

ABSTRACT

Title of Document: PREDICTING SUCCESS IN THE
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PRE-RELEASE
CENTER: THE ACTUARIAL EFFICACY OF
THE SELECTION SUITABILITY SCALE

Shawn Marie Flower, Ph.D., 2007

Dissertation directed by: Professor Sally S. Simpson
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice

The rising costs of incarceration and a renewed interest in rehabilitation has prompted a resurgence of interest in community corrections. A major concern is determining which offenders are appropriate for community corrections without compromising public safety. The Montgomery County Pre-Release Center (PRC) is a work release facility that offers comprehensive services designed to assist offenders with transitioning back to the community after a period of incarceration. The PRC uses the “Selection Suitability Scale” (SSS), a structured instrument created by PRC staff over 20 years ago, to ascertain which offenders are appropriate for admission to the institution.

The SSS quantifies criteria believed to influence the applicant’s probability of success in the PRC, and classify their level of risk to the community. Criteria include measures of criminal history, employment history, residential stability, as well as mental

health and substance abuse. Those with higher scores on the SSS are hypothesized to be more likely to succeed in the institution.

This study assessed whether the instrument predicted an offender's performance using three outcome measures, and whether the SSS, the total scale score and disaggregated by sub-category component score, predicted the applicant's performance above and beyond demographic and criminal history information easily obtained from institutional records. Using multivariate regression, three outcome measures of success were examined. These include whether the resident incurred an infraction, was discharged in good standing, and a composite scale score of 13 performance areas assessed by the staff during the resident's last month of program participation. Study subjects included 600 male ($n=427$) and female ($n=173$) residents from 2001 to 2004.

The SSS performed as expected – those with higher scores on the scale perform better than those with lower scores. Further, the total SSS score provided a small improvement over demographic and criminal history factors alone. Likewise, several SSS component scores, depending on the outcome examined, are predictive. The general conclusion is despite the modest predictive power of the SSS, this should not chill additional experimentation either with this or other predictive tools. Study limitations, including that these results were not cross-validated and future research plans are explicated.

PREDICTING SUCCESS IN THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY
PRE-RELEASE CENTER: THE ACTUARIAL EFFICACY OF THE
SELECTION SUITABILITY SCALE

by

Shawn Marie Flower

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2007

Advisory Committee:

Professor Sally S. Simpson, Chair
Professor Denise C. Gottfredson
Professor Gary D. Gottfredson
Professor Doris L. Mackenzie
Professor Raymond Paternoster

© Copyright by
Shawn Marie Flower
2007

Dedication

To Friends

You taught me the objective was not simply to survive, but to thrive.

Literally, figuratively, and spiritually,

I wouldn't be here without you.

To Janet

Without whose encouragement I would never have had the courage to return to school.

I miss your smile.

and

To Jennie

You are a wonderful example of how one can turn their life around.

You are an inspiration.

Acknowledgements

I am an extremely fortunate person because I would need pages and pages to properly acknowledge all those who have helped, nurtured and cajoled me in this process. Thus I will do the next best thing by giving thanks generally to my teachers, friends and family, and specifically to those to whom without a special acknowledgement I would be grossly remiss.

This dissertation simply would not have happened without the support of the Montgomery County Pre-Release Center. I had the good fortune of meeting Art Wallenstein, Director, Montgomery County Corrections and Rehabilitation, when I was asked by Dr. Charles Wellford and Song Zhao to assist with a Conference jointly sponsored by the University of Maryland, Department of Criminology and the Minister of Justice in Yangzou China. Art encouraged me to conduct my doctoral research at the PRC, and after meeting with the Director of the PRC, Stefan LoBuglio, and the PRC staff, I engaged in this project. I was allowed to observe intake screenings as well as team and orientation meetings, I was given an office, complete access to the files and the photocopy machine, and the staff at the PRC were always willing to assist me by answering my innumerable questions and providing support wherever needed. Special thanks to Art Wallenstein, Stefan LoBuglio, Stephanie Hall, Theresa Still, Tina Michaels, Scott Gunderson, Debbie Lyons-Prince, and Becky Fitzgerald.

To my teachers - those still here, and those who have gone before us. Special note to my Dissertation Committee – Sally Simpson, my advisor over the last 8 years, many thanks again for the early Saturday morning meetings, for careful editing and making this a priority among undoubtedly many competing tasks; Ray Paternoster,

providing incredible support and a sense of humor throughout this process – I can never thank you enough; Doris MacKenzie, Denise Gottfredson, and Gary Gottfredson – I appreciate the time and your efforts in this endeavor.

To my friends - the line blurs between employers and friends, teachers and friends, colleagues and friends. And then there are friends. Departmental, grant funding and part-time employment outside the university kept me in colored pens, dog food, and a roof over my head – thanks to Shawn Bushway, Charles Wellford, Sally Simpson, David Soulé at the Maryland State Commission on Criminal Sentencing Policy, and the Hoernig family for wonderful employment experiences. Extra special thanks to Denise Gottfredson, with whom I was fortunate to work for three years of graduate school, and who provided me an opportunity to build my skills in new and vital ways.

Teachers come in all levels of knowledge and expertise – from professors to peers. Special thanks to Laure Brooks, Bobby Brame, Doug Smith, John Laub, Brian Johnson, Laura Dugan, Nancy Morris, Lee Slocum, Jill Farrell, Carole Gibbs, Stacy Najaka, Wendy Povitsky, my comp study partners Nadine Connell and Sarah Bacon, and Smackdown -- I couldn't have done it without you. To those who keep the departmental lights on and payroll checks coming -- life would have been much more difficult to maneuver had it not been for your support -- thank you Kim Schmidt, Beth Lingg, Donna Owens, Cynthia Williams, and Paula Allen.

I am also deeply grateful to my friends -- the Hoernig family, Alex & Gary Slippy, Roz Silverstone, Pat & John Perkins, Thia Kim, Nora Sincilitco, Peggy McDade, Catherine Hinton, Mike & Mary Gibbons, Laura Newton, Lynn Mount, Paula Wolf, Ruth Ellen Allison, Monica Edwards, Catherine Callaghan, Sherri Manuel, Aretha

Johnson, Cindy Addington and the worms. What would I have done without the laughter?

Tremendous thanks to my family – Mom and Dale, Kathy, Kenny, Erica, Alex, Mark, Martin, Lauren, Dad and Marguerite, and the “extendeds” - the Newton and Westman clans, the Ohio cousins, and my Japanese family – the Genslers and the DiPauls. I am privileged to have such a family. Finally, to my four-legged companions – Samantha, Franny and Banjo – always a source of joy and solace.

When I returned to school over 16 years ago, attending evening classes at Northern Virginia Community College, I had no idea I would end up where I am today. I have been given much; I feel blessed. In the coming years, as I move forward in my career, taking the lessons I’ve learned, and the support I’ve received, perhaps I can begin to pay back a little of what was given to me. I promise I will do my best.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------|
| Dedication..... | ii |
| Acknowledgements..... | iii |
| Table of Contents..... | vi |
| | |
| List of Tables | viii |
| | |
| Chapter I: Introduction..... | 1 |
| | |
| Chapter II: Literature Review | 8 |
| Community Corrections..... | 8 |
| Work Release..... | 9 |
| Cost-Effectiveness | 14 |
| Work Release as a Crime Reduction Strategy | 16 |
| Institutional Misconduct | 25 |
| Theoretical Framework – A Limited Review | 25 |
| Correlates of Disciplinary Infractions..... | 27 |
| Demographic and Situational Factors..... | 27 |
| Psychological and Personality Factors..... | 33 |
| Misconduct in Work Release Programs..... | 34 |
| Prediction in Criminal Justice..... | 36 |
| Stable Predictors and Static versus Dynamic Factors..... | 36 |
| Comparison of Prediction Methods: Subjective versus Objective | 38 |
| Validity and Reliability..... | 40 |
| Ethical and Legal Concerns | 43 |
| Prior PRC Research | 46 |
| Mason, 1979: Primary/Secondary Classification Scheme and Recidivism..... | 47 |
| Hughes 1996: A Process Evaluation and Recidivism with a Comparison Group | 54 |
| Present Study Contributions | 59 |
| Prior PRC Research | 59 |
| Overall Literature..... | 60 |
| Literature Review Summary..... | 61 |
| | |
| Chapter III: Methods..... | 63 |
| Research Question | 63 |
| Design Overview | 63 |
| Data Sources | 65 |
| Independent Variable #1 - Scores on the Selection Suitability Scale..... | 65 |
| Prediction Scale | 67 |
| Classification Scale..... | 69 |
| Psychological Screening/Personality Assessment..... | 70 |
| Independent Variable #2 – Demographics and Criminal History..... | 71 |
| Demographic Variables | 72 |
| Criminal History Variables..... | 72 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Dependent Variable #1 - Monthly Performance Ratings..... | 74 |
| Dependent Variable #2 – Adjustment Actions | 79 |
| Dependent Variable #3 – Discharge Status | 80 |
| Sample Selection..... | 80 |
| Sampling Procedure..... | 80 |
| Statistical Testing..... | 84 |
| Data Collection | 85 |
| Analytic Models..... | 86 |
| Method of Analysis..... | 86 |
| Data Analysis..... | 88 |
| Chapter IV: Results..... | 91 |
| Correlations..... | 91 |
| By Outcome | 94 |
| Performance Ratings..... | 94 |
| Adjustment Actions | 97 |
| Discharge Status..... | 99 |
| Chapter V: Discussion | 102 |
| Key Findings..... | 102 |
| Correlations – Explaining the Unexpected | 102 |
| Predictive Efficacy of Demographic and Criminal History Variables | 107 |
| Predictive Efficacy of the SSS..... | 110 |
| Does the SSS Improve Upon Readily Available Institutional Data?..... | 114 |
| Study Limitations and Future Research..... | 119 |
| Chapter VI: Conclusion..... | 124 |
| Appendices..... | 144 |
| Appendix A Selection Suitability Scale..... | 145 |
| Appendix B Definitions of PRC Behavioral Classification..... | 148 |
| Appendix C Psychological Screening/Personality Assessment..... | 151 |
| Appendix D Description of Selection Suitability Scale Point Allocation | 153 |
| Appendix E Description of Performance Ratings & Program Activities | 160 |
| Appendix F Case Summary Card | 169 |
| Appendix G Correlation Matrices..... | 172 |
| Appendix H Supplemental Analysis for Discussion Chapter..... | 175 |
| References..... | 184 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 1. Summary of Research Findings..... | 125 |
| Table 2. Sample Demographics..... | 130 |
| Table 3. Intake Interview and Selection Suitability Scale..... | 132 |
| Table 4. Hypothetical Offender Portrait and Selection Suitability Scale Score..... | 134 |
| Table 5. Selection Suitability Scale Scores In Analysis..... | 137 |
| Table 6. Demographic & Criminal History Variables in Analysis..... | 138 |
| Table 7. Breakdown of Offense Types by Most Serious Instant or VOP Offenses..... | 139 |
| Table 8. Performance Ratings – Last 7Month Rating..... | 140 |
| Table 9. Results – Performance Ratings Z-Score Scale..... | 141 |
| Table 10. Results – Adjustment Actions..... | 142 |
| Table 11. Results – Discharge Status..... | 143 |

Chapter I: Introduction

The rising costs of incarceration and a renewed interest in rehabilitation has prompted a resurgence of interest in community corrections. A major concern for community corrections is determining which offenders are appropriate for community corrections without compromising public safety.

The Montgomery County Pre-Release Center (PRC) is a work release facility that offers comprehensive services designed to assist offenders with transitioning back to the community after a period of incarceration. PRC residents work, seek work, or pursue academic or vocational training in the community during the day and return to the facility in the evening.¹ The population served by the PRC includes county, state and Federal prisoners. For Federal and state offenders, the PRC provides services to those in their last 6 months of incarceration, as well as diversion and/or parole cases for state offenders. County offenders include those awaiting trial (pre-trial cases), prisoners with short sentences, probationers, and offenders serving a split sentence (Mason 1979). Those who apply to participate in the PRC program (PRC applicants) must not have a record of an escape or a work release program revocation within the prior two years, any serious charges or detainers from other jurisdictions pending, and must be physically and psychologically fit to participate (Hughes, 1996).

The goals of the PRC program are summarized in Mason 1979 (pp 28-29) and are restated verbatim here:

¹ A small number of residents, particularly in the initial months of participation, are classified as “inside workers” and do not seek employment in the community.

1. Operate a highly structured correctional center which provides residential treatment services to selected offenders who are nearing release into our communities.
2. Increase the “opportunities” for offenders to change themselves and those conditions that brought them into the criminal justice system (e.g., problems of immaturity, alcohol, employment, leisure time).
3. Develop a social climate and program which facilitates personal change, encourages individual responsibility and increases one’s social problem solving skills.
4. Encourage and guide participants toward development of positive interpersonal relationships with family members and/or appropriate significant others.
5. Operate a correctional center in such a manner that the community feels comfortable with the center’s presence.
6. Provide the Parole Commission or Court, whichever is appropriate, an assessment of the offender’s preparedness for release.
7. Release participants to the community with appropriate employment, cash savings, and suitable housing.
8. Implement a correctional program that provides economic and social advantages to the community (e.g., residents pay 20% of income toward room and board at PRC, pay family support, restitution, taxes, etc.).

9. Through providing “opportunities” to offenders to prepare themselves for the responsibilities of freedom, decrease the need and probability of continued crime after release to the community.

These goals, established in the 1970s, are still reflected in the process of selecting applicants, and in the programming and services provided to PRC residents today. While some of the elements have changed over time (e.g., a higher degree of reliance on community treatment services rather than on in-house programs), the focus of the PRC remains to offer an environment which provides “a reasonable opportunity to resolve those problems underlying the deviant behavior” such as employment, housing and “problem solving skills” (Mason 1979, p. 25).

To facilitate these goals, the PRC uses a “Selection Suitability Scale” (SSS) (Appendix A) to ascertain which offenders are appropriate² for admission to the PRC. The SSS is a structured instrument based on an intake interview which quantifies categorical criteria believed to influence the applicant’s probability of success in the PRC and classifies³ their level of risk⁴ to the community. For example, the categories

²Approximately 90% of applicants to the PRC are admitted because selection into the PRC is based on the notion that the PRC has a responsibility to provide pre-release services to all those being released into the community. Thus only “those individuals who were “most” likely to fail in the program” were not accepted (Mason, 1979, p. 34).

³Some resident’s activities are restricted more than other PRC residents. For example, PRC participants who are residents of another state or county who intend to return to their homes and do not intend to retain permanent employment in Montgomery County may be classified as inside workers. In terms of classification by security level, a review of the case files indicates that some PRC residents considered at higher risk of escape or unaccountability are classified as inside workers with restricted movements, but the decision to restrict these residents appears informal and decided on a case by case basis. Generally the purpose of classification instruments is to denote a specific level of security “to keep custodial order” within a continuum of security level options (Farr, 2000, p. 4). However, except as noted, resident movement is restricted in the PRC based on phase levels (1 to 4) with each subsequent phase allowing for greater freedom. PRC residents start at Phase 1 and most residents have the opportunity to advance through the phases if they are exhibiting responsible behavior with concomitant performance ratings.

contained within the SSS include the PRC applicant's criminal history (age at first conviction, number of arrests, convictions, and prior incarcerations) employment history (months employed in the last 24 months, job quality and skill level of the PRC applicant and the employer's need for the PRC applicant), and a variety of factors that are categorized by the PRC as "failure indicators" including how long the PRC applicant has lived in their place of residence, substance abuse, and history of suicide attempts, mental hospitalizations and past escapes from correctional facilities.

The PRC has established point ranges prioritizing applicants based on scores received on the SSS so that higher scores denote higher priority applicants (Montgomery County Pre-Release Center, 1989b). Applicants with higher scores are given priority⁵ as they are hypothesized to be more suitable for placement in the PRC and are more likely to have positive post-release correctional outcomes (e.g., arrest, incarceration, probation and/or parole violations). While post-release correctional outcomes are clearly relevant and important in assessing the effectiveness of community corrections, there is an intermediate step which has not been thoroughly examined in the literature. While most studies of prediction instruments focus on post-release measures, this study explores whether the Selection Suitability Scale (SSS), both as a total score and by the sum of items within specific categories contained within the SSS, predicts the degree to which offenders will succeed in the PRC program. Moreover, does the SSS predict success better than demographic and other criminal history factors alone? Although the PRC has

⁴ Risk is defined as the "likelihood of one engaging in subsequent criminal behavior" (Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2005, p. 264).

⁵ The Manager of Assessment Services advised that the SSS score is used primarily as a guide rather than a mandate, as there are times when applicants who score in the unsuitable range are admitted to the PRC (T. Still, personal communication, April 6, 2005).

been using this instrument for many years, it has never determined whether or not the instrument actually predicts success within the PRC program. Thus, the institution is using this instrument blindly, at a cost of staff and budgetary resources without knowing whether or not the instrument works in predicting who will be successful in the PRC program.

Success in the PRC is based on three outcome measures: whether or not the PRC resident incurs an institutional adjustment any time during their participation in the PRC; whether the resident was successfully discharged from the PRC, and the resident's score on a composite scale of the staff's assessment of the resident's behavior within 13 of the 18 performance area measures.⁶ The performance area measures in the scale are compliance with the resident's individualized treatment plan, participation in treatment group, accepting responsibility for their actions, problem solving skills, job performance, punctuality, accountability, interpersonal functioning with authority, interpersonal functioning with peers, functioning with intimates, engagement in outside counseling, a recovery program, money management, adherence to In-house responsibilities, substance free (alcohol and/or drugs), constructive use of leisure time and suitable living conditions. PRC residents are evaluated on these performance measures on a monthly basis, and are given specific and on-going feedback about their performance so that they may understand their behavior and make necessary changes. This study examines whether the SSS predicts a resident's performance at their last monthly rating. The goal of this exploratory research project is to ascertain if the SSS, in total and in part, more accurately

⁶ Five of the 18 performance measures (participation in PRC treatment group, outside counseling, education, money management, suitable living conditions and a second functioning with intimates measure (coded as satisfactory/unsatisfactory) were dropped from the model. See Chapter III Methods for explication.

predicts who will succeed in the PRC program than readily available demographic and criminal history factors alone. If this is the case, then the SSS provides a more effective way for selecting individuals most suited for this community corrections program without compromising public safety.

Chapter II provides a literature review of community corrections generally, and work release programs specifically, which have been the subject of scholarly examination for over 30 years. A brief summary of this work includes the cost-effectiveness of work release programs and the effectiveness of work release as a crime reduction strategy. As there are no studies available in the literature which evaluate offenders on outcomes similar to the staff assessed performance measures used by the PRC, an analogous body of literature of institutional misconduct is reviewed. A brief review of the two primary theoretical explanations of inmate adjustment is provided, as well as an exploration of individual demographic and situational characteristics predictive of disciplinary infractions.

The use of assessment instruments to predict recidivism is reviewed as many of the factors contained in the Selection Suitability Scale include a number of factors that consistently provide measures of risk and post-release outcomes. The types of methods used (objective versus subjective), concerns relating to the validity and reliability in predicting offender behavior, methodological and ethical concerns are also discussed. Finally, two prior studies of the PRC are reviewed, followed by a discussion of how the current study improves on these specific prior evaluations and the overall research in this topic area. Table 1 provides a summary of the relevant research findings.

Chapter III states the research question to examine the relationship between the Selection Suitability Scale and offender performance and provides a detailed discussion of the data and method of analysis. Chapter IV provides the results of the analysis, indicating that the SSS provides a modestly improvement in predicting performance over demographic and criminal history factors alone, as does certain components of the scale, depending on the outcome measured. A discussion of these results and recommendations for directions of future research are found in Chapter V. A brief conclusion follows.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Community Corrections

The purpose of community corrections is to reduce correctional overcrowding while ensuring public safety⁷ at a lower cost (Marion 2002). Most adults (70%) under the control of the criminal justice system are not incarcerated but are on probation or parole and are supervised in the community (Petersilia, 2002). Within community corrections there are a number of different ways to restrain the offender. These include probation and parole (standard and intensive), home detention with or without electronic monitoring, GPS tracking systems, day reporting centers, random urinalyses, and non-confining residential facilities (e.g., halfway houses, community correction residential centers, and work release programs). These restraints are intended to increase the level of supervision and offender accountability within the community, thereby reducing both the capacity of the offender and his/her opportunity for criminal activity (MacKenzie, 2002).

Work Release is both a specific label and a generic term for the purposes of this dissertation. It is specific when discussing the Montgomery County Pre-Release Center (PRC), which is identified as a work release program through their stated mission and program emphasis. Halfway houses, Community Correction Residential Facilities (CCRF), and Community Reentry Centers may also be considered work release programs based on their overall function. All share key requirements that offenders are released unsupervised to work and attend programs and counseling within the community, return to the facility when not engaged in approved activities, and pay room and board.

⁷ A study of work release participants in Washington State revealed that less than 5% recidivated while on work release, and of those, 99% committed property offenses such as theft and forgery. The “public safety risks are nearly nonexistent” (Turner & Petersilia, 1996, p. 2).

According to McCarthy & McCarthy (1984) “any program that provides for (1) the labor of prison or jail inmates in the community, (2) under conditions of relaxed supervision, (3) for which inmates are paid prevailing free-world wages may be defined as work release” (p. 160). Some Community Correction Residential Centers differ based on their emphasis on control and custody and are more like minimum security prisons rather than “old style” halfway houses which focus on social services and rehabilitation (Latessa & Travis, 1992). In addition, some of these residential centers are used for pre-trial detainment for offenders deemed inappropriate for unsupervised release pending adjudication, as well as those who require a transitional assistance after a period of incarceration (Latessa & Travis, 1992; MacKenzie, 2002). Part of the difficulty in distinguishing between these programs is that the literature, particularly the evaluation literature, fails to provide descriptions sufficient to distinguish between these facilities. Thus programs of this general description will be called “work release” unless there is a clear distinction that allows for a different label. Work release programs, the subject of this dissertation, are discussed more fully below.

Work Release

As noted above, work release is a type of community corrections program that allows inmates to work full-time while remaining under custodial control at other times. Work release programs began in 1913 with the enactment of the Huber Law, a Wisconsin state law, which allowed low-level offenders to work in the community. However, the practice did not become widespread until World War II when a municipal judge in Wisconsin began a work release program that required non-violent offenders from jails to work and pay a fee for room and board (Doeren & Hageman, 1982). Although this was a

promising start, it was not until 1957 (when North Carolina began a program that included state prisoners convicted of felony offenses) that work release programs became commonplace throughout the United States (Doeren & Hageman, 1982; McCarthy & McCarthy, 1984). Work release programs also benefited from President Johnson's Blue-Ribbon Panel and the focus on rehabilitation, diversion, reintegration, education and employment programs, which resulted in the expanded use of graduated release and furlough programs (MacKenzie, 2001). In addition, the decision by the Federal Bureau of Prisons in 1965 to mandate that Federal prisoners participate in temporary release, work release and furlough programs also helped to garner acceptance of work release programs (McCarthy & McCarthy, 1984). Funding provided by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration facilitated development of work release programs (Turner & Petersilia, 1996) and by 1975, programs were implemented in 48 states. While these facilities widely exist, they have never been fully utilized – less than 10% of prisoners participate in work release programs nationwide (Doeren & Hageman, 1982; Latessa & Travis, 1992; Petersilia, 2003).

The majority of offenders do not have an opportunity to participate in work release programs because of political and financial concerns (Petersilia, 2003). For instance, while the public is in favor of offenders participating in some type of transitional housing when released from a period of incarceration, they do not want such housing in their community. Politicians who control the budget are also reluctant to support these types of facilities for fear of appearing “soft on criminals” (Harris & Smith, 1996, p. 188) and the possible backlash if an offender participating in such a program

commits a crime which captures media and public attention (Petersilia, 2003).⁸ As a result, work release programs are not funded for expansion beyond the small number of offenders presently served by these facilities. This is unfortunate given that work release programs are considered to be both cost effective and a promising crime reduction strategy (Petersilia, 2003).

Work release programs utilize a graduated sanction approach where the goal is to “help selected inmates prepare for release and to assist them in making a successful transition . . . into the free community” (Doeren & Hageman, 1982, p. 133). These programs are based not only on the idea of individual responsibility to offset a portion of the financial burden of incarceration, but also on rehabilitative ideals (Latessa & Travis, 1992). Once employed, work release participants pay a portion of their salary to the state for room and board, as well as court ordered restitution, child and spousal support. In addition to meeting these financial obligations, offenders are given a small allowance while the remainder of their pay is placed in a savings account which provides them with a financial base from which to draw upon release (McCarthy & McCarthy, 1984).

The rehabilitative ideals of work release programs are found in the emphasis on work and recovery from addiction, addressing mental health issues and poor social and/or coping skills, enhancing family bonds, and the development of pro-social community ties (Doeren & Hageman, 1982). This is important because offenders influenced by informal social control (as a result of social bonds established through family, work, and/or community members) are more likely to desist from crime (Petersilia, 2003).

⁸ For example, during in the 1988 Presidential election the story of Willie Horton, the offender from Massachusetts who committed rape and assault while on furlough, helped to defeat Michael Dukakis (Turner & Petersilia, 1996).

Furthermore, at least 50% of offenders commit crime as a means of resource or status attainment. If provided with pro-social opportunities and alternatives, participation in criminal activities will decline (Cohen & Vila, 1996).

Given the rehabilitative and re-entry goals of work release programs and the need to balance public safety with these concerns, participants are selected based on a variety of factors including perceived dangerousness, criminal record, ties to family, and amenability to treatment. Work release participants generally have at least six months remaining in their sentence (Doeren & Hageman, 1982). Offenders volunteer to participate and are screened by correctional personnel through an application process to determine their eligibility. In this process they can be accepted, rejected, or advised to re-apply at a later time when their application will be reconsidered (Doeren & Hageman, 1982). Once an offender is accepted into a work release program, they are assessed to ascertain their specific needs, assigned to a primary counselor, an individualized treatment plan is developed, and participation in addiction, counseling, social skills and other treatment programming is based on that treatment plan. Work release provides “a critical bridge ...by providing assistance for the psychological, social and legal obstacles” that hinder successful outcomes (Inciardi, Martin & Butzin, 2004, p. 103). Many work release programs also provide educational assistance and seminars in job readiness and retention and reentry.

