowan's (2016) systematic literature review expanded what is known about halfway houses and their positive impact, despite what some research suggests. The United States had not seen the need and potential for rehabilitative halfway housing, according to McGowan. The correctional systems lack understanding and do not recognize that an offender's mind is multidimensional (McGowan, 2016). Changes in residential areas and the housing type both correlate with the use of substances and crime significance (Wooditch et al., 2018).

### **Research Gap**

There is a dearth of information available that explores adult United States societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States.

## **Importance of Research**

Housing accommodation is essential to a prior offender's reentry into society. Some communities and neighborhoods can influence negative behaviors that result in a previous offender reentering the incarceration system (Drawve et al., (2019). This research revealed where offenders stay when they exit the incarceration system, how society feels about providing housing for prior offenders, and if a need exists for the creation of stable housing for previous offenders.

## **Problem Statement**

Recidivism is one aspect of the criminal justice system that has been occurring and impacting the community for years. More than 20% of people who are incarcerated and released will return to incarceration status less than 18 months after being released, or 6 months if the individual was serving a sentence less than 1 year (Costopoulos et al., 2017, p. 304). Research has been conducted to determine if pre-release community-based services pertaining to cash, food, and medical assistance could positively impact recidivism; however, no significant change was indicated in Costopoulos et al.'s (2017) study. Mowbray et al. (2016) identified incarcerated individuals re-entering society had several needs, which included mental and physical health, along with substance abuse treatment. There is a large population of incarcerated individuals with mental health needs, which stems from the deinstitutionalization and closing of mental institutions in 1959, consequently leading to the increase in persons with mental health needs now filling the correctional industry (Baker, 2015). At least one traumatic event has occurred for over 60% of men before they had become incarcerated, and there is an indication that

trauma correlates with the number of crimes being committed (Maschi et al., 2018, p.12; Pettus-Davis et al., 2018, p. 379). Offenders' integration into a community before and after release from incarceration indicates improvement in employment, how income was achieved, and volunteerism; however, no significant data was available regarding the deterioration in the community (Moore et al., 2018a). Sentencing offenders to home confinement can reduce recidivism rates within an incarceration facility (Bouchard & Wong, 2018). Addressing recidivism is important for many reasons. Approximately 95% of individuals who are incarcerated will re-enter the community during their lifetime, and by address recidivism, incarceration overpopulation can be reduced, well-being can be improved, and the cost of housing offenders can be lessened (Berghuis, 2018, p. 4655; Clark, 2015, p. 194; Huynh et al., 2015, p. 1007; Moore et al., 2018a, p. 976; Pettus-Davis et al., 2018, p.379). Incarceration recidivism has been researched using several different factors, such as education, employment, mental disorders, and substance abuse (Piper & Nagy, 2018). More people addicted to substances were incarceration after the 1980's drug epidemic, which resulted in policy alterations and changes in sentences guidelines for crimes related to drugs (Mitchell et al., 2017b). Many offenders who re-offend do so because they are released back into society without their addiction and or mental health needs being adequately addressed during their incarceration (Segeren et al., 2017; Taxman et al., 2015). Upon reviewing literature on society, offenders, and housing, I discovered a potential problem. The current problem was that a dearth exists in understanding United States societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States.

## **Research Purpose**

For this study, I reviewed empirical peer-reviewed literature from multiple journal databases and conducting a secondary search on Google Scholar over the past 5 years. The purpose of this mixed design study was to explore United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States. Extensive keywords search inquiry can be found in Appendix A of this document and included the keywords, years, databases, and number of results for each inquiry. Secondary data and interviews were used to help explore the research. Secondary data revealed where an offender's plans to live after their release and added to existing data. Interviews expanded and clarified secondary data. Interviewing societal members revealed their perception of allowing prior offenders the use of their own residence, enrollment in a treatment program, shelter acceptability, living in a privately owned housing, residing in publicly owned housing, the offender's criminal offense that could reside in a halfway house, and if crime classification types impacted the society member's perception. Available research implied unstable housing could lead to someone being reintroduced to criminal behavior, thus increasing recidivism rates (Connolly & Granfield, 2017; Morenoff & Harding, 2014; Pleggenkuhle et al., 2016). Housing accommodation and crime type were independent variables for this study, with public perception being the dependent variables. Qualitative data were kept organized using the NVivo software, and secondary data were quantified using the software SPSS. Qualitative and quantitative data were interpreted separately, then analyzed together.

### **Research Question and Hypothesis**

The proposed study had one primary research question and one hypothesis.

RQ: What are United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States?

$H_1$ : United States adult societal member perception of the term offender and crime type will influence post-incarcerated housing accommodations.

$H_0$ : U. S. adult societal member perception of the term offender and crime type bias will not influence post-incarcerated housing accommodations.

Data results may be interpreted with a 95% confidence interval and a 0.05  $p$  value. Data cleanse may be occurred by review frequencies data and triple checking manually inputted data.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The labeling theory formulated by Howard Becker is complementary to this study. Becker theorized behavior as neutral until society perceives a behavior as deviant, and individual identities are formed based on society's perspectives (Beggan, 2004; Best, 2004; & Shulman, 2005). Conformists, falsely accused, secret deviants, and pure deviants are the four categories of Becker's labeling theory (Pollner, 1978; Shulman, 2005). Class and race are two demographics that are influenced by labeling (Gold & Richards, 2012; Shulman, 2005). Treating an individual differently is one consequence of labeling a person (Fuller, 2003; Shulman, 2005). This research was designed to explore United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning

post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States. Existing research suggested that when an offender is given a label successfully due to their crimes, they were likely to go through challenges, such as being shunned and lacking the ability to become gainful employed (Fuller, 2003).

### **Nature of the Study**

A mixed method research design allowed for the gathering of different data sources. In a mixed methods research design, data gathering methods from both qualitative and quantitative methods are used and analyzed to adequately address the proposed research (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). The integration of two research designs can prospectively address one design weakness by adding the strength from the other research design (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). In this study, I used a mixed method design. Offenders and their post-release housing options were the population being explored. Incarcerated individuals are a protected and vulnerable population. Accessibility to incarcerated offenders as participants in a research study is not always feasible, thus making a qualitative research design difficult. In lieu of interviewing offenders who are incarcerated to determine where the individual will live post-incarceration, quantifying secondary data may reveal a prior offender's post-incarceration reentry housing plan and other demographic information. The secondary data analysis identified post-incarceration housing accommodations from the offender's viewpoint without directly talking to the offender. The use of two different qualitative interview online provided an exploration of society members' perception on the term offender, offender criminal classifications, and if they both have an impact on post-incarceration

housing options. Set two interview questions verified crime types that were allowed in housing accommodation options, such as apartments, halfway housing, and residential treatment facilities. Quantitative secondary data indicate the housing options available to an offender and where the offender may reside post-release. Confirmation of the quantitative secondary data analysis was validated through the qualitative interviewing of society members who housed prior offenders. The parallel concurrent quantitative and qualitative data complemented each other. The mixed method design revealed detailed information about United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type, and adult societal members' perspective regarding the two's impact on offender housing accommodations options.

The variables housing accommodation, crime type, and offender demographics were tested using the secondary data obtained. Quantitative tests included descriptive statistics, ANOVA, chi-square, multiple regression, Pearson's correlation coefficient, and *t* test. Secondary data sources included offender housing reentry information obtained from specific United States State Department of Corrections. Qualitative data were collected using two different interview sources. An online societal members perception interviews with questions that pertained to the term offender, crime type, and receiving housing assistance (set one interview). Appendix B specifies the questions asked in an online interview. The online interviews was initially planned to be possibly submitted to Amazon Mechanical Turk, SurveyMonkey audience, Facebook, other social media sources, and one news publication for each United States. The online interview recruitment was data gathering was conducted using SurveyMonkey audience and virtual



news publications outlets which was based on United States census regions. The possibility of a tenant who is an offender being accepted into housing was planned to initially be revealed using phone, e-mail, and telephone interview conducted using possibly two of each of the following: apartments, halfway homes, and residential treatment housing programs for each census regions (set two interview). Offender acceptance into various housing accommodation types was conducted using publicly available online data found on each of the housing type. Appendix C lists the questions asked for in-person, e-mail, or phone interviews for offenders as a potential tenant. The variables housing accommodation (i.e., living with family, shelters, rehabilitation programs), crime type (i.e., murder, rape, theft, disorderly conduct, impaired driving), and societal members perception was tested using open-ended online interview questions. Interview data were coded using the process of attribute, in vivo, and value coding. Quantitative data were analyzed separately from qualitative data. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS and qualitative data were organized through the NVivo software. Results of both quantitative and qualitative data were interpreted together. Definitions that were beneficial to this study are included in the next section.

### **Definitions**

In this section, keywords are defined, followed by the proposal assumption detailed in the next section.

*Adult* is an individual who is over the age of 18 or who is not classified as a juvenile (Minnesota Department of Correction, n.d.).

*Community supervision or community correction* is the process of supervising offenders in society rather than in incarceration facilities and is broken into two categories: parole and probation (Bureau of Justice Statistics, n.d.a).

*Crime* is any intentional or unintentional behavior that common and statutory laws believe should result in a punishment (Cornell Law School, n.d.).

*Crime type* includes crimes that pertain to cyber, drugs, gangs, hate, identity, property, violence, trafficking, and weapons (Bureau of Justice Statistics, n.d.b).

*Ex-offender* is when someone has been convicted of a crime or entered a guilty plea for an offense that was criminal (Jefferson-Jones, 2018). The prefix ex in the case of this research can be interchanged with former and prior.

*Incarceration or incarcerated* is when an offender is held within in a county, federal, juvenile, private, or state correctional facility (Pennsylvania State Police, n.d.).

*Living arrangement* is where a person lives. Living arrangements of a person includes independently buying or renting their own home, apartment, mobile or manufactured home, living with a family or non-family member, living in a group home, living in supervised housing, living in supportive housing, living with a foster family, or living in an institution (Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, 2011; Social Security Administration, 2019).

*Offender* is someone that was found guilty of committing a crime, provided a court sentence, and assigned a specific punishment.

*Offense(s)* are behaviors that are punishable by the laws, statues, and rules determined by government legalization authorities and imposes an incarceration sentence and or fines depending on court ruling.

*Probation or parole* refers to an offender being supervised within a community following the individual completion of their incarceration term (Minnesota Department of Corrections, n.d.).

*Re-arrest* is when someone who has been released back into society is re-arrested for a new criminal charge after the individual served their sentence in prison or probation (Johnson, 2017).

*Recidivism* is defined as a new felony or misdemeanor criminal conviction or re-arrest that occurred after a person has begun or exited probation, treatment, or program (Cimino et al., 2015; Maume et al., 2018; Myer & Buchholz, 2018).

*Societal members* in this study consist of anyone over the age of 18 years old who is currently residing in the United States.

### **Assumptions**

There were four assumptions in this study. I assumed firstly that online participants answered all interview questions accurately and that they responded honestly. Participants may feel uncomfortable answering online questions, in which they must give their perspective on a sensitive topic. Participants may fear that their confidentiality may be breached, and that other people may find out how they feel towards former offenders. I assumed secondly that the online interview questions are written without bias, without coherence the interviewees' answers, and adequately

addressed individual perception regarding prior-offenders. The interview questions are subject to human error. Peers and colleagues reviewed the interview questions. Thirdly, I assumed offenders answered their housing plan questions honestly when obtained by the state department of corrections. Offenders who are released back into society finally living arrangement choices may have changed from when their reentry form was first submitted. Verifying living arrangement options of a prior offender cannot be done once a person is released from incarceration status. Secondary data did not include a follow-up survey once an offender left the incarceration facilities. Lastly, I assumed that I was able to obtain enough data to reach research saturation and meet minimum sample size recommendations. The gathering of secondary data was dependent on approval from the organization and agencies. Virtual survey interviews were collected online at random and open to any adult in the United States. Obtaining participants was dependent on public interest in the proposed study and the participants' willingness to address all questions.

### **Scope and Delimitations**

This study only included adults and secondary offender data because offenders and juveniles are protected populations. The studying of adult offenders and juvenile delinquency may not be easily accessible or allowed. Secondary data allowed for indirect contact with offender information. Mental health, substance abuse, and housing accommodation were researched due to their intertwinement and barrier to an offender's successful reentry into society. This research did not include employment and education because they are both factors that are affected by mental health and substance use.

### **Limitations**

There are several weaknesses in using a solely non-experimental exploratory quantitative design, which is balanced by a qualitative component in the research design. A non-experimental correctional design is descriptive and examines multiple facets; however, the variables cannot be controlled (Walden University, 2010). Data were gathered from incarcerated individuals through secondary data, but not directly from the perception of prior offenders. Online interviews did not allow for follow-up questions; therefore, if a participant did not answer the questions with depth, there is no way to clarify the information.

### **Significance**

Offender recidivism is a social issue that both the public sector and government are still working to decrease (Amasa-Annang & Scutelnicu, 2016). Individuals who continue to re-offend place a monetary burden on both the government and a nation's citizens, as well as causes the incarceration facilities to become overcrowded (Chamaki et al., 2019). Many factors contribute to someone offending, such as drug addiction and mental illness (Katsiyannis et al., 2018; Mitchell et al., 2017b). An offender's housing arrangement's post-release possible influence on recidivism is a factor in which limited studies exist. I sought to understand United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States. Studying societal members' perception regarding offenders provided information about the possible labeling of an offender and available housing accommodation options post release that contributed to why an offender re-offends. The

information derived from this study adds to recidivism information that already exists, as well as provides an indication of the importance of an offender's housing post-incarceration.

### **Summary**

A dearth of available research exists that discusses an offender's housing accommodation options after incarceration. This research used a mixed-method design with secondary data and interviews to explore housing accommodation options, crime type, and the labeling of offenders. Housing is one barrier that impedes an offender's successful reentry back into society; furthermore, offender housing is impacted by mental health and substance abuse. The next chapter provides a detailed overview of existing information available from a broad perspective of offender housing barriers to a narrower research examination.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

### **Research Problem**

The current problem was that a dearth exists in available information that explores United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States.

### **Research Purpose**

The purpose of this mixed design study was to explore United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime classification concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States.

### **Overview**

Recidivism is a vital component of the criminal justice system. Repeat offending is costly to society and can be harmful to the offenders who enter the incarceration facilities, which are often overcrowded and underfunded. Prison overcrowding increased medical care for incarcerated offenders but lowered the treatment and diagnosis of offenders' mental health (Spycher et al., 2021). Rhodes et al. (2016) indicated that recidivism rates were exaggerated and that, in their study, most offenders did not return to incarceration status. Recidivism was decreased for offenders who were newly discharged from an incarceration status and if the individual received assistance from the public as portrayed in study (Yang, 2017). In Andersen et al.'s (2020) study, former offenders were successful in reentry society when they individually were able to obtain stable employment, entrepreneurship, or own their own home, focused on assisting others, and accomplish the goals they set themselves relating to masculinity. Cannonier et

al. (2021) gathered data from Davidson County Sheriff's office and an offender after reentry aftercare program. Upon data analysis, Cannonier et al. found that not all offender programs work for everyone. Recidivism rates in Cannonier et al.'s study were lower for individuals who were either Caucasian or older. One of Cannonier et al.'s suggestions was for facilities to collect more data to determine why programs interest some people more than others. When adding the cost of treatment to mental health court (MHC) costs compared to incarceration, MHC was more costly, according to the MacArthur MHC data set explored by Steadman et al. (2014). Lucken and Fandetti's (2019) qualitative survey taken by professionals in the criminal justice field indicated reentry responsibilities were primarily the incarceration system and resources for reentry is dependent on resources that are available in the community. Prison does not necessarily influence individuals becoming imprisoned within an incarceration facility, nor does it have a deterrent effect (Gaes et al., 2016). The leisure activities offenders partake in during incarceration impacts their likelihood of reoffending (Link & Williams, 2017). Warner et al. (2018) explained that offender participation in programs during incarceration could change the offender's criminal attitude. Approximately half of the incarceration population has a substance use disorder (SUD), and nearly two million individuals are estimated to have entered an incarceration facility yearly (Kopak et al., 2019). Over a period of time, the use of substances can negatively impact employment (Bellair et al., 2018). Former offenders in Mizel and Abrams's (2020) study felt they needed practical assistance when they reentry society, such as housing, transportation, and how to enroll in school. Reestablishing familiarity and society emotional



connections, support of peers, and bridgeway program connecting inside and outside of incarceration programs were other assistance former offenders felt they needed (Mizel & Abrams, 2020). The formulation of reentry programs promoted change in offenders' behavior by using a holistic treatment plan (Miller & Miller, 2015). Programs can reduce the rates of recidivism (Growth et al., 2018) and lessen the chance of committing a new criminal offense (Mitchell Miller et al., 2017). Reentry programming was found not to be geared towards older offenders, thus leading to the individual considering reoffending (Lares & Montgomery, 2020). Farringer et al. (2019) conducted a quantitative assessment of programs in correctional facilities over a 14-year research period and found that correctional programs was modest, declining, and needed improvements in order to reduce and change behaviors that are criminal. Lindberg and Zeid's (2018) research implied that offenders who were insecure with their parental attachment predicated their unlawful behavior. Reentry programs initially began during an offender's incarceration and continue after an offender's released back into society while also addressing the offenders many needs (Miller & Miller, 2015). Participants' behaviors were identified as conventional, and goal creation was attributed to decreased engagement in deviant actions (Lee et al., 2016).

Dangerous behavior, depression, loneliness, previous overdose, and severe anxiety were not significant for any of the men or women participants who were incarcerated in Muñoz-Laboy et al.'s (2018) study. Financial hardship can contribute to recidivism; however, in Morash et al.'s (2017) research, women offenders' change in finances did not depict a link with recidivism risk. Scott et al. (2017) conducted a

women-only research and data were gathered from a jail located in Cook County. Scott et al.'s (2017) findings suggested that many participants had a problem with using substances and approximately 43% of the sample population had additional comorbid disorders besides substance usage (p. 66). The recovery management checkups in Scott et al.'s study encouraged relapse time increase for participant recovery, which had positive impacts on participants who were not in the probation group. Over half (75%) of Zortman et al.'s (2016) research study participants who were offenders used substances (p. 432). Zortman et al. examined three reentry programs located in Pennsylvania. Participants in the program had lowered recidivism rates, improved family relationships, and increased the obtainment of employment. Zortman et al.'s results insinuated an impact on the attitudes and behaviors of participants. Dependency on substance and criminal thinking has an individual effect, according to Caudy et al. (2015), when referencing rates of recidivism. Criminal thinking has a significant correlation with recidivism when the offender has less than three symptoms of SUD (Caudy et al., 2015). An association exists between reincarceration and conflict within a family (Mowen & Boman, 2019). Mowen and Visher's (2015) quantitative inquiry using secondary data results supported two out of four of their hypotheses. Mowen and Visher found that family discord when an offender is incarcerated increases the possibility the offender would partake in drugs post-incarceration. An offender's use of drugs over a period of time also correlated with different levels of conflict within a family (Mowen & Visher, 2015). Motherhood did not dissuade the exploitation or marketing of drugs for lifetime substance user in Bachman et al.'s (2016) analysis. The approach intensive supervision probation (ISP) is another

method used in community-based corrections (Hyatt & Barnes, 2017). In the city of Philadelphia, the ISP did not have an impact on patterns of male-only offender arrest, violation of probation, or strategy for supervisor; however, ISP did influence absconding and the length of time participants remained on probation before reoffending (Hyatt & Barnes, 2017). Barrenger et al. (2017) suggested policies exist that act as a barrier for former offenders reentering society, such as the preparation of individuals with mental health issues to enter a different environment and the challenges that arose from being a prior offender living in a community. Reentry programs have often contributed to the reduction of recidivism related to mental health and substance usage. Community supervision officers, social service clinicians, and the community in Bunting et al.'s (2018) study lacked the necessary resources to address offender's reentry boundaries, or the resources needed may not have been available in the community a former offender resides.

Auglaize County transition (ACT) is a reentry program that evaluated recidivism and re-arrests (Miller & Miller, 2015). The ACT evaluation noticed that a change in altercations during incarceration is not as likely; meanwhile, there was a lesser chance that participation reduced probation (Miller & Miller, 2015). The ACT program design was the groundwork of the Delaware County transition program; in fact, findings suggest that program graduates may not re-offend as much as probation participants (Mitchell Miller et al., 2017). The Delaware County transition program reduced the number of revocations for probation and decreased recidivism (Miller et al., 2019). In the program high-risk revocation reduction, participants had lower re-arrest numbers, lower chance of

being placed on supervised release, and fewer new offenses than the participants in the control group (Clark, 2015). Factors that correlated with the chance of re-arrests were the age when an offender was released, prior incarceration arrests, convictions, admissions, gender, race, supervised or unsupervised release, initial offense, and sentence length (Zgoba & Salerno, 2017). The post-conviction risk assessment revealed accuracy when using race to predict who would be re-arrested (Skeem & Lowenkamp, 2016). In a women-only study, offenders who were driving under the influence (DUI) of alcohol were likely to have an alcohol disorder and a history of depending on nicotine, and almost half of the participants suffered from depression and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Bender et al., 2018). Offender programs offering housing that is supportive can decrease recidivism rates (Fontaine, 2013). When a former offender could obtain stable housing, recovery and abstinence from substance use could occur depending on the length of time the previous offender lived in permanent accommodation (Whipple et al., 2016). Harding et al. (2014) revealed that former offenders struggle to meet their basic daily needs such as housing and food. Former offenders' obtaining stability economically was rarely achieved in Harding's et al.'s qualitative study that included interview data obtained from Michigan Department of Corrections former offenders. The information in the following sections encompass this research literature review and is aligned with the following outline: research search strategy, review of literature containing six prominent background information sections, and theoretical research framework. The background section includes research on mental health, substance abuse, mental health and substance abuse intertwined, recidivism predictors, and offender housing.

### **Research Search Strategy**

The research strategy for this study began with the research question: What are United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States? When researching offender post-incarceration housing, substance use and mental health were significant factors that influenced an offender's successful reentry into society. Peer-reviewed journal articles were limited to a collection year period between 2014 to 2020. Journal articles were collected from the Academic Search Complete, Business Source Complete, CINAHL, CINAHL Plus, Crossmark, Education Source, Gale Academic OneFile Select, IEEE Xplore Digital Library, Medline, ProQuest Central, PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, Psychiatric Online, PubMed, Sage Journals, ScienceDirect, Science Citation Index, Social Sciences Citation Index, SocINDEX databases. The reference list of each journal article obtained title and year were reviewed for correlation with the proposed topic then the abstract was reviewed for further information before selecting the article for inclusion in this study. A Google Scholar search was conducted from the years 2014 to 2020 without the words juvenile, dissertation, and thesis. Peer-reviewed articles found in Google Scholar when full text was not available was searched through the Walden University library. If Walden University library did not have an article, Research Gate was then searched. Documents that could not be obtained from Research Gate were requested through the Walden University library Document Delivery Services. The inclusion of substance use and mental health background data provided an extensive history of offenders' barriers to society reentry and illustrated their impact on

offender post-residential housing options. The correlation between substance abuse and mental health was uncovered during the review of literature, which then led to their connection with housing accommodation for prior offenders. Appendix A details the keyword search inquiries used to gather data for this research literature review. Appendix T describes a final keyword search for 2020 to 2022 using the same criteria listed in Appendix A. This study only focused on adults located in the United States; as a result, research outside of the United States location was not included. Juvenile data were removed from this study due to laws of protecting juveniles and because criminal charges are different between juveniles and adults. This research did not include foreign articles due to the criminal justice system, sentences, guidelines, and programs may differ from the United States. Only English written studies were included due to the researcher's inability to speak a language other than English. The following sections are a compilation of data obtained from using the keyword search inquiries found in Appendix A.

### **Mental Health**

Formally incarcerated individuals may not receive adequate care during and after incarceration. McCauley and Samples (2017) designed a mixed-method case study using program participants from the Supplement Security Income /social security disability insurance outreach access recovery program staff. McCauley and Samples explained that individuals with a mental health condition whose primary care had become the justice system. Incarceration had a negative influence on people who have a mental health condition (McCauley & Samples, 2017). Often, incarceration facilities do not have the resources and/or financial means to provide adequate care and treatment for offenders

with a mental health condition (McCauley & Samples, 2017). Programs in prison increased the likelihood an offender would succeed in transitioning back into the community (O'Brien & Bates, 2005). Nardi et al. (2017) reported approximately 44% of the 496 offenders were referred to Region 10 by the Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail (ACRJ) for mental health-related services (p. 155). Suicides that occurred in a North Carolina Division of Adult Correction (NCDC) were from people who had a mental disorder; however, analysis did not determine if the individuals who committed suicide was on medication, nor were their psychological diagnoses revealed (Lize et al., 2015). Proper psychological care can decrease the presence of incarcerated offenders with mental health in incarceration facilities.

### **Reducing Mental Health Recidivism**

The overcrowding of prisons is an association of recidivism rates that are considered high (Ruderman et al., 2015). Several methods exist that could reduce criminal recidivism, thus lowering the overcrowding in incarceration facilities and the financial burden placed on members of society. Incarceration facilities lack the design to appropriately meet the needs of offenders with mental illness; thus, participants in a diversion program increases the chance of an offender's needs being addressed through services in the community (Liles et al., 2018). Addressing the mental health needs of offenders during and after incarceration can lower the commitment of new criminal offenses and violations (Wallace & Wang, 2020).

## **Diversion and Treatment Programs**

Boland and Rosenfeld (2018) implemented a quantitative method to analyze secondary data about the treatment alternatives for safer communities diversion program and found that people with specific mental health diagnoses; for instance, schizoaffective had a high chance of being re-arrested than other diagnoses. A link exist in Wilson and Wood (2014) data finding among schizophrenia and psychotic disorders and depleted recidivism risk. Research studies conducted by Alarid and Rubin (2018); Boutros et al. (2018); Frisman et al., (2017); and Gill and Murphy (2017) all contained quantitative aspects through the utilization of secondary diversion program data. Alarid and Rubin; Boutros et al.; Frisman et al.; and Gill and Murphy described diversion programs as an alternative to incarcerating individuals diagnosed with a mental health disorder. Programs of diversion could improve participants' mental health status, reduce re-arrests rates, lower sentences, and or lessen recidivism rates (Alarid & Rubin, 2018; Boutros et al., 2018; Frisman et al., 2017; and Gill & Murphy, 2017). Boutros et al. analyzed and quantified eight journal articles, whereas Alarid and Rubin and Frisman et al. used data from a diversion program evaluation. Diversion programs provide treatment and support for participants in a community-based setting. Offenders who are unable to or did not want to participant in a diversion program can participate in programs located inside of an incarceration facility. Davis et al., (2015) coded secondary qualitative data, and then quantified the information. Davis et al. discovered the use of multisystemic therapy, which, is a community-family based intervention for emerging adults, could reduce symptoms of mental health. Older former offenders on community supervision (parole



and or probation) had an increased probability of being diagnosed with a mental illness, receiving some form of treatment for their mental illness, and were motivated to get treatment (Bryson et al., 2019). An offender with a mental illness should not automatically be disqualified from a program due to their diagnoses; because the program can still be beneficial to the individual (Wilson & Wood, 2014). Mental health courts can offer community diversion programs.

### **Mental Health Court**

Deinstitutionalization of mental institutions occurred around the 1990s, which prompted the creation MHC (Lowder et al., 2018; Seck et al., 2017). An increasing number of the mental health population reside within an incarceration facility, MHC's are a form of post-booking programs of diversion that can take charge of an offenders criminal proceeding, sentencing, supervision, and treatment for mental health diagnoses (Anestis & Carbonell, 2014; Lowder et al., 2018; Seck et al., 2017). Knowledge of MHC's and voluntary participation in MHC decreased recidivism and increased compliance guidelines set by the courts (Redlich & Han, 2014). Over 85% of jail diversion rehabilitation program participants had control over whether they wanted to participate and approximately 24% of participants had to be talked into participating (Trojano et al., 2017, p. 413). Han and Redlich's (2016) MHC participants perceived that their choice to receive treatment was not as volunteer as they first detected; nevertheless, the treatment received was estimated to reduce reoffending. A treatment facility called women's initiative supporting health transitions clinic was used in Thomas et al. (2019) research study which found that sometimes women who were former offenders in the

program felt controlled; on the contrary, other women felt gratitude due to the services and assistance they were provided. Mental health court participation correlated positively with the use of services for mental health needs; but did not relate to volunteering for treatment (Matejkowski et al., 2020). Traditional court judges and MHC judges have a different understanding of the exigences of offenders with special needs (Seck et al., 2017). Conventional judges were more likely to sentence offenders to prison than MHC judges who were increasingly likely to order a community-based sentence (Seck et al., 2017). Lowder et al. (2018) coded meta-analysis of existing literature first qualitatively then quantified the data to examine MHC effectiveness. Lowder et al. found that MHC was effective at reducing the reoffending of adults who had a mental condition when compared to traditional court proceedings (Ray, 2014); however, the significance of the effect varied if the participants completed the program. Lowder et al., (2016) secondary quantitative data analysis of Ramsey County MHC participant records established found that participants enrolled in the MHC spent less day's incarceration than individuals who went through a traditional court proceeding. Offenders who went through conventional court proceedings were three times more likely to be convicted of a crime and two times more likely to get another charge after completing a program (Lowder et al., 2016). Offenders who did not complete an MHC program are then adjudicated or their charges are heard in the traditional court; in fact, the court case is either dismissed, offender is sentenced to probation, or the offender is sentenced to incarceration (Ray et al., 2015a). The MHC Hiday et al., (2014) studied did not automatically terminated participants for using drugs; because the court understand behavior took time to change and the offender

needed encouragement to continue to change. The MHC courts secondary data analyzed by Ray et al. (2015a) included 64% of participants who did not complete the MHC program and had their case disposition to traditional court (p. 805). The cases heard in regular court was either dismissed; however, 21% of participants were sentenced to probation and 15% of participants were sentenced to time in jail (Ray et al., 2015a, p. 806). Ray et al. (2015b) reviewed of secondary data that included crime types. MHC's did not have a significant greater graduation success rate than therapeutic jurisprudence (Redlich & Han, 2014). Individuals with a felon and who did not complete MHC spend fewer days incarcerated than individuals who did not complete the MHC program but had a misdemeanor (Ray et al., 2015a). There are some individuals with a felony or misdemeanor that displays behavior or cognitive issue that could be related to a mental health diagnosis.

### **Mental Health Diagnoses**

There are numerous mental health offenders with diagnoses and subcategories that enter, leave, and return to incarceration status. Everyone is different and unique. There are many people in prison who have an undiagnosed mental or psychiatric disorder that has never went through a treatment program (Redlich & Han, 2014). Currently, there is not one individual treatment plan or program that works for everyone, due to the uniqueness of society's individuals. Offenders who receive conditional release have low re-arrest rates, high rehospitalization rates, and high revocation rates; however, acquittees released based on conditions had a better success rate after being discharged (Norko et al., 2016). An association exists amongst young people with attention deficit

hyperactivity disorder, criminal activities, an increased number of incarcerations, which, was discovered by the secondary quantitative data analyzed in Román-Ithier et al. (2017) study. Individuals who had been to jail on multiple occasions in Kopak et al. (2019) study was likely to foreshadow PTSD. Individuals with an incarceration history are more likely than people with no incarceration history to have experienced a variety of potentially harrowing events and to have PTSD (Anderson et al., 2016). King et al., (2018) obtained secondary data from prisons located in North Carolina and found that women with a severe mental disorder that interrupts their daily livelihood; as a result, of the person's mood and or thoughts are likely to be re-arrested post-incarceration. Offenders with mental illness that was articulated as acute lasted longer in the community before reoffending than offenders with a non-acute mental illness (Blank Wilson et al., 2014). Duwe (2015) quantitative investigation assimilated secondary data and ascertained that offenders with persistent and serious mental illnesses who had a reentry plan rate of recidivism was not different than the group they were compared to. Offenders with "serious psychological distress" were not given a different length of sentencing time than other offenders, and they made up a large portion of offenders with mental illness in Bronson and Berzofsky (2017, p. 1) findings. In Cuddeback, et al. (2019) exploration offenders with a sex offender charge who also had an acute mental illness emanated a higher committal into facilities for violators; but, had less readmission into incarceration facilities than offenders with charges that were not sex offense related. Matejkowski and Ostermann (2015) also discovered during their secondary data analysis of New Jersey State Parole Board Department of Corrections inmate cases, that a link exists between

risk factors, the severity of a person's mental condition, and their likelihood of recidivating. A person's mental health condition could also be a consequence of using and becoming addicted to substances. Wilson and Wood (2014) found that almost all participants who had a diagnosed substance disorders displayed acute mental illnesses and reincarnation.

### **Substance Abuse**

Individuals with substance-related charges has increased in the incarceration populations after the establishment of the war on drugs policy and changes in drug-related sentences. The overcrowding of prisons can be attributed to increased recidivism for drugs due to the SUD overrepresented in the incarceration facilities population (Ruderman et al., 2015). Schmidt et al. (2018) analysis of a Mayo Clinic in Minnesota implied that individuals with a SUD would interact at some point with the justice department and were likely to use some form of nicotine. Offenders on probation who use more than one substance was an indicator that the individual would violate probation when compared to individuals who only use one substance (Medina & Zettler, 2020). Western and Simes (2019) evaluation of a reentry survey signaled an increased use of drugs throughout the first year of an offender's released from incarceration. Offenders who used hard substance were more likely to use drugs illicitly when assigned to probation (Caudy et al., 2014). Zaller et al. (2016) interviewed African American who partook in the use of cocaine interviewees advised that drugs were available in incarceration settings, which, lead to a minor difference in the consumption of substance when incarcerated. The Hope Council had 261 offenders who had repeat alcohol

intoxication offenses, upon entrance into the program, and the assessment conducted revealed 79% of the 261 participants were dependent on alcohol, drugs, or both (Bean et al., 2017, p. 13). DeMichele et al. (2016) study found that offenders who was charged with driving while impaired on a chronic level were more likely to lie and have depression. Participants in Nelson et al. (2019) inspection who had a diagnosis of alcohol, conduct, drugs, or gambling dependence and or disorders had more offenses before beginning the Middlesex driving under the influence of liquor program, than participants who did not have any disorders and dependencies. Costopoulos et al. (2017) found that new drugs-related offenses were the primary offense category for participants when they checked secondary data 6-months after offenders released from incarceration. Individuals who were dependent on tobacco in Gunter and Philibert (2015) study was also associated with alcohol, marijuana, and stimulant dependence. Offenders who partook in drugs and had more than one substance use disorders in Raggio et al. (2019) examination committed harsher nonviolent crimes that had the power to generate income. Offenders with a property crime charge were more inclined to have meet criteria found in the DSM-IV than other offenses and was less likely to have received treatment for drugs (Bronson et al., 2017). Ibañez et al. (2017) cross-sectional exploratory study and Miller et al. (2016) female only quasi-experimental evaluation also found that between tobacco lifetime use and drug use an attachment exist. Link and Hamilton (2017) quantitative study incorporating secondary data from the serious and violent offender reentry initiative dataset. Link and Hamilton analyses indicated a connection did not significantly exist between the use of substance and reoffending taken place throughout the time an

offender was in the process of reentry society. The use of drugs increased the likelihood of using substances in almost all waves of Link and Hamilton study. Mullen et al. (2015) data examination a residential jail diversion treatment facility indicated that offenders with driving while intoxicated offenses treatment needs was beyond their misuse of alcohol, for instance, the need for co-occurring disorders care. Recidivism in Morash, et al. (2019) research did not lower due to the amount of drug treatments, or violations in the populations with low or high-risk women offenders. Misuse of alcohol and substances can be lowered, which, could also reduce the likelihood of reoffending behavior.

### **Reducing Substance Abuse Recidivism**

There are times when an offender does not believe they have a problem, nor does the individual believes they do not need help getting over their use of substances (Owens et al., 2018). The offender may not have time to seek help, and the only way the individual may see reason is through motivated intervention (Owens et al., 2018). Offenders reentering society were concerned in Moore et al. (2020) exploration with substance usage and the possible outcomes of using substances. Case management in Moore et al. study was not effective lowering the use of substances and recidivism, due to managers not following-up on referrals. The use of extended-release naltrexone given to individuals suffering from opioid use in the criminal justice system population did not lower the number or initial time of arrests (Soares III et al., 2019). Barta et al. (2017) descriptive figures suggest recidivism for individuals with DUI charges is reduced by intensive supervision programs that require offenders to stay within their home instead of being incarcerated. As a person continues the cycle of incarceration over the years, their

odds of participating in a treatment program increase by 6% (Nowotny, 2015, p. 151). Spiritual or religious support was an association of decreased substance abuse amongst the male-only participants in Stansfield et al. (2018) quantitative research study. Reducing substance recidivism may be achieved using treatment and rehabilitation programs.

***Treatment programs.***

Mississippi alcohol safety education program (MASEP) court-ordered program records, driving records, and assessment data was compiled by Robertson et al. (2016) for their research. Robertson et al. found that the MASEP program was effective at reducing recidivism in persons who finished the program. A jail-based treatment program titled screening, brief intervention, and referral to treatment was evaluated through a computer assessment, secondary data, and an interview by Prendergast et al. (2017). The screening, brief intervention, and referral to treatment program was not effective at lowering the use of alcohol or drugs, participants were not likely to attend treatment, and participants' re-arrests rate was higher, however, life quality levels were higher than the control group (Prendergast et al., 2017). Intense in-patient treatment was not always more effective than treatment on an outpatient level (Welsh et al., 2014). Implementation therapeutic education system (TES) in prisons can be done successfully (Chaple et al., 2014). The TES program was computer based and was indicated to be successful in assisting with delivery of treatment to offenders suffering from abuse of substance (Chaple et al., 2014). The results of Chaple et al. (2014) study also indicated that the TES program may lower the number of offenders who have untreated moderate or mild substance disorders.



Results of a quasi-experimental research design showed that substance abuse treatment program reduced offender recidivism; but not the use of substances (Hollis et al., 2019). Therapeutic community was no more effective in providing residents with a stable support system for abstinence or resource for employment than Oxford House or the usual care setting as concluded by the rejected hypothesis in Jason et al. (2015) evaluation. Treatment dosage at an increased level had a positive impact on the usage of substances (Jason et al., 2015).

Moore et al. (2019) quantitative analysis of medication-assisted treatment programs did not reduce recidivism or criminal behavior; however, the treatment program did reduce the use of opioids and engagement within the treatment. Former offenders who are addicted to opioids and receiving treatment while on community supervision, needs to be closely monitored, and monitored directly; to reduce substance use addictive behavior (Schwartz et al., 2018). Utilizing treatment facilities to treat opioid addiction over detoxification had a lower crime cost in Krebs et al. (2017) quantitative study, the estimated total \$17,350 when reviewed over a 6-month time frame. The 2014 data Saloner et al. (2016) used indicated that offenders who were on medicated had a greater chance of having their substance treatment paid for by Medicaid than in previous years. Westerberg et al. (2016) performed a study on methadone maintenance therapy (MMT) in a detention facility in which data suggested that individuals who were placed in a group to detoxify from opioids had a 72% likelihood of being rebooked (p. 4). The group detoxing from alcohol had a 68% likelihood of being rebooked, and the group containing MMT individuals only had a 53% chance of being rebooked when compared to the

general offender population, whose rebooking chance was 50% (Westerberg et al., 2016, p. 4). A quasi-experimental design study with participants from a solely male jail located in Connecticut was the methodology choice for Moore et al. (2018b). Southeastern United States treatment accountability for safer communities (TASC) program examined by Clark et al. (2014a) study research uncovered that methadone maintenance treatment participants with felons were likely to be older, white, lived with family, had a job, had insurance, took mental health medication, and had a decreased change of residing at a shelter. Offenders participating in the methadone maintenance treatment in jail did not receive as many disciplinary sanctions as the comparison group and had a greater likelihood of continuing treatment post jail release (Moore et al., 2018b). Methadone treatment analyzed in Maradiaga et al. (2016) examination was available in jail but not in the state incarceration facility. When an offender is incarcerated and going through methadone treatment the treatment is reduced rapidly in incarceration facilities, the treatment in incarceration facility is often inadequate, treatment is often stopped, and when an offender is released from incarceration, they often decided not to restart the methadone treatment (Maradiaga et al., 2016). Rich et al. (2015) discovered that during incarceration the forced methadone withdrawal postpones or stops the restarting of post-incarceration treatment for methadone; however, when the offender received methadone treatment before they were released from incarceration the likelihood of the offender restarting methadone in the community post incarceration increased. Schwartz et al. (2017) secondary data analysis is one study in which the methadone treatment did not lower rearrest rates or offense charge severity. Schwartz et al. (2019) analyzed MMT in

their study of opioid offenders housed in a Baltimore Detention Center. Schwartz et al. discovered that when compared to starting a methadone treatment in jail versus the community, participants in jail substance usage was more severe. The participants in Beadnell et al. (2015) assessment who were in the motivation-enhancing intervention program due to driving while influenced by alcohol, were re-arrested less than individuals who were not in the program. Law enforcement assisted diversion (LEAD) program accepts people with minor drug crimes and offenses of prostitution (Collins et al., 2017). The LEAD program explored by Collins et al. (2017) indicated the participants in the program were 83% likely of re-arrest at least once before beginning the program and 58% likely of reincarceration after completion of the program (pg. 53); whereas 77% of the control group was likely to have at least one arrest before the LEAD program began and 80% after the LEAD program completed (Collins et al., 2017, p.53). Some offenders may not be ready to change their behavior due to lack of motivation, only join a treatment group because they are being forced to do so and may not negatively affect the treatment program environment (Davidson & Young, 2019). Meyer et al. (2014) report determined that there are several reasons why an offender did not participant in a treatment program in jail, such as, the jail did not have a program that fit what the offender needed the offender lacked motivation to participant and the offender was worried about the treatment stigmatism. Attitudes towards treatment and lack of motivation influencers were an individual's educational, philosophical, political, and religious background, and how others perceive drug treatment programs for offenders who did drugs (Giordano, 2016). Zaller et al. (2016) noticed that interest in treatment for

substance use was low, repeat involvement with the justice authoritarian system increased the risk of continued use of drugs, and there was a chance that when an individual was release from corrections that they were susceptible to relapsing on drugs. The social service clinicians (SSCs) interviewed by Bunting et al. (2018) in their qualitative study felt that offenders were not motivated to participate in substance treatment due to them being young offenders who lacked experiences gained from life; consequently, lead to young offenders having a higher probability of using different types of drug types.

Schonbrun et al. (2019) research sample was made up of only women. The women who attended the TMGs 12-Step mutual help group were likely to participant in other treatment programs; however, women who attended the program for a lifetime believed that contact with other TMG members from past groups was not helpful (Schonbrun et al., 2019). Most of Clark et al. (2014b) participants were former offenders sentenced to community supervision who were likely to externalize their behaviors if they had a traumatic history and used substances on a regular basics. Wahlstrom et al. (2015) used the I3 theory as a building block for their quantitative research study and determined that offenders participating in the drug programs while incarcerated who had symptoms of PTSD, also displayed aggression acts. The aggressive behaviors was connected to the difficulty in controlling impulsive behavior; but not the inability to regulate emotions or awareness, goal-derived behavior, or limited emotional precision (Wahlstrom et al., 2015). When compared to before treatment outset the reporting of opioid consumption and unlawful reduced significantly (Schwartz et al., 2018). Behavior modification and treatment for drugs can be more altered in drug court verses traditional court.

