

205

REACH OUT: A REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE AND
A STATISTICAL DESCRIPTION OF INMATE PARTICIPANTS

Prepared By:

Joseph Landolfi
Research Specialist

Massachusetts Department of Correction

William T. Hogan, Jr.
Commissioner

PUBLICATION #12090

Approved By: John J. Manton, Acting State Purchasing Agent

ABSTRACT

Recent publicity generated by the documentary "Scared Straight" prompted inquiries from Massachusetts Correctional administrators regarding Reach Out, a juvenile counseling program conducted by inmates at the maximum security institution at MCI-Walpole. The intent of this report was twofold. First, a review of previous and existing inmate sponsored juvenile counseling programs was conducted. Additionally, a statistical profile of the Reach Out inmate participants comprised of prior criminal history, personal history background and furlough history data was conducted. Data presented in the inmate participant profile was compared to similar data available on residents of the Massachusetts Correctional Institutions on January 1, 1979. Analysis of the data revealed several noteworthy differences between the two populations. First, it was noted that in all instances the Reach Out inmate participants exhibited a disproportionately greater number of individuals with prior incarcerations, paroles and parole violations of any type. Lastly, analysis of the data reflecting present offense, determined that the Reach Out inmate participants tended to be older at the time of their present incarceration and more likely than the comparison Massachusetts Correctional Institution population to be incarcerated for offense against the person, specifically the crime of armed robbery.

Introduction

The concept of criminal deterrence is a primary tenet of the criminal justice system in this country today. The notion of deterrence has provided the rationale for the system's use of punishment as a means by which to prevent crime. More recently the deterrence theory has provided the system with the theoretical basis needed for the introduction and implementation of rehabilitative programming within the criminal justice system.

The juvenile justice system as conceptualized by the juvenile courts also has as its basis an inherent preventative function. Based on the underlying premise that juveniles should be subject to no more contact with the system than necessary, juvenile courts make frequent use of diversionary programs. The deterrent or preventive action of the juvenile justice system is directed at preventing the juvenile from becoming an adult criminal.¹

The idea of delinquency prevention has met with little resistance from within the juvenile justice system. In practice, however, delinquency prevention programs have reported little success. A review of delinquency prevention literature has in fact revealed virtually no evidence in support of such efforts.²

¹Hawes, Joseph, Children in Urban Society. Oxford University Press, 1971.

²Wright and Dixon, Evaluation of Delinquency Prevention Programs. National Science Foundation.

Recent publicity generated by the documentary "Scared Straight" filmed at New Jersey's Rahway State Prison depicting the inmate sponsored Juvenile Awareness Project Help (JAPH) has however, rekindled legislative and administrative interest in this type of delinquency prevention programming. Spurred by proponents of JAPH who claim an 80% - 90% success rate associated with participation in the Rahway Project, administrators throughout the country have taken steps to adopt like programs. Similarly, the JAPH phenomenon has prompted inquiries from Massachusetts correctional administrators regarding Reach Out, a juvenile counseling program conducted by inmates at the maximum security institution at Walpole (MCI-Walpole).

Reach Out, a legally chartered inmate sponsored corporation, was founded at MCI-Walpole in August of 1974. The premise of Reach Out according to the group's charter is to divert the flow of juveniles entering the criminal justice system. The inmate counselors, through a series of individual and group sessions with the juveniles attempt to establish a relationship with the youth in the hope of deterring them from involvement with the criminal justice system.

Juvenile participants are referred to Reach Out from a variety of Department of Youth Service facilities, the Juvenile Court system and private agencies. This includes: Children in Need of Service youth (CHINS), and juveniles classified as children with special needs according to Chapter 766 of the Massachusetts General Laws. CHINS youth are generally categorized as status offenders and are typically not formerly adjudicated delinquent. Further, juveniles classified as Chapter 766 youth are statutorily described as school age children with special needs who because of certain learning disabilities are unable to

progress effectively in a regular school program. The status of these youths in terms of delinquency is unclear. However, adjudicated delinquents are remanded to Reach-Out via the courts as a stipulation of their probation. Juveniles referred to Reach Out are initially provided with a tour of MCI-Walpole followed by an indoctrination lecture dealing with the realities of prison life at the maximum security institution. Subsequent to the orientation session, juveniles participate in weekly group counseling sessions. By the third week of participation the youths are expected to choose a resident counselor who subsequently initiates weekly individual counseling sessions with the juvenile. Juveniles referred to Reach Out are requested to attend the program once a week for a minimum of three months.

