

ROXBURY COMMUNITY REHABILITATION CENTER:
A PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS AND A RECIDIVISM FOLLOW UP

Prepared by:

Joseph Landolfi
Research Analyst

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Frank A. Hall
Commissioner

March 1977

ABSTRACT

The present analysis consists of an evaluation of the Roxbury Community Rehabilitation Center (CRC), a private organization operated by the Roxbury Multi-Service Center. The CRC was designated a community-based pre-release center by the Massachusetts Department of Correction in January, 1974.

The present study was designed with the purpose of answering the following research questions:

1. What variables distinguish between individuals who complete and individuals who do not complete their assignments to the CRC pre-release program?
2. Are those inmates who ended their terms of incarceration in the CRC less likely to be reincarcerated within one year of their release than are similar types of inmates who did not participate in the pre-release program?

The evaluation resulted in two findings. First, of the 90 individuals who participated in the pre-release program since the inception of the program through December 1975, 51 (57%) successfully terminated from the facility. The remaining 39 (43%) were either returned to the various Massachusetts Correctional Institutions or declared escapees. A statistical comparison of commitment, personal history background characteristics and criminal history background characteristics yielded thirteen (13) variables that produced statistically significant differences between the two completion samples. This analysis resulted in a profile based on the above mentioned variables of a typical CRC program non-completer.

Secondly, even after controlling for a possible selection bias it was determined that individuals who had completed the CRC program exhibited a lower rate of recidivism than similar types of individuals who did not participate in the pre-release program. The difference, however, between the two rates was not statistically significant.

INTRODUCTION

Following the enactment of the 1972 Correctional Reform Act the Massachusetts Department of Correction, recognizing the valuable rehabilitative potential of community resources, began implementing "a system of community based correctional programs that will stress individual decision-making and responsibility for one's actions and community involvement and support for returning ex-offenders".¹ This act (chapter 777) enabled the Commissioner of Corrections to authorize the establishment of small, separately operated community-based facilities to which offenders could be transferred prior to their release on parole. These facilities were either directly operated by or sub-contracted to the Department of Correction.²

One example of a contract house is the Community Rehabilitation Center (CRC), a private organization operated by the Roxbury Multi-Service Center. The center is located in Dorchester, Massachusetts, an urban community that is part of the metropolitan Boston area. The CRC was designated a community-based Pre-Release Center by the Massachusetts Department of Correction January 1974. The contract provides residential facilities for 25 male offenders, referred to the program by the Department of Correction, who are within 6 months of their parole eligibility date.

The Roxbury Multi-Service Center was initially organized in 1965 as a three year demonstration program by Action for

-
- 1 Edwin Powers, The Basic Structure of the Administration of Criminal Justice in Massachusetts (Boston; Massachusetts Correctional Association, 1973), p.222
 - 2 For a research evaluation of pre-release programs operated directly by the Department of Correction see LeClair, Daniel P., An Analysis of Recidivism Among Residents Released from Boston State and Shirley Pre-Release centers During 1972-1973 Massachusetts Department of Correction, August, 1975

Boston Community Development and United Community Services. Over the past ten years the Roxbury Multi-Service Center has provided the Roxbury/North Dorchester area with a variety of community services. The Community Rehabilitation Center functions as a component of the Roxbury Multi-Service Center and provides a self help residential program for males who have experienced incarceration in the various Massachusetts correctional institutions. The center provides supportive services for residents during the critical stages of re-entry into the community. These services include individual and group counseling, employment, educational and training counseling and referral and recreational activity.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The present study was designed with the purpose of answering the following research questions:

1. What variables distinguish between individuals who complete and individuals who do not complete their assignments to the Community Rehabilitation Center pre-release program?
2. Are those inmates who ended their terms of incarceration in the Community Rehabilitation Center less likely to be reincarcerated within one year of their release than are similar types of inmates who did not participate in the pre-release program?