## **Drug court**

Drug court provides continuous treatment and mandatory drug testing through a distinguish court system (Dickerson & Stacer, 2015) in order, to reduce the use of substances (Cheesman et al., 2016; DeVall et al., 2017; Dickerson & Stacer, 2015; Gallagher et al., 2018a) and criminal behavior (DeVall et al., 2017). The westside drug treatment court program evaluated by DeVall et al. (2017), revealed that some exposure to court treatment for drugs had more significant benefits than not receiving any exposure. Interviewees of the Foothill County drug court program stated they were able to improve their life, family, parenting, and self when they participated in the drug court program (Messer et al., 2016). The use of drug courts can save the justice system money (Cheesman et al., 2016); however, in Joudrey et al. (2021), 112 evaluations indicated a lack of data upkeep measures needed to evaluate the quality of drug court. Some people are increasing more likely to graduate the Indiana drug court program than others; such, as if the individual were employed or a student before they began the program (Gallagher et al., 2018b). Lack of a high school diploma, lack of employment, cocaine consumption, having a positive drug screening, and criminal records are variables associated with termination from a drug court program (Gallagher et al., 2015). The effects of completing a drug court program included lower re-offenses and crime-related incidents (Jewell et al., 2017), along with the reduction of substance usage and the improvement of an offender's mental status (Carey & Luo, 2020). Reich et al. (2016) investigated of three New York drug courts using secondary data and found that placing high modalities restrictions on offenders who were at minimum risk resulted in re-arrest and failure to

complete the program. A Kentucky drug court secondary data examination divulged statistical data regarding the termination of a drug program (Shannon et al., 2018a; Shannon et al., 2018b). Participants terminated from the Kentucky drug court program had felonies, test positive for drugs, received incarceration sanctions, and were arrested within two years of the programs completed (Shannon et al., 2018a; Shannon et al., 2018b). There was a 43.9% recidivate rate for participants in Gallagher's (2014) study that were involved in drug court but was terminated (p. 22). A quasi-experiment examination of the Ada County drug court program located in Idaho data explained that the drug court program situated in the community is more effective than placing individuals on probation (Koetzle et al., 2015). Women who participated in a specific gender drug court just for women had treatment reductions, lower recidivism rates, and had a lesser chance of obtaining a conviction that was new, than women who were on probation (Myer & Buchholz, 2018). Somers and Holtfreter (2018) gathered information from the multisite adult drug court evaluation drug court, which, implied a specialized court was a significant predictor of procedural justice perceptions. The multisite adult drug court evaluation program did not have a considerable impact on participants who were females (Somers & Holtfreter, 2018). Gallagher and Wahler (2018) conducted a survey, and their participants explained that the drug program helpfulness and a change in environment were the best aspects of the drug court. Contrino et al. (2016) conducted a survey of individuals who graduated court. Offenders in Contrino et al. study stated they volunteered for drug court to stay out of jail. Many offenders stayed in the program because the program improved the offenders lives (Contrino et al., 2016). Offender drug

court participants in Koetzle et al. (2015) study likelihood of committing new criminal offenses was less than participants on probation. If the participant did commit a new crime the individual would have been released into society longer than individuals who did not participate in drug court (Koetzle et al., 2015). There are several reasons for convicted lawbreakers to avoid incarceration, a way to live a clean life, and because a parent who takes care of responsibilities (Patten et al., 2015). Individuals who have issues refraining from drug usage may also have mental health needs.

### **Mental Health and Substance Abuse are Intertwined**

Killian et al. (2018) data sample only consisted of women; yet they were able to determine that a factor of recidivism was trauma. A person who encounters excruciating events are at risk of developing PTSD, depression, and substance abuse (Killian et al., 2018). A person's willingness to alter their behavior is influenced by the distress the individual may have experienced psychologically and the severity of their substance usage (Killian et al., 2018). Offenders who are not ready to change and who are in a jail-based treatment program can disrupt the recovery of other program members (Davidson & Young, 2019). Precisely 16.7% of Seck et al. (2017) participants had both a mental health condition and substance abuse problem (p. 34). Individuals with a lifetime history of extensive criminal behavior may externalize psychiatric comorbidity (Nelson et al., 2019). Of the 153 extended-release naltrexone treatment participants in Soares III et al. (2019) examination reported that none of the contributors relapsed, 96 associates missed at least one visit, and 47 (49%) partakes were re-arrested; on the other hand, the to the control group that had 73 participants relapse (49%), and 64 (88%) out 148 participants

arrested (p. 484). The history of alcohol and drugs were correlation with individuals who took medication for their mental health needs (Western & Simes, 2019). Women involved in a specialty probation program specializing in both substance abuse and mental health treatment who were also parents, recidivism was not lowered (Stalans & Lurigio, 2015). Children in foster care, parents were four times likely to not attend all treatment meetings (Stalans & Lurigio, 2015). Recidivism is affected by participants who had more than one diagnosis, and the individuals are likely to re-offend (Zettler, 2018). Former crimes and discontinuing of treatment were indicators of reoffending in Victor et al. (2021) research. Probationers in Balyakina et al. (2014) study had a higher chance of being violent and committing crimes in the future when the individual had a both a substance usage and mental health co-occurring disorder. Some offenders with substance usage and mental health diagnoses are veterans.

### *Veterans*

People incarcerated have many different occupations. Veterans are distinctive and protected population that the criminal justice system focuses on probably because their profession put them at risk of having both mental health and substance abuse issues. Offenders who were veterans had a higher chance of having an offense that was violent if the individual had aggression and PTSD (Bennett et al., 2018). Posttraumatic stress disorder is a mental disorder a recidivism predictor and is associated with new offenses (Sadeh & McNeil, 2015). Schaffer (2016) found that over half of the 399-incarcerated veteran sample population had some type of psychiatric issue. Incarcerated veteran



offenders are not able to receive certain veteran benefits, such as, insurance or pension when they are incarcerated (Schaffer, 2016).

The veterans justice program participant was interviewed by Blonigen et al. (2017) who found that resources and treatment services were available to address substance abuse, negative involvement in work or school, dysfunction in families, lack of interest in social activities, and displaying tendencies of antisocial behaviors. Antisociality in veterans was a predictor and association of criminal offenses (Blonigen et al., 2017). The encouragement of veteran behavioral change may occur in veterans court.

### ***Veterans court***

Veterans court was established in the year 2018 after the tragic September 11 event, the war in Afghanistan, and the war in Iraq (Arno, 2015). Veterans courts evaluate the needs of a veteran who committed an offense (Tsai et al., 2016). Veterans court is a combination of both drug and mental health court (Tsai et al., 2016). The purpose of the veterans' court is to establish and provide continuing mental health and substance rehabilitative care, mentorship, and networking throughout and after the court process (Arno, 2015). The veterans' court Canada et al. (2015) researched used mandatory therapeutic journaling, which, allowed some participants the ability to address their drug problem, increase self-esteem, and to communicate with the judge. Erickson (2016) evaluated three veterans court from different states and discovered that Broward County veterans court dismissed misdemeanors or felons after offenders completed of the program successfully. Veterans court lowered recidivism rates in Erickson's study; although, the program was longer than the time participants may have been assigned in

traditional court. Several research studies exist that indicate the effectiveness of a veteran's court. Tsai et al. (2018) reviewed extracted data from the homeless operations management and evaluation system. Tsai et al. found that previously incarcerated participants had a history of criminal activities, were likely to be detained, and they may not have had a home or employment after completing their program. When compared to participants who were not in the veteran's court program the individual was less likely to have offenses related to drugs; however, public-order and alcohol-related charges were common almost veteran criminal offenders (Tsai et al., 2016). Knudsen and Wingenfeld (2016) offender participants involved in veterans treatment court showed substantial progress in several areas of their lives, such as mental health, substance abuse, and social connections. Probation participants, when contrasted with the veteran sample population in Hartley and Baldwin (2019) veteran court assessment, had more increased recidivism rates; however, the risk and needs assessment was higher for the veterans. Johnson et al. (2016a) survey on a veterans justice program program indicated that program termination was lower when disciplinary sanctions had a gradual escalation process. Contracts for negative behavior decreased veterans' rates of incarceration; however, the decrease was not significant (Johnson et al., 2016a). The timeframe veteran participated in a veterans court program decreased participates changes of rearrest (Johnson et al., 2015). Recidivisms factors: such as, behavior may exist as predictors of crime.

### **Recidivism Factor Predictors**

Researchers have found that predictors can decrease or increase the chances of an offender reoffending. Age is a factor of recidivism and data results suggests older individuals lower odds of reoffending; however, younger participants are more likely to be re-arrested (Andersen, 2018; Dickerson & Stacer, 2015; King et al., 2018; Mowen et al., 2019; Ray et al., 2015b; Tsai et al., 2018; Zettler, 2018). Age was also a predictor of suicide, as discussed in Lize et al. (2015) study, which suggested older offenders were more than two times more likely to commit suicide than offenders who were between the ages of 18 and 24. Older offenders was also more open to receiving substance abuse treatment than their younger counter parts (Schonbrun et al., 2019). Brown et al. (2019) research indicated prior offenders who stopped mental health treatment are more likely to re-offend than those who continue treatment. Brown et al. quantitative study indicated 80% of participants stopped mental health treatment post-incarceration and the participants likelihood of reoffending was the same as their comparison group (p. 612). Even if a former offender was interested in continuing treatment post-release, they might not be able to do so. Thompson et al. (2016) qualitative analysis with a perception on taken from parole officers implied, funding was not available to provide adequate treatment or treatment for everyone who needed mental health or substance abuse treatments. Individuals who are on probation could respond positivity to a holistic treatment system; such, as the seamless system model in which Wooditch et al. (2017) explored that indicated lowered recidivism. Incarcerated offenders needs a multi-focused

reentry plan to incorporate community, family, and programming; to encourage successful re-entry back into the community (Datchi et al., 2016).

People whose age was greater than 34 completed the MASEP more often than individuals whose age was less than 34; which, depicted age, adherence, and program completion as recidivism predictors (Maume et al., 2018; Robertson et al., 2016). Taylor et al. (2019) focused on factors of recidivism and misconnect. Taylor et al. collected secondary data from a risk-need-responsivity review taken from a correctional department, which, uncovered age, gender, race, and commitment to attending program meetings were all factors that predicted where participants would attend class. Kelly et al. (n.d.) survey and Staton-Tindall et al. (2015) secondary data analysis revealed that age, completion of a treatment program, and previous criminal record were reincarceration predictors. Age and felony convictions before participating in a drug court program were items that influence whether a participant graduated (Cheesman et al., 2016). Gordon et al. (2015) longitudinal quantitative buprenorphine drug treatment programs study improved crime and the use of drugs when factoring in age and sex. Dependence on drugs (Kopak et al., 2016a), age, and unemployment were predictors that Kopak et al., (2016b) found in their longitudinal study in which secondary data was quantified. Linn et al. (2016) found that age and criminal record; along with, impulsivity as a child were predictors of recidivism for offenders with DUI offenses. Perception of an offender may be a predictor of recidivism.

## Perception

Stone et al. (2018) longitudinal mixed-method study explored the power of identity. When a person becomes an offender their identity changes (Stone et al., 2018). In Stone et al. study when women whose new identity after incarceration was verified positively, they felt more motivated to continue changing for their betterment and had a higher self-esteem. Women whose new identity is not verified began to feel hopeless and frustrated, which, can cause the former offender to revert to former networks of reoffending (Stone et al., 2018). Verification of identity can be done through supportive relationships with family, friends, parole officers, and mentors (Stone et al., 2018). A halfway house located in Chicago Illinois was observed and interview in a narrative qualitative study developed by Schwarz (2020). Participants felt that not only did they have to face stigmatization in the community but also in the halfway house (Schwarz, 2020). The employees of the halfway house in Schwarz's study understood that what people think impacts their lives; thus, participants were repeatedly motivated to change their thinking. Sometimes the visiting speakers unconsciously stigmatized participants, which, lead to a negative shift in the housing environment (Schwarz, 2020). Former offenders felt embarrassment and frustration due to being assigned a scarlet letter (Hlavka et al., 2015). Shaming was also felt by former offenders after having to repeatedly report and explain their offender status to potential employers and social network ties (Hlavka et al., 2015). Overcoming the label offender is a key aspect to transitioning and reentering society successfully (Hlavka et al., 2015). Former offenders with a purpose, emotions, spirituality, professionalism, and social support prompts change in the life of the former

offender, that is meaningful, and promotes triumphant reentry back into the community (Hlavka et al., 2015). Employment recommendations were decreased for individuals with criminal charges and depending on the sex of the individual in charge of hiring, biases of race were displayed Holloway and Wiener (2020). Men in charge of hiring stigmatized between applications that were black with criminal offenses and without offenses (Holloway & Wiener, 2020). Females would prefer to employ Caucasian men with no criminal background than Caucasian men with criminal offenses (Holloway & Wiener, 2020). Former and current offenders who were incarcerated during the emission into Pettus-Davis et al. (2014) study may not have been able to identify the difference between negative and positive support. In Pettus-Davis et al. mixed-method cross-sectional researched current offenders who were still incarcerated, were receiving listening support, and who also stated their parents would provide abetment if the support was not personal or emotional. Both currently incarcerated prisoners and former prisons did not receive support in challenging the offender to change their thinking, behaviors, and attitudes (Pettus-Davis et al., 2014). Former offenders received more support from their parents and their siblings and less support from their friends (Pettus-Davis et al., 2014). Correctional officers distrusted and was not likely to include people who loved the offender or the offender's family as reliable support. Correctional staff perceived parole officers, volunteers, churches, support groups that are formal and informal as more reliable than support provided from family (Pettus-Davis et al., 2014). How participants in Yuan and McNeeley (2017) secondary data study felt towards neighborhoods being unsafe dependent upon the number of family and friends who lived in the community that

was not safe. In Yuan and McNeeley study social networking connections impacted how a person felt about criminal activities in a community. Younger students' participants who attended University of Southern Mississippi and who also agreed to partake in Weaver et al. (2019) quantitative cross-sectional research perceived offenders who had a mental illness negatively. The younger students felt that offenders with mental illness were more dangerous to the community (Weaver et al., 2019). Students who majored in social work had less stereotypes towards offenders that was not negative and supported the idea of offender rehabilitation (Weaver et al., 2019). When compared to students with no criminal records, faculty staff had an overall positive attitude of students with a criminal background attending college; however, faculty members attitudes was more negative depending on the interaction with the student and if their crime was violent (Ott & McTier, 2020). Faculty members felt afraid, upset, and unsafe if a student with a violent record asked to meet after officer hours; than students with no criminal convictions (Ott & McTier, 2020). Mental health treatment perceived to be voluntary was a foundational element to offenders "quality of life" enhancement (Matejkowski et al., 2020, p. 193).

Treatment programs during incarceration reduced stigmatism in Bryson et al. (2019) cross-sectional secondary data examination. Between the years 1998 and 2002 the news portrayed opioid abuse as a problem for the justice system verses something that could be treated (McGinty et al., 2015). Policy and public perception influenced by the news indicated opioid abuse should not be treated (Schwarz, 2020). Staggs and Landreville (2017) organized a quantitative study using an online survey designed with a

framework based on agenda-setting and framing theories. How the public perceived an offender can be altered by media publicity (Staggs & Landreville, 2017). Increased publicity can impact offender's punishment; make the offender appear more malicious, and contribute to supportive retributivist (Staggs & Landreville, 2017). American probation and parole associations professionals were recruited to take an online survey for Call's (2018) quantitative study. Call's finding suggested that professional in corrections did not alter how they felt individual about offenders with sex related charges; however, fear felt by parents who were professional attitudes was different. Attendance in lifetime TMG programs correlated with former women offenders fearing stigmatism (Schonbrun et al., 2019). The debit a former offender must pay limits housing options, employment, and change with the community; while, keeping the former offender dependent on others, and the negativity that comes with the label offender (Pleggenkuhle et al., 2016). Landlords are also aware that neighborhoods that are desirable increases the economic value; however social perception about an offender and their threat to society can result in a landlord losing income when people vacant the premises (Decoteau, 2019).

### **Home**

Where does someone go after they are released from incarceration? There are several places a recently released offender may transition to after they are released from jail or prison. Connolly and Granfield (2017) research focused on faith, offenders who abused drugs, and reintegration into society. The interviewees in Connolly and Granfield's study were participates of the organization street ministry. Participants who



had an addiction and was a previous offender explained that the street ministry helped them obtain suitable housing (Connolly & Granfield, 2017). Kendall et al. (2018) qualitative systematic review research design using grounded theory had a sample of eight journal articles evaluations. Kendall et al. uncovered that housing was one of the significant needs a person who has been released from incarceration, which, included the need for housing support. In Nordberg's (2015) study, participants were offenders diagnosed with psychosis, had completed a diversion court program, and were seen as a problem housed at housing or shelters. Inadequate plans for rehabilitation post-incarceration, lack of resources for housing, employment accessibility, and recently released from prison lead to homeless according to the results of Egleton et al., (2016) research. When Dong et al., (2018) coded their qualitative interview, they and discovered that their sample of individuals on probation classified housing as a tremendous priority.

Some offenders are released from incarceration status are confined within their homes, which, is often a supervision program that can reduce incarceration costs and rates of reconviction (Barta et al., 2017). Over 84% of Pleggenkuhle (2017) sample population consisted of former offenders who were given a monetary sentencing charge that average approximately \$1000 (p. 123). A monetary amount was assigned to former offenders on supervision within the community, which, estimated to cost \$70 per month (Pleggenkuhle (2017). The sentencing financial charges and the cost of supervision within the community placed former offenders in debit, which, afflicted credit and the ability to afford housing (Pleggenkuhle (2017). The housemates living with offenders on probation are, in essence, taught how to supervise the offender and are also under

surveillance (Sandoval, 2020). Housing status and type were the main variables in Wooditch et al. (2018) quantitative randomized clinical trial study, which, included participants who were dependent on opioids. Of the 504 participants in Wooditch et al. study 267 lived in their own home, 66 participants stayed with family, and 205 participants were changing residences from or too unstable or stable housing: for instance, changing in halfway housing, homelessness, shelters, and or incarceration status. Housing security, homelessness, subjections to neighborhoods, and friends who abused substances was barriers to participants saying abstinent from the use of drugs and following treatment guidelines (Velasquez et al., 2019).

### **Recovery and Treatment Homes**

Housing for recovery is an option that a former offender can go to post-release depending on housing location and availability. Of the participants enrolled in the TASC program 5% of the participants who completed the program stated they were homeless or temporary (Maume et al., 2018, p. 4785). Participants who did complete the TASC program said they were homeless or living in makeshift houses (11%), and some participants stated they resided in some type of institution or facility (9%) (Maume et al., 2018, p. 4785). Jason et al. (2016) conducted a quantitative interview study of the female prior offenders selected for the Oxford House recovery home. The findings of Jason et al. research suggests the overall, an effect of Oxford House was no different than prior offender release from incarceration care. The Oxford House did have a significant positive impact on reducing the number of days the participant drank alcohol, used drugs, and were more likely to become employed (Jason et al., 2016).

## **Programs**

Formerly incarceration offender housed can increase their chance of gaining and or maintain a home that is stable by participating in reentry programs, such as, the jail in-reach project which is a program that displayed housing improvement when measured from intake to completion of three months in the program (Hignite & Haff, 2017).

Veterans who participated in a national VA veterans justice outreach program and did not have a home before entering a veteran's programs were more likely to have housing once the program finished (Tsai et al., 2018), than when compared to other participants (Tsai et al., 2016). Veterans were more likely to have their own place than people not a part of the veteran's court process (Tsai et al., 2017). Clark (2015) randomized control group participants who were involved with the HRRC program and used both transitional housing and community substance treatment displayed a positive impact on decreased recidivism rates; although, the relationship was not significant. Other former offenders participated in the housing program that was considered permanent. Cusack and Montgomery (2017) gathered secondary data from housing and urban development and veterans affairs supportive housing for their study with participants who were veterans. Cusack and Montgomery research goal was to determine if participants in permanent housing led to eviction. Of the 2,802 participants in Cusack and Montgomery's (2017) study 10% of participants faced expulsion from the program became homeless (p. 58). Evicted housing participants used more emergency, inpatient, and outpatient services for mental health and or substance use concerns (Cusack & Montgomery, 2017). Former offenders who were homeless and participated in a treatment program were not as likely

to successfully complete the program when compared to individuals who were not homeless (Reich et al., 2015). Mental health diagnoses such as schizophrenia and outpatient assistant for substance use recovery were a predictor of returning to homelessness (Cusack & Montgomery, 2017). The results of Woo and Joh (2015) research conducted using low-income housing tax credit program indicated that housing built by the could decrease crimes that are considered criminal; however, the research did not specific if the former offender could reside in the affordable housing.

### **Halfway and Transitional Housing**

Halfway housing can reduce prison overcrowding and is a way to provide offender supervision within society, helps with reintegration barriers, and is an initiative that reduces criminal reoffending (Wong et al., 2019). Zgoba and Salerno's (2017) mentioned halfway housing as a predictor was not meaningful to re-arrest. Vigesaa et al. (2016), non-experimental quantitative secondary data results focused mainly on reentry programs for women; however, halfway housing was one of the study's control groups. Compared to the reentry group participants in the halfway group were younger, had fewer children, not married, had more problems with alcohol or drugs, not likely to have a dual diagnosis, decreased previous convictions, and received educational help during incarceration (Vigesaa et al., 2016). The women housed in a short stay halfway house in Kerrison (2018) study felt protocols were rules developed to further punish and to encourage the women to follow the ideal norms for women. Hsieh and Hamilton's (2016) overall research goal was to determine if substance abuse halfway houses could reduce the recidivism propensity of participants. Hsieh and Hamilton's quasi-experimental

research used secondary program evaluation data, and research findings proposed that recidivistic behavior lowered if the participants entered the program with three months of their release from incarceration. Quasi-experimental research design for a halfway house study examination conducted by Hyatt and Han (2018) implied that an operational halfway house within a community can negatively impact that community; because, of increased criminal activity. Ratcliffe et al. (2015) discovered that the average society members living in areas with high violent crimes were not aware of increased policing and crimes. Routh and Hamilton (2015) research model centered around model risk-need-responsivity and focused on transiting through work release housing. The quantitative data analysis of Routh and Hamilton's study suggests that when compared to participants not involved in halfway housing, the halfway house participants were more likely to return to incarceration status. Offenders in Liles et al. (2018) research who resided in their own resident to receive programming services verses being relocated to alternative housing for supervised accommodations were more likely to complete a mental health program.

### **Housing Challenges and Benefits**

Housing stability for former offenders is often unstable due to challenges that comes with finding housing as a former offender, such as, upon release from incarceration the offender is not able to return to previous residential housing due to the family's inability to maintain the home after the offender's absence, having to live in housing that is subsidized in communities that are disadvantaged, and repeat stays in jails and treatment facilities (Morenoff & Harding, 2014). Dobmeier et al. (2017)

phenomenology study had one older individual who was discouraged from finding housing after being rejected from an apartment building based on their criminal background.

Drawve et al. (2019) researched the measurement of risk of crime, which, implied that individuals on parole were more at risk of reoffending if they resided in a neighborhood that was considered risky.

Housing that is considered stable can lower incarceration rates (Johnson et al., 2016b). When an offender is released from incarceration and resides in different housing than before incarceration, Kirk's (2019) research implied that offender recidivism was lessened than those who lived in the same housing before and after incarceration. At the beginning of probation during the intake process women who were married were more likely to have stable housing, and women who lived in residences that were not stable missed more appointments for probation (Stalans & Lurigio, 2015). Morash et al., (2017) longitudinal interview study showed risk factors for women lowered when they had no housing needs. Incarcerated women in Willging et al. (2016) qualitative cross-sectional study felt the responsibilities they must take on immediately upon leaving incarceration status and were not sure how to address the responsibilities changes when they were lacking stable housing, which, could lead to an increased risk of reincarceration due to the reentry constraints. Street ministry helped their participants find employment and obtain housing that was in "desirable neighborhoods"; which, motivated participants to recovery from substances and refrain from participating in criminal behavior (Connolly & Granfield, 2017). When released from incarceration status securing housing was a significant challenge (Lee et al., 2016). Changes in policies and procedures can keep

former offenders from obtaining housing (Barrenger et al., 2017); also, housing obtainment can be impacted based on an offender's crime, mental health, and behavior. Offenders that are a high risk have a greatly chance of gaining assistance with housing than offenders who are low risk; because high risk offenders are a greater concern for society's safety (Growth et al., 2018). The sex offender residence restriction laws stipulate where an offender who has committed a sexual offense may reside (Socia et al., 2015). There are times that sex offenders do not have to do anything to violate housing restrictions. Rydberg et al. (2017) found that violation of the sex offender residence restriction is influenced by the structure of economic in which a sex offender is released and recidivates. Violations are impacted by availability of housing, resources, stability of sex offender being released into an area that is disadvantaged, and areas with limited social control. Registered sexual offenders are likely to be homeless or transience if they live in housing and neighborhoods that are not affordable (Socia et al., 2015), and they were not likely to live with family members (Rolfe et al., 2018). There were sex offenders concerned with finding post-incarceration housing and others who did not appear to understand the difficulty of finding housing after incarceration (Baker et al., 2021). Society stigmatism given to sex offenders and transitional housing was for Rydberg (2018) participants to reenter society. Transience increased when a registered sex offender resided in unaffordable and dense counties, lacked supervision, and had convictions due to not registering as a sex offender (Socia et al., 2015). Rolfe et al. (2017) conducted a quantitative study of four homeless shelters that were all located in different states. Participants in Rolfe et al. study were e-mail an online survey, and a few

days later, the participants received a follow-up survey (Rolfe et al., 2017). The results of Rolfe et al. research sought to determine if homeless shelters allowed offender who had sex-related crimes, which, results decided that polices, or lack of policies was a predictor of whether sex offenders were allowed to stay in a hostel. There was a less likely chance that shelters without regulations would allow registered sex offenders into the shelter (Rolfe et al., 2017). Shelters in Michigan and Ohio agreed to allow registered sex offenders into their shelters were greater than 451% when compared to Kentucky and Tennessee (Rolfe et al., 2017, p. 1841). In Remster (2019) quantitative investigation that obtained a sample of 11,964 individuals from three secondary data sources discovered that 92.6% of the individuals had never used a shelter for housing before becoming incarcerated, and approximately 49.6% of the sample used shelter for over two years (p. 459). Reintegration back into society was a complex process that took years and some people never reintegrated as indicated in Remster's study. Some shelters have a maxed time a person can stay which lead to the former offender having to find and use multiple shelters (Remster, 2019). Individual with a mental illness treatment during incarceration increased the likelihood of using a shelter after release from incarceration (Remster, 2019). Florida is one state that has sex offender "bus stop restrictions"; which, resulted in sex offenders inability to live in approximately 95% of living options available in Florida and contributes to over 13% of the sex offender population in Florida being transience and homeless (Levenson et al., 2015, p. 333, 327, 334). Transition facilities maybe an option for sex offenders who have difficulty meeting housing goals because the staying in the transition facility is a required sanction, housing reentry plans are denied for not



meeting the sex offender restrictions, the offender is not able to obtain housing that is stable, there are limited areas that are child free, the offender has no support from family members or friends, and limited access to resources in the community exist (Kras et al., 2016). Evans and Porter (2015) conducted quasi-experimental quantitative research that allowed testers to contact landlords in New York with a series of questions. Evans and Porter found that a criminal charge decreased the prospect that a landlord would allow an offender to rent. Sex offenders were often not allowed to rent due to children living in the building, or the landlord was worried if the offender could pay the rent. Landlords were reluctant to allow offenders with drug related charges to rent; because the landlord knew that drug offenses could correlate with the illegal selling and use of drugs in the home and the landlord did not want to disturb the other residents (Evans & Porter, 2015). Male landlords were more willing to give offenders a second chance; however, women offenders were more likely to obtain housing (Evans & Porter, 2015). Some apartment policies reject individuals who have a felony conviction, which, can make finding housing difficult (Dong et al., 2018). Whether the crime was nonsexual or sexual in nature, housing options that were in a safe condition in Rydberg et al. study was a barrier for former offenders reentering society successfully. Sometimes family did not allow the offender to live with them due to victimization, crime, or offender behavior (Rydberg et al., 2017). Transitional housing were not always rehabilitator, and public housing could become more unaffordable when the offender had to inform the landlord of their felony status, which, resulted in the housing price increasing depending on the crime committed (Rydberg et al., 2017).

### ***Mental health***

All participants in Viron et al. (2014) research were from a homeless shelter for transitioning in Massachusetts, and all participants were hospitalized to meet psychiatric needs. There is a greater chance that participants who transferred from the transitional shelter to independent living would stop adhering to medication guidelines (Viron et al., 2014). Almost 59% of Farabee et al. (2019) sample population was concerned about post-incarceration housing (p. 193). Farabee et al. researched the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) facility via interviews; in which, participants received monetary compensation by mail after the completion of the interviews and through the gathering of secondary data obtained from California's justice department. Offenders who are incarcerated or formally incarceration may not take their mental health medication due to how others perceive them and the stigmatism that is an association with people who have a mental condition (Farabee et al., 2019). An individual housing situation could cause a decrease in mental health status not being stable (Brown et al., 2019). Mental health can impact a former offender's housing situation; however, so can the abuse of substances.

### ***Substance abuse***

A significant correlation exists between changes in residence status, crime, and the use of substances (Wooditch et al., 2018). In Wooditch et al. (2018) study the use of drugs in terms of days utilizing drugs occurred more during periods of homelessness or when participants lived in their own home. Crimes often occurred more when the individual was homeless than living in a shelter; however, crimes committed while living

in a halfway house were ranked high after homelessness (Wooditch et al., 2018). Living with family and friends after an offender was released from incarceration was enormously correlated with the use of substances. Former offenders who were younger, male, not assigned to community supervision, living arrangement status, mental health diagnoses, history of incarceration, and who spent time in the transitions clinic network in Chamberlain et al. (2019) study related to the offenders use of substances after being released from incarceration. Criminal types are one reason why this study's theoretical framework may be a good fit for the labeling theory.

### ***Mental Health and Substance Abuse Intertwined***

Residential housing instability is predicted by the usage of alcohol, drugs, incarceration history, mental illness, and prior homelessness (Herbert et al., 2015). Housing instability is generated by the criminal justice system due to the moves caused by sanctions, treatment programing, incarceration, or absconding (Herbert et al., 2015). Former offenders on parole who moved frequently were less likely to fail than those who did not move to different residents (Huebner & Pleggenkuhle, 2015). Older former offenders who had a substance abuse or mental illness were unlikely to receive support from family after incarceration and were likely to stay in a resident that was not secure (Western et al., 2015). Individuals on parole who lived with family were more likely to succeed (Huebner & Pleggenkuhle, 2015). The solid start housing program provides former offender residents with a positive environment and “emotional support”; which, lead to the residents becoming successfully independent and appreciative (Pleggenkuhle et al., 2016, p. 389). Obtainment of housing caused former offenders to feel independent,

stable, and promoted a positive change on a cognitive level (Pleggenkuhle et al., 2016). The secondary interview data analysis conducted by Pleggenkuhle et al. (2016) found that the participants had a difficult time finding appropriate housing after their release from incarceration, and most did not find housing. Pleggenkuhle et al. research indicated housing that was stable was the foundation to building successful relationship; since, employment, mental, and substance treatment is more likely to be contingent on acquiring housing that is both stable and secure. Offender status and criminal types are one reason why this study's theoretical framework will incorporate the labeling theory.

### **Theoretical Foundation**

Howard Becker wrote a book in 1973 called the *Outsiders*; in which, he formulated the labeling theory (Beggan, 2004; Best, 2004; Shulman, 2005). In the labeling theory, Becker determined that society defines what deviant behavior consists of and that people form their identities based on society's perspectives about behaviors (Best, 2004; Shulman, 2005). Behaviors are neutral until the rule's community creates projects on to the behaviors changing them from neutral to deviant (Beggan, 2004; Shulman, 2005). There are four categories of labeling: 1. Conformists are people who refrain from deviations; 2. Falsely accused individuals are people giving the label deviant even though they have not broken any rules; 3. Secret deviants are people who have broken the rules, but not caught; and 4. Pure deviants are people who broke the rules and caught breaking them (Pollner, 1978; Shulman, 2005). Labeling influencers are class, gender, pre-existing stereotypes, and race stereotypes (Gold & Richards, 2012; Shulman, 2005). The labeling of a person causes other people in society to treat the individual

differently; which, can lead to the offenders deviate future behavior and deviance on a secondary nature (Fuller, 2003; Shulman, 2005). Offenders with successfully applied labels have the following challenges: ability to obtain employment is difficult, are often denied various opportunities, shamed, shunned, may not be able to maintain interactions, and are always watched by law enforcement personnel; due to the label given to them based on the individual's previous criminal actions (Fuller, 2003). Research has indicated that sometimes offenders do not take medication, because of the stigmatized that is associated with people who receive mental health medication (Farabee et al., 2019).

### **Labeling Theory, Offenders, and Crime**

Several investigators have used the labeling theory in their criminal justice study. Pope and Jones (2020) believed the labeling theory was essential to understanding the experiences of their study participants who were age 17 to 20 years old on a psychology level. Participants who completed a diversion program did not receive the label associated with people who had a criminal court record and went through the traditional court system (Pope & Jones, 2020). The diversion program gave participants a chance to have a future without criminal blemishes; because, of the dismissed charges, court cases available for the public to review, and traditional court findings are public record (Pope & Jones, 2020).

Intergenerational transmission, offender parent, criminal labels, and children of offender are labeling components of Besemer et al., (2017) research. Besemer et al. discovered that a conviction was a predictor of a person reporting behavior of offending despite the previous accountment of offending type behavior. Parents who had criminal

convictions had a significant impact on the offending behavior of someone else when compared to parents who did not have a conviction (Besemer et al., 2017). Children of parents who had committed a crime were more likely to report offending behavior (Besemer et al., 2017). Gaes et al., (2016) study focused on imprisonment effects on offender recommitment. The labeling of prior offenders can result in them being denied or prohibited from public housing and employment opportunities (Gaes et al., 2016).

Cybercrime characteristics and patterns examined using labeling theory in Payne et al. (2019) research, which, included most offenders with cybercrime was male. Payne et al. explained that the labels placed on women dissuaded women from participating in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) activities, thus lowering their availability to the community computer-related jobs. The media reported more articles with more words for a more extended time for men than women (Payne et al., 2019). Media reports for women who commit cybercrimes appear less severe than the same crime committed by men or foreign offenders (Payne et al., 2019).

Early offending criminal activities, and later in life, mental health was examined by Craig et al., (2018), and their research framework consisted of the labeling theory. Criminal status such as offender, incarceration, conviction, and arrest are supposed to deter crime; however, Craig et al. research indicated that the theses labeling is counterproductive and will lead to increased future participating in events of a criminal nature. In Hlavka et al. (2015) qualitative narrative study several former felons felt they were giving a lifelong sentence when they were labeled a felon. The label felon influenced social connections and resource availability (Hlavka et al., 2015). In Boppre

and Reed's (2021) study, women on probation or parole felt angry, dehumanized, discouraged, indifferent, or outcasted from society when labeled a criminal, inmate, and or felon. Offender's criminal history label can lead to an offender not obtaining stable housing; however, in Hawaii, their laws limit background checks crime description (D'Alessio et al., (2015). In the investigation report compiled by D'Alessio et al. (2015), offenders were less than 57% likely to repeat a crime due to Hawaii's laws that pacifying stigmatized society place on a person's criminal record to obtain employment (p. 347). Previous research is one rationale for this study, along with the suitability of the labeling theory.

### **Labeling Rationale**

This research sought to explore United States societal members possible perceptions of the term offender and crime type protentional impact on offender post-incarceration housing options. The labeling theory suggests that labels placed on someone can cause them to be treated differently than people without the label given to them (Fuller, 2003; Shulman, 2005). The label offender can cause the individual to re-offend due to the individual not obtaining adequate employment; because, of shaming or sunning from society (Fuller, 2003). Crime type can affect housing options that are available to a former offender. Family homes do not often accept registered sex offenders, nor do homeless shelters (Rolfe et al., 2018; Socia et al., 2015). Some apartment policies do not allow offenders with a felony offense to reside in their apartment buildings (Dong et al., 2018). The many labels an offender receive can stop them from obtaining housing, employment, and more. This research explored which

crime type labels impact offenders' housing options, the significance of crime type, and accessibility to better living conditions.

### **Summary**

The purpose of this mixed design study was to explore United States societal members possible perception of the term offender and crime type potential impact on offender post-incarceration housing options. Existing research suggests crime type, mental health, substance use, a combination of both mental health and substance can determine housing available for prior offenders after release from incarceration (Dong et al., 2018; Rolfe et al., 2018; Socia et al., 2015). Registered sex offenders and felons are the most mention crime type that impacts housing choices (Rolfe et al., 2018; Socia et al., 2015); however, specific types of felony types were not identified. A dearth in existing literature regarding United States societal members possible perceptions of offenders, offender crime type committed, and housing may be present. The opinion, perspectives, and procedures of society labels may be detrimental to a prior offender's reentry success. The label offender limits employment, social relationships, and jousting options that are available to former offender (Fuller, 2003; Gaes et al., 2016; Hlavka et al., 2015). Chapter 3 will give a more in-depth description of this proposal's research design.

### **Chapter 3: Research Method**

#### **Research Purpose**

The purpose of this mixed design study was to explore United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime classification concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States



## **Chapter Overview**

This research consisted of secondary data, online interviews (set one interview), and clarifying in-person, e-mail, or telephone interviews (set two interview). The mixed-method design applied secondary data and interviews that complimented each other. Multiple data sources helped provide validity and credibility. I gathered, de-sensitized, and analyzed the collected data. Information obtained included informed consent and confidentiality agreement. Virtual survey interviews were open to the public using an online SurveyMonkey link. SurveyMonkey audience pool was used to randomly select participants. Participant recruitment was also conducted by the placement of an ad in virtual news publications outlets. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, in person interviews were substituted with e-mail or telephone interviews. Interview data organization and analysis occurred using NVivo. Secondary data were quantified using SPSS. Data results from secondary data and interviews were analyzed separately but interpreted together. Major components of this section include descriptions of the setting, research design and rationale, researcher role, and methodology.

### **Setting**

This research used a quantitative deductive design and a simultaneous qualitative supplemental component. Secondary data sources included offender housing reentry information from the United States state Department of Corrections (DOC). The United States state DOCs record convicted offenders who have been incarceration and where the offender is released back into the community on probation or through a reentry program. Probation and reentry programs may offer clues as to the housing accommodation option

the offender may go to post-incarceration. Qualitative data were collected using online, phone, e-mail, and or telephone interviews. Using an online setting, anyone with a computer, mobile device, or tablet could participant in the study regardless of where they were residing in the United States Currently, the nation is going through a pandemic, and social distancing mandates limited interviewing possibilities. Online, phone, e-mail, and telephone interviews insured social distancing and compliance with both state and federal laws. There are no key organization members that was impacted this study. The setting of this research was a part of the research mixed-method design.

### **Research Design and Rationale**

#### **Research Question**

What are United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime classification concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States?

#### **Research Phenomenon**

Labeling of former offenders and others' perspective of an offender's crimes can impact post-incarceration housing (Dong et al., 2018; Fuller, 2003; Gaes et al., 2016; Rolfe et al., 2018; Shulman, 2005; & Socia et al., 2015).

#### **Mixed-Method Justification**

Teddlie and Tashakkori's parallel mixed method design has a concurrent timeframe that allows for the interpretation of quantitative and qualitative data after the data collected during the results stage of the purposed research (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). In a research study, there is no specific priority in terms of quantitative and

qualitative data collection (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). Teddlie and Tashakkori's design addresses and confirms exploratory questions, provides a more robust conclusion when data methods are combined, offers a view that is assorted and diverse, and offsets research disadvantages (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). Information obtained via secondary data uncovered where an offender resided post-release. Interviews revealed public opinion regarding housing accommodation options for prior offenders. Knowledge gained from societal members' perceptions may either validate or invalidate offenders' housing options based on housing plans former offender provided after their release. Secondary data consisted of information that is pre-existing and does not consider if the former offender changed how they perceive the successful obtainment of housing upon release.

### **Quantitative and Qualitative Importance**

Secondary data provided a statistical analysis indicating where a former offender lived upon their release. Qualitative data outlined housing options that were available and if some housing policies refuse tenants based on their criminal history (interview set two). Understanding where a former offender resides may indicate the need for more housing accommodation that allows former offenders, the need for more housing programs, and if society is willing to allow former offenders to reside within their home (interview set one).

### **Data Collection Analysis and Interpretation Rationale**

Secondary data, survey data, and interview data were analyzed separately and interpreted together. A separate analysis of data allowed for triangulation and increases

aspects of trustworthiness. Interpreting data independently then together increases validity in a research study. I collected secondary data that already existed; therefore, waiting to conduct an interview was not necessary. Secondary data results are not dependent on the answers of interviews, surveys, or vice versa. Secondary data was reviewed, uploaded into SPSS, and tested using the SPSS software. Survey data was reviewed, demographics were uploaded into SPSS, data were tested using SPSS, and the qualitative data portions was organized and analyzed using NVivo.

### **Researcher's Role**

I collected and depersonalized secondary data. Interview data were collected using open-ended questions, which I then coded for the main themes. The online survey interview questions can be found in Appendix B and in-person, e-mail, or phone interview questions can be found in Appendix C. I had no personal relationship with any participants, nor did I have any power over the research. Researcher biases may appear in the formation of interview questions; however, bias was limited by allowing peers to review the questions. There are no power type relationships that I needed to manage. An incentive was given to online participants obtained through Survey Monkey Audience pool. The small incentive was to thank participants for their time and offer a small compensation for time lost, which is a requirement to access these two participant pools. The amount of the incentive was less than five dollars per person. Participants were informed that they were allowed to leave at any time without repercussions, despite being given an incentive.

## **Methodology**

### **Participants**

In this research, secondary data were gathered for every state DOC in the United States I did not have any relationship with any state DOC. Every state has their own research request process. Each state DOC research process was reviewed after IRB approval. Purposive sampling was used to select a DOC. I submitted an approved proposal to the chosen DOC research program based on the specific DOC research submission deadlines and cost to conduct the research. Data gathered from each state DOC may provide offender demographics which is generally public records may be found on the DOC website. A research proposal request must be submitted to each DOC individually to obtain offender post-release housing plans. Apartments, halfway homes, and residential treatment housing programs were selected randomly by census regions, then purposive sampling was applied for set two interview surveys. Two states in each census region were randomly selected using PickerWheel. Purposive sampling was then used after PickerWheel identified a state to select at least two apartments, halfway homes, and residential treatment housing programs to interview. PickerWheel is an online website that allows users to input data that will appear on the wheel. The user will then press the spin button in the middle of the wheel and a result will appear in the middle of the screen (PickerWheel, n.d.). I was able to save and print the results from the PickerWheel (n.d.). The word apartments, halfway homes, and residential treatment housing programs, along with the selected state following each housing option for instance, apartments in Virginia were searched using the internet. After searching a

housing accommodation options for a state, I chose two of each from the top result inquiry. The selection process was repeated if both housing accommodation opts out of participating in the study. Amazon Mechanical Turk and SurveyMonkey Audience is a web database in which people can review the study and chose to answer questions anonymously. A SurveyMonkey link was embedded into the recruitment or advertising sections for Amazon Mechanical Turk, SurveyMonkey audience, Facebook, and news publication for set one interview survey. The research study was open to any adult in the United States. The SurveyMonkey link was shared by other participants in a form of virtual snowballing, which allowed new potential participants to take an online interview survey. There were two exclusion questions that was used to determine if a potential participant will be allowed to participant in the research study: Select your age according to the range below, and What country do you currently reside. Exclusion questions were added to the SurveyMonkey survey after the informed consent form. The study was estimated to include a minimum of 110 participants to follow the normal distribution curve requirements and easier to manage qualitative data. Amazon Mechanical Turk, social media, and news publication online survey submitted to cover a 30-day timeframe for data gathering obtained for the online public survey. An exit page included a brief debriefing. Virtual survey participants were reminded the survey was voluntary and given national resources in case the individual felt any distress or emotional responses. The debriefing's final page notified participants that I was not endorsing any specific resources. The resources are a starting point, and the participants should seek help from local government organization or doctor for participant tailored referrals. The debriefing

informed participants that no follow-up was needed and thanked them for their time. This study involved two consent forms. One consent form included a signature and data section for in-person interviews and secondary data collection permission. In-person interview was substituted for email or phone interviews that were documented, translated, and written email consent obtained. The second informed consent form was listed as the first question asked on the SurveyMonkey survey form, and consent was given by selecting agree or disagree.