Work release facilities allow inmates who act responsibly to leave the premises in order to work, to attend counseling and 12 step/self-help groups (e.g., Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) or Narcotics Anonymous (NA)), and are allowed to visit their home and families for short periods of time (typically on a weekend). In addition, programs

directed at building and improving social and coping skills (e.g., anger and stress management, parenting and problem solving skills, and classes in domestic violence) are provided to work release participants either within the work release facility or in the community. By engaging in these activities, offenders are encouraged to look at the issues that contributed to their prior criminal behavior, and attempt to resolve these issues in the hopes of attaining a meaningful recovery from a criminal lifestyle. Ideally, these activities encourage the development of positive bonds between the offender and their family and with others who eschew deviant values. In addition, those who attend 12 step groups are encouraged to develop relationships with those who share their difficulties, but who have learned to manage their addiction through long term recovery.

Work as a rehabilitative ideal is based on the establishment of informal social bonds that can increase self-control and engender behavioral change (Sampson & Laub, 1993). Work can increase pro-social values through the establishment of “‘proper’ work habits” (Scull, 1984, p. 26) and provide workers with an opportunity to practice the day-to-day discipline generally required by employers. An increased attachment to pro-social values may also help to improve a worker’s sense of worthiness and self-esteem (Doeren & Hageman, 1982). Work is an integral part of life – admittedly, most individuals work due to financial need -- but work also has intrinsic value in the establishment of a daily routine, in a sense of satisfaction in a job well done and in knowing that one has provided for loved ones. Work plays a vital role in an individual’s ability to conform to “familial and communal roles” (Piven & Cloward, 1993, p. 7).

Work release programs, due to their transitional nature, provide a very different “contextual milieu” than jail or prison (Butzin, Martin & Inciardi, 2005, p. 357). Given

that these programs are set in the community, participants are engaged in an environment similar to what they will experience once released, but must remain crime and substance free. Transitional programs allow offenders to test the waters of a prosocial life while remaining accountable for their actions. In addition to helping offenders to isolate and work on those issues which may make transition to freedom more difficult, work release programs also provide correctional authorities an opportunity to evaluate offenders during this period of transition to assess their suitability for, and chances of, a successful release. While a parole or probation officer can review the offender's institutional record to determine an appropriate level of supervision, a work release or pre-release environment allows for further assessment within a less structured environment that includes challenges akin to what the offender will experience once released (Doeren & Hageman, 1982; McCarthy & McCarthy, 1984).

Cost-Effectiveness

Community correction programs generally, and work release programs specifically, are more cost-effective than incarceration in a jail or prison facility (Clear & Dammer, 2003; Doeren & Hageman, 1982; Katz & Decker, 1982). This is based not only on the economic benefits to the work release participant (paying room and board, restitution and support payments) but also on the offender's ability to pay state and Federal taxes once they are gainfully employed (McCarthy & McCarthy 1984). However, the cost equation must also include the savings of prison bed space and the impact when work release participants fail to comply with program requirements are revoked⁹ from the program and

⁹ While traditionally the term "revoked" relates to the revocation of an individual's right to drive (the revocation of a state issued driver's license) or revocation of an offender's parole or probation due to misconduct, in the context of the PRC work release program, the term revoked is commonly used to

returned to prison or jail. Given the participant population and mission, work release facilities are minimum security correctional facilities. While there may be a sign-in clerk at the front door, armed correctional personnel do not populate the facility and there are few locks on the doors. Thus, if the level of security is the determinate of cost, then the cost of housing an offender in a community work release program is approximately half the cost of maintaining an offender in an institutional facility (Doeren & Hageman, 1982). On the other hand, a study of work release programs in Washington State found that when revocations of program failures are considered, the cost can be equivalent to incarceration due to the expense of re-processing and re-incarcerating offenders into jail or prison (Turner & Petersilia, 1996).

While the operational costs of community correction programs are more economical than incarceration (Turner & Petersilia, 1996) it is also true that due to revocations and net-widening, these cost savings are not consistently realized (Petersilia, 1998; Turner & Petersilia, 1996). Net-widening is less of an issue in work release programs when correctional staff control program entry, but occurs more frequently when offenders are sentenced into programs by judges (Tonry, 1996). Petersilia (1998) notes that community corrections programs that are well managed can keep non-violent offenders in the community with no risk and lower costs than incarceration. Thus, while some community corrections programs may not contribute substantially to overall cost savings; work release programs are economically equivalent to incarceration in prison or jail. Further, when one considers the economic contribution by participants to the work

indicate a program participant who has been expelled from the program and returned to jail or prison to serve the remainder of his/her sentence. Thus, the term revoked in this document refers to work release participants whose acceptance to the program was cancelled due to misconduct.

release facility, to their family and the community, work release programs are more cost-effective than other community corrections options such as probation or parole.

Work Release as a Crime Reduction Strategy

Latessa & Travis (1992) conducted a review of evaluations of community residential centers and found few. Studies that have been conducted are beset with methodological problems (Katz & Decker, 1982). The lack of research may be explained by several factors. First, because relatively few offenders participate in these programs, they comprise a small portion of the corrections field. Second, there is a fair amount of program specific variety in the types of services provided to offenders. Third, experimental designs are difficult to implement and adequate comparison groups are scarce. Fourth, one of the most frequent outcome measures is recidivism but there is variability in how recidivism is measured (Katz & Decker, 1982; Marion, 2002). Studies define recidivism as new arrests, convictions and/or imprisonment (Marion, 2002; Petersilia, 2003). Finally, evaluations of the work release programs also look at other outcomes such as post-release employment status, changes in pro-social attitudes, and number of adjustment-free discharges and rates of escape (Doeren & Hageman, 1982, Latessa & Travis, 1992; McCarthy & McCarthy, 1984; Petersilia, 2003). These factors make it difficult to generalize findings across studies, but individual evaluations are informative.

Of the evaluations which included a comparison group, results are mixed showing either lower recidivism than the comparison group or no difference in criminal behavior between the groups (Katz & Decker, 1982; MacKenzie, 2002; Turner & Petersilia, 1996). One quasi-experimental evaluation included a matched comparison group and sorted

them by criminal seriousness categories (felony vs. misdemeanor) and whether the offender had existing addiction or mental health issues. The results of this study revealed that work release participants had a lower parole revocation or reincarceration than the comparison group (Katz & Decker, 1982 citing Hecht 1971). In contrast, a study by Waldo & Chiricos (1977), utilizing 18 measures of recidivism, found no difference between the work release participants and the matched comparison group.

More recently, there were two state-wide studies of work release programs in Washington State that utilized a comparison group¹⁰ (Turner & Petersilia, 1996). The first was an evaluation of 2,452 offenders released from Washington State prisons in 1990, of which 40% spent a portion of their time in work release. This study evaluated the characteristics of those who participated in, and successfully completed, the work release programs. Work release participants tended to be middle aged, white or black, and had committed primarily property crimes (those who committed serious violent crimes such as rape and murder were not eligible to participate). Hispanics and first time offenders were less likely to participate in Washington's work release program because first time non-violent offenders were offered alternatives to work release (such as a "work ethic camp"). Hispanics may have had immigration issues which made them ineligible for admission to the work release program (p. 5).

When evaluating whether these offenders completed the program successfully, the definition of success was trichotomized into successful, moderately successful and unsuccessful. Of the 965 work release participants, 56% completed the work release

¹⁰ While both studies discussed in Turner & Petersilia, 1996 had a comparison group of non-work release offenders, the results for the first study only discuss outcomes of offenders while participating in the work release program.

successfully – they did not commit any infractions while in the program nor did they commit any new crimes. Of the remaining, 131 were considered moderately successful – prior to release into the community they committed a rule infraction, but it was of insufficient seriousness to necessitate permanent removal from the program. Finally, 290 were unsuccessful and were returned to prison due to a disciplinary infraction or new crime. Most (58%) committed rule infractions (e.g. possession of alcohol, failure to meet curfew rules, fighting) while a substantial portion (35%) were in possession of illegal substances (Turner & Petersilia, 1996). Only 3.6% of these offenders were revoked from the program due to a new crime, and these were low-level property offenses; none committed a violent crime.

To ascertain correlates of successful release from the work release program, a number of demographic, criminal history, employment, and substance use variables were “cross-tabulated” with the three outcome categories (Turner & Petersilia, 1996, p. 5). Older, white and first time offenders were more likely to successfully complete the work release program. In contrast, African American and Hispanic and property and drug offenders (particularly those addicted to crack or cocaine) were most likely to be returned to prison for an infraction.

The second Washington State study attempted to use random assignment consisting of offenders released into the community from a work release facility (the treatment group) and those released directly from prison (the control group) (Turner & Petersilia, 1996). However, fewer than the expected numbers of offenders applied to the work release program, and in order to obtain a sufficiently large sample, additional cases were matched and included in the evaluation, creating a non-equivalent comparison

group design. The final sample consisted of 218 offenders. This evaluation controlled for demographic, employment, drug use and criminal history variables. In addition, the model included the types of jobs obtained while in work release, the amount earned, how often their case managers met with participants, frequency of drug testing and the types of rehabilitation programs in which the participant engaged (Turner & Petersilia, 1996). The evaluation revealed no significant overall difference between the treatment and control groups on re-arrest outcomes 12 months post-release. These results were nonetheless encouraging because while these offenders had “lengthy criminal histories, serious substance abuse programs, and possessed limited education and job skills ... they found jobs, paid rent and refrained from crime” (Turner & Petersilia, 1996, p. 12).

The evaluations of work community residential centers reviewed by Latessa & Travis (1992) revealed that participants generally have greater needs related to criminal behavior (e.g., drug addiction and mental health issues) than others placed on parole and probation. Fortunately, these participants are also more likely to receive substance abuse treatment and counseling. While the empirical evidence remains mixed – some evaluations suggest that participants in work release facilities do not exhibit lower recidivism rates – work release participants generally do no worse or no better than others on probation and parole. This is a positive outcome given that the community residential center participants were more disadvantaged to begin with (Latessa & Travis, 1992). Another evaluation of community corrections was conducted by Marion in 2002 which compared prison recidivism rates of offenders participating in 5 types of community corrections programs including a half-way house, work release, Community Based

Correctional Facility (CBCF), a day reporting center and a home incarceration program.¹¹ While Marion's study revealed that those who completed the work release program had a lower recidivism rate than those released from prison, the study failed to control for criminal seriousness between the samples. Thus, these results may be a function of selection bias.

A more rigorous evaluation (including a matched comparison group on education, gender, age, race, and criminal history) was conducted on a Day Reporting Center (DRC) in Chicago in 2002. The DRC, while not a residential facility, is comparable to work release programs in that both assessed the offender's needs, employed a case manager and constructed individualized treatment plans (Petersilia 2003). The evaluation found that recidivism rates (measured as re-arrest and reincarceration) in a 3 year follow-up were significantly lower than those of the comparison group (35% versus 52%). In addition to reducing criminal participation, the program "reduced drug use, increased job attainment and responded to the real needs of residents" (Petersilia, 2003, p. 101).

A recent study by Lowenkamp & Latessa (2005) is the most comprehensive evaluation to date of community based correctional programs. The study examined post-release criminal behavior of 7,306 offenders referred to a residential program, compared to 5,801 offenders on parole and probation. Measures of offender risk (based on the offender's criminal history, age, education, marital status, and the existence of psychological and/or substance use problems) and categorized into four groups – low risk, low/moderate risk, moderate risk and high risk were incorporated in the evaluation.

¹¹ Marion (2002) failed to describe these programs in sufficient detail to distinguish between the Community Based Correctional Facility, the halfway house and the work release program. Thus only the results of the work release program are reported.

Following a two year period and observing rates of recidivism (measured as arrests and incarceration) this study found that correctional programming was differentially effective based on risk. Those who were in the lower level risk groups fared significantly worse than those in higher risk groups. Of the offenders in the low and low/moderate risk categories, over 20% recidivated – 29% of the 1,500 offenders who completed the program versus 22% of the 474 who did not, compared to 27% of the 1,522 in the comparison group. In contrast, those in the moderate and high risk groups had better outcomes. The most striking difference was in the high risk group – 21% of the 1,096 who completed the residential program recidivated compared to 30% of the 625 who did not complete the program and 30% of 1,744 offenders in the comparison group. In addition, Lowenkamp & Latessa (2005) found that the effectiveness of treatment varied “regardless of the risk level of offenders” (p. 285) and suggested researchers include specific program characteristics and implementation fidelity to ensure maximum effectiveness and program replication.

More recently, Lowenkamp, Latessa & Holsinger (2006) presented additional findings in their 2005 study by reporting recidivism outcomes by type of program (residential versus non-residential) in 97 correctional programs combining offender samples from two studies ($n=13,676$). Work release facilities, community based correctional facilities, and halfway houses were classified as residential programs while electronic monitoring, day reporting and intensive supervision were catalogued as non-residential. Following a 2 year follow-up period, offenders participating in residential correctional programs exhibited a significant reduction in recidivism (measured as return to prison for any reason) when compared to those participating in

non-residential programs. Further, the amount of time the offender stayed in the program and received services was a significant contributor to the reduction in recidivism, particularly with high risk offenders. “Programs that kept offenders who were high risk in the program as long as or longer than offenders who were lower risk” were more effective (p. 86-87). High risk offenders needed a sufficient length of time in order to take advantage of programs and services targeted at their identified criminogenic needs.

While research in this area often focuses on recidivism as the outcome of interest, there may be alternative measures of effectiveness (attitudinal change, employment, substance use, and completion of probation and parole) which may be more realistic outcomes for work release programs. These other types of measures are also more likely to facilitate feedback to correctional personnel because they focus on areas with which they have more control (Turner & Petersilia, 1996). Correctional personnel generally do not expect to have an impact on recidivism; they understand that they “can rarely do for their clients what parents, teachers, friends, neighbors, clergy or economic opportunities may have failed to do” (Turner & Petersilia, 1996, p. 12). Additionally, measures of recidivism fail in providing feedback to program personnel. As “recidivism-centered findings provide administrators with no direction for program improvement, they are routinely pushed aside with no corrective actions taken” (Boone & Fulton, 1996, p. 4). Evaluations of work release programs using such outcomes are mixed.

An evaluation by Waldo, Chiricos & Dobrin (1973) measured attitudinal change of 269 randomly assigned offenders to work release and non-work release from a pool of offenders deemed eligible to participate in the work release program. Surveys were administered to the two groups at two periods – for the work release group they were

surveyed directly prior to their transfer to work release and then again prior to release – approximately 6 months apart. The control group was similarly surveyed 6 months prior to release and then at release. The authors hypothesized that those in work release would experience a positive change in self-esteem compared to the control group due to obtaining employment, resuming financial obligations to their family, while paying “room and board”, and saving money in anticipation of their return to the community. The surveys measured whether or not offenders experienced increased self-esteem, as well as increased perceptions of “legitimate opportunity ... [and] achievement motivation” (McCarthy & McCarthy, 1984, p. 183) while controlling for criminal history (sentence length, number of arrests, convictions, age at first arrest and first “penal commitment”) and individual factors (race, IQ, reading level, marital and employment status) (Waldo, Chiricos, & Dobrin, 1973, p. 365). The evaluation showed no significant improvement for work release participants compared to the control group in measures of perceived opportunity and motivation to achieve (although there was a high degree of attrition – surveys were administered to 50% of the subjects in each group) and the only significant finding was unfavorable and contrary to their hypothesis. Work release participants had significantly lower self-esteem at the conclusion of their time in work release compared to when they entered work release and lower self-esteem than the control group at the end of their prison confinement (Waldo, Chiricos, & Dobrin, 1973). The authors explain these findings first by stating that there is limited opportunity for attitudinal change due to the short program period (usually less than 6 months). In addition, if the experience of work release (going to work, earning a paycheck) is not substantially different from the offender’s experience prior to their incarceration there

may be a limited impact on attitudes. It may be that working, if it is a new experience, is more salient to those who were “chronically unemployed before imprisonment” (Waldo, Chiricos, & Dobrin, 1973, p. 371)). It may also be that once these offenders faced the reality – not simply the prospect – of returning to the community, and dependent on the level of acceptance experienced from family members and employers, they become more aware of the stigma of their criminal past. Faced with an uncertain future, confidence and self-esteem declined (Waldo, Chiricos, & Dobrin, 1973).

Evaluations looking at employment outcomes found that work release participants had better work histories (higher paying and more stable employment) post-release than those who did not participate in the work release program (Katz & Decker, 1982; McCarthy & McCarthy, 1984; Turner & Petersilia, 1996). Studies which employed outcomes of escape rates and those released without incurring any disciplinary infractions indicate that in general, work release participants were more likely to complete the program adjustment-free and with fewer escapes when compared to non-work release participants (Doeren & Hageman, 1982). However, a study by Decision Research Associates (Undated) for the Maryland Division of Correction explored prediction of infractions and escapes and incorporated an interaction term of those on work release. They found the work release interaction term failed to contribute significantly to the variation explained in the model, thus implying no difference between work release populations and others incarcerated in minimum security facilities.

While these evaluations are germane to assessing the effectiveness of work release programs, this study focuses not on post-release outcomes but on an offender’s performance while participating in a work release program. Performance is measured by

a series of ratings on a variety of areas including the offender's ability to interact with peers and authority figures, commitment to treatment and employment status. The correctional team supervising the offender provides ratings on a monthly basis. A review of the literature indicates no other study with this type of outcome. However, institutional misconduct provides an analogous body of literature as the focus is on the offender's behavior while in the institution.

Institutional Misconduct

Theoretical Framework – A Limited Review

There is extensive research on how the prison environment and operations of a prison impact inmate misconduct. Within this literature, there are two theoretical models which explain inmate behavior – deprivation and importation theory (Acevedo & Bakken, 2003; Goodstein & Wright, 1989; Gover, MacKenzie, & Armstrong, 2000; Jiang, 2005). These theories will be described briefly as they provide a context of inmate behavior within institutional environments.

Deprivation theory holds that specific prison environments (e.g., crowding, staff to inmate ratio, and security level of the institution) influence inmate behavior through the stress experienced while incarcerated (Gover, MacKenzie, & Armstrong, 2000). Deprivation may also result from the lack of individual choice which is prevalent in almost all areas of life while imprisoned (from when to wake up to when and what to eat, exercise, shower, and which clothes to wear), thereby increasing feelings of depression, anxiety, low self-esteem and self-efficacy and poor coping skills (Goodstein & Wright, 1989, p. 232; Gover, MacKenzie & Armstrong, 2000).

The theory of importation contests the basic tenant of deprivation that inmate behavior is solely a response to the prison environment (Goodstein & Wright, 1989). In contrast, importation theory demands incarcerated individuals be viewed in context; that they bring to the institution their own individual characteristics and personal histories which are “important predictors of later adjustment” (Gover, MacKenzie & Armstrong, 2000, p. 451). In addition to the influence of the characteristics of the individual, sub-groups of prisoners (which mirror subcultures outside of prison), hold divergent norms and values from other sub-groups/subcultures in the prison and these groups compete against each other “for power and influence” within the institution (Goodstein & Wright, 1989, p. 234; Gover, MacKenzie & Armstrong, 2000). This results in a higher likelihood of inmate rule violations. While deprivation and importation are competing models, some researchers convincingly argue that an integrated model of both theories is a more meaningful test of inmate behavior because it allows for both “personal and situational factors” (Gover, MacKenzie & Armstrong, 2000, p. 454). A full examination of this literature and these theories is beyond the scope of this project (see Bottoms, 1999, Camp, Gaes, Langan & Saylor, 2003 and Jiang, 2005 for reviews). Furthermore, as this evaluation is of a specific population of inmates housed in community corrections based work release program, this body of literature is merely tangentially relevant to the present study. Consequently, this review of offender misbehavior while institutionalized is focused on two areas – individual characteristics of those who commit disciplinary infractions¹² and offender behavior in work release programs.

¹² Infraction data are subject to measurement error as inmates are disciplined by correctional officers who have great deal of latitude in deciding whether to charge an inmate with an infraction or to overlook it (Light, 1990). In addition, most inmate violations are not observed by correctional staff and many violations go unreported. An example is provided in Light (1990) who cites Poole & Regoli (1980) in that

Correlates of Disciplinary Infractions

Demographic and Situational Factors

As it is often found in studies of human behavior, past behavior is one of the best predictors of future behavior. Sampson & Laub (1993) assert that “stability characterizes those at the extremes of the antisocial-conduct distribution” (p. 13) and this holds when applied to inmates with institutional infractions. Inmates who have violated institutional rules in the past are more likely to do so in the future. Likewise, controlling for time at risk, those who have not incurred an infraction in a long period of time are less likely to engage in rule breaking (Camp, Gaes, Langan, & Saylor 2003). Once a behavioral pattern of compliance or non-compliance is established, inmates are more likely to remain consistent with that pattern.

Studies also reveal that offenders who are young, male, and have a more serious criminal history are more likely to violate institutional rules (Camp, Gaes, Langan, & Saylor 2003; Flanagan, 1983). Age is a salient factor in inmate misconduct for both men and women (Acevedo & Bakken, 2003; Collie & Polaschek, 2003; Kruttschnitt & Gartner, 2005) because young inmates are likely to react to authority and to others in the situation aggressively and impulsively, failing to completely consider the consequences of their actions (Liebling, 1999; Toch, Adams & Greene, 1987). Further, there is a prisoner subculture that values the use of physical violence as a way to retaliate and

approximately 92% of inmates self-report committing an infraction within a specified time period, but only 17% have an official record. Measurement data may also be impacted by changes in reporting practices and differences in policies and procedures; infractions recorded in one state are not necessarily comparable to infraction data in another. For instance, some agencies lump all infractions into a summary measure while others catalog offenses by type such as violence, drug use, accountability, security related, and other (Camp, Gaes, Langan & Saylor, 2003).

resolve conflicts (Bottoms, 1999). Inmates who fail to respond to conflicts with the use of force may be seen as weak, thereby increasing the likelihood of further victimization.

Age is associated not only with aggression and violence, but younger offenders are also more likely to perceive “prison as a dangerous place” (Hemmens & Marquart, 2000, p. 299). In a study conducted by Hemmens & Marquart, offenders under the age of 29 were significantly more likely to report that there was a lack of correctional staff to “provide safety and security for inmates” (2000, p. 304). Consequently, younger inmates are more likely to be involved with interpersonal violence than older offenders due to their adoption of a pro-active aggressive coping strategy within the dangerous environment of prison, and due to their retaliatory actions against other young inmates (Bottoms, 1999).

That women are less likely to incur infractions than men is not surprising. Generally, our culture has a gendered socialization process whereby women and men respond dissimilarly to social control mechanisms. In a study of delinquency and differential association while linking structural factors and cultural processes, Heimer & De Coster (1999) found that girls are indirectly controlled through the internalization of values and attitudes that favor obedience and reject violence. Violence and aggression are not considered feminine. In contrast, boys have been socialized to be aggressive and are subject to control through direct supervision and coercive discipline (Heimer & De Coster, 1999). In addition to gendered socialization, men and women differ in manifestation of antisocial personality disorder, a correlate of criminal and aberrant behavior. While men and women are subject to the same risk factors that predict anti-social behavior, men are more likely to be diagnosed as conduct disordered, are more

likely to fight with others, and have problems controlling violence (Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter & Silva, 2001). Antisocial behavior in women more often tends to impact personal relationships, depression and poor physical health, rather than violence and criminal behavior (Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter & Silva, 2001; Salekin, Rogers, Ustad & Sewell, 1998).

The research on this area confirms that generally, women are less likely to engage in violent inmate misconduct, although there are exceptions. In a study of inmate misconduct among 886 female prisoners in New Zealand, Collie & Polaschek (2003) examined a range of disciplinary offenses -- from assaults on staff and prisoners, to disorderly behavior (e.g., “abusive gestures/language, threats”) to use and possession of alcohol and/or drugs, to “offenses against good order (nuisance [and] tattooing)” (p. 106). Their study concluded that “most women didn’t commit misconduct and, where they did, it typically did not involve violence” (p. 107). Conversely, other researchers assert that there is a “core group of chronic [female] offenders who engage in violent infractions” particularly among more serious offenders (Acevedo & Bakken, 2003, p. 37).

However, this finding may be a consequence of both age and parental status. In a longitudinal study of 222 female offenders, Acevedo & Bakken (2003) found that women with dependent children are older than those without children (with a mean age of 38 versus 25 years old) and are significantly less likely to be incarcerated for a violent offense; “66% of non-mothers were incarcerated for violent offenses compared to 37% of mothers” (p. 44). Acevedo and Bakken also cite a 1979 study by Faily & Roundtree which found that women with no children had higher rates of disciplinary infractions, and among mothers, a negative relationship existed between the number of children and disciplinary infractions. “[A]s the number of children increased, the rates of disciplinary

infractions decreased” (p. 40). Given that women are socialized to be less violent, that women with antisocial disorders manifest behaviors differently than men, and as up to 80% of female inmates are mothers (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999) this explains the gender difference in rates of inmate misconduct.

Studies of criminal history factors as predictors of inmate misconduct have mixed results. For example, as cited in Goetting & Howson, 1986, there is a positive relationship between juvenile contacts with police, the frequency of juvenile commitments, and time spent incarcerated as an adult with institutional misconduct. In contrast, other studies found no relationship between infractions and frequency of juvenile commitments, frequency of adult contact with police, number of arrests, prior convictions and incarcerations. One consistent finding is that offenders convicted of violent offenses are more likely to commit prison infractions than non-violent offenders (Bottoms, 1999; Collie & Polaschek, 2003). However, this is problematic as it is often confounded with age (Bottoms, 1999).

Other characteristics of rule-breaking behavior include marital status, employment, substance use, and race, but as with the findings surrounding criminal history, these factors have mixed results (Acevedo & Bakken, 2003; Bottoms, 1999; Flanagan, 1983; Goetting & Howson, 1986; Kruttschnitt & Gartner, 2005; Toch & Adams, 1986). Married inmates had fewer infractions than single inmates (Acevedo & Bakken, 2003). Inmates who were unemployed or had an unstable work history prior to imprisonment had more disciplinary actions (Toch & Adams, 1986). Marital status and employment can be a gauge of social stability, and may act as proxy indicators of

individuals with pro-social orientations who would be less inclined to break institutional rules than unmarried and/or unemployed inmates.

The relationship between institutional misconduct and offenders with addiction issues is uncertain. Inmates with substance abuse issues were found to have violated the rules more frequently than those without a substance abuse history (Flanagan, 1983; Jiang, 2005) while other studies found that alcoholic inmates incurred infractions less often. Additional research found no relationship between substance use and misconduct (Goetting & Howson, 1986). A multi-level evaluation of the relationship between substance use and inmate misconduct was recently conducted and provides clarification of this relationship. Utilizing nationally representative survey data of state prisoners, Jiang (2005) found that substance use was a “significant predictor of substance rule violations ... and of non-substance use violations” controlling for race, age, criminal history, sentence length and a variety of environmental variables including level of security, size of the facility, and whether the institution housed only men, only women, or both (p. 153).