In determining the existence of characteristics distinguishing between program completers and program non-completers a population consisting of residents admitted to and released from the Community Rehabilitation Center since the inception of the program in January 1974 through December 1975 was chosen (N=90). Included in this sample are both program completers - individuals who had been released directly to the community - and program non-completers - individuals who were removed from the program and returned to their sending institutions.

In measuring the reduction of further criminal behavior, a population consisting of all residents released from the Community Rehabilitation Center, either by permit of the Parole Board or a certificate of discharge, during the years 1974 and 1975 (N=51), was chosen. It should be noted that only the successful completions were included in this population.

Residents who were categorized as program non-completers were either terminated from the CRC and returned to their original sending Massachusetts Correctional Institution or were declared escapees. The majority of the non-completion sample tended to have later release dates and therefore, could not be included in the one year recidivism follow-up analysis.

Data Collection

Data collected for both samples consisted of commitment, social background and criminal history variables. This material was generated by the Massachusetts Department of Correction Community Rehabilitation Center computerized data base. Booking and probation data was provided by the data base maintained by the Correction/Parole Information System Unit.

Base Expectancy Tables

When addressing the second research question, the existence of a selection bias must be taken into account. Because of the possible existence of a non-random selection process in the assignment of clients to pre-release programs, Expected Rates of recidivism were constructed and applied to the CRC pre-release completion sample. The Expected Rate of recidivism for the pre-release sample was then compared to the Actual Rate of recidivism for the CRC sample. Tests of statistical significance were used in comparison to determine whether a low or high risk population was chosen in the process of selection for program participants.

FINDINGS

VARIABLES DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN PROGRAM COMPLETERS AND PROGRAM NON-COMPLETERS

Of the 90 individuals who participated in the Community Rehabilitation Center pre-release program since the inception of the program through December 1975, 51 (57%) successfully terminated from the facility. The remaining 39 (43%) were either returned to the various Massachusetts Correctional Institutions or declared escapees. A program completion was defined as any resident who successfully completed his stay at the CRC and was released to the streets either by permit of the parole board or a certificate of discharge. A program non completion was defined as any resident who did not complete his stay at the CRC facility but was instead declared an escapee or was returned to his sending MCI.

In determining the existence of characteristics distinguishing between program completers and program non-completers, a multivariate analysis was conducted on the total sample. A statistical comparison of commitment, personal history background characteristics and criminal history background characteristics on each of the program completers and each of the program non-completers was carried out to determine whether or not any significant differences existed between these two sub-samples. A complete statistical breakdown by variable for the sample is documented in Appendix I.

Analysis of these variables yielded thirteen (13) variables that produced statistically significant differences between the non-completers and the program completers. These variables were: Total Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations, Number of Juvenile Paroles, Age at Incarceration, Age at First Arrest, Time on Job of Longest Duration, Number of Prior Court Appearances for Property Offenses, Number of Adult Paroles, Total Incarcerations, Number of State or Federal Incarcerations, Total Court Appearances, Number of Prior Court Appearances for Person Offenses, Total Adult Incarcerations and Last Grade Completed. The specific dividing point and the actual direction of each of these differences is presented below:

(1) The program non-completion sample had a disproportionately higher number of individuals who had been incarcerated one or more times as a juvenile. Whereas, 49% of the program non-completion sample had experienced a juvenile incarceration, only 10% of the program completion sample had experienced incarceration as a juvenile.

(2) Similar to Item I above, the program non-completion sample had a disproportionately higher number of individuals who had previously been paroled as a juvenile, specifically, 36% of the program non-completion sample had experienced parole status as a juvenile whereas only 6% of the completion sample had experienced parole status as a juvenile.

(3) In terms of the variable Age At Incarceration, it was determined that significantly more of the program non-completers 65% than the completers, 29% were 21 years of age or younger at the time of their incarceration.

(4) Regarding the variable Age At First Arrest, it was determined that significantly more of the program non-completion sample (71%) were 17 years of age or younger at the time of their first arrest. Whereas, only 42% of the completion sample were 17 years of age or younger at the time of their first arrest.