### **Instrumentation Data**

Secondary data approval was provided once the proposal had been tentatively approved and submitted to housing accommodations locations. DOC research proposal submission occurred after IRB approval. A letter, fax, or e-mail with an informed consent form was sent to locations in which secondary data were gathered. Secondary data was collected and desensitized according to the agencies and organizations policies in which data were gathered. Any personal identifying information was removed from any data. Two sets of interview questions were developed by me and reviewed by peers in the criminal justice field. Set one interview questions for the online survey interview can be found in Appendix B. Appendix C details set two interview questions used in-person, e-mail, or phone interview. Set types of interviews were conducted to measure content validity and verify information found on housing application and policies of housing accommodation locations. I was not able to obtain pre-existing interviews surveys that ask open-ended questions from the perceptions of society regarding former offenders therefore the research developed their own survey. Virtual survey data were used to

gather online data from several recruitment pooling resources, such as Amazon Mechanical Turk, SurveyMonkey Audience, Facebook, and news publication. Online survey interview data were collected over a 30-day period unless data saturation is reached first. The first virtual survey interview question asked about implied consent with a choice to agree or not agree to the study. Informed consent allows for the respondents to remain anonymous. Survey interview questions responses were collected through SurveyMonkey link; data were then extracted from SurveyMonkey and coded for themes. Debriefing occurred at the end of the interview survey, and participants were asked to confirm or deny the use of their survey data. Available printed in-person survey data notes were placed in a secured lockbox and scheduled to be destroyed via fire in 5 years. Email and phone transcriptions were secured on an encrypted USB drive set to be deleted and burned in 5 years.

### **Data Analysis Plan**

Qualitative data were kept organized using the NVivo software, and quantitative data was analyzed using the software SPSS. Qualitative and quantitative data was interpreted separately then integrated together.

#### ***Quantitative***

Depersonalized DOC secondary data were manually inputted into SPSS. Descriptive statistics, ANOVA, chi-square, multiple regression, Pearson's correlation coefficient, and *t* test are statistical tests were used to test the hypothesis:

H<sub>1</sub>: United States societal members' perception of the term offender and crime classification bias will influence post-incarcerated housing accommodations.



H<sub>0</sub>: United States societal members' perception of the term offender and crime classification bias will not influence post-incarcerated housing accommodations.

When data results were interpreted, they were done with a 95% confidence interval and a 0.05 *p* value. Data cleansing occurred by reviewing frequencies data and triple checking manually inputted data.

### *Qualitative*

Interview data were transcribed, coded using attribute, in vivo, and value then coded by sentence. Qualitative data were managed and analyzed using NVivo. Incomplete interview questions were mentioned as missing data but were not included in the research. Qualitative data were analyzed separately from quantitative, but both were interpreted together.

### **Threats to Validity**

Validity in a research study indicates the researched quality, reflections the research concept accurately, rigor, and is true to the experiences of participants (Babbie, 2017; Ravitch & Carl, 2015). External, internal, construct, content, and predictive validity is addressed in this section.

#### **External Validity Threats**

Research results generalizable to real life is the purpose of external validity. The proposed research was not experimental; therefore, no experimental validity issues will be addressed. Reactivity threats pertain to the researcher's potential influence on the participant's behavior, which can be limited when the researcher is away from the individuals involved or if the research gathering process occurs over a few months

(Walter et al., 2015). The research study gathered exiting offender data, which, allows the research to have no participant contact. The use of existing data also has had internal validity threats.

### **Internal Validity Threats**

The chance that the results of an experiment are accurate and have inferences that are meaningful refers to internal validity (Babbie, 2017). Although no experiments was conducted in this study, nor did the study have control or treatment groups, there are some internal validity threats that do apply. In October of 2016, there was a protest turned riot in Charlotte, North Carolina, that could have resulted in more people being arrested. The individuals arrested in 2016 may have had to fill out a reentry form depicted their living arrangements post-incarceration. The increase in arrests due to an event in history can confound the research results (Babbie, 2017). In 2020 the COVID-19 pandemic could have resulted in less criminal convictions. Historical validity was addressed by keeping up with events during the gathering of secondary offender data that could impact the research study. Any events was addressed in the analysis section of the proposal. Maturation validity and selection favoritism was observed in this study by allowing anyone located in the United States to take an online interview and accepting diverse offender secondary data. Data was not limited based on culture, education, sex, or income. Testing validity may be accomplished by adding clarifying interview questions at different stages of the online interview survey form. The use of two different variations of the same survey can fight against instrumentation threats (Fishman, 2017). There are two sets of interviews purposed. Set one interview survey was for online societally

members possible perception and set two is used to clarify offender housing options from possible housing options. Peers who are experts in criminal justice reviewed housing questions that was listed in the demographic section. Peer assistance also contribute towards other validity threats.

### **Construct, Content Validity, Predictive**

Non-experimental research such as the currently proposed design for this project, identifying possible covaries is a necessitate to locate and isolate effects; because of the lack of controlled variables or settings (Walter et al., 2015), this still does not control the setting data is gathered. The interview survey measuring the construct underlining the study was accomplished in the current research and manage to construct validity.

Increasing meaningful fidelity can be achieved by getting a specialist who can review the topics' information (Koskey et al., 2016). Construct validity was addressed by having peers review demographic questions and making sure they were all relate to the research study. An interview measuring public opinion impact on offender's living arrangement and secondary data indicated offender's living arraignment post-release may meet the standards of content validity. Secondary data was quantified and tested using both chi-square and Pearson's correlation coefficient. Predictive validity seeks to determine if the test prediction scores were the same if the test used to measure something different (Jones & Liu, n.d.). Secondary data from more than one incarceration facility and post-release source can offer more predictive validity to the study. Threats of validity are one form of validity issues mentioned in the research; problems with trustworthiness is another validity issue to include within this same study.

### **Issues of Trustworthiness**

There are a few components under trustworthiness, and credibility is one of them, which pertains to the accuracy of the researcher's perception regarding the experiences of the participants (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). Debriefing peers and triangulation are two ways to increase the quality of findings (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). When asking peers to review the research, the researcher is encouraged to remain honest, the peer provides support, and ask questions regarding the collection of the research data process (Rudestam & Newton, 2015). Research depicts triangulation when more than one source of data is included in the research design, which, provides checks and balances and evidence collaboration (Rudestam & Newton, 2015). The study presented used a mixed-method design that included both secondary data and interviews, which, may increase the credibility of the research. Credibility can also be seen by peer member check reviewing the interview question. Reaching participant saturation may add to credibility. Transferability is another component of trustworthiness, which, can be done by sample generalizing to populations in quantitative studies and context emphasize data inferences in qualitative studies (Rudestam & Newton, 2015). Gathering detailed information regarding the chosen research topic assisted with the transferability aspect of the research design. Interviews was open to any who lives in the United States Secondary data with offender housing re-entry plan and demographics may gathered from more than one DOC. Dependability is indicated by an apartment, homeless shelters, or rehabilitative programs, and using interviews with the same or similar variations for data collection. Analyzing secondary data and interview questions separately, then interpret the

information together may add dependability validity. Auditing the research data and analyzing the research procedures may help find any biased and or distortion in which judgments decided (Web Center for Social Research Method, n.d.). Auditing of data in this research was conducted by recording in detail how interviews are obtained, coded, and then interpreted. Documenting what is occurring during the dissertation process, along with my interests, thoughts, and values, can address reflexivity issues. Reflexivity documentation may reveal any bias and being aware of prejudice may add to the confirmability aspects of the research. The researcher was the sole coder of the interview and will code the data using attribute, in vivo, and value coding.

### **Ethical procedures**

Formal letters, verbal, or electronic content from places that data is potential gather must be obtained and provided to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) (Walden University Center for Research Quality; n.d.-a). Permission to use secondary data was provided once approval had been given per the request of the individual states DOC. Informed consent was also obtained from interviews conducted using apartments, halfway homes, and residential treatment programs The University IRB acted on behalf of all parties involved in the research process and will do the following: review research proposal for any risk or benefits; ensure the study is in compliance with all required laws, policies, ethics standards; and that participants who are humans are protected (Walden University Center for Research Quality, n.d.-a). To safeguard all participants the following occurred: potential risks acknowledged, kept to a bare minimum, and notice given of any risks to the participants; participants selected randomly to ensure the chosen

of the sample population is equal; informed consent gained from all participants and participants notified they could stop the data collection process at any point in the research; and respect was given to all individuals even if the person has chosen to drop out of the study (Walden University Center for Research Quality, n.d.-a). SurveyMonkey filter was enabled to anonymous responses, which eliminates SurveyMonkey from obtaining participants IP (internet protocol) address and personal identification information. Informed consent form was gathered from each participant, as well as approval from the agencies and organization in which former and current offenders reside, was essential for the research study. No personal identifiable questions was asked; to insure anonymous. Participants taking the research study online study received implied consent to maintain confidentiality. Participants who chose to drop out of the survey was reminded that there will be no adverse effects, and their data was not included in the study. All data was kept confidential, and paper data secured in a locked boxed to only be only by the researcher. The organization and agencies will receive a copy of the research results for their policy purposes and data destroyed after five years. Electronic data will be purged from the SurveyMonkey system and hardcopy data 5 years in the future will shredded and burned. Data saved on external storage drives would be cleansed then crushed before being discarded. The data that may be shredded may be sent to Cintas to be furthered destroyed. The IRB guidance program provided any ethical concerns during the writing of the dissertation proposal stage and the mentorship of facility members; because the research study includes vulnerable populations data, and the IRB will review the proposal for ethical concerns and issues (Walden University Center for Research

Quality, n.d.-b). Research data was disseminated into an approved journal publication; however, no one will have access to the study's raw data. Amazon Mechanical Turk and SurveyMonkey Audience were given a small incentive that is less than five dollars and is a requirement to access research participants using these two participant pools. The incentive is to thank participants for their time and provide a small compensation for the time they have lost.

### **Summary**

Identifying ethical issues is a part of ensuring trustworthiness in a study. This mixed-method proposal contained secondary and interview data. Multiple data collection methods can add validity to research and triangulation. All data that is collected was secured, and interview data remained anonymous. Obtaining informed consent ensured participants understood what the proposed study was about and gives participants the necessary data needed to determine if they wanted to participate in the study. Details pertaining to data collection, results, and analysis can be found in the next chapter titled chapter 4.

## Chapter 4: Results

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to explore United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States. Data collected were intended to answer the research question: What are United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States? This chapter will begin with the data collection methods and then will be organized in the following sections: demographics, data collection, and data analysis.

### **Setting**

The setting for all data collection methods was virtual and confidential; therefore, no known organizational or personal circumstances impacted participants' experiences or in general. Participants' survey questions did not cover private events occurring in their lives or their feelings regarding current events. Data collection occurred in the second year of the COVID-19 pandemic. The United States Capital building was attacked in 2021, resulting in the arresting of approximately 200 people. The attack on the Capital building occurred not too long after the 46th President Joe Biden election in last 2020. The following section, titled demographics, will expand some on settings about each data collection method.



## **Demographics**

### **Secondary Data**

The research accessed every state in the United States of America DOC website and reviewed available policies regarding conducting external research. The study did not include 20 United States' DOCs. I submitted research proposals asking permission to conduct external research to 29 different state DOCs. There were two DOCs who approved and released data: one located in the Midwest United States Census region included 355 offenders, and one located in the Southern United States Census region and included 637 offenders.

### **Interview Data**

Only one e-mail interview was obtained from a Southern United States census region, although I intended to collect interviews from all over the United States. The one interview obtained was from a halfway house.

### **Public Housing Data**

Data for public housing were completed for each state and organized by the four United States Census regions. The Midwest public housing included 66 apartments, 25 halfway houses, and 22 residential treatment program housing. Fifty apartments, eight halfway houses, and 19 residential treatment program housing were found for the Northeast United States Census region. The United States census region for the South had 99 apartments, 24 halfway houses, and 39 residential treatment program housing. The last United States census regions located in the West had 70 apartments, 27 halfway houses, and 35 residential treatment program housing.

## **Data Collection**

Secondary data, survey data, and interview data were the three core data collection methods for this mixed-methods study. Publicly available internet data was added as a core data collection method. The segments below will explain the data collection methods.

### **Department of Corrections Secondary Data**

The DOC's website for each state in the United States was accessed as a potential participant to retrieve offender-related data. I used an excel spreadsheet to document DOC selection status, why a DOC was not selected, if a proposal was submitted to a DOC, if a DOC responded with an approval or denial to the submitted proposal request, and why the DOC denied the submitted proposal. There were 20 United States, states not chosen for this study due to the following reasons: lack of submission contact information, e-mail to submit the proposal was rejected by a correctional facility due to policy violation, lack of submission contact information and research guidelines, cost \$50.00 per offender to request criminal offender data, and inability to determine research guidelines, unable to submit a research request, and no research department/personnel contact information listed. Research proposals asked for offender information and their post housing type for a one 30-day timeframe were submitted to 29 DOCs between March 3, 2021 and May 4, 2021. Responses were included in the research if received by November 18, 2021. The two DOCs who agreed to participate in this research study e-mailed their data in an excel file, which was then downloaded into an encrypted file and saved on an external hard drive. The following section will cover interview data.

**Interview Data**

The purpose of collecting interview data was to speak directly to individuals who can approve and decline housing applications to see how criminal offense impacts former offenders' likelihood of residing in different housing accommodation types. There were four interview questions, for example: If yes: What crime types are allowed acceptance into your \_\_\_\_\_ (apartment, halfway house, rehabilitation house, transitional home, treatment facility)? Appendix C lists all interview questions. The interview questions were written to understand policies housing facilities may have that related to convicted offenders residing in an apartment, halfway house, or residential treatment housing program. Virtual survey interview questions were different from interview questions because the questions were asked from an individual belief versus company policies. Interview data and virtual survey interviews were used to identify the individuals and housing accommodation potentially a former offender can reside. There was only one respondent who agreed and followed through with being interviewed. Interview data were collected over approximately 7 months, including waiting for return e-mails and phone calls. Interview data have been reviewed, and now public housing data as a collection method will be examined.

**Public Housing Data**

The phrases United States population by state city and town were searched using the Google web browser Chrome. The result "United States Census bureau titled: City and Town Populations: 2010-2020 City and Town Population Totals: 2010-2020" was selected (United States Census Bureau, 2021, p.1). States' population excel documents

were ordered from least to great. For each United States state, the population with the highest, lowest, and middle range were selected. The middle city and or town was selected by taking the highest Excel line number minus the header line and dividing the number by two. The results of the mathematical equation indicated the line number for middle population city/town/county. Results populated a number with a decimal were rounding up if 0.5 or down if 0.4 to make a whole number. The lowest city/town/county was selected if the population was one. The keyword phrase Apartments in \_ (city/town/county/borough) \_ (State) was searched using Google Chrome over 60 days.

If possible, two apartments, halfway houses, and residential treatment program housing were selected for each state and city or town. Several housing types did not populate feasible housing locations. The housing types of results consisted of 287 apartments, 84 halfway houses, and 53 residential treatment housing program data. The public housing data were recorded using an excel spreadsheet. There were five headers to input data. A yes or no was placed in the excel headers application requirements, background check, credit check, and security deposit or cost after reviewing the website for the corresponding public housing result. In the fifth header, titled notes, specific criminal charges not accepted for specific housing were noted. The excel public housing document was imported into SPSS, and the type was changed from string to numerical to run statistical tests. Society survey data is the next component of data collection described.

### **Society Survey Data**

A virtual survey was posted on virtual community newspaper websites and virtual Survey Monkey Audience. Eight society members answered the online community newspaper posting and 153 society members went through Survey Monkey Audience to participated in the online survey. Sixty society members rejected the informed consent or dropped out of the study, resulting in a combined participant county of 101 included in this research. Online community newspaper selection was made based on the previously randomly selected states chosen for the interview data potion of this research and was collected for 70 days. A survey was posted in the Survey Monkey Audience participant portal for 1 day. The survey was compiled using the Survey Monkey link. Survey data were recorded anonymously and confidentially using the Survey Monkey software and available in an excel document. Quantitative data were then numerically transcoded in excel then imported into SPSS for data testing. Society survey data were the last final data collection source for this study.

### **Data Collection Variation**

Information gathered from publicly available websites was not initially included in the initial data collection methods, however, due to the lack of ability to obtain interview data. Publicly available housing data answered questions that would have been answered during interviews, to be answered via data available on the websites of apartments, halfway houses, and residential treatment facilities. As applicable, public housing data were tested using descriptive statistics, Pearson Correlation, linear, and ANOVA tests.

## Data Analysis

This section discusses the process used to code the qualitative data obtained from virtual survey answers participants. Each applicable survey question was reviewed and coded based on how respondents answered. Value and in vivo coding was the coding method used; however, how respondents responded to in vivo coding was used the most. One hundred one participants responded to the social survey question, and 23 survey questions that were coded. Due to the number of survey questions and responses tables, questions one through four have been inserted in this section with each question, coding type, number of codes, a coding example, and participant response examples. Appendix Q a contains a complete list of codes. Vivo and value codes were grouped based on similarities amongst the society survey questions. The offender is someone who committed and was convicted of a crime that was given some type of punishment; former offenders' prior crimes do matter, but second chances can be given due to all humans make mistakes; offenders, when released, may need help but not from me and if given help would only be for a specific timeframe; offender opinion is derived from somewhere, and offenders can reside with someone but not with me are the five themes that arose after survey questions were assembled based on the questions related to each other. Participant responses that did not specifically answer the survey question were read and coded as not applicable (N/A). The survey response n/a was used less than 20 times per survey question. The following section, categorized as the result section, will discuss in further detail the society virtual survey results and quantitative data results.

Table 1 displays six of the virtual survey questions along with the qualitative code, total number of codes, code example, and example participate quotes. The question What do you think should be the length of time housing assistance should be given to a former offender? was coded using in vivo and had 46 codes.

**Table 1***Coding Society Virtual Survey Responses*

Survey question	Code type	Total codes	Code example	Example quote
What are your thoughts on people who have been convicted of a crime?	Value	11	No thoughts	“Neutral non-judgmental [sic]”
What circumstances do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance?	In Vivo	33	Always	“Always”
When an offender is released from incarceration (jail or prison) what help do you think the individual will need to successfully re-adjust in society?	Value	57	Accountability partner	“Work with someone to help get them on their feet”
	In Vivo	28	Family or government	“Relatives, the government, aid societies”
In your opinion, who is responsible for providing housing assistance to offenders after they are released from incarceration?	In Vivo	46	1 week	“At the most, one week, but hopefully not even a single day.”
What do you think should be the length of time housing assistance should be given to a former offender?	In Vivo	40	Unemployable	“Can’t get jobs”
What are some beliefs and values that you have learned from others concerning to a former offender?				



Table 2 has six virtual survey codes. Only one question was code using value coding. What are some labels or titles you have heard that refers to a former offender? had the highest number of total codes.

**Table 2**

*Continued Coding Society Virtual Survey Responses 1*

Survey question	Code type	Total codes	Code example	Example quote
How did you learn about offenders?	In Vivo	30	Work in law enforcement	“Correction officer and law enforcement Deputy Federal Officer”
When would you identify an offender’s crime as important?	In Vivo	43	Need to know basics	“Just when this information will impact in the thing [sic]”
What are some labels or titles you have heard that refers to a former offender?	In Vivo	61	Sex offender	“Too vulgar to list, especially sex offenders.”
What past beliefs and stereotypes that were taught in the past do you still hold today pertaining to offenders?	In Vivo	40	Can not be trusted	“They are ugly and not to be trusted.”
How do you feel about providing housing assistance for a person who had previously been convicted of a crime?	Value	13	Depends	“Depends on what they did”
Would you recommend other people opening their place of residence to previous offenders in order to provide housing assistance?	In Vivo	8	No	“I would not recommend that”

All the questions in Table 3 were codes using in vivo coding. Coding examples consisted of unsure, no, and concerned.

**Table 3***Continued Coding Society Virtual Survey Responses 2*

Survey Question	Code Type	Total Codes	Code Example	Example Quote
What kind of feelings do you experience when you think of a former offender living with you?	In Vivo	26	Concerned	“Concern, I have kids”
When you are at a store or out to dinner how do you identify who is a former offender?	In Vivo	21	Behavior and body language	“The way they act, Carry [sic] themselves”
In your opinion should former offenders who have a mental illness or disorder receive housing assistance?	In Vivo	9	Psychiatric care	“A mental disorder should receive psychiatric care.”
Describe the offender crimes you would allow to reside with you and for how long?	Value	38	Non-Serious	“Probably less crimes or petty crimes nothing serious.”
What are your thoughts on veteran former offenders receiving housing assistance?	In Vivo	7	No	“I think they already have enough help”
Do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance if they are addicted to substances such as drugs or alcohol?	In Vivo	5	Unsure	“I don’t know. Probably not, but it depends on the circumstances.”

Table 4 identifies the last two virtual survey question. One of the two survey questions was coded using both in vivo and value coding.

**Table 4***Continued Coding Society Virtual Survey Responses 3*

Survey Question	Code Type	Total Codes	Code Example	Example Quote
If at any time during this survey you stated, you do not believe a former offender should receive housing assistance please provide the reason why?	In Vivo and Value	24	Should not reward bad behavior	“It all seems dependent on the situation and also I don’t necessarily agree with rewarding them for spending time in jail”
Would your answer to a former offender staying in your home be different if the former offender was a member of your family or friend?	In Vivo	7	Depends	“I cannot say it could never alter my view, but my nephew, for example, who did a stint in prison for child rape, I would never let live in my home. My best friend of 20 years, who was convicted of DUI, I might consider letting stay for a week or so. My good friend’s son, whom I like a lot, but who has been involved in drugs and bank robbery, like my nephew [ <i>sic</i> ], never.”

Tables one through four provided a summary of qualitative survey questions, coding type, and examples. The result section will identify the results for each applicable data collection method.

### Results

The results section will begin with the quantitative component section, followed by the qualitative component. The research results being discussed consisted of only one research question and hypothesis.

## Quantitative Component

The quantitative component section has the subsequent sections that are organized by data collection sources: Department of Corrections Secondary data, public housing data, Society Survey Monkey Audience Data, and Society Survey Online Newspaper Publication.

### *Department of Corrections Secondary Data*

The two DOC information will test separately because the information released was not the same. The Midwest DOC information for 355 veteran offenders did not include crime type or post-incarceration housing. A descriptive statistical test was conducted; however, only one variable was available for the DOC located in the Midwest. An ANOVA, chi-square, multiple regression, Pearson's correlation coefficient, and t-test were not performed. Tables 5 and 6 identified that 355 offenders were released on parole, and with a 95% confidence interval, the standard deviation was 0.000 with a mean of 3.

### **Table 5**

#### *Midwest Department of Corrections Descriptive*

##### *Descriptive Statistics*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ReleaseType	355	3	3	3.00	.000
Valid N (listwise)	355				

**Table 6***Midwest Department of Corrections Frequency**Statistics*

<u>ReleaseType</u>	
Valid	355
Missing	0

*ReleaseType*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Parole	355	100.0	100.0	100.0

The second DOC located in the South data included some demographic information, crime type, and post-incarceration housing information for 637 offenders. Table 7 reveals the results of a descriptive statistics test for all variables that will be used for the South United States Census regions, such as gender, race, age at release, primary offense, and (post-incarceration) housing plan. The researcher compared the standard deviation to the mean score. All variables indicated that some variation exists; however, the variables age at release (scale), primary offense (ordinal), and housing plan (nominal) had the most variation.

**Table 7***South United States Census Region Descriptive Statistics**Descriptive Statistics*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Gender	637	0	1	.19	.396
Race	637	1	5	1.74	.559

AgeAtRelease	637	18	77	37.45	10.679
PrimaryOffense	637	1	98	49.53	26.084
HousingPlan	637	1	11	7.76	2.774
Valid N (listwise)	637				

The variable primary offenses were selected as a factor in a one-way ANOVA with a 95% confidence interval, and housing plan was listed as a dependent variable. The F obtained between groups was 0.762 with a significance of 0.950, which indicated that the idea that housing plans were dependent on primary offenses should be rejected. The researcher used the variables age, race, and gender as a factor, along with housing plan as a dependent variable. Each one-way ANOVA test significance was over the 0.05 alpha level, which indicates the dependent variables independently did not have a dependency on the housing plan variable. Descriptive for each crime, age, and race one-way ANOVA has been added to Appendix D. Significance levels of 0.02 for gender, 0.010 for race, and 0.001 age at release proposes that each of these variables is influenced by an offender's primary offenses whereas housing plan at 0.950 was not. A Chi-Square with a two-sided significance (Table 8) confirms that a relationship does not exist between housing plan and primary offense; however, a multiple regression test uncover a minimal relationship between primary offense as the independent variables and the dependent variables gender, race, and age at release (Appendix E). A Pearson Correlation test concurs with the Chi-Square and ANOVA test. Appendix F displays the results of the Pearson Correlation test whom values were closest to 0 than 1, and all values were under 0.070.

**Table 8***Housing Plan and Primary Offense**-Square Tests*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	913.510 <sup>a</sup>	960	.856
Likelihood Ratio	664.365	960	1.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.532	1	.466
N of Valid Cases	637		

047 cells (98.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00.

***Public Housing Data***

A descriptive statistics test was conducted with the standard deviation and mean options selected for the nominal variables Housing Type, United States Census Region, Application Requirements, Background Check, Credit Check, and Security Deposit and or Cost using a 95% confidence interval. The results of the descriptive frequencies test are displayed in Table 9. When compared to the mean score, all variables had a low standard deviation indicating the reliability of the data obtained.

**Table 9***Public Housing Descriptive Statistics**Descriptive Statistics*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
HousingType	484	1	3	1.65	.839
United StatesCensusRegion	484	1	4	2.65	1.115
ApplicationRequirements	484	0	1	.82	.386

BackgroundCheck	484	0	1	.85	.362
CreditCheck	484	0	1	.85	.362
SecurityDepositandorCost	484	0	1	.75	.432
Valid N (listwise)	484				

Two one-way ANOVA was performed; the first test was conducted using housing type as factor and application requirements, background check, credit check, and security deposit and or cost were listed in the dependent list. In the second ANOVA test, the dependent variable list remained the same; however, the factor section was updated with the variable United States Census region. The ANOVA tests outcomes exhibited in tables 10 and 11 suggested with an alpha level of 0.05 indicates a failure to reject the idea that housing type impacts application requirements due to a significance of 0.258; however, since the significance level for the background check, credit check, and security deposit and or cost were all was 0.000, the suggestion that the variables are impacted by housing was rejected. A failure to reject was given to the idea that United States Census regions affected background check, credit check, and security deposit and or cost variables due to each significance level being over 0.757.



**Table 10***Public Housing: Housing Type ANOVA*  
*ANOVA*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
ApplicationRequirements	Between Groups	.404	2	.202	1.358	.258
	Within Groups	71.596	481	.149		
	Total	72.000	483			
BackgroundCheck	Between Groups	5.713	2	2.857	23.827	.000
	Within Groups	57.665	481	.120		
	Total	63.378	483			
CreditCheck	Between Groups	7.124	2	3.562	30.457	.000
	Within Groups	56.254	481	.117		
	Total	63.378	483			
SecurityDepositandor Cost	Between Groups	3.594	2	1.797	9.975	.000
	Within Groups	86.654	481	.180		
	Total	90.248	483			

**Table 11***Public Housing: United States Census Regions ANOVA**ANOVA*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Application Requirements	Between Groups	1.218	3	.406	2.753	.042
	Within Groups	70.782	480	.147		
	Total	72.000	483			
Background Check	Between Groups	.111	3	.037	.280	.840
	Within Groups	63.267	480	.132		
	Total	63.378	483			
Credit Check	Between Groups	.096	3	.032	.243	.866
	Within Groups	63.282	480	.132		
	Total	63.378	483			
Security Deposit and/or Cost	Between Groups	.222	3	.074	.395	.757
	Within Groups	90.026	480	.188		
	Total	90.248	483			

The variables in the public housing portion are all nominal; as a result, when running a Chi-Square test for more information, the Phi and Cramer's V Lambda option was selected. Appendix D and Appendix E contains all tests relevant test completed in SPSS Crosstabs Chi-square statistics. Independent variable housing type relationships with the dependent variables are as follows: application requirements 0.257 significance, background check 0.000, credit check 0.000 significance, and security deposit and or cost 0.000. The results of the Chi-square for Housing type and application requirements relationship indicates that not enough data exist to suggest a relationship between the two; however, in relation to housing type and the variables background check, credit check, and security deposit individual, the data suggest a relationship exists. United States Census regions Chi-square results in associations with a background check, credit

check, and security deposit and or cost variables predicates no relationship exists between the individual variables and the independent variable. A relationship was predicated to exist between housing type and application requirements. A multiple regression test was performed using housing type and United States census regions as independent variables and application requirements, background check, credit check, and security deposit and or cost as dependents variables. The multiple regression test results exhibited in Appendix F suggest that the independent variables and application requirements (R 0.083) had an extremely weak relationship; however, the dependent variables background check (R 0.081), credit check, and security deposit and or cost had a weak relationship. The T-Test was used to confirm prior statistical tests conducted in the study.

Displayed in Appendix G is the expanded form of the T-test completed, which suggests that when completing the test using a 0.05 significance level, there was no significant relationship between the independent variable housing type apartments and halfway houses and the dependent variable application requirement T-test result -0.192. The subsequent T-test values indicated a significant relationship exists between the dependent variables: background check -4.340, credit check -4.780, and security deposit and or cost -2.745. Housing type halfway houses and residential treatment program houses T results lead to rejecting the idea that housing type halfway houses and resident program houses shared a relationship with the dependent due to the T results such as applicant requirements -1.152 and credit check -1.666 value was over the 0.05 significance level. When selecting United States Census Region Northeast and Midwest as an independent variable and using all dependent variables, the T-test values located on

the Distribution of T chart were over the 0.05 significance level, and some values were not located on the Distribution of T chart; thus, suggesting United States Census regions does not have a significant relationship between any of the dependent variables. United States Census Region South and West t as an independent variable and using all dependent variables T-test result did suggest a significant relationship for the variable application requirements (2.457) but not the remaining variables.

A Pearson Correlation test (displayed in table 12) indicated a significant positive linear relationship between housing type and application requirements variables and a moderate linear relationship between the variables housing type and United States Census Region. Housing type also has a weak positive linear relationship amongst the background check, credit check, and security deposit and or cost variables. United States Census region had a weak negative relationship between the application requirements, background check, security deposit, and or cost variables. The credit check variable, when paired with United States Census Region, had a weak positive relationship.

**Table 12**

*Public Housing Pearson Correlation*

		HousingType	U.S. CensusRegi on	Application Requirements	Background Check	CreditChec k	SecurityDep ositandorCo st
HousingType	Pearson Correlation	1	.053	.071	.284	.318	.193
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.245	.120	.000	.000	.000
	N	484	484	484	484	484	484
U.S.CensusRegion	Pearson Correlation	.053	1	-.039	-.008	.018	-.019
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.245		.393	.866	.694	.679
	N	484	484	484	484	484	484

### *Society Survey Monkey Audience Data*

There were 97 out of 153 participants from Survey Monkey Audience included in quantitative data testing. Table 13 displays the descriptive statistics for the society survey data variables: What sex do you identify as?; What is your race?; What is your level of education, or what is the highest grade you have completed?; What is your employment status?; What is your income level?; Are you a student?; If applicable, what type of employment field do you work in, for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc....?; What is your housing status?; What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?; Does your home have enough room for guests?; and Have you ever been convicted of a crime. A low to moderate variability exists amongst the variables. Age has a 16.217 standard deviation, and a 53.74 mean, whereas student status standard deviation was 0.288 with a mean of 0.98. The population sample had almost equal division amongst men and women, with men taking the survey 2% more. Descriptive frequency information such as the number of people who are a specific age, race, and education level has been added to Appendix K.

**Table 13**

#### *Society Survey Monkey Audience Survey Data*

<i>Descriptive Statistics</i>						
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	
How old are you?	97	21	83	53.74	16.217	
What sex do you identify as?	97	1	3	1.51	.523	
What is your race?	97	1	8	3.16	1.028	

What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?	97	1	13	4.27	3.101
What is your employment status?	97	1	10	4.36	2.176
What is your income level?	97	1	7	5.00	1.665
you a student?	97	0	3	.98	.288
If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, 6, 24, 23, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please 40 put the company you work for.	97	1	43	27.91	12.242
What is your housing status?	97	1	8	1.54	.969
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	97	1	4	3.11	1.298
Does you home have enough room for guests?	97	0	1	.25	.434

Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This question.	97	0	1	.86	.353
id N (listwise)	97				

---

A one-way ANOVA with age as a factor and the variables what is your housing status; what kind of housing accommodation do you live in; does your home have enough room for guests; and have you ever been convicted of a crime uncovered that the variable what is your housing status, and have you ever been convicted of a crime both had significance values under 0.05 and a positive relationship with the variable age. Sex as a factor and the dependent variable have you ever been convicted of a crime had a significance of 0.019 and out of the four variables was the only one that was over the 0.05 alpha and had results indicating a positive relationship. The significance value of 0.006 indicates that have you ever been convicted of a crime also had a positive relationship with the factor race, which was also the only variable out of the four in which a relationship populated. The dependent variable does your home has enough room for guests, and the factor educational level had a significance level of 0.017. The variable educational level was the only variable out of the four variables that revealed a positive

relationship occurred between the variables. The two variables, what is your housing status and what kind of housing accommodation do you live in, were the only two variables that had a significance value under 0.019, indicating a relationship between each dependent variable and the factor employment status. All variables but have you ever been convicted of a crime had significance values under 0.030 when the factor was age, thus indicating a positive relationship existed. Selecting employment status as a factor and using the four dependent variables previously mentioned the variables what is your housing status and what kind of housing accommodation do you live in significance level under 0.019 depicts a positive relationship exist. A positive relationship exists amongst all variables, but the dependent variable, have you ever been convicted of a crime, which had a 0.072 significance level and suggested a relationship does not exist when compared with the factor of income. The descriptive values and one-way ANOVA testing can be reviewed for further details in Appendix L. A Chi-Square, Pearson's correlation coefficient, and independent sample tests were not conducted for the Survey data due to the test's pertinence for this study; however, a multiple regression test was completed.

A multiple regression test with the independent variables (predictors, constant), If applicable, what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education, or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level? and Was used for



four dependent variables. The variable What is your housing status had an R-value of 0.542, and the variable what kind of housing accommodation do you live in had a 0.401 R-value, which indicates a moderate association exists between the individual dependent variables and the independent variables. The variables does your home have enough room for guest (R-value 0.334) and have you ever been convicted of a crime (R 0.316) had a weak correlation with the independent variables, which was indicated by a value less than 0.5 but more than 0.1. Other tests results auto-populated with the multiple regression test have been listed in Appendix M. Society survey data was collected from two choosing Survey Monkey and online newspaper publication.

#### ***Society Survey Online Newspaper Publication***

There were eight people who showed interest in the research study; however, only four people completed the online survey. Appendix N has a list of frequency information for each variable. Table 14 shows that when the standard deviation was compared to the mean value in the descriptive statistic test, the variables age, race, employment status, income level, employment type, and housing accommodation had more variability than the remaining five variables.

**Table 14**

#### ***Society Survey Online Newspaper Publication***

##### ***Descriptive Statistics***

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How old are you?	4	37	57	46.25	8.995
What sex do you identify as?	4	0	1	.75	.500

What is your race?	4	2	3	2.75	.500
What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?	4	2	4	3.00	1.155
What is your employment status?	4	3	9	5.75	2.754
What is your income level?	4	3	7	4.75	1.708
If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for.	4	15	40	26.00	10.985
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	4	4	4	4.00	.000
What is your housing status?	4	1	3	1.50	1.000
Does your home have enough room for guests?	4	0	0	.00	.000

Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	4	0	1	.75	.500
Valid N (listwise)	4				

---

There were seven independent variables and four dependent variables (factors) that were used to conduct one-way ANOVA testing. The results of the society survey online newspaper publication one-way ANOVA is itemized in detail in Appendix O. The excessively low participate numbers did not populate f statistic and significant data for the independent variable age and the dependent variables what is your housing status, what kind of housing accommodation do you live in, does your home have enough room for guest, and have you ever been convicted of a crime. The dependent variable, have you ever been convicted of a crime, was the only dependent variable out of four when tested with the independent variable sex had a result which was  $f = 0.250$  and significance of  $0.667$ . At a 95% confidence level, the significance value was greater than the  $0.05$  alpha, which suggested a relationship between sex and convicted crime did not exist. All tests included a 95% confidence level and an alpha of  $0.05$ . The dependent variables, what is your housing status, and have you ever been convicted of a crime, were the only two

dependent variables that, when tested, data result populated for the independent variables race and education level. Race had an outcome  $f$  value of 0.250, and education level value was 1. The significance score for race was 0.667, and education level was 0.423. The independent variable race and educational levels when computed with the dependents significance score above 0.05, thus implying that a relationship did not exist. The independent variables employment status, income level, and employment type did not populate any ANOVA data between any of the four factors. Multiple regression testing was conducted next to test for the relationship between independent variables and each dependent variable.

The variables for the online survey obtained from online newspaper publications were the same as the variables identified when data was obtained from Survey Monkey Audience. There were seven constant independent predictors (employment field, sex, education level, race, employment status, age, and income) variables and four dependent variables (housing status, housing accommodation, room for guest, and convicted of a crime). The variable what is your housing status had an  $R$ -value of 0.542 and was the only variable that had a moderator relationship with the independent variables. The remaining variables: What kind of housing accommodation do you live in  $R$  0.401, does your home have enough room for guest  $R$  0.334, and have you ever been convicted of a crime  $R$  0.316 had a weak relationship with the predictor variables.

### **Qualitative Component**

Combined virtual society survey data consisted of 101 participants. When asked the question If you have a guest, please describe where they would sleep and have access

to: There were 63 out of 101 participants who had a spare, guest, or basement private area for their guest to reside in during their stay. There were 16 participants that would allow guests, but they would have to sleep on the couch, floor, or air mattress. Out of the 101, 56 participants did not explain what areas in their home guests would be allowed, such as the kitchen, bathroom, living room, and or the entire residence. There were 20 participants that would allow guests to have access to their entire home; two participants only allowed access to their kitchen, and 11 participants were allowed access to only their bathroom. The remaining participants were only allowed access to a combination of a bathroom, kitchen, and or living room areas of the residence. When asked the survey question: Would the items available to a guest change if the guest was a former offender? Twenty-one participants stated yes, 53 responded with no, 22 participants replied with it depends, 3 participants would not allow an offender in their place of residence, one participant answered no, and one participant gave the word good as a response to the question. The next section of information will disclose the finding of the remaining 21 virtual society survey research questions that were asked to address this study one research question and the five overarching themes.

### ***Research Question***

What are United States adult societal members possible perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States?

### ***Hypotheses***

H<sub>1</sub>: United States adult societal member perception of the term offender and crime type will influence post-incarcerated housing accommodations.

H<sub>0</sub>: U. S. adult societal member perception of the term offender and crime type bias will not influence post-incarcerated housing accommodations?

***Theme: Offender is Someone who Committed and was Convicted of a Crime That was Given Some Type of Punishment***

The virtual society member survey participants used the words and phrases "ex-convict legally proven to have committed a crime," "someone who has been convicted of a crime," "person who has been charged with a crime and paid duty to society [*sic*] through parole or imprisonment.", "anyone who has broken the law," "A person who has previously committed a felony or crime.", "someone that had charges against a child," "dishonest or unethical or violent behavior (physical or mental)," and "someone that robbed, raped, or killed" to define the term offender. Codes ex-convict; anyone who has been convicted of a crime; and a person who committed a crime and was found guilty were applied using in vivo coding. Table 15 identifies the codes and examples uncovered for the survey question: Using your own words, how would you define former offender?

**Table 15**

*Using your own words, how would you define former offender?*

Codes	Example quote
Ex-convict	<p>“Ex-convict legally proven to have committed a crime.”</p> <p>“Ex con”</p>
Anyone who has been convicted of a crime.	<p>“Someone who was convicted of a crime”</p> <p>“Anyone who has broken the law”</p>
A person who committed a crime and was found guilty	<p>“Someone who’s committed a crime and has been guilty.”</p> <p>“Person who has been charged with a crime and paid duty to society [<i>sic</i>] through parole or imprisonment.”</p>

In Table 15 a participant defined an offender as an ex-con which was a response to the survey question Using your own words, how would you define former offender? Some people who have been convicted of a crime should be given a second chance while others should not, according to several respondents who answered the survey question: Using your own words, how would you define a former offender?

***Theme: Former Offender Prior Crimes Does Matter but Second Chances can be Given due to all Humans Make Mistakes***

There were 11 value codes that derived from participants answering the survey question: What are your thoughts on people who have been convicted of a crime, which can be found in Table 16, along with one example. There were several participants who

believed that depending on the circumstances, prior offenders deserved a second chance. Other participants believed once convicted offender complete their punishment, and they should be able to move on with their lives. The idea that everyone makes mistakes and punishing a prior offender due to their past behaviors was the attitude of some survey participants. A small about of participants had a distrust of convicted offenders and or believed they should not be given another chance.

**Table 16**

*What are your thoughts on people who have been convicted of a crime?*

Value Codes	Example quote
No Thoughts	“I have no thoughts on this”
Depends on the Crime/Situation	“Most I feel are not harmful to safety in society, but some should be totally kept away”
Should be Punished	“Everyone is entitled to mistakes, but harm caused is not acceptable. There must be a process that tries to ameliorate damages.”
Punishment is Complete	“Deserve a second chance.”
Offender is Still a Person	“They are people just like anyone else except they have made some bad choices and were caught and punished”
Action and Reaction	“They are responsible for their actions and need to accept the ramifications of their actions”
Give Help	“We need to work with this people”
Proceed with Caution	“Caution”
Should not Be Trusted	“Wouldn’t trust”
Victim Matters	“I feel bad for the victim”
Justified for Some	“It could be justified for a small percentage, for the others they were found guilty”



The in vivo code located in Table 16 give help was attached to the participant comment “We need to work with this people”. Table 16 were the codes connected to the virtual survey interview question What are your thoughts on people who have been convicted of a crime? There were circumstances and time limits as to how long former offenders should be given help from certain individuals and organizations, as well the things that offenders may need to re-adjust to society.

***Theme: Offenders when Released may Need Help but not from me and if Given for a Specific Timeframe***

There were 24 different in vivo codes discovered for the virtual society survey question: What circumstances do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance? The main codes and examples have been identified in table 17. Several participants did not have an opinion on the question asked. Other respondents believed that there were no circumstances that would warrant the receiving of assistance if the individual was a convicted offender. Various participants explained that if the individual had fully completed their sentence, the individual should be allowed housing assistance. Numerous respondents were okay with respondents receiving housing assistance if the individual’s past crime was non-violent, if the individual was unable to find employment, and if the former offender was working on improving themselves. There were 62 respondents who answered yes to housing assistance if the former offender had a mental illness, with only eight individuals specifically saying no, and seven said the individual needed psychiatric care. The 16 respondents who said no to prior offenders who were veterans receiving housing assistance had a strong feeling towards the idea and made

comments such as "Veterans who are criminals are no different than anybody else who is a criminal. Individual considerations will vary widely, but merely being in the service should not be one of them.", "OK through veterans' services," and, "I think they already have enough help."

The 58 participants who said yes to former offenders who were veterans receiving housing assistance thought several different ways, for instance, "It sounds like they need it and totally deserve it" and "yes, because otherwise it's hard to get back on your feet." The answer yes is how 48 participants answered the question Do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance if they are addicted to substances such as drugs or alcohol? If so, for how long? and 43 participants said no. Violent offenders, recidivism, lack of self-improvement, would not feel safe, and do not want around children are several reasons why respondents said no to former offenders receiving housing assistance. If the offender was a family member or friend, 25 participants would not change their no to a yes, whereas 41 participants said yes, and 13 participants stated it would depend on the crime. There was one respondent who said yes however they would be stricter with their family than a stranger. When were survey participants asked: When an offender is released from incarceration (jail or prison), what help do you think the individual will need to successfully re-adjust in society? Outside of housing assistance, many participants believed released offenders should receive mental health, financial, job placement, environmental change, and guidance assistance.

**Table 17**

*What circumstances do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance?*

In Vivo Coding	Example quote
Completed sentence	“If they have already fulfilled their sentence, they should have access to assistance.”
No circumstances	“Former offenders should not receive any form of assistance. They are responsible for their actions and should not receive any assistance from any government agency that is”
No opinion	“I know nothing about the circumstances that make a person eligible to receive housing assistance, so I cannot comment on when I believe former offenders should or should”
Non-violent crimes	“Should be provided assistance as long as they are non-violent [ <i>sic</i> ] and not a threat to society”
Self-Improvement	“If the person has shown remorse and attempted to improve their goals in life during punishment.”
Should be given housing assistance	“Just like any other person who needs assistance they should be entitled to the same things”
Unable to find employment	“If they are unemployed but seeking work.”