In addition to the aforementioned duties, Reach Out counselors are required to work with and report to probation officers, outside case workers, families and the courts in an attempt to create a structured, rehabilitative environment for the juveniles.

MCI-Walpole inmates interested in participating as counselors are carefully screened and interviewed by Reach Out administrators prior to their selection. The entire Walpole inmate population, excluding only those residents with prior convictions for sex offenses, are eligible to participate in Reach Out. Inmates selected as prospective counselors are required to complete a 12 week classroom training course followed by four weeks of on the job training. At the completion of this period, inmate trainees become probationary counselors for 90 days.

Purpose of Report

This report will not attempt to assess the efficacy of Reach Out in terms of deterring delinquent behavior among the juvenile participants for several reasons. The unavailability of comprehensive program participation data on the youth reduced the feasibility of conducting a valid post Reach Out follow-up of the juveniles. Additionally, it was discerned that non-adjudicated juveniles, including CHINS and Chapter 766 youth, were regular participants in the Reach Out program. The participation of individuals such as CHINS and Chapter 766 youth whose status in terms of delinquency is unclear, posed specific methodological restraints. Participating juveniles who evidenced no delinquent behavior and who were unlikely to become delinquent would necessarily bias a post Reach Out delinquency recidivism measure.

In light of the aforementioned limitations certain parameters were outlined for this project. The focus of this paper will be two-fold. First a review of previous and existing inmate sponsored juvenile counseling programs will be presented. Additionally, a statistical profile of the Reach Out inmate participants will be documented and compared to similar data available on the entire resident population of the Massachusetts Correctional Institutions on January 1, 1979. This descriptive information will provide administrators with useful information pertaining to the Reach Out program.

The data presented in the profile will include prior criminal history, personal history background and furlough history data. The criminal history and personal history background data will include complete booking and probation information for each inmate participant prior to the individual's initial participation date in Reach-Out.

Since the inception of the program in May of 1975 through June of 1979 a total of 129 inmates have participated in the Reach Out juvenile counseling program. This population was chosen as the study sample.

Literature Review

The development of inmate sponsored groups designed to address community, civic and youth groups regarding crime and corrections had its origins in the decade of the sixties. An underlying objective of these programs has been to deter potential juvenile offenders from further criminal involvement (Brodsky, 1970).

Evaluation of these programs has been limited and incomprehensive, generally restricted to information gathered from letters and comments of participants and sponsors. A rigorous study of this type of program was conducted by Brodsky in 1970 in an attempt to determine if "youth attitudes toward the punishment of criminals and attitudes toward prison were modified as a result of being exposed to the programs."³ In his analysis of high school pre-delinquents and forestry camp youth who had participated in the Prison Profiles Program at Illinois State Penitentiary Brodsky concluded that, "...the pre delinquents and delinquents are likely target groups for changing attitudes and, hopefully, behavior. The results indicate that they were not strongly influenced".⁴

A recent outgrowth of the aforementioned inmate sponsored speaker programs was the emergence of inmate sponsored delinquency deterrence programs. The most publicized of these programs has been the Juvenile Awareness Project Help (JAPH) in operation at New Jersey's Rahway State Prison. Founded in 1976 by the Lifers Group at Rahway the Juvenile Awareness Project Help was designed to enlighten youth about the effects of their involvement in crime.

³Brodsky, S. "The Prisoner as Agent of Attitude Change: A Study of Prison Profiles Effects, "British Journal of Criminology, 280-285, 1970.

⁴Ibid, Pp. 280-285.

Juvenile participants in the Rahway Program are subjected to a single visit to the institution. Following a tour of the facility, the juveniles are confronted by participating inmates who through a "shock, confrontation approach", graphically and aggressively portray the harsh realities of prison life. The overly dramatic approach of the inmates is intended to represent the most negative aspects of prison life to the youths. Although initial publicity concerning Rahway's Juvenile Awareness project has been extremely positive, careful empirical evaluations of the project have revealed predominantly negative findings.

Professor James Finckenauer of Rutgers University has produced two evaluations concerning the Juvenile Awareness Project Help. The goals of his research were: 1) to evaluate the psychological and behavioral reactions juveniles experienced as a direct result of their involvement in JAPH, 2) document the recidivism rates of these juveniles, and 3) assess the extent to which the initial exposure to the project and the effects there from were manifested in the lives of the participants.⁵ Finckenauer's initial research effort addressed only the attitude change component of the evaluation.