(5) It was discovered when considering Longest Period of Employment at Any One Job (excluding unknowns) that the program non-completion sample had a disproportionately higher number of individuals with less than 6 months at any one job. Fifty-five percent of the non-completion sample compared to 25 percent of the completion sample had worked less than 6 months at any prior job.

(6) The program non-completion sample had a disproportionately higher number of individuals with Prior Court Appearances for Property Offenses. Eighty-two percent of the non-completion sample compared to 57 percent of the completion sample had one or more prior court appearances for property offenses.

(7) Analysis of the variable Number of Adult Paroles revealed that more of the non-completion sample had experienced parole status as an adult.

(8) A disproportionately higher number of individuals in the program non-completion sample had experienced one or more incarcerations prior to their present confinement. Sixty-two percent of the non-completion sample as compared to 35 percent of the completion sample had one or more prior incarcerations.

(9) A disproportionately higher number of individuals in the non-completion sample experienced at least one or more prior State or Federal Incarcerations. Specifically, 38 percent of the non-completion sample as compared to 16 percent of the completion sample experienced one or more prior state or federal incarcerations.

(10) In terms of the variable Total Court Appearances a disproportionate number of the program non-completion sample exhibited more total court appearances than the completion sample. Sixty-nine percent of the non-completion sample as compared to 45 percent of the completion sample had six or more total court appearances.

(11) A disproportionately higher number of individuals in the program non-completion sample had three or more prior court appearances for person offenses. Sixty-nine percent of the non-completion sample as compared to 45 percent of the completion sample had three or more prior court appearances for person offenses.

(12) Regarding the variable Total Adult Incarcerations, it was determined that 51 percent of the non-completion sample as compared to 29 percent of the completion sample had one or more adult incarcerations.

(13) Finally, analysis of the education variable, Last Grade Completed, revealed that significantly more of the non-completion sample than the completion sample had not graduated from high school. Eighty-five percent of the program non-completers as compared to 65 percent of the program completers did not graduate from high school.

In summary, analysis revealed that program non-completers at the Roxbury Community Rehabilitation Center more often than not tended to be younger offenders in terms of age at first arrest, with lengthy court records largely for property offenses and/or offenses against the person whose incarceration and parole histories began at the juvenile level. This criminal activity was continued into adulthood where the program non-completers tended to have more total court appearances, prior state/federal incarcerations and prior adult paroles than the program completers. Additionally the program non-completers also exhibited a sporadic employment history and generally did not go beyond the 11th grade in school.

³ The chi square statistic for the most significant splits for each of the variables utilized in the analysis are presented in Appendix II

RESULTS OF RECIDIVISM FOLLOW-UP ANALYSIS

In measuring the reduction of further criminal behavior, the standard used will be recidivism rates. A recidivist is defined as any subject who is returned for whatever reason to a Federal or State Prison or to a county house of correction or to a jail for 30 days or more. The follow-up period will be exactly one full year from the date of the subject's release from the Community Rehabilitation Center. It should be noted that a person can be returned either as a parole violator or on a new conviction for a new offense.

Of the 51 individuals who successfully completed the Roxbury Community Rehabilitation Center pre-release program in 1974 and 1975, only 3 recidivated. This results in an overall recidivism rate of 5.9%.

This figure appears quite low when compared to the recidivism rates for the total walled institutions' release population. The most recent recidivism figures available for the releasees from the walled institutions are for the releasees in the year 1973. For that year the combined recidivism rate for MCI's Walpole, Concord, Norfolk, Forestry, Pre-Release and Framingham was 19%. These figures are presented in Table I below:⁴

TABLE I
DIFFERENTIAL RECIDIVISM RATES BY INSTITUTION
OF RELEASE: ONE YEAR FOLLOW-UP

<u>INSTITUTION OF RELEASE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF RELEASES</u>	<u>PERCENT OF TOTAL RELEASES</u>	<u>RECIDIVISM RATE</u>
Walpole	132	(14)	21%
Concord	332	(34)	26%
Norfolk	211	(22)	14%
Forestry	70	(7)	14%
Pre-Release	109	(11)	12%
Framingham Men	24	(3)	17%
Framingham Women	88	(9)	17%
TOTAL	966	(100)	19%