Table 17 provides the in vivo codes that answered the question What circumstances do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance? An example of participants response for each code was also attached to Table 17. A select few participants believed prior offers when released from incarceration should not receive any assistance. One participant responded with, "Support to meet basic needs of housing and employment. Counseling and follow-up to ensure that the transition to civilian life is being accomplished. Most offenders are aware of their proclivity level to re-offend and can cooperate in their rehabilitation and anger management.", while

another participant said, "They need to do it themselves." State and or federal government, family, church, taxpayers, no one, and offenders themselves were organizations, and people whom respondents believed should be responsible for paying for the assistance prior offenders needed when asked: In your opinion, who is responsible for providing housing assistance to offenders after they are released from incarceration? One year was the most frequent amount of time participants felt prior offenders should receive housing assistance followed by two years, six months, three years, and dependent on the crime. A few participants responded to the survey question. What do you think should be the length of time housing assistance should be given to a former offender? With "a maximum penalty," "Just couple of weeks," and "as long as needed." Participants were not only asked about their opinion on offender housing assistance but regarding the term offender as well.

***Theme: Offender Opinion is Derived from Somewhere***

Second chances, none, do not be quick to judge, criminal behavior will not change, and offenders are humans that make mistakes were In Vivo coding uncovered from the question What are some beliefs and values that you have learned from others concerning to a former offender? Some examples of participants responses are as follows: "Do not trust my personal and banking information," "Don't be too judgmental [*sic*] because you don't know what he is going through," "The are people too," "You have to be very careful," and "Each is unique and should be evaluated individually." Respondents learned about offenders from being incarcerated themselves, school, working in law enforcement, family, and media. Con, convict, felon, criminal, ex-con, jailbird, and none

were the most common labels participants heard offender referred to as. Offender crimes were important to participants for numerous reasons, such as when the crime was related to murder, children, violent crimes, any crimes, and depending on the severity of the crime committed.

The question When would you identify an offender's crime as important? Received responses such as "Depends on what they did", "I would always identify a crime as important, no matter what crime it is. I might view it as less important if it was a relatively minor crime and/or it was committed a long time", "Any injury to a person or significant damage/loss [*sic*] of property," and "Violent or sexual." Not only did various participants have an opinion on when a crime was important, but participants were also able to identify stereotypes regarding offenders that they still believe. Respondents considered stereotypes such as "Drugs are the endgame, and it's a dead end game for many former offenders," "will reoffend when they get out," and "Dangerous, shifty, unreliable, black, poor, junkies" as truth. If participants still held negative stereotypes towards former offenders, would the individual allow a prior offender to reside with them? The next section address participants' opinion on former convicted offenders residing with them personally.

***Theme: Offenders can Reside with Someone but not me***

There were four participants who specifically stated an offender with a prior crime could reside with them. A total of 44 participants agreed that a prior offender should receive housing assistance but did not specifically agree to a prior offender living with them. There were eight respondents who did not want a prior offender living with

them. Three participants used the phrase "Absolutely no housing assistance using tax dollars from United StatesA. citizens", "Don't believe in it", and "Guide them provide for their [*sic*] own don't [*sic*] give handout" when declining housing assistance within their own home. Other participants felt providing housing assistance was unsafe or doing so depends on the crime committed. Participants were asked to describe the offender crimes they would allow to reside with you and for how long? Most participants did not identify a timeframe a prior offender can reside with them; however, 45 participants said no to an offender with any criminal offense living in their home. The six participants that did specify a length of time a prior offender can reside within their home replied with less than six months to one year as the timeframe. Nine respondents implied that an offender with any crime can reside with them, but with stipulations; for instance, one participant stated, "just about any as long as they are behaving in an appropriate manner." Other respondents would allow offenders to reside within their homes if the crime was non-violent, tax evasion, or domestic self-defense violence. Fifty-four respondents said no to the survey question, would you recommend other people opening their place of residence to previous offenders to provide housing assistance? There were 24 participants who would recommend other people housing a previous offender: however, four respondents yes but with stipulations. Table 18 contains additional records of the In Vivo Coding and respondent replies. When participants thought about an offender living with them, 24 felt fear, 16 felt nervous, 14 stated they did not want any strangers living with them and did not identify a feeling, eight felt unsure, other eight participants stated it would depend on the crime, seven did not have any feelings, six felt concerned, and the remaining

participant listed a host of other emotions including a mixture of emotions. When not in their personal home but at the store, respondents felt that some former offenders could be identified by prison-like mannerisms, tattoos, body language, and speech. There were 31 participants who explained there was no way for them to identify who a former offender was if they were at the store or at dinner, whereas 37 participants did not try and identify former offenders.

**Table 18**

*Would you recommend other people opening their place of residence to previous offenders in order to provide housing assistance?*

In Vivo Coding	Example quote
Depends	“Depends on the housing circumstances.”
No	“NO, THEY NEED TO LIVE [ <i>sic</i> ] ALONE”
Open-mindedness	“They should be open minded”
Unsure	“I’d have to think about that.”
Yes	“Yes, and also Planning and Zoning authorities [ <i>sic</i> ] should become part of the justice system”
Yes with Stipulations	“If they knew [ <i>sic</i> ] the person, and knew they were a good person.”

The question *Would you recommend other people opening their place of residence to previous offenders in order to provide housing assistance*, in vivo codes and participant responses was displayed in Table 18. For instance, the in vivo code unsure was assigned to a participant who stated, “I’d have to think about that.”

### *Secondary Data*

One Department of Correction (DOC) facility located in the Southern United States Census regions provided data for 637 offenders. There were 11 types of housing accommodation options in which offenders in the Southern DOC facility planned to reside upon their release from incarceration. There were 14 offenders who planned to live with their child; 34 offenders had a detainer and would be released to another law enforcement agency's custody; 45 offenders would stay with a friend; 30 offenders would live with a grandparent; 11 offenders had no housing assignment listed; one offender listed other as a housing assignment that was not identified; 59 offenders chose other family to reside with; 96 offenders had their own house or apartment; 198 offenders would live with a parent; 57 offenders would stay with a sibling, and 95 offenders would reside in a transitional house after being released from incarceration. There were 254 offenders who were incarcerated on a drug-related charge, with an additional 19 offenders who had a criminal charge titled "Simul. Poss. Of Drugs/Firearm". Drug-related charges were the most common crime offenders in the Southern DOC facility, followed by burglary and robbery-related charges. A total of 71 people were incarcerated burglary related crimes, whereas 45 offenders were incarcerated for robbery-related charges. Offenders were convicted of rape, murder, and stalking, the least at only one offender for each type of crime. A total of 17 criminal offense type in vivo codes was discovered and have been outlined in Appendix S. There was only one DOC facility used



for this which is in common with the only one interview that was obtained for this research.

### ***Interview Data***

A halfway house in the South accepted former offenders as residents except for former offenders who have a terminal illness or who have been convicted of a sexually related crime. When asked the survey question, Does the label offender effect how much security deposit or rent a convicted offender will have to pay?

The interviewee responded with, "No we operate a structured program geared at assisting the offender in reclaiming their place in society. We do not charge rent, but a program service fee per man per week/month". There were no other interviews obtained which limited the ability to code and compare to other housing facilities. The interview section summarized the interview results, and the next section discusses the trustworthiness of each of the data methods, including the interview.

### **Evidence of Trustworthiness**

There was no change in the credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability strategies outlined in Chapter 3. A doctoral student at Walden University from the Psychology department reviewed the interview and survey questions. Questions that may have been confusing or written above a fifth-grade level were revised. An appointment was made with a doctoral capstone mixed-method methodologist at Walden University, who suggested a sample size of 30 for survey participants. A total number of 104 survey participants was obtained, which is six participants short of the sample quoted in chapter 3. Although a total of 110 was not used for the survey portion of the research,

the number required for a normal distribution for quantitative testing purposes was still achieved. Data saturation was met for survey data but not for interview data. The obtainment of online public available data was used to add to the data that was not received from an interview. Online public information met data saturation. Secondary data had over 300 inmates information provided from the Department of Correction, which although DOC's could not be compared to each other, the information that was received contributed to the data saturation of secondary data. A mixture of data gathered from interview data, survey data, secondary data, and the addition of online publicly available data assisted with transferability and dependability. Quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed separated, a summary was given in the summary section of Chapter 4, and a detailed interpretation was given in chapter 5. Reflexivity along with confirmability was conducted by using a Microsoft word document to record the qualitative coding process, the researcher's thoughts, and the things that may have impacted the researcher. The researcher coded and tested all data without assistance and used the in Vivo and Value coding.

### **Summary**

Data testing and analysis revealed that 63 out of 101 participants had a separate space for guests to reside in a while visiting. An additional 16 participants stated they would allow guests, but the individual would have to sleep on an air mattress, couch, and or floor. There were 21 participants with a yes response, and 22 respondents had a depends on response when asked Would the items available to a guest changed if the guest was a former offender? Less than half of survey participants (44) believed former

offenders should receive housing assistance but did not specify whether the former offender could reside with them. When asked if participants would change their opinion on whether former offenders should be given housing assistance: 41 participants said yes if the individual was a family member, 48 participants said yes if the former offender had a substance addiction, 62 respondents said yes if the offender had a mental health problem, and 58 respondents said yes if the prior offender was a veteran.

There were 45 participants who would not allow an offender to stay at their home, 3 participants were unsure, and two respondents did not answer. Inmates exiting the Southern DOC planned to live with their child, friend, grandparent, family, parent, sibling, own apartment or house, transitional house, or the offender would detain until another law enforcement agency picks the individual up. Out of 637 Southern DOC Inmates, 358 inmates, which is over half of the provided sample, estimated that they would stay with a family member when they are released from incarceration. The facility halfway house owner who was interviewed would allow former offenders in the resident if the individual did not have a terminal illness or sexual offender offenses. Survey participants mostly learned about offenders from the media (22 participants). There were 23 virtual survey participants whose thoughts towards offenders reflected the belief that a former offender is still a person, whereas 29 participants' thoughts were dependent on different variables such as if the crime committed was victimless, misdemeanor, or culture.

Online survey participants held a variety of different beliefs and values towards former offenders, such as 12 participants believed the offender deserved a second chance,

seven believed former offenders could change, six former offenders could not be trusted, and six participants believed all offenders were the same. The words jailbird (16 respondents) and con (16 participants) were the top two labels and titles former offenders heard directed towards former offenders. A public housing search revealed that under 100 apartments out of 287 apartments identified on their website specified crimes that would result in a declined application if the application asked criminal history questions and or made potential applications aware that a background check would be conducted. Some apartment housing facilities denied applications if a former offender was convicted of a misdemeanor, felony, sex offender, or drug-related charges. There were 18 halfway house websites out of 84 that listed an online application question pertaining to applications criminal history, background check, or application disqualification. Arson, violent crimes and sex offenders were the few specified crimes listed on the eight halfway houses website. Only one residential treatment housing program website mentioned a crime type being no sex offenders, out of the 53 residential treatment housing online webpage reviewed. Public housing research, DOC data, virtual survey information, and interview group interpretation will be conducted in the first two sections of chapter 5.

## Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this mixed-method study was to explore United States adult societal members' perception of the term offender and crime type concerning post-incarceration housing accommodations in the United States. The study's nature consisted of a mixed-method parallel concurrent with secondary data, virtual survey data, interview day, and publicly available online data was added to the research and used as data collection methods. Housing accommodation types, crime type, and offender demographics were variables included in this study. Quantifiable data were tested using descriptive statistics, ANOVA, chi-square, multiple regression, Pearson's correlation coefficient, and *t-test*. Interview and virtual survey data were coded using in vivo and value coding. I tested quantitative data tested first separately from qualitative data. The literature reviewed indicated that an offender's housing arrangements post-release may influence recidivism.

### **Interpretation of the Findings**

There was limited research found and documented in the literature review that discussed criminal offense type and housing accommodation options or society perception regarding offenders and how society members' opinion may influence offender housing options. Interpreting the available data resulted in accepting the null hypothesis that United States adult societal member perception of the term offender and crime type bias will not influence post-incarcerated housing accommodations. Most virtual survey participants learned about offenders from the media. Seventy-three virtual

survey participants still held stereotypes about offenders such as bad; the individuals will always re-offend, and the former offenders cannot be trusted; however, over 40 participants felt a former offender should still receive housing assistance when leaving incarceration. Secondary data from a southern state DOC facility found that the housing plan was not dependent on crime.

There were approximately 301 inmates who planned to stay with a family member after they were released from incarceration. Virtual survey data estimated that 30 participants would allow their families to reside within their homes. When combining apartments, halfway houses, and residential treatment housing programs, 119 housing types identified crimes and or criminal offenses that would result in a declined housing application such as arson and sexual offender. Publicly available data tested using a one-way ANOVA and T-test indicated that a relationship did not exist between the variables housing type and application requirements. Not enough data from the Chi-Square test was available to suggest a connection between the two variables.

A multiple regression test revealed a weak relationship between the variables housing type and application requirements; however, a Pearson Correlation Test indicated a significant positive relationship. Forty-five participants took the virtual survey and specifically stated they did not want a former offender residing within their home. Forty-four participants felt former offenders should receive housing; however, they did not say they would be willing to help. When participants were asked to describe what crimes a former offender would allow residing within their household, 45 participants said none, and nine would allow anyone but with stipulations. Twenty-six virtual survey

respondents would allow participants with non-violent crimes to reside within their residence. Forty-six participants had feelings of fear, nervousness, and concern when they thought about a former offender living in their home. Sixty-eight participants responded that there was no way, or you don't identify a person's outward appearance to determine if the individual was a former offender.

### **Limitations of the Study**

There are several weaknesses in using a solely non-experimental exploratory quantitative design, balanced by a qualitative component in the research design. Anyone under the age of 18 years old and those not located in the United States of America were excluded from this survey. Offender secondary data were gathered from two DOC facilities but not directly from the perception of prior offenders. Out of the available DOCs, only two responded and agreed to participate in the study; as a result, possible housing plan data were limited to what was provided. One out of two DOC facilities recorded offender housing location data post-release. DOC housing plan data estimate where a former offender plans to reside post-incarceration, not where an offender lives. The two DOCs that agreed to participate in the study did not keep follow-up records of where an offender ended up living after their correctional sentence was complete. Online surveys and interviews did not allow for follow-up questions; therefore, if a participant did not answer the questions in-depth, there was no way to clarify the information. Only one interview prospective responded to the interview participant request; therefore, the minimum number of six interviews was not obtained. Delimitation during data collection included adding publicly available data to see in the interview questions could be

answered with the information available online and stopping the seeking of interview data by contacting apartments, halfway houses, and residential treatment housing facilities.

### **Recommendations**

Less than five virtual survey participants suggested that there were too many survey questions and that the survey questions appeared to be repetitive. One recommendation is to make the survey questions more condensed and decrease open-ended questions—the COVID-19 pandemic caused in-person solicitation of interview and survey participants almost impossible. When contacting halfway houses, one manager suggested that they would complete the interview; however, I must come in person due to the manager's schedule. I could not visit the halfway house in person because the facility was in Ohio and not close to my location. A second recommendation is to limit interviews to a drivable distance from the researcher's primary housing location and to go in person to solicit participants.

### **Implications**

The research of societal members' perception regarding offenders provided information about the possible labeling of an offender and available offender post-release housing accommodation options that contributed to why an offender re-offends. Over half of virtual survey participants still held negative stereotypes about a former offender and believed former offenders should receive assistance post-incarceration; however, close to half of the participants would not be willing to provide housing assistance for several reasons. Crime type was a major deciding factor when participants determined to



help a former offender with housing assistance. Public housing potential resident applications were not transparent in providing application denial reasons. A former offender may have to apply or call before knowing if their criminal offense would be accepted. The information derived from this study may impact positive social change in the following ways. Society members may become more knowledgeable about the assumptions they hold about someone who has committed a crime and how they judge a person by their outward appearance.

United States individuals and family members may become aware that many offenders plan to stay with a family or friend after being released from incarceration due to a lack of potential post-incarceration housing programs and funding. Research data may add to justice organizations' recidivism pool information, thus adding material that many an offender's family may not be willing to house a convicted offender. Data may inform organizations that a former offender may not be accepted into an apartment, halfway house, or residential treatment facility without housing assistance based on their criminal offense. Justice social change organizations may be willing to add policies that require housing accommodations facilities to disclose criminal offense types that could result in an application being declined before a former offender formally applies. Several housing accommodation options require application and leasing fees that are non-refundable. Society housing policies may change to require the refund of application-related fees if a housing accommodation facility does not disclose a criminal offense, resulting in a declined housing application. Housing policies might include the idea if a housing application was declined after a former offender applied for housing due to a

criminal offense. Not all members of society have money saved that would cover accommodation if they were incarcerated. Research indicates that many offenders, when released from incarceration, may become homeless and re-offend (Eggleton et al., 2016; Kendall et al., 2018). Housing offenders with incarceration facilities are costly to society members (Pleggenkuhle, 2017), and organizations that consider developing a post-incarceration housing program may lower incarceration costs and recidivism rates.

### **Conclusions**

United States society members support offenders whether they are aware or not by contributing to incarceration houses or allowing a prior offender to reside in their homes. Society members are more likely to agree to former offenders receiving housing assistance if the individual had a mental illness, addiction, or a veteran. Many society members still hold negative stereotypes against former offenders, although research data suggested that a relationship does not exist between housing and criminal type. Society members may not want to have a former offender residing in their home due to feelings of fear, nervousness, and disapproval. This research added information to recidivism literature and provided an indication of the importance of an offender's housing post-incarceration. Public housing accommodation options are more likely not to provide information about whether they will house a convicted offender. Most offenders do have a tentative plan for where they plan to reside after incarceration; however, they may not be able to. Prior research suggests reoffending many continue, and the cost of recidivism may not change if offender post-incarceration housing options are not addressed (Eggleton et al., 2016; Kendall et al., 2018; Pleggenkuhle, 2017).

## References

- Alarid, L. F., & Rubin, M. (2018). Misdemeanor arrestees with mental health needs: Diversion and outpatient services as a recidivism reduction strategy. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62(3), 575–590. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X16652892>
- Amasa-Annang, J., & Scutelnicu, G. (2016). How Promising is the Second Chance Act in Reducing Recidivism among Male Ex-Offenders in Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi? *Journal of Public Management & Social Policy*, 23(2), 22–37.
- Andersen, T. S. (2018). Social support and one-year outcomes for women participating in prison-based substance abuse treatment programming. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 31(1), 80–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2017.1396218>
- Andersen, T. S., Scott, D. A. I., Boehme, H. M., King, S., & Mikell, T. (2020). What matters to formerly incarcerated men? Looking beyond recidivism as a measure of successful reintegration. *Prison Journal*, 100(4), 488–509. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885520939295>
- Anderson, R. E., Geier, T. J., & Cahill, S. P. (2016). Epidemiological associations between posttraumatic stress disorder and incarceration in the National Survey of American Life. *Criminal Behaviour & Mental Health*, 26(2), 110–123. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.1951>
- Anestis, J. C., & Carbonell, J. L. (2014). Stopping the revolving door: Effectiveness of mental health court in reducing recidivism by mentally ill offenders. *Psychiatric Services*, 65(9), 1105–1112. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201300305>

- Arno, C. (2015). Proportional response: The need for more-- and more standardized-- veterans' courts. *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*, 48(4), 1039–1072.
- Babbie, E. R. (2017). *The basics of social research* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Bachman, R., Kerrison, E. M., Paternoster, R., Smith, L., & O'Connell, D. (2016). The complex relationship between motherhood and desistance. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 26(3), 212–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2015.1113153>
- Baker, J. N. A. (2015). Mental health courts. *Judges' Journal*, 54(2), 1.
- Baker, T., Zgoba, K., & Gordon, J. A. (2021). Incarcerated for a sex offense: In-prison experiences and concerns about reentry. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 33(2), 135–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063219884588>
- Balyakina, E., Mann, C., Ellison, M., Sivernell, R., Fulda, K., Sarai, S., & Cardarelli, R. (2014). Risk of future offense among probationers with co-occurring substance use and mental health disorders. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 50(3), 288–295. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-013-9624-4>
- Barrenger, S., Draine, J., Angell, B., & Herman, D. (2017). Reincarceration risk among men with mental illnesses leaving prison: A risk environment analysis. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 53(8), 883–892. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-017-0113-z>
- Barta, W. D., Fisher, V., & Hynes, P. (2017). Decreased re-conviction rates of DUI offenders with intensive supervision and home confinement. *American Journal of*

*Drug & Alcohol Abuse*, 43(6), 742–746.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00952990.2016.1237519>

Beadnell, B., Crisafulli, M. A., Stafford, P. A., Rosengren, D. B., & DiClemente, C. C.

(2015). Operating under the influence: Three-year recidivism rates for motivation-enhancing versus standard care programs. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 80,

48–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2015.03.027>

Bean, P., Brown, G., Hallinan, P., Becerra, S., & Lewis, D. (2017). Improved recovery of repeat intoxicated drivers using fingernails and blood spots to monitor alcohol and other substance abuse. *Traffic Injury Prevention*, 18(1), 9–18.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15389588.2016.1190014>

Beggan, J. (2004). Labeling theory. In G. R. Goethals, G. J. Sorenson & J. M. Burns

(Eds.), *Encyclopedia of leadership* (Vol. 1, pp. 809-812). SAGE Publications, Inc.

<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412952392.n187>

Bellair, P. E., Vuolo, M., & LaPlant, E. G. (2018). Frequent drug use and negative

employment outcomes among the criminally active. *Substance Use & Misuse*,

53(5), 828–836. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2017.1388260>

Bender, A. K., Bucholz, K. K., Heath, A. C., & McCutcheon, V. V. (2018). Comparison of characteristics of female drivers with single and multiple DUI convictions.

*Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, 42(3), 646–653.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.13590>

Bennett, D. C., Morris, D. H., Sexton, M. B., Bonar, E. E., & Chermack, S. T. (2018).

Associations between posttraumatic stress and legal charges among substance

using veterans. *Law & Human Behavior (American Psychological Association)*, 42(2), 135–144. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000268>

Berghuis, M. (2018). Reentry programs for adult male offender recidivism and reintegration: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology*, 62(14), 4655–4676. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X18778448>

Besemer, S., Farrington, D. P., & Bijleveld, C. C. J. H. (2017). Labeling and intergenerational transmission of crime: The interaction between criminal justice intervention and a convicted parent. *PLoS ONE*, 12(3), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0172419>

Best, B. L., Wodahl, E. J., & Holmes, M. D. (2014). Waiving away the chance of freedom: Exploring why prisoners decide against applying for parole. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 58(3), 320–347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X12470812>

Best, J. (2004). Theoretical issues in the study of social problems and deviance. In G. Ritzer *Handbook of social problems: A comparative international perspective* (pp. 14-29). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412973526.n>

Blank Wilson, A., Draine, J., Barrenger, S., Hadley, T., & Evans, A. (2014). Examining the impact of mental illness and substance use on time till re-incarceration in a county jail. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health*

*Services Research; New York*, 41(3), 293–301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0467-7>

Blonigen, D. M., Rodriguez, A. L., Manfredi, L., Britt, J., Nevedal, A., Finlay, A. K., Rosenthal, J., Smelson, D., & Timko, C. (2017). The availability and utility of services to address risk factors for recidivism among justice-involved veterans. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 28(8), 790–813.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403416628601>

Boland, J. K., & Rosenfeld, B. (2018). The role of controlled substance use in diversion outcomes among mentally ill offenders: A pilot study. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62(9), 2709–2725.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X17735093>

Boppre, B., & Reed, S. M. (2021). “I’m Not a Number, I’m a Human Being:” A Phenomenological Study of Women’s Responses to Labeling. *Feminist Criminology*, 16(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085120953488>

Bouchard, J., & Wong, J. S. (2018). The new panopticon? Examining the effect of home confinement on criminal recidivism. *Victims & Offenders*, 13(5), 589–608.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2017.1392387>

Boutros, A., Kang, S. S., & Boutros, N. N. (2018). A cyclical path to recovery: Calling into question the wisdom of incarceration after restoration. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 57, 100–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2018.01.007>

Bronson, J., & Berzofsky, M. (2017). Indicators of mental health problems reported by prisoners and jail inmates (No. NCJ 250612; pp. 1–17). Retrieved from United

States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice

Statistics website: <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/imhprpji1112.pdf>

Bronson, J., Stroop, J., Zimmer, S., & Berzofsky, M. (2017). *Drug use, dependence, and abuse among state and jail inmates* (No. NCJ 250546; pp. 1–27). Retrieved from

United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of

Justice Statistics website: <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/dudaspi0709.pdf>

Brown, S. L., Xie, Y., & Scarbrough, A. W. (2019). Pre–post release health in US adult male convicts. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 45(5), 609–621.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01488376.2018.1487362>

Bryson, W. C., Cotton, B. P., Barry, L. C., Bruce, M. L., Piel, J., Thielke, S. M., &

Williams, B. A. (2019). Mental health treatment among older adults with mental illness on parole or probation. *Health & Justice*, 7(1), 4.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-019-0084-y>

Bunting, A. M., Oser, C. B., Staton, M., Eddens, K. S., & Knudsen, H. (2018). Clinician identified barriers to treatment for individuals in Appalachia with opioid use disorder following release from prison: A social ecological approach. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice*, 13(1), 23. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13722-018-0124-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13722-018-0124-2)

[2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13722-018-0124-2)

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (n.d.-a). *Terms & definitions: Community corrections (probation and parole)*. Retrieved from

<https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tdtp&tid=15#:~:text=Probation%20and%20Pa>



role), Community%20corrections, referred%20to%20as%20community%20supervision.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (n.d.-b). *Violent crime*. Retrieved from

<https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=31>

Call, C. (2018). The community corrections perspective toward sex offender management policies and collateral consequences: Does contact with sex offenders matter?

*Criminal Justice Studies*, 31(1), 1–17.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2017.1393418>

Canada, K. E., Brinkley, A., Peters, C., & Albright, D. L. (2015). Military veterans:

Therapeutic journaling in a veterans treatment court. *Journal of Poetry Therapy*,

28(2), 113–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08893675.2015.1011373>

Cannonier, C., Galloway Burke, M., & Mitchell, E. (2021). The Impact of a Reentry and Aftercare Program on Recidivism. *The Review of Black Political Economy*, 48(1),

93–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034644620973931>

Carey, M. T., & Luo, F. (2020). Intended and unintended benefits of specialty courts:

results from a Texas DWI court. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 59(5), 247–

266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2020.1745979>

Caudy, M. S., Folk, J. B., Stuewig, J. B., Wooditch, A., Martinez, A., Maass, S.,

Tangney, J. P., & Taxman, F. S. (2015). Does substance misuse moderate the relationship between criminal thinking and recidivism? *Journal of Criminal*

*Justice*, 43(1), 12–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2014.11.001>

- Caudy, M. S., Tang, L., Wooditch, A., & Taxman, F. S. (2014). Short-term trajectories of substance use in a sample of drug-involved probationers. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 46*(2), 202–213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2013.07.006>
- Chamaki, F. N., Jenkins, G. P., & Hashemi, M. (2019). Social Impact Bonds: Implementation, Evaluation, and Monitoring. *International Journal of Public Administration, 42*(4), 289–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2018.1433206>
- Chamberlain, A., Nyamu, S., Aminawung, J., Wang, E. A., Shavit, S., & Fox, A. D. (2019). Illicit substance use after release from prison among formerly incarcerated primary care patients: A cross-sectional study. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice, 14*(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13722-019-0136-6>
- Chaple, M., Sacks, S., McKendrick, K., Marsch, L., Belenko, S., Leukefeld, C., Prendergast, M., & French, M. (2014). Feasibility of a computerized intervention for offenders with substance use disorders: a research note. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 10*(1), 105–127. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-013-9187-y>
- Cheesman, F. L., Graves, S. E., Holt, K., Kunkel, T. L., Lee, C. G., & White, M. T. (2016). Drug court effectiveness and efficiency: Findings for Virginia. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly, 34*(2), 143–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07347324.2016.1148486>
- Cimino, A. N., Mendoza, N., Thieleman, K., Shively, R., & Kunz, K. (2015). Women reentering the community: Understanding addiction and trauma-related

- characteristics of recidivism. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 25(5), 468–476. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2014.983257>
- Clark, C. B., Hendricks, P. S., Lane, P. S., Trent, L., & Cropsey, K. L. (2014a). Methadone maintenance treatment may improve completion rates and delay opioid relapse for opioid dependent individuals under community corrections supervision. *Addictive Behaviors*, 39(12), 1736–1740. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.07.011>
- Clark, C. B., Reiland, S., Thorne, C., & Cropsey, K. L. (2014b). Relationship of Trauma Exposure and Substance Abuse to Self-Reported Violence Among Men and Women in Substance Abuse Treatment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(8), 1514–1530. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513507138>
- Clark, V. (2015). Making the most of second chances: An evaluation of Minnesota’s high-risk revocation reduction reentry program. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(2), 193–215. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9216-5>
- Collins, S. E., Lonczak, H. S., & Clifasefi, S. L. (2017). Seattle’s law enforcement assisted diversion (LEAD): Program effects on recidivism outcomes. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 64, 49–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2017.05.008>
- Connolly, K., & Granfield, R. (2017). Building recovery capital: the role of faith-based communities in the reintegration of formerly incarcerated drug offenders. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 47(3), 370–382. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022042617696916>

- Contrino, K. M., Nochajski, T., Farrell, M. G., & Logsdon, E. (2016). Factors of success: Drug court graduate exit interviews. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, (1), 136. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-015-9333-3>
- Cornell Law School. (n.d.). *Crime*. Retrieved from <https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/crime>
- Costopoulos, J. S., Plewinski, A. M., Monaghan, P. L., & Edkins, V. A. (2017). The impact of US government assistance on recidivism. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 27(4), 303–311. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.1997>
- Craig, J. M., Piquero, A. R., Murray, J., & Farrington, D. P. (2018). A quasi-experimental test of the effects of criminal justice involvement on later mental health. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 14(4), 485–506. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-018-9341-7>
- Cuddeback, G. S., Grady, M., Blank Wilson, A., Van Deinse, T., & Morrissey, J. P. (2019). Persons with severe mental illnesses and sex offenses: Recidivism after prison release. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 63(12), 2157–2170. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X19842994>
- Cusack, M., & Montgomery, A. E. (2017). The role of eviction in veterans' homelessness recidivism. *Journal of Social Distress & the Homeless*, 26(1), 58–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10530789.2017.1314093>
- D'Alessio, S., Stolzenberg, L., & Flexon, J. (2015). The effect of Hawaii's ban the box law on repeat offending. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40(2), 336–352. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-014-9251-9>

- Datchi, C. C., Barretti, L. M., & Thompson, C. M. (2016). Family services in adult detention centers: Systemic principles for prisoner reentry. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice*, 5(2), 89–104.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/cfp0000057>
- Davidson, K. M., & Young, J. T. N. (2019). Treatment engagement in a prison-based therapeutic community: A mixed-methods approach. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 103, 33–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2019.05.011>
- Davis, M., Sheidow, A., & McCart, M. (2015). Reducing recidivism and symptoms in emerging adults with serious mental health conditions and justice system involvement. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 42(2), 172–190.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-014-9425-8>
- Decoteau, A. (2019). Housing and recidivism: The critical link to reducing Louisiana’s bulging prisons. *Southern University Law Review*, 2, 346.  
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3379210>
- Definitions of A.R.S. 1 §13-105.
- DeMichele, M., Payne, B., & Lowe, N. (2016). Identifying the characteristics of chronic drunk drivers using a criminological lens. *Crime & Delinquency*, 62(12), 1570–1596. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128713510079>
- DeVall, K. E., Gregory, P. D., & Hartmann, D. J. (2017). Extending recidivism monitoring for drug courts: Methods issues and policy implications. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(1), 80–99.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15590205>

- Dickerson, J. G., & Stacer, M. J. (2015). Participants and those who opted out: An exploratory recidivism study of the Vanderburgh County (Indiana) treatment court. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences; Cumberland*, 8(8), 455–466.
- Dobmeier, R. A., Korn, S. K., Johnson, C., Fleck, C. M., Cenci, E. S., Giglia, L. A., Broomfield, R. M., & Morde, M. D. (2017). Reentry needs: Men who are young, Hispanic, older, or with mental illness. *Adulthood Journal*, 16(2), 93–105.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/adsp.12038>
- Dong, K. R., Must, A., Tang, A. M., Beckwith, C. G., & Stopka, T. J. (2018). Competing priorities that rival health in adults on probation in Rhode Island: Substance use recovery, employment, housing, and food intake. *BMC Public Health*, 18(1), 289–289. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5201-7>
- Drawve, G., Caplan, J., & Ostermann, M. (2019). Utilizing a risk of crime measure for recidivism research: Moving environmental corrections forward. *Crime & Delinquency*, 65(5), 606–629. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128718779359>
- Duwe, G. (2015). Does release planning for serious and persistent mental illness offenders reduce recidivism? Results from an outcome evaluation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 54(1), 19–36.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2014.974854>
- Egleton, M. C., Banigo, D. M., McLeod, B. A., & Vakalahi, H. F. O. (2016). Homelessness among formerly incarcerated African American men: Contributors and consequences. *Contemporary Social Science*, 11(4), 403–413.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2016.1258590>

- Erickson, J. W. (2016). Veterans treatment courts: A case study of their efficacy for Veterans' needs. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 49, 221–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2016.10.009>
- Evans, D. N., & Porter, J. R. (2015). Criminal history and landlord rental decisions: A New York quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(1), 21–42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9217-4>
- Farabee, D., Hall, E., Zaheer, A., & Joshi, V. (2019). The impact of perceived stigma on psychiatric care and outcomes for correctional mental health patients. *Psychiatry Research*, 276, 191–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2019.05.018>
- Farringer, A. J., Duriez, S. A., Manchak, S. M., & Sullivan, C. C. (2019). Adherence to “What Works”: Examining trends across 14 years of correctional program assessment. *Corrections*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2019.1659193>
- Fishman, D. B. (2017). The pragmatic case study in psychotherapy: A mixed methods approach informed by psychology's striving for methodological quality. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 45(3), 238–252. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-016-0612-3>
- Fontaine, J. (2013). The role of supportive housing in successful reentry outcomes for disabled prisoners. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 15(3), 53-75-. Retrieved from
- Frisman, L. K., Lin, H., Rodis, E. T., Grzelak, J., Aiello, M., & Lin, H.-J. (2017). Evaluation of CT's ASIST program: Specialized services to divert higher risk defendants. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 35(5/6), 550–561. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2302>

- Fuller, J. (2003). Aggression: Sociological theories. In E. Hickey (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of murder and violent crime* (pp. 20-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412950619.n7>
- Gaes, G., Bales, W., & Scaggs, S. (2016). The effect of imprisonment on recommitment: An analysis using exact, coarsened exact, and radius matching with the propensity score. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *12*(1), 143–158.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-015-9251-x>
- Gallagher, J. R. (2014). Predicting criminal recidivism following drug court: Implications for drug court practice and policy advocacy. *Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling*, *35*(1), 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1874.2014.00021.x>
- Gallagher, J. R., Nordberg, A., Deranek, M. S., Ivory, E., Carlton, J., & Miller, J. W. (2015). Predicting termination from drug court and comparing recidivism patterns: Treating substance use disorders in criminal justice settings. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, *33*(1), 28–43.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07347324.2015.982451>
- Gallagher, J. R., Nordberg, A., & Gallagher, J. M. (2018a). Participants' views on the strengths and limitations of drug court: Recommendations to enhance assessment and treatment of mental illnesses. *Social Work in Mental Health*, *16*(4), 436–450.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15332985.2017.1419536>
- Gallagher, J. R., & Wahler, E. A. (2018). Racial disparities in drug court graduation rates: The role of recovery support groups and environments. *Journal of Social Work*



*Practice in the Addictions*, 18(2), 113–127.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1533256X.2018.1448277>

Gallagher, J. R., Wahler, E. A., Lefebvre, E., Paiano, T., Carlton, J., & Miller, J. W.

(2018b). Improving graduation rates in drug court through employment and schooling opportunities and medication-assisted treatment (MAT). *Journal of Social Service Research*, 44(3), 343–349.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01488376.2018.1472173>

Garland, B., Wodahl, E., & Saxon, C. (2017). What influences public support of transitional housing facilities for offenders during reentry? *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 28(1), 18–40.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403414564866>

Gill, K. J., & Murphy, A. A. (2017). Jail diversion for persons with serious mental illness coordinated by a prosecutor's office. *BioMed Research International*, 2017, 1–7.

<https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/7917616>

Giordano, V. A. (2016). Treatment or jail public support of drug treatment options.

*Corrections Today*, 78(6), 26-30.

Gold, M. E., & Richards, H. (2012). To label or not to label: The special education

question for African Americans. *Educational Foundations*, 26(1/2), 143–156.

Gordon, M. S., Kinlock, T. W., Schwartz, R. P., Couvillion, K. A., Sudec, L. J., O'Grady,

K. E., Vocci, F. J., & Shabazz, H. (2015). Buprenorphine treatment for probationers and parolees. *Substance Abuse*, 36(2), 217–225.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/08897077.2014.902787>

- Growns, B., Kinner, S. A., Conroy, E., Baldry, E., & Larney, S. (2018). A systematic review of supported accommodation programs for people released from custody. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62(8), 2174–2194. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X17714108>
- Gunter, T. D., & Philibert, R. A. (2015). Smoking, methylation at AHRR, and recidivism risk in a community correction sample of individuals at high risk for recidivism. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 33(5), 691–700. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2205>
- Han, W., & Redlich, A. D. (2016). The impact of community treatment on recidivism among mental health court participants. *Psychiatric Services*, 67(4), 384–390. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201500006>
- Harding, D. J., Wyse, J. J. B., Dobson, C., & Morenoff, J. D. (2014). Making ends meet after prison. *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management*, 33(2), 440–470. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21741>
- Harmon-Darrow, C. (2022). Conflict Resolution Interventions and Tertiary Violence Prevention Among Urban Nonintimate Adults: A Review of the Literature. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 23(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838020918672>
- Hartley, R. D., & Baldwin, J. M. (2019). Waging war on recidivism among justice-involved veterans: An impact evaluation of a large urban veterans treatment court. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 30(1), 52–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403416650490>

- Herbert, C. W., Morenoff, J. D., & Harding, D. J. (2015). Homelessness and Housing Insecurity Among Former Prisoners. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 1(2), 44. <https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2015.1.2.04>
- Hiday, V. A., Ray, B., & Wales, H. W. (2014). Predictors of mental health court graduation. *Psychology Public Policy and Law*, 20(2), 191–199. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000008>
- Hignite, L. R., & R. Haff, D. (2017). Rapid rehousing of formerly homeless jail and prison inmates. *Housing, Care & Support*, 20(4), 137–151. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HCS-06-2017-0015>
- Hlavka, H., Wheelock, D., & Jones, R. (2015). Exoffender accounts of successful reentry from prison. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 54(6), 406–428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2015.1057630>
- Hollis, M. E., Jennings, W. G., & Hankhouse, S. (2019). An outcome evaluation of a substance abuse program for probationers: Findings from a quasi-experimental design. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44(3), 395–408. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-019-9472-z>
- Holloway, C. P., & Wiener, R. L. (2020). Criminal History, Sex, and Employment: Sex Differences in Ex-Offender Hiring Stigma. *Analyses of Social Issues & Public Policy*, 20(1), 211–229. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12192>
- Hsieh, M.-L., & Hamilton, Z. K. (2016). Predicting success in residential substance abuse interventions: New Jersey's pre-release incarceration alternatives. *Criminal*

*Justice Policy Review*, 27(2), 182–202.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403414556148>

- Huebner, B. M., & Pleggenkuhle, B. (2015). Residential Location, household composition, and recidivism: An analysis by gender. *Justice Quarterly*, 32(5), 818–844. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2013.827231>
- Huynh, K. H., Hall, B., Hurst, M. A., & Bikos, L. H. (2015). Evaluation of the positive re-entry in corrections program: A positive psychology intervention with prison inmates. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(9), 1006–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X14523385>
- Hyatt, J. M., & Barnes, G. C. (2017). An experimental evaluation of the impact of intensive supervision on the recidivism of high-risk probationers. *Crime & Delinquency*, 63(1), 3–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128714555757>
- Hyatt, J. M., & Han, S. (2018). Expanding the focus of correctional evaluations beyond recidivism: The impact of halfway houses on public safety. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 14(2), 187–211. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-018-9326-6>
- Ibañez, G. E., Agudo, M., Martin, S. S., O’Connell, D. J., Auf, R., & Sheehan, D. M. (2017). Offending behavior, drug use, and mental health among foreign-born versus United States born Latino criminal justice clients. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health; New York*, 19(3), 674–685. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-016-0542-8>

Jason, L. A., Olson, B. D., & Harvey, R. (2015). Evaluating alternative aftercare models for ex-offenders. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 45(1), 53–68.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022042614552019>

Jason, L. A., Salina, D., & Ram, D. (2016). Oxford recovery housing: Length of stay correlated with improved outcomes for women previously involved with the criminal justice system. *Substance Abuse*, 37(1), 248–254.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/08897077.2015.1037946>

Jefferson-Jones, J. (2018). Extending “Dignity Takings”: Re-conceptualizing the damage caused by criminal history and ex-offender status. *St. Louis University Law Journal*, 62(4), 863–886.

Jewell, J., Rose, P., Bush, R., & Bartz, K. (2017). The long term effectiveness of drug treatment court on reducing recidivism and predictors of voluntary withdrawal. *International Journal of Mental Health & Addiction*, 15(1), 28–39.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-016-9652-8>

Johnson, J. L. (2017). *Comparison of recidivism studies: AOUSC, USSC, and BJS*. *Federal Probation*, 18(1), 52-54. Retrieved from

[https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/81\\_1\\_6\\_0.pdf](https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/81_1_6_0.pdf)

Johnson, R., Stolar, A., McGuire, J., Clark, S., Coonan, L., Hausknecht, P., & Graham, D. (2016a). US veterans’ court programs: An inventory and analysis of national survey data. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 52(2), 180–186.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-015-9972-3>

- Johnson, R. S., Stolar, A. G., McGuire, J. F., Mittakanti, K., Clark, S., Coonan, L. A., & Graham, D. P. (2016b). Predictors of incarceration of veterans participating in United States veterans' courts. *Psychiatric Services, 68*(2), 144–150.  
<https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201500266>
- Johnson, R. S., Stolar, A. G., Wu, E., Coonan, L. A., & Graham, D. P. (2015). An analysis of successful outcomes and associated contributing factors in veterans' court. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic; New York, 79*(2), 166–173.  
[https://doi.org/ http://doi.org/101521bumc2015792166](https://doi.org/http://doi.org/101521bumc2015792166)
- Jones, M. A., & Liu, S. (n.d.). *Instrument selection in quantitative studies*. [PDF file].
- Joudrey, P. J., Howell, B. A., Nyhan, K., Moravej, A., Doernberg, M., Ross, J. S., & Wang, E. A. (2021). Reporting of substance use treatment quality in United States adult drug courts. *International Journal of Drug Policy, 90*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2020.103050>
- Katsiyannis, A., Whitford, D. K., Zhang, D., & Gage, N. A. (2018). Adult recidivism in United States: A meta-analysis 1994-2015. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 27*(3), 686–696. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0945-8>
- Kelly, C. E., Welsh, W. N., & Stanley, J. N. (n.d.). The treatment group and recidivism: A multilevel analysis of prison-based substance abuse treatment. *Prison Journal, 99*(5), 515-534. Retrieved from  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885519875002>
- Kendall, S., Redshaw, S., Ward, S., Wayland, S., & Sullivan, E. (2018). Systematic review of qualitative evaluations of reentry programs addressing problematic drug

use and mental health disorders amongst people transitioning from prison to communities. *Health & Justice*, 6(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-018-0063-8>

Kenemore, T. K., & In, B. S. (2020). Relationship matters with citizens returning from prison: qualitative findings from a mentoring program. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 59(6), 315–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2020.1767257>

Kerrison, E. M. (2018). Risky business, risk assessment, and other heteronormative misnomers in women's community corrections and reentry planning. *Punishment & Society*, 20(1), 134–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474517740115>

Killian, M., Cimino, A. N., Mendoza, N. S., Shively, R., & Kunz, K. (2018). Examining trauma and readiness to change among women in a community re-entry program. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 53(4), 648–653. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2017.1355387>

King, E. A., Tripodi, S. J., & Veeh, C. A. (2018). The relationship between severe mental disorders and recidivism in a sample of women released from prison. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 89(3), 717–731. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11126-018-9572-9>

Kirk, D. S. (2019). The association between residential relocation and re-incarceration among drug-dependent former prisoners. *Addiction*, 114(8), 1389–1395. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14617>

Knudsen, K., & Wingenfeld, S. (2016). A specialized treatment court for veterans with trauma exposure: Implications for the field. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 52(2), 127–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-015-9845-9>

- Koetzle, D., Listwan, S. J., Guastafarro, W. P., & Kobus, K. (2015). Treating high-risk offenders in the community: The potential of drug courts. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(5), 449–465.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X13515635>
- Kopak, A., Hoffmann, N., & Guston, K. (2019). Evaluating jail readmission risk with a nine-item behavioral health screen. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Research and Practice*, 19(3), 230–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24732850.2019.1601933>
- Kopak, A., Hoffmann, N., & Proctor, S. (2016a). Key risk factors for relapse and re-arrest among substance use treatment patients involved in the criminal justice system. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(1), 14–30.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-015-9330-6>
- Kopak, A., Hurt, S., Proctor, S., & Hoffmann, N. (2016b). Clinical indicators of successful substance use treatment among adults in the criminal justice system. *International Journal of Mental Health & Addiction*, 14(5), 831–843.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-016-9644-8>
- Koskey, K. L., Sondergeld, T. A., Stewart, V. C., & Pugh, K. J. (2016). Applying the mixed methods instrument development and construct validation process: The transformative experience questionnaire. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*. 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689816633310>
- Kras, K. R., Pleggenkuhle, B., & Huebner, B. M. (2016). A new way of doing time on the outside: Sex offenders' pathways in and out of a transitional housing facility.