At the outset Finckenauer intended to randomly assign approximately 100 juveniles to experimental and control groups. The experimental group would participate in JAPH while the control group would not. The research design became a quasi-experimental design in which assignment to experimental and control groups was not purely random for all agencies. Because of this the evaluators deemed it necessary to test for comparability of the experimental and control groups, based on five independent variables: sex, race, delinquency probability, age

⁵Finckenauer, James. Juvenile Awareness Project Help. Evaluation Report No. 1, Rutgers. The State University of New Jersey.

and time lapse between pre and post testing. Tests of significance revealed that on four characteristics, age, delinquency probability, race and sex the two groups were well matched.

Utilizing the Glueck Social Prediction Table the juveniles were classified into low, medium and high probability of delinquency categories. The results of this instrument revealed that relatively few of the juveniles who participated in JAPH were likely to evidence delinquent behavior. Specifically, 70% of the experimental group had a low probability of delinquency while only 3% had a high probability. This finding is noteworthy in that, assuming that the Glueck Table is a valid prediction of delinquency the majority of juveniles exposed to JAPH were, according to the Finckenauer report, "...not likely to be or become delinquents in any event."⁶

The final independent variable examined was time lapse between pre and post testing of the two groups. Analysis of this variable revealed a significant difference between the experimental and control groups. For this reason the researchers controlled for time lapse in testing for differences in outcome.

In an attempt to gauge attitude change among the juveniles, nine different measures were administered to the experimental and control groups. Utilizing the statistical technique analysis of variance as a means to compare differences for each of the nine attitude measures by group, Finckenauer discerned that eight of the nine instruments used to measure attitudes toward law, justice, police, prison,

⁶ Finckenauer, James. Juvenile Awareness Project Help. Evaluation Report No. 1. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

punishment and self failed to show any significant change.

The measure used to gauge differences in attitude toward crime by group resulted in the sole significant shift in attitude by participants in the Rahway Project. The introduction of time lapse between pre and post-testing as a source of variance in the aforementioned measures proved to be significant in the measures used to gauge differences in attitude toward crime and law by group. Specifically, the juvenile group that participated in the Rahway Program became significantly more negative in their outlook on crime than did the control group. This significant difference held when time lapse between pre and post-testing was introduced. Finally, though it was determined that there was no difference in the variance between the groups on their attitude toward law both groups did in fact become more negative when the time lapse variable was introduced.

Based on these findings the researchers concluded that the Juvenile Awareness Project Help had no effect on the attitudes of the juvenile participants. They further concluded that, "consistent with most theories of delinquency causation which indicate that delinquent behavior and its predisposing attitudes arise from a multitude of complex factors, we maintain, until there is further evidence to the contrary, that it is probably simplistic and unrealistic to expect that a two or three hour visit to Rahway can counteract the long term effects of all these other factors".⁷

⁷Finckenauer, James. Juvenile Awareness Project Help. Evaluation Report No. 1. Rutgers. The State University of New Jersey.

Professor Finckenauer's second report dealing with behavioral change in the experimental and control groups documented findings that further questioned the effectiveness of the Rahway program. The underlying assumption of the second report was that the Juvenile Awareness Project had no effect on the participating youth in terms of deterring future delinquent behavior.

In an attempt to document any occurrence of delinquent behavior each juvenile's court record was tracked for a minimum of six months subsequent to the experimental group's visit to Rahway and after the control group was pre-tested. Each recorded occurrence of delinquency was then weighted in terms of the seriousness of the offense.

The follow-up analysis of the participating juveniles' court records revealed that a significantly higher proportion of the youths who did not attend the Project evidenced fewer subsequent offenses than did the juveniles who attended. Specifically, 27 or 58% of the experimental group evidenced no incidences of delinquency during the follow-up period as compared to 31 or 88% of the control group. This finding is noteworthy in that tests for comparability between the two groups revealed that they did not differ significantly in terms of evidencing prior records of delinquency.

To further assess the impact of JAPH on the participating juveniles, each documented occurrence of delinquency was weighted in terms of the seriousness of the offense. A difference of means test for the mean seriousness scores of the two group was conducted and analysis revealed that more of the experimental group than control group committed subsequent offenses and their mean seriousness of subsequent delinquency scores was significantly higher.⁸ Further,

⁸Finckenauer, James. Juvenile Awareness Project Help. Evaluation Report No. 1. Rutgers. The State University of New Jersey.

the subsample comprised of non-delinquent experimental juveniles did significantly worse than a like subsample of non-delinquents in the control group.