⁴ LeClair, Daniel P., An Analysis of Recidivism Rates Among Residents Released from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions During the Year 1973 Massachusetts Department of Correction, August, 1975

To place the comparison between the Community Rehabilitation Center Program with the overall releasee population from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions in perspective a test of selection biases is necessary. It is necessary to analyze the Roxbury pre-release population in terms of selection factors to determine whether or not low risk recidivists were in fact selected for transfer into the facility. This was accomplished by determining the expected recidivism rates for the pre-release program completion population through the use of base expectancy tables. The specific base expectancy table utilized was constructed on a population of residents released from Massachusetts Department of Correction facilities during the year 1971. This table is presented below as Table II.

TABLE II

VALIDATED BASE EXPECTANCY TABLE

Total Sample RR = 25%	Twelve or More Prior Court Appearances RR = 35%	Age 27 or Younger at Time of Release RR = 48%	
		Age 28 or Older at Time of Release RR = 23%	
	Eleven or Fewer Prior Court Appearances RR = 17%	Age 25 or Younger at Time of Release RR = 24%	Total Num- ber of Charges 7 or More RR = 32%
			Total Number of Charges 6 or Less RR = 14%
		Age 26 or Older at Time of Release RR = 6%	

The completed and validated Base Expectancy Table yielded 5 basic risk categories. These will be used to determine the expected rates of recidivism for the treatment samples. A rank ordering of these 5 categories in terms of their risk level (i.e. recidivism rate) is summarized in Table III below:

TABLE III

BASE EXPECTANCY RISK CATEGORIES

CATEGORY NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	RECIDIVISM RATE
I	Age 27 or younger at time of release, 12 or more prior court appearances	48%
II	Age 25 or younger at time of release 11 or fewer prior court appearances and total number of charges 7 or more	32%
III	Age 28 or older at time of release 12 or more prior court appearances	23%
IV	Age 25 or younger at time of release, 11 or fewer prior court appearances, and total number of charges 6 or less	14%
V	Age 26 or older at time of release 11 or fewer prior court appearances	6%

The Base Expectancy Risk Categories as summarized in Table III above, were applied to the Roxbury Pre-Release population. This procedure resulted in an expected recidivism rate of 14.0% for the Roxbury Community Rehabilitation Center sample.

EXPECTED RATES OF RECIDIVISM COMPARED TO OBSERVED RATES:

In order to test the second hypothesis this study compared the expected recidivism rate of the Community Rehabilitation Center with their actual rate. Selective factors, to the extent that they exist, will be controlled for by using the expected rates of recidivism.

When we compare the expected rate with the actual rate, we see that releases from the Roxbury Program had a considerably lower rate than expected. Table IV below summarizes this finding.

TABLE IV

EXPECTED RATES OF RECIDIVISM COMPARED TO OBSERVED
RATE, ROXBURY COMMUNITY REHABILITATION CENTER POPULATION

Expected Rate	14.0%
Observed Rate	5.9%

However, as large as the difference between the two rates is, the result was not statistically significant at the .05 significance level.⁵

⁵ $\chi^2 = 2.79$, 1dF, $P < .10$

DISCUSSION

The present study was designed with the purpose of evaluating the rehabilitative impact of the Roxbury Community Rehabilitation Center pre-release program. The program emerged out of the 1972 Correctional Reform Act which allowed the Massachusetts Department of Correction to initiate a system of community based correctional facilities. The philosophy behind these centers is the establishment of a smooth transition between total institutionalization and the nearly complete freedom of parole. Essentially, community corrections is a continuum of increasing freedoms which inherently involves the accrual of greater responsibilities. The rationale behind this process was that it would reduce the present high levels of recidivism associated with correctional institution releases.