*International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 60(5), 512–534. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X14554194>

Krebs, E., Urada, D., Evans, E., Huang, D., Hser, Y., & Nosyk, B. (2017). The costs of crime during and after publicly funded treatment for opioid use disorders: A population-level study for the state of California. *Addiction*, 112(5), 838–851. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.13729>

Lares, L. A., & Montgomery, S. (2020). Psychosocial Needs of Released Long-Term Incarcerated Older Adults. *Criminal Justice Review*, 45(3), 358–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016820913101>

Lee, J. J.-H., Guilamo-Ramos, V., Muñoz-Laboy, M., Lotz, K., & Bornheimer, L. (2016). Mechanisms of familial influence on reentry among formerly incarcerated Latino men. *Social Work*, 61(3), 199–207. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/sww023>

Lee, K., Harding, D. J., & Morenoff, J. D. (2017). Trajectories of neighborhood attainment after prison. *Social Science Research*, 66(2017), 211–233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2016.12.004>

Levenson, J., Ackerman, A. R., Socia, K. M., & Harris, A. J. (2015). Where for art thou? Transient sex offenders and residence restrictions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 26(4), 319–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403413512326>

Liles, A., Thomas, J., & Moak, S. (2018). Predicting program success for adult offenders with serious mental illness in a court ordered diversion program. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 16(6), 665–681. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332985.2018.1476285>

- Lindberg, M. A., & Zeid, D. (2018). Tests of the attachment and developmental dynamic systems theory of crime (ADDSTOC): Toward a differential RDoC diagnostic and treatment approach. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62(12), 3746–3774.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X17750353>
- Link, A. J., & Williams, D. J. (2017). Leisure functioning and offender rehabilitation: A correlational exploration into factors affecting successful reentry. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(2), 150–170.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15600695>
- Link, N. W., & Hamilton, L. K. (2017). The reciprocal lagged effects of substance use and recidivism in a prisoner reentry context. *Health & Justice*, 5(1), 8.  
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-017-0053-2>
- Linn, B. K., Nochajski, T., & Wieczorek, W. (2016). Relationship of aggression, negative affect, substance use problems, and childhood delinquency to DWI recidivism. *American Journal of Drug & Alcohol Abuse*, 42(1), 48–55.  
<https://doi.org/10.3109/00952990.2015.1085541>
- Lize, S. E., Scheyett, A. M., Morgan, C. R., Proescholdbell, K. S., Norwood, T., & Edwards, D. (2015). Violent death rates and risk for released prisoners in North Carolina. *Violence and Victims; New York*, 30(6), 1019–1036. <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-13-00137>
- Lowder, E. M., Desmarais, S. L., & Baucom, D. J. (2016). Recidivism following mental health court exit: Between and within-group comparisons. *Law & Human*

*Behavior (American Psychological Association)*, 40(2), 118–127.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000168>

- Lowder, E. M., Rade, C. B., & Desmarais, S. L. (2018). Effectiveness of mental health courts in reducing recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Psychiatric Services*, 69(1), 15–22. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201700107>
- Lucken, K., & Fandetti, R. (2019). Offender reentry as correctional reform: Finding the boundaries of meaning in post-prison supervision. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 42(2), 184–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2018.1497525>
- Maradiaga, J. A., Nahvi, S., Cunningham, C. O., Sanchez, J., & Fox, A. D. (2016). “I Kicked the Hard Way. I Got Incarcerated.” Withdrawal from methadone during incarceration and subsequent aversion to medication assisted treatments. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 62, 49–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2015.11.004>
- Maschi, T., Morgen, K., Leibowitz, G., & Rees, J. (2018). Exploring the relationship between cumulative trauma and recidivism among older adults: Does race and offense history matter? *Traumatology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/trm0000167>
- Matejkowski, J., Han, W., & Conrad, A. (2020). Voluntariness of treatment, mental health service utilization, and quality of life among mental health court participants. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 26(2), 185–197. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000227>

- Matejkowski, J., & Ostermann, M. (2015). Serious mental illness, criminal risk, parole supervision, and recidivism: Testing of conditional effects. *Law and Human Behavior, 39*(1), 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000094>
- Maume, M. O., Lanier, C., & DeVall, K. (2018). The effect of treatment completion on recidivism among TASC program clients. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, 62*(15), 4776-4795. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X18780421>
- McCauley, E., & Samples, L. (2017). Navigating the disability determination process from the perspective of incarcerated adults with serious mental illnesses. *Community Mental Health Journal, 53*(8), 905–915. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-017-0140-9>
- McGinty, E. E., Kennedy-Hendricks, A., Baller, J., Niederdeppe, J., Gollust, S., & Barry, C. L. (2015). Criminal activity or treatable health condition? News media framing of opioid analgesic abuse in the United States, 1998–2012. *Psychiatric Services, 67*(4), 405–411. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201500065>
- McGowan, M. J. (2016). Location, location, mis-location: How local land use restrictions are dulling halfway housing’s criminal rehabilitation potential. *Urban Lawyer, 48*(2), 329–363.
- Medina, J. C., & Zettler, H. R. (2020). Multisubstance-Using Probationers and the Odds of Arrest While in the Community. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 64*(8), 818–839. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X19895975>

- Messer, S., Patten, R., & Candela, K. (2016). Drug courts and the facilitation of turning points. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, 43(1), 6–24.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0091450916632545>
- Meyer, C. L., Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Moore, K. E. (2014). Why do some jail inmates not engage in treatment and services? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 58(8), 914–930.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X13489828>
- Miller, H. V., & Miller, J. M. (2015). A promising jail reentry program revisited: Results from a quasi-experimental design. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 28(2), 211–225.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2014.1000489>
- Miller, H. V., Miller, J. M., & Barnes, J. C. (2016). Reentry programming for opioid and opiate involved female offenders: Findings from a mixed methods evaluation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 46, 129–136.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.04.001>
- Miller, J. M., Miller, H. V., & Barnes, J. C. (2019). Treating co-occurring disorders in jails: Outcome findings from a second chance act offender reentry program. *Crime & Delinquency*, 65(5), 583–605.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128718789860>
- Minnesota Department of Corrections. (n.d.). *Offender profile report definitions*. Retrieved from <https://mn.gov/doc/data-publications/offender-statistics/offender-profile-report-definitions/>

- Mitchell, J., Clark, C., & Guenther, C. (2017a). The impact of criminal justice involvement and housing outcomes among homeless persons with co-occurring disorders. *Community Mental Health Journal* (53), 901–904. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-017-0089-8>
- Mitchell, O., Cochran, J., Mears, D., & Bales, W. (2017b). The effectiveness of prison for reducing drug offender recidivism: A regression discontinuity analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 13(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-017-9282-6>
- Mitchell Miller, J., Barnes, J., & Miller, H. (2017). Profile of two second chance act offender treatment initiatives: A research note. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(4), 759–767. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-017-9405-7>
- Mizel, M. L., & Abrams, L. S. (2020). Practically Emotional: Young Men’s Perspectives on What Works in Reentry Programs. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 46(5), 658–670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01488376.2019.1617225>
- Moore, J., & Eikenberry, J. (2021). Recidivism by Conviction Offense Type and Release Status Among Prisoners Released in Iowa. *Crime & Delinquency*, 67(3), 344–365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128720944075>
- Moore, K. E., Gregorian, M. J., Tangney, J. P., Folk, J. B., Stuewig, J. B., & Salatino, A. C. (2018a). Changes in community integration from pre- to post-incarceration: The Influence of psychological and criminal justice factors. *Crime & Delinquency*, 64(8), 975–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128718756037>

- Moore, K. E., Hacker, R. L., Oberleitner, L., & McKee, S. A. (2020). Reentry interventions that address substance use: A systematic review. *Psychological Services, 17*(1), 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ser0000293>
- Moore, K. E., Oberleitner, L., Smith, K. M. Z., Maurer, K., & McKee, S. A. (2018b). Feasibility and effectiveness of continuing methadone maintenance treatment during incarceration compared to forced withdrawal. *Journal of Addiction Medicine, 12*(2), 156–162. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ADM.0000000000000381>
- Moore, K. E., Roberts, W., Reid, H. H., Smith, K. M. Z., Oberleitner, L. M. S., & McKee, S. A. (2019). Effectiveness of medication assisted treatment for opioid use in prison and jail settings: A meta-analysis and systematic review. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 99*, 32–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2018.12.003>
- Morash, M., Kashy, D. A., Bohmert, M. N., Cobbina, J. E., & Smith, S. W. (2017). Women at the nexus of correctional and social policies: Implications for recidivism risk. *British Journal of Criminology, 57*(2), 441–462. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azv124>
- Morash, M., Kashy, D. A., Smith, S. W., & Cobbina, J. E. (2019). Technical violations, treatment and punishment responses, and recidivism of women on probation and parole. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 30*(5), 788–810. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403417723425>
- Morenoff, J. D., & Harding, D. J. (2014). Incarceration, prisoner reentry, and communities. *Annual Review of Sociology, 40*(2014), 411–429. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145511>

- Mowbray, O., McBeath, B., Bank, L., & Newell, S. (2016). Trajectories of health and behavioral health services use among community corrections-involved rural adults. *Social Work Research, 40*(1), 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svv048>
- Mowen, T. J., & Boman, J. H. (2019). Do we have it all wrong? The protective roles of peers and criminogenic risks from family during prison reentry. *Crime & Delinquency, 65*(5), 681–704. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128718800286>
- Mowen, T. J., Stansfield, R., & Boman IV, J. H. (2019). Family matters: Moving beyond “If” family support matters to “Why” family support matters during reentry from prison. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency, 56*(4), 483–523. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427818820902>
- Mowen, T. J., & Visher, C. A. (2015). Drug use and crime after incarceration: The role of family support and family conflict. *Justice Quarterly, 32*(2), 337–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2013.771207>
- Mullen, J., Ryan, S. R., Mathias, C. W., & Dougherty, D. M. (2015). Treatment needs of driving while intoxicated offenders: The need for a multimodal approach to treatment. *Traffic Injury Prevention, 16*(7), 637–644. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15389588.2015.1013189>
- Muñoz-Laboy, M., Martinez, O., Draine, J., Guilamo-Ramos, V., Severson, N., Levine, E., & Benjamin, G. (2018). The assets and challenges of formerly incarcerated Latino men’s social support networks in promoting healthy behaviors. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of The New York Academy of Medicine, 95*(4), 534–546. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-017-0183-9>



- Myer, A. J., & Buchholz, M. M. (2018). Examining the impact of a gender-specific drug court on recidivism. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *41*(2), 206–221.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2016.1246260>
- Nardi, M., Levinson, C., Lawrence, M., Kamauff, A., Wilby, J., & Burge, W. (2017). Evidence-based decision support for managing the mentally ill inmate population. *2017 Systems and Information Engineering Design Symposium (SIEDS)*, 150–155. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SIEDS.2017.7937706>
- Nelson, S. E., Shoov, E., LaBrie, R. A., & Shaffer, H. J. (2019). Externalizing and self-medicating: Heterogeneity among repeat DUI offenders. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *194*, 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.09.017>
- Nordberg, A. (2015). Liminality and mental health court diversion: An interpretative phenomenological analysis of offender experiences. *British Journal of Social Work*, *45*(8), 2441–2457. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcu104>
- Norko, M. A., Wasser, T., Magro, H., Leavitt-Smith, E., Morton, F. J., Hollis, T., & Leavitt-Smith, E. (2016). Assessing insanity acquittee recidivism in Connecticut. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *34*(2/3), 423–443.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2222>
- Nowotny, K. M. (2015). Race/ethnic disparities in the utilization of treatment for drug dependent inmates in United States State correctional facilities. *Addictive Behaviors*, *40*, 148–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.09.005>

- O'Brien, P., & Bates, R. (2005). Women's post-release experiences in the UNITED STATES: Recidivism and re-entry. *International Journal of Prisoner Health; Bingley*, 1(2), 207–221. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17449200600554579>
- Okonofua, J. A., Saadatian, K., Ocampo, J., Ruiz, M., & Oxholm, P. D. (2021). A scalable empathic supervision intervention to mitigate recidivism from probation and parole. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 118(14). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2018036118>
- Ostermann, M., Salerno, L. M., & Hyatt, J. M. (2015). How different operationalizations of recidivism impact conclusions of effectiveness of parole supervision. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 52(6), 771–796. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427815580626>
- Ott, M., & McTier Jr., T. S. (2020). Faculty attitudes toward college students with criminal records. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 13(4), 297–308. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000138>
- Owens, M. D., Chen, J. A., Simpson, T. L., Timko, C., & Williams, E. C. (2018). Barriers to addiction treatment among formerly incarcerated adults with substance use disorders. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13722-018-0120-6>
- Patten, R., Messer, S., & Candela, K. (2015). “I don't see myself as prison material”: Motivations for entering a rural drug court. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(11), 1188–1202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X14532321>

- Payne, B. K., Hawkins, B., & Xin, C. (2019). Using labeling theory as a guide to examine the patterns, characteristics, and sanctions given to cybercrimes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44(2), 230–247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-018-9457-3>
- Pennsylvania State Police. (n.d.). *Megan's law terms and definitions*. Retrieved from <https://www.pameganslaw.state.pa.us/InformationalPages/TermsDefinitions>
- Pettus-Davis, C., Renn, T., Lacasse, J. R., & Motley, R. (2018). Proposing a population-specific intervention approach to treat trauma among men during and after incarceration. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000171>
- Pettus-Davis, C., Scheyett, A., & Lewis, M. (2014). Is positive social support available to re-entering prisoners? It depends on who you ask. *Journal of Forensic Social Work*, 4(1), 2–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1936928X.2014.893549>
- PickerWheel. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://pickerwheel.com/>
- Piper, A. J., & Nagy, V. M. (2018). Risk factors and pathways to imprisonment among incarcerated women in Victoria, 1860-1920. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 42(3), 268–284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14443058.2018.1489300>
- Plano Clark, V. L., & Ivankova, N. V. (2016). *Mixed methods research: A guide to the field*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Pleggenkuhle, B. (2017). The financial cost of a criminal conviction: Context and consequences: *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854817734278>

- Pleggenkuhle, B., Huebner, B. M., & Kras, K. R. (2016). Solid start: Supportive housing, social support, and reentry transitions. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 39(3), 380–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2015.1047465>
- Pollner, M. (1978). Constitutive and mundane versions of labeling theory. *Human Studies*, 1(3), 269–288. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02132617>
- Pope, R. J., & Jones, J. N. (2020). Exploring organizational strategies and participant experience in the young adult diversion court. *Victims & Offenders*, 15(2), 267–290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2019.1711275>
- Prendergast, M. L., McCollister, K., & Warda, U. (2017). A randomized study of the use of screening, brief intervention, and referral to treatment (SBIRT) for drug and alcohol use with jail inmates. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 74, 54–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2016.12.011>
- Raggio, A. L., Kopak, A. M., & Hoffman, N. G. (2019). Opioid use disorders and offending patterns among local jail inmates. *Corrections*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2019.1659193>
- Ratcliffe, J., Groff, E., Sorg, E., & Haberman, C. (2015). Citizens' reactions to hot spots policing: Impacts on perceptions of crime, disorder, safety and police. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(3), 393–417. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-015-9230-2>
- Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2015). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Ray, B. (2014). Long-term recidivism of mental health court defendants. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 37(5), 448–454.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2014.02.017>
- Ray, B., Hood, B. J., & Canada, K. E. (2015a). What happens to mental health court noncompleters? *Behavioral Sciences & The Law*, 33(6), 801–814.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2163>
- Ray, B., Kubiak, S. P., Comartin, E. B., & Tillander, E. (2015b). Mental health court outcomes by offense type at admission. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research; New York*, 42(3), 323–331.  
<https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-014-0572-2>
- Redlich, A. D., & Han, W. (2014). Examining the links between therapeutic jurisprudence and mental health court completion. *Law & Human Behavior (American Psychological Association)*, 38(2), 109–118.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000041>
- Reich, W. A., Picard-Fritsche, S., Lebron, L., & Hahn, J. W. (2015). Predictors of mental health court program compliance and rearrest in Brooklyn, New York. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 54(6), 391–405.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2015.1055035>
- Reich, W. A., Picard-Fritsche, S., Rempel, M., & Farley, E. J. (2016). Treatment modality, failure, and re-arrest: a test of the risk principle with substance-abusing criminal defendants. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 43(3), 234–246.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022042616638490>

- Reichert, J., DeLong, C., Sacomani, R., & Gonzales, S. (2015). Fidelity to the intensive supervision probation with services model: An examination of adult redeploy Illinois programs. *Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority*. Retrieved from <http://www.icjia.org/assets/articles/ISP%20FIDELITY%20FINAL%2006-16-16.pdf>
- Remster, B. (2019). A life course analysis of homeless shelter use among the formerly incarcerated. *Justice Quarterly*, *36*(3), 437–465. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2017.1401653>
- Rhodes, W., Gaes, G., Luallen, J., Kling, R., Rich, T., & Shively, M. (2016). Following incarceration, most released offenders never return to prison. *Crime & Delinquency*, *62*(8), 1003–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128714549655>
- Rich, J. D., McKenzie, M., Larney, S., Wong, J. B., Tran, L., Clarke, J., Noska, A., Reddy, M., & Zaller, N. (2015). Methadone continuation versus forced withdrawal on incarceration in a combined US prison and jail: A randomised, open-label trial. *The Lancet*, *386*(9991), 350–359. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)62338-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)62338-2)
- Robertson, A., Gardner, S., Walker, C. S., & Tatch, A. (2016). DUI recidivism by intervention adherence: A multiple risk factor approach. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, *42*(5), 597–605. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00952990.2016.1167898>
- Rolfe, S. M., Tewksbury, R., & Lahm, K. F. (2018). Living arrangements for sex offenders in Ohio: Effects of economics, law, and government assistance

programs. *Prison Journal*, 98(5), 544–559.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885518793949>

Rolfe, S. M., Tewksbury, R., & Schroeder, R. D. (2017). Homeless shelters' policies on sex offenders: Is this another collateral consequence? *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology*, 61(16), 1833–1849.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X16638463>

Román-Ithier, J. C., González, R. A., Vélez-Pastrana, M. C., González-Tejera, G. M., & Albizu-García, C. E. (2017). Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder symptoms, type of offending and recidivism in a prison population: The role of substance dependence. *Criminal Behaviour & Mental Health*, 27(5), 443–456.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2009>

Routh, D., & Hamilton, Z. (2015). Work release as a transition: Positioning success via the halfway house. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 54(4), 239–255.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2015.1024909>

Ruderman, M. A., Wilson, D. F., & Reid, S. (2015). Does prison crowding predict higher rates of substance use related parole violations? A recurrent events multi-level survival analysis. *PLoS ONE*, 10(10), 1–19.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141328>

Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2015). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School. (2011). *Living arrangements*. Retrieved from <https://rwjms.rutgers.edu/boggscenter/projects/documents/Chapter-1.pdf>

- Rydberg, J. (2018). Employment and housing challenges experienced by sex offenders during reentry on parole. *Corrections*, 3(1), 15–37.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2017.1369373>
- Rydberg, J., Grommon, E., Huebner, B., & Pleggenkuhle, B. (2017). Examining the correlates of sex offender residence restriction violation rates. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 33(2), 347–369. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-016-9303-z>
- Sadeh, N., & McNiel, D. E. (2015). Posttraumatic stress disorder increases risk of criminal recidivism among justice-involved persons with mental disorders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42(6), 573–586.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854814556880>
- Saloner, B., Bandara, S. N., McGinty, E. E., & Barry, C. L. (2016). Justice-involved adults with substance use disorders: Coverage increased but rates of treatment did not in 2014. *Health Affairs; Chevy Chase*, 35(6), 1058–1066. <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2016.0005>
- Sandoval, J. R. (2020). “Everyone is on supervision”: the function of home visits in structuring family dynamics and exerting continuous control. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 59(4), 177–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2020.1733166>
- Schaffer, B. J. (2016). Incarcerated veterans outreach program. *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work*, 13(3), 293–304.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23761407.2015.1006945>



- Schmidt, K. A., Lamoureux, I. C., Schak, K. M., Lachner, C., Burton, M. C., Larrabee, B. R., & Rummans, T. A. (2018). Substance use disorders and their effect on the psychiatric and justice systems. *American Journal on Addictions, 27*(7), 574–577. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajad.12789>
- Schonbrun, Y. C., Anderson, B. J., Johnson, J. E., Kurth, M., Timko, C., & Stein, M. D. (2019). Barriers to entry into 12-step mutual help groups among justice-involved women with alcohol use disorders. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly, 37*(1), 25–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07347324.2018.1424596>
- Schwartz, R. P., Kelly, S. M., Mitchell, S. G., Gryczynski, J., O’Grady, K. E., & Jaffe, J. H. (2017). When does methadone treatment reduce arrest and severity of arrest charges? An analysis of arrest records. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 180*, 385–390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2017.08.025>
- Schwartz, R. P., Kelly, S. M., Mitchell, S. G., Gryczynski, J., O’Grady, K. E., & Jaffe, J. H. (2019). Initiating methadone in jail and in the community: Patient differences and implications of methadone treatment for reducing arrests. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 97*, 7–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2018.11.006>
- Schwartz, R. P., Mitchell, M. M., O’Grady, K. E., Kelly, S. M., Gryczynski, J., Mitchell, S. G., Gordon, M. S., & Jaffe, J. H. (2018). Pharmacotherapy for opioid addiction in community corrections. *International Review of Psychiatry, 30*(5), 117–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540261.2018.1524373>

- Schwarz, C. (2020). Transitioning house: A “safe umbrella” from criminal stigmatization? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 59(5), 285–314.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2020.1745978>
- Scott, C., Dennis, M., & Lurigio, A. (2017). The effects of specialized probation and recovery management checkups (RMCs) on treatment participation, substance use, HIV risk behaviors, and recidivism among female offenders: Main findings of a 3-year experiment using subject by intervention interaction analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 13(1), 53–77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-016-9281-z>
- Seck, M. M., Tsagaris, G. S., & Rowe, R. (2017). Mental health courts and adult offenders with developmental disabilities and co-occurring Diagnoses. *Best Practices in Mental Health*, (2), 30-40.
- Segeren, M., de Wit, M., Fassaert, T., & Popma, A. (2017). Determinants of prisoners’ perceived need for care in association with criminal recidivism. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 28(4), 477–497.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2017.1301527>
- Shannon, L. M., Jackson Jones, A., Newell, J., & Neal, C. (2018a). Examining the impact of prior criminal justice history on 2-year recidivism rates: A comparison of drug court participants and program referrals. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62(2), 291–312.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X16645323>

- Shannon, Lisa M., Jones, A. J., Newell, J., & Payne, C. (2018b). Examining individual characteristics and program performance to understand two-year recidivism rates among drug court participants: Comparing graduates and terminators. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62(13), 4196–4220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X18769602>
- Shulman, D. (2005). Labeling theory. In *Encyclopedia of social theory* (pp. 427-428). G. Ritzer (Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/97814129525552.n161>
- Skeem, J. L., & Lowenkamp, C. T. (2016). Risk, race, and recidivism: Predictive bias and disparate impact. *Criminology*, 54(4), 680–712. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12123>
- Soares III, W. E., Wilson, D., Gordon, M. S., Lee, J. D., Nunes, E. V., O'Brien, C. P., Shroff, M., Friedmann, P. D., & Soares, W. E., 3rd (2019). Incidence of future arrests in adults involved in the criminal justice system with opioid use disorder receiving extended release naltrexone compared to treatment as usual. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 194, 482–486.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.10.035>
- Socia, K. M., Levenson, J. S., Ackerman, A. R., & Harris, A. J. (2015). “Brothers Under the Bridge”: Factors influencing the transience of registered sex offenders in Florida. *Sexual Abuse*, 27(6), 559–586.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214521472>

- Social Security Administration. (2019). *Understanding supplement security income living arrangements*. Retrieved from <https://www.ssa.gov/ssi/text-living-ussi.htm>
- Somers, L. J., & Holtfreter, K. (2018). Gender and mental health: An examination of procedural justice in a specialized court context. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 36(1), 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2325>
- Spycher, J., Dusheiko, M., Beaupère, P., Gravier, B., & Moschetti, K. (2021). Healthcare in a pure gatekeeping system: utilization of primary, mental and emergency care in the prison population over time. *Health & Justice*, 9(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-021-00136-8>
- Staggs, S. M., & Landreville, K. D. (2017). The impact of pretrial publicity on “Eye for an Eye” retributivist support and malicious perceptions of criminal offenders. *Mass Communication & Society*, 20(1), 116–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2016.1167917>
- Stalans, L. J., & Lurigio, A. J. (2015). Parenting and intimate relationship effects on women offenders’ recidivism and noncompliance with probation. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 25(3), 152–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2014.909764>
- Stansfield, R., Mowen, T. J., & O’Connor, T. (2018). Religious and spiritual support, reentry, and risk. *Justice Quarterly*, 35(2), 254–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2017.1306629>
- Staton-Tindall, M., Harp, K. L. H., Winston, E., Webster, J. M., & Pangburn, K. (2015). Factors associated with recidivism among corrections-based treatment

- participants in rural and urban areas. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 56, 16–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2015.03.005>
- Steadman, H. J., Callahan, L., Robbins, P. C., Vesselinov, R., McGuire, T. G., & Morrissey, J. P. (2014). Criminal justice and behavioral health care costs of mental health court participants: A six-year study. *Psychiatric Services*, 65(9), 1100–1104. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201300375>
- Stone, R., Morash, M., Goodson, M., Smith, S., & Cobbina, J. (2018). Women on parole, identity processes, and primary desistance. *Feminist Criminology*, 13(4), 382–403. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085116670004>
- Taxman, F. S., Walters, S. T., Sloas, L. B., Lerch, J., & Rodriguez, M. (2015). Motivational tools to improve probationer treatment outcomes. *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, 43, 120–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cct.2015.05.016>
- Taylor, L. R., Lee, J., & Taxman, F. S. (2019). Participant and program characteristics: Correlates of substance abuse treatment participation and prison misconducts. *Prison Journal*, 99(1), 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885518814704>
- Thomas, K., Wilson, J. L., Bedell, P., & Morse, D. S. (2019). “They didn’t give up on me”: A women’s transitions clinic from the perspective of re-entering women. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice*, 14(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13722-019-0142-8>
- Thompson, M., Newell, S., & Carlson, M. J. (2016). Race and access to mental health and substance abuse treatment in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 55(2), 69–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2015.1112867>

- Trojano, M. L., Christopher, P. P., Pinals, D. A., Harnish, A., & Smelson, D. (2017). Perceptions of voluntary consent among jail diverted veterans with co-occurring disorders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 35(5–6), 408–417.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2299>
- Tsai, J., Finlay, A., Flatley, B., Kaspro, W. J., & Clark, S. (2018). A national study of veterans treatment court participants: Who benefits and who recidivates. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research; New York*, 45(2), 236–244. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-017-0816-z>
- Tsai, J., Flatley, B., Kaspro, W. J., Clark, S., & Finlay, A. (2016). Diversion of veterans with criminal justice involvement to treatment courts: Participant characteristics and outcomes. *Psychiatric Services*, 68(4), 375–383.  
<https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201600233>
- United States Census Bureau. (2021). *City and Town Population Totals: 2010-2020*.  
<https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/technical-documentation/research/evaluation-estimates/2020-evaluation-estimates/2010s-cities-and-towns-total.html>
- Velasquez, M., Flannery, M., Badolato, R., Vittitow, A., McDonald, R. D., Tofighi, B., Garment, A. R., Giftos, J., & Lee, J. D. (2019). Perceptions of extended-release naltrexone, methadone, and buprenorphine treatments following release from jail. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice*, 14(1), 1–12.  
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13722-019-0166-0>

- Victor, G. A., Comartin, E., Willis, T., & Kubiak, S. (2021). Factors of Recidivism among Individuals with Co-occurring Conditions in Rural Mental Health Jail Interventions. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x211013521>
- Vigesaa, L. E., Bergseth, K. J., & Richardson Jens, K. (2016). Who participates in reentry programming? An examination of women offenders in a midwestern state. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 55(5), 308–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2016.1181131>
- Viron, M., Bello, I., Freudenreich, O., & Shtasel, D. (2014). Characteristics of homeless adults with serious mental illness served by a state mental health transitional shelter. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 50(5), 560–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-013-9607-5>
- Wahlstrom, L. C., Scott, J. P., Tuliao, A. P., DiLillo, D., & McChargue, D. E. (2015). Posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms, emotion dysregulation, and aggressive behavior among incarcerated methamphetamine Users. *Journal of Dual Diagnosis*, 11(2), 118–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15504263.2015.1025026>
- Walden University. (2010). *Research design: Some thoughts on the research process*. Minneapolis, MN: Walden University.
- Walden University Center for Research Quality. (n.d.-a). *Institutional review board for ethical standards in research: IRB faq tutorial (students) audio transcript*. [PDF file]. Retrieved from [https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/ld.php?content\\_id=48070812](https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/ld.php?content_id=48070812)

- Wallace, D., & Wang, X. (2020). Does in-prison physical and mental health impact recidivism? *SSM - Population Health*, *11*, 100569.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2020.100569>
- Walter, S. R., Dunsmuir, W. T. M., & Westbrook, J. I. (2015). Studying interruptions and multitasking in situ: The untapped potential of quantitative observational studies. *International Journal of Human - Computer Studies*, *79*, 118–125.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2015.01.008>
- Wamsley, D. (2019). Neoliberalism, mass incarceration, and the US debt–criminal justice complex. *Critical Social Policy*, *39*(2), 248–267. Doi:  
 10.1177/0261018318779477
- Warner, C., Conley, T., & Murphy, R. (2018). Criminal thinking shifts among male prisoners participating in a cognitive-based education programme. *Criminal Behaviour And Mental Health: CBMH*, *28*(2), 152–157.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2053>
- Weaver, C., Lee, J., Choi, H., Johnson, W. W., & Clements, C. (2019). Offenders living with mental illness: How are they perceived by future professionals? *Journal of Social Work*, *19*(1), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017318757383>
- Web Center for Social Research Method. (n.d.). Social research methods: Qualitative validity. Retrieved from <https://socialresearchmethods.net/kb/qualval.php>
- Welsh, W., Zajac, G., & Bucklen, K. (2014). For whom does prison-based drug treatment work? Results from a randomized experiment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *10*(2), 151–177. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-013-9194-z>



- Westerberg, V. S., McCrady, B. S., Owens, M., & Guerin, P. (2016). Community-based methadone maintenance in a large detention center is associated with decreases in inmate recidivism. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 70*, 1–6.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2016.07.007>
- Western, B., Braga, A. A., Davis, J., & Sirois, C. (2015). Stress and hardship after prison. *American Journal of Sociology, 120*(5), 1512–1547.  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/681301>
- Western, B., & Simes, J. T. (2019). Drug use in the year after prison. *Social Science & Medicine, 235*, 112357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112357>
- Whipple, C. R., Jason, L. A., & Robinson, W. L. (2016). Housing and abstinence self-efficacy in formerly incarcerated individuals. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 55*(8), 548–563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2016.1229713>
- Willging, C. E., Nicdao, E. G., Trott, E. M., & Kellett, N. C. (2016). Structural inequality and social support for women prisoners released to rural communities. *Women & Criminal Justice, 26*(2), 145–164.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2015.1067174>
- Wilson, J. A., & Wood, P. B. (2014). Dissecting the relationship between mental illness and return to incarceration. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*(6), 527–537.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2014.09.005>
- Wong, J. S., Bouchard, J., Gushue, K., & Lee, C. (2019). Halfway out: An examination of the effects of halfway houses on criminal recidivism. *International Journal of*

*Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 63(7), 1018–1037.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X18811964>

Woo, A., & Joh, K. (2015). Beyond anecdotal evidence: Do subsidized housing developments increase neighborhood crime? *Applied Geography*, 64, 87–96.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2015.09.004>

Wooditch, A., Mbaba, M., Kiss, M., Lawson, W., Taxman, F., & Altice, F. L. (2018).

Housing experiences among opioid-dependent, criminal justice-involved individuals in Washington, D.C. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 95(1), 61–70. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-017-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-017-0156-z)

[0156-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-017-0156-z)

Wooditch, A., Sloas, L. B., & Taxman, F. S. (2017). A multisite randomized block experiment on the seamless system of care model for drug-involved probationers.

*Journal of Drug Issues*, 47(1), 50–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022042616678606>

Yang, C. S. (2017). Does public assistance reduce recidivism? *American Economic Review*, 107(5), 551–555. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20171001>

Yuan, Y., & McNeeley, S. (2017). Social ties, collective efficacy, and crime-specific fear in Seattle neighborhoods. *Victims & Offenders*, 12(1), 90–112.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1006799>

Zaller, N., Cheney, A. M., Curran, G. M., Booth, B. M., & Borders, T. F. (2016). The criminal justice experience of African American cocaine users in Arkansas.

*Substance Use & Misuse*, 51(12), 1566–1576.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2016.1188954>

Zettler, H. R. (2018). Exploring the relationship between dual diagnosis and recidivism in drug court participants. *Crime & Delinquency*, 64(3), 363–397.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128717697960>

Zgoba, K., & Salerno, L. M. (2017). A three-year recidivism analysis of state correctional releases. *Criminal Justice Studies: A Critical Journal of Crime, Law & Society*, 30(4), 331–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2017.1364641>

Zortman, J. S., Powers, T., Hiester, M., Klunk, F. R., & Antonio, M. E. (2016).

Evaluating reentry programming in Pennsylvania's board of probation & parole: An assessment of offenders' perceptions and recidivism outcomes. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 55(6), 419–442.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2016.1194945>

Appendix A: Keyword Search Inquiry

## Appendix B: Online Survey Interview Questions

Thank you again for agreeing to take part in this survey. Remember at any time if you know longer want to participant you can. There are no penalties. This is a two part survey. Part one consists of demographic questions and part two are questions that directly related to the study. Please not place your name, address, phone number, or other personal information on the survey. This survey is confidential and eliminating personal identifiable information is for your protection and helps you remain anonymous. Below are some definitions that can bring clarity to any questions asked and will be included within the corresponding questions:

*Convicted* ~ a person who has went court and given a punishing sentence and or fine by a judge for a crime committed.

*Crime* ~ is any intentional or unintentional behavior that common and statutory laws believe should result in a punishment (Cornell Law School. (n.d.).

*Crime types* ~ includes crimes that pertain to cyber, drugs, gangs, hate, identity, property, violence, trafficking, and weapons (Bureau of Justice Statistics, n.d.b).

*Former offender* ~ is when someone has been convicted of a crime or entered a guilty plea for an offense that was criminal (Jefferson-Jones, 2017).

*Housing assistance* ~ the giving and taking of financial help in order to pay for a housing security deposit, rent, mortgage, to stay at a hotel or motel, or any place that requires payment in order to live at a residence.

*Incarceration* ~ is when an offender is held within in a county, federal, juvenile, private, or state correctional facility (Pennsylvania State Police, n.d.).

*Offender* ~ someone that was found guilty of committing a crime, provided a court sentence, and assigned a specific punishment.

*Re-adjust* ~ the process of trying to reacclimate, cope, or adapt to a changed society or environment after being away from the environment or society for a period of time.

#### Part 1: Demographics

1. How old are you?
2. What sex do you identify as?
3. What is your race?
4. What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?
5. What is your employment status?
6. What is your income level?
  1. No income
  2. Social security or disability
  3. 0 to 9,999
  4. 10,000 to 39,000
  5. 39,001 to 60,000
  6. 69,001 to 99,000
  7. 99,001 and beyond
7. Are you a student?

8. If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...?

Please DO NOT put the company you work for.

9. What is your housing status?

1. Own
2. Rent
3. Live with a family member and pay rent
4. Live with a friend and pay rent
5. Live with a relative and do not pay rent
6. Live with a friend and do not pay rent
7. Shelter, Transitional housing, Rehabilitation housing or Program housing
8. Homeless

10. What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?

1. Apartment
2. Condo
3. Dormitory
4. House
5. Homeless

2. Do you home have enough room for guests?

1. Yes
2. No

3. Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentence for the crime.

\*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This question is **NOT** asking if you committed a crime.

- a. Yes
  - b. No
  - c. I refused to answer
4. If you have a guest, please describe where would they sleep and have access to?

### **Part 2. Survey Questions**

1. Would the items available to a guest change if the guest was a former offender?
2. Using your own words, how would you define former offender?
3. What are your thoughts on people who have been convicted of a crime?
4. What circumstances do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance?
5. When an offender is released from incarceration (jail or prison) what help do you think the individual will need to successfully re-adjust in society?
6. In your opinion, who is responsible for providing housing assistance to offenders after they are released from incarceration?
7. What do you think should be the length of time housing assistance should be given to a former offender?



8. What are some beliefs and values that you have learned from others concerning to a former offender?
9. How did you learn about offenders?
10. When would you identify an offender's crime as important?
11. What are some labels or titles you have heard that refers to a former offender?
12. What past beliefs and stereotypes that were taught in the past do you still hold today pertaining to offenders?
13. How do you feel about providing housing assistance for a person who had previously been convicted of a crime?
14. Would you recommend other people opening their place of residence to previous offenders in order to provide housing assistance?
15. What kind of feelings do you experience when you think of a former offender living with you?
16. When you are at a store or out to dinner how do you identify who is a former offender?
17. In your opinion should former offenders who have a mental illness or disorder receive housing assistance?
18. Describe the offender crimes you would allow to reside with you and for how long?
19. What are your thoughts on veteran former offenders receiving housing assistance?
20. Do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance if they are addicted to substances such as drugs or alcohol? If so for how long?

21. If at any time during this survey you stated, you do not believe a former offender should receive housing assistance please provide the reason why?
22. Would your answer to a former offender staying in your home be different if the former offender was a member of your family or friend? If so who would you allow to stay in your home (aunt, uncle, mom, dad, high school friend, friend you just meet 30 days ago etc...)?

This concludes the survey. Thank you for your participants. Next we will conduct a brief debriefing.

Appendix C: In-person, E-mail, or Phone Interview Questions

1. Does your \_\_\_\_\_ (apartment, halfway house, rehabilitation, transitional home, treatment facility) allow residents who are convicted of a crime?
2. If yes: What crime types are allowed acceptance into your \_\_\_\_\_ (apartment, halfway house, rehabilitation house, transitional home, treatment facility)?
3. If no: Are there any circumstances that you would allow someone who has been convicted of a crime? If so what are they?
4. Does the label offender effect how much security deposit or rent a convicted offender will have to pay?