The findings documented in Finckenauer's second report support the researchers initial hypothesis that, "...the Juvenile Awareness Project has no significant effect on the juveniles participating in terms of deterring their future delinquent behavior."⁹

Additional evidence as to the ineffectiveness of "Scared Straight" model programs was documented by the Michigan Department of Correction. Their evaluation examined the experiences of youths referred to the Juvenile Offenders Learn Truth (JOLT) program, founded by inmate residents in 1978 at the State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine whether the JOLT program was an effective method to deter juvenile delinquents from further criminal offenses.¹⁰

At the outset certain parameters were outlined regarding the administration of the JOLT program. Juveniles deemed eligible by participating juvenile referral courts were required to attend a two and one half hour JOLT session. As outlined by the founders of JOLT several conditions of eligibility were required for participating juveniles: "(a) they had to be male, (b) had to have had an arrest or petition for an offense that would be criminal if committed by an adult, and (c) had to be accompanied to the prison by a parent or legal guardian."

Upon arrival at the institution JOLT participants are taken on

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Yarborough, James, C. Evaluation of JOLT as a Deterrence Program. Program Bureau, Michigan Department of Correction.

a brief tour of the prison culminating in a mock lockup in the institution's reception and guidance center where they are subjected to such verbal harassment as is generally accorded new inmates. During this period of confinement the juveniles are observed, unknowingly by their parents, guardians or escorts. Following their brief confinement the juveniles are subjected to an intensive confrontation session with participating inmates.

The intensive confrontation session, though quite similar in format to the session depicted in the film documentary, "Scared Straight", tends to be less extreme in terms of the use of obscenities and verbal intimidation. During this session parents and escorts meet with other JOLT members who describe the session that the juveniles are attending.

Utilizing an evaluation design referred to as static group comparison, juvenile participants were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups and post JOLT recidivism was measured at three and six months. To insure comparability between the groups statistical comparisons on a number of pre-JOLT variables including demographic, social background and prior criminal history data was conducted. This analysis determined that the experimental and control groups were, in fact, comparable.

Post analysis at three and six months of the experimental and control groups in terms of subsequent offense and detention data revealed no significant differences between the two groups.

Though JOLT did not have a negative impact upon the participants it seemed clear to the researchers that, "...there can be little doubt that the preponderance of evidence reported...supports the conclusion that JOLT, unfortunately is not an effective criminal deterrent".¹¹

¹¹ Ibid.

Reach Out Participant Profile

The population chosen as the study sample consisted of the 129 inmates who had participated in the Reach Out Juvenile Counseling Program since the inception of the program in May of 1975 through June of 1979. A review of the individual inmate participation dates revealed that the average length of participation by residents during the time frame of this study was approximately eight months.

The data presented in the profile of the Reach Out inmate participants includes: prior criminal history, personal history background and furlough history data. The criminal history and personal history background data includes complete booking and probation information for each resident participant prior to the individual's initial participation date in Reach-Out. A complete statistical breakdown by variable for the Reach Out sample is documented in Appendix I.

The statistical profile of the Reach Out participants has added significance when compared to a like population. For this reason data presented in the Reach Out participants' profile will be compared to similar data available on residents of the Massachusetts Correctional Institutions (MCI) on January 1, 1979.¹²

¹²Metzler, Charles. A Statistical Description of Residents of the Massachusetts Correctional Institutions on January 1, 1979. Massachusetts Department of Correction, June, 1979.

It should be noted that comparative statistics presented in the aforementioned statistical report on MCI residents will necessarily include statistical information on MCI-Walpole residents who had participated in Reach Out during 1979. Due to the relatively small number of residents, 45 or 35% of the Reach Out participants, who would fall into this category, it was determined that the comparison would be valid.

Criminal History

In terms of the data reflecting prior criminal history it was discerned that, with several notable exceptions the Reach Out participants were similar in background to the MCI population. Specifically, each population exhibited like backgrounds in terms of prior offense data including total number of prior court appearances, and prior charges for person, property, narcotic and escape offenses. Though each population again exhibited similar backgrounds in terms of prior charges for sex offenses it was noted that 17 or 13% of the Reach Out participants exhibited one or more prior criminal charges for sex offenses. Further, 11 or 8% of these individuals had been convicted for various sex offenses. This is significant in that the Reach Out Charter as drafted and adopted by administrators and inmate participants expressly prohibited from participation those inmates with prior convictions for sex offenses.

Additionally, it was discerned that the two populations were similar in terms of prior arrest data including age at first arrest, age at first drunkenness arrest and age at first narcotics arrest.

A review of prior incarceration data evidenced numerous differences between the Reach Out inmate participants and the MCI population. A breakdown of this data revealed that 81% of the Reach Out sample as compared to 65% of the MCI population evidenced one or

more prior incarceration of any type. Further scrutiny of the data discerned that proportionately more of the Reach Out participants than MCI residents exhibited one or more prior juvenile, adult, county, and state or federal incarcerations.