Demographic and status variables have also been the subject of study in the inmate misconduct literature. In an evaluation of over 5000 prison inmates, Goetting & Howson (1986) examined demographic and “preinstitutional and institution-related inmate traits” and found that rule breaking behavior was associated with “being young, black, and male, having a relatively high number of prior convictions, ... unemployed prior to incarceration and having been imprisoned for a relatively long period of time” (p. 63). They do not, however, find a significant relationship with marital status, educational attainment, substance use, income, and amount of time spent out of the cell.

Thus, it is the “young, black, unemployed, male, career offender who poses the most concentrated behavior problems inside ...the prison community” (Goetting & Howson, 1986, p. 63)

It is important to note that these findings may reflect “labeling and selective enforcement practices” (Flanagan, 1983, p. 36; Goetting & Howson, 1986). Young, black male inmates may perceive that the “largely white, conservative and somewhat older correctional staff” treat them differently than other inmates (Goetting & Howson, 1986, p. 64). In this event, they may “act out” and be more likely to be written up by correctional staff than others engaged in the same or similar types and levels of misconduct. In addition, inmates labeled as “troublemakers” are more likely to incur infractions than those viewed more favorably by correctional personnel (Flanagan, 1983, p. 31). In terms of female offenders, Acevedo & Bakken (2003) also found a race effect – black women were more likely to engage in violent infractions.

The race effect found in prior evaluations was recently re-examined in two methodologically rigorous studies. The first study, which included a sample of over 100,000 offenders in the Federal Bureau of Prison facilities, found that when past history of violence is controlled, race is no longer a significant indicator of inmate misconduct (Camp, Gaes, Langan, & Saylor 2003). The second study found that when infractions are categorized by substance use and non-substance use rule violations, the impact of race differs for younger offenders with serious criminal histories (measured as number of prior sentences) (Jiang, 2005). For those offenders, white prisoners are more likely to commit substance rule violations, while black offenders are more likely to violate non-substance use rules.

Psychological and Personality Factors

Psychological and personality factors are directly related to an inmate's "successful treatment and functioning" in an institutional setting (Kinlock, O'Grady, & Hanlon, 2003, p. 264). In fact, inmates diagnosed with a personality disorder, or who have antisocial attitudes, are more likely to incur infractions (Hemphill & Hart, 2002; Knight, Garner, Simpson, Morey, & Flynn, 2006). Overall, criminal populations are 2 to 3 times more likely to suffer from psychological dysfunction than others (Harrison, 2001; Peters, 1993) and between 10 % and 15% of the inmate population suffers from a "major ... thought disorder or mood disorder usually associated with severe or chronic mental illness" (O'Connor, Lovell, & Brown, 2002, p. 232). Other researchers report the range of inmates suffering from "significant mental disorders" is approximately 35% (McCorkle, 1995, p. 53). Further, depression among incarcerated offenders is common; in a study of 1,494 male and female state prisoners, more than half reported feelings of depression that ranged from mild to meeting the criteria of depressive disorder (Boothby & Durham, 1999). The proportion of inmates with mental illnesses has risen since the deinstitutionalization movement of the 1970s. Government fiscal strain, coupled with the lack of mental health institutions, has led to increasing numbers of mentally ill who are incarcerated rather than hospitalized or treated in the community (McCorkle, 1995).

The relationship between personality characteristics and mental health issues on inmate adjustment is relevant as part of the selection process at the PRC involves a psychological screening and personality assessment of the applicant. PRC applicants complete the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI) (a self-report questionnaire). The psychologist uses the MCMI to assess the applicant's state of mind in accordance

with diagnoses contained within the DSM-IV (e.g., narcissistic, histrionic, depressive, dependent, bipolar, and anxiety) and to complete the psychological assessment portion of the Selection Suitability Scale. Psychological factors are clearly germane to inmate adjustment and misconduct, and the logical extension is that the PRC participant's mental health will impact his/her performance in the PRC. Unfortunately, however, the MCMI scores were not available for inclusion in this study thus the capacity to account for psychological and personal factors is limited to the 5 measures contained within the psychological screening/personality assessment portion of the Selection Suitability Scale and 2 items in the "Failure Indicators" component that assess prior mental hospitalization and suicide attempts.¹³ For this reason, a detailed literature review of mental health issues and offender behavior is beyond the scope of this project. See Goodstein, 1979 and Van Voorhis, 1993 for a discussion of typologies; Toch & Adams, 1986, Toch, Adams & Greene, 1987 for more on the relationship between mental health and adjustment actions; McCorkle 1995 and Loper, 2003 for literature related to gender differences; and Kinlock, O'Grady & Hanlon 2003, for one of the few studies of offenders and mental health in a community based correctional program.

Misconduct in Work Release Programs

There is little research available specifically related to inmate misconduct in work release programs. One significant study was the state-wide evaluation of Washington State work release programs conducted by Turner & Petersilia (1996). These researchers examined many of the characteristics found to be significant indicators of inmate misconduct including race, marital status, educational attainment, employment history

¹³These two items are not assessed individually but as part of the failure indicators component of the scale.

(occupation and stability of employment), criminal history, substance use, and length of current sentence. They found that older, white, offenders convicted of person crimes (e.g., robbery and assault) (when compared to offenders with a substance (cocaine and crack) abuse history) and first time offenders are the least likely to incur a rule infraction while participating in a work release program. Specifically, 40% of African Americans and Hispanic participants in the work release program were revoked to prison compared to 25% of white participants, and two-thirds of first time offenders completed the work release program without a significant infraction compared to less than half of those with at least one prior conviction. Finally, participants convicted of property and drug offenses (particularly those addicted to crack or cocaine) were more likely to return to prison for an infraction prior to successfully completing the work release program than those convicted of a person offense.

Based on literature outlining the correlates of inmate misconduct, I hypothesize that those least likely to incur an infraction in an institutional environment will also most likely succeed in the Montgomery County Pre-Release Center. Women, older, married non-substance using offenders with stable employment records, convicted of person, situational or alcohol-related offenses are more likely to succeed. While this review of literature was a good first step in setting the context of this study, it remains clear that we know little about offender performance while participating in a minimum security work release program. The next step is to expand the review of the prediction literature to include studies on recidivism. Predictors of recidivism are relevant to the present study because the Selection Suitability Scale is comprised of a number of factors found to be predictive of post-release offender behavior. This area of research provides insight into

offender characteristics and circumstances that consistently exhibit predictive stability, the methods used to predict behavior, and insight into the methodological and ethical concerns of prediction.

Prediction in Criminal Justice

”If one seeks to control crime behavior, one needs first to be able to predict it” (Gottfredson, 1987, p. 6). There is a wealth of research in the field seeking the most efficient, effective and accurate means of predicting offender behavior; some of which explores the differences among specific prediction instruments (Gottfredson & Moriarty, 2006), but as the Selection Suitability Scale is a “home-grown” prediction instrument (created by and for the exclusive use of the Montgomery County Pre-Release Center), an inclusion of this segment of the prediction literature is unnecessary. The following explores the common predictors of criminal behavior, the types of variables used (static and dynamic), the methods employed -- objective (statistical or actuarial) and subjective (clinical or intuitive) -- and the validity and reliability of these factors to predict behavior. The ethical concerns surrounding prediction are also discussed.

Stable Predictors and Static versus Dynamic Factors

Prediction “is the use of information to estimate the probable future occurrence of some event or behavior” (Gottfredson, 1987, p. 23). Criminal justice practitioners use prediction to assess offender risk in a variety of venues. Gottfredson (1987) reviewed a number of prediction studies to ascertain what were the most common and powerful predictors used by criminal justice agencies and focused on decisions made at all stages in the criminal justice process. These included pre-trial release and bail decisions, prosecutorial charge decisions, sentencing decisions in the event of a conviction, and

parole and probation decisions. Both descriptive (decisions actually made) and normative (decisions that individuals should make) studies were explored. The predictors in each stage varied, but across all stages, offense type, prior record and age were among the common (although not necessarily the most powerful) predictors of behavior.

In recent years researchers have focused on both static and dynamic predictors of criminal behavior. Static predictors are factors that don't change and include gender, race, age and criminal and family history. Dynamic factors may be more amenable to change and include substance use, social support, attitudes, and deviant values (Holsinger, Lurigio, & Latessa, 2001; Latessa, 2005). Dynamic factors are important because "offenders do change ... over time [and when we only include] factors that are historical in nature, such change will go undetected" (Gendreau & Goggin, 1996, p.66). Research findings indicate that both static and dynamic factors predict criminal behavior equally well and that both should be examined in order to maximize the predictive power of assessment tools (Gendreau & Goggin, 1996; Holsinger, Lurigio & Latessa, 2001).

Reiss (1951) provides a definition of "stable predictors" as "subcategories of a factor which are consistently observed to be statistically significant in repeated sampling trials ... [and] the most crucial aspect ... is stability across time" (p. 553). Reviews of the recidivism prediction literature by Pritchard (1979) and a meta-analysis by Gendreau, Little & Goggin (1996) indicate there are static and dynamic offender characteristics that are stable predictors across studies and over time. Pritchard (1979) examined 71 studies and found static factors (age at first arrest and prior convictions) and dynamic factors (current income, employment stability, opiate use and alcohol abuse) were consistently related to offender recidivism. In addition, type of job and prior probation were "more

often related to recidivism than unrelated” and thus warrant additional scrutiny (Pritchard, 1979, p. 20).

The Gendreau, Little & Goggin (1996) study synthesized findings from 131 studies and created “predictor domains” to catalog static and dynamic factors (p. 583). Among static factors, criminal history was the most significant predictor of recidivism. In the dynamic domain, antisocial personality¹⁴, companions (“identification/socialization with other offenders” (p. 597)) and criminogenic needs (“antisocial attitudes supportive of an antisocial lifestyle and behavior regarding education [and] employment” (p. 597)) were the most predictive of continued criminal behavior. Static factors found to be poor predictors include family criminality, intelligence, and socio-economic-status, while of the dynamic risk factors, personal distress (e.g., anxiety, depression, attempted suicide) fared the worst.

Comparison of Prediction Methods: Subjective versus Objective

Criminal Justice practitioners and researchers first began using subjective methods to predict human behavior by relying on the professional judgment of experts

¹⁴ A number of scholars assert that antisocial personality is a stable trait formed in childhood and subject to only relative change in adulthood (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Nagin and Paternoster, 2000; Robbins, 1978). However, the Gendreau, Little & Goggin (1996) meta-analysis classify antisocial personality as a dynamic factor. Perhaps this can be clarified if one views antisocial personality as reflecting “several factors ... [of which] the overtly behavioral one, reflecting early and continuing involvement in diverse antisocial conduct, may be better conceptualized as antisocial behavioral history... [while other factors] are more clearly temperamental” (Andrews, et al., 2006, p. 9). Mitchell & MacKenzie (2006) state that “literally hundreds of studies have assessed the effectiveness of various social interventions aimed at reducing future antisocial behavior ... [but do not test whether] interventions directly change individuals’ level of self control” (p. 436). Admittedly, the degree of change possible may be a function of type (behavioral versus temperamental), a function of exposure to treatment (as those diagnosed with a personality disorder are less likely to complete treatment (Hemphill & Hart, 2002)) and/or the type of intervention, as different manifestations of antisocial behavior are based on different “dynamic needs” which are then subject to disparate treatment solutions (Andrews, et al., 2006, p.11). For instance, interventions for those classified as having a history of antisocial behavior would seek to “build noncriminal alternative behavior in risky situations” while those exhibiting an antisocial personality pattern would benefit from interventions which “build problem-solving skills, self-management skills, anger management and coping skills” (Andrews et al., 2006, p. 11).

(e.g., a psychologist or parole board) (Gendreau & Goggin, 1996; Gottfredson, 1987). The subjective method is often flavored by the expert's frame of reference and their experiences. Assessments thus are "apt to rely on the decision maker's own experience, probably from biased samples and unsystematically observed, using combinations of evidence, conceptualizations, hunches, and untested hypotheses that are difficult to articulate" (Gottfredson, 1987, p. 8). In addition, subjective assessments are more difficult to quantify and replicate (Bonta, 1996). Objective (or actuarial) measures of prediction consist of utilizing standardized data-based instruments consisting of factors associated with an outcome of interest, such as recidivism (Holsinger, Lurigio & Latessa, 2001). Objective tools are based on probability theory that offenders with the same characteristics and circumstances will behave similarly. As data are compiled and analyzed, patterns of human behavior emerge (Reiss, 1951).

Studies that compare these two basic methods reveal that objective methods are far superior to subjective assessments (Gendreau & Goggin, 1996; Gottfredson, 1987; Gottfredson & Moriarty, 2006; Holsinger, Lurigio & Latessa, 2001). Subjective assessments of "trained decision makers" are not as accurate or reliable as "systematically derived statistical tools" (Gottfredson, 1987, p.8). While there are benefits to subjective assessments including the incorporation of information not generally found in statistical assessments such as an offender's demeanor and body language, the prediction research overwhelmingly confirms that subjective methods lack validity (Gendreau, Little & Goggin, 1996; Gottfredson, 1987). Gottfredson (1987) summarizes: "human decision makers often do not use information reliably ... [they fail to pay attention to] base rates ... they may inappropriately weight items of information

that are predictive ... [they] assign weight to items that are not predictive, and they may be overly influenced by causal attributions... or by spurious correlations” (p. 37).

Nonetheless, actuarial methods (referred to as “second generation” tools (Bonta 1996)) are not without error. Prediction tools fail to accurately predict criterion approximately 30% of the time and rarely explain more than 20% of the variance (Holsinger, Lurigio & Latessa, 2001). These issues are explored more fully below.

Validity and Reliability

Validity concerns the accuracy of prediction, while reliability refers to the consistency of the prediction (Latessa, 2005). An “efficient” assessment tool allows for “a greater number of correct decisions than can be made in terms of the base rate alone” (Meehl & Rosen, 1955, p. 194). Further, in order for an instrument to be “useful, it must discriminate between high- and low-risk cases, with individual failure rates as close to either 0 or 1 as possible” (Jones, 1996, p. 53). There are a number of factors which impact the accuracy of an assessment tool including (1) low base rates (“the relative frequency of occurrence of that event in the population of interest” (Gottfredson & Moriarty, 2006, p. 184); (2) the samples upon which prediction tools are validated; and (3) the reliability of the measures used as predictors and in the outcomes examined (Gottfredson & Moriarty, 2006). These issues are explored below.

First, it is difficult to predict events that occur rarely; thus low base rates can limit the accuracy of a risk assessment (Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2006; Glaser, 1987; Gottfredson, 1987; Gottfredson & Moriarty, 2006; Jones, 1996; Meehl & Rosen, 1955). “The more frequent or infrequent an event is” (e.g., the more the base rate differs from .50) the more likely predictions will fall short (Gottfredson & Moriarty, 2006, p. 184).

If the probability that a violent act occurs is .10 and if one predicts that the crime would not occur, one would be right, simply by chance, 90% of the time (Jones, 1996). Most statistically-derived instruments would predict that same act of violence approximately 80% of the time. Thus, in this example, due to the low base rate, guessing improved on objective measures by 10%. Meehl & Rosen (1955) acknowledged that while “actual quantitative knowledge of the base rates is usually lacking” (p. 212) researchers should still consider this issue. In addition, measures of the base rate (such as “minimum and maximum” criterion values) should be estimated to provide a framework with which to test the efficiency of assessment tools (p. 212).

While we can increase our predictive power by including items that consistently predict our outcome of interest, the obvious issue remains that there are occasions when the failure rate is far from 0 or 1. Prediction errors occur because while we can predict the behavior of a group of people based on common characteristics, we cannot predict who in the group will behave differently than predicted (Latessa, 2005). In the criminal justice system, this occurs when we predict that someone will re-offend and they do not (a false positive) or predict they will not re-offend and they do (a false negative) (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1994; Petersilia & Turner, 1987).

Second, prediction tools validated on one sample aren't necessarily going to equally predict on other samples (Gottfredson & Moriarty, 2006); “errors occur when sample statistics, computed from one random sample, are applied to other random samples” (Reiss, 1951 p. 553). Further, errors derived from this process are more than

would be evident “if the population distribution were known” (p. 553). However, Reiss admits that it is unlikely we will ever know the true population distribution of recidivism. Given this limitation, how can we reduce errors? First, use predictors found to be stable across time and across samples. Second, ensure that these predictors are not just stable but also have a substantial association with the outcome of interest.¹⁶ Third, seek parsimony -- it is better to use a small set of stable factors than to employ a “kitchen sink” approach of including everything that may be relevant. Conduct an item analysis to facilitate data reduction and eliminate those items from the model which are either not sufficiently related to the outcome or are highly collinear (Farrington & Tarling, 1985). In sum, seek a small number of stable “fundamental attributes” with a significant relationship to the behavior one is attempting to predict (Reiss, 1951, p. 560).

Third, as noted above, the validity and reliability of prediction instruments are impacted by the quality of data examined (Farrington & Tarling, 1985); “In short, no risk-assessment device can be better than the data from which it is constructed” (Gottfredson & Moriarty, 2006, p. 183). Through the 1970s actuarial prediction instruments were based primarily on readily available data which, most often, was garnered from institutional files. In a review of the available research at this time period, Hill (1985) noted that institutional misconduct was considered the most predictive factor in recidivism studies. However, institutional files generally lacked information on other known predictive factors. Thus, in these early studies, it was unclear, relative to other factors, how well disciplinary infractions actually predicted recidivism (Hill, 1985).

Researchers began to call for theoretically constructed, rather than data driven, prediction

¹⁶ One problem with this is multi-collinearity as it is rare to find “*independent* prediction variables which are appreciably associated with the criterion” (Reiss, 1951 p. 556) (emphasis in original). In the present study, tests for multi-collinearity were conducted.

instruments to ensure that the necessary data would be collected within a conceptual framework (Farrington & Tarling, 1985).

Since the Petersilia and Turner study in 1987 and the Hill 1985 review, there have been changes in the conceptual formulation of, and types of variables used in, assessment tools.¹⁷ Many instruments incorporate both a level of risk and criminogenic needs associated with recidivism and these advances have improved the validity of prediction instruments. To maximize the accuracy of prediction instruments, one must follow several rules. First, select the least possible number of stable and highly predictive static and dynamic factors. Second, practice parsimony. Third, pay attention to inter-rater reliability of those implementing the instrument. The reliability of any prediction instrument can be adversely affected by the complexity of the instrument, a lack of adequate staff training, and the amount of employee turnover (Brumbaugh & Steffey, 2005; Latessa, 2005).

Ethical and Legal Concerns

Prediction instruments are 70% to 80% accurate (Latessa, 2005); “accuracy in *predicting* recidivism [is] about 20% greater than chance” (Petersilia & Turner, 1987, p. 170) (emphasis in original). This leads to several ethical and legal concerns about the use of prediction in criminal justice -- particularly when prediction is employed in incarceration and release decisions. Some “obviously invidious” (Gottfredson, 1987, p. 12) static factors such as race/ethnicity and gender should be not included in prediction instruments as individuals should not be held responsible for these characteristics

¹⁷ This area of research continues to develop. A recent article by Knight, et al., (2006) explores what may be the next generation of prediction tools -- assessment of risk level as a dynamic process. Currently, “static” instruments fail to account for the “changes in risk as a result of intervention” or programs developed to address an offender’s specific criminogenic needs (p. 159).

(Farrington, 1987; Tonry, 1987). As an alternative, there are other “acceptable [factors which can be included in the assessment tool] “such as history of drug abuse” ... [which is viewed by others] as behavior for which the person may be held responsible ... [and] may be perceived also as a “proxy” for the racial or ethnic classification since the predictor variables are correlated” (Gottfredson, 1987, p. 12). While state and Federal laws generally prohibit the use of race, ethnicity, gender, and religious or political affiliation in custodial classification decisions, criminal justice officials have virtually no limitations in the types of instruments and variables used for post-trial prediction purposes (Tonry, 1987).

Among the legally permissible static factors is past offending record, and there are ethical difficulties associated with imprisoning an individual not for what they have done, but for what they may do in the future (Tonry, 1987). There are also limitations to using criminal history records as predictors of future behavior. For instance, only a small number of crimes result in conviction, and criminal records take time to accumulate. Consequently, those predicted to continue to offend at a high rate may have “aged out” and would have stopped offending without continued intervention by authorities. Gottfredson & Gottfredson (1994) provided key information that speaks to this issue in their study of 6,000 felons incarcerated in California’s prisons. They conducted a 26-year follow-up records check and found that they were unable to predict who would continue to offend based on their prior criminal history. Specifically, 77% were rearrested after release from prison, while 23% were not. Had all 6,000 offenders been incapacitated based on their criminal record, most would have offended again. However, a non-trivial minority would not have, thereby wasting not only money in the cost of incarcerating

non-active offenders, but the lives of 1,380 men. In addition, as detailed below in the discussion of prediction and race and ethnicity, criminal history records are not racially neutral; the accumulation and seriousness of a criminal record are subject to systematic racial differences. When classification decisions are based on prediction tools that incorporate measures of criminal history, offenders within racial and ethnic minority groups are perceived as higher risk offenders than non-minorities.

Finally, whether or not a 70 to 80% accuracy rate is “good enough” considering the type of life-altering decisions made with prediction instruments is, in some regards, both a practical and a moral question. From a practical standpoint, an 80% accuracy rate is realistic given the complexity of human beings. On the other hand, it is not the prediction instrument itself that presents the difficulty – it is the use of the instrument. Despite our best efforts, some level of error will always exist. There is debate about the actual prevalence of false positives given that those predicted to be false positives are actually “true positives” who simply were not caught (Tonry, 1987, p. 397). However, given that the dark figure of crime cloaks the true crime rate (because not all criminals are caught for every criminal act they commit) the extent to which false positives are true positives is unknown. Further, I find this argument fallacious if it is an attempt to advocate wholesale use of prediction instruments. While prediction instruments are useful tools, they are not infallible; thus utilization of such instruments warrants measured and thoughtful use. This is particularly true with regard to incapacitation and release decisions. In this context, error translates into risk -- to both the individual offender and to public safety – “[i]n the disposal of offenders we must accommodate, both morally and scientifically, the idea of uncertainty” (Wilkins, 1985, p. 51). Wilkins

goes on to assert that “uncertainty need not be disabling when transformed into probabilities” and when those in authority share the responsibility of these policy and moral decisions (p.51). Petersilia & Turner (1987) note that the error rate may indicate that continued pursuit of this area of research may not be “worthwhile to press” (p. 170). While the error rate is unarguably a valid and major concern, prediction instruments are routinely employed in many areas of the criminal justice system; thereby justifying the need for continued vigilance in this area of research.

The Selection Suitability Scale is a scale constructed for the PRC and contains several static and dynamic factors predictive of offender behavior. Static factors in the scale include criminal history and history of anti-social behavior, while dynamic factors captured include the presence (or absence) of a significant caring other, employment stability, number of address changes and substance abuse. Additional factors are contained within the primary/secondary designations and the psychological assessment. While the extant literature indicates that many of these factors predict recidivism, we do not know if these factors contained in the Selection Suitability Scale (SSS) accurately and reliably predict behavior while participating in a work release program. This study attempts to address that deficit. Before commencing to Chapter III (which details the data and methods used in this study) the findings of two prior evaluations of the Montgomery County PRC are reviewed.

Prior PRC Research

There are two prior evaluations of the Montgomery County Pre-Release Center. One was conducted in 1979 by Kent Mason. Mr. Mason, as Director of the PRC, examined a primary/secondary typology created and utilized by the PRC which, based on

the intake interview and the initial meeting with the unit team, identifies the applicant's primary and secondary factors for their criminal behavior. Mr. Mason evaluated the impact of the primary/secondary designation on two dichotomous outcome measures – release and recidivism. The second study of the PRC was a Master's Thesis completed in 1996 by a University of Maryland Sociology student, Erika Christine Hughes. In this study, Hughes conducted both a process and outcome evaluation of the PRC. The process evaluation outlined the goals of the PRC and their associated "program elements" (Hughes, 1996, p. 18). The outcome evaluation compares a group of PRC residents matched with a group of offenders from the Department of Corrections on two dichotomous outcomes -- arrest and conviction 33 months post-release. A detailed review of both studies follows.

Mason, 1979: Primary/Secondary Classification Scheme and Recidivism

The Mason 1979 study explored the relationship between the behavioral classification scheme established by the PRC in the 1970s and recidivism. This classification scheme classified the offender's primary and secondary cause of their criminal involvement in the current offense (referred to as Primary/Secondary pattern or typology) (Montgomery County Pre-Release Center, 1989c). "The key is to identify the predominant classification patterns based upon the degree to which the offender demonstrates traits (as defined by the typologies) relevant to their criminal activity" (Mason, 1979, p. 22). The primary/secondary typologies were based on studies conducted on "levels of interpersonal maturity" which were typified by the "interpersonal reactions ranging from childish, dependent, impulsive, demanding behavior to mature, independent, rational, contributing social behavior" (Mason, 1979, p. 15). Evaluations of

levels of maturity, security classification and treatment programming found that maturity levels differentially impacted treatment and recidivism outcomes (Warren, 1971). In response to these findings, the PRC implemented the primary/secondary classification system in 1972.

The process of designating a primary/secondary classification involves the PRC applicant, the intake screener, and in some cases, the unit team.¹⁸ Prior to the intake interview, PRC applicants are asked to complete a “Pre-Release Services Application and Life Plan Worksheet” which includes questions related to the applicant’s lifestyle before they were arrested. Applicants are to assess their concerns and problems prior to and during the time of their offense, what they did that caused problems for them, what they could have done differently, and what was important to them at the time of their offense. Based on their written responses and the interview, the Intake Screener designates the applicant’s primary/secondary behavioral classification. There are nine behavioral classifications which can be combined in numerous ways to signify the primary and secondary reasons for the instant offense (Refer to Appendix B for a full description of the behavioral classifications).

Briefly, the classifications are defined as follows: An individual exhibiting an Inadequate/Immature (II) pattern has limited self-control, poor judgment, and/or little self direction. Those with a Socialized Deviant Pattern (SD) value a deviant lifestyle modeled from peers and family. An offender with an Alcohol Pattern (A or AP) use,

¹⁸ PRC personnel advised that sometimes, during the first interview with the offender after they have been transferred to the PRC, the unit team will re-evaluate the primary/secondary designation to determine if it should be changed from that assigned by the intake screener. The frequency with which this occurs is unknown, but can be determined if the intake instrument reflects a different primary/secondary code than the one listed on the Case Summary Card. In addition, Mason 1979 reveals that procedures allow for the reclassification of the primary/secondary designation any time prior to discharge, but this happens infrequently.

abuse or are dependent on alcohol while those with a Drug Pattern (D or DP) use, abuse or are dependent on drugs. Those classified as a Poly-Substance Abuse Pattern (P, PA or PD) use, abuse or are dependent on a combination of drugs, including alcohol. Those with Emotional Dysfunction (ED) are emotionally unstable and have a mental disorder, while those designated as Unsocialized Aggressive (UA) are akin to psychopaths or sociopaths – they are manipulative, selfish, show little interest in or concern for others, and exhibit little anxiety or guilt. Finally, the last two behavioral classifications are Situational Incident (SI) and Organic Dysfunction Pattern (OD). Those who are classified as SI are generally pro-social individuals who reacted to a unique situation resulting in criminal behavior; however, continued engagement in the criminal lifestyle is unlikely. Those with an Organic Dysfunction are mentally retarded or suffer significant brain damage due to alcohol and/or drug abuse.