## Appendix D: Department of Correction United States Census Region South ANOVA

**Independent Variable Primary Offense – Dependent Variable Housing Plan***Descriptive*

HousingPlan

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Advertise Drug Paraphernalia	3	6.67	3.215	1.856	-1.32	14.65	3	9
Agg. Assault on Corr. Employee	2	10.00	1.414	1.000	-2.71	22.71	9	11
Aggravated Assault	4	8.25	3.594	1.797	2.53	13.97	3	11
Aggravated Residential Burglary	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Aggravated Robbery	12	9.42	.996	.288	8.78	10.05	8	11
Arson	2	6.00	4.243	3.000	-32.12	44.12	3	9
Battery 1st Degree	18	7.33	2.951	.695	5.87	8.80	2	10
Battery 2nd Degree	7	6.43	3.552	1.343	3.14	9.71	1	11
Breaking and Entering	12	6.00	3.357	.969	3.87	8.13	1	11
Commercial Burglary	14	8.29	2.813	.752	6.66	9.91	2	11
Criminal Attempt	8	6.50	3.338	1.180	3.71	9.29	2	10
Criminal Mischief	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Del Cont Sub Sched Meth Cocaine => 2g <28g	1	7.00	.	.	.	.	7	7

Del Cont Sched Hydromorphone => 80 DU < 160g	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Deliver Meth Cocaine <2g	11	8.18	2.676	.807	6.38	9.98	3	11
Deliver Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	25	7.84	2.718	.544	6.72	8.96	1	11
Discharge Firearm from Vehicle	3	5.33	4.163	2.404	-5.01	15.68	2	10
Dist/Poss/View Sex Explicit	1	11.00	.	.	.	.	11	11
Domestic Battering 1st Degree	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Domestic Battering 2nd Degree	6	7.67	3.445	1.406	4.05	11.28	3	11
Domestic Battering 3rd Degree	6	9.83	.983	.401	8.80	10.87	9	11
Domestic Battery 2nd Deg - Sub Offense or to Pregnant Woman	1	11.00	.	.	.	.	11	11
DUI 6th or Subsequent within 10 years of prior offense	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Engage Welfare Minor - 1st Degree	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Engage In Vol Crim Group Act	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9

Escape 1st Degree	1	11.00	.	.	.	.	11	11
Escape 3rd Degree	5	8.80	.447	.200	8.24	9.36	8	9
Fail to Appear Regarding Order Issued Before Revocation Hear	7	7.57	4.237	1.601	3.65	11.49	1	11
Fail to Register Child/Sex off	9	7.22	2.906	.969	4.99	9.46	3	11
Failure to Stop Acc. W/Inj/Death	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Failure to Appear	19	8.42	2.912	.668	7.02	9.82	2	11
False Imprisonment 1st Degree	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Falsely Making Terror Threat	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Financial Identity Fraud	2	11.00	.000	.000	11.00	11.00	11	11
Fleeing	3	8.67	2.082	1.202	3.50	13.84	7	11
Forgery	17	8.00	3.202	.776	6.35	9.65	3	11
Forgery 1st Degree	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Forgery 2nd Degree	3	10.00	1.000	.577	7.52	12.48	9	11
Furnishing Prohib. Articles	7	6.86	4.451	1.682	2.74	10.97	1	11
Internet Stalk - Child Fel. B	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Kidnapping	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Maintain Drug Premises	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9

Maintain Drug Premises Drug Free Zone	3	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Mann Methamphetamine 2nd or Subs Offense	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
Manu/Del/Poss Control Subs.	11	8.00	2.608	.786	6.25	9.75	3	11
Murder - 2nd Degree	3	8.00	1.000	.577	5.52	10.48	7	9
Non-Support	3	7.67	3.512	2.028	-1.06	16.39	4	11
Permit Child Abuse	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II => Excluding Meth Cocaine <2g	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II Ex Meth Cocaine =>28g <200g	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine <2g	60	7.37	2.846	.367	6.63	8.10	1	11
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 10g <200g	4	7.50	1.000	.500	5.91	9.09	7	9
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 2g <10g	17	7.41	3.554	.862	5.58	9.24	1	11
Poss Drug Paraphernalia Man Meth Cocaine	16	7.31	3.049	.762	5.69	8.94	2	11

Poss Drug Paraphernalia Meth Cocaine	21	8.81	2.294	.501	7.77	9.85	3	11
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Hydromorphone = > 80 DU < 160 DU	1	10.00	.	.	.	.	10	10
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sched I,II Ex. Meth Cocaine => 2g < 128g	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched I, II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	4	7.50	3.000	1.500	2.73	12.27	3	9
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched IV, V Dep Hall => 80DU 160 DU	2	8.00	1.414	1.000	-4.71	20.71	7	9
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched VI V >14g < 4oz	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine <2g	15	7.13	3.292	.850	5.31	8.96	1	11
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	21	7.81	2.657	.580	6.60	9.02	1	11
Poss. Firearm Certain Person	13	7.54	2.787	.773	5.85	9.22	2	11
Rape	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8



Reg Sex Offend near Cert Facl	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Residential Burglary	56	8.04	2.867	.383	7.27	8.80	2	11
Robbery	31	7.74	2.175	.391	6.94	8.54	2	11
Sexual Assault	9	8.11	2.315	.772	6.33	9.89	4	11
Sexual Indecency with a Child	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Sexual Solicitation Of a Child	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Simul = Poss Of Drugs/Firearm	19	6.68	2.849	.654	5.31	8.06	2	11
Stalking	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Tampering With Physical Evid.	2	5.50	4.950	3.500	-38.97	49.97	2	9
Terroristic Act	5	8.40	1.342	.600	6.73	10.07	7	10
Terroristic Threatening	3	8.33	3.786	2.186	-1.07	17.74	4	11
Theft By Receiving	2	8.00	4.243	3.000	-30.12	46.12	5	11
Theft by Receiving (Credit/Debit Card)	2	7.00	5.657	4.000	-43.82	57.82	3	11
Theft by Receiving > \$1,000 < \$5,000	2	7.50	4.950	3.500	-36.97	51.97	4	11
Theft By Receiving > \$5,000 < \$25,000	4	7.75	4.031	2.016	1.34	14.16	2	11
Theft By Receiving >= \$25,000	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3

Theft by Receiving Firearm Value is <\$25,000	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Theft of Leased Property	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Theft of Property	2	7.50	3.536	2.500	-24.27	39.27	5	10
Theft of Property (Credit/Debit Card)	3	8.33	4.619	2.667	-3.14	19.81	3	11
Theft of Property (Firearm) < \$2,000	2	8.00	1.414	1.000	-4.71	20.71	7	9
Theft of Property > \$25,000	5	7.60	2.608	1.166	4.36	10.84	3	9
Theft of Property >= \$1,000 <\$5,000	4	7.00	2.708	1.354	2.69	11.31	3	9
Theft of Property >= \$5,000 < \$25,000	14	7.36	2.530	.676	5.90	8.82	3	11
Theft of Property Obtained By Theft	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Theft of Scrap metal Obtained by Threat	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Trafficking Controlled Substance	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Use OF Anothers Prop For Crime	1	7.00	.	.	.	.	7	7
Use/Poss. Of Parap to Manu Control Subst not meth/cocaine	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4

Deliver Meth Cocaine=>10g<200g	3	5.67	4.163	2.404	-4.68	16.01	1	9
Criminal Conspiracy	3	8.67	1.528	.882	4.87	12.46	7	10
Posses W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine =>10g<200g	25	8.12	1.922	.384	7.33	8.91	3	11
Deliver Cont Sub Sched I,II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>7.76</b>	<b>2.774</b>	<b>.110</b>	<b>7.54</b>	<b>7.98</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>

## ANOVA

## HousingPlan

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	583.667	96	6.080	.762	.950
Within Groups	4310.584	540	7.983		
<b>Total</b>	<b>4894.251</b>	<b>636</b>			

**Independent Variable Age – Dependent Variable Housing Plan***Descriptives*

HousingPlan

N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for		Minimum	Maximum
				Mean			
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
3	9.67	.577	.333	8.23	11.10	9	10
4	7.00	3.559	1.780	1.34	12.66	4	11
10	8.20	1.033	.327	7.46	8.94	7	9
8	7.75	2.765	.977	5.44	10.06	4	11
18	8.00	2.275	.536	6.87	9.13	4	11
20	6.70	2.849	.637	5.37	8.03	2	11
17	7.88	2.759	.669	6.46	9.30	2	11
19	7.95	2.368	.543	6.81	9.09	3	11
20	6.95	2.929	.655	5.58	8.32	2	10
21	7.81	1.965	.429	6.91	8.70	3	11
33	6.97	3.067	.534	5.88	8.06	2	11
24	7.75	2.863	.584	6.54	8.96	2	11
18	7.28	2.347	.553	6.11	8.44	2	11
15	9.20	1.320	.341	8.47	9.93	7	11
29	7.79	2.704	.502	6.76	8.82	2	11
23	8.35	2.656	.554	7.20	9.50	2	11
23	8.22	2.255	.470	7.24	9.19	3	11
21	7.95	2.397	.523	6.86	9.04	2	11
19	8.37	1.862	.427	7.47	9.27	2	11
29	7.62	2.783	.517	6.56	8.68	2	11
22	8.23	2.927	.624	6.93	9.52	2	11

17	7.65	3.372	.818	5.91	9.38	2	11
30	8.27	2.392	.437	7.37	9.16	3	11
15	7.80	3.489	.901	5.87	9.73	1	11
11	7.45	3.532	1.065	5.08	9.83	2	11
13	8.38	2.468	.684	6.89	9.88	1	11
14	7.71	2.785	.744	6.11	9.32	3	11
10	8.20	3.521	1.114	5.68	10.72	2	11
9	7.33	3.122	1.041	4.93	9.73	1	10
8	8.50	2.563	.906	6.36	10.64	3	11
15	8.13	2.924	.755	6.51	9.75	3	11
13	7.77	3.395	.942	5.72	9.82	1	11
8	7.88	3.137	1.109	5.25	10.50	1	11
8	7.88	2.748	.972	5.58	10.17	3	11
7	6.57	3.690	1.395	3.16	9.98	1	11
14	7.29	2.894	.773	5.61	8.96	1	10
5	8.80	3.493	1.562	4.46	13.14	3	11
8	8.63	3.335	1.179	5.84	11.41	1	11
4	7.50	1.915	.957	4.45	10.55	5	9
4	8.25	1.893	.946	5.24	11.26	7	11
4	10.25	.957	.479	8.73	11.77	9	11
5	3.60	2.608	1.166	.36	6.84	1	8
4	5.00	3.651	1.826	-.81	10.81	1	9
4	5.25	4.924	2.462	-2.59	13.09	1	10
2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
2	6.50	6.364	4.500	-50.68	63.68	2	11
1	7.00	.	.	.	.	7	7

	3	6.67	4.509	2.603	-4.53	17.87	2	11
	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>7.76</b>	<b>2.774</b>	<b>.110</b>	<b>7.54</b>	<b>7.98</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>

*ANOVA**HousingPlan*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	438.885	50	8.778	1.155	.223
Within Groups	4455.366	586	7.603		
Total	4894.251	636			

**Independent Variable Race – Dependent Variable Housing Plan***Descriptives**HousingPlan*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Black	194	7.95	2.566	.184	7.59	8.32	1	11
Caucasian	422	7.74	2.807	.137	7.47	8.01	1	11
Hispanic	17	6.12	3.569	.866	4.28	7.95	1	11

Native Hawaiian or Pacific Isl	1	11.00	.	.	.	.	11	11
Asian	3	6.67	4.163	2.404	-3.68	17.01	2	10
Total	637	7.76	2.774	.110	7.54	7.98	1	11

*ANOVA**HousingPlan*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	67.434	4	16.859	2.207	.067
Within Groups	4826.817	632	7.637		
Total	4894.251	636			

**Independent Variable Gender – Dependent Variable Housing Plan***Descriptives**HousingPlan*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Male	513	7.85	2.712	.120	7.62	8.09	1	11
Female	124	7.38	2.998	.269	6.85	7.91	1	11
Total	637	7.76	2.774	.110	7.54	7.98	1	11

## ANOVA

## HousingPlan

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	22.325	1	22.325	2.910	.089
Within Groups	4871.926	635	7.672		
Total	4894.251	636			

**Independent Variable Primary Offenses – Dependent Variable Housing Plan, Gender, Race, Age at Release**

## Descriptive

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Gender	Advertise Drug Paraphernalia	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	Agg. Assault on Corr. Employee	2	.00		.000	.00	.00	0	0
	Aggravated Assault	4	.25	.500	.250	-.55	1.05	0	1
	Aggravated Residential Burglary	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Aggravated Robbery	12	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0



---

Arson	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
Battery 1st Degree	18	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Battery 2nd Degree	7	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Breaking and Entering	12	.25	.452	.131	-.04	.54	0	1
Commercial Burglary	14	.07	.267	.071	-.08	.23	0	1
Criminal Attempt	8	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Criminal Mischief	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Del Cont Sub Sched Meth Cocaine => 2g <28g	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Del Cont Sched Hydromorphone => 80 DU < 160g	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Deliver Meth Cocaine <2g	11	.18	.405	.122	-.09	.45	0	1
Deliver Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	25	.52	.510	.102	.31	.73	0	1
Discharge Firearm from Vehicle	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Dist/Poss/View Sex Explicit	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Domestic Battering 1st Degree	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Domestic Battering 2nd Degree	6	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0

---

Domestic Battering 3rd Degree	6	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Domestic Battery 2nd Deg - Sub Offense or to Pregnant Woman	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
DUI 6th or Subsequent within 10 years of prior offense	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Engage Welfare Minor - 1st Degree	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Engage In Vol Crim Group Act	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Escape 1st Degree	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Escape 3rd Degree	5	.20	.447	.200	-.36	.76	0	1
Fail to Appear Regarding Order Issued Before Revocation Hear	7	.43	.535	.202	-.07	.92	0	1
Fail to Register Child/Sex off	9	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Failure to Stop Acc. W/Inj/Death	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Failure to Appear	19	.37	.496	.114	.13	.61	0	1
False Imprisonment 1st Degree	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1

---

Falsely Making Terror Threat	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Financial Identy Fraud	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
Fleeing	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
Forgery	17	.18	.393	.095	-.03	.38	0	1
Forgery 1st Degree	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Forgery 2nd Degree	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1
Furnishing Prohib. Articles	7	.57	.535	.202	.08	1.07	0	1
Internet Stalk - Child Fel. B	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Kidnapping	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Maintain Drug Premises	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Maintain Drug Premises Drug Free Zone	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
Mann Methamphetamine 2nd or Subs Offense	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Manu/Del/Poss Control Subs.	11	.18	.405	.122	-.09	.45	0	1
Murder - 2nd Degree	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Non-Support	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Permit Child Abuse	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II => Excluding Meth Cocaine <2g	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0

---

---

Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II Ex Meth Cocaine =>28g <200g	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine <2g	60	.27	.446	.058	.15	.38	0	1
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 10g <200g	4	.50	.577	.289	-.42	1.42	0	1
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 2g <10g	17	.29	.470	.114	.05	.54	0	1
Poss Drug Paraphernalia Man Meth Cocaine	16	.44	.512	.128	.16	.71	0	1
Poss Drug Paraphernalia Meth Cocaine	21	.43	.507	.111	.20	.66	0	1
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Hydromorphone = > 80 DU < 160 DU	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sched I,II Ex. Meth Cocaine => 2g < 128g	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched I, II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	4	.25	.500	.250	-.55	1.05	0	1

---

Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched IV, V Dep Hall => 80DU 160 DU	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched VI V >14g < 4oz	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine <2g	15	.13	.352	.091	-.06	.33	0	1
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	21	.29	.463	.101	.08	.50	0	1
Poss. Firearm Certain Person	13	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Rape	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Reg Sex Offend near Cert FacI	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Residential Burglary	56	.05	.227	.030	-.01	.11	0	1
Robbery	31	.16	.374	.067	.02	.30	0	1
Sexual Assault	9	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Sexual Indecency with a Child	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Sexual Solicitation Of a Child	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Simul = Poss Of Drugs/Firearm	19	.05	.229	.053	-.06	.16	0	1
Stalking	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0

Tampering With Physical Evid.	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
Terroristic Act	5	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Terroristic Threatening	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Theft By Receiving	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Theft by Receiving (Credit/Debit Card)	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Theft by Receiving > \$1,000 < \$5,000	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Theft By Receiving > \$5,000 < \$25,000	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Theft By Receiving >= \$25,000	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Theft by Receiving Firearm Value is <\$25,000	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Theft of Leased Property	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Theft of Property	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Theft of Property (Credit/Debit Card)	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
Theft of Property (Firearm) < \$2,000	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Theft of Property > \$25,000	5	.20	.447	.200	-.36	.76	0	1

Theft of Property >= \$1,000 <\$5,000	4	.25	.500	.250	-.55	1.05	0	1
Theft of Property >= \$5,000 < \$25,000	14	.21	.426	.114	-.03	.46	0	1
Theft of Property Obtained By Theft	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Theft of Scrap metal Obtained by Threat	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Trafficking Controlled Substance	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
Use OF Anothers Prop For Crime	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Use/Poss. Of Parap to Manu Control Subst not meth/cocaine	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
Deliver Meth Cocaine=>10g<200g	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
Criminal Conspiracy	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
Posses W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine =>10g<200g	25	.20	.408	.082	.03	.37	0	1
Deliver Cont Sub Sched 1,II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Total	637	.19	.396	.016	.16	.23	0	1

Race	Advertise Drug Paraphernalia	3	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
	Agg. Assault on Corr. Employee	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
	Aggravated Assault	4	1.50	1.000	.500	-.09	3.09	1	3
	Aggravated Residential Burglary	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Aggravated Robbery	12	1.25	.452	.131	.96	1.54	1	2
	Arson	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
	Battery 1st Degree	18	1.61	.979	.231	1.12	2.10	1	5
	Battery 2nd Degree	7	1.71	.488	.184	1.26	2.17	1	2
	Breaking and Entering	12	1.83	.577	.167	1.47	2.20	1	3
	Commercial Burglary	14	1.64	.497	.133	1.36	1.93	1	2
	Criminal Attempt	8	1.88	.641	.227	1.34	2.41	1	3
	Criminal Mischief	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	Del Cont Sub Sched Meth Cocaine => 2g <28g	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Del Cont Sched Hydromorphone => 80 DU < 160g	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	Deliver Meth Cocaine <2g	11	1.91	.302	.091	1.71	2.11	1	2
	Deliver Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	25	1.88	.440	.088	1.70	2.06	1	3



Discharge Firearm from Vehicle	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
Dist/Poss/View Sex Explicit	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Domestic Battering 1st Degree	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Domestic Battering 2nd Degree	6	1.67	.516	.211	1.12	2.21	1	2
Domestic Battering 3rd Degree	6	1.83	.408	.167	1.40	2.26	1	2
Domestic Battery 2nd Deg - Sub Offense or to Pregnant Woman	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
DUI 6th or Subsequent within 10 years of prior offense	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Engage Welfare Minor - 1st Degree	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Engage In Vol Crim Group Act	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Escape 1st Degree	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Escape 3rd Degree	5	2.00	.707	.316	1.12	2.88	1	3
Fail to Appear Regarding Order Issued Before Revocation Hear	7	1.86	.378	.143	1.51	2.21	1	2

Fail to Register Child/Sex off	9	1.78	.441	.147	1.44	2.12	1	2
Failure to Stop Acc. W/Inj/Death	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Failure to Appear	19	1.89	.567	.130	1.62	2.17	1	3
False Imprisonment 1st Degree	2	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Falsely Making Terror Threat	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Financial Identity Fraud	2	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Fleeing	3	1.67	.577	.333	.23	3.10	1	2
Forgery	17	1.65	.493	.119	1.39	1.90	1	2
Forgery 1st Degree	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Forgery 2nd Degree	3	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Furnishing Prohib. Articles	7	1.86	.378	.143	1.51	2.21	1	2
Internet Stalk - Child Fel. B	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Kidnapping	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Maintain Drug Premises	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Maintain Drug Premises Drug Free Zone	3	1.33	.577	.333	-.10	2.77	1	2
Mann Methamphetamine 2nd or Subs Offense	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2

Manu/Del/Poss Control Subs.	11	1.82	.603	.182	1.41	2.22	1	3
Murder - 2nd Degree	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
Non-Support	3	1.67	.577	.333	.23	3.10	1	2
Permit Child Abuse	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II => Excluding Meth Cocaine <2g	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II Ex Meth Cocaine =>28g <200g	60	1.83	.587	.076	1.68	1.98	1	5
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine <2g	4	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 10g <200g	17	2.06	.243	.059	1.93	2.18	2	3
Poss Drug Paraphernalia Man Meth Cocaine	16	2.06	.854	.213	1.61	2.52	1	5
Poss Drug Paraphernalia Meth Cocaine	21	1.95	.218	.048	1.85	2.05	1	2

Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Hydromorphone => 80 DU < 160 DU	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sched I,II Ex. Meth Cocaine => 2g < 128g	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched I, II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	4	1.75	.500	.250	.95	2.55	1	2
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched IV, V Dep Hall => 80DU 160 DU	2	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched VI V >14g < 4oz	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine <2g	15	1.73	.458	.118	1.48	1.99	1	2
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	21	1.86	.573	.125	1.60	2.12	1	3
Poss. Firearm Certain Person	13	1.54	.519	.144	1.22	1.85	1	2
Rape	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Reg Sex Offend near Cert FacI	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Residential Burglary	56	1.80	.553	.074	1.66	1.95	1	3

Robbery	31	1.19	.402	.072	1.05	1.34	1	2
Sexual Assault	9	1.89	.928	.309	1.18	2.60	1	4
Sexual Indecency with a Child	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Sexual Solicitation Of a Child	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Simul = Poss Of Drugs/Firearm	19	1.63	.597	.137	1.34	1.92	1	3
Stalking	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Tampering With Physical Evid.	2	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Terroristic Act	5	1.20	.447	.200	.64	1.76	1	2
Terroristic Threatening	3	1.33	.577	.333	-.10	2.77	1	2
Theft By Receiving	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
Theft by Receiving (Credit/Debit Card)	2	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Theft by Receiving > \$1,000 < \$5,000	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
Theft By Receiving > \$5,000 < \$25,000	4	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Theft By Receiving >= \$25,000	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Theft by Receiving Firearm Value is <\$25,000	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2

Theft of Leased Property	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Theft of Property	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
Theft of Property (Credit/Debit Card)	3	1.67	.577	.333	.23	3.10	1	2
Theft of Property (Firearm) < \$2,000	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
Theft of Property > \$25,000	5	1.80	.447	.200	1.24	2.36	1	2
Theft of Property >= \$1,000 <\$5,000	4	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Theft of Property >= \$5,000 < \$25,000	14	1.86	.363	.097	1.65	2.07	1	2
Theft of Property Obtained By Theft	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Theft of Scrap metal Obtained by Threat	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Trafficking Controlled Substance	2	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Use OF Anothers Prop For Crime	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Use/Poss. Of Parap to Manu Control Subst not meth/cocaine	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Deliver Meth Cocaine=>10g<200g	3	1.67	1.155	.667	-1.20	4.54	1	3

	Criminal Conspiracy	3	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
	Posses W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine =>10g<200g	25	1.68	.476	.095	1.48	1.88	1	2
	Deliver Cont Sub Sched I,II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	Total	637	1.74	.559	.022	1.70	1.78	1	5
AgeAtRelease	Advertise Drug Paraphernalia	3	50.33	10.504	6.064	24.24	76.43	40	61
	Agg. Assault on Corr. Employee	2	39.00	16.971	12.000	-113.47	191.47	27	51
	Aggravated Assault	4	48.50	9.000	4.500	34.18	62.82	36	56
	Aggravated Residential Burglary	1	23.00	.	.	.	.	23	23
	Aggravated Robbery	12	39.42	9.346	2.698	33.48	45.36	27	54
	Arson	2	53.50	4.950	3.500	9.03	97.97	50	57
	Battery 1st Degree	18	35.83	10.101	2.381	30.81	40.86	21	60
	Battery 2nd Degree	7	29.57	7.138	2.698	22.97	36.17	23	42
	Breaking and Entering	12	34.58	11.759	3.394	27.11	42.05	18	60
	Commercial Burglary	14	35.07	7.426	1.985	30.78	39.36	27	56
	Criminal Attempt	8	40.00	13.352	4.721	28.84	51.16	20	66
	Criminal Mischief	1	38.00	.	.	.	.	38	38
	Del Cont Sub Sched Meth Cocaine => 2g <28g	1	57.00	.	.	.	.	57	57

Del Cont Sched Hydromorphone => 80 DU < 160g	1	51.00	.	.	.	.	51	51
Deliver Meth Cocaine <2g	11	41.55	7.725	2.329	36.36	46.74	27	51
Deliver Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	25	38.52	10.809	2.162	34.06	42.98	24	66
Discharge Firearm from Vehicle	3	28.00	13.077	7.550	-4.48	60.48	19	43
Dist/Poss/View Sex Explicit	1	55.00	.	.	.	.	55	55
Domestic Battering 1st Degree	1	30.00	.	.	.	.	30	30
Domestic Battering 2nd Degree	6	36.67	10.386	4.240	25.77	47.57	23	52
Domestic Battering 3rd Degree	6	26.50	5.394	2.202	20.84	32.16	20	35
Domestic Battery 2nd Deg - Sub Offense or to Pregnant Woman	1	45.00	.	.	.	.	45	45
DUI 6th or Subsequent within 10 years of prior offense	1	61.00	.	.	.	.	61	61
Engage Welfare Minor - 1st Degree	1	59.00	.	.	.	.	59	59



Engage In Vol Crim Group Act	1	23.00	.	.	.	.	23	23
Escape 1st Degree	1	25.00	.	.	.	.	25	25
Escape 3rd Degree	5	27.40	6.229	2.786	19.67	35.13	21	37
Fail to Appear Regarding Order Issued Before Revocation Hear	7	40.29	17.144	6.480	24.43	56.14	29	77
Fail to Register Child/Sex off	9	41.33	11.979	3.993	32.13	50.54	26	59
Failure to Stop Acc. W/Inj/Death	1	52.00	.	.	.	.	52	52
Failure to Appear	19	37.00	10.812	2.480	31.79	42.21	22	59
False Imprisonment 1st Degree	2	36.00	1.414	1.000	23.29	48.71	35	37
Falsely Making Terror Threat	1	41.00	.	.	.	.	41	41
Financial Identy Fraud	2	37.00	11.314	8.000	-64.65	138.65	29	45
Fleeing	3	41.33	11.504	6.642	12.76	69.91	30	53
Forgery	17	36.12	9.266	2.247	31.35	40.88	23	55
Forgery 1st Degree	1	25.00	.	.	.	.	25	25
Forgery 2nd Degree	3	31.33	7.024	4.055	13.89	48.78	24	38
Furnishing Prohib. Articles	7	34.00	10.198	3.854	24.57	43.43	25	50
Internet Stalk - Child Fel.	1	41.00	.	.	.	.	41	41

---

 B

Kidnapping	1	28.00	.	.	.	.	28	28
Maintain Drug Premises	1	38.00	.	.	.	.	38	38
Maintain Drug Premises Drug Free Zone	3	33.33	1.528	.882	29.54	37.13	32	35
Mann Methamphetamine 2nd or Subs Offense	1	54.00	.	.	.	.	54	54
Manu/Del/Poss Control Subs.	11	47.82	7.948	2.396	42.48	53.16	37	60
Murder - 2nd Degree	3	37.67	7.638	4.410	18.69	56.64	31	46
Non-Support	3	45.67	9.292	5.364	22.59	68.75	38	56
Permit Child Abuse	1	33.00	.	.	.	.	33	33
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II => Excluding Meth Cocaine <2g	1	39.00	.	.	.	.	39	39
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II Ex Meth Cocaine =>28g <200g	1	61.00	.	.	.	.	61	61
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine <2g	60	38.08	10.911	1.409	35.26	40.90	21	65
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 10g <200g	4	38.00	7.958	3.979	25.34	50.66	30	49
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 2g <10g	17	36.18	9.619	2.333	31.23	41.12	20	53

Poss Drug Paraphernalia Man Meth Cocaine	16	39.94	11.234	2.808	33.95	45.92	24	66
Poss Drug Paraphernalia Meth Cocaine	21	36.90	9.460	2.064	32.60	41.21	25	62
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Hydromorphone = > 80 DU < 160 DU	1	63.00	.	.	.	.	63	63
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sched I,II Ex. Meth Cocaine => 2g < 128g	1	24.00	.	.	.	.	24	24
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched I, II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	4	37.00	10.614	5.307	20.11	53.89	27	52
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched IV, V Dep Hall => 80DU 160 DU	2	28.00	9.899	7.000	-60.94	116.94	21	35
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched VI V >14g < 4oz	2	49.50	12.021	8.500	-58.50	157.50	41	58
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine <2g	15	41.00	11.295	2.916	34.75	47.25	24	62
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	21	36.71	11.778	2.570	31.35	42.08	21	62
Poss. Firearm Certain Person	13	39.46	11.414	3.166	32.56	46.36	23	64

Rape	1	34.00	.	.	.	.	34	34
Reg Sex Offend near Cert FacI	1	49.00	.	.	.	.	49	49
Residential Burglary	56	36.39	9.180	1.227	33.93	38.85	19	54
Robbery	31	34.06	10.752	1.931	30.12	38.01	19	64
Sexual Assault	9	30.22	5.019	1.673	26.36	34.08	25	42
Sexual Indecency with a Child	1	43.00	.	.	.	.	43	43
Sexual Solicitation Of a Child	1	24.00	.	.	.	.	24	24
Simul = Poss Of Drugs/Firearm	19	39.89	7.400	1.698	36.33	43.46	29	54
Stalking	1	29.00	.	.	.	.	29	29
Tampering With Physical Evid.	2	40.50	4.950	3.500	-3.97	84.97	37	44
Terroristic Act	5	32.40	16.426	7.346	12.00	52.80	21	61
Terroristic Threatening	3	29.67	8.327	4.807	8.98	50.35	23	39
Theft By Receiving	2	32.00	1.414	1.000	19.29	44.71	31	33
Theft by Receiving (Credit/Debit Card)	2	44.00	4.243	3.000	5.88	82.12	41	47
Theft by Receiving > \$1,000 < \$5,000	2	36.50	19.092	13.500	-135.03	208.03	23	50
Theft By Receiving > \$5,000 < \$25,000	4	37.25	10.720	5.360	20.19	54.31	22	47

Theft By Receiving >= \$25,000	1	26.00	.	.	.	.	26	26
Theft by Receiving Firearm Value is <\$25,000	2	24.50	4.950	3.500	-19.97	68.97	21	28
Theft of Leased Property	1	30.00	.	.	.	.	30	30
Theft of Property	2	59.50	3.536	2.500	27.73	91.27	57	62
Theft of Property (Credit/Debit Card)	3	30.33	8.737	5.044	8.63	52.04	23	40
Theft of Property (Firearm) < \$2,000	2	25.50	4.950	3.500	-18.97	69.97	22	29
Theft of Property > \$25,000	5	40.00	21.012	9.397	13.91	66.09	22	70
Theft of Property >= \$1,000 <\$5,000	4	35.50	7.550	3.775	23.49	47.51	26	44
Theft of Property >= \$5,000 < \$25,000	14	35.14	9.478	2.533	29.67	40.62	24	58
Theft of Property Obtained By Theft	1	29.00	.	.	.	.	29	29
Theft of Scrap metal Obtained by Threat	1	39.00	.	.	.	.	39	39
Trafficking Controlled Substance	2	32.50	12.021	8.500	-75.50	140.50	24	41
Use OF Anothers Prop For Crime	1	27.00	.	.	.	.	27	27

	Use/Poss. Of Parap to Manu Control Subst not meth/cocaine	1	24.00	.	.	.	.	24	24
	Deliver Meth Cocaine=>10g<200g	3	39.33	3.055	1.764	31.74	46.92	36	42
	Criminal Conspiracy	3	40.67	15.275	8.819	2.72	78.61	24	54
	Posses W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine =>10g<200g	25	39.48	8.670	1.734	35.90	43.06	22	59
	Deliver Cont Sub Sched I,II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	1	49.00	.	.	.	.	49	49
	<b>Total</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>37.45</b>	<b>10.679</b>	<b>.423</b>	<b>36.61</b>	<b>38.28</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>77</b>
usingPlan	Advertise Drug Paraphernalia	3	6.67	3.215	1.856	-1.32	14.65	3	9
	Agg. Assault on Corr. Employee	2	10.00	1.414	1.000	-2.71	22.71	9	11
	Aggravated Assault	4	8.25	3.594	1.797	2.53	13.97	3	11
	Aggravated Residential Burglary	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
	Aggravated Robbery	12	9.42	.996	.288	8.78	10.05	8	11
	Arson	2	6.00	4.243	3.000	-32.12	44.12	3	9
	Battery 1st Degree	18	7.33	2.951	.695	5.87	8.80	2	10
	Battery 2nd Degree	7	6.43	3.552	1.343	3.14	9.71	1	11
	Breaking and Entering	12	6.00	3.357	.969	3.87	8.13	1	11

Commercial Burglary	14	8.29	2.813	.752	6.66	9.91	2	11
Criminal Attempt	8	6.50	3.338	1.180	3.71	9.29	2	10
Criminal Mischief	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Del Cont Sub Sched Meth Cocaine => 2g <28g	1	7.00	.	.	.	.	7	7
Del Cont Sched Hydromorphone => 80 DU < 160g	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Deliver Meth Cocaine <2g	11	8.18	2.676	.807	6.38	9.98	3	11
Deliver Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	25	7.84	2.718	.544	6.72	8.96	1	11
Discharge Firearm from Vehicle	3	5.33	4.163	2.404	-5.01	15.68	2	10
Dist/Poss/View Sex Explicit	1	11.00	.	.	.	.	11	11
Domestic Battering 1st Degree	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Domestic Battering 2nd Degree	6	7.67	3.445	1.406	4.05	11.28	3	11
Domestic Battering 3rd Degree	6	9.83	.983	.401	8.80	10.87	9	11
Domestic Battery 2nd Deg - Sub Offense or to Pregnant Woman	1	11.00	.	.	.	.	11	11

DUI 6th or Subsequent within 10 years of prior offense	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Engage Welfare Minor - 1st Degree	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Engage In Vol Crim Group Act	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Escape 1st Degree	1	11.00	.	.	.	.	11	11
Escape 3rd Degree	5	8.80	.447	.200	8.24	9.36	8	9
Fail to Appear Regarding Order Issued Before Revocation Hear	7	7.57	4.237	1.601	3.65	11.49	1	11
Fail to Register Child/Sex off	9	7.22	2.906	.969	4.99	9.46	3	11
Failure to Stop Acc. W/Inj/Death	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Failure to Appear	19	8.42	2.912	.668	7.02	9.82	2	11
False Imprisonment 1st Degree	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Falsely Making Terror Threat	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Financial Identity Fraud	2	11.00	.000	.000	11.00	11.00	11	11
Fleeing	3	8.67	2.082	1.202	3.50	13.84	7	11
Forgery	17	8.00	3.202	.776	6.35	9.65	3	11
Forgery 1st Degree	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8



Forgery 2nd Degree	3	10.00	1.000	.577	7.52	12.48	9	11
Furnishing Prohib. Articles	7	6.86	4.451	1.682	2.74	10.97	1	11
Internet Stalk - Child Fel. B	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Kidnapping	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Maintain Drug Premises	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Maintain Drug Premises Drug Free Zone	3	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Mann Methamphetamine 2nd or Subs Offense	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
Manu/Del/Poss Control Subs.	11	8.00	2.608	.786	6.25	9.75	3	11
Murder - 2nd Degree	3	8.00	1.000	.577	5.52	10.48	7	9
Non-Support	3	7.67	3.512	2.028	-1.06	16.39	4	11
Permit Child Abuse	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II => Excluding Meth Cocaine <2g	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II Ex Meth Cocaine =>28g <200g	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine <2g	60	7.37	2.846	.367	6.63	8.10	1	11

Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 10g <200g	4	7.50	1.000	.500	5.91	9.09	7	9
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 2g <10g	17	7.41	3.554	.862	5.58	9.24	1	11
Poss Drug Paraphernalia Man Meth Cocaine	16	7.31	3.049	.762	5.69	8.94	2	11
Poss Drug Paraphernalia Meth Cocaine	21	8.81	2.294	.501	7.77	9.85	3	11
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Hydromorphone = > 80 DU < 160 DU	1	10.00	.	.	.	.	10	10
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sched I,II Ex. Meth Cocaine => 2g < 128g	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched I, II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	4	7.50	3.000	1.500	2.73	12.27	3	9
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched IV, V Dep Hall => 80DU 160 DU	2	8.00	1.414	1.000	-4.71	20.71	7	9
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched VI V >14g < 4oz	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8

Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine <2g	15	7.13	3.292	.850	5.31	8.96	1	11
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	21	7.81	2.657	.580	6.60	9.02	1	11
Poss. Firearm Certain Person	13	7.54	2.787	.773	5.85	9.22	2	11
Rape	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Reg Sex Offend near Cert FacI	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Residential Burglary	56	8.04	2.867	.383	7.27	8.80	2	11
Robbery	31	7.74	2.175	.391	6.94	8.54	2	11
Sexual Assault	9	8.11	2.315	.772	6.33	9.89	4	11
Sexual Indecency with a Child	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Sexual Solicitation Of a Child	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Simul = Poss Of Drugs/Firearm	19	6.68	2.849	.654	5.31	8.06	2	11
Stalking	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Tampering With Physical Evid.	2	5.50	4.950	3.500	-38.97	49.97	2	9
Terroristic Act	5	8.40	1.342	.600	6.73	10.07	7	10
Terroristic Threatening	3	8.33	3.786	2.186	-1.07	17.74	4	11
Theft By Receiving	2	8.00	4.243	3.000	-30.12	46.12	5	11

Theft by Receiving (Credit/Debit Card)	2	7.00	5.657	4.000	-43.82	57.82	3	11
Theft by Receiving > \$1,000 < \$5,000	2	7.50	4.950	3.500	-36.97	51.97	4	11
Theft By Receiving > \$5,000 < \$25,000	4	7.75	4.031	2.016	1.34	14.16	2	11
Theft By Receiving >= \$25,000	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
Theft by Receiving Firearm Value is <\$25,000	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Theft of Leased Property	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Theft of Property	2	7.50	3.536	2.500	-24.27	39.27	5	10
Theft of Property (Credit/Debit Card)	3	8.33	4.619	2.667	-3.14	19.81	3	11
Theft of Property (Firearm) < \$2,000	2	8.00	1.414	1.000	-4.71	20.71	7	9
Theft of Property > \$25,000	5	7.60	2.608	1.166	4.36	10.84	3	9
Theft of Property >= \$1,000 <\$5,000	4	7.00	2.708	1.354	2.69	11.31	3	9
Theft of Property >= \$5,000 < \$25,000	14	7.36	2.530	.676	5.90	8.82	3	11
Theft of Property Obtained By Theft	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2

Theft of Scrap metal Obtained by Threat	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Trafficking Controlled Substance	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Use OF Anothers Prop For Crime	1	7.00	.	.	.	.	7	7
Use/Poss. Of Parap to Manu Control Subst not meth/cocaine	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
Deliver Meth Cocaine=>10g<200g	3	5.67	4.163	2.404	-4.68	16.01	1	9
Criminal Conspiracy	3	8.67	1.528	.882	4.87	12.46	7	10
Posses W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine =>10g<200g	25	8.12	1.922	.384	7.33	8.91	3	11
Deliver Cont Sub Sched 1,II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
Total	637	7.76	2.774	.110	7.54	7.98	1	11

## ANOVA

		Sum of	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
		Squares				
<u>Gender</u>	Between Groups	21.301	96	.222	1.525	.002

	Within Groups	78.561	540	.145		
	Total	99.862	636			
Race	Between Groups	39.843	96	.415	1.410	.010
	Within Groups	158.898	540	.294		
	Total	198.741	636			
AgeAtRelease	Between Groups	16156.114	96	168.293	1.612	.001
	Within Groups	56375.268	540	104.399		
	Total	72531.381	636			
HousingPlan	Between Groups	583.667	96	6.080	.762	.950
	Within Groups	4310.584	540	7.983		
	Total	4894.251	636			

## Appendix E: Department of Correction United States Census Region South Multiple

## Regression

Primary offense - dependent variables gender, race, and age at release

*Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>*

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
	AgeAtRelease, Gender, PrimaryOffense, Race <sup>b</sup>		Enter

a. Dependent Variable: HousingPlan

b. All requested variables entered.

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	52.834	4	13.208	1.724	.143 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	4841.418	632	7.660		
Total	4894.251	636			

a. Dependent Variable: HousingPlan

b. Predictors: (Constant), AgeAtRelease, Gender, PrimaryOffense, Race

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	8.920	.565		15.775	.000
PrimaryOffense	-.003	.004	-.031	-.778	.437
Gender	-.419	.280	-.060	-1.499	.134
Race	-.301	.198	-.061	-1.517	.130
AgeAtRelease	-.011	.010	-.040	-1.022	.307

a. Dependent Variable: HousingPlan



## Appendix F: Department of Correction United States Census Region South Pearson Correlation

*Correlations*

		Gender	Race	AgeAtRelease	PrimaryOffen se	HousingPlan
Gender	Pearson Correlation	1	.137**	-.011	-.007	-.068
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.791	.868	.089
	N	637	637	637	637	637
Race	Pearson Correlation	.137**	1	.026	.000	-.070
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.520	.997	.078
	N	637	637	637	637	637
AgeAtRelease	Pearson Correlation	-.011	.026	1	-.036	-.040
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.791	.520		.362	.310
	N	637	637	637	637	637
PrimaryOffense	Pearson Correlation	-.007	.000	-.036	1	-.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.868	.997	.362		.466
	N	637	637	637	637	637
HousingPlan	Pearson Correlation	-.068	-.070	-.040	-.029	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.089	.078	.310	.466	
	N	637	637	637	637	637

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

## Appendix G: Public Housing - Housing Types

## Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer's V, and Lambda Statistical Table Results

*Case Processing Summary*

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
HousingType * ApplicationRequirements	484	100.0%	0	0.0%	484	100.0%
HousingType * BackgroundCheck	484	100.0%	0	0.0%	484	100.0%
HousingType * CreditCheck	484	100.0%	0	0.0%	484	100.0%
HousingType * SecurityDepositandor Cost	484	100.0%	0	0.0%	484	100.0%

**Housing Type – Application Requirements***Crosstab*

Count		ApplicationRequirements		Total
		Yes	No	
HousingType	Apartments	57	228	285
	Halfway Houses	16	68	84
	Residential Treatment Program Houses	15	100	115
	Total	88	396	484

*Chi-Square Tests*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.717 <sup>a</sup>	2	.257
Likelihood Ratio	2.877	2	.237
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.425	1	.119
N of Valid Cases	484		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.27.

*Directional Measures*

			Value	Asymptotic Standard Error <sup>a</sup>	Approximate T	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	b	b
		HousingType Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
		ApplicationRequiremen ts Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	HousingType Dependent	.003	.004		.218 <sup>c</sup>
		ApplicationRequiremen ts Dependent	.006	.006		.258 <sup>c</sup>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

*Symmetric Measures*

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.075	.257
	Cramer's V	.075	.257
N of Valid Cases		484	

**Housing Type – Background Check**

*Crosstab*

Count

		BackgroundCheck		Total
		Yes	No	
HousingType	Apartments	70	215	285
	Halfway Houses	3	81	84
	Residential Treatment Program Houses	2	113	115
Total		75	409	484

*Chi-Square Tests*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	43.629 <sup>a</sup>	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	53.604	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	38.863	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	484		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.02.

*Symmetric Measures*

	Value	Approximate Significance
--	-------	-----------------------------

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.300	.000
	Cramer's V	.300	.000
N of Valid Cases		484	

*Directional Measures*

			Value	Asymptotic Standard Error <sup>a</sup>	Approximate T	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	b	b
		HousingType Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
		BackgroundCheck Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	HousingType Dependent	.059	.010		.000 <sup>c</sup>
		BackgroundCheck Dependent	.090	.018		.000 <sup>c</sup>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

*Symmetric Measures*

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.300	.000
	Cramer's V	.300	.000
N of Valid Cases		484	

**Housing Type – Credit Check***Crosstab*

Count		CreditCheck		
		Yes	No	Total
HousingType	Apartments	73	212	285
	Halfway Houses	2	82	84
	Residential Treatment Program Houses	0	115	115
	Total	75	409	484

*Chi-Square Tests*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	54.404 <sup>a</sup>	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	74.194	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	48.752	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	484		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.02.



*Directional Measures*

			Value	Asymptotic Standard Error <sup>a</sup>	Approximat e T	Approximat e Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	b	b
		HousingType Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
		CreditCheck Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	HousingType Dependent	.073	.008		.000 <sup>c</sup>
		CreditCheck Dependent	.112	.016		.000 <sup>c</sup>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

*Symmetric Measures*

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.335	.000
	Cramer's V	.335	.000
N of Valid Cases		484	

**Housing Type – Security Deposit and or Cost***Crosstab*

## Count

		SecurityDepositandorCost		Total
		Yes	No	
HousingType	Apartments	91	194	285
	Halfway Houses	14	70	84
	Residential Treatment Program Houses	15	100	115
Total		120	364	484

*Chi-Square Tests*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.274 <sup>a</sup>	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.366	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.022	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	484		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.83.

*Directional Measures*

			Value	Asymptotic Standard Error <sup>a</sup>	Approximate T	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	b	b
		HousingType Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
		SecurityDepositandor Cost Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	HousingType Dependent	.026	.011		.000 <sup>c</sup>
		SecurityDepositandor Cost Dependent	.040	.016		.000 <sup>c</sup>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

*Symmetric Measures*

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.200	.000
	Cramer's V	.200	.000
N of Valid Cases		484	

## Appendix H: Public Housing - United States Census Regions

## Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer's V, and Lambda Statistical Table Results

*Case Processing Summary*

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
U.S.CensusRegion * ApplicationRequiremen ts	484	100.0%	0	0.0%	484	100.0%
U.S.CensusRegion * BackgroundCheck	484	100.0%	0	0.0%	484	100.0%
U.S.CensusRegion * CreditCheck	484	100.0%	0	0.0%	484	100.0%
U.S.CensusRegion * SecurityDepositandor Cost	484	100.0%	0	0.0%	484	100.0%

**Application Requirements***Crosstab*

Count

	ApplicationRequirement s		
	Yes	No	Total

United	Midwest	23	90	113
StatesCensusRegio	Northeast	10	67	77
n	South	22	140	162
	West	33	99	132
Total		88	396	484

*Chi-Square Tests*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.186 <sup>a</sup>	3	.042
Likelihood Ratio	8.138	3	.043
Linear-by-Linear Association	.731	1	.392
N of Valid Cases	484		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.00.

*Directional Measures*

			Value	Asymptotic Standard Error <sup>a</sup>	Approximat e T <sup>b</sup>	Approximat e Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.027	.018	1.487	.137
		U.S.CensusRegion Dependent	.034	.023	1.487	.137
		ApplicationRequiremen ts Dependent	.000	.000	. <sup>c</sup>	. <sup>c</sup>
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	U.S.CensusRegion Dependent	.006	.004		.029 <sup>d</sup>
		ApplicationRequiremen ts Dependent	.017	.012		.043 <sup>d</sup>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

*Symmetric Measures*

		Value	Approximat e Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.130	.042
	Cramer's V	.130	.042
N of Valid Cases		484	

**Background Check**

*Crosstab*

Count

		BackgroundCheck		Total
		Yes	No	
U.S.CensusRegion	Midwest	18	95	113
	Northeast	12	65	77
	South	22	140	162
	West	23	109	132
Total		75	409	484

*Chi-Square Tests*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.846 <sup>a</sup>	3	.839
Likelihood Ratio	.850	3	.838
Linear-by-Linear Association	.028	1	.866
N of Valid Cases	484		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.93.



*Symmetric Measures*

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.042	.839
	Cramer's V	.042	.839
N of Valid Cases		484	

**Credit Check***Crosstab*

## Count

		CreditCheck		Total
		Yes	No	
U.S. CensusRegion	Midwest	19	94	113
	Northeast	13	64	77
	South	22	140	162
	West	21	111	132
Total		75	409	484

*Chi-Square Tests*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.846 <sup>a</sup>	3	.839
Likelihood Ratio	.850	3	.838

Linear-by-Linear Association	.028	1	.866
N of Valid Cases	484		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.93.