The present study was designed with the purpose of answering the following research questions:

1. What variables distinguish between individuals who complete and individuals who do not complete their assignments to the Community Rehabilitation Center pre-release program?
2. Are those inmates who ended their terms of incarceration in the Community Rehabilitation Center less likely to be reincarcerated within one year of their release than are similar types of inmates who did not participate in the pre-release program?

In summation the present evaluation resulted in two findings. First, of the 90 individuals who participated in the pre-release program, since the inception of the program through December 1975, 51 (57%) successfully terminated from the facility. The remaining 39 (43%) were either returned to the various Massachusetts Correctional Institutions or declared escapees. A statistical comparison of commitment, personal history background characteristics and criminal history background characteristics on each of the samples yielded thirteen (13) variables that produced statistically significant differences. This analysis resulted in a profile based on the above mentioned variables of a typical Community Rehabilitation Center program non-completer. Analysis of this nature is useful for both administrative and classification purposes.

Secondly, even after controlling for a possible selection bias it was determined that individuals who had completed the Community Rehabilitation Center pre-release program exhibited a much lower rate of recidivism than similar types of individuals who did not participate in the pre-release program. However, as large as the difference between the two rates was, the result was not statistically significant.

APPENDIX I

COMMUNITY REHABILITATION CENTER

VARIABLE	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. <u>PRESENT OFFENSE CATEGORY</u>						
Murder 2	1	(2)	2	(5)	3	(3)
Manslaughter	9	(18)	0	(0)	9	(10)
Armed Robbery	22	(43)	20	(51)	42	(47)
Unarmed Robbery	2	(4)	4	(10)	6	(7)
Assault with Intent to Rob	1	(2)	2	(5)	3	(3)
Other Person Offenses	2	(4)	2	(5)	4	(4)
Rape	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
Other 'Sex	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
Burglary	1	(2)	2	(5)	3	(3)
Larceny from the Person	1	(2)	1	(3)	2	(2)
Larceny	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
Other Property	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
Narcotics	10	(20)	4	(10)	14	(16)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
2. <u>RACE</u>						
White	2	(4)	2	(5)	4	(4)
Black	49	(96)	37	(95)	86	(96)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
3. <u>MARITAL STATUS</u>						
Married	18	(36)	9	(23)	27	(30)
Single	28	(55)	28	(72)	56	(62)
Divorced	0	(0)	2	(5)	2	(2)
Widowed	2	(4)	0	(0)	2	(2)
Separated	3	(6)	0	(0)	3	(3)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
4. <u>MILITARY HISTORY</u>						
None	46	(90)	36	(92)	82	(91)
Honorable	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
Discharge Unknown	5	(10)	2	(5)	7	(8)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
5. <u>ADDRESS PRIOR TO INCAR- CERATION</u>						
Boston	44	(86)	36	(92)	80	(89)
Cambridge	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
Springfield	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
Somerville	1	(2)	1	(3)	2	(2)
Holyoke	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
Lowell	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
New Bedford	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)

VARIABLE	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. ADDRESS PRIOR TO INCARCERATION (continued)						
Waltham	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
Outside New England	2	(4)	0	(0)	2	(2)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
6. OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL						
Clerical & Sales	6	(12)	7	(18)	13	(15)
Semi Professional	2	(4)	0	(0)	2	(2)
Protection & Service	16	(32)	12	(31)	28	(31)
Manual	24	(48)	16	(41)	40	(45)
In Army	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
Unemployed	2	(4)	0	(0)	2	(2)
Unknown	0	(0)	3	(8)	3	(3)
TOTAL	50	(100)	39	(100)	89	(100)

Missing Observations = 1

7. <u>TIME AT MOST SKILLED POSITION</u>						
1 Month	0	(0)	3	(10)	3	(4)
2 Months	3	(7)	5	(16)	8	(11)
3 Months	4	(9)	7	(23)	11	(15)
4 Months	4	(9)	3	(10)	7	(9)
5 Months	3	(7)	0	(0)	3	(4)
6 Months	4	(9)	6	(19)	10	(10)
7 Months	11	(25)	3	(10)	14	(19)
8 Months	9	(21)	2	(7)	11	(15)
9 Months	6	(14)	2	(7)	8	(11)
TOTAL	44	(100)	31	(100)	75	(100)