The population of the PRC during the Mason 1979 study period consisted of 787 offenders, 660 of whom were successfully released from July 1973 to December 1977.¹⁹ Most were residents of Montgomery County (74%) while the remaining was split between residing in Washington DC or in other Maryland counties. The majority (62%) were white, 37% were black and 1% was classified as other. Eighty-nine percent of the offenders were male, with a median age of 24 years. Approximately half of the sample had 11 or fewer years of formal education (51%), 39% had a high school diploma or GED and 10% had attended at least some college (but did not necessarily graduate). The marital status of the sample was 53% single, 23% married or involved in a common law marriage, and 24% were separated or divorced. In terms of crime patterns, half had been

¹⁹ This study only reviewed arrest records for the 660 cases of those who were successfully released; thus, for the recidivism outcome this is a study of “completers”.

charged with misdemeanors, half with felonies. Most were charged with property offenses (44%) followed by personal crimes (22%), drug offenses (11%) and other crimes (23%).

The distribution of primary/secondary classifications across the sample varied. Inadequate/immature was the most frequent primary classification (23%), followed by drugs (21%), alcohol (21%), and socialized deviance (18%). For the secondary behavior classification, in 31% of the cases there was no secondary classification identified or the data were missing. For the remaining cases, inadequate/immature was by far the most frequent secondary category (in 23% of cases), followed by socialized deviance (14%), alcohol (10%), emotional dysfunction (9%) and drugs (7%). Mason then examined the most frequent primary/secondary classification combinations and found 24 combinations that had at least 10 subjects in each combination, totaling 660 subjects. The distribution of the 24 combinations is diverse – ranging from .8% to 8.3% of the population and the top 3 primary/secondary classifications represents a total of 22% of the population. The top 3 are Inadequate/Immature/no secondary identified (representing 8.3% of the population), Alcohol/no secondary identified (7.3%) and Socialized Deviance/Inadequate/Immature classifying 7% of the sample.

The 24 combined classifications were compared to two dichotomous (1 or 0) outcome measures – discharge status and recidivism. The first outcome measure was discharge status – offenders were coded as successful when they were released from the PRC, and as not successful when returned (or revoked) to the Montgomery County Detention Center (MCDC) from the PRC due to disciplinary reasons. The second dichotomous measure was recidivism, defined as “arrest that occurs within one year after

discharge from the PRC” (excluding arrests for minor traffic violations) (p. 43). Of those arrested, Mason defined recidivism as conviction and if there was a conviction, whether or not the offender was reincarcerated.

Mason (1979) first conducted chi-square tests on a variety of demographic, criminal and employment variables in a series of 2 by 2 cross-tabulations with each of the outcome variables to ascertain if there were any statistically significant relationships of interest. The demographic variables included were coded categorically and included age, sex, race, county of residence, marital status, number of dependents and level of education. The criminal variables cross-tabulated included whether the offender was charged with a felony or a misdemeanor, identification of their first charge (whether property, personal, drugs or other), their original sentence length, number of prior felony and overall number of prior convictions, original correctional jurisdiction (county, state or Federal), and length of incarceration time. The study also captured employment measures of type of occupation, hourly wage, and skill level²⁰ at discharge. Finally, Mason included the number of days the resident stayed in the PRC program.

²⁰ The Montgomery County Community Corrections Guidelines for Rating Items on the Suitability Selection Scale (1989a) provides definitions of these various skill levels. For example, an unskilled worker is one who is in an entry level position, working for less than one year, or who has switched jobs frequently. In addition they have received little formal or on the job training. Unskilled positions include laborer, fast food clerk, warehouse worker and dishwasher. A semi-skilled worker has been employed in their field from one to three years, has some formal or on the job training, has developed knowledge of the position with concomitant responsibilities, and possesses the tools necessary for the position. Examples of a semi-skilled worker include helpers in various industries including auto repair, construction (carpenter, plumber or electrical helpers), health care (nurses aide) or are employed in office settings such as a word processor or data entry clerk. Skilled workers are those who have been in their position for more than 3 years and have formal training and/or experience. They have a long-term commitment to the industry and have all the tools necessary to “consider himself a professional” (MCPRC, 1989a). Examples of skilled workers include computer and equipment operators, store managers and auto mechanics. The guidelines note there are exceptions which should be coded based on the interviewer’s common sense. For example – an applicant who has a semi-skilled position but they have been on the job an extensive period of time (e.g., over 5 years) and receive a salary consistent with their time employed, they are more appropriately coded as a skilled rather than unskilled worker.

If a statistically significant relationship (at $p < .05$) between any combination of two of these variables was found, Mason cross-tabulated those variables with the primary and secondary classification categories in order “to discover the nature of their interaction” (p. 45). Mason found that age (collapsed to 23 and younger and 24 and older) was significantly related to both release and recidivism, while skill level was related to release status. No other variables were found to have a relationship with the outcome measures. Mason then looked at the interaction between age and skill level and found “an interdependence between age and skill level in that older subjects are more likely to be skilled ... age is controlling skill level” (p. 53).

A cross-tabulation of the primary/secondary classifications on the two outcome measures found a statistically significant, but weak relationship, to release and re-arrest status.²¹ A comparison between the expected rate of release and re-arrest to the actual release and re-arrest rates by primary/secondary classification found that four classification types did substantially better in these outcomes -- Inadequate/Immature/Emotional Dysfunction, Alcohol/Emotional Dysfunction, Socialized Deviance/Alcohol and Situational/No secondary classification. On the other end of the spectrum, there were six classifications that did substantially worse than other classifications including Inadequate/Immature/No secondary, Inadequate/Immature/Drugs, Drugs/Emotional Dysfunction, Socialized Deviance/Inadequate Immature, Emotional Dysfunction/ Drugs, and Unsocialized Aggressive/No Secondary. Mason then included age and skill into the cross-tab with the primary/secondary classifications that did better and worse and found that both age and

²¹ Re-conviction and re-incarceration results were similar but weaker (Mason, 1979).

skill have a significant relationship of moderate strength (as measured by Cramer's V of .39 and .26 respectively) but overall the results were inconsistent. This indicates there are interactions between age and skill and some of the primary/secondary classes but "neither can adequately explain" the relationship (p. 60).

In the discussion of this evaluation, Mason suggested that PRC staff should concentrate on the need for change for those participants who are classified in the categories that did worse once they were released. Further, those classified as "Situational" offenders should be given probation, rather than utilizing the resources of the PRC, as they will most likely do well without extensive intervention. Skill level should also be considered – residents that are more highly skilled need fewer PRC resources while those with no or few skills (particularly those classified as Inadequate/Immature, Drug/Inadequate/Immature and Socialized Deviance/Inadequate/Immature) require positions that provide on-the-job training to increase their skill levels and thereby provide a greater chance of success once released.

In terms of limitations, the lack of a control group and the inability to control for omitted variable bias are major weaknesses. While Mason individually evaluated the relationship between the outcome measures and a number of key demographic, criminal, and employment variables, Mason did not utilize any multivariate analyses which would have allowed for combined observation of these factors. Another weakness noted by the author was measuring outcome as either success or failure when "in reality, such simplistic summations of outcome factors do not exist ... and [g]raduations of program completion status would have been helpful" (p. 72). Future studies should also control for not only the primary/secondary classification but for the number of adjustment actions

the PRC participants receive because some residents do “just enough to get by” and have numerous adjustments but are not revoked (p. 73). These individuals aren’t sincere and thus the probability of a successful outcome is unlikely.

Hughes 1996: A Process Evaluation and Recidivism with a Comparison Group

The second evaluation of the Montgomery County PRC was conducted by Hughes in 1996 and addressed some of the limitations of the Mason 1979 evaluation. Hughes included a matched control group and provided a process evaluation. Hughes observed that success of community corrections agencies should include both recidivism and rehabilitation. Whether or not programs necessary for rehabilitation (e.g., substance abuse, education, life skills) are actually provided to PRC residents is captured in the process evaluation. The process evaluation also seeks to evaluate the success (or failure) of the PRC mission to provide “an effective community residential alternative that falls between probation/parole supervision and security confinement for male and female adult offenders” (p. 18).

To this end, Hughes reviews the major goals and notes the policies and procedures of the PRC. This includes the 24 hour monitoring of PRC residents (confirming that residents are doing what they are supposed to do within the structured schedule set out by the PRC). Operationally, if a resident works outside the facility, they are monitored to ensure they went to work. If they are seeking a job, staff observes if they are engaged in job-seeking activities. Residents are also subject to staff confirmation of activities outside the PRC including calling their employer to confirm the resident is at work, conducting checks on home visitation passes, and speaking with those in the resident’s 12 step group support network. An additional measure of resident

accountability is random urine tests for drug and/or alcohol use, and room inspection and searches (Hughes, 1996). To facilitate re-entry to the community, the PRC manages the resident's finances. While living in the PRC, monies earned are turned over to the PRC where a portion is deducted for rent and food, for court-ordered payments, and for program fees and expenses (such as community counseling). The resident is given a portion of their pay for spending money and the remaining is placed in a savings account pending their release (Hughes, 1996).

For the process evaluation, Hughes utilized both qualitative and quantitative research methods by interviewing key PRC staff members, observing PRC activities (over 100 hours of observation was conducted), reviewing PRC operations documentation (e.g., policies and procedures manuals), and analyzing data available in resident files (e.g., calculating length of stay to determine if offenders were in the PRC longer than 6 months, thereby not meeting the standard that only those with 6 months remaining in their sentence should be transferred to the PRC.) Other process measures included an analysis of the number and type of programs residents participated in order to ascertain if there is variety of programming between residents, evidencing the use of individualized treatment plans. Hughes also noted the total amount of money paid to the PRC for room and board per participant, the total paid toward court ordered payments, and the amount of support paid to dependents. Hughes also reviewed case files to ascertain if the documentation of the offender's participation in the PRC was complete.

The results indicated that Hughes found that the PRC met their specified standards; the PRC is a highly structured, treatment-oriented program and only those who

have six months until release are transferred to the PRC (1996).²² Employment and confinement records of PRC residents revealed that over 97% were employed while in the PRC program and only 4% were revoked to MCDC for “walking off” (p. 61). Hughes was also able to confirm that the PRC was meeting some of their goals in terms of ensuring offender accountability through their monitoring activities (e.g., employment verification, home visitation pass checks, room inspections, and drug/alcohol testing) and with compliance to PRC security procedures (1996). Although Hughes notes room for improvement in this area, her general conclusion was that the PRC screens applicants appropriately and monitors residents carefully to ensure the majority participate in the program while not putting the community at great risk. PRC residents receive programming in accordance with an individualized treatment plan. When residents are released, most are employed, have some cash savings, and almost all have housing. The process evaluation concludes that overall, the PRC conducts their program in accordance with their stated goals, policies, and procedures.

In order for the PRC to meet their overall mission of providing an “effective community residential alternative” there must be some measure of the offender’s success once released from the PRC. To assess this, Hughes conducted an outcome evaluation using data of 213 PRC participants successfully released into the community in fiscal year 1993.²³ In addition to the PRC participants, Hughes reviewed the records of a

²² Hughes (1996) notes that it is possible for a resident to stay longer than 6 months even though they never have a sentence of more than 6 months remaining at any one period of time. This occurs when a pending charge is adjudicated or at the loss of good time. As long as the sentence remaining is less than 6 months the resident can remain at the PRC to serve out their time.

²³ Of the 461 offenders in the PRC in fiscal year 1993, Hughes excluded 82 offenders revoked from the PRC and 136 who were released to the PRC electronic monitoring program called Community Accountability, Reintegration and Treatment Program (CART) and files were missing on 30 additional cases. Of the 213 cases included in the study, there was a portion of programming information missing

matched comparison sample of 122 offenders released from the Montgomery County Detention Center (MCDC) in the same period. The MCDC sample was matched to the PRC sample on gender, age, education and number of prior arrests.²⁴ The outcome evaluation measured whether or not the offender was re-arrested and whether or not they were convicted from the end of fiscal year 1993 to March 1996, a 33 month follow-up period, using a two population proportion z test.

Hughes (1996) finds that after 33 months, those released from the PRC were significantly less likely to be re-arrested than the matched sample from the MCDC (55% versus 74%). Likewise, 53% of those released from the MCDC were convicted of a new crime versus 28% of PRC participants. Analysis was then conducted comparing the PRC sample to the MCDC sample the using logistic regression with arrest (0, 1 or more) as the dependent variable, while controlling for education (less than high school versus high school or more), age (less than 35, 35 and older), and race (coded as black/other and white/other).²⁵ The full model indicated a significant difference between those participating in the PRC and the MCDC comparison group – MCDC offenders were 2.5 times more likely to recidivate. Additionally, race (black/other) and education were significant. If the offender were black, they are 4.2 times more likely to recidivate and those with less than a high school diploma were twice as likely to be re-arrested.

from 51 cases (e.g., 35 case files were missing data on housing and performance reports, 41 were missing financial data) so while Hughes included all files whenever possible, there were only 162 files with all relevant data.

²⁴ Hughes intended to also match on race but did not due to the disproportionate number of African Americans at MCDC.

²⁵ The author fails to indicate why number of prior arrests was not included in the regression model (Hughes, 1996).

Hughes (1996) addressed several important limitations of Mason (1979), particularly the utilization of a comparison group matched on gender, education, age and number of arrests to the PRC group. In addition, Hughes controlled for race in the regression model. Nonetheless, there are still questions as to whether or not the PRC and MCDC samples were equivalent. First, while the number of prior arrests is one indicator of past criminal behavior, we know nothing about the types of prior arrests, so we lack an adequate measure of offender seriousness. Second, as with the recidivism portion of the Mason 1979 study, Hughes excluded those who were revoked from the PRC from the sample, and these individuals may be significantly different than those released in good standing from the PRC.

There are two additional methodological issues of note. First, Hughes failed to indicate the number of subjects in each of her statistical analysis and she did not include sufficient information on the arrest data from which to surmise the sample size or shape of the distribution. For this reason, it is difficult to ascertain if some of the findings are biased. This is particularly relevant with the two proportion test given that the z statistic assumes a normal distribution and relies heavily on inclusion of a sufficient number of cases. Second, Hughes discusses an important limitation to studies of the Montgomery County Pre-Release Center, that of selection bias. As offenders must volunteer to participate in the PRC, it is likely that those who are the most motivated to succeed are the ones to apply to the PRC. Thus the finding that PRC participants who complete the program recidivate less than offenders released from the MCDC may be spurious.

Present Study Contributions

Prior PRC Research

The two prior PRC studies provide the foundation from which this study will build. The Mason 1979 and Hughes 1996 studies presented information on the relevant goals, policies and procedures of the PRC, provided evidence of positive (albeit limited) results, and indicated that there are several important factors that need to be included in studies of the PRC, some of which are included in the present study (e.g., age, race, offender seriousness, and primary/secondary identification classification). Further, unlike the prior PRC evaluations, this study retained all cases in the model regardless of discharge status – I do not exclude those who were revoked from the PRC prior to completion of their sentence. Finally, the methodology employed in this effort (multivariate regression) is more sophisticated and allows for a greater understanding of the relationships between the variables of interest. In sum, retaining all cases, including key variables, and incorporating a more rigorous analytic technique should help to overcome concerns related to omitted variable and attrition bias.

It is important to note that examining this research question on this sample of PRC residents does have limited generalizability, and thus lacks external validity. Nonetheless, at this juncture, within this examination, there is no intent to draw conclusions about offenders who did not participate in the PRC, nor is there any intent to postulate post-release outcomes in this project. Chapter III provides complete details on the random selection process and the data included in this evaluation.

²⁷ As discussed later, 4 areas were dropped due to missing data and 1 area was dropped to increase the alpha to above .70.

Overall Literature

It is unknown how risk and classification instruments predict performance while in a community corrections programs such as the PRC. Although the literature review detailed an analogous body of literature of adjustment actions in correctional settings, most research on community corrections focus on post-release outcomes. While this study does not attempt to extrapolate the findings to offenders beyond the PRC, the primary contribution to the overall literature is the exploration of whether the predictors included in the study (e.g., demographic, criminal history, and information provided in the Selection Suitability Scale (SSS)) are predictive of an offender's performance within a work release setting. Performance was measured by a composite scale of the staff assessed performance ratings in the last month of residence, whether or not the resident had any adjustment actions, and whether or not they were discharged successfully from the PRC.

This study compared the predictive efficacy of the SSS total score and significant SSS components to demographic and criminal history information easily and inexpensively obtained from institutional records. The goal was to ascertain if the time and resources expended by the institution in conducting the intake interview and calculating the SSS scores provided measurable improvements in predicting performance in the PRC. If the SSS (in whole or in part) predicts an offender's performance in the PRC beyond what is predicted with easily obtained demographic and criminal history factors alone, this may help target offenders who are most likely to succeed in a community corrections venue, at a lower cost than jail or prison, without compromising public safety.

Literature Review Summary

Given the information presented in the preceding literature review, what do we know about predicting the performance of offenders in work release program? What questions remain unanswered and what does this study add to the knowledge on this topic? The following summary attempts to answer these questions.

First, work release programs are operationally more economical than incarceration and have been evaluated for effectiveness focusing solely on post-release outcomes with mixed findings. Studies with favorable results indicate that work release participants have lower rates of recidivism, fewer revocations, more favorable employment outcomes and fewer institutional infractions. Other evaluations have mixed results indicating no difference in arrest rates between those in work release and comparison groups and a more recent study indicated that outcomes are dependent on risk; participation is appropriate for high risk offenders but harmful to low and low/moderate offenders.

Second, in terms of predicting offender behavior, objective methods of prediction are more reliable than subjective methods and that prediction instruments are accurate 70 to 80% of the time; errors will always occur. Nonetheless, several static and dynamic factors are stable across time and across studies for both post-release and institutional behavior. Of the static factors, age and prior record are the most consistent predictors, while in the dynamic realm antisocial personality, deviant companions, employment and substance use consistently predict behavior. Studies of institutional misconduct indicate that marital and parental status, history of violence, and education are often predictive of inmate misconduct. Offenders diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder (e.g., histrionic,

bipolar, anxiety) and/or are receiving mental health services are more likely to incur institutional infractions.

The Selection Suitability Scale (SSS) consists of many stable predictive factors of recidivism (such as age, employment history, and substance use) yet it is unknown whether those factors can accurately predict performance in a community corrections facility. Offender behavior is also measured in a completely new way with monthly staff performance ratings at the last assessment. These performance ratings are rich in aspects theorized to matter in successful post-release outcomes including work habits, abstention of substance use, association with pro-social peers and financial stability. This study provides baseline data from which future studies can ascertain if performance in these factors, while under community correctional control, impacts post-release outcomes.

Currently, post-release studies primarily include criminal history and demographic variables. While the Turner & Petersilia 1996 evaluation also included data regarding activities engaged in while participating in work release programs (type of rehabilitation programs, employment information, and frequency of drug testing), none of the prior studies have anything similar to the performance ratings contained in this study. At the end of this examination, we will know whether the Selection Suitability Scale, in whole and in part, predicts which participants will be successful in the PRC program. In addition, the extent to which the SSS improves upon easily accessible and inexpensively obtainable demographic and criminal history variables in predicting participant's performance is explored. Chapter III describes the data and method in this examination.

Chapter III: Methods

Research Question

This is an exploratory study with one primary research question. Do scores on the Selection Suitability Scale (SSS), in whole or in part, predict offender performance in a community based work release program above and beyond demographic and criminal history variables? The offender's performance in the PRC is measured (1) on a composite scale of monthly staff-assessed performance ratings during the resident's last month of participation in the PRC, (2) whether or not the PRC resident had an adjustment action, and (3) whether or not they were successfully discharged from the PRC. Age, race and gender are related to successful criminal justice outcomes. An offender's criminal history is also related to success. Demographic and criminal history variables are readily available to decision-makers and may inform decisions about who gets access to institutional programs.

To answer the question in this study, performance outcomes were regressed on demographic and criminal history variables, the SSS total score, and the SSS component scores. My expectation was that the SSS in whole and in part, predicted the PRC participant's performance better than demographic and criminal history variables alone. Further, those with higher scores on the SSS will perform better than those with lower scores on these outcomes. Details of this study, including the design, data, and analytic strategy, are outlined below.

Design Overview

Three models were constructed to answer these research questions. The first model (Model 1) regressed each outcome (the composite scale of performance ratings,

adjustment actions, and successful discharge) on 3 demographic and 8 criminal history variables. The second model (Model 2) added the total Selection Suitability Scale (SSS) score to the Model 1 predictors. The third model (Model 3) contained the demographic and criminal history variables found in Model 1, but added 9 of the SSS components into the equation using forward stepwise regression, for the three performance outcomes. Model 1 assessed the strength of the association between the demographic and criminal history factors and the outcomes. Comparing Model 1 to Model 2 indicated whether the SSS adds anything to the basic demographic and criminal history model. Finally, comparing Model 3 to the results of both Model 1 and Model 2 answers whether the individual components of the SSS perform equally well (or poorly) as the total SSS score.

The demographic variables included in all of the models are gender, age, and race; the criminal history variables include type (drug, property, person, DUI/DWI or Violation of Probation) and class (felony versus misdemeanor) of the most serious current offense, the number of prior times on parole and probation, number of times revoked from parole and probation, and number of periods of incarceration for over 30 days as an adult. These variables can be reasonably (and inexpensively) obtained by PRC staff from either the institutional file or the offender's rap sheet. The total SSS score in Model 2 is composed of the following 9 component scores: employment, personal data, failure indicators, identification of specific primary/secondary factors, place of residency, situational factors, recommendations from other criminal justice agencies or actors (eg., jail administrator or Judge), screener's assessment and psychologist/personality assessment score.

For the examination of the performance ratings, the data were analyzed using ordinary least squares regression with the performance ratings combined into a single dependent variable by averaging 13 of the 18 performance rating areas available.²⁷ An F-ratio was calculated to assess whether the difference in R-square values between models was statistically significant. The remaining outcome measures were binary and were analyzed using logistic regression. Since the models were nested, a likelihood ratio test between them was conducted. Prior to finalization of the models, collinearity diagnostics were run to determine if any of the variables were subject to near-collinearity, and thus would erroneously fail to reach statistical significance (Allison, 1999). None of the variables were eliminated as the results indicated none had a tolerance statistic lower than .40 nor a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) greater than 2.5, a commonly used cut-off points for multicollinearity problems. A detailed explanation of the data and method follows.

Data Sources

Independent Variable #1 - Scores on the Selection Suitability Scale

Offenders wishing to participate in the PRC during their last 6 months of incarceration in preparation for release must apply to the program and complete an intake interview with a PRC Intake Screener. See Table 2 for demographics of the sample. The Selection Suitability Scale (SSS) is a structured instrument based on the intake interview (MCPRC, 1989a). Applicants are rated on a variety of weighted criteria believed to influence the applicant's probability of success in the PRC and their level of risk to the community. The PRC has established point ranges prioritizing applicants based on scores received on the SSS so that higher scores denote higher priority applicants

(MCPRC, 1989b). Applicants receiving a score of 64 or more are the highest priority candidates, those who score between 63 and 44 are considered moderate priority, those between 43 to 34 are labeled as lower priority, and those who scored 33 and below are deemed unsuitable, not to be transferred to PRC.²⁸ Table 3 provides descriptive information regarding elements of the intake interview and the SSS.

There are four sections to the SSS: (1) the prediction scale, (2) the classification scale, (3) consideration of time to release and (4) the psychological screening/personality assessment (Appendix C) which is scored by a Clinical Psychologist rather than the Intake Screener. (To demonstrate the Selection Suitability Scale scoring, a portrait of a hypothetical offender and their corresponding SSS scores are provided in Table 4.) Within the prediction, classification and psychological screening/personality assessment scales there are 12 components comprised of groupings of individual items that are conceptually similar (e.g., employment, crime, place of residency, and screener's recommendation). (For more information on how each of the items was coded, see Appendix D). When all scores are totaled, applicants can receive up to 124 points. Theoretically, the applicant can score a maximum of 50 points in the prediction scale, 54 points in the classification scale, 10 points for being within 120 days of a definite release date, and 10 points for the psychological screening/personality assessment. However, the consideration of time to release component of the scale was not utilized during the study period. Further, since the most recent version of the Montgomery County Community Corrections Guidelines for Rating Items on the Suitability Selection

²⁸ The SSS scores were converted to categorical level priority rankings in accordance with the stated PRC Policy. Those with a total Selection Suitability Scale score of 0 to 43 were designated as a low priority applicant, those with a score of 44 to 63 were a medium priority applicant, and those with a score of 64 and above were a high priority applicant.

Scale (“Suitability Rating Guidelines”) (MCPRC, 1989a), the psychological screening/personality assessment section of the prediction scale has also changed. While the psychological screening/personality assessment is still scored by a Psychologist, the maturity/responsibility/impulsivity category has been split into two categories each with a maximum score of 2 points, rather than a single category worth 4 points. With those exceptions, the SSS is still implemented according to the guidelines point allocation.

As noted, there are a total of 12 components between the predication, classification and psychological screening/personality assessment scales of the SSS. However, this study excluded 3 components²⁹ containing indicators of the criminal history of the applicant as these were captured in either the same or similar manner to the individual criminal history variables.³⁰ Thus, the crime section of the prediction scale and the criminal history and revocation/recidivism sections of the classification scale were not included in the analysis, thus the SSS total score does not incorporate these components (See Table 5 for descriptives of the SSS scores after omitting these 3 criminal history components). The remaining 9 SSS components were included in the analysis, and are summarized below.

Prediction Scale

The prediction scale components in the analysis included employment (10 points), personal data (8 points), failure indicators (16 points), and identification of primary/secondary specific factors (6 points) – the behavioral classification scheme

²⁹ Given that these components are not included in the analysis, it is likely that any estimates of the efficacy of the Selection Suitability Scale are more conservative than if these components of the scale were included in the model.