This relationship held constant when a comparison between the two populations regarding prior parole data was conducted. Regarding the variable "total number of any prior paroles", it was discerned that 60% of the Reach Out population as compared to 39% of the MCI residents evidenced one or more prior paroles. It was further discerned that a proportionately greater number of Reach Out participants than MCI residents evidenced one or more prior parole violations. Specifically, 42% of the Reach Out participants as compared to 25% of the comparative MCI population experienced one or more prior parole violations. Finally, further delineation of the parole data revealed that Reach Out inmate participants consistently evidenced a more active history than did the MCI population regarding prior juvenile paroles, prior juvenile parole violations and prior adult paroles and adult parole violations.

Present Offense

A review of present offense data revealed that the two populations exhibited similar minimum and maximum sentences for the offenses for which they were presently incarcerated. A breakdown of the present offense data for the two populations by the specific offense categories revealed that a disproportionate number of the Reach Out sample were presently incarcerated for violation of a person offense. That is, 113 or 88% of the Reach Out inmate participants as compared to 187 or 71% of the MCI population were presently incarcerated for offenses against the person. Further, it was determined that the most common person offense committed by members of either sample was the

crime of armed robbery. Specifically, 44% of the Reach Out sample as compared to 31% of the MCI population were presently incarcerated for the offense of armed robbery.

Additional analysis of present offense data showed that, 1 individual or 1% of the Reach Out participants was presently incarcerated for a sex offense. Again, this is noteworthy in that the Reach Out juvenile counseling programs charter expressly prohibits convicted sex offenders from program participation. Finally, a review of present offense data revealed that a disproportionate number of Reach Out inmate participants as compared to MCI residents were incarcerated on their present offense at an older age. Specifically, 59% of the Reach Out sample as compared to 41% of the MCI comparison group were presently incarcerated between the ages of 25 to 39.

Analysis of the variables pertaining to personal background characteristics including race, marital status, military history occupational history, education level and reported narcotics use, failed to reveal any noteworthy difference between the two populations.

Finally, a review of the furlough history variables including the total number of furloughs and the number of successful and non-successful furloughs also failed to indicate any significant differences between the Reach Out inmate participant population and the MCI resident population.

Discussion

Spurred by the acclaim and criticism garnered by the Juvenile Awareness Project at Rahway State Prison the intent of this report was to provide the reader with a factual perspective from which to consider inmate sponsored juvenile counseling programs. Specifically, a review of previous and existing inmate sponsored juvenile counseling programs was conducted. Further a statistical profile of Reach Out inmate participants comprised of prior criminal history, personal history background and furlough history data was conducted. Data presented in the Reach Out inmate participant profile was compared to similar data available on residents of the Massachusetts Correctional Institutions on January 1, 1979.

In terms of the prior criminal history data documenting total number of court appearances, and charges for prior person, sex, property, narcotic and escape offenses, the two populations were quite similar. It should be noted, however, that contrary to the inmate eligibility regulations as set forth in the programs charter 11 or 8% of the Reach Out inmate participants had evidenced prior convictions for sex offenses.

Relevant to the prior incarceration and parole history data, it was noted that in all instances the Reach Out population exhibited a disproportionately greater number of individuals with prior incarcerations, paroles and parole violations of any type. In terms of the data reflecting present offense, it was determined that the Reach Out population tended to be older at the time of their present incarceration and more likely than the MCI population to be incarcerated for offense against the person; specifically the crime of armed robbery. Lastly, analysis of the personal background

characteristics and furlough history data failed to discern any dissimilarities between the two populations.

The review of previous and existing inmate sponsored juvenile counseling programs presented in this report indicate that the results of these projects have not been encouraging. In light of the aforementioned findings, it is suggested that implementation of similar inmate sponsored counseling programs be conducted with caution.

The American Correctional Association (ACA), in a policy statement regarding the Juvenile Awareness Project Help at New Jersey's Rahway State Prison suggested several guidelines to be followed when implementation of such programs is intended. The ACA recommendations though specifically geared toward the Rahway Project, provide a relevant basis from which to review the Reach Out program.

The ACA's initial recommendation was that programs of this type include, "a monitored research design to evaluate their impact". In order to gauge the efficacy of Reach Out and similar inmate sponsored counseling groups, comprehensive program participation data on the juvenile participants should necessarily be recorded.