Missing Observations = 15

8. TIME ON JOB OF LONGEST DURATION						
1 Month	0	(0)	2	(7)	2	(3)
2 Months	3	(7)	4	(13)	7	(10)
3 Months	0	(0)	6	(19)	6	(8)
4 Months	3	(7)	5	(16)	8	(11)
5 Months	5	(12)	0	(0)	5	(7)
6 Months	4	(9)	5	(16)	9	(12)
7 Months	12	(28)	4	(13)	16	(22)
8 Months	10	(23)	3	(10)	13	(18)
9 Months	6	(14)	2	(7)	8	(11)
TOTAL	43	(100)	31	(100)	74	(100)

Missing Observations = 16

VARIABLE	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
9. <u>LAST GRADE COMPLETED</u>						
4th Grade	3	(6)	0	(0)	3	(3)
6th Grade	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
7th Grade	3	(6)	3	(8)	6	(7)
8th Grade	5	(10)	11	(28)	16	(18)
9th Grade	7	(14)	6	(15)	13	(15)
10th Grade	5	(10)	8	(21)	13	(15)
11th Grade	8	(16)	5	(13)	13	(15)
High School Graduate	15	(31)	6	(15)	21	(24)
One Year of College	2	(4)	0	(0)	2	(2)
TOTAL	49	(100)	39	(100)	88	(100)
Missing Observations = 2						
10. <u>DRUG USE</u>						
None	21	(43)	17	(44)	38	(43)
No Specific Use	4	(8)	2	(5)	6	(7)
Heroin	19	(39)	15	(39)	34	(39)
Other than Heroin/ Marajuana	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
Marajuana only	4	(8)	5	(13)	9	(10)
TOTAL	49	(100)	39	(100)	88	(100)
Missing Observations = 2						
11. <u>TOTAL COURT APPEARANCES</u>						
First Offense	4	(8)	2	(5)	6	(7)
2 to 5	24	(47)	10	(26)	34	(38)
6 to 10	11	(22)	10	(26)	21	(23)
11 to 15	8	(16)	12	(31)	20	(22)
16 to 20	3	(6)	3	(8)	6	(7)
21 to 25	1	(2)	1	(3)	2	(2)
26 or More	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
12. <u>NUMBER OF PRIOR COURT APPEARANCES FOR PERSON OFFENSES</u>						
None	5	(10)	3	(8)	8	(9)
1	12	(24)	6	(15)	18	(20)
2	11	(22)	3	(8)	14	(16)
3	6	(12)	7	(18)	13	(14)
4	7	(14)	7	(18)	14	(16)
5	3	(6)	5	(13)	8	(9)
6 to 10	4	(8)	7	(18)	11	(12)
11 to 15	2	(4)	0	(0)	2	(2)
16 or More	1	(2)	1	(3)	2	(2)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)

VARIABLE	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. <u>NUMBER OF PRIOR COURT APPEARANCES FOR PROPERTY OFFENSES</u>						
None	22	(43)	7	(18)	29	(32)
1	5	(10)	4	(10)	9	(10)
2	6	(12)	4	(10)	10	(11)
3	5	(10)	2	(5)	7	(8)
4	3	(6)	2	(5)	5	(6)
5	3	(6)	1	(3)	4	(4)
6 to 10	5	(10)	13	(33)	18	(20)
11 to 15	2	(4)	4	(10)	6	(7)
16 or more	0	(0)	2	(5)	2	(2)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
14. <u>NUMBER OF PRIOR COURT APPEARANCES FOR SEX OFFENSES</u>						
None	47	(92)	37	(95)	84	(93)
1	2	(4)	2	(5)	4	(4)
2	2	(4)	0	(0)	2	(2)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
15. <u>NUMBER OF PRIOR COURT APPEARANCES FOR NARCOTIC OFFENSES</u>						
None	35	(69)	25	(64)	60	(67)
1	3	(6)	2	(5)	5	(6)
2	4	(8)	3	(8)	7	(8)
3	2	(4)	4	(10)	6	(7)
4	1	(2)	2	(5)	3	(3)
5	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
6 to 10	4	(8)	3	(8)	7	(8)
11 to 15	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
16. <u>NUMBER OF PRIOR COURT APPEARANCES FOR ESCAPE OFFENSES</u>						
None	50	(98)	37	(95)	87	(97)
1	1	(2)	2	(5)	3	(3)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
17. <u>NUMBER OF JUVENILE INCARCERATIONS</u>						
None	46	(90)	20	(51)	66	(73)
1	3	(6)	7	(18)	10	(11)
2	0	(0)	6	(15)	6	(7)
3	0	(0)	2	(5)	2	(2)
4	0	(0)	2	(5)	2	(2)
5	2	(4)	0	(0)	2	(2)
6	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
7	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)