³⁰ Several of the criminal history factors captured in the scale are not represented in the individual criminal history variables because I did not collect that data. Among them are number of prior arrests, number of prior convictions, age of first conviction, and crime-free period of time.

which identified the applicant's primary and secondary factors for criminal behavior which resulted in the instant offense. The employment section incorporated the applicant's work history prior to their incarceration and captured the number of months employed in the last 24 months. It also provided a measure of job quality which considered issues such as salary, level of responsibility, type of employment, and the potential for upward mobility. In addition, the employment component provided points if the applicant's employer had a critical and immediate need for the applicant's services, as evidenced by direct communication between the employer and the PRC. The personal data component included a categorical measure which captured the applicant's current age and the presence (but not necessarily living with) of a "significant caring other" (e.g., husband, wife, boyfriend, girlfriend) and dependents in the applicant's life. The failure indicators component consisted of 7 items including instability of residence, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, suicide attempts, mental hospitalizations, past escapes and "none of the above". Instability of residence detailed the number of address changes in the prior 12 months, the drug and alcohol abuse items captured the range of substance problems from chronic substance user, to problematic, to experimental, to not being a problem, as perceived by the Intake Screener based on information provided by the applicant. The suicide attempts item included points for those who had ever intentionally attempted suicide, while the mental hospitalizations item scored those with a history of receiving mental health services on an inpatient basis. Past escapes identified applicants who had a history of past escapes during a court ordered stay at a juvenile or adult facility. The final component of the prediction scale was the primary/secondary identification of specific factors item (described in the review of the Mason 1979 study) where the screener

designated the applicant with a primary and secondary behavioral classification. Of all the possible primary/secondary combinations, 6 (the “SSS Big 6”) are viewed as the least suitable for selection into the PRC. This item measured whether or not the applicant was identified as one of these 6 undesirable primary/secondary combinations. If an applicant was designated as one of the SSS Big 6, they received no points for this component item; all others received 6 points.

Classification Scale

The classification scale components utilized in the analysis included place of residency (6 points), situational factors (6 points), criminal justice recommendations (14 points) and the intake screener’s assessment (10 points). The place of residency component operated under the assumption that those who have close ties to the community are more likely to succeed, thus preference was given to Montgomery County residents. The situational factors component was divided into 3 items -- restitution/court ordered payments, household contribution and the need for treatment services. Those with greater household responsibilities or need for vocational and rehabilitative services received more points on this component. The recommendations section of the classification scale allowed for relevant actors within the criminal justice system to provide input about the applicant regarding their participation in work release. Relevant actors included the judge, the Pre-Sentence Investigator (PSI) Agent, the Parole Commission, and the Montgomery County detention facility staff. The final section on the classification scale was the subjective assessment of the applicant by the Intake Screener. There were 5 items in the screener’s assessment component -- acceptance of responsibility for one’s own actions, straightforwardness in screening process, motivation

to change, probability for PRC success, and probability for recidivism. For acceptance of responsibility for one's own actions, applicants are assessed by the degree of acceptance, and presence or absence of concern for their role in the situation. For straightforwardness in the screening process, the screener assessed the applicant's truthfulness and openness during the interview, while motivation to change captured motivation assessed through the applicant's personal insight and the degree to which their goals were realistic. The screener's assessment of the applicant's probability for success in the PRC ranged from those who believed to be successful, those expected to have numerous problems within the PRC, and those the screener felt would not succeed in a community corrections setting. Finally, the screener determined the probability of recidivism which ranged from not likely to recidivate, to having some difficulties and possibly recidivating, and those who were regarded as likely to recidivate within 2 years from release.

Psychological Screening/Personality Assessment

The psychological screening/personality assessment was conducted by a consulting Clinical Psychologist. The PRC applicant completed the Million Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI-III) from which the psychologist determined if the applicant had mental health issues that impeded their ability to participate in, and benefit from, the PRC program.³¹ The MCMI-III is normed for adult correctional populations and provided a way to "quickly and accurately assess DSM-IV³² related personality disorders

³¹This study would have been enhanced with the inclusion of the MCMI scores. However, attempts to obtain the scores were unsuccessful. The psychologist maintained control of these data, in an office not located at the PRC. Further, these records were maintained electronically, and unfortunately, many of the records for those in the study period were lost when the computer containing the data crashed. Paper records were not available as the tests were shredded once the data was transferred to electronic form.

³² DSM-IV is the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition and is considered the "bible" of mental health diagnostics (Carbonell & Perkins, 2000, p. 66).

and clinical syndromes” (Million, Million, Davis & Grossman, 2006). In some cases, particularly when the MCMI-III results indicated that the applicant may be unsuitable, the psychologist conducted an interview with the applicant. The psychologist then coded up to 10 additional points in the personality assessment portion of the SSS. The Suitability Rating Guidelines indicated that the first part of the personality assessment ranged from 0 to 4 points (MCPRC, 1989a). Applicants were scored depending on whether they were extremely impulsive and immature, exhibited marginal self control with a low tolerance for stress, immature but showed some measure of self-control, acted responsibly and in control most of the time, or who exhibited appropriate control even under stressful situations. The other personality assessment items included the psychologists’ assessment of the applicant’s awareness of a need to change, whether or not they exhibited a deviant value orientation (and if so, to what degree), and whether the applicant exhibited a pathological test response on the MCMI-III. Those indicating no pathology on testing were privileged over those with either some indication of pathology, or who were clearly pathological. Finally, the last item was “concealing versus revealing” which indicated the level of honesty the applicant exhibited in their pattern of responses on the MCMI-III

Independent Variable #2 – Demographics and Criminal History

The question in this study is very narrow -- I am exploring the predictive efficacy of the Selection Suitability Scale above and beyond demographic and criminal history factors available to the institution prior to the screening interview. For this reason, only those demographic and criminal history variables that could be obtained by PRC personnel through institutional files and the applicant’s adult criminal history record

obtained through the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) are included in this examination.³³

Demographic Variables

Demographic variables included in the model are gender coded as 1 for male, 0 for female; age (at time of screening), and race (1 for White, 0 for Non-White) (see Table 6 for descriptives of the variables used in the analysis).

Criminal History Variables

Several measures of the applicant's criminal history would be readily available to PRC staff and these are included in the model. For instance, the applicant's current offense (or offenses) is coded according to the type (e.g., person, property, or drug) of the most serious offense and class (felony (coded as 1), or misdemeanor (coded as 0)) in accordance with Maryland State statutes.³⁴ For example, a charge of theft under \$300 was coded as a misdemeanor while a charge of uttering (forgery/counterfeiting) was coded as a felony. Likewise, the most serious offense in the instant offense was cataloged by offense type – 5 dichotomous mutually exclusive variables were created to capture whether the most serious offense was a person, property, drug, violation of probation (VOP) or DUI/DWI offense. While DUI/DWI offenses are by statute classified as person offenses, in these data applicants charged with DUI/DWI are coded as a separate category and not as person offenders.

³³ While CJIS records contain the offender's date of first arrest as an adult, this information is not recorded in the applicant's file. The age of first arrest information contained in the applicant's file is based on self-report data obtained in the intake interview.

³⁴ Sources for statute classification information included the Maryland State Commission on Criminal Sentencing Guidelines Manual Guidelines Offense Table Appendix A, updated 4/2005 and information provided in the Annotated Code of Maryland Criminal Law articles located at http://www.dsd.state.md.us/comar/Annot_Code_Idx/CriminalLaw.htm.

In creating these offense type and class variables, those charged with solely a VOP offense were typed and classified based on the original offense which led the PRC applicant to be placed on probation or parole. If the applicant was charged with both a new offense and a VOP offense, then the new offense was privileged as the most serious offense. When the PRC applicant was charged with more than one offense, and/or in cataloguing the original offense in VOP cases, person offenses were privileged over property, drug, and violation of probation offenses in deciding which charge was the most serious offense. Thereafter, seriousness was determined based on the specific charges in accordance with the State of Maryland criminal law statutes. The majority of applicants (89%) in this sample were charged in the instant or VOP original offense with a single crime type (either as a sole charge or multiple counts of the same crime type). The remaining 11% of offenders were charged with more than one crime type (see Table 7).

As these crime type and class variables are based on the instant offense and not on the criminal career of the PRC applicant, the obvious problem with utilizing this type and class coding scheme is that these “mutually exclusive” categories may be misleading. The implication is that these are offenders who specialized in the crimes they were charged with in the most current offense (or in the case of VOP offenses, the original offense). However, support for offender specialization varies -- from researchers who assert a generalized offending pattern (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990); to studies finding that specialization occurs more often with adult offenders, particularly those who are white and/or have longer criminal careers (Blumstein, Cohen, Das & Moitra, 1988); to more recent examinations of serious felony offenders finding the “coexistence of

short-term specialization [within] long-term versatility in offending” (Sullivan, McGloin, Pratt & Piquero, 2006, p. 224). In addition, an individual’s motivation certainly plays a role in criminal behavior. For instance, while a PRC applicant’s most serious instant offense was a property crime, they may have committed that crime to obtain money to buy drugs. Thus, some of those cataloged as property offenders may have been more appropriately typed as drug offenders. Unfortunately, data are not available to make this distinction. Another issue is that offenders are charged with the offenses for which the police and the prosecutor have sufficient evidence. In other cases prosecutors engage in “charge bargaining” where, in exchange for a guilty plea, the offender is charged with fewer and/or less severe charges than what they could have been charged without the plea (Piehl & Bushway, 2007; Smith, 1986). Consequently, offenders may have committed additional crimes, of varying types, in the instant case, but may have only been charged with selected offenses, rather than with all of the crimes they committed.

While these offense type (person, property, drug, DUI/DWI and VOP) and offense class (felony versus misdemeanor) variables have some flaws, they are included in the analysis to provide measures of the seriousness of the applicant’s criminal record. Additional criminal history measures included the number of prior times on Parole and Probation (P&P), number of prior P&P revocations, and number of periods of incarceration as an adult for over 30 days (Table 6 provides descriptives of these variables in the analysis).

Dependent Variable #1 - Monthly Performance Ratings

The monthly performance ratings are based on the PRC resident’s observed behaviors and actions, and captured the PRC resident’s engagement in programs and

activities, interpersonal and problem solving skills, and adherence to rules. Nearly half of the 18 performance areas focused on the resident's participation in a variety of programs and activities which provided PRC residents with the opportunity to address key issues related to their criminal behavior (Mason 1979). These programs and activities included educational and vocational classes, mental health counseling, wellness, and leisure activities. Every 28 days, PRC residents were rated on these 18 distinct areas based on the Primary Counselor's recommendation, with input from the team working on the unit to which the resident was assigned. The unit team consisted of the Unit Manager, Work Release Coordinator, Community Release Coordinator, Primary Counselor, Resident Supervisors, and several interns. (See Appendix D for a detailed description of the performance measures and PRC program activities).

The assignment of the performance ratings process was as follows. First, the Primary Counselor met with the PRC resident weekly and reviewed the resident's progress on their individualized treatment plan and discussed the resident's behavior. Based on these weekly meetings and the resident's behavior over the preceding four week period, the Primary Counselor recommended the performance rating to the unit team at the monthly team meeting. Second, the Work Release Coordinator spoke with each resident's job supervisor to ascertain their work performance within the prior four week period, and the Community Release Counselors reviewed the resident's file for participation in community activities including attendance at 12 step meetings, counseling appointments and leisure activities. The Resident Supervisors, if unable to attend the team meeting (primarily because they often worked an evening or night shift

and were not available during the day) left notes about the resident's performance which were considered in the team meeting.

At the team meeting the proposed performance ratings and recommendations of the Primary Counselor, Resident Supervisors, Work and Community Release Coordinators were reviewed and sanctioned by the team. If there was a dispute among the team members, the team discussed the issues and came to a consensus, and when necessary, the Unit Manager acted as the "tie breaker".³⁵ The ratings mostly likely to be disputed among team members (and thus were most likely to change in the team meeting) were functioning with peers and authority, accepts responsibility for actions and daily problems solving skills. The performance areas that were more objective (such as accountability, whether the resident tested alcohol and/or drug free, and participation in leisure activities) or were either directly observed by the rater (e.g., treatment group) or the information was provided by the source (e.g., work performance) were less often in dispute. Generally, these performance rating areas did not change when discussed in the team meeting (S. Hall, personal communication, October 4, 2006). Following the team meeting, residents were given immediate and specific feedback, in writing, in order to fully understand their behavior and make necessary changes.

Ratings are specifically defined and codified for each performance measure in the Rating Standards for Resident Performance Manual (MCPRC, 2003b). PRC residents score a rating from 1 to 5 (with higher values indicating better performance) on 13 of the

³⁵ The degree of influence of the Unit Manager in these team meetings varied. One Unit Manager was more easy-going while another was a strong presence in asserting his or her views. Thus the final performance ratings may reflect these different management styles between the units (S. Hall, Personal Communication, October 4, 2006). As this study examined the predictive validity of the SSS at the time when the resident is screened, the model does not include the unit to which the resident is housed, thus the influence of the Unit Manager is unaccounted for in this examination.

18 performance areas and the remaining 5 areas are coded as either satisfactory (coded as 5 points) or unsatisfactory (1 point). In general, a 5 indicates the resident performs exceptionally and consistently exceeds expectations, a 4 indicates a very good performance and on occasion exceeds expectations and a rating of 3 means the resident consistently meets expectations and follows the rules of the facility. Those who receive a rating of 2 are performing poorly, sometimes below expectation, while a rating of 1 indicates an extremely poor performance where the resident is generally uncooperative and resistant to meeting the expectations and rules of the PRC.

The 18 performance areas are treatment plan, treatment group, accepts responsibility for own actions, daily problem solving skills, job/training performance, punctuality, accountability, interpersonal functioning with authority, interpersonal functioning with peers, interpersonal functioning with intimates³⁶, outside counseling, recovery program, educational participation, in-house responsibilities, responsible use of money, drug/alcohol free, suitable living conditions and constructive use of leisure time (see Table 8 for performance measure descriptives). As the PRC residents are rated every month in each of the 18 performance areas, all monthly ratings were coded in the data. A dummy variable was created to distinguish the last month of ratings and a count

³⁶ PRC unit staff were instructed to code the functioning with intimates area in two steps – the second of which was conditional on the rating in the first step. The first step was to indicate if the PRC participant was behaving in a satisfactory (coded as 5) or unsatisfactory (coded as 1) fashion. The second step, coded numerically from 1 to 5 (with higher values indicating a more positive performance), was only to be completed in the event that the resident received an unsatisfactory rating. However, there were instances where either the staff completed a numeric value in the second step for a resident coded as having satisfactory relationships with their intimates, and other instances where the numeric values in the second step were missing for those coded as unsatisfactory. For purposes of this study, the two steps were combined into a new variable. For those who were rated as satisfactory, but had no numeric value in the second step (N=60) they were coded as 5 on the new combined variable, 13 residents who received an unsatisfactory but were missing a numeric value in the second step were coded with the mean of 2.73, and the remaining received the numerical value provided in the second step.

variable was created to capture the total number of performance ratings available for each resident.

In four performance areas (treatment group, outside counseling, education, and money management), there were substantial missing data (listwise deletion excluded 518 of 548 cases). This may be more aptly categorized as data that was “not applicable” rather than “missing” as PRC residents are only rated on those areas in which they were engaged. For example, those who were not involved in outside counseling, in a recovery program, education, or in any in-house special focus treatment group did not have ratings in these areas. Likewise, the performance area of money management was only evaluated for those engaged in outside employment. The not applicable/missing data in these areas ranged from 21% missing (treatment group) to approximately 35% missing (outside counseling and money management) to 85% missing (education). Due to the extent of not applicable/missing data, these four performance areas were dropped and reliability analysis was conducted on the remaining performance rating areas.

After creating a scale of the average rating in the last month of program participation within the remaining 14 performance areas (with a mean of 48.26, standard deviation of 4.80, retained 485 cases, and an alpha of .68), I decided to use a 13 item scale because by dropping the suitable living condition performance area, the alpha increased to .72.³⁷ The mean of this 13 item scale was 44.24, with a standard deviation of 4.35, retained 485 cases, and an alpha of .72. Mean values were substituted for the missing data for each item and the reliability analysis was repeated with similar result.

³⁷ Generally speaking, scales with an alpha level of .70 or higher are considered adequate (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000).

The scale now had a mean of 44.18, standard deviation of 4.22 and alpha of .71. Finally, as response categories varied across the performance areas, I standardized the outcome by converting the 13 performance area ratings to z-scores, and then constructed the performance rating outcome scale of mean z-scores. The final performance rating scale had an alpha of .72 and included the performance areas of treatment plan, accepts responsibility for actions, daily problem solving, job performance, punctuality, accountability, functioning with authority, functioning with peers, functioning with intimates, recovery program, in-house responsibilities, drug and alcohol free and constructive use of leisure time.

Dependent Variable #2 – Adjustment Actions

In general, adjustments (or disciplinary infractions) and the consequent punishment rendered by the PRC were recorded on the back of the Case Summary card³⁸ (the “22”) (Appendix E). From the 22, the total number of adjustment actions incurred by the PRC resident was recorded. As half of the PRC participants did not incur an adjustment action and of the remaining, 35% had 2 or fewer infractions, the data were

³⁸ During data collection I observed that some of the files had copies of written warnings (a "75B") in response to infractions that were not captured on the 22. This raised the concern of possibly underreporting adjustment actions in these data, particularly as the PRC purges portions of their case files after 3 years and 75Bs are not retained in the file. However, in addition to the 22, I reviewed other documents that reported aspects of infractions and consequent punishment. For example, I gathered information from the Performance Report (a letter written to the Judge by the Unit Manager which summarized the resident's overall PRC performance including infractions) and I reviewed the Diminution of Confinement Record (DCR) which provided the number of good conduct time days lost due to an infraction. While it is difficult to know precisely how many adjustment actions may be missing from these data, I was assured by PRC staff that given that I cross-referenced the 22 with the Performance Report and the DCR, that more than likely I captured around 95% of the infractions (S. Hall, Personal Communication, March 28, 2007). PRC staff also advised that it is likely that the more serious infractions resulting in the participant revoked back to the jail were not recorded on the 22, as the file may have been temporary located outside the Unit (e.g., on the Administrator's desk awaiting review). Often, once the file returned to the Unit, if the resident was no longer at the PRC their file may have been stored without notation of the infraction on the 22. However, given that the Performance Report and DCR capture these types of serious infractions, I am confident that I captured most of the adjustment actions and missing infractions appear to be randomly missing.

recoded into a dichotomous variable where those who had any adjustments were coded as 1 and those who did not were coded as 0.

Dependent Variable #3 – Discharge Status

Discharge status (e.g., time served, revocations) is recorded in several locations in the case file including the Case Summary Card and the Performance Report.

A dichotomous variable was created to reflect successful discharge from the PRC.

PRC residents were coded as successfully discharged when released time served, released to the electronic monitoring program (CART), when administratively removed (e.g., the discovery of a detainer in another jurisdiction which rendered the resident ineligible for participation in the PRC, or when a resident is reclassified back to the detention center when it is recognized the individual was not psychologically or medically capable of meeting program requirements), released on bond or by court order. Those unsuccessfully discharged were those revoked or escaped from the PRC. Of the 600 PRC residents from 2001 to 2004 in this study, 525 were discharged successfully, while 73 were revoked and 2 escaped.

Sample Selection

Sampling Procedure

From an Access database provided by the PRC, consisting of 4,178 records³⁹ of those who transferred to the PRC between March 1997 and July 2005, 600 subjects were

³⁹While the Access database contains 4,178 records, this does not mean there are 4,178 unique offenders in the sample pool. Offenders can transfer to the PRC more than once (either as a new intake, returning from being suspended to the jail as a result of an adjustment action, or as an alternative sanction to be placed on home monitoring, or for a technical violation of probation or parole) and the Access database contained a separate record each time an individual transferred to the PRC. Of the 4,178 records, 389 (7%) cases were recorded in the database more than one time. For those cases where they participated in the PRC more than

selected for this study. The 600 subjects in the study included all women who participated in PRC from 2001 to 2004 ($n=173$) and a randomly selected sample of 427 men from a pool of 1,733 who participated in the PRC from 2001 to 2004 (please see discussion below regarding how this difference in sampling by gender impacts interpretation of statistical tests utilized in this study). The sample selection process is described below.

As the PRC serves not only state and county offenders, but also a number of offenders transferred from the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the first step in selecting my sample was to omit the Federal prisoners because their intake process was different. Federal prisoners were not interviewed and intake data were based on archival records. Federal prisoners were identified in two ways. The first was by examining two variables in the Access database. One variable captured the incoming transfer status of PRC residents -- Federal prisoners were listed as "FED", "FED-IT", "FED-PRE" and "FED-PROB" in the database. The second variable captured the type of offender and Federal offenders were listed as "FED" or "FED-HC". Through this process, 367 Federal prisoners were dropped from the subject pool. The second means of Federal prisoner identification was by review of the PRC resident's file. An additional 41 Federal offenders (10 women and 31 men) were eliminated from the sample through the file review process.

The PRC database that I used for selection of subjects did not include a gender variable. Knowing that the women were housed only in unit 2 – the co-ed unit of the

once during the study period, I coded the first time within the study period in which they participated, except in cases where there were no performance ratings available. For these cases I coded the next PRC participation.

PRC, the data was sorted by unit and 378 subjects were identified as women based on their first names.⁴⁰ Of the 378 cases, 170 had participated in the PRC either before 2001 or after 2004, so these records were eliminated from consideration. The remaining 208 files were examined and during the file review, I found that 10 subjects had been misidentified as women.⁴¹ In addition, I was unable to locate 2 of the female subject files, and 1 case was not included in the study because while the individual had been screened and was scheduled to transfer to the PRC, she never did so. The remaining 12 records in the Access database were duplicates – 8 women had participated in the PRC more than once in the study period, and while the initial transfer to the PRC was the participation period selected for the study, 2 women transferred twice and 1 woman transferred 3 times to the PRC during their stay. The final sample of women in the study was 173 (see women’s sample selection chart below to follow these inclusion criteria).

| Year Women Participated in PRC ⁴² | Initial Sample | Misidentified as Female | Federal Cases Omitted | Multiple Records | Missing Files and Not PRC Participant | Final |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|
| 2001 | 69 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| 2002 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 41 |
| 2003 | 42 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 36 |
| 2004 | 46 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 35 |
| Total | 208 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 3 | 173 |

⁴⁰ For names that were unusual, I referred to www.babynamesworld.com a database of 11,000 multinational names that provided the gender of names.

⁴¹ These files were re-classified as male subjects and while two were retained in the study as they were coded at the point of gender identification, the remaining cases were placed back into the sample pool and were eligible for random selection.

⁴² The 2001 sample differs somewhat from other years because it includes all those who participated in the PRC in 2001 however, 19 of the 2001 cases were interviewed and transferred to the PRC in 2000.

Once the women were selected, 3,453 records remained in the Access database. Initially the sampling scheme excluded those PRC residents who had participated in the PRC prior to the study period. Before the decision to change the sampling protocol, data for 33 of the male residents had been collected, and these subjects were eliminated from the sample pool, this left 3,420 records from which to select the remaining male sample. The next step was to exclude those cases outside the sampling period (prior to 2001 and after 2004) and for each year in the study period, approximately 114 cases were randomly selected (I over sampled by a few cases in the event that duplicates remained in the pool due to different spelling of names or different dates of birth. Duplicate cases were then identified and deleted from consideration by comparing the name, date of birth and an identification number assigned by Montgomery County. This ensured that only one record for each individual resident would be included in the selection process.

Once data collection commenced, 27 cases were identified as Federal cases by reviewing the file, and I was unable to locate 19 of the male resident files. Fifty-five additional cases were randomly selected from 1,733 records in the Access database of male PRC participants from 2001 to 2004 who had not been selected in the prior sampling efforts. These 55 cases were then sorted into a list randomly, and the first 46 cases on the list were selected to replace the Federal cases and missing files (see men's sample selection chart below).

| Year Men Participated in PRC ⁴³ | Initial Sample Retained Coded Cases | Second Sample of Initial Cases | Federal Cases Omitted | Missing Files | Third Sample to Replace Fed and Missing Files | Final |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---|-------|
| 2001 | 13 | 98 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 133 |
| 2002 | 10 | 101 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 112 |
| 2003 | 10 | 100 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 98 |
| 2004 | 0 | 95 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 84 |
| Total | 33 | 394 | 27 | 19 | 46 | 427 |

In summary, a total of 173 women and 427 men who participated in the PRC from 2001 to 2004 were included in the study. The breakdown of cases by year and gender is as follows:

| Year | Women | Men | Total |
|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| 2001 | 61 | 133 | 194 |
| 2002 | 47 | 112 | 159 |
| 2003 | 34 | 98 | 132 |
| 2004 | 31 | 84 | 115 |
| Total | 173 | 427 | 600 |

Statistical Testing

As noted above, the decision to include a random sample of men and the population of women who participated in the PRC from 2001 to 2004 impacts the interpretation of the statistical tests in this study. The very nature of inferential statistics is the assumption that the sample is considered to be representative of a greater

⁴³ As with the women, the 2001 sample differs somewhat from the samples in other years, for two reasons. First, the 2001 sample includes all those who participated in the PRC in 2001 however, 10 of the 2001 cases were interviewed and transferred to the PRC in 2000. Second, beginning in 2002, the PRC served a higher number of Federal prisoners than in prior years. As a result, once Federal prisoners were excluded from the sample, there were more male subjects available for random selection in 2001 than in other years.

population of individuals who share something in common (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). It is unusual to include the population of interest in a study (Bachman & Paternoster, 1997).

While rare, this study included the population of women who participated in the PRC from 2001 to 2004; consequently eliminating the need to make inferences about the population characteristics. Nonetheless, I will report statistical tests in this study for several reasons. First, while the results for the women in the analysis are not an estimate, but are population values, statistical tests provide guidance⁴⁴ in asserting whether or not differences, if they exist, are meaningful. Second, while this study speaks to the actual experiences of the women in the PRC from 2001 to 2004, I believe these results can be generalized to other female residents who have been in the past or will be in the future, in the PRC program. Thus this population of women in the PRC is a hypothetical sample of past and future female PRC residents.

Data Collection

Data were collected by reviewing each resident's case file and coding the SSS and intake data into several electronic forms contained on a palm pilot or a laptop computer. During the file review other information, largely qualitative in nature, deemed relevant and of substantive interest to the study (e.g., the psychologist's assessment of the applicant's "suitability" for PRC participation, the staff's assessment of the resident's attitude during participation in the PRC) was recorded. Information was also coded from the Performance Report (including the resident's discharge status, employment data, for revocations, a summary of the circumstances surrounding the event). As noted

⁴⁴ Scientists often make decisions on whether to reject or fail to reject the null hypothesis by observing the probability value (p-value) commonly provided in analytic output.

previously, the 18 performance measures as well as the number of adjustments and resulting disciplinary actions and discharge were collected from the Case Summary Card.