A second recommendation by the Association suggested that "procedures that are sensitive to the participants and the security needs of the institution", be adopted when implementation of inmate sponsored counseling program is intended. As stated in Finckenaue's second evaluation of the Rahway Juvenile Awareness Project, "a delinquency fulfilling prophecy may be set in motion in which the project actually increases the probability of delinquent behavior". This factor takes on added significance in view of Finckenaue's finding that juveniles attending the Rahway program, including non-delinquents, fared worse regarding their behavioral outcomes measures than did juveniles who

did not participate in the program. In light of these findings, the policy of permitting non-adjudicated delinquents, including CHINS and Chapter 766 youth to participate in Reach Out should be reviewed.

It should be noted, however, that the Reach Out programmatic format involves a less intense verbal confrontation between participating juveniles and inmates. The Reach Out juvenile counseling program, instead, endeavors to divert the flow of juveniles entering the criminal justice system through a series of individual and group sessions with the juvenile participants.

Another recommendation of the ACA suggested, "careful selection of both adult offenders and juvenile participants". The impact of this recommendation on Reach Out is significant in that the Reach Out charter detailing administrative and programmatic guidelines for the program expressly prohibits convicted sex offenders from participating in the program. Analysis of the data reflecting prior criminal history revealed, that 11 or 8% of the Reach Out inmate participants had in fact been convicted of prior sex violations. Further the participation in Reach Out of juveniles whose status in terms of delinquency was ambiguous posed serious ethical and methodological problems.

A fourth guideline recommended by the ACA is that inmate sponsored counseling programs include a "commitment from involved juvenile supervisory agencies to provide follow-up counseling services". As outlined in the program's charter, Reach Out inmate members are required to work with and report to probation officers, outside case workers, families and the courts.

A final recommendation suggested by the ACA was to include, "provisions in the program for adult offenders to develop motivation and behavior that will have a positive impact on their own condition".

Inmates who participate in the Reach Out counseling program are eligible for good time deductions from their sentence of up to two and one-half days per month of participation. Deduction from sentence should not, however, be the sole motivating factor for inmate participation in the Reach Out counseling program.

In light of the information presented in this report administrators desiring to implement inmate sponsored juvenile counseling programs should proceed with caution. The phenomenon of juvenile delinquency is the result of a myriad of complex behavioral and societal issues. The continuation of this type of program should be conducted in an atmosphere where administrators and program participants realize that research on such programs has produced mixed results and that such programs should not be regarded as a panacea for the problems of delinquency.