VARIABLE	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
18. <u>NUMBER OF HOUSE OF CORRECTION INCARCERATIONS</u>						
None	39	(77)	28	(72)	67	(74)
1	10	(20)	5	(13)	15	(17)
2	2	(4)	3	(8)	5	(6)
3	0	(0)	3	(8)	3	(3)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
19. <u>NUMBER OF STATE OR FEDERAL INCARCERATIONS</u>						
None	43	(84)	24	(62)	67	(74)
1	4	(8)	10	(26)	14	(16)
2	3	(6)	1	(3)	4	(4)
3	1	(2)	3	(8)	4	(4)
4	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
20. <u>NUMBER OF JUVENILE PAROLES</u>						
None	48	(94)	25	(64)	73	(81)
1	1	(2)	4	(10)	5	(6)
2	0	(0)	4	(10)	4	(4)
3	0	(0)	2	(5)	2	(2)
4	2	(4)	2	(5)	4	(4)
6	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
7	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
21. <u>NUMBER OF JUVENILE PAROLE VIOLATIONS</u>						
Not Applicable	48	(94)	25	(64)	73	(81)
None	1	(2)	4	(10)	5	(6)
1	0	(0)	5	(13)	5	(6)
2	0	(0)	2	(5)	2	(2)
3	1	(2)	1	(3)	2	(2)
4	1	(2)	1	(3)	2	(2)
5	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
22. <u>NUMBER OF ADULT PAROLES</u>						
None	45	(88)	26	(67)	71	(79)
1	5	(10)	11	(28)	16	(18)
2	1	(2)	1	(3)	2	(2)
3	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)

VARIABLE	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
23. NUMBER OF ADULT PAROLE VIOLATIONS						
Not Applicable	45	(88)	26	(67)	71	(79)
None	1	(2)	4	(10)	5	(6)
1	4	(8)	8	(20)	12	(13)
2	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
3	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
24. TOTAL ADULT INCARCERATIONS						
0	36	(71)	19	(49)	55	(61)
1	7	(14)	9	(23)	16	(18)
2	5	(10)	6	(15)	11	(12)
3	2	(4)	2	(5)	4	(4)
4	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
5	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
6	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
7	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
25. TOTAL INCARCERATIONS						
0	33	(65)	15	(39)	48	(53)
1	8	(16)	5	(13)	13	(14)
2	6	(12)	5	(13)	11	(12)
3	2	(4)	6	(15)	8	(9)
4	0	(0)	3	(8)	3	(3)
5	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
6	0	(0)	2	(5)	2	(2)
9	1	(0)	1	(3)	2	(2)
11	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
14	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	39	(100)	90	(100)
26. AGE AT INCARCERATION						
17	0	(0)	2	(5)	2	(2)
18	3	(6)	7	(19)	10	(11)
19	4	(8)	5	(14)	9	(10)
20	6	(12)	7	(19)	13	(15)
21	2	(4)	3	(8)	5	(6)
22 to 25	13	(26)	7	(19)	20	(23)
26 to 29	11	(22)	3	(8)	14	(16)
30 to 34	3	(6)	3	(8)	6	(7)
35 to 39	5	(10)	0	(0)	5	(6)
40 to 44	3	(6)	0	(0)	3	(3)
45 and Over	1	(2)	0	(0)	1	(1)
TOTAL	51	(100)	37	(100)	88	(100)