*Directional Measures*

			Value	Asymptotic Standard Error <sup>a</sup>	Approximate T	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	b	b
		U.S.CensusRegion Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
		CreditCheck Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	U.S.CensusRegion Dependent	.001	.001		.836 <sup>c</sup>
		CreditCheck Dependent	.002	.003		.865 <sup>c</sup>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

*Symmetric Measures*

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.039	.865
	Cramer's V	.039	.865
N of Valid Cases		484	

## Security Deposit and or Cost

*Crosstab*

Count		SecurityDepositandorCost		Total
		Yes	No	
U.S.CensusRegion	Midwest	29	84	113
	Northeast	16	61	77
	South	39	123	162
	West	36	96	132
Total		120	364	484

*Chi-Square Tests*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.191 <sup>a</sup>	3	.755
Likelihood Ratio	1.209	3	.751
Linear-by-Linear Association	.172	1	.678
N of Valid Cases	484		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.09.

*Directional Measures*

			Value	Asymptotic Standard Error <sup>a</sup>	Approximate T	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000	b	b
		U.S.CensusRegion Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
		SecurityDepositandor Cost Dependent	.000	.000	b	b
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	U.S.CensusRegion Dependent	.001	.001		.796 <sup>c</sup>
		SecurityDepositandor Cost Dependent	.002	.004		.756 <sup>c</sup>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

*Symmetric Measures*

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.050	.755
	Cramer's V	.050	.755
N of Valid Cases		484	

## Appendix I: Public Housing Multiple Regression

**Application Requirements***Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>*

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	U.S. CensusRegion, HousingType <sup>b</sup>		Enter

a. Dependent Variable:  
ApplicationRequirements

b. All requested variables entered.

*Model Summary<sup>b</sup>*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.083 <sup>a</sup>	.007	.003	.386

a. Predictors: (Constant), U.S.CensusRegion, HousingType

b. Dependent Variable: ApplicationRequirements

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.493	2	.246	1.658	.192 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	71.507	481	.149		
	Total	72.000	483			

a. Dependent Variable: ApplicationRequirements

b. Predictors: (Constant), U.S.CensusRegion, HousingType

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardize	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	d Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	.802	.056		14.439	.000
	HousingType	.034	.021	.073	1.607	.109
	U.S.CensusRegion	-.015	.016	-.043	-.940	.348

a. Dependent Variable: ApplicationRequirements

*Residuals Statistics<sup>a</sup>*

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	.78	.89	.82	.032	484
Residual	-.888	.224	.000	.385	484
Std. Predicted Value	-1.311	2.186	.000	1.000	484
Std. Residual	-2.303	.580	.000	.998	484

a. Dependent Variable: ApplicationRequirements

**Background Check***Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>*

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	U.S. CensusRegi on, HousingTyp e <sup>b</sup>		Enter

a. Dependent Variable: BackgroundCheck

b. All requested variables entered.



*Model Summary<sup>b</sup>*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.285 <sup>a</sup>	.081	.077	.348

a. Predictors: (Constant), U.S.CensusRegion, HousingType

b. Dependent Variable: BackgroundCheck

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.132	2	2.566	21.191	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	58.246	481	.121		
	Total	63.378	483			

a. Dependent Variable: BackgroundCheck

b. Predictors: (Constant), U.S.CensusRegion, HousingType

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.662	.050		13.205	.000
	HousingType	.123	.019	.285	6.508	.000
	U.S.CensusRegion	-.007	.014	-.023	-.520	.603

a. Dependent Variable: BackgroundCheck

*Residuals Statistics<sup>a</sup>*

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	.76	1.02	.85	.103	484
Residual	-1.001	.245	.000	.347	484
Std. Predicted Value	-.871	1.730	.000	1.000	484
Std. Residual	-2.877	.703	.000	.998	484

a. Dependent Variable: BackgroundCheck

**Credit Check**

*Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>*

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	U.S. CensusRegion, HousingType <sup>b</sup>		Enter

a. Dependent Variable: CreditCheck

b. All requested variables entered.

*Model Summary<sup>b</sup>*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.318 <sup>a</sup>	.101	.097	.344

a. Predictors: (Constant), U.S.CensusRegion, HousingType

b. Dependent Variable: CreditCheck

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6.397	2	3.199	27.001	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	56.981	481	.118		
	Total	63.378	483			

a. Dependent Variable: CreditCheck

b. Predictors: (Constant), U.S.CensusRegion, HousingType

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardize	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	d Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	.618	.050		12.466	.000
	HousingType	.137	.019	.318	7.337	.000
	U.S.CensusRegion	.000	.014	.001	.026	.979

a. Dependent Variable: CreditCheck

*Residuals Statistics<sup>a</sup>*

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	.76	1.03	.85	.115	484
Residual	-.894	.244	.000	.343	484
Std. Predicted Value	-.778	1.614	.000	1.000	484
Std. Residual	-2.597	.710	.000	.998	484

a. Dependent Variable: CreditCheck

**Security Deposit and or Cost***Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>*

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	U.S. CensusRegi on, HousingTyp e <sup>b</sup>		Enter

a. Dependent Variable:  
SecurityDepositandorCost

b. All requested variables entered.

*Model Summary<sup>b</sup>*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.195 <sup>a</sup>	.038	.034	.425

a. Predictors: (Constant), U.S.CensusRegion, HousingType

b. Dependent Variable: SecurityDepositandorCost

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.444	2	1.722	9.542	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	86.804	481	.180		
	Total	90.248	483			

a. Dependent Variable: SecurityDepositandorCost

b. Predictors: (Constant), U.S.CensusRegion, HousingType

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.617	.061		10.078	.000
	HousingType	.100	.023	.195	4.348	.000
	U.S.CensusRegion	-.011	.017	-.029	-.652	.515

a. Dependent Variable: SecurityDepositandorCost

*Residuals Statistics<sup>a</sup>*

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	.67	.91	.75	.084	484
Residual	-.906	.328	.000	.424	484
Std. Predicted Value	-.952	1.825	.000	1.000	484
Std. Residual	-2.133	.773	.000	.998	484

a. Dependent Variable: SecurityDepositandorCost

## Appendix J: Public Housing: T Test

Housing Types Apartments and Halfway Houses

*Group Statistics*

	HousingType	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ApplicationRequirements	Apartments	285	.80	.401	.024
	Halfway Houses	84	.81	.395	.043
BackgroundCheck	Apartments	285	.75	.431	.026
	Halfway Houses	84	.96	.187	.020
CreditCheck	Apartments	285	.74	.437	.026
	Halfway Houses	84	.98	.153	.017
SecurityDepositandorCost	Apartments	285	.68	.467	.028
	Halfway Houses	84	.83	.375	.041



*Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
ApplicationRequirements	Equal variances assumed	.150	.699	-.192	367	.848	-.010	.050	-.107	.088
	Equal variances not assumed			-.194	137.284	.847	-.010	.049	-.107	.088
BackgroundCheck	Equal variances assumed	134.084	.000	-4.340	367	.000	-.210	.048	-.305	-.115
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.425	318.841	.000	-.210	.033	-.274	-.146
CreditCheck	Equal variances assumed	181.473	.000	-4.780	367	.000	-.232	.049	-.328	-.137
	Equal variances not assumed			-7.534	357.464	.000	-.232	.031	-.293	-.172
SecurityDepositandorCost	Equal variances assumed	44.161	.000	-2.745	367	.006	-.153	.056	-.262	-.043
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.091	166.125	.002	-.153	.049	-.250	-.055

*Independent Samples Effect Sizes*

		Standardizer <sup>a</sup>	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
ApplicationRequirements	Cohen's d	.399	-.024	-.267	.220
	Hedges' correction	.400	-.024	-.267	.219
	Glass's delta	.395	-.024	-.267	.219
BackgroundCheck	Cohen's d	.390	-.539	-.785	-.292
	Hedges' correction	.390	-.538	-.783	-.291
	Glass's delta	.187	-1.124	-1.419	-.825
CreditCheck	Cohen's d	.392	-.593	-.840	-.346
	Hedges' correction	.392	-.592	-.838	-.345
	Glass's delta	.153	-1.515	-1.847	-1.177
SecurityDepositandorCost	Cohen's d	.448	-.341	-.585	-.096
	Hedges' correction	.449	-.340	-.584	-.096
	Glass's delta	.375	-.407	-.657	-.155

- a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.  
 Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.  
 Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.  
 Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

### **Housing Types Halfway Houses and Residential Treatment Housing Program**

*Group Statistics*

	HousingType	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ApplicationRequirements	Halfway Houses	84	.81	.395	.043
	Residential Treatment Program Houses	115	.87	.338	.032
BackgroundCheck	Halfway Houses	84	.96	.187	.020
	Residential Treatment Program Houses	115	.98	.131	.012
CreditCheck	Halfway Houses	84	.98	.153	.017
	Residential Treatment Program Houses	115	1.00	.000	.000
SecurityDepositandor Cost	Halfway Houses	84	.83	.375	.041
	Residential Treatment Program Houses	115	.87	.338	.032

*Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
ApplicationRequirements	Equal variances assumed	5.260	.023	-1.152	197	.251	-.060	.052	-.163	.043
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.124	161.899	.263	-.060	.053	-.166	.045
BackgroundCheck	Equal variances assumed	2.662	.104	-.813	197	.417	-.018	.023	-.063	.026
	Equal variances not assumed			-.771	140.458	.442	-.018	.024	-.065	.029
CreditCheck	Equal variances assumed	11.669	.001	-1.666	197	.097	-.024	.014	-.052	.004
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.423	83.000	.159	-.024	.017	-.057	.009
SecurityDepositandorCost	Equal variances assumed	2.015	.157	-.713	197	.477	-.036	.051	-.136	.064
	Equal variances not assumed			-.701	167.841	.484	-.036	.052	-.138	.066

*Independent Samples Effect Sizes*

		Standardizer <sup>a</sup>	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
ApplicationRequirements	Cohen's d	.363	-.165	-.447	.117
	Hedges' correction	.365	-.165	-.445	.116
	Glass's delta	.338	-.178	-.459	.105
BackgroundCheck	Cohen's d	.157	-.117	-.398	.165
	Hedges' correction	.158	-.116	-.397	.164
	Glass's delta	.131	-.140	-.421	.143
CreditCheck	Cohen's d	.100	-.239	-.521	.043
	Hedges' correction	.100	-.238	-.519	.043
	Glass's delta	.	.	.	.
SecurityDepositandorCost	Cohen's d	.354	-.102	-.384	.179
	Hedges' correction	.356	-.102	-.382	.179
	Glass's delta	.338	-.107	-.389	.175

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

**United States Census Regions Midwest and Northeast**

*Group Statistics*

	U.S.CensusRegion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ApplicationRequiremen ts	Midwest	113	.80	.404	.038
	Northeast	77	.87	.338	.039
BackgroundCheck	Midwest	113	.84	.368	.035
	Northeast	77	.84	.365	.042
CreditCheck	Midwest	113	.83	.376	.035
	Northeast	77	.83	.377	.043
SecurityDepositandor Cost	Midwest	113	.74	.439	.041
	Northeast	77	.79	.408	.047
HousingType	Midwest	113	1.61	.795	.075
	Northeast	77	1.60	.862	.098

*Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
ApplicationRequirements	Equal variances assumed	7.410	.007	-1.315	188	.190	-.074	.056	-.184	.037
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.360	180.146	.176	-.074	.054	-.181	.033
BackgroundCheck	Equal variances assumed	.016	.899	-.064	188	.949	-.003	.054	-.110	.103
	Equal variances not assumed			-.064	164.119	.949	-.003	.054	-.110	.103
CreditCheck	Equal variances assumed	.001	.980	.012	188	.990	.001	.056	-.109	.110
	Equal variances not assumed			.012	162.981	.990	.001	.056	-.109	.111
SecurityDepositandorCost	Equal variances assumed	2.498	.116	-.775	188	.440	-.049	.063	-.173	.076
	Equal variances not assumed			-.785	170.841	.433	-.049	.062	-.172	.074
HousingType	Equal variances assumed	1.431	.233	.109	188	.914	.013	.122	-.227	.253
	Equal variances not assumed			.107	154.444	.915	.013	.124	-.231	.257

*Independent Samples Effect Sizes*

		Standardizer <sup>a</sup>	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
ApplicationRequirements	Cohen's d	.379	-.194	-.484	.096
	Hedges' correction	.381	-.194	-.482	.096
	Glass's delta	.338	-.218	-.509	.075
BackgroundCheck	Cohen's d	.367	-.009	-.299	.280
	Hedges' correction	.368	-.009	-.298	.279
	Glass's delta	.365	-.009	-.299	.280
CreditCheck	Cohen's d	.376	.002	-.288	.291
	Hedges' correction	.378	.002	-.287	.290
	Glass's delta	.377	.002	-.288	.291
SecurityDepositandorCost	Cohen's d	.427	-.114	-.404	.176
	Hedges' correction	.428	-.114	-.403	.175
	Glass's delta	.408	-.120	-.409	.171
HousingType	Cohen's d	.823	.016	-.274	.306
	Hedges' correction	.826	.016	-.273	.304
	Glass's delta	.862	.015	-.274	.305

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.



### United States Census Regions South and West

#### *Group Statistics*

	U.S.CensusRegion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ApplicationRequirements	South	162	.86	.344	.027
	West	132	.75	.435	.038
BackgroundCheck	South	162	.86	.344	.027
	West	132	.83	.381	.033
CreditCheck	South	162	.86	.344	.027
	West	132	.84	.367	.032
SecurityDepositandor Cost	South	162	.76	.429	.034
	West	132	.73	.447	.039
HousingType	South	162	1.63	.848	.067
	West	132	1.73	.855	.074

*Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
ApplicationRequirements	Equal variances assumed	25.680	.000	2.516	292	.012	.114	.045	.025	.204
	Equal variances not assumed			2.457	246.409	.015	.114	.046	.023	.206
BackgroundCheck	Equal variances assumed	3.293	.071	.909	292	.364	.038	.042	-.045	.122
	Equal variances not assumed			.899	266.922	.369	.038	.043	-.046	.123
CreditCheck	Equal variances assumed	1.252	.264	.560	292	.576	.023	.042	-.058	.105
	Equal variances not assumed			.557	271.998	.578	.023	.042	-.059	.106
SecurityDepositandorCost	Equal variances assumed	1.539	.216	.624	292	.533	.032	.051	-.069	.133
	Equal variances not assumed			.621	275.207	.535	.032	.051	-.069	.133
HousingType	Equal variances assumed	.058	.810	-1.054	292	.293	-.105	.100	-.302	.091
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.054	279.236	.293	-.105	.100	-.302	.091

*Independent Samples Effect Sizes*

		Standardizer <sup>a</sup>	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
ApplicationRequirements	Cohen's d	.387	.295	.064	.526
	Hedges' correction	.388	.294	.064	.524
	Glass's delta	.435	.263	.030	.494
BackgroundCheck	Cohen's d	.361	.107	-.124	.336
	Hedges' correction	.362	.106	-.123	.336
	Glass's delta	.381	.101	-.129	.331
CreditCheck	Cohen's d	.354	.066	-.164	.296
	Hedges' correction	.355	.066	-.164	.295
	Glass's delta	.367	.063	-.167	.293
SecurityDepositandorCost	Cohen's d	.437	.073	-.157	.303
	Hedges' correction	.438	.073	-.156	.302
	Glass's delta	.447	.072	-.159	.301
HousingType	Cohen's d	.851	-.124	-.354	.107
	Hedges' correction	.853	-.123	-.353	.106
	Glass's delta	.855	-.123	-.353	.107

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Advertise Drug Paraphernalia	3	6.67	3.215	1.856	-1.32	14.65	3	9
Agg. Assault on Corr. Employee	2	10.00	1.414	1.000	-2.71	22.71	9	11
Aggravated Assault	4	8.25	3.594	1.797	2.53	13.97	3	11
Aggravated Residential Burglary	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Aggravated Robbery	12	9.42	.996	.288	8.78	10.05	8	11
Arson	2	6.00	4.243	3.000	-32.12	44.12	3	9
Battery 1st Degree	18	7.33	2.951	.695	5.87	8.80	2	10
Battery 2nd Degree	7	6.43	3.552	1.343	3.14	9.71	1	11
Breaking and Entering	12	6.00	3.357	.969	3.87	8.13	1	11
Commercial Burglary	14	8.29	2.813	.752	6.66	9.91	2	11
Criminal Attempt	8	6.50	3.338	1.180	3.71	9.29	2	10
Criminal Mischief	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Del Cont Sub Sched Meth Cocaine => 2g <28g	1	7.00	.	.	.	.	7	7
Del Cont Sched Hydromorphone => 80 DU <160g	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Deliver Meth Cocaine <2g	11	8.18	2.676	.807	6.38	9.98	3	11
Deliver Meth Cocaine => 2g <10g	25	7.84	2.718	.544	6.72	8.96	1	11
Discharge Firearm from Vehicle	3	5.33	4.163	2.404	-5.01	15.68	2	10
Dist/Poss/View Sex Explicit	1	11.00	.	.	.	.	11	11

Domestic Battering 1st Degree	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Domestic Battering 2nd Degree	6	7.67	3.445	1.406	4.05	11.28	3	11
Domestic Battering 3rd Degree	6	9.83	.983	.401	8.80	10.87	9	11
Domestic Battery 2nd Deg - Sub Offense or to Pregnant Woman	1	11.00	.	.	.	.	11	11
DUI 6th or Subsequent within 10 years of prior offense	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Engage Welfare Minor - 1st Degree	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Engage In Vol Crim Group Act	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Escape 1st Degree	1	11.00	.	.	.	.	11	11
Escape 3rd Degree	5	8.80	.447	.200	8.24	9.36	8	9
Fail to Appear Regarding Order Issued Before Revocation Hear	7	7.57	4.237	1.601	3.65	11.49	1	11
Fail to Register Child/Sex off	9	7.22	2.906	.969	4.99	9.46	3	11
Failure to Stop Acc. W/Inj/Death	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Failure to Appear	19	8.42	2.912	.668	7.02	9.82	2	11

False Imprisonment 1st Degree	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Falsely Making Terror Threat	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Financial Identity Fraud	2	11.00	.000	.000	11.00	11.00	11	11
Fleeing	3	8.67	2.082	1.202	3.50	13.84	7	11
Forgery	17	8.00	3.202	.776	6.35	9.65	3	11
Forgery 1st Degree	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Forgery 2nd Degree	3	10.00	1.000	.577	7.52	12.48	9	11
Furnishing Prohib. Articles	7	6.86	4.451	1.682	2.74	10.97	1	11
Internet Stalk - Child Fel. B	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Kidnapping	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Maintain Drug Premises	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Maintain Drug Premises Drug Free Zone	3	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Mann Methamphetamine 2nd or Subs Offense	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
Manu/Del/Poss Control Subs.	11	8.00	2.608	.786	6.25	9.75	3	11
Murder - 2nd Degree	3	8.00	1.000	.577	5.52	10.48	7	9
Non-Support	3	7.67	3.512	2.028	-1.06	16.39	4	11
Permit Child Abuse	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II => Excluding Meth Cocaine <2g	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Poss Cont Sub Sched. I,II Ex Meth Cocaine =>28g <200g	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine <2g	60	7.37	2.846	.367	6.63	8.10	1	11

Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 10g <200g	4	7.50	1.000	.500	5.91	9.09	7	9
Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 2g <10g	17	7.41	3.554	.862	5.58	9.24	1	11
Poss Drug Paraphernalia Man Meth Cocaine	16	7.31	3.049	.762	5.69	8.94	2	11
Poss Drug Paraphernalia Meth Cocaine	21	8.81	2.294	.501	7.77	9.85	3	11
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Hydromorphone => 80 DU < 160 DU	1	10.00	.	.	.	.	10	10
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sched I,II Ex. Meth Cocaine => 2g < 128g	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched I, II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g	4	7.50	3.000	1.500	2.73	12.27	3	9
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched IV, V Dep Hall => 80DU 160 DU	2	8.00	1.414	1.000	-4.71	20.71	7	9
Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched VI V >14g < 4oz	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine <2g	15	7.13	3.292	.850	5.31	8.96	1	11
Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g	21	7.81	2.657	.580	6.60	9.02	1	11

Poss. Firearm Certain Person	13	7.54	2.787	.773	5.85	9.22	2	11
Rape	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Reg Sex Offend near Cert FacI	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Residential Burglary	56	8.04	2.867	.383	7.27	8.80	2	11
Robbery	31	7.74	2.175	.391	6.94	8.54	2	11
Sexual Assault	9	8.11	2.315	.772	6.33	9.89	4	11
Sexual Indecency with a Child	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Sexual Solicitation Of a Child	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Simul = Poss Of Drugs/Firearm	19	6.68	2.849	.654	5.31	8.06	2	11
Stalking	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Tampering With Physical Evid.	2	5.50	4.950	3.500	-38.97	49.97	2	9
Terroristic Act	5	8.40	1.342	.600	6.73	10.07	7	10
Terroristic Threatening	3	8.33	3.786	2.186	-1.07	17.74	4	11
Theft By Receiving	2	8.00	4.243	3.000	-30.12	46.12	5	11
Theft by Receiving (Credit/Debit Card)	2	7.00	5.657	4.000	-43.82	57.82	3	11
Theft by Receiving > \$1,000 < \$5,000	2	7.50	4.950	3.500	-36.97	51.97	4	11
Theft By Receiving > \$5,000 < \$25,000	4	7.75	4.031	2.016	1.34	14.16	2	11



Theft By Receiving >= \$25,000	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
Theft by Receiving Firearm Value is <\$25,000	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Theft of Leased Property	1	9.00	.	.	.	.	9	9
Theft of Property	2	7.50	3.536	2.500	-24.27	39.27	5	10
Theft of Property (Credit/Debit Card)	3	8.33	4.619	2.667	-3.14	19.81	3	11
Theft of Property (Firearm) < \$2,000	2	8.00	1.414	1.000	-4.71	20.71	7	9
Theft of Property > \$25,000	5	7.60	2.608	1.166	4.36	10.84	3	9
Theft of Property >= \$1,000 <\$5,000	4	7.00	2.708	1.354	2.69	11.31	3	9
Theft of Property >= \$5,000 < \$25,000	14	7.36	2.530	.676	5.90	8.82	3	11
Theft of Property Obtained By Theft	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
Theft of Scrap metal Obtained by Threat	1	8.00	.	.	.	.	8	8
Trafficking Controlled Substance	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Use OF Anothers Prop For Crime	1	7.00	.	.	.	.	7	7
Use/Poss. Of Parap to Manu Control Subst not meth/cocaine	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4

Deliver Meth	3	5.67	4.163	2.404	-4.68	16.01	1	9
Cocaine=>10g<200g								
Criminal Conspiracy	3	8.67	1.528	.882	4.87	12.46	7	10
Posses W Purpose Del Meth	25	8.12	1.922	.384	7.33	8.91	3	11
Cocaine =>10g<200g								
Deliver Cont Sub Sched 1,II	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g								
Total	637	7.76	2.774	.110	7.54	7.98	1	11

---

## Appendix K: Society Survey Monkey Audience Frequency Test Results

<i>How old are you?</i>		
	N	%
21	1	1.0%
24	1	1.0%
25	2	2.1%
26	1	1.0%
27	2	2.1%
28	1	1.0%
30	1	1.0%
31	1	1.0%
33	1	1.0%
34	3	3.1%
35	3	3.1%
37	3	3.1%
38	1	1.0%
39	2	2.1%
40	2	2.1%
41	1	1.0%
42	2	2.1%
44	2	2.1%
45	3	3.1%
46	1	1.0%
47	4	4.1%

48	1	1.0%
50	2	2.1%
51	4	4.1%
52	1	1.0%
53	2	2.1%
54	1	1.0%
56	2	2.1%
57	2	2.1%
59	1	1.0%
60	2	2.1%
61	3	3.1%
62	1	1.0%
63	3	3.1%
64	3	3.1%
65	3	3.1%
66	2	2.1%
67	3	3.1%
68	3	3.1%
69	2	2.1%
70	3	3.1%
71	4	4.1%
73	1	1.0%
74	1	1.0%
76	1	1.0%
77	3	3.1%
78	1	1.0%

81	1	1.0%
82	1	1.0%
83	2	2.1%

*What sex do you identify as?*

	N	%
Man/Male/M	49	50.5%
Woman/Female/Femini e/F	47	48.5%
N/A	1	1.0%

*What is your race?*

	N	%
Asian	1	1.0%
Black/African American	4	4.1%
Caucasian/White	86	88.7%
Latino	1	1.0%
Hispanic	1	1.0%
Two or more races/mixed	1	1.0%
N/A	3	3.1%

*What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?*

	N	%
High School	16	16.5%
Some College	17	17.5%
Associate Degree	4	4.1%
Bachelors Degree	25	25.8%
Masters Degree/Post Graduate	22	22.7%
Vocational or Trade School/Professional	2	2.1%
Doctorate	2	2.1%
Juris Doctor Law Degree	1	1.0%
Unspecified	5	5.2%
Some Graduate level courses	3	3.1%

*What is your employment status?*

	N	%
Student	3	3.1%
Part-time	8	8.2%
Full-Time	27	27.8%
Retired	32	33.0%

Self-Employed/Co owner	8	8.2%
Disabled	5	5.2%
Homemaker	2	2.1%
Executive Officer	1	1.0%
Unemployed	7	7.2%
Unspecified	4	4.1%

*What is your income level?*

	N	%
No Income	2	2.1%
Social Security or Disability	10	10.3%
0 to \$9,999	3	3.1%
\$10,000 to \$39,000	22	22.7%
\$39,001 to \$60,000	16	16.5%
\$69,001 to \$99,000	22	22.7%
\$99,001 and beyond	22	22.7%

*Are you a student?*

	N	%
Yes	4	4.1%
No	92	94.8%

Unspecified            1    1.0%

*If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for.*

	N	%
Aerospace	1	1.0%
Architecture	1	1.0%
Assistance	1	1.0%
Associate	1	1.0%
Aviation	1	1.0%
Banking/Financial Services	4	4.1%
Business Services	1	1.0%
Construction	5	5.2%
Consulting	1	1.0%
Disabled	2	2.1%
Education	2	2.1%
Government	5	5.2%
Healthcare	6	6.2%
Information Technology	3	3.1%



Law Enforcement	1	1.0%
Legal	3	3.1%
Marine Engineer	1	1.0%
Non-Profit	3	3.1%
Pharmacy	1	1.0%
Professional	1	1.0%
R&D	1	1.0%
Real Estate	1	1.0%
Retail	3	3.1%
Retired	8	8.2%
Sales	1	1.0%
Self-employed	4	4.1%
Surveys	1	1.0%
Teacher	1	1.0%
Unemployed	30	30.9%
Warehouse	1	1.0%
Wildlife Management	1	1.0%
Insurance	1	1.0%

*What is your housing status?*

	N	%
Own	60	61.9%
Rent	30	30.9%
Live with a family member and pay rent	3	3.1%

Live with a relative and do not pay rent	3	3.1%
Live with a friend and pay rent	1	1.0%

---

*What kind of housing  
accommodation do you live in?*

	N	%
Apartment	22	22.7%
Condo	10	10.3%
House	65	67.0%

---

*Does your home have enough  
room for guests?*

	N	%
Yes	73	75.3%
No	24	24.7%

---

*Have you ever been  
convicted of a crime?*

*Meaning you were arrested,  
went before a judge, and  
sentenced for the crime.*

*\*NOTE: Your answer does  
not impact your  
participation in this study  
and is not a reflection on  
you. You can refuse this  
question. This qu*

	N	%
Yes	14	14.4%
No	83	85.6%

*Descriptives*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
						What is your housing status?	21		
	24	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	25	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8
	26	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	27	2	2.00	1.414	1.000	-10.71	14.71	1	3
	28	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	30	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	31	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	33	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	34	3	1.33	.577	.333	-.10	2.77	1	2
	35	3	1.33	.577	.333	-.10	2.77	1	2
	37	3	1.33	.577	.333	-.10	2.77	1	2
	38	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	39	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
	40	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	41	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	42	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
	44	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
	45	3	2.00	1.732	1.000	-2.30	6.30	1	4
	46	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	47	4	1.50	.577	.289	.58	2.42	1	2
	48	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	50	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	51	4	1.25	.500	.250	.45	2.05	1	2

52	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
53	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
54	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
56	2	2.50	.707	.500	-3.85	8.85	2	3
57	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
59	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
60	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
61	3	1.33	.577	.333	-.10	2.77	1	2
62	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
63	3	1.33	.577	.333	-.10	2.77	1	2
64	3	1.67	.577	.333	.23	3.10	1	2
65	3	2.00	1.000	.577	-.48	4.48	1	3
66	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
67	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
68	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
69	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
70	3	1.67	.577	.333	.23	3.10	1	2
71	4	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
73	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
74	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
76	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
77	3	1.67	.577	.333	.23	3.10	1	2
78	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
81	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2

	82	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	83	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	Total	97	1.54	.969	.098	1.34	1.73	1	8
What kind of housing	21	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
accommodation do you	24	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
live in?	25	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
	26	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	27	2	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	28	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	30	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	31	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	33	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	34	3	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	35	3	3.00	1.732	1.000	-1.30	7.30	1	4
	37	3	3.00	1.732	1.000	-1.30	7.30	1	4
	38	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	39	2	2.50	2.121	1.500	-16.56	21.56	1	4
	40	2	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	41	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	42	2	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	44	2	2.50	2.121	1.500	-16.56	21.56	1	4
	45	3	2.00	1.732	1.000	-2.30	6.30	1	4
	46	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	47	4	3.25	1.500	.750	.86	5.64	1	4

48	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
50	2	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
51	4	3.25	1.500	.750	.86	5.64	1	4
52	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
53	2	2.50	2.121	1.500	-16.56	21.56	1	4
54	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
56	2	2.50	2.121	1.500	-16.56	21.56	1	4
57	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
59	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
60	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
61	3	3.00	1.732	1.000	-1.30	7.30	1	4
62	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
63	3	3.33	1.155	.667	.46	6.20	2	4
64	3	1.33	.577	.333	-.10	2.77	1	2
65	3	3.00	1.732	1.000	-1.30	7.30	1	4
66	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
67	3	3.33	1.155	.667	.46	6.20	2	4
68	3	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
69	2	2.50	2.121	1.500	-16.56	21.56	1	4
70	3	3.00	1.732	1.000	-1.30	7.30	1	4
71	4	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
73	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
74	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
76	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4

---

	77	3	3.00	1.732	1.000	-1.30	7.30	1	4
	78	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	81	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	82	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	83	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
	Total	97	3.11	1.298	.132	2.85	3.38	1	4
Does you home have	21	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
enough room for guests?	24	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	25	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
	26	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	27	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
	28	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	30	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	31	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	33	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	34	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	35	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	37	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
	38	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	39	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	40	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	41	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	42	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
	44	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1



45	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
46	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
47	4	.50	.577	.289	-.42	1.42	0	1
48	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
50	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
51	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
52	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
53	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
54	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
56	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
57	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
59	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
60	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
61	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1
62	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
63	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
64	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
65	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1
66	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
67	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
68	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
69	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
70	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1
71	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0

---

	73	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	74	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	76	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	77	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
	78	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	81	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	82	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	83	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	Total	97	.25	.434	.044	.16	.33	0	1
Have you ever been	21	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
convicted of a crime?	24	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Meaning you were	25	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
arrested, went before a	26	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
judge, and sentenced for	27	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
the crime. *NOTE: Your	28	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
answer does not impact	30	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
your participation in this	31	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
study and is not a	33	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
reflection on you. You	34	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1
can refuse this question.	35	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1
This qu	37	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	38	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	39	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	40	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1

41	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
42	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
44	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
45	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
46	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
47	4	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
48	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
50	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
51	4	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
52	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
53	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
54	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
56	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
57	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
59	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
60	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
61	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
62	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
63	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
64	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1
65	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
66	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
67	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
68	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1

---

69	2	.50	.707	.500	-5.85	6.85	0	1
70	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
71	4	.75	.500	.250	-.05	1.55	0	1
73	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
74	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
76	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
77	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
78	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
81	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
82	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
83	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
Total	97	.86	.353	.036	.78	.93	0	1

Appendix L: Society Survey Monkey Audience One-way ANOVA Results

**Dependent Variables for Each of the Following One-way ANOVA:** what is your housing status; what kind of housing accommodation do you live in; does your home have enough room for guests; and have you ever been convicted of a crime

**Factor: Age**

*ANOVA*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
--	----------------	----	-------------	---	------

What is your housing status?	Between Groups	61.540	49	1.256	2.065	.007
	Within Groups	28.583	47	.608		
	Total	90.124	96			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	67.753	49	1.383	.691	.898
	Within Groups	94.000	47	2.000		
	Total	161.753	96			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	8.395	49	.171	.833	.736
	Within Groups	9.667	47	.206		
	Total	18.062	96			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were	Between Groups	7.729	49	.158	1.744	.029
	Within Groups	4.250	47	.090		

arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Total	11.979	96
---	-------	--------	----

---

**Factor: Gender**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	Man/Male/M	49	1.59	1.240	.177	1.24	1.95	1	8
	Woman/Female/Femine/F	47	1.49	.585	.085	1.32	1.66	1	3
	N/A	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Total	97	1.54	.969	.098	1.34	1.73	1	8
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Man/Male/M	49	3.16	1.247	.178	2.80	3.52	1	4
	Woman/Female/Femine/F	47	3.04	1.367	.199	2.64	3.44	1	4
	N/A	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Total	97	3.11	1.298	.132	2.85	3.38	1	4
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Man/Male/M	49	.18	.391	.056	.07	.30	0	1
	Woman/Female/Femine/F	47	.32	.471	.069	.18	.46	0	1
	N/A	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Total	97	.25	.434	.044	.16	.33	0	1
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Man/Male/M	49	.82	.391	.056	.70	.93	0	1
	Woman/Female/Femine/F	47	.91	.282	.041	.83	1.00	0	1
	N/A	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Total	97	.86	.353	.036	.78	.93	0	1



*ANOVA*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	.542	2	.271	.285	.753
	Within Groups	89.581	94	.953		
	Total	90.124	96			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	1.144	2	.572	.335	.716
	Within Groups	160.609	94	1.709		
	Total	161.753	96			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	.502	2	.251	1.344	.266
	Within Groups	17.560	94	.187		
	Total	18.062	96			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you	Between Groups	.973	2	.486	4.154	.019
	Within Groups	11.007	94	.117		

were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

---

**Factor: Race**

*Descriptives*

---

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	Asian	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Black/African American	4	1.50	.577	.289	.58	2.42	1	2
	Caucasian/White	86	1.53	.979	.106	1.33	1.74	1	8
	Latino	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Hispanic	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1

	Two or more races/mixed	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	N/A	3	1.33	.577	.333	-.10	2.77	1	2
	Total	97	1.54	.969	.098	1.34	1.73	1	8
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Asian	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Black/African American	4	3.25	1.500	.750	.86	5.64	1	4
	Caucasian/White	86	3.06	1.323	.143	2.77	3.34	1	4
	Latino	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Hispanic	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	Two or more races/mixed	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	N/A	3	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	Total	97	3.11	1.298	.132	2.85	3.38	1	4
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Asian	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Black/African American	4	.50	.577	.289	-.42	1.42	0	1
	Caucasian/White	86	.24	.432	.047	.15	.34	0	1
	Latino	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Hispanic	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Two or more races/mixed	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	N/A	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
	Total	97	.25	.434	.044	.16	.33	0	1

Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Asian	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Black/African American	4	.50	.577	.289	-.42	1.42	0	1
	Caucasian/White	86	.88	.322	.035	.81	.95	0	1
	Latino	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Hispanic	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Two or more races/mixed	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	N/A	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
Total	97	.86	.353	.036	.78	.93	0	1	

---

**ANOVA**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	7.062	6	1.177	1.275	.277
	Within Groups	83.062	90	.923		
	Total	90.124	96			
What kind of housing	Between Groups	6.293	6	1.049	.607	.724
	Within Groups	155.459	90	1.727		

accommodation do you live in?	Total	161.753	96			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	.523	6	.087	.447	.845
	Within Groups	17.539	90	.195		
	Total	18.062	96			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Between Groups	2.142	6	.357	3.266	.006
	Within Groups	9.837	90	.109		
	Total	11.979	96			

## Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	High School	16	1.88	.806	.202	1.45	2.30	1	4
	Some College	17	1.41	.507	.123	1.15	1.67	1	2
	Associate Degree	4	1.25	.500	.250	.45	2.05	1	2
	Bachelors Degree	25	1.44	.870	.174	1.08	1.80	1	4
	Masters Degree/Post Graduate	22	1.55	1.535	.327	.87	2.23	1	8
	Vocational or Trade School/Professional	2	1.50	.707	.500	-4.85	7.85	1	2
	Doctorate	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	Juris Doctor Law Degree	1	2.00	.	.	.	.	2	2
	Unspecified	5	1.80	.837	.374	.76	2.84	1	3
	Some Graduate level courses	3	1.33	.577	.333	-.10	2.77	1	2
	Total	97	1.54	.969	.098	1.34	1.73	1	8
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	High School	16	2.75	1.483	.371	1.96	3.54	1	4
	Some College	17	3.29	1.312	.318	2.62	3.97	1	4
	Associate Degree	4	2.25	1.258	.629	.25	4.25	1	4
	Bachelors Degree	25	3.20	1.225	.245	2.69	3.71	1	4
	Masters Degree/Post Graduate	22	3.68	.839	.179	3.31	4.05	1	4
	Vocational or Trade School/Professional	2	2.50	2.121	1.500	-16.56	21.56	1	4
	Doctorate	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
	Juris Doctor Law Degree	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Unspecified	5	2.20	1.643	.735	.16	4.24	1	4
	Some Graduate level courses	3	3.00	1.732	1.000	-1.30	7.30	1	4
	Total	97	3.11	1.298	.132	2.85	3.38	1	4
Does your home have enough room for guests?	High School	16	.50	.516	.129	.22	.78	0	1
	Some College	17	.41	.507	.123	.15	.67	0	1
	Associate Degree	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	Bachelors Degree	25	.12	.332	.066	-.02	.26	0	1
	Masters Degree/Post Graduate	22	.09	.294	.063	-.04	.22	0	1
	Vocational or Trade School/Professional	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	Doctorate	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	Juris Doctor Law Degree	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Unspecified	5	.40	.548	.245	-.28	1.08	0	1
	Some Graduate level courses	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
	Total	97	.25	.434	.044	.16	.33	0	1
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	High School	16	.81	.403	.101	.60	1.03	0	1
	Some College	17	.88	.332	.081	.71	1.05	0	1
	Associate Degree	4	.50	.577	.289	-.42	1.42	0	1
	Bachelors Degree	25	.84	.374	.075	.69	.99	0	1
	Masters Degree/Post Graduate	22	.95	.213	.045	.86	1.05	0	1
	Vocational or Trade School/Professional	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	Doctorate	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	Juris Doctor Law Degree	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Unspecified	5	.60	.548	.245	-.08	1.28	0	1
	Some Graduate level courses	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1

*ANOVA*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	3.925	9	.436	.440	.910
	Within Groups	86.199	87	.991		
	Total	90.124	96			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	22.400	9	2.489	1.554	.142
	Within Groups	139.352	87	1.602		
	Total	161.753	96			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	3.619	9	.402	2.423	.017
	Within Groups	14.442	87	.166		
	Total	18.062	96			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were	Between Groups	1.263	9	.140	1.139	.345
	Within Groups	10.717	87	.123		

arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Total	11.979	96
---	-------	--------	----

---



**Factor: Employment Status**

*Descriptives*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	Student	3	4.33	3.512	2.028	-4.39	13.06	1	8
	Part-time	8	1.50	.535	.189	1.05	1.95	1	2
	Full-Time	27	1.19	.396	.076	1.03	1.34	1	2
	Retired	32	1.38	.554	.098	1.18	1.57	1	3
	Self-Employed/Co owner	8	1.88	1.126	.398	.93	2.82	1	4
	Disabled	5	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
	Homemaker	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	Executive Officer	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Unemployed	7	2.00	1.000	.378	1.08	2.92	1	4
	Unspecified	4	1.50	1.000	.500	-.09	3.09	1	3
Total	97	1.54	.969	.098	1.34	1.73	1	8	
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Student	3	3.33	1.155	.667	.46	6.20	2	4
	Part-time	8	2.88	1.553	.549	1.58	4.17	1	4
	Full-Time	27	3.41	1.152	.222	2.95	3.86	1	4
	Retired	32	3.13	1.264	.223	2.67	3.58	1	4
	Self-Employed/Co owner	8	3.13	1.246	.441	2.08	4.17	1	4
	Disabled	5	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	Homemaker	2	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	Executive Officer	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Unemployed	7	2.71	1.604	.606	1.23	4.20	1	4
	Unspecified	4	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
Total	97	3.11	1.298	.132	2.85	3.38	1	4	
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Student	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1
	Part-time	8	.13	.354	.125	-.17	.42	0	1
	Full-Time	27	.19	.396	.076	.03	.34	0	1
	Retired	32	.22	.420	.074	.07	.37	0	1
	Self-Employed/Co owner	8	.38	.518	.183	-.06	.81	0	1
	Disabled	5	.40	.548	.245	-.28	1.08	0	1
	Homemaker	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	Executive Officer	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Unemployed	7	.57	.535	.202	.08	1.07	0	1
	Unspecified	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Total	97	.25	.434	.044	.16	.33	0	1	
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a	Student	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	Part-time	8	.88	.354	.125	.58	1.17	0	1
	Full-Time	27	.93	.267	.051	.82	1.03	0	1
	Retired	32	.91	.296	.052	.80	1.01	0	1
	Self-Employed/Co owner	8	.63	.518	.183	.19	1.06	0	1
	Disabled	5	.80	.447	.200	.24	1.36	0	1
	Homemaker	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	Executive Officer	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0

*ANOVA*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	32.008	9	3.556	5.324	.000
	Within Groups	58.116	87	.668		
	Total	90.124	96			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	31.889	9	3.543	2.374	.019
	Within Groups	129.864	87	1.493		
	Total	161.753	96			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	2.188	9	.243	1.332	.232
	Within Groups	15.874	87	.182		
	Total	18.062	96			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were	Between Groups	1.680	9	.187	1.577	.135
	Within Groups	10.299	87	.118		

arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Total	11.979	96
---	-------	--------	----

---

## Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	No Income	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
	Social Security or Disability	10	1.80	.422	.133	1.50	2.10	1	2
	0 to \$9,999	3	1.67	1.155	.667	-1.20	4.54	1	3
	\$10,000 to \$39,000	22	2.18	1.563	.333	1.49	2.87	1	8
	\$39,001 to \$60,000	16	1.50	.516	.129	1.22	1.78	1	2
	\$69,001 to \$99,000	22	1.09	.294	.063	.96	1.22	1	2
	\$99,001 and beyond	22	1.09	.426	.091	.90	1.28	1	3
	Total	97	1.54	.969	.098	1.34	1.73	1	8
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	No Income	2	2.50	2.121	1.500	-16.56	21.56	1	4
	Social Security or Disability	10	2.20	1.549	.490	1.09	3.31	1	4
	0 to \$9,999	3	3.00	1.732	1.000	-1.30	7.30	1	4
	\$10,000 to \$39,000	22	2.73	1.453	.310	2.08	3.37	1	4
	\$39,001 to \$60,000	16	3.00	1.366	.342	2.27	3.73	1	4
	\$69,001 to \$99,000	22	3.55	1.011	.215	3.10	3.99	1	4
	\$99,001 and beyond	22	3.64	.790	.168	3.29	3.99	2	4
	Total	97	3.11	1.298	.132	2.85	3.38	1	4
Does your home have enough room for guests?	No Income	2	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	Social Security or Disability	10	.30	.483	.153	-.05	.65	0	1
	0 to \$9,999	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1
	\$10,000 to \$39,000	22	.59	.503	.107	.37	.81	0	1
	\$39,001 to \$60,000	16	.19	.403	.101	-.03	.40	0	1
	\$69,001 to \$99,000	22	.09	.294	.063	-.04	.22	0	1
	\$99,001 and beyond	22	.05	.213	.045	-.05	.14	0	1
	Total	97	.25	.434	.044	.16	.33	0	1
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	No Income	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	Social Security or Disability	10	.70	.483	.153	.35	1.05	0	1
	0 to \$9,999	3	.33	.577	.333	-1.10	1.77	0	1
	\$10,000 to \$39,000	22	.95	.213	.045	.86	1.05	0	1
	\$39,001 to \$60,000	16	.88	.342	.085	.69	1.06	0	1
	\$69,001 to \$99,000	22	.82	.395	.084	.64	.99	0	1
	\$99,001 and beyond	22	.91	.294	.063	.78	1.04	0	1
	Total	97	.86	.353	.036	.78	.93	0	1

Factor: Income

*ANOVA*

		Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig.
		Squares		Square		
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	22.948	6	3.825	5.124	.000
	Within Groups	67.176	90	.746		
	Total	90.124	96			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	22.743	6	3.791	2.454	.030
	Within Groups	139.009	90	1.545		
	Total	161.753	96			
Does you home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	4.767	6	.794	5.378	.000
	Within Groups	13.295	90	.148		
	Total	18.062	96			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you	Between Groups	1.417	6	.236	2.013	.072
	Within Groups	10.562	90	.117		

were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Total	11.979	96
--	-------	--------	----

## Appendix M: Society Survey Monkey Audience Multiple Regression

*Model Summary*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.542 <sup>a</sup>	.294	.239	.845

a. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	26.517	7	3.788	5.300	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	63.607	89	.715		
	Total	90.124	96			

a. Dependent Variable: What is your housing status?



b. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.719	.585		6.355	.000
	How old are you?	-.018	.006	-.296	-3.136	.002
	What sex do you identify as?	-.276	.171	-.149	-1.613	.110
	What is your race?	-.011	.087	-.012	-.127	.899
	What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?	.021	.028	.066	.729	.468
	What is your employment status?	-.039	.041	-.088	-.945	.347
	What is your income level?	-.224	.057	-.384	-3.924	.000

---

If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for.	.015	.008	.189	1.989	.050
---	------	------	------	-------	------

---

a. Dependent Variable: What is your housing status?