Analytic Models

To address the questions raised in this study, three statistical models were utilized. The first model (Model 1) consists of the individual demographic and criminal history variables -- age, gender, race, prior times on parole and probation, prior times revoked from parole and probation, prior number of times incarcerated over 30 days as an adult, current offense class (felony versus misdemeanor), and offense type (person, drug, property, DUI/DWI or solely a violation of probation). The second model (Model 2) retained the demographic and prior criminal history measures but added the total SSS scale score. This score was the summed value of the 9 separate SSS components (employment, personal data, failure indicators, primary/secondary ID, place of residency, situational factors, recommendations, screener's assessment and psychological screening/personality assessment). The third model (Model 3) incorporated the individual scores of the 9 SSS components (as listed above) as well as the demographic and criminal history variables. Due to the different types of outcomes (e.g., interval/ratio and limited dependent) the method of analyses in this study varied to include both multivariate ordinary least squares and logistic regression, as detailed below.

Method of Analysis

A review of the prediction literature indicates that one of the most widely-used and appropriate method of analysis for this type of work with interval/ratio level data is Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression (Gottfredson, 1987; Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1994). This method is advantageous due to the ability of the model to

combine a number of different variables and assign a relative weight to each so that the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable allows for the “unique contribution” of each (Allison, 1999, p. 3). The efficacy of the SSS to predict success in the PRC as measured by the performance ratings scale was tested with OLS regression. To determine whether the models examined were significantly different, an F-ratio was calculated to provide evidence of whether the difference in R-square values between the models was significant.⁴⁵

Adjustment actions and discharge status are binary non-linear outcomes and thus these data were analyzed using multivariate logistic regression. To determine whether the models examined were significantly different, Likelihood Ratio (LR) tests were conducted which examined the difference of the two likelihood values.⁴⁶ The likelihood ratio test can only be conducted when comparing two models that are “nested”; in other words, while new variables are added to the second model (the unconstrained model) under consideration, all of the variables in the first model (the constrained model) must also be in the second model – the first model therefore is nested in the second model.

⁴⁵ The formula for the F-Ratio is:

$$\frac{[R^2(\text{model2}) - R^2(\text{model1})] / [K2-K1]}{[1-R^2(\text{model2})] / [N-K2-1]}$$

Where K1 is the number of variables in Model 1
 K2 is the number of variables in Model 2 and
 N is the number of cases in the sample
 DF [K2-K1], [N-K2-1]

⁴⁶ The formula for the Likelihood Ratio is the absolute value of:

$$(\text{Log Likelihood of Reduced Model} - \text{Log Likelihood of Full Model}) * 2$$

χ^2 Critical Value DF = (Number parameters Full model) less (Number parameters Reduced model).

Long (1997) stated “if the constraint significantly reduces the likelihood, then the null hypothesis is rejected” (p. 87).

Data Analysis

Each resident who was in the PRC more than 30 days should have at least one performance rating, with subsequent ratings for each 30 day period thereafter. Based on the study sample obtained from the PRC Access database, on average, most residents stayed approximately 90 days. Of the 600 cases in this study, 52⁴⁷ cases did not have any performance ratings and 548 had at least one performance rating. Of the 52 who did not have any performance ratings, 14 were discharged because they had served their time, 20 were discharged to CART (the home electronic monitoring program of the PRC) and 5 were revoked from the PRC program and returned to jail or prison. Of the remaining, 7 cases were discharged without performance ratings for a variety of reasons including 6 cases of administrative removal⁴⁸, one resident escaped, and 3 cases were released pending appeal, bond or by order of the Court. Finally, 3 cases did not have performance ratings because of missing data -- the case summary cards (which contain the performance ratings) were missing from these files.

⁴⁷ These cases are significantly different from the subjects with performance ratings – they tend to have a less serious criminal history, are less likely to be drug and violation of probation offenders, and more likely to be DWI/DUI offenders. They also are less likely to be male and have higher scores on the psychological screening/personality assessment and the employment component (at $p < .10$) and higher scores on the personal data component. These cases also have significantly shorter stays in the PRC – 21 days compared to 100 days, and have far fewer adjustment actions, but are equally as likely to be discharged successfully as those with performance ratings. Given these findings, the analysis for the outcomes of adjustment actions and discharge status will be run both with and without these subjects.

⁴⁸ Administrative removal pertains to those offenders who were discharged from the PRC for reasons other than disciplinary. One example is when an offender was sentenced for more than 6 months on another charge and thus was ineligible for PRC participation. Alternative reasons for administrative removal includes that after the offender was transferred to the PRC it was found they were severely mentally unstable or suicidal (Mason, 1979).

This study measured how well the scores of the Selection Suitability Scale, in whole or in part, predicted performance in the PRC, as measured by a composite scale of staff assessed performance measures in the final set of performance ratings, if the PRC resident had any adjustment actions and if the resident was successfully discharged from the PRC. In addition, the predictive capacity of the SSS was compared to the predictive efficacy of a set of individual demographic and criminal history variables. To meet these goals, three models were run for each outcome. The first model (Model 1) contained only the demographic and criminal history variables and the outcomes of interest, the second model (Model 2) regressed the outcomes of performance ratings, whether a resident had an adjustment action, and were successfully discharged from the PRC on the total SSS score along with demographic and criminal history variables.

With Model 3, an incremental validity assessment was conducted to empirically ascertain which (if any) of the components of the Suitability Selection Scale (SSS) were the best predictor(s) for the three outcomes. Each of the individual SSS components and the individual demographic and criminal history variables were entered into a regression equation, using forward entry stepwise analysis.

Forward entry stepwise is an iterative process which evaluates each variable as it is added to the model, and compares it to the outcome of interest. The variable that best predicts the outcome is included first, the second variable entered is the one that best explains the remaining variance, and so on, until the last variable is entered. If the predictive effect of the variable meets the critical value or significance level set by researcher, then it is added to the model. In this case, the critical value for addition to the model was set at $p < .50$ to ensure that all but the most non-significant variables would

remain in the model. Thereafter, Model 3 was revised based on the results of the stepwise regression. While all of the demographic and criminal history variables were included in the final revised model, only those SSS components that were statistically significant (at $p < .05$) were retained.

To determine whether the models examined were significantly different from one another, depending on the type of analytic model, either the difference in the R-Square (in the OLS regression models) or the Likelihood ratios (in the logistic regression models) were examined. The results of this study are detailed in Chapter IV.

Chapter IV: Results

The main purpose of this exploratory study was to determine if scores on the Selection Suitability Scale (SSS), in whole or in part, could predict an offender's performance in a community based work release program above and beyond demographic and criminal history variables. In other words, I wanted to know how useful the SSS was for PRC administrators – does it add information beyond basic criminal history and demographics that can identify suitable candidates for this program?

Performance measures for PRC residents included the performance ratings scale, successful release from the PRC, and whether or not the resident had an adjustment action. My expectation was that the SSS, in whole and in part, would predict the PRC participant's performance better than demographic and criminal history variables alone, and that those with higher scores on the SSS would perform better than those with lower scores on these outcomes.

As expected, I found that higher SSS scores are positively related to performance ratings and discharge status and negatively related to adjustment actions. However, incorporating the total SSS scale or the SSS components in the model provides only a modest improvement in the variance explained. Correlations and model results by outcome are detailed below.

Correlations

Prior to running the analytic models, two correlation matrices were estimated (see Appendix G). The first matrix looked at the relationships between the total SSS score and the outcome measures (the performance rating scale, adjustment actions and whether the PRC participant was successfully discharged) and the demographic and criminal history

variables in the models. The second correlation matrix examined the relationships between the three outcome measures and the total SSS and component SSS scores.

This was done to confirm that the variables of interest are related in the anticipated direction and that the independent variables are not highly collinear, as suspected by a correlation .70 and above. An examination of the first matrix reveals that none of the correlations between these independent variables are high enough to signal multicollinearity. The strongest correlation of .42 is between the number of prior periods of incarceration and number of prior times revoked from parole and/or probation. Correlations among the remaining independent variables in this matrix vary in strength from a low of .08 (performance ratings and property offenders) to .21, (performance ratings and age at screening) to a high of .39 (number of prior periods on parole and probation and number of prior periods of incarceration).

Similarly, none of the correlations in the second matrix reached the .70 level although one is nearly that high at .67 (employment). While at .67, the correlation between the employment component and the total SSS score may raise concerns of possible multicollinearity, as noted in Chapter III, the variables were subjected to tests for multicollinearity. The results indicated that none of the variables had a tolerance statistic lower than .40, nor a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) greater than 2.5, which are common cut-off points indicating problems of multicollinearity. The remaining correlations in this matrix ranged in strength from a low of .10 (recommendations) to .23 (residency) to a high of .54 (failure indicators). All of these correlations are significant at $p < .05$ or higher.

Looking at the dependent variables, the three outcome measures are significantly correlated with each other at $p < .01$. Performance ratings and successful discharge status are positively associated at .31, while performance ratings and successful discharge are negatively related to adjustment actions at .36 and .35 respectively. Success in one dimension is clearly related to success in another.

Generally, demographic and criminal history variables and the SSS total and component scores are related to the three outcomes in the expected directions.⁴⁹ Examining the first matrix results more closely, I observe that, as expected, older, white residents score higher on performance ratings, are less likely to have an adjustment action, and are more likely to be discharged successfully than young, non-white residents. Person offenders and those with a felony charge are positively associated with adjustment actions and residents who are DUI/DWI offenders are less likely to incur an adjustment action, and are more likely to be discharged successfully. Unexpectedly, there is a finding of a positive association with performance ratings and the two measures of parole and probation; the possible reasons for this will be discussed more at length in Chapter V.

The second matrix also reveals that the outcome measures and SSS components are significantly related in the expected direction -- those who score higher on the components have higher performance ratings, are more likely to be discharged successfully and are less likely to have an adjustment action. Specifically, employment history, personal data and screener's assessment components are positively related to performance ratings. Five of the SSS components are significantly and negatively correlated with adjustment actions -- psychological screening, employment, personal data,

⁴⁹ It is important to note that correlations containing dichotomous variables may be understated due to limited variation (Bachman & Paternoster, 1997).

failure indicators and situational factors. These same components and the SSS Big 6 primary/secondary ID component⁵⁰ predict successful discharge from the PRC.

The next step was to conduct the regression analysis and compare the three models for significant differences as a test of the predictive efficacy of the total SSS score, and the SSS component scores, compared to utilizing demographic and criminal history scores alone. These results are organized by outcome and are provided below.

By Outcome

Performance Ratings

The results of the three models for the outcome of performance ratings z-score scale are provided in Table 9. The first model, which examined the predictive relationship of demographic and criminal history variables on the performance rating scale, revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between age and race and performance ratings. Those who are older and white score higher on the performance ratings scale at $p < .01$. With each additional year, residents score .009 standard deviations higher the mean performance ratings than younger residents, and those who are white score .122 standard deviations above the mean than those who are non-white. The only significant criminal history factor for this outcome was the property offender – those charged with a property crime as the most serious offense in either the instant or original VOP offense have lower scores (.159 standard deviations below the mean) on the performance ratings scale than the reference category of drug offenders (at $p < .05$). The

⁵⁰ The SSS Big 6 is the identification classification scheme created by Kent Mason (1979) where during the intake interview, the screener designates the applicant with a classification indicating the offender's primary and secondary cause of their criminal involvement in the current offense. Of all the possible primary/secondary combinations, six (the "SSS Big 6") are viewed as the least suitable for selection into the PRC and these applicants received 0 points on this component, while those applicants not identified as one of the Big 6 were given 6 points. See Appendix D for more information on scoring this component.

first model has an adjusted R^2 of .0863 explaining approximately 8.6% of the variance in the model.

The second model adds the SSS total score to the first model and has an adjusted R^2 of .0937, explaining 9.4% of the variance. In this model, the findings in the first model hold, but also that the SSS total score significantly and positively predicts performance ratings ($p < .05$); those residents with higher scores on the SSS score higher on the performance ratings scales by .008 standard deviations above the mean. Comparing the two R^2 values using an F-Ratio test, the F obtained of 4.34 is statistically significant with a critical value of 3.84 (at $p < .05$). While the difference between the models is significant, the increase in variance explained is less than 1%. Thus, while the SSS total score (Model 2) predicts performance ratings better than demographics and criminal history variables alone (Model 1), it is a small improvement.

As noted in the methods chapter, the finalization of the forward stepwise regression model was a two-step process. In the first step, all of the demographic and criminal history variables, as well as all of the SSS components were analyzed using forward stepwise so that all of the variables which had a p value of less than .50 were retained in the model.⁵¹ The second step was to observe which of the SSS components were statistically significant at $p < .05$ and include only those components in the final model. For the performance ratings scale, two of the SSS components were statistically significant – employment history and the screener’s assessment. Those who score higher on the employment scale and the screener’s assessment have higher performance ratings. Consistent with Models 1 and 2, age remains a strong positive predictor in Model 3 and

⁵¹ These results are available from the author upon request.

while race is still predictive, it is less so (as reflected in a decline in the coefficient from .122 in Model 1 and .119 in Model 2, to .097 in Model 3). Compared to drug offenders, both property and DUI/DWI offenders score lower on the performance ratings scale at $p < .01$ and $p < .05$ respectively. Finally, Model 3 has an adjusted R^2 of .1099, thus explaining 11% of the variance.

To determine if the individual components of the SSS perform equally as well (or as poorly) as the total SSS score, I compared the adjusted R^2 value of Model 3 to the adjusted R^2 values in both Model 1 and Model 2. Comparing the SSS components (Model 3) to demographic and criminal history variables alone (Model 1), I observe an F-Ratio of 7.06, with a critical value of 6.64, is significant at $p < .01$. With an increase of variance explained of 2.4%, the SSS components of employment history and the screener's assessment are modestly more predictive than demographic and criminal history variables alone. Likewise, conducting the same test but comparing Model 3 to the demographic and criminal history variables plus the total SSS score (Model 2) and noting that at a critical value of 6.64 (at $p < .01$) the F obtained of 9.66 is statistically significant, yet again, the increase in variance explained is only 1.6%. While employment and the screener's assessment predicted performance ratings better than the SSS total score, this was a modest improvement.

In summary, both the Selection Suitability Scale total score and the employment history and the screener's assessment components predict performance ratings better than demographics and criminal history variables alone. Moreover, these two SSS components predict performance better than SSS total score. However, the improvement in variance explained is quite modest – ranging from less than 1% to marginally over 2%.

Adjustment Actions

Table 10 provides the results for this outcome. The first model considered the capacity of the demographic and criminal history variables of race, age, gender, offender class and types, number of times the applicant had been on parole and probation, number of times revoked off of parole and probation, and number of periods of incarceration of over 30 days to predict whether or not participants had an adjustment action. The analysis revealed that only age and race were significant predictors, with a pseudo R^2 of .0682. Younger ($p < .01$) and non-white ($p < .05$) residents are more likely to incur an adjustment.

In Model 2, the SSS total score is added to the regression and minimally increases the pseudo R^2 to .0829 (an improvement of only 1.4% over the first Model). Age is still significantly related to adjustment actions, but with a minimal reduction in the odds ratio. In Model 1, with each year older, the odds of the PRC resident incurring an adjustment action is .968 times smaller compared to not incurring an adjustment action, and .975 smaller with the inclusion of the SSS total scale score in Model 2. Race also remained significantly and negatively related to adjustment action – the odds of an adjustment action are approximately .68 times smaller for white residents than non-whites residents. In addition, those charged with a felony are more likely to incur an infraction. The SSS total score is also significant and negatively related -- those with a higher total score on the SSS are less likely to incur an adjustment during their residency at the PRC ($p < .01$). Comparing the log likelihood of Model 1 and Model 2 in a ratio test, the χ^2 obtained value of 14.75 exceeds the critical χ^2 value of 6.63 (at $p < .01$) indicating that the SSS total

score predicts adjustment actions modestly better than demographics and criminal history variables alone.

For Model 3, personal data and failure indicators were the significant SSS components retained in the final model⁵², and these components were significant predictors. The improvement the variance explained was very small – less than one-half percent (.039%) increase in the pseudo R^2 than Model 2. These findings indicate that a lower score on the personal data component (composed of a categorical measure of the current age of the PRC applicant, the presence of a caring other and family dependents) increases the likelihood of incurring an adjustment. Likewise, those with a lower score on failure indicators (including instability of residency, past history of drug and alcohol abuse, suicide attempts and mental hospitalizations as well as past escapes) are more likely to have an adjustment action. However, age, a consistent predictor in the first two models, drops out as a significant predictor. This is most likely due to collinearity between the age variable and the personal data component, because both variables measures of age of the applicant – the age variable is continuous, while age in the SSS is measured categorically. Applicants older than 26 years of age score 4 points on this item, 2 points for those between the ages of 21 and 25, and those under 20 years old receive no points. In addition, race grows stronger -- whites are .59 times less likely than non-whites to incur an adjustment action when the personal data and failure indicator components are in the model. There is no change for felony class; this variable remains significant. Non-white applicants, charged with a felony, and dependent on the distribution of the individual items within the personal data and failure indicator

⁵² These results are available from the author upon request.

components, are younger and/or generally less stable are more likely to have difficulty and face disciplinary action at some point while in residence at the PRC.

Similar to the process with the performance ratings, but now using a ratio test of the log likelihood, I compared the two models (SSS component scores versus demographics and criminal history) and observed an χ^2 obtained value of 15.51, which exceeded the critical χ^2 value of 9.21 (at $p < .01$). The SSS components of personal data and failure indicators predicted adjustment actions better than demographics and criminal history variables alone. However, this did not hold in the comparison between the SSS total and the SSS component scores; SSS components are not significantly more predictive than the total SSS score.

To summarize these findings, both the total SSS score and two of its components (personal data and failure indicators) significantly predict adjustment actions beyond demographic and criminal history variables alone, but these additions represent a small improvement in the models. This analysis also revealed that SSS components are not significantly different in predicting adjustment actions than the total SSS score.

Discharge Status

Discharge status results are provided in Table 11. Consistent with the performance rating scale and adjustment actions, age was significant; older residents are more likely to be discharged successfully. This model had a pseudo R^2 of .0641 and none of the other variables were significantly related to discharge status in this model.

The SSS total score is added to the regression, and is positively predictive; age remains significant; and a pseudo R^2 of .0820 (indicating a small improvement (1.8%))

over Model 1). Those with a higher total score on the SSS are more likely to be discharged from the PRC in good standing ($p < .01$). Conducting the log likelihood ratio test, the χ^2 obtained value of 8.75 exceeds the critical χ^2 value of 6.63 (at $p < .01$) indicating that the SSS total score predicts discharge status better than demographics and criminal history variables alone.

Finally, in Model 3, employment history and whether the applicant was identified as one of the undesirable SSS Big 6 were the significant SSS components retained in the final model.⁵³ These two components were significant predictors of discharge status with a pseudo R^2 of .0949 -- an improvement of 3% in the variance when compared to Model 1 and of 1.2% over Model 2. Those with a higher score on employment history and those not identified as a SSS Big 6 are more likely (at $p < .01$) to be discharged successfully. Again, age remains a positive and significant predictor in Model 3.

The log likelihood of Model 3 (components) and Model 1 (demographics and criminal history variables) resulted in an χ^2 obtained value of 14.42, which exceeded the critical χ^2 value of 9.21 (at $p < .01$). The SSS components of employment history and Identification of SSS Big 6 predicted discharge status beyond demographic and criminal history variables alone, improving the overall variance of the model by 3%. Further, the log likelihood ratio between SSS components and the total SSS score revealed a χ^2 obtained of 5.85, which exceeded the critical value of 3.84 critical value at $p < .05$. SSS components are significantly more predictive of successful discharge the total SSS score, although the improvement in the variance explained is just over 1%.

⁵³ These results are available from the author upon request.

In summary, my examination of who will successfully depart the PRC reveals that both the total SSS score and employment and not being identified as one of the undesirable primary/secondary SSS Big 6 are significant improvement in predicting discharge status when compared to demographics and criminal history alone and in comparison to the total SSS score. Consistent with the results of the outcome measures of performance ratings and adjustment actions, the overall improvement is modest.

Taking these results as a whole, we see that the total SSS score is an improvement in prediction of performance ratings, adjustment actions and successful discharge over demographic and criminal history factors alone, albeit a small improvement. In addition, specific components, depending on the outcome examined, modestly add to our understanding of the outcomes over demographic and criminal history factors alone. For example, employment history predicted both performance ratings and discharge status, screener's assessment predicted performance ratings, an applicant not designated as one of the undesirable SSS Big 6 predicted discharge status, and personal data and failure indicators predicted adjustment actions. I discuss these findings in Chapter V as they relate to prior research findings, present study limitations, and plans for future research.

Chapter V: Discussion

The chapter is organized as follows. I will discuss the results described in Chapter IV, including possible explanations for three correlations that were contrary to expectations. I then focus on the efficacy of demographic and criminal history variables and the Selection Suitability Scale (SSS) in predicting performance in the PRC. I also discuss the degree to which the SSS, in whole and by component, improves upon predicting performance compared to demographic and criminal history measures alone. Finally, I look at how well SSS components perform when compared to the SSS total score. The feasibility of solely using readily available demographic and criminal history variables is explored, as well as study limitations and plans for future research.

Key Findings

Correlations – Explaining the Unexpected

While most of the relationships between the three outcome measures were correlated in the expected direction with the SSS, demographic and criminal history measures, there were several somewhat surprising findings. First, there was a positive association with performance ratings and the two measures of parole and probation (correlated at .18 for number of prior times on parole and probation and .14 for number of prior revocations). Notably, age is associated in both the correlation and regression results with all three outcomes, indicating that older offenders generally perform better than younger offenders. Further, age is positively correlated with number of times on parole and number of prior periods of incarceration. To discern whether the positive correlation between performance ratings and the parole and probation measures was

spurious, and better explained by the fact that these offenders were older, partial correlation analyses were conducted (see Appendix H, Tables H-1 and H-2). The partial correlation tests revealed that when controlling for age, the positive relationship between performance ratings and these measures of parole and probation remained significant. This indicates that those with more experience with times on, and revocations from, parole & probation had better performance ratings, regardless of their age.

Perhaps those with more experience being on parole and probation found it easier to comply with the rules of the PRC and consequently, they had higher performance ratings. However, one problem with this hypothesis that discharge status is not significantly related to either number of times on parole and probation or revocations, rendering the positive association with revocations and performance ratings a bit puzzling. If PRC participants who were seasoned parolees or probationers knew how to follow the rules in order to obtain higher performance ratings in their last month of participation, it follows that they should be able to sustain this behavior to discharge. At this juncture, speculation as to the utility of this information should be minimal, because while these are significant correlations (at $p < .01$), the strength of the relationship between these measures are low.

Second, residents who were identified as DUI/DWI offenders in the instant offense (or in the case of VOP, the original charge was a DUI/DWI) are less likely to incur an adjustment action and are more likely to be discharged successfully, but being a DUI/DWI offender is unrelated to performance ratings. Offenders charged with DUI/DWI may be different from those charged in street crimes; they may be more likely to be pro-social and stable in their employment and family circumstances. Further, the

DUI/DWI charge may be indicative of a singular problem (e.g., alcohol dependence) as opposed to those offenders involved in street crimes who may have a more serious criminal history, less stable employment, and more transient residential and family relationships.

In this sample, DUI/DWI offenders ($n=133$) are older, more likely to be white, and somewhat more likely to be male ($p<.10$) than other offenders (see Table H-3 in Appendix H). While DUI/DWI offenders are equally likely to be in a relationship with a significant other (e.g., husband, wife, boyfriend or girlfriend), DUI/DWI offenders in a relationship ($n=78$) have been in the relationship for longer periods of time (7.69 years compared to 5.18 years for non-DUI/DWI offenders). Non-DUI/DWI offenders are more likely to be parents (at $p<.10$), but for those with children ($n=76$) DUI/DWI offenders are more likely to have children living with them at the time of the intake interview.

Looking at criminal histories, while DUI/DWI offenders experienced a higher number of times on parole and probation (also at $p<.10$), they have substantially fewer revocations from parole and probation and fewer periods of incarceration. In addition, DUI/DWI offenders average much higher scores on the employment history component (5.02 versus 2.28 for those charged with other offenses) and are significantly less likely to be identified as one of the SSS Big 6 undesirable Primary/Secondary personality classifications (11% of DUI/DWI offenders were identified as a SSS Big 6 versus 29% of Non-DUI offenders). Differences between the DUI/DWI offender and other types of offenders in this sample may be indicative of differences not only in their economic and employment standing, but in their consequent level of informal social control, resulting in variations in these two measures of performance in the PRC.

The lack of association with performance ratings may be explained by the finding that DUI/DWI offenders had significantly shorter stays in the PRC than those charged with other offenses (68 days compared to 100 days ($p < .01$)). It is possible that with a shorter length of time in which the PRC unit staff had to get to know a participant, the less likely they were to favorably rate the resident's performance. This explanation has some anecdotal support -- while coding the performance rating data, I observed that at least one PRC unit tended to code most of the first ratings with the scores in the middle of the range. As the months went by, ratings appeared more specific to the individual's performance. While receiving low or poor performance ratings can result in less freedom while in residence at the PRC, participants were generally revoked from the PRC for serious behavioral infractions rather than poor performance on monthly ratings. Of the 75 residents who were revoked from the PRC program and discharged unsuccessfully, 71 case files contained information on why the participant was revoked (Appendix H, Table H-4). The top three reasons for revocation were 1) broke PRC rules (including participated in a sexual relationship, threatened staff or another PRC resident, terminated from their job for cause), 2) tested positive for drugs on urinalysis, and 3) were unaccountable in the community.

The third finding of note is that in this study, person offenders are positively associated with adjustment actions. Reviewing prior research on infractions and work release populations, the finding in this study is unexpected. Turner and Petersilia (1996) found that older, white, first time offenders, and offenders convicted of person crimes (e.g., robbery and assault) (when compared to offenders with cocaine and/or crack abuse history) are the least likely to incur a rule infraction while participating in a work release

program. However, in the Turner & Petersilia study, those convicted of very serious person offenses (e.g., murder and rape) were excluded from participation in the work release facility. The SSS contains an individual item (item #1a within the criminal history section of the classification scale) which captures the seriousness of the instant offense (and if a VOP, the original offense was scored). Those who committed a serious offense such as murder, a violent sex crime, armed robbery, kidnapping, arson and escape received 0 points for this item (MCPRC, 1989a). Of the 109 person offenders in the sample, 28 (or 26%) received 0 points on this item (Appendix H, Table H-5). Thus, it is likely that the current project sample was substantially different from the Turner & Petersilia 1996 sample. Of note, however, is that the positive association found here between those who commit person offenses and adjustment actions is consistent with other research endeavors that examine incarcerated, not specifically work release, populations (see Bottoms, 1999; Collie & Polaschek, 2003).