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
1. <u>Present Offense</u>		
Person	113	(88)
Sex	1	(1)
Property	13	(10)
Drug	2	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)
2. <u>Race</u>		
White	69	(54)
Black	56	(43)
Other	4	(3)
TOTAL	129	(100)
3. <u>Marital Status</u>		
Married	37	(29)
Single	60	(47)
Divorced	20	(16)
Widowed	1	(1)
Separated	10	(8)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
4. <u>Military Discharge</u>		
No Service	97	(75)
Honorable	6	(5)
Bad Conduct	2	(2)
Discharge Unknown	13	(10)
Unknown	11	(9)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
<u>5. Occupation</u>		
Professional	1	(1)
Business	2	(2)
Sales-Clerical	5	(4)
Manual	74	(57)
Services	22	(17)
Armed Services	15	(12)
Student	1	(1)
Unemployed	1	(1)
Unknown	8	(6)
TOTAL	129	(100)
<u>6. Time at Most Skilled Position</u>		
Less than 1 Month	9	(7)
1-2 Months	12	(9)
3-4 Months	25	(19)
5-6 Months	13	(10)
7-9 Months	6	(5)
10-12 Months	8	(6)
1-2 Years	21	(16)
2-5 Years	18	(14)
5 plus Years	4	(3)
Unknown	13	(10)
TOTAL	129	(100)
<u>7. Time on Job of Longest Duration</u>		
Less than 1 Month	8	(6)
1-2 Months	11	(9)
3-4 Months	20	(16)
5-6 Months	13	(10)
7-9 Months	8	(6)
10-12 Months	9	(7)
1-2 Years	22	(17)
2-5 Years	21	(16)
5 plus Years	4	(3)
Unknown	13	(10)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
<u>8. Last Grade Completed</u>		
4th	2	(2)
5th	2	(2)
6th	4	(3)
7th	7	(5)
8th	26	(20)
9th	32	(25)
10th	14	(11)
11th	13	(10)
High School Graduate	22	(17)
Some College	3	(2)
College Graduate	1	(1)
Unknown	3	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)
<u>9. Known Drug Use</u>		
None	57	(44)
Non-specific	9	(7)
Heroin	43	(33)
Marijuana	8	(6)
Other	9	(7)
Unknown	3	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)
<u>10. Total Number of Court Appearances</u>		
First Offense	3	(2)
Two	4	(3)
Three	5	(4)
Four	4	(3)
Five	4	(3)
6 to 8	14	(11)
9 to 11	20	(16)
12 to 15	24	(19)
16 to 20	24	(19)
More than 20	27	(21)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
11. <u>Number of Charges for Person Offenses</u>		
None	3	(2)
One	8	(6)
Two	12	(9)
Three	16	(12)
Four	13	(10)
Five	12	(9)
6 to 8	25	(19)
Over 8	40	(31)
TOTAL	129	(100)
12. <u>Number of Charges for Property Offenses</u>		
None	16	(12)
One	6	(5)
Two	11	(9)
Three	11	(9)
Four	8	(6)
Five	10	(8)
6 to 8	17	(13)
Over 8	50	(39)
TOTAL	129	(100)
13. <u>Number of Charges for Sex Offenses</u>		
None	112	(87)
One	9	(7)
Two	6	(5)
Three	2	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
14. <u>Number of Charges for Narcotic Offenses</u>		
None	75	(58)
One	14	(11)
Two	13	(10)
Three	7	(5)
Four	7	(5)
Five	5	(4)
6 to 8	4	(3)
Over 8	4	(3)
TOTAL	129	(100)
15. <u>Number of Charges for Drunkenness Offenses</u>		
None	77	(60)
One	23	(18)
Two	10	(8)
Three	3	(2)
Four	7	(5)
Five	2	(2)
6 to 8	5	(4)
Over 8	2	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)
16. <u>Number of Charges for Escape Offenses</u>		
None	105	(81)
One	17	(13)
Two	2	(2)
Three	2	(2)
Four	1	(1)
6 to 8	1	(1)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
17. <u>Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations</u>		
None	80	(62)
One	16	(12)
Two	19	(15)
Three	8	(6)
Five	4	(3)
Six or More	1	(1)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
18. <u>Number of Prior County Incarcerations</u>		
None	60	(47)
One	30	(23)
Two	23	(18)
Three	8	(6)
Four	3	(2)
Five	3	(2)
Six or More	1	(1)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
19. <u>Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations</u>		
None	56	(43)
One	32	(25)
Two	25	(19)
Three	8	(6)
Four	4	(3)
Five	2	(2)
Six or More	1	(1)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
20. <u>Number of Juvenile Paroles</u>		
None	87	(67)
One	15	(12)
Two	14	(11)
Three	6	(5)
Four or More	6	(5)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
21. <u>Number of Juvenile Parole Violations</u>		
Never Paroled	87	(67)
None	20	(16)
One	11	(9)
Two	4	(3)
Three	3	(2)
Four or More	3	(2)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
22. <u>Number of Adult Paroles</u>		
None	63	(49)
One	41	(32)
Two	12	(9)
Three	7	(5)
Four or More	5	(4)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
23. <u>Number of Adult Parole Violations</u>		
Never Paroled	63	(49)
None	20	(16)
One	31	(24)
Two	10	(8)
Three	3	(2)
Four or More	1	(1)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
24. <u>Total Number of Furloughs</u>		
None	87	(67)
One	12	(9)
2 to 5	13	(10)
6 to 10	9	(7)
11 to 15	4	(3)
16 to 20	1	(1)
21 to 30	1	(1)