*Model Summary*

---

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.401 <sup>a</sup>	.161	.095	1.235

---

a. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*Model Summary*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.401 <sup>a</sup>	.161	.095	1.235

a. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	25.986	7	3.712	2.433 <sup>c</sup>	.025 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	135.767	89	1.525		
	Total	161.753	96			

a. Dependent Variable: What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?

b. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

c. Footnote

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.742	.855		2.037	.045
	How old are you?	.001	.008	.018	.179	.858
	What sex do you identify as?	.145	.250	.058	.579	.564
	What is your race?	.031	.127	.025	.247	.805
	What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?	-.057	.042	-.137	-1.375	.172
	What is your employment status?	.017	.060	.028	.275	.784

What is your income level?	.290	.083	.372	3.486	.001
If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for.	-.011	.011	-.103	-.992	.324

a. Dependent Variable: What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?

*Model Summary*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.334 <sup>a</sup>	.111	.041	.425

a. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.009	7	.287	1.592	.148 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	16.052	89	.180		
	Total	18.062	96			

a. Dependent Variable: Does your home have enough room for guests?

b. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients		
1	(Constant)	.596	.294		2.027	.046
	How old are you?	-.001	.003	-.039	-.365	.716
	What sex do you identify as?	.060	.086	.073	.700	.486
	What is your race?	.010	.044	.023	.227	.821

---

What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?	-.003	.014	-.024	-.239	.812
What is your employment status?	.006	.021	.032	.309	.758
What is your income level?	-.077	.029	-.297	-2.703	.008
If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for.	-.001	.004	-.042	-.393	.695

---

a. Dependent Variable: Does you home have enough room for guests?

*Model Summary*

---

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.316 <sup>a</sup>	.100	.029	.348

---

a. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.196	7	.171	1.410	.211 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	10.783	89	.121		
	Total	11.979	96			

a. Dependent Variable: Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu



b. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.797	.241		3.307	.001
	How old are you?	.004	.002	.204	1.917	.058
	What sex do you identify as?	.035	.071	.052	.499	.619
	What is your race?	-.022	.036	-.065	-.629	.531
	What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?	-.002	.012	-.021	-.207	.837
	What is your employment status?	-.029	.017	-.178	-1.697	.093
	What is your income level?	.012	.023	.057	.513	.609

---

If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self- employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for.	-.003	.003	-.108	-1.004	.318
---	-------	------	-------	--------	------

---

a. Dependent Variable: Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

Appendix N: Society Survey Online Newspaper Publication Frequency Table

*Statistics*

---

												Have you ever been convict ed of a crime? Meanin g you were arrested , went before a judge, and sentenc ed for the		
			What is your level of educati on or what is the highest									What Does kind of you housing home accom have modati enough on do room you live for in? guests?	crime. *NOTE : Your answer does not impact your	
How old are you?	What sex do you identify as?	What is your race?	What is your highest grade you have complet ed?	What is your employ ment status?	What is your income level?	Are you a student ?	What is your housing status?	What is your on do you live in?						

---

---

particip  
ation in  
this  
study  
and is  
not a  
reflecti  
on on  
you.  
You  
can  
refuse  
this  
questio  
n. This  
qu

---

N	Val	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	id											
	Mis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	sing											

*How old are you?*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	37	1	25.0	25.0
	41	1	25.0	50.0
	50	1	25.0	75.0
	57	1	25.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	100.0	

*What sex do you identify as?*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	25.0	25.0
	Man/Male/M	3	75.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	100.0	

*What is your race?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Black/African American	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Caucasian/White	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

*What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Some College	2	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Bachelors Degree	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

*What is your employment status?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Full-Time	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Retired	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Homemaker	1	25.0	25.0	75.0
	Unemployed	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

*What is your income level?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 to \$9,999	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	\$10,000 to \$39,000	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	\$39,001 to \$60,000	1	25.0	25.0	75.0
	\$99,001 and beyond	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

*What is your housing status?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Own	3	75.0	75.0	75.0
	Live with a family member and pay rent	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

*What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	-----------------------



Valid	House	4	100.0	100.0	100.0
-------	-------	---	-------	-------	-------

*Does your home have enough room for guests?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	4	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	No	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

Appendix O: Society Survey Online Newspaper Publication One-way ANOVA Results

**Dependent Variables for Each of the Following One-way ANOVA:** what is your housing status; what kind of housing accommodation do you live in; does your home have enough room for guests; and have you ever been convicted of a crime

**Independent Variable:** Age

*Descriptive*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	37	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	41	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
	50	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	57	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Total	4	1.50	1.000	.500	-.09	3.09	1	3
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	37	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	41	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	50	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	57	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Total	4	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	37	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	41	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0

Does you home	50	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
have enough	57	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
room for guests?	Tot	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	al								
Have you ever	37	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
been convicted	41	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
of a crime?	50	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
Meaning you	57	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
were arrested,	Tot	4	.75	.500	.250	-.05	1.55	0	1
went before a	al								

judge, and sentenced for the crime.  
 \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

ANOVA

		Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig.
		Squares		Square		
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	3.000	3	1.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	3.000	3			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	.000	3	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	.000	3			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	.000	3	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	.000	3			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you	Between Groups	.750	3	.250	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		

were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

---

**Independent Variable: Sex**

*Descriptives*

---

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	0	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
	Man/Male/M	3	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
	Total	4	1.50	1.000	.500	-.09	3.09	1	3
	0	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4

What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Man/Male/M	3	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	Total	4	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	<hr/>								
Does your home have enough room for guests?	0	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Man/Male/M	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	Total	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Have you ever been convicted of a	0	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Man/Male/M	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1
	<hr/>								

crime?	Total	4	.75	.500	.250	-.05	1.55	0	1
Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime.									
*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu									

*ANOVA*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
--	----------------	----	-------------	---	------

What is your housing status?	Between Groups	3.000	1	3.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	2	.000		
	Total	3.000	3			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	2	.000		
	Total	.000	3			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	2	.000		
	Total	.000	3			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you	Between Groups	.083	1	.083	.250	.667
	Within Groups	.667	2	.333		



were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

---

**Independent Variable: Race**

*Descriptives*

---

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	Black/African American	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Caucasian/White	3	1.67	1.155	.667	-1.20	4.54	1	3
	Total	4	1.50	1.000	.500	-.09	3.09	1	3

What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Black/African American	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Caucasian/White	3	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	Total	4	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Black/African American	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Caucasian/White	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
	Total	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Have you ever been convicted of a crime?	Black/African American	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Caucasian/White	3	.67	.577	.333	-.77	2.10	0	1

Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime.	Total	4	.75	.500	.250	-.05	1.55	0	1
--	-------	---	-----	------	------	------	------	---	---

\*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

*ANOVA*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	.333	1	.333	.250	.667

	Within Groups	2.667	2	1.333		
	Total	3.000	3			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	2	.000		
	Total	.000	3			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	2	.000		
	Total	.000	3			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Between Groups	.083	1	.083	.250	.667
	Within Groups	.667	2	.333		
	Total	.750	3			



of a crime?	Bachelors	2	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1
Meaning you	Degree								
were arrested,	Total	4	.75	.500	.250	-.05	1.55	0	1
went before a									
judge, and									
sentenced for									
the crime.									
*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu									

*ANOVA*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	1.000	1	1.000	1.000	.423
	Within Groups	2.000	2	1.000		

	Total	3.000	3			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	2	.000		
	Total	.000	3			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	2	.000		
	Total	.000	3			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Between Groups	.250	1	.250	1.000	.423
	Within Groups	.500	2	.250		
	Total	.750	3			

**Independent Variable:** Employment Status*Descriptives*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Mini mum	Maxi mum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	Full- Time	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Retired	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Home- maker	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Unempl- oyed	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
	Total	4	1.50	1.000	.500	-.09	3.09	1	3
What kind of housing accommodatio n do you live in?	Full- Time	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Retired	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Home- maker	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Unempl- oyed	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Total	4	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
Does you home have	Full- Time	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0



enough room for guests?	Retired	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Homem aker	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Unempl oyed	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Total	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and	Full- Time	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Retired	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Homem aker	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Unempl oyed	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1

sentenced for the crime.  
 \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

---

*ANOVA*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	3.000	3	1.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	3.000	3			
		Between Groups	.000	3	.000	.

What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Within Groups	.000	0	.	.
	Total	.000	3		
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	.000	3	.000	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.	.
	Total	.000	3		
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Between Groups	.750	3	.250	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.	.
	Total	.750	3		

**Independent Variable:** Income Level

*Descriptives*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	0 to \$9,999	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
	\$10,000 to \$39,000	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	\$39,001 to \$60,000	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	\$99,001 and beyond	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Total	4	1.50	1.000	.500	-.09	3.09	1	3
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	0 to \$9,999	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	\$10,000 to \$39,000	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	\$39,001 to \$60,000	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	\$99,001 and beyond	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Total	4	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
Does your home have enough room for guests?	0 to \$9,999	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	\$10,000 to \$39,000	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	\$39,001 to \$60,000	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Total	3	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0

	\$99,001 and beyond	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Total	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime.	0 to \$9,999	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	\$10,000 to \$39,000	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	\$39,001 to \$60,000	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	\$99,001 and beyond	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Total	4	.75	.500	.250	-.05	1.55	0	1
*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu									

*ANOVA*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	3.000	3	1.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	3.000	3			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	.000	3	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	.000	3			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	.000	3	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	.000	3			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you	Between Groups	.750	3	.250	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		

were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

---

**Independent Variable:** Employment Type

*Descriptives*

---

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
What is your housing status?	Educational	1	3.00	.	.	.	.	3	3
	Healthcare	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Professional	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1

	Unempl oyed	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Total	4	1.50	1.000	.500	-.09	3.09	1	3
What kind of housing accommodatio n do you live in?	Educati on	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Healthc are	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Professi onal	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Unempl oyed	1	4.00	.	.	.	.	4	4
	Total	4	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
Does you home have enough room for guests?	Educati on	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Healthc are	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Professi onal	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Unempl oyed	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Total	4	.00	.000	.000	.00	.00	0	0
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you	Educati on	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Healthc are	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1



were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime.	Professi onal	1	1.00	.	.	.	.	1	1
	Unempl oyed	1	.00	.	.	.	.	0	0
	Total	4	.75	.500	.250	-.05	1.55	0	1

\*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

*ANOVA*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What is your housing status?	Between Groups	3.000	3	1.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		

	Total	3.000	3			
What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?	Between Groups	.000	3	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	.000	3			
Does your home have enough room for guests?	Between Groups	.000	3	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		
	Total	.000	3			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested,	Between Groups	.750	3	.250	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	0	.		

went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. *NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu	Total	.750	3
--	-------	------	---

---

## Appendix P: Society Survey Online Newspaper Publication Multiple Regression

*Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>*

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level? <sup>b</sup>		. Enter

a. Dependent Variable: What is your housing status?

b. All requested variables entered.

*Model Summary*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.542 <sup>a</sup>	.294	.239	.845

a. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	26.517	7	3.788	5.300	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	63.607	89	.715		
	Total	90.124	96			

a. Dependent Variable: What is your housing status?

b. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
		Coefficients		Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.719	.585		6.355	.000
	How old are you?	-.018	.006	-.296	-3.136	.002
	What sex do you identify as?	-.276	.171	-.149	-1.613	.110
	What is your race?	-.011	.087	-.012	-.127	.899
	What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?	.021	.028	.066	.729	.468
	What is your employment status?	-.039	.041	-.088	-.945	.347
	What is your income level?	-.224	.057	-.384	-3.924	.000

---

If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...?	.015	.008	.189	1.989	.050
--	------	------	------	-------	------

Please DO NOT put the company you work for.

---

a. Dependent Variable: What is your housing status?

*Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>*

---

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
-------	-------------------	-------------------	--------

---





1	.401 <sup>a</sup>	.161	.095	1.235
---	-------------------	------	------	-------

a. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	25.986	7	3.712	2.433	.025 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	135.767	89	1.525		
	Total	161.753	96			

a. Dependent Variable: What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?

b. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients		
1	(Constant)	1.742	.855		2.037	.045
	How old are you?	.001	.008	.018	.179	.858
	What sex do you identify as?	.145	.250	.058	.579	.564
	What is your race?	.031	.127	.025	.247	.805
	What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?	-.057	.042	-.137	-1.375	.172
	What is your employment status?	.017	.060	.028	.275	.784
	What is your income level?	.290	.083	.372	3.486	.001

---

If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for.	-0.11	.011	-.103	-.992	.324
---	-------	------	-------	-------	------

---

a. Dependent Variable: What kind of housing accommodation do you live in?

*Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>*

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level? <sup>b</sup>		. Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Does your home have enough room for guests?

b. All requested variables entered.

*Model Summary*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.334 <sup>a</sup>	.111	.041	.425

a. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.009	7	.287	1.592	.148 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	16.052	89	.180		
	Total	18.062	96			

a. Dependent Variable: Does your home have enough room for guests?

b. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.596	.294		2.027	.046
	How old are you?	-.001	.003	-.039	-.365	.716
	What sex do you identify as?	.060	.086	.073	.700	.486
	What is your race?	.010	.044	.023	.227	.821

---

What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?	-.003	.014	-.024	-.239	.812
What is your employment status?	.006	.021	.032	.309	.758
What is your income level?	-.077	.029	-.297	-2.703	.008
If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for.	-.001	.004	-.042	-.393	.695

---

a. Dependent Variable: Does your home have enough room for guests?

*Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>*

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level? <sup>b</sup>		. Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

b. All requested variables entered.



*Model Summary*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.316 <sup>a</sup>	.100	.029	.348

a. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*ANOVA<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.196	7	.171	1.410	.211 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	10.783	89	.121		
	Total	11.979	96			

- a. Dependent Variable: Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu
- b. Predictors: (Constant), If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self-employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for., What sex do you identify as?, What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?, What is your race?, What is your employment status?, How old are you?, What is your income level?

*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients		
1	(Constant)	.797	.241		3.307	.001
	How old are you?	.004	.002	.204	1.917	.058
	What sex do you identify as?	.035	.071	.052	.499	.619
	What is your race?	-.022	.036	-.065	-.629	.531
	What is your level of education or what is the highest grade you have completed?	-.002	.012	-.021	-.207	.837
	What is your employment status?	-.029	.017	-.178	-1.697	.093
	What is your income level?	.012	.023	.057	.513	.609

---

If applicable what type of employment field do you work in; for instance, banking, legal, law enforcement, self- employed, teachers, warehouse, etc...? Please DO NOT put the company you work for.	-.003	.003	-.108	-1.004	.318
---	-------	------	-------	--------	------

---

a. Dependent Variable: Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Meaning you were arrested, went before a judge, and sentenced for the crime. \*NOTE: Your answer does not impact your participation in this study and is not a reflection on you. You can refuse this question. This qu

## Appendix Q: Society Survey Questions and Codes

I. Question: What are your thoughts on people who have been convicted of a crime?

a. Value Codes

- i. No Thoughts
- ii. Depends on the Crime/Situation
- iii. Should be Punished
- iv. Punishment is Complete
- v. Offender is Still a Person
- vi. Action and Reaction
- vii. Give Help
- viii. Proceed with Caution
- ix. Should not be Trusted
- x. Victim Matters
- xi. Justified for Some

II. Question: What circumstances do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance?

a. In Vivo Codes

- i. Always
- ii. Can contribute to society
- iii. Completed sentence
- iv. Completed sentence and unable to find employment
- v. Completed sentence displayed good behavior but are living in poverty
- vi. Crime was accepted as not guilty
- vii. Dependent on crime
- viii. Have Income
- ix. Homeless
- x. Homeless and have completed their sentence
- xi. Limited to no income
- xii. Meets income limits and in areas that is safe for all residents
- xiii. Mental Capable
- xiv. Mental Incapable

- xv. N/A
- xvi. No circumstances
- xvii. No family and good behavior
- xviii. No family willing to let the offender live with them
- xix. No income
- xx. No Job and Homeless
- xxi. No opinion
- xxii. Non-violent crimes
- xxiii. Not addicted
- xxiv. Parents
- xxv. Prevent homelessness
- xxvi. Probation
- xxvii. Reduces burden on society
- xxviii. Rehabilitated
- xxix. Restricted to certain areas

- xxx. Self-improvement and refrain from doing wrong
- xxxi. Self-Improvement
- xxxii. Self-improvement and shown remorse
- xxxiii. Self-improvement or homeless
- xxxiv. Should be given housing assistance
- xxxv. Stable income and rehabilitated
- xxxvi. Unable to find employment
- xxxvii. Unable to find housing
- xxxviii. Vouched

III. Question: When an offender is released from incarceration (jail or prison) what help do you think the individual will need to successfully re-adjust in society?

- a. Value Codes
  - i. A lot of help
  - ii. Accountability partner
  - iii. Environmental Change



- iv. Etiquette, Education, Job readiness
- v. Family support
- vi. Financial Assistance
- vii. Financial Assistance and housing placement
- viii. Financial assistance and job placement
- ix. Financial assistance, housing placement, cell phone
- x. Food assistance, job placement, mental health
- xi. Former Offender Advocacy
- xii. Guidance
- xiii. Housing and job assistance, mental health, community support
- xiv. Housing and job placement
- xv. Housing and job placement, clothing assistance
- xvi. Housing and job placement, community acceptance, mental health, medical care, dental care
- xvii. Housing and job placement, emotional support
- xviii. Housing and job placement, financial assistance

- xix. Housing and job placement, financial assistance, mental health
- xx. Housing and job placement, food assistance, job readiness
- xxi. Housing and job placement, food assistance, mental health
- xxii. Housing and job placement, mental health
- xxiii. Housing and job placement, mental health and food assistance
- xxiv. Housing and job placement, transitional services
- xxv. Housing assistance
- xxvi. Housing assistance and job readiness
- xxvii. Housing placement
- xxviii. Housing placement, advisor, support system, reinteraction with loved ones
- xxix. Housing placement, job readiness, supervision, mental health, financial assistance
- xxx. Housing placement, mental health, medical assistance, job readiness
- xxxi. Job placement
- xxxii. Job placement and accountability partner
- xxxiii. Job placement and etiquette

- xxxiv. Job placement, education
- xxxv. Job placement, financial assistance
- xxxvi. Job placement, mental health, medical, food assistance, and ID assistance
- xxxvii. Job placement, Role model, Friend
- xxxviii. Job readiness
  - xxxix. Job readiness and life skill classes
    - xl. Job readiness and mental health
    - xli. Mental Health
    - xlii. Mental health and Family support
    - xliii. Mental health and job placement
    - xliv. Mental Health and Job readiness
    - xlv. Mental health, housing and job placement
    - xlvi. Mental health and reentry program
    - xlvii. N/A
    - xlviii. None

- xlix. Not important
  - l. Re-Adjusting
  - li. Reentry program
  - lii. Rehabilitation
  - liii. Religion, Financial assistance, a second chance
  - liv. Rely own oneself
  - lv. Self-re-adjustment
  - lvi. Social worker guidance
  - lvii. Society acceptance and Financial Assistance
  - lviii. Unsure

IV. Question: In your opinion, who is responsible for providing housing assistance to offenders after they are released from incarceration?

- a. In Vivo Codes
  - i. Charities or State Government
  - ii. Church

- iii. City government
- iv. Correctional System
- v. Everyone
- vi. Family
- vii. Family and State Government
- viii. Family or Friends
- ix. Family or Government
- x. Federal Government
- xi. Federal or State Government
- xii. Government
- xiii. Government and Self-help
- xiv. Housing authorities
- xv. Landlords and Housing Authorities
- xvi. Local or State Government
- xvii. N/A

- xviii. NGO
- xix. Non-profit Organizations
- xx. Not Society
- xxi. Self-help
- xxii. Self-help and Family
- xxiii. Self-help and Federal Government
- xxiv. Self-help or Family
- xxv. State Government
- xxvi. State or Federal Government
- xxvii. Taxpayers
- xxviii. Taxpayers and Charities
- xxix. Unsure

V. What do you think should be the length of time housing assistance should be given to a former offender?

a. In Vivo Codes

i. 1 day

- ii. 1 month
- iii. 1 month after Stable employment obtained
- iv. 1 or 2 weeks
- v. 1 to 2 years
- vi. 1 week
- vii. 1 year minimum
- viii. 1 year or until goals are met
- ix. 1 year to a few years
- x. 1.5 years
- xi. 12 months maximum
- xii. 18 months
- xiii. 2 months
- xiv. 2 year minimum
- xv. 2 years
- xvi. 24 month minimum

- xvii. 3 months
- xviii. 3 to 6 months
- xix. 3 years
- xx. 3 years n/a
- xxi. 30 days
- xxii. 5 years
- xxiii. 6 months
- xxiv. 6 months to 1 year
- xxv. 6 months to indefinitely
- xxvi. 6 to 12 months
- xxvii. 6 to 8 months
- xxviii. 60 days
- xxix. 90 days
- xxx. Couple of weeks
- xxxi. Depends



- xxxii. Equivalent to time spend incarcerated
- xxxiii. Indefinitely
- xxxiv. Indefinitely or reoffend
- xxxv. N/A
- xxxvi. No Opinion
- xxxvii. None
- xxxviii. Till evicted
- xxxix. Unsure
  - xl. Until employed
  - xli. Until employed and financially stable
  - xlii. Until re-adjusted
  - xliii. Until stable
  - xliv. Until stable or reoffend
  - xlv. Up to 6 months

VI. What are some beliefs and values that you have learned from others concerning to a former offender?

a. In Vivo Codes

- i. ?
- ii. All offenders are not the same
- iii. Always an offender
- iv. Behavior want improve
- v. Burden on society
- vi. Cannot be trusted
- vii. Change occurs with help
- viii. Depends
- ix. Do you want to change
- x. Emotional needs have not been met
- xi. Everyone goes through something
- xii. Forgiveness
- xiii. Formed own beliefs
- xiv. Guilty

- xv. Humans make mistakes
- xvi. Incarceration is just the beginning of repaying society
- xvii. Must fight community for second chance
- xviii. N/A
- xix. None
- xx. Not all offenders are violent
- xxi. Not possible to change behavior
- xxii. Offender lacking support
- xxiii. Offenders are human
- xxiv. Offends need guidance
- xxv. People can change
- xxvi. Prison does not reform
- xxvii. Recidivism
- xxviii. Rehabilitation can happen
- xxix. Re-offend

- xxx. Second chance
- xxxi. Self-help
- xxxii. Some crimes need lifetime supervision
- xxxiii. Survival is needed
- xxxiv. Treat everyone the same
- xxxv. Unemployable
- xxxvi. Unsure
- xxxvii. Victimless crimes should serve jail time
- xxxviii. Will not change
- xxxix. Will re-acclimation occur

VII. Question: How did you learn about offenders?

- a. In Vivo Codes
  - i. Casenet
  - ii. Close relationship ties consist of an offender(s)
  - iii. Did not learn

- iv. Family
- v. Family consist of an offender(s)
- vi. Judge
- vii. Jury Duty
- viii. Life experience
- ix. Life experience and word of mouth
- x. Media
- xi. Media and family
- xii. Met an offender
- xiii. N/A
- xiv. New someone
- xv. None
- xvi. Participant was a former offender
- xvii. Reading
- xviii. Reading and word of mouth

- xix. Research
- xx. School
- xxi. Second chance restaurant for offender
- xxii. Sex offender registry
- xxiii. Significant other
- xxiv. Social worker
- xxv. Media
- xxvi. Unsure
- xxvii. Watching court proceedings
- xxviii. Word of mouth
- xxix. Work
- xxx. Work in law enforcement
- xxxi. Worked with offenders

VIII. When would you identify an offender's crime as important?

- a. In Vivo Codes

- i. All capital offense
- ii. Always
- iii. Animal, child, elderly, spouse abuse
- iv. Anything but minor drug infractions
- v. Anytime but not when victimless crime
- vi. Attempted murder, murder, sexual violence, external mental conditions
- vii. Child molestation
- viii. Court
- ix. Crime harms others
- x. Crime involves another human being
- xi. Crime is harmful to another person or community
- xii. Crime is relevant to employment, living, or social situation
- xiii. Crime is violent or sexual relation involving children
- xiv. Crime is violent or theft
- xv. Crimes harms other or murder

- xvi. Crimes harms others
- xvii. Crimes harms others or financial in nature
- xviii. Crimes harms others or property
- xix. Crimes hurt someone
- xx. Crimes hurt someone or involves theft
- xxi. Crimes involves abuse, drugs, or death
- xxii. Crimes involves children, murder, rape
- xxiii. Criminal behavior harmed others
- xxiv. Depends
- xxv. Felony level crimes
- xxvi. Homicide
- xxvii. Major felonies
- xxviii. Murder
- xxix. N/A
- xxx. Need to know basis



- xxxi. None
- xxxii. Offender attitude
- xxxiii. Offender is incarcerated
- xxxiv. Rape, robbery, murder
- xxxv. Repeat offender
- xxxvi. Self-defense
- xxxvii. Serious crimes
- xxxviii. Sex offender and murder
- xxxix. Unable to define
- xl. Unsure
- xli. Upon conviction
- xlii. Violent crimes
- xliii. Violent crimes or sexual in nature crimes
- xliv. When proof exists beyond a doubt
- xlv. When released from incarceration

IX. What are some labels or titles you have heard that refers to a former offender?

a. In Vivo Codes

- i. Addict, druggie, failure, rebel, rulebreaker
- ii. As a person offenders are not bad
- iii. Con
- iv. Con Artist, Ex Con
- v. Con, Deviate
- vi. Con, Felon
- vii. Con, in the pen
- viii. Convict
- ix. Convict, Criminal
- x. Convict, crook, felon
- xi. Convict, ex-con
- xii. Convict, prisoner
- xiii. Convicted felon, jailbird, criminal

- xiv. Criminal
- xv. Criminal, deadbeat
- xvi. Criminal, ex-con
- xvii. Criminal, loser, low-life
- xviii. Crook, Criminal
- xix. Crook, loser
- xx. Did time
- xxi. Ex-Con
- xxii. Ex-con, felon
- xxiii. Ex-con, Jailbird
- xxiv. Ex-con, junkie, felon
- xxv. Ex-con, Loser
- xxvi. Ex-con, paid debt to society. Psychopath...
- xxvii. Ex-con, Parolee
- xxviii. Ex-Convict

- xxix. Ex-Offender
- xxx. Felon
- xxx. Felon, convict, inmate
- xxxii. Felon, crook, unrepentant
- xxxiii. Felon, ex-con, con, convict...
- xxxiv. Fugitive
- xxxv. Inmate
- xxxvi. Institutionalized, felon, flunky, trash
- xxxvii. Jailbird
- xxxviii. Jailbird, Convict
- xxxix. Jailbird, convict, criminal
  - xl. Jailbird, jailer
  - xli. Jailbird, parolee
  - xlii. Loser
  - xliii. Murder, offender

- xliv. N/A
- xlv. None
- xlvi. Parolee
- xlvii. Pedophile
- xlviii. Person with a background
- xlix. Prior jailbird
  - l. Repeat offender
  - li. Scum, lost soul, recovered
  - lii. Sex offender
  - liii. Sex Offender, convict, con, hood, thug
  - liv. Sex offender, ex-con
  - lv. Squid, loser, repeater, offender
  - lvi. Thug
  - lvii. Unable to readjust
  - lviii. Unsure

lix. violent criminal, pedophile

lx. went to jail

lxi. Will not reoffend

lxii. Worthless

X. What past beliefs and stereotypes that were taught in the past do you still hold today pertaining to offenders?

a. In Vivo Codes

i. All are used

ii. Bad

iii. Can not be trusted

iv. Cheater

v. Crimes pertaining to children and death do not deserve a second chance all other crimes do

vi. Dangerous, shifty, unreliable ...

vii. Delinquency

viii. Depends

ix. Dope

- x. Drugs ends lives
- xi. Equality for all
- xii. Form gangs during incarcerated divided by race
- xiii. Get off
- xiv. Guilty
- xv. Guilt should be proven
- xvi. He/She looks like a criminal
- xvii. Justice system led to name calling
- xviii. N/A
- xix. None
- xx. Not all offenders are caught
- xxi. Offenders need treatment help
- xxii. Paid their dues
- xxiii. Poor, uneducated, desperate...
- xxiv. Punishment for crimes are required

- xxv. Race
- xxvi. Rebuild trust
- xxvii. Recidivism
- xxviii. Rehabilitation is not possible
- xxix. Reoffender
- xxx. Repentance is possible
- xxxi. Second chance should not be given
- xxxii. Sex offenders cant be rehabilitated
- xxxiii. Should get second chance
- xxxiv. Society causes problems
- xxxv. Some can change
- xxxvi. The guilty maybe innocent
- xxxvii. Time is needed
- xxxviii. Unsure
- xxxix. Violent



xl. Will not change

XI. How do you feel about providing housing assistance for a person who had previously been convicted of a crime?

a. Value Codes

i. As long as working on self-improvement and no further crime

ii. Depends

iii. I do not want to

iv. N/A

v. No opinion

vi. Not my responsibility

vii. Not safe to help

viii. Offender does not deserve support

ix. Should receive support

x. Should receive support as long as improving themselves

xi. Should receive support to reduce recidivism

xii. Yes

xiii. Yes/Help shouldn't depend on the past.

xiv. Yes: depends on crime

XII. Would you recommend other people opening their place of residence to previous offenders in order to provide housing assistance?

a. In Vivo Codes

i. Depends

ii. N/A

iii. No

iv. Other people should be open minded

v. Possibly

vi. Unsure

vii. Yes

viii. Yes with stipulations

XIII. What kind of feelings do you experience when you think of a former offender living with you?

a. In Vivo Codes

- i. Ambiguity
- ii. Anger
- iii. Concerned
- iv. Depends
- v. Do not want strangers living in home
- vi. Fair
- vii. Fear
- viii. Fear/Depends
- ix. Fear/Sad
- x. Foolish
- xi. Helpful
- xii. Hope
- xiii. Hopeful
- xiv. Human
- xv. Mistrust

- xvi. N/A
- xvii. Nervous
- xviii. None
- xix. Purpose
- xx. Reluctant
- xxi. Sad
- xxii. Shocked
- xxiii. Skeptical
- xxiv. Unsafe

XIV. When you are at a store or out to dinner how do you identify who is a former offender?

- a. In Vivo Codes
  - i. Ankle monitor
  - ii. Attitudes
  - iii. Behavior and body language
  - iv. Features

- v. If individual identified themselves
- vi. Knew the individual
- vii. Look and speech
- viii. Looks
- ix. Media
- x. N/A
- xi. No way
- xii. No way/ tattoos
- xiii. Recognized due to being previously incarcerated as well
- xiv. Research
- xv. Speech
- xvi. Tattoos
- xvii. Tattoos, speech, behavior
- xviii. Unsure
- xix. What appears to be prison behavior

xx. You Don't

XV. In your opinion should former offenders who have a mental illness or disorder receive housing assistance?

a. In Vivo Codes

- i. Depends
- ii. Maybe
- iii. N/A
- iv. Nervous
- v. No
- vi. Psychiatric care
- vii. Supervised housing
- viii. Unsure
- ix. Yes

XVI. Describe the offender crimes you would allow to reside with you and for how long?

a. Value Codes

- i. Any

- ii. Anyone
- iii. Anyone but with stipulations
- iv. Anything but with stipulations
- v. Armed robbery, simple assault
- vi. Bank robber
- vii. Cyber, drugs
- viii. Depends
- ix. Disturbing the peace
- x. Domestic violence in self defense
- xi. Dui
- xii. Falsely accused
- xiii. Larceny, white collar
- xiv. Lesser drug offenses
- xv. Lesser offense
- xvi. Low level drug crimes and white collar crimes

- xvii. Marijuana use
- xviii. Marijuana use, prostitution
- xix. Minor Crimes
- xx. Minor offenses
- xxi. Misdemeanor
- xxii. N/A
- xxiii. No Crimes against property
- xxiv. No mass murder, rape, kidnapping
- xxv. No Murders
- xxvi. None
- xxvii. None/Depends
- xxviii. Non-Serious
- xxix. Non-Violent
- xxx. Non-Violent, non-sexual
- xxxi. Petty Crimes



- xxxii. Petty Thief
- xxxiii. Property crimes
- xxxiv. Small misdemeanors
- xxxv. Small Robbery
- xxxvi. Tax evasion
- xxxvii. Traffic violations, certain misdemeanors, property crime
- xxxviii. Unsure
- xxxix. White color crimes
  - xl. White color crimes, non-violent crimes

XVII. Question: What are your thoughts on veteran former offenders receiving housing assistance?

- a. In Vivo Codes
  - i. Depends
  - ii. N/A
  - iii. No
  - iv. Supervised

- v. Unsure
- vi. Yes
- vii. Yes with stipulations

XVIII. Do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance if they are addicted to substances such as drugs or alcohol? If so for how long?

- a. In Vivo Codes
  - i. N/A
  - ii. No
  - iii. Unsure
  - iv. Yes
  - v. Yes with stipulations

XIX. If at any time during this survey you stated, you do not believe a former offender should receive housing assistance please provide the reason why?

- a. In Vivo and Value Codes
  - i. Addiction and mental illness

- ii. Already given a chance and does not deserve a second
- iii. Child molester
- iv. Crimes against another person or for drugs
- v. Drug use and Recidivism
- vi. Drugs destroys other people lives
- vii. Family should help
- viii. Irresponsible
- ix. Lack of Self Improvement
- x. N/A
- xi. No one should be around respondent children
- xii. Not my responsibility
- xiii. Private citizens at risk of harm
- xiv. Recidivism
- xv. Scared of offenders
- xvi. Sex Offender

- xvii. Sex Offender and Pedophiles
- xviii. Should earn own way
- xix. Should not reward bad behavior
- xx. Too much risk
- xxi. Violent crimes
- xxii. Violent crimes against children
- xxiii. Violent offender
- xxiv. Would not feel safe

XX. Would your answer to a former offender staying in your home be different if the former offender was a member of your family or friend?

- a. In Vivo Codes
  - i. Depends
  - ii. N/A
  - iii. No
  - iv. Probably

- v. Unsure
- vi. Yes
- vii. Yes-more strict

## Appendix R: Themes and Corresponding Survey Questions

- I. Offender is someone who committed and was convicted of a crime that was given some type of punishment.
  - a. How would you define former offender?
- II. Former offender's prior crimes does matter but second chances can be given due to all humans make mistakes.
  - a. What are your thoughts on people who have been convicted of a crime?
- III. Offenders when released may need help but not from me and if given for a specific timeframe
  - a. What circumstances do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance?
  - b. In your opinion should former offenders who have a mental illness or disorder receive housing assistance?
  - c. What are your thoughts on veteran former offenders receiving housing assistance?
  - d. Do you believe former offenders should receive housing assistance if they are addicted to substances such as drugs or alcohol? If so for how long?
  - e. Would your answer to a former offender staying in your home be different if the former offender was a member of your family or friend?
  - f. When an offender is released from incarceration (jail or prison) what help do you think the individual will need to successfully re-adjust in society?

- g. If at any time during this survey you stated, you do not believe a former offender should receive housing assistance please provide the reason why?
- h. In your opinion, who is responsible for providing housing assistance to offenders after they are released from incarceration?
- i. What do you think should be the length of time housing assistance should be given to a former offender?

IV. Offender opinion is derived from somewhere.

- a. What are some beliefs and values that you have learned from others concerning to a former offender?
- b. How did you learn about offenders?
- c. What are some labels or titles you have heard that refers to a former offender?
- d. When would you identify an offender's crime as important?
- e. What past beliefs and stereotypes that were taught in the past do you still hold today pertaining to offenders?

V. Offenders can reside with someone but not me are.

- a. How do you feel about providing housing assistance for a person who had previously been convicted of a crime?
- b. Describe the offender crimes you would allow to reside with you and for how long?

- c. Would you recommend other people opening their place of residence to previous offenders in order to provide housing assistance?
- d. What kind of feelings do you experience when you think of a former offender living with you?
- e. When you are at a store or out to dinner how do you identify who is a former offender?



## Appendix S: Department of Corrections Southern Criminal Offense Codes and Number of Offenders

Criminal charges that are less than two will stand alone. All crimes that have more than three people with have a bullet with the total number of offenders incarcerated at the DOC facility in the South.

### I. Drug Related Charges

1. Advertise Drug Paraphernalia
  - a. Number of Offenders: 3
2. Del Cont Sub Sched Ex Meth Cocaine=> 2g < 28g
3. Del Cont Sub Sched Hyromorphone => 80 DU < 160 g
4. Deliver Cont Sub Sched 1,II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g
5. Deliver Meth Cocaine < 2g
  - a. Number of Offenders: 11
6. Deliver Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g
  - a. Number of Offenders: 25
7. Deliver Meth Cocaine=>10g<200g
  - a. Number of Offenders: 3

8. Maintain Drug Premises
9. Maintain Drug Premises Drug Free Zone
  - a. Number of Offenders: 3
10. Man Methamphetamine 2nd or Subs Offense
11. Manu/Delv/Poss Control Subs.
  - a. Number of Offenders: 11
12. Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II => Excluding Meth Cocaine <2g
13. Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Ex Meth Cocaine => 28g < 200g
14. Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine < 2g
  - a. Number of Offenders: 60
15. Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 10g < 200g
  - a. Number of Offenders: 4
16. Poss Cont Sub Sched I,II Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g
  - a. Number of Offenders: 17
17. Poss Drug Paraphernalia Man Meth Cocaine

a. Number of Offenders: 16

18. Poss Drug Paraphernalia Meth Cocaine

a. Number of Offenders: 21

19. Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Hydromorphone=> 80 DU< 160 DU

20. Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Hydromorphone=> 80 DU< 160 DU

21. Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched I,II Exc Meth Cocaine=>2g<28g

22. Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched I,II Excl Meth Cocaine < 2g

a. Number of Offenders: 4

23. Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched IV,V Dep Hall => 80DU < 160DU

24. Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched VI > 14g < 4oz

25. Poss W Purp Del Cont Sub Sched VI > 14g < 4oz

26. Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine < 2g

a. Number of Offenders: 15

27. Poss W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine => 2g < 10g

a. Number of Offenders: 21

28. Posses W Purpose Del Meth Cocaine =>10g <200g

a. Number of Offenders: 25

29. Trafficking Controlled Substance

30. Trafficking Controlled Substance

## II. Robbery Related Charges

1. Aggravated Residential Burglary

2. Aggravated Robbery

a. Number of Offenders: 12

3. Robbery

a. Number of Offenders: 31

## III. Burglary Related Charges

1. Commercial Burglary

a. Number of Offenders: 14

2. Residential Burglary

a. Number of Offenders: 57

IV. Firearm Related Charges

1. Discharge Firearm From Vehicle

a.Number of Offenders: 3

2. Poss. Firearm Certain Person

a.Number of Offenders: 13

V. Assault Related Charges

1. Aggravated Assault

a.Number of Offenders: 4

2. Agg. Assault On Corr. Employee

a.Number of Offenders: 2

3. Sexual Assault

a.Number of Offenders: 9

VI. Battery Related Charges

1. Battery-1st Degree

a.Number of Offenders: 18

2. Battery-2nd Degree
    - a.Number of Offenders: 7
  3. Domestic Battering-1st Degree
  4. Domestic Battering-2nd Degree
    - a.Number of Offenders: 6
  5. Domestic Battering-3rd Degree
    - a.Number of Offenders: 6
  6. Domestic Battery 2nd Deg-Subq Offense or to Pregnant Woman
- VII. Breaking and Entering Related Charges
1. Breaking And Entering
    - a.Number of Offenders: 12
- VIII. Theft of Property or by Receiving Related Charges
1. Theft By Receiving
  2. Theft By Receiving
  3. Theft by Receiving (Credit/Debit Card)

4. Theft by Receiving (Credit/Debit Card)
5. Theft by Receiving > \$1,000 <= \$5,000
6. Theft by Receiving > \$1,000 <= \$5,000
7. Theft By Receiving > \$5,000 < \$25,000
  - a. Number of Offenders: 4
8. Theft By Receiving >= \$25,000
9. Theft by Receiving Firearm Value is <\$2500
10. Theft by Receiving Firearm Value is <\$2500
11. Theft Of Leased Property
12. Theft Of Property
13. Theft Of Property
14. Theft of Property (Credit/Debit Card)
  - a. Number of Offenders: 3
15. Theft of Property (Firearm) < \$2,000
16. Theft of Property (Firearm) < \$2,000

17. Theft of Property > \$25,000
  - a.Number of Offenders: 5
18. Theft of Property >= \$1,000 < \$5,000
  - a.Number of Offenders: 4
19. Theft of Property >=\$5,000 < \$25,000
  - a.Number of Offenders: 14
20. Theft of Property Obtained By Threat
21. Theft of scrap metal Obtained by Threat

IX. Crimes Against a Child

1. Fail To Register Child/Sex Off
  - a.Number of Offenders: 9
2. Internet Stalk.- Child Fel. B
3. Permit Child Abuse
4. Reg Sex offend near cert fac1
5. Sexual Indecency With A Child



6. Sexual Solicitation Of A Child
  7. Endanger Welfare Minor-1st Dg
- X. Failure to Appear Related Charges
1. Fail to Appear Regarding Order Issued Before Revocation Hear
    - a.Number of Offenders: 7
  2. Failure To Appear
    - a.Number of Offenders: 19
- XI. Forgry Related Crimes
1. Forgery
    - a.Number of Offenders: 17
  2. Forgery 1st Degree
  3. Forgery 2nd Degree
    - a.Number of Offenders: 3
- XII. Terroristic Related Charges
1. Terroristic Act

a.Number of Offenders: 5

2. Terroristic Threatening

a.Number of Offenders: 3

XIII. Drug/Firearm Related Charges

1. Simul. Poss Of Drugs/Firearm

a.Number of Offenders: 19

XIV. Criminal Attempt

1. Criminal Attempt

a.Number of Offenders: 7

XV. Escape Related Charges

1. Escape-1st Degree

2. Escape-3rd Degree

a.Number of Offenders: 5

XVI. Furnishing Prohibited Articles

1. Furnishing Prohib. Articles

a.Number of Offenders: 7

XVII. Other Crimes that was not Common in the Provided Population

1. Arson

a.Number of Offenders: 2

2. Criminal Conspiracy

a.Number of Offenders: 3

3. Criminal Mischief-1st Degree (Damage $\geq$ \$25,000)

4. Dist/Poss/View Sex Explicit

5. DWI - 6th or subsequent within 10 years of prior offense

6. Engage In Viol Crim Group Act

7. False Imprisonment-1st Degree

a.Number of Offenders: 2

8. Falsely Making Terror Threat

9. Financial Identity Fraud

a.Number of Offenders: 2

10. Fleeing
  - a. Number of Offenders: 3
11. Kidnapping
12. Murder-2nd Degree
  - a. Number of Offenders: 3
13. Non-Support
  - a. Number of Offenders: 3
14. Rape
15. Stalking
16. Tampering With Physical Evid.
  - a. Number of Offenders: 2
17. Use Of Anothers Prop For Crime
18. Use/Poss. Of Paraph to Manuf Control Subst not meth/cocaine

### Appendix T: Final Keyword Search Inquiry

Search keywords and criteria followed the initial search in Appendix A with minor updates; such as date was updated to 2020 to 2022.

i.