While correlations provide an indicator of the strength of association among these variables, it is important to note that bivariate correlations, by design, do not include other factors that may be driving these relationships; these findings could be spurious and subject to omitted variable bias. Consequently, the next section discusses the results of the multivariate regression analyses which does allow for inclusion of additional explanatory variables. The regression analysis focuses on the total Selection Suitability Scale score and component scores and whether or not these scores, and the readily available demographic and criminal history variables, predict PRC performance.

Predictive Efficacy of Demographic and Criminal History Variables

Echoing prior research on predictors of offender behavior within the criminal justice system (e.g., infractions while incarcerated and measures of recidivism), age had the most consistent relationship with all performance measures. Race predicted both performance ratings and adjustment actions. Older and white offenders are more likely to succeed in this type of community corrections setting than younger and non-white offenders. Older offenders may be more established, with a good job and with stronger bonds to prosocial others. Another possibility is that older offenders, over their criminal career, have gained experience at operating successfully in institutional settings – they are able to follow the rules until released. Older offenders may also be ready to desist from crime and the criminal lifestyle, and a positive performance in the PRC is a proxy of their intent to change.

Non-white offenders (who also tend to be young) do not succeed as well in the PRC as white offenders in performance ratings and adjustment actions; they have lower ratings and are more likely to incur infractions. This is consistent with research by Goetting and Howson, (1986), who found that young and black offenders were more likely to violate institutional rules. Adjustment actions are also likely to be directly or indirectly (e.g., indicating an overall poor performance) reflected in the participant's performance ratings.

Three of the criminal history variables proved significant in predicting performance. Across all three models, when compared to drug offenders, property offenders had lower performance ratings. Contrary to expectations, DUI/DWI offenders, who are generally older and therefore are more likely to perform better than other PRC

program participants, also had lower performance ratings than drug offenders. This negative relationship between DUI/DWI offenders and performance ratings was only in the model that included the SSS component scores. Finally, when either the SSS total score or the SSS components scores were examined, offenders charged with a felony were more likely to incur an adjustment action than those charged with a misdemeanor. Each of these three findings are discussed below. None of the remaining criminal history variables examined predicted performance ratings, adjustment actions, or successful discharge.

DUI/DWI offenders had lower performance ratings when compared to drug offenders but only in the model which included the SSS component scores ($p < .05$). There are several possible explanations for this result. First, this relationship is significant only for performance ratings and only in one model – DUI/DWI offenders are not significantly different than other offenders, when compared to drug offenders, on adjustment actions or discharge status. As such, it is possible that one or several of the variables in the model containing the SSS components may be slightly collinear, resulting in the appearance of this significant relationship, when otherwise it does not exist. Second, as noted in the discussion of the correlation results, DUI/DWI offenders participated in the PRC for a substantially shorter period than other offender types, which may not allow PRC staff sufficient time to get to know the participant, which is then reflected in their performance ratings. Third, as DUI/DWI offenders are older than other offender types in this sample (see Appendix H, Table H-3), and as age is a strong predictor both in this project and in prior research (although generally in the opposite direction), then it is plausible that age may play a role in relationship between performance ratings and DUI/DWI offenders.

I ran a partial correlation, which after controlling for age and including all of the SSS components (but excluding the remaining demographic and criminal history variables), this test revealed that the finding that DUI/DWI offenders have significantly lower performance ratings lost significance (Appendix H, Table H-6). In short, this finding is not robust and it would be premature to consider a change in the PRC procedures based on this evidence.

The finding that property offenders had lower performance ratings than drug offenders may be explained by differential exposure to 12-step programs. Drug offenders, as part of their treatment plan, are more likely to participate in 12 step self-help groups, which encourage pro-social values and ties to other recovering individuals. Studies have shown that 12 step self-help groups have been effective in improving psychological and social functioning (Tonigan, Miller & Connors, 2000) and offenders who attend 12-step meetings may be benefiting from the experience. This, in turn, may lead to better performance ratings than those charged with a property offense. Data captured from PRC participant files included the average number of AA/NA meetings attended per week. Proportionally speaking, property offenders were less likely to attend at least one 12 step meeting weekly than drug offenders (Appendix H, Table H-7). Of the property offenders with data on participation in AA/NA meetings, 28% did not go to weekly 12-step meetings. In contrast, only 2 (or 3%) of the 70 participants identified as drug offenders did not attend a self-help meeting on a weekly basis. The fact that so few drug offenders did not attend 12-step meetings compared to property offenders makes sense, as property offenders may not have had a substance abuse problem which required their participation.

Finding that offenders charged with a felony are more likely to incur an adjustment action than those charged with a misdemeanor when the SSS total and component scores are included in the model is not surprising. The identification of felony offenders, although based on the most serious current or original VOP offense is intended to denote the more serious offender. Offenders with more serious criminal records are more likely to incur infractions (Goetting & Howson, 1986).

In conclusion, age is the most consistent predictor of performance in the PRC, followed by race. There are no significant differences by gender, and with a few exceptions, most criminal history variables fail to significantly predict performance outcomes. In the next section, I focus on the predictive power of the SSS.

Predictive Efficacy of the SSS

For all outcomes, the SSS predicts performance as expected. Those with higher scores on the SSS had higher performance ratings on average than those with lower scores, were less likely to have an adjustment action, and were more likely to be discharged successfully. The validity of this SSS tool is enhanced by the consistency of these results.

Breaking the SSS into components, I found that five of the components (employment history, screener's assessment, primary/secondary identification, personal data and failure indicators) were also related to program success but their effects varied, depending on the outcome examined. Applicants who had higher scores on the employment history component also scored higher on their last performance rating. They were also more likely to be discharged successfully. As we know from the earlier discussion, this component captures aspects of the applicant's past and present work

history including number of months employed, the quality of their current position, the highest level of skill ever attained by the applicant, and their employer's needs. That employment matters for performance ratings and discharge status is not surprising for two reasons. First, the PRC is a work release facility that strongly values and emphasizes employment as a condition of program participation. Second, prior research has evidenced that work provides mechanisms of informal social control through the bonds which develop between workers, co-workers, and employers, prompting increased prosocial behavior (Sampson & Laub, 1993). Work that is meaningful to the individual is more likely to foster the interdependency required to form social bonds. As such, those applicants who score higher on the employment history component are more likely to be engaged in meaningful employment with stronger prosocial bonds and behaviors. In addition, those who have a good and/or stable job history are more likely to do well in other areas contained in the performance ratings which mirror those qualities required to retain such a position. These include daily problem solving skills, punctuality, and interpersonal functioning with others. Consequently, those who score higher on the employment history component may perform better overall, thus leading to a successful discharge from the facility.

The screener's assessment component also positively predicted performance ratings. This component measures the applicant's acceptance of responsibility for their actions, their motivation to change, and how honest they were in the interview process. This measure also incorporated how likely candidates were to succeed in the PRC, and the probability they would recidivate. One of the performance rating scale areas is

“accepts responsibility for own actions” and if the applicant does so in the interview, it is reasonable to believe that this will carry into their behavior while living in the PRC.

In support of the Mason (1979) study, applicants who were designated as one of the undesirable SSS Big 6 were less likely to be discharged successfully. Mason created and tested each of the individual primary/secondary identifications separately in his study but he did not include those who were revoked from the PRC prior to the completion of their sentence. While the current project included all cases regardless of discharge status, the 6 undesirable types were aggregated into one measure. Additional research needs to separate out each of the SSS Big 6 types to determine which of the primary/secondary designations matters the most and at what point in the PRC process (e.g., within the first few months of PRC participation, at the end of participation, and/or at discharge). If specific primary/secondary ID types are found to be more at risk for failure in the PRC, then those individuals could be targeted for more intensive attention and services.

Finally, in looking at adjustment actions, two components were significant predictors. Those who scored higher on personal data and failure indicators were less likely to incur an adjustment action. Personal data categorically captures both the age of the applicant and the existence of family bonds (presence of a spouse/partner and dependents). This finding has support in prior research efforts which found that marital and parental status are negatively related to incurring an adjustment action -- married offenders with children are less likely to incur infractions (Acevedo & Bakken, 2003; Turner & Petersilia, 1996).

The failure indicator component captures up to four areas that may impact a PRC resident’s performance – residential stability, substance use, mental health, and escapes

or attempted escapes from a correctional facility in the prior 5 years. A higher score on this component denotes an applicant who has either not moved, or moved only once from their current residence within the prior 12 months, has a limited or no escape history, and has few or no psychological and/or substance use problems. The aggregation of these varied items within this single component limits my ability to substantively link this finding to prior research, however, the significance of the results suggests that scores on this SSS component may be consistent with prior research on offenders with mental health and/or substance use issues, and their increased likelihood of institutional infractions (see Jiang, 2005; McCorkle, 1995; Toch & Adams, 1986; Turner & Petersilia, 1996). Another possibility is that those who score higher on the failure indicators component are generally less troubled. These individuals would likely have less difficulty assimilating and complying with the PRC rules, resulting in lower likelihood of incurring an infraction.

A note of caution related to the preceding discussion -- future research efforts might disaggregate the components into their individual items to determine, more precisely, the nature of the relationships stated herein. While one can posit why a high or low score on the component may explain a high or low score on performance ratings, whether a participant was discharged successfully, or incurred an adjustment action, until each item of the Selection Suitability Scale is tested, the exact nature of these relationships is uncertain. To test whether this idea has merit, I disaggregated the employment history component by item, and analyzed two models for each of the three outcomes (Appendix H, Table H-8). The first model regressed the outcome measures on the SSS employment component score, controlling for age, gender and race. The second

model incorporated the 4 individual items within the employment component (work history, job quality, job skill, and employer need) in lieu of the total employment score. Results indicate that the employment component score significantly and positively predicted performance ratings, adjustment actions and discharge status (at $p < .05$ or better). Disaggregating the component by item, I found that none of the individual items predicted performance ratings but the work history item (number of months employed in the previous 2 years) predicted both whether or not the applicant had an adjustment action ($p < .05$) and successful discharge ($p < .01$). Consistent with the other findings of this study, age was highly predictive across outcomes and models, while race predicted both adjustment actions and performance ratings. None of the other variables were predictive. These findings suggest that it may be unnecessary to capture all of the information contained within the 4 items in this component, as only 1 of the 4 is predictive of performance. Further research of the SSS individual items appears warranted.

The main goal of this study was to determine whether or not the SSS, in whole and in part, improved our ability to predict who would perform well (or poorly) in the PRC when compared to demographic and criminal history variables alone. Below, I highlight the empirical findings as they relate to this goal and then discuss the feasibility of using only readily available institutional data.

Does the SSS Improve Upon Readily Available Institutional Data?

The SSS does improve upon readily available institutional data. Comparing the SSS total score in Model 2 to demographic and criminal history variables alone in Model 1, I find the SSS improves our ability to predict all three outcomes – performance ratings,

adjustment actions, and discharge status. In addition, for performance ratings and discharge status, when comparing Model 3, containing the SSS components, to Model 2, the SSS components added to the variance explained when compared to model containing the total SSS score. However, in all cases, the degree of improvement over using demographic and criminal history variables alone was modest; an improvement in the variance explained, as evidenced by R^2 or pseudo R^2 , from less 1% to 3%.

These findings may lead one to conclude that given the expense in time and resources of conducting intake interviews and calculating the SSS scores, it would be more efficient to use readily available information from the institutional files. However, of the demographic variables available, only age was predictive across all outcomes and models, and race was significant across the three models predicting performance ratings and adjustment actions. Further, only three of the criminal history variables were significantly related to PRC performance -- property and DUI/DWI offenders (when compared to drug offenders) predict performance ratings, and those charged with a felony were more likely to incur an adjustment action.

Prior criminological research has shown, time and again, that older offenders are more likely to desist in criminal offending, incur fewer infractions while incarcerated (Goetting & Howson, 1986) and have better post-release outcomes than younger offenders (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Uggen, 2000). But, while age may be acceptable selection criteria, it is not practical. While the average age of PRC participants in this sample was 33, the range was broad – from 18 to age 67. To use age as a predictor for selection into the program, the PRC would have to choose a cut-point whereby those older than the cut-point would participate in the PRC, while the

remaining, younger, applicants would not. Using an age cut-point would require additional research to determine the appropriate cut-point for the PRC population. For instance, the present study results could be repeated, but separating out the sample by age groups to determine at what age individuals in the PRC show an improvement in the performance measures.

Another option may be to base the cut-point on findings in the existing literature. Uggen (2000) found that offenders age 27 and older reported better outcomes than those under 27. If the PRC denied admittance to those below the age cut-point, many offenders returning from jail and prison would be released directly to the community, without the benefit of receiving PRC services that might make the difference in their successful re-entry into the community. In the current sample, eliminating all applicants who were 26 and younger would have prohibited 34% of the population from participating in, and benefiting from, PRC services. Further, utilizing an age cut-point as selection criteria would result in the PRC “skimming the cream” of the population -- selecting only those who have aged or are aging out of their criminal behavior and are more likely to do well regardless of services provided by the program.

Race was also a significant predictor – white PRC residents have higher performance ratings and are less likely to incur an adjustment action than non-white residents. However, to admit or deny applicants the opportunity to participate in the PRC based on their race is both problematic and prejudicial. Federal and state laws prohibit the use of race in custodial classification decisions. While the PRC is a work release program housed in the community it remains a correctional facility and admittance or rejection into the program is a custodial classification decision.

As race and criminal history measures are confounded, this further complicates the utilization of these factors as selection criteria for admittance to the PRC. As noted, among the criminal history variables examined, two were significantly predictive. Property offenders, when compared to drug offenders, had significantly lower ratings on the composite performance ratings scale across all the three models (demographics and criminal history alone, adding the SSS total score, and significant SSS components). Secondly, those PRC residents charged with a felony were more likely to incur an adjustment action, but only when the model included either the SSS total or component scores. While these types of measures of offender seriousness may help to inform aspects of the selection decision making process, to do so may be problematic. Evidence suggests that criminal records are not racially neutral and this affects whether offenders are perceived as higher risk offenders than others. This is particularly true if the measures encapsulate the applicant's criminal career (e.g., number of prior periods of incarceration, number times on parole and probation).

Despite largely successful efforts to eliminate racial and ethnic discrimination and institute a "color-blind" justice system, racial disparities remain.⁵⁴ From arrest (Smith & Visher, 1981), to formal petitioning and secure detention (Sampson & Laub, 1993), to the likelihood of detention prior to trial which increases the probability of incarceration, and an increased prison term (Spohn & Cederblom, 1991) to sentencing for both African Americans and Hispanics (Spohn, 2000); disparities exist. For example, in the sentencing literature, research shows that extralegal factors play a role in sentencing decisions even after controlling for relevant factors including, but not limited to, severity of offense and

⁵⁴ Racial discrimination in criminal justice happens when "officials make ad hoc decisions based on race rather than clearly defined objective standards" while disparity occurs "when such standards are applied but have different results for different racial groups" (Petersilia & Turner, 1987, p. 153).

criminal history (Bushway & Piehl, 2001; Mustard 2001; Spohn, 2000; Steffensmeier & Demuth, 2000; Zatz, 2000). Evaluations of state and Federal sentencing guidelines that look at decisions to incarcerate (or not) and length of sentence found that African American and Hispanic minorities generally are treated more harshly. Consequently, they are more likely to have more serious criminal records, and thus would be viewed as higher risk applicants.

It is possible that the instant offense seriousness measures used in this study (charge types (e.g., person, property, drug, DUI/DWI and VOP) and class of offenses (felony versus misdemeanor)) are less racially-biased than utilizing items that capture the individual's criminal history.⁵⁵ The limitations to these measures have been noted previously – including include the lack of offender specialization and offenders are not charged with the totality of crimes they committed either because authorities have insufficient evidence, or charges were dropped to facilitate a guilty plea. Consequently, this offense measure may still be both an inadequate and biased measure of offender seriousness. Additional research on measures of offender history and seriousness are necessary to determine whether these variables are suitable as selection criteria for admittance to the PRC. The evidence at this juncture does not warrant consideration of changes in the PRC selection policy.

For all of the outcomes examined, the results of this study indicate that the predictive power of the SSS is a modest improvement over demographic and criminal history variables alone. Reviewing the results of the SSS component scores, employment

⁵⁵ In these data, offense type (person, property, drug, DUI/DWI and VOP) were subjected to a chi-square test for significant differences by race (white vs. non-white). Results indicated that only two of the offense types differed by race – DUI/DWI offenders were more likely to be white, and VOP offenders were more likely to be non-white.

history was predictive for both performance ratings and discharge status, while the screener's assessment resulted in an increase in the variance explained over both Model 1 (demographics and criminal history variables alone) and Model 2 (which added the SSS total score) in performance ratings. Being identified as one of the undesirable primary/secondary SSS Big 6 was predictive of discharge status over and above both Model 1 and Model 2. However, this was not the case for predicting adjustment actions – while the SSS total score and SSS component scores both significantly improved our predictive capacity beyond demographics and criminal history variables alone for this outcome, the SSS component scores did not improve over the model containing the SSS total score. In order to explore all three outcome measures, both the total SSS score and the SSS component scores should be subjected to further research. While the improvements in the predictive efficacy of the SSS total score and component scores are modest, this study is but a first step in the research process; further explorations of these data are warranted. Study limitations and future research plans follow.

Study Limitations and Future Research

This study has several important limitations, some of which will be addressed in future research endeavors. First and foremost, these results were not cross validated. In the prediction literature, a number of researchers emphasize the importance of validating risk assessment instruments both in terms of accuracy and whether the instrument is appropriate for the population for which the tool will be used (Brumbaugh & Steffey, 2005; Glaser, 1987; Meehl & Rosen, 1955; Wright, Clear, & Dickson, 1984). Clear (1984 as cited in Brumbaugh & Steffey, 2005) detailed the five steps to designing and validating risk instruments, and the key to this strategy is the incorporation of a two

sample design – the construction sub-sample and the validation sub-sample.

Cross-validation provides an “empirical approach to the problem of attempting to obtain an unbiased estimate of the accuracy of predictions” (Gottfredson, 1987, p. 27). As the present study did not utilize a cross-validation design, the results may be the consequence of this particular sample of PRC residents, may not generalize to other PRC program participants, and both specific coefficients and percentages of variance accounted for in this study may change in new samples

One way to approach this limitation in the future would be to collect another PRC sample and conduct the study again. However, the PRC has made a number of institutional changes in late 2004 through 2006, including a new performance rating system based on the resident achieving set goals or tasks in the treatment plan, rather than on the monthly performance ratings assessed by the staff. In addition, while PRC screeners still conduct the intake interview as they have in prior years, they no longer score the Selection Suitability Scale. Thus, a sample pulled from this latter period would not have comparable selection scores or performance measures.

Another option would be to select a new sample in the same time period of 2001 to 2004. However, as all of the women who participated in the PRC in this time period were included in the present project, the cross validation sample would have to consist only of male subjects. As there were no significant differences in these findings by gender, this may be a good option to address this study limitation. Alternatively, a different time period could be selected which would include both men and women, but this would have to be prior to 2001 because of the institutional changes noted above.

A second major limitation is the limited range of criminal history variables included in the analysis. Several criminal history variables shown in prior research to be effective at predicting outcomes were excluded including number of prior arrests, number of prior convictions, and age of first arrest. As noted in footnote 30, number of prior arrests and number of prior convictions were readily available to the institution. However, I did not collect these data. While age at first arrest was contained in the PRC files, this information was based on self-reported data. As the PRC does not access juvenile records, the information was not readily available to the institution, and consequently was excluded from this study. Excluding these key variables may overestimate the predictive power of the SSS when compared to basic demographic and criminal history variables. Conversely, not all of the components in the SSS were included in either the total score or by component; the 3 components capturing the criminal history of the applicant were excluded. Therefore, it is possible that this examination underestimates the predictive power of the SSS. Further research is needed.

Third, the modest strength of the findings may be due to how the variables were constructed. In constructing the independent and dependent variables, I reduced the data for to ease analysis. I examined the total SSS score and the component SSS scores, and I created a composite scale of performance ratings. However, all of these measures can be further separated into individual items and assessed. It may be that individual items are particularly salient for prediction, but these effects are masked when a more global or composite measure is used. Specifically, 13 of the 18 performance ratings were averaged to create a single outcome measure. While providing an overall assessment of performance ratings, the reality is that residents could have scored well in one

performance area, while poorly in another. By averaging the performance ratings, I cannot address how well the SSS predicts any particular area -- job performance, or accountability or participation in a recovery program.

Similarly, adjustment actions were dichotomized for this project. It may be that whether or not a PRC resident had an adjustment action was too crudely constructed to reflect an accurate predictive value of the SSS total or component scores. Even if I had used the number of adjust actions as an outcome variable, this would have failed to differentiate between types of adjustment actions. The different types of adjustment actions (such as unaccountability in community or testing positive for drugs or alcohol, are both much more serious offenses than being 10 minutes late to the group meeting) are not currently available, as I coded the total number, not whether it was a formal or informal or type of adjustment. While I have the information needed to capture these distinctions, the data are qualitative, not quantitative. Likewise, I coded those who transferred to the electronic monitoring unit (CART) as successful discharges. This may have overestimated the probability of success because while the individual has been discharged to the community, they are still under the supervision of the PRC. Future research projects can define discharge more precisely and incorporate the discharge status when released from CART.

Fourth, all of the measures of the resident's behavior are interconnected -- in the event a resident incurs an adjustment action, this can impact both performance ratings and/or discharge status. As noted in the footnote 3 of Chapter I, PRC residents have the opportunity to progress through a series of phases -- and with every increasing phase there are more privileges (movement around the facility) and freedoms (e.g., access to home

passes) than in a lower phase. Performance ratings are tied to phase movement and residents who perform well advance accordingly. Conversely, residents who perform poorly can be demoted to a lower phase. In the event a resident incurs an adjustment action, this may impact their performance ratings, a return to a lower phase, and possibly discharge status. There may be differences in the validity of the SSS on outcomes if these data were examined with a method to capture the timing of these events. While I did not capture dates of adjustment actions in the data, I did record the dates of phase movement and whenever a phase was repeated, and how often that occurred. There may be differences in the validity of the SSS on outcomes if these data were examined with a method to capture the timing of events. In essence, this would examine time to failure using surviving analysis techniques.

There are many directions to go from this first study of participants in the Montgomery County Pre-Release Center. Utilizing the performance scores, discharge status and other available performance measures, future research efforts should include a comparison group of those who applied to the PRC but did not enter and assess whether or not the SSS predicts recidivism. Refinement of the variables used, the inclusion of a comparison group in a study of recidivism, and utilizing survival analysis to capture timing will further inform these findings.

Chapter VI: Conclusion

The Selection Suitability Scale (SSS) is composed of many factors commonly found to be predictive of offender outcomes once they have been released from incarceration. This study provided insight into the actuarial efficacy of the factors contained in the SSS in a way not previously explored. None of the prior literature reviewed examined these factors on these types of measures of offender performance while under custodial control.

The results of this study indicate that despite the limited predictive validity of the SSS, it does perform as expected and future research with the instrument is warranted. As such, I recommend that the institution continue to experiment with this instrument to determine how in the future it might utilize and even add to the information in selecting offenders into the program. One suggestion is to add back the criminal history components excluded from this study, as well as disaggregating the SSS components and performance ratings into individual items and conducting further analysis. The general conclusion, however, is that these modest findings about the predictive power of the SSS should not unduly chill additional experimentation either with this or other predictive tools.