31 to 50	2	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)
25. <u>Number of Successful Furlough Outcomes</u>		
Never Furloughed	87	(67)
None	3	(2)
One	9	(7)
2 to 5	16	(12)
6 to 10	6	(5)
11 to 15	4	(3)
16 to 20	1	(1)
21 to 30	1	(1)
31 to 50	2	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
26. <u>Number of Late Under Furlough Outcomes</u>		
Never Furloughed	87	(67)
None	35	(27)
One	5	(4)
2 to 5	2	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)
27. <u>Number of Late Over Furlough Outcomes</u>		
Never Furloughed	87	(67)
None	40	(31)
One	2	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)
28. <u>Number of Escape Furlough Outcomes</u>		
Never Furloughed	87	(67)
None	35	(27)
One	7	(5)
TOTAL	129	(100)
29. <u>Number of Arrest Furlough Outcomes</u>		
Never Furloughed	87	(67)
None	40	(31)
One	2	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
30. <u>Number of Other Furlough Outcomes</u>		
Never Furloughed	87	(67)
None	41	(32)
One	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
31. <u>Total Number Any Prior Incarcerations</u>		
None	23	(18)
One	27	(21)
Two	16	(12)
Three	15	(12)
Four	14	(11)
Five	10	(8)
Six or More	23	(18)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
32. <u>Total Number of Prior Adult Incarcerations</u>		
None	26	(20)
One	35	(27)
Two	23	(18)
Three	17	(13)
Four	11	(9)
Five	9	(7)
Six or More	7	(5)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
33. <u>Total Number of Paroles</u>		
None	51	(40)
One	26	(20)
Two	16	(12)
Three	19	(15)
Four or More	16	(12)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
34. <u>Total Number of Parole Violations</u>		
Never Paroled	51	(40)
None	23	(18)
One	27	(21)
Two	14	(11)
Three	7	(5)
Four or More	6	(5)
Unknown	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
35. <u>Age at Incarcerations</u>		
17	2	(2)
18	3	(2)
19	5	(4)
20	4	(3)
21	5	(4)
22	9	(7)
23	7	(5)
24	12	(9)
25	15	(12)
26-29	34	(26)
30-39	27	(21)
40 and Over	4	(3)
Unknown	2	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
36. <u>Age at First Arrest</u>		
8	2	(2)
9	3	(2)
10	4	(3)
11	2	(2)
12	7	(5)
13	12	(9)
14	15	(12)
15	13	(10)
16	15	(12)
17	23	(18)
18	8	(6)
19	10	(8)
20	4	(3)
21	4	(3)
23	2	(2)
25	1	(1)
26-29	3	(2)
40 and Over	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
37. <u>Age at First Drunk Arrest</u>		
Not Applicable	78	(61)
8 to 14	1	(1)
15 to 17	12	(9)
18 to 19	12	(9)
20 to 21	12	(9)
22 to 24	7	(5)
25 to 29	3	(2)
30 to 34	2	(2)
35 to 39	1	(1)
40 and Over	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
38. <u>Age at First Drug Arrest</u>		
Not Applicable	76	(59)
8 to 14	2	(2)
15 to 17	7	(5)
18 to 19	19	(15)
20 to 21	9	(7)
22 to 24	8	(6)
25 to 29	5	(4)
30 to 34	1	(1)
35 to 39	1	(1)
40 and Over	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
39. <u>Minimum Sentence in Years</u>		
3 Years	7	(5)
4 Years	4	(3)
5 Years	12	(9)
6 Years	3	(2)
7 Years	10	(8)
8 Years	5	(4)
9 Years	5	(4)
10 Years	14	(11)
11 to 12 Years	10	(8)
13 to 15 Years	12	(9)
16 to 19 Years	9	(7)
20 to 24 Years	2	(2)
25 or More Years	2	(2)
Life	32	(25)
Indeterminate	2	(2)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
40. <u>Maximum Sentence in Years</u>		
2 Years	1	(1)
5 Years	6	(5)
6 Years	2	(2)
7 Years	7	(5)
8 Years	1	(1)
9 Years	1	(1)
10 Years	13	(10)
11 to 12 Years	9	(7)
13 to 15 Years	22	(17)
16 to 19 Years	4	(3)
20 to 24 Years	22	(17)
25 or More Years	9	(7)
Life	32	(25)
TOTAL	129	(100)
41. <u>Time Until First Parole Eligibility Date</u>		
4 to 6 Months	1	(1)
10 to 12 Months	2	(2)
13 to 18 Months	1	(1)
19 to 24 Months	6	(5)
2 to 3 Years	7	(5)
3 to 5 Years	19	(15)
5 to 10 Years	39	(30)
10 to 15 Years	24	(19)
Over 15 Years	2	(2)
Life	15	(12)
Unknown	13	(10)
TOTAL	129	(100)

APPENDIX I

REACH OUT PARTICIPANTS PROFILE DATA

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
42. <u>Present Offense Categories</u>		
A. <u>Drug Offenses</u>		
Not Applicable	127	(98)
Sale of Heroin	1	(1)
Controlled Substance	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
B. <u>Person Offenses</u>		
Not Applicable	16	(12)
Murder - 1	16	(12)
Murder - 2	17	(13)
Manslaughter	9	(7)
Assault-Intent	6	(5)
Armed Robbery	57	(44)
Armed Assault	6	(5)
Unarmed Assault	1	(1)
Other Person	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
C. <u>Sex Offenses</u>		
Not Applicable	128	(99)
Rape	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)
D. <u>Property Offenses</u>		
Not Applicable	116	(90)
Burglary	12	(9)
Possession of Burglary Tools	1	(1)
TOTAL	129	(100)