Missing Observations = 2

VARIABLE	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
27. AGE AT FIRST ARREST						
8-9	0	(0)	2	(5)	2	(2)
10-11	0	(0)	5	(13)	5	(6)
12-13	7	(14)	4	(11)	11	(13)
14-15	6	(12)	12	(32)	18	(20)
16-17	8	(16)	4	(11)	12	(14)
18-19	13	(26)	6	(16)	19	(22)
20-21	3	(6)	2	(5)	5	(6)
22-23	3	(6)	0	(0)	3	(3)
24-25	3	(6)	1	(3)	4	(5)
26-27	2	(4)	2	(5)	4	(5)
28-30	2	(4)	0	(0)	2	(2)
Over 35	3	(6)	0	(0)	3	(3)
TOTAL	50	(100)	38	(100)	88	(100)

Missing Observations = 2

APPENDIX II

VARIABLES FOUND TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PROGRAM NON-COMPLETERS AND PROGRAM COMPLETERS

I. Total Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
None	20	(51)	46	(90)
One or More	19	(49)	5	(10)

($\chi^2=17.11$, 1dF, P .001)

II Number of Juvenile Paroles

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
None	25	(64)	48	(94)
One or More	14	(36)	3	(6)

($\chi^2 = 11.11$, 1dF, P .001)

III Age At Incarceration

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
21 or Younger	24	(65)	15	(29)
22 or Older	13	(35)	36	(71)

($\chi^2 = 10.92$, 1dF, P .001)

IV Age At 1st Arrest

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
17 or Younger	27	(71)	21	(42)
18 or Older	11	(29)	29	(58)

($\chi^2 = 7.35$, 1dF, P .01)

V Time on Job of Longest Duration

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Less Than 6 Months	17	(55)	11	(25)
6 Months or More	14	(45)	32	(75)

($\chi^2 = 6.55$, 1dF, P .01)

APPENDIX II

VARIABLES FOUND TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PROGRAM NON-COMPLETERS AND PROGRAM COMPLETERS

VI Number of Prior Court Appearances for Property Offenses

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
None	7	(18)	22	(43)
One or More	32	(82)	29	(57)

$$(X^2 = 6.42, 1dF, P .02)$$

VII Number of Adult Paroles

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
None	26	(67)	45	(88)
One or More	13	(33)	6	(12)

$$(X^2 = 6.17, 1dF, P .02)$$

VIII Total Incarcerations

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
None	15	(38)	33	(65)
One or More	24	(62)	18	(35)

$$(X^2 = 6.12, 1dF, P .02)$$

IX Number of State Or Federal Incarcerations

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
None	24	(62)	43	(84)
One or More	15	(38)	8	(16)

$$(X^2 = 6.03, 1dF, P .02)$$

X Total Court Appearances

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Five or Less	12	(31)	28	(55)
Six or More	27	(69)	23	(45)

$$(X^2 = 5.21, 1dF, P .05)$$

APPENDIX II

VARIABLES FOUND TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PROGRAM NON-COMPLETERS AND PROGRAM COMPLETERS

XI Number of Prior Court Appearances For Person Offenses

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Two or Less	12	(31)	28	(55)
Three or More	27	(69)	23	(45)

($\chi^2 = 5.21$, 1dF, P .05)

XII Total Adult Incarcerations

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
None	19	(49)	36	(71)
One or More	20	(51)	15	(29)

($\chi^2 = 4.45$, 1dF, P .05)

XIII Last Grade Completed

	<u>Non-Completions</u>		<u>Completions</u>	
	N	%	N	%
High School Graduate	6	(15)	17	(35)
11th Grade or Less	33	(85)	32	(65)

($\chi^2 = 4.19$, 1dF, P .05)

Missing Observation = 2