Table 1. Summary of Research Findings

| Citation | Sample Description | N | Outcome(s) | Findings |
|--|---|------------|---|---|
| Work Release (WR) as a Crime Reduction Strategy | | | | |
| <i>Hecht, 1971 cited by Katz & Decker, 1982</i> | Work Release vs. Parole Releases | Not Stated | Parole Revocation; Incarceration | Favorable: WR fewer revocations and reincarceration than comparison group. |
| <i>Lowenkamp, Latessa & Holsinger, 2006</i> | Residential vs. Non-Residential | 13,676 | Return to Prison | Favorable: Residential lower recidivism; Length of stay promotes better outcomes for high risk |
| <i>Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2005</i> | Probation, Parole or Post-Release Offenders | 13,107 | Arrest; Incarceration | Mixed: Risk level mediates treatment effects. High risk offenders in TX group recidivated less; TX group Low/Low Moderate risk recidivated more than similar risk offenders vs. comparison. |
| <i>Marion, 2002</i> | Work Release completers vs. prison releases | Not Stated | Arrest; Conviction; Incarceration | Favorable: WR rates of recidivism lower than those in a correctional setting; 5 year follow-up. |
| <i>Petersilia, 2003</i> | Day Reporting Center (DRC) vs. Matched Comparison | Not Stated | Arrest; Incarceration | Favorable: 35% DRC reincarcerated vs. 52% Comparison group; 3 year follow-up |
| <i>Turner & Petersilia, 1996</i> | Released state prisoners in Work Release | 965 | WR completion; Infractions; Revocations; Arrest while in WR | Favorable: 70% completed WR with 0 or 1 rule infraction, 0 arrests, 0 revocations vs. 30% revoked – alcohol & drug possession; minor infractions; no violent crimes |
| <i>Turner & Petersilia, 1996</i> | Work Release vs. State Prison Releases | 218 | Arrest; Employment | Mixed: No difference in arrest rates, WR more favorable employment; 1 year follow-up |
| <i>Waldo & Chiricos, 1977</i> | Work Release vs. Matched Comparison | 269 | Recidivism | No Difference between WR and comparison group |
| <i>Waldo, Chiricos & Dobrin, 1973</i> | WR vs. Non-WR Randomly Assigned | 269 | Attitude; Self-Esteem | Mixed/Negative: No difference in perceived opportunity and Motivation; Decline in self-esteem; 6 month follow-up |

Table 1. Summary of Research Findings (Page 2)

| Citation | Sample Description | N | Outcome(s) | Findings |
|--|---|----------|---|--|
| Institutional Misconduct: Demographic and Situational Factors | | | | |
| <i>Acevedo & Bakken, 2003</i> | Female offenders | 222 | Disciplinary infractions | Married inmates had fewer infractions; Age and parental status matter: women with children are older and are less likely to commit infractions; and are less likely to be incarcerated for a violent offense; Race differences: black women more likely to be violent. |
| <i>Camp, et al., 2003</i> | Federal prisoners | 120,855 | Inmate misconduct | Race not significant once control for violence; young male offenders more likely to act out. |
| <i>Collie & Polaschek, 2003</i> | Female prisoners in New Zealand | 886 | Assault; Disorderly conduct; Substance possession and use | Women are less likely commit infractions but when they do, they are less violent; Those convicted of violent offenses are more likely to incur prison infractions. |
| <i>Goetting & Howson (1986)</i> | Prison inmates | 5,000 | Rule violations | Young, black, unemployed males (at time of incarceration) with a more serious criminal history are more likely to violate rules; Failed to find a relationship with martial status, education, substance use or income. |
| <i>Jiang, 2005</i> | National sample of state prisoners | 12,472 | Rule violations substance use and non-substance | Inmates with substance abuse are more likely to incur infractions; Race differences interact with more serious criminal history. Black offenders violate non-substance rules; White offenders violate substance use rules. |
| <i>Toch & Adams, 1986</i> | State inmates who received mental health vs. those who did not. | 9,085 | Disciplinary infractions | Inmates with stable employment histories were less likely to incur disciplinary actions |
| <i>Turner & Petersilia, 1996</i> | State prisoners in Work Release | 965 | Rule infractions | Race, martial, education, employment, criminal history, & substance use related to infractions. |

Table 1. Summary of Research Findings (Page 3)

| Citation | Sample Description | N | Outcome(s) | Findings |
|--|--|----------|---|--|
| Institutional Misconduct: Psychological and Personality Factors | | | | |
| <i>Loper, 2003</i> | Incarcerated women diagnosed with a personality disorder | 116 | Disciplinary infractions; Self-reported misconduct | Psychological: Offender behavior differs by personality disorder (e.g., Impaired Limits more violent and incur more self-report infractions). |
| <i>McCorkle, 1995</i> | Male and female state inmates who received mental health services vs. those who did not. | 11,500 | Self-reported infractions | Psychological: Those receiving mental services more likely to incur infractions than those not receiving services; Gender and race differences black women more likely to report infractions. |
| <i>Toch & Adams, 1986</i> | Inmates who received mental health services vs. those who did not. | 9,085 | Disciplinary infractions | Psychological: Those treated for mental health more likely to incur infractions; those more severely ill (e.g., schizophrenic, antisocial) highest rate of infractions; those treated for mental health with fewer coping skills were more likely to act out and to use violence. |
| <i>Goodstein, 1979</i> | State prisoners from three institutions of varying security levels | 470 | Attitudes re: rehabilitation and satisfaction; Rule violations | Personality: type and race effect: “Rebellious Inmate” more likely to be younger, non-white, with juvenile record more likely to violate rules. |
| <i>Kinlock, O’Grady, & Hanlon 2003</i> | Male and female participants in a community corrections release program | 188 | Self-reported infractions; Reclassification | Personality: Offender behavior differs by type: passive-aggressive more likely to be reclassified; self-defeating less likely to report infractions |
| <i>Van Voorhis, 1993</i> | Federal Offenders | 179 | Disciplinary infractions; Staff assessments; Self-reports | Personality: Behavior differs by type, and interacts with race (young black character disordered inmates more likely to incur official infractions and self-report aggressive behavior). |

Table 1. Summary of Research Findings (Page 4)

| Citation | Sample Description | N | Outcome(s) | Findings |
|--|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Prediction in Criminal Justice – Stable Predictors, Gender and Race | | | | |
| <i>Bonta, Law & Hanson, 1998</i> | Meta-Analysis Predictors of mental disordered offenders vs. non-disordered | 58 Studies | Recidivism and Violent Recidivism | Stable Predictors: Criminal history, substance use and antisocial personality consistent for general and violent recidivism across 64 samples. |
| <i>Gendreau, Little & Goggin, 1996</i> | Meta-Analysis Predictors of adult offenders | 131 Studies | Recidivism | Stable Predictors: Static - criminal history most predictive; Dynamic: antisocial personality, companions and criminogenic needs. Factors which predict poorly include family criminality, SES, IQ, personal distress (anxiety, depression) |
| <i>Pritchard, 1979</i> | Literature Review Predictors of adult offenders | 71 Studies | Recidivism | Stable Predictors: Static: age at first arrest, prior convictions; Dynamic: income, employment stability, opiate, alcohol use. |
| <i>Hubbard & Pratt, 2002</i> | Meta-Analysis Predictors of female delinquents | | Delinquency | Gender: Strongest predictors are anti-social peers and history of anti-social behavior, anti-social personality, school relationships, and a history of physical or sexual abuse. |
| <i>Petersilia & Turner, 1987</i> | Probationers, prisoners and all convicted felons | 16,000 | Recidivism | Race: Association weak factors related to race but not recidivism except employment. Black probationers less likely to be employed and more likely to be re-arrested if unemployed. |

Table 1. Summary of Research Findings (Page 5)

| Citation | Sample Description | N | Outcome(s) | Findings |
|---------------------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|--|
| Prior PRC Research | | | | |
| <i>Hughes, 1996</i> | PRC participants who successfully completed program vs. matched comparison group released from Jail | 335 | Arrest; Conviction | PRC participants significantly less likely to be re-arrested than comparison (55% vs. 74%) and less likely to be convicted (28% vs. 55%). Jail group 2.5 times more likely to recidivate; 33 month follow-up |
| <i>Mason, 1979</i> | PRC participants who successfully completed program | 660 | Release Status; Recidivism | Age related to successful release and recidivism, skill level associated with release; but skill and age are confounded; 1 year follow-up. Four of the primary/secondary classifications perform better on outcomes: Inadequate Immature/Emotional Dysfunction, Alcohol/Emotional Dysfunction, Socialized Deviance/Alcohol, Situational/No Secondary. Six classifications worse on outcomes: Inadequate Immature/No secondary, Inadequate Immature/Drugs, Drugs/Emotional Dysfunction, Socialized Deviance/Inadequate Immature, Emotional Dysfunction/ Drugs, and Unsocialized Aggressive/No Secondary |

Table 2. Sample Demographics

| | N | Freq. | Range | Mean (SD) |
|---|----------|--------------|--------------|------------------|
| Age at Transfer to PRC | 600 | 600 | 18 to 67 | 33.39 (10.06) |
| Gender | 600 | | | |
| Male | | 427 | | |
| Female ⁵⁶ | | 173 | | |
| Race/Ethnicity | 600 | | | |
| White | | 257 | | |
| Black | | 265 | | |
| Latino, White-Latino, Black-Latino | | 64 | | |
| Asian and Indian | | 13 | | |
| Native American/Alaskan | | 1 | | |
| Marital Status | 596 | | | |
| Married | | 90 | | |
| Single | | 191 | | |
| Girlfriend/Boyfriend | | 241 | | |
| Divorced/Separated/Widowed | | 74 | | |
| Length of Involvement in Current Relationship (in Years) | 600 | 281 | 1 to 40 | 6.71 (6.58) |
| Not Applicable/Not Involved | | 269 | | |
| Less than 1 Year | | 50 | | |
| 1 to 2 Years | | 84 | | |
| 3 to 5 Years | | 82 | | |
| 6 to 9 Years | | 49 | | |
| 10 to 15 Years | | 35 | | |
| 16 Years or More | | 31 | | |
| Number of Dependents | 600 | | 0 to 11 | 1.38 (1.52) |
| Those with Children | | 387 | 1 to 11 | 2.18 (1.51) |
| Number Living with PRC Applicant | | | 0 to 6 | .64 (1.02) |
| Number Who are Adults (over 18) | | | 0 to 9 | .37 (.97) |
| Employment Status Intake Interview | 600 | | | |
| Employed | | 242 | | |
| Unemployed | | 358 | | |
| Number of Months Employed Last 24 | | | 0 to 24 | 12.92 (9.49) |

⁵⁶ As this is the population of women, this value is mu (μ), not the mean.

Table 2. Sample Demographics (Page 2)

| | N | Freq. | Range | Mean (SD) |
|---|----------|--------------|--------------|------------------|
| Education (In Years) | 600 | | 0 to 20 | 11.53 (2.75) |
| Highest Grade Achieved | 600 | | | |
| Less than High School | | 171 | | |
| GED | | 87 | | |
| High School | | 173 | | |
| Some College | | 128 | | |
| College Graduate/Graduate Work/Degree | | 41 | | |
| School Disciplinary Actions | 600 | | | |
| Number in Sample Ever Suspended | | 260 | | |
| Number of Times Suspended ⁵⁷ | | | 1 to 10 | 3.17 (3.08) |
| Number in Sample Ever Expelled | | 64 | | |
| Number of Times Expelled | | | 1 to 5 | 1.17 (.66) |
| U.S. Citizen? | 600 | | | |
| Yes | | 552 | | |
| No | | 48 | | |
| Primary Language⁵⁸ | 600 | | | |
| English | | 552 | | |
| Spanish | | 54 | | |
| Other | | 2 | | |
| Literacy (in English) | 600 | | | |
| Literate | | 543 | | |
| Fair | | 34 | | |
| Poor | | 4 | | |
| Illiterate | | 19 | | |
| Religious Involvement? | 600 | | | |
| Yes | | 311 | | |
| No | | 289 | | |
| Self-Esteem on Scale 1 to 10 (Higher value = more positive) | 565 | | 1 to 10 | 7.26 (1.92) |

⁵⁷ Thirty-four PRC Applicants indicated they had been suspended either 10 or more times, thus the data is truncated at 10 times suspended

⁵⁸ Not mutually exclusive - PRC Applicants may identify more than 1 primary language.

Table 3. Intake Interview and Selection Suitability Scale

| | N | Freq. | Range | Mean (SD) |
|---|-----|-------|----------|---------------|
| Intake Interview Conducted At: | 595 | | | |
| County Detention Center | | 396 | | |
| Pre-Release Center | | 177 | | |
| Other Location | | 22 | | |
| Intake Interview Conducted By: | 599 | | | |
| Interviewer 1 | | 160 | | |
| Interviewer 2 | | 10 | | |
| Interviewer 3 | | 208 | | |
| Interviewer 4 | | 78 | | |
| Interviewer 5 | | 89 | | |
| Interviewer 6 | | 7 | | |
| Interviewer 7 | | 1 | | |
| Interviewer 8 | | 29 | | |
| Interviewer 9 | | 10 | | |
| Interviewer 10 | | 5 | | |
| Interviewer 11 | | 2 | | |
| Selection Suitability Scale (SSS) Scores | 600 | | | |
| Total SSS Score | | | 32 to 84 | 54.92 (10.44) |
| Prediction Score | | | 9 to 46 | 25.65 (7.15) |
| Classification Score | | | 14 to 43 | 27.58 (4.85) |
| Personality Assessment Score | | | 0 to 5 | 1.69 (.88) |
| SSS Total Score By Priority Level | 600 | | | |
| Low/Unsuitable | | 84 | 32 to 43 | 39.87 (2.80) |
| Medium | | 382 | 44 to 63 | 52.95 (5.35) |
| High | | 134 | 64 to 84 | 69.96 (4.72) |
| Primary/Secondary Classification | 596 | | | |
| SSS Big 6 - Undesirable Classification | 149 | | | |
| Drug/Emotional Dysfunction | | 35 | | |
| Emotional Dysfunction/Drug | | 10 | | |
| Inadequate Immature/Drug | | 3 | | |
| Social Deviant/Drug | | 49 | | |
| Social Deviant/Inadequate Immature | | 52 | | |
| Unsocialized Aggressive | | 0 | | |
| SSS Big 6 - Classification Missing | | 2 | | |
| Other | 447 | | | |

Table 3. Intake Interview and Selection Suitability Scale (page 2)

| | N | Freq. | Range | Mean (SD) |
|---|-----|-------|-------|-----------|
| Primary/Secondary (Not SSS Big 6) | 447 | | | |
| Alcohol, Drug or Poly Primary & /Social Deviant | | 339 | | |
| /ED, II, UA, or No Secondary | | 37 | | |
| Emotional Dysfunction Primary & /Alcohol, II, SD or No Secondary | | 22 | | |
| Inadequate Immature Primary & /Alcohol, ED, SD or No Secondary | | 18 | | |
| Social Deviant Primary & /Alcohol, ED, UA or No Secondary | | 23 | | |
| Other/Missing Data | | 9 | | |
| Primary Psychological Diagnosis | 600 | | | |
| None | | 237 | | |
| Antisocial Personality | | 35 | | |
| Avoidant | | 13 | | |
| Bipolar | | 28 | | |
| Borderline Personality | | 9 | | |
| Dependent Personality | | 9 | | |
| Dysthymia | | 10 | | |
| Histrionic | | 17 | | |
| Narcissist | | 43 | | |
| Compulsive/Obsessive | | 13 | | |
| Paranoid | | 5 | | |
| Passive Aggressive | | 9 | | |
| PTSD | | 28 | | |
| Sadistic | | 11 | | |
| Schizoid | | 16 | | |
| Socially Deviant | | 110 | | |
| Other | | 7 | | |
| Depression | 600 | | | |
| No Indicators of | | 358 | | |
| Mild/Episodes/Problems/Vulnerable | | 55 | | |
| Exhibits/Possible Depressed Affect | | 92 | | |
| Self-Medicating with Drugs and Alcohol | | 16 | | |
| Diagnosed | | 13 | | |
| On Medications for | | 40 | | |
| Major/Chronic | | 26 | | |

Table 4. Hypothetical Offender Portrait and Selection Suitability Scale Score

Overview: “Tony” is a 39 year old Montgomery County resident with several prior arrests and one prior conviction. Tony was raised by biological parents until his mother’s death when he was 9 years old and after her death was raised by father, sister & Grandmother. Father was a drinker and physically abusive. Tony is a high school graduate and participated in technical classes for electronics and practical cooking skills but has a poor employment history. Tony is single, not currently in a relationship and has no children. Tony engages in frequent alcohol use and daily cocaine use although he had a prior 2 year period of abstinence and participated in inpatient treatment on two occasions - 1994 and 1996. Tony is currently participating in the Jail Alcohol Services program. Tony suffers from seizures.

Criminal History: Tony was first arrested and convicted at the age of 19. His criminal record consists of eight charges, (ranging from robbery to assault with a dangerous weapon, simple assault, forgery, theft and possession of a controlled substance) however most of these charges were dismissed. He was convicted twice and received a sentence for possession of marijuana (6 months unsupervised probation) and theft under \$300 where Tony was incarcerated for 36 days. Tony’s Primary/Secondary cause of his criminal activities was identified by the screener as Poly Substance/Social Deviant.

Alert Issues/Needs: Relapse Prevention, employment assistance, independent sober housing and sober support network.

Charge: 2nd Degree Assault

Instant Offense Dates/Explanation: Tony and his girlfriend were forced to move from their housing because the house had been sold. Initially, they moved to a motel. Tony “lost track” of his girlfriend because he was incarcerated on a theft charge and also spent a period of time in the hospital. On New Years Eve, Tony located his girlfriend and went to her hotel room to get his coat. She did not want to give it to him as she was angry because she didn’t know where he had been and assumed he had been on a coke binge. Tony broke the window in the hotel room, they argued, and Tony pinned his girlfriend up against the wall by the throat. Tony indicates that he was drunk during the incident.

Sentence: 2 Years, Suspend all but 1 year

Table 4. Hypothetical Offender Portrait (Page 2)

| Prediction Scale (60) | | | | | Tony's Score | Score |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Criminal History (10) | | | | | | 5 |
| ▪ Prior # arrests | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | |
| ▪ Prior # convictions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| ▪ Prior # incarcerations | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| ▪ Age at first conviction | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | |
| 2. Employment (10) | | | | | | 2 |
| ▪ Past work pattern | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | |
| ▪ Job quality | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | |
| ▪ Skill level | 0 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | |
| ▪ Employment needs | 0 | 1 | 3 | | 0 | |
| 3. Personal Data (8) | | | | | | 4 |
| ▪ Current age | 0 | 2 | 4 | | 4 | |
| ▪ Significant caring other | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | |
| ▪ Family dependents | 0 | 2 | | | 0 | |
| 4. Failure Indicators (16) | | | | | | 7 |
| ▪ Instability of residence | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | |
| ▪ Drug abuse | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | |
| ▪ Alcohol abuse | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | |
| ▪ Suicide attempt | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| ▪ Mental hospitalization | 0 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | |
| ▪ Past escape | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | |
| ▪ None of the above | 0 | 2 | | | 0 | |
| 5. Primary/Secondary (6) | | | | | | 6 |
| ▪ Unsocialized Aggressive | 0 | | | | | |
| ▪ Drug/Emotional Dysfunction | 0 | | | | | |
| ▪ Emotional Dysfunction/Drug | 0 | | | | | |
| ▪ Socialized Deviance/Drug | 0 | | | | | |
| ▪ Inadequate Immature/Drug | 0 | | | | | |
| ▪ Socialized Dev/Inadequate Immature | 0 | | | | | |
| ▪ None of the above | 6 | | | | | |
| Prediction Score | | | | | <i>6 - Poly/SD</i> | <u>24</u> |

Table 4. Hypothetical Offender Portrait (Page 3)

| | | | | | Tony's Score | Score |
|--|----|---|---|---|-------------------------|------------------|
| Classification Scale (54) | | | | | | |
| 1. Criminal History (10) | | | | | | 5 |
| ▪ Seriousness of offense | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | |
| ▪ Crime-free period of time | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | |
| 2. Place of Residency (6) | | | | | 6 | 6 |
| 3. Situational Factors (6) | | | | | | 2 |
| ▪ Restitution/Court ordered payments | 0 | 2 | 4 | | 0 | |
| ▪ Financial contribution to household | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 0 | |
| ▪ Need for PRC treatment services | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | |
| 4. Revocation/Recidivism (8) | | | | | | 8 |
| ▪ Prior probation/parole supervision | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | |
| ▪ Prior probation /parole violation | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | |
| ▪ prior work release | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | |
| ▪ prior work release revocation | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | |
| 5. Recommendations (14) | | | | | | 4 |
| ▪ Judge | 0 | 2 | 4 | | 2 | |
| ▪ Post-Trial Coordinating Team or PSI | 0 | 2 | 4 | | 0 | |
| ▪ Parole Commission | 0 | 4 | | | 0 | |
| ▪ Institutional adjustment | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | |
| 6. Screener's Assessment (10) | | | | | | 8 |
| ▪ Acceptance of responsibility actions | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | |
| ▪ Straightforwardness in screening | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | |
| ▪ Motivation to change | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | |
| ▪ Probability of PRC success | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | |
| ▪ Probability for recidivism | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | |
| Classification Score | | | | | | <u>33</u> |
| Personality Assessment (10) | | | | | | 1 |
| ▪ Impulsivity | NA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | |
| ▪ Maturity/Responsibility | NA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | |
| ▪ Need for change recognized | NA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| ▪ Deviant value orientation | NA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | |
| ▪ Pathological test response pattern | NA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | |
| ▪ Concealing versus revealing | C | A | R | | A | |
| Personality Assessment Score | | | | | | <u>1</u> |
| Total SSS Score | | | | | | 58 |

Table 5. Selection Suitability Scale Scores In Analysis

| | N | Range | Mean (SD) |
|--|----------|--------------|------------------|
| Values After Omitting the Criminal History Portions of the Prediction and Classification Scales | | | |
| <u>Total SSS Score</u> | | | |
| With Psychological Assessment | 598 | 18 to 62 | 38.57 (7.73) |
| Without Psychological Assessment | 598 | 17 to 59 | 36.88 (7.32) |
| <u>Prediction Scale</u> | | | |
| Employment | 600 | 0 to 10 | 2.89 (2.71) |
| Personal Data | 600 | 0 to 8 | 4.63 (1.87) |
| Failure Indicators | 600 | 0 to 16 | 8.97 (2.64) |
| Identification of Specific Factors | 598 | 0, 6 | 4.51 (2.60) |
| Total Prediction Sub-Score | 598 | 7 to 37 | 21.02 (5.95) |
| <u>Classification Scale</u> | | | |
| Residency | 600 | 0 to 6 | 4.88 (1.97) |
| Situational Factors | 600 | 0 to 6 | 2.63 (1.32) |
| Recommendations | 600 | 0 to 6 | 2.64 (1.95) |
| Screener's Assessment | 600 | 0 to 10 | 5.72 (1.96) |
| Total Classification Sub-Score | 600 | 5 to 27 | 15.87 (3.83) |
| <u>Psychological Screening/Personality</u> | | | |
| Assessment Score | 600 | 0 to 5 | 1.69 (.88) |

Table 6. Demographic & Criminal History Variables in Analysis

| | N | Freq. | Percent | Range | Mean (SD) |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|----------|------------------|
| <u>Demographic</u> | | | | | |
| Age at Screening | 600 | | | 17 to 67 | 32.80 (10.07) |
| Male (versus Female) | 600 | 427 | 71% | | |
| White (versus Non-White) | 600 | 257 | 43% | | |
| <u>Criminal History</u> | | | | | |
| Number of Prior ... | | | | | |
| Times on Parole & Probation (P&P) | 600 | | | 0 to 21 | 2.22 (2.01) |
| P&P Revocations | 600 | | | 0 to 11 | .64 (1.14) |
| Periods of Adult Incarceration | 600 | | | 0 to 20 | 1.03 (1.84) |
| Class by Most Serious Offense | | | | | |
| Number Charged with a Felony | | 206 | 34% | | |
| Type by Most Serious Offense | | | | | |
| Person (Non-DUI) Offender | | 109 | 18% | | |
| Person: DUI/DWI Offender | | 133 | 22% | | |
| Property Offender | | 160 | 27% | | |
| Drug Offender | | 70 | 12% | | |
| VOP Only Offender | | 128 | 21% | | |

Table 7. Breakdown of Offense Types by Most Serious Instant or VOP Offenses

| | One Charge | Two or More Charges but Same Offense Type | More than One Charge and More than One Offense Type |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| N=600 | | | |
| Type by Most Serious Offense | | | |
| Person (Non-DUI) Offender | 56 | 23 | --- |
| Person: DUI/DWI Offender | 92 | 32 | --- |
| Property Offender | 95 | 49 | --- |
| Drug Offender | 40 | 17 | --- |
| VOP Only Offender | 109 | 19 | --- |
| Multiple Charges -- Offense Types | | | |
| Person & Property | --- | --- | 19 |
| Person & Drug | --- | --- | 9 |
| Drug & Property | --- | --- | 13 |
| Person, Drug, & Property | --- | --- | 2 |
| Person & Gun/Weapon | --- | --- | 3 |
| Property & Gun/Weapon | --- | --- | 2 |
| Drug & Gun/Weapon | --- | --- | 5 |
| Person, Drug & Gun/Weapon | --- | --- | 1 |
| DUI & Person | --- | --- | 3 |
| DUI & Drug | --- | --- | 4 |
| DUI & Property | --- | --- | 7 |
| | 392 | 140 | 68 |

Table 8. Performance Ratings – Last Month Rating

| | Scoring Range | N | Range | Mean (SD) |
|--|--------------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| Performance Areas (High Values = More Positive) | | | | |
| Treatment Plan | (1 to 5) | 545 | 1 to 5 | 3.00 (.53) |
| Treatment Group | (1 to 5) | 432 | 2 to 5 | 3.02 (.53) |
| Accepts Responsibility Actions | (1 to 5) | 548 | 1 to 5 | 2.91 (.60) |
| Daily Problem Solving Skills | (1 to 5) | 548 | 1 to 5 | 2.94 (.68) |
| Job/Training Performance | (1 to 5) | 527 | 1 to 5 | 3.37 (.76) |
| Punctuality | (1 to 5) | 548 | 1 to 5 | 3.68 (.93) |
| Accountability | (1,5) | 548 | 1 to 5 | 4.83 (.80) |
| Interpersonal Functioning: | | | | |
| Authority | (1 to 5) | 548 | 2 to 5 | 3.07 (.57) |
| Peers | (1 to 5) | 548 | 1 to 5 | 2.48 (.59) |
| Intimates | (1 to 5) | 544 | 1 to 5 | 2.98 (.92) |
| Outside Counseling | (1 to 5) | 348 | 1 to 5 | 3.07 (.53) |
| Recovery Program | (1 to 5) | 517 | 1 to 5 | 2.67 (.59) |
| Educational Program | (1 to 5) | 81 | 1 to 5 | 3.96 (1.76) |
| In-House Responsibilities | (1,5) | 540 | 1 to 5 | 4.94 (.48) |
| Responsible Use of Money | (1 to 5) | 356 | 1 to 5 | 3.13 (.68) |
| Drug/Alcohol Free | (1, 3, 5) | 548 | 1 to 5 | 4.91 (.47) |
| Suitable Living Conditions | (1, 3, 5) | 544 | 1 to 5 | 4.07 (1.40) |
| Constructive Use Leisure Time | (1 to 5) | 539 | 1 to 5 | 2.41 (.82) |

**Table 9. Results – Performance Ratings Z-Score Scale
Coefficients and t Statistic**

| | Model (1) Demographics & Criminal History | Model (2) Demographics, Criminal History & SSS Score | Model (3) Demographics, Criminal History & SSS Components |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Age at Screening | 0.009 (4.11)** | 0.008 (3.41)** | 0.008 (3.62)** |
| Gender (Male=1) | -0.070 (1.51) | -0.070 (1.52) | -0.077 (1.68) |
| Race (White=1) | 0.122 (2.93)** | 0.119 (2.85)** | 0.097 (2.33)* |
| Prior Times P&P | 0.020 (1.66) | 0.022 (1.80) | 0.021 (1.82) |
| Prior P&P Revocations | 0.037 (1.74) | 0.036 (1.70) | 0.039 (1.91) |
| Prior Periods Incarceration | -0.008 (0.62) | -0.002 (0.16) | |
| Felony Class Offense | 0.026 (0.56) | 0.024 (0.52) | |
| Person Offender ^a | -0.088 (1.21) | -0.080 (1.10) | -0.049 (0.85) |
| Property Offender ^a | -0.159 (2.31)* | -0.154 (2.25)* | -0.133 (2.63)** |
| DUI/DWI Offender ^a | -0.101 (1.33) | -0.124 (1.62) | -0.126 (2.10)* |
| VOP Offender ^a | -0.040 (0.57) | -0.035 (0.50) | |
| SSS Total Score | | 0.006 (2.23)* | |
| Employment History | | | 0.024 (2.84)** |
| Screener's Assessment | | | 0.021 (2.05)* |
| Constant | -0.278 (2.76)** | -0.490 (3.57)** | -0.426 (4.08)** |
| Observations | 548 | 546 | 548 |
| Adjusted R-squared | .0863 | .0937 | .1099 |
| <i>F</i> Ratio | Model 2 to Model 1 Model 3 to Model 1 Model 3 to Model 2 | | 4.34* 7.06** 9.66** |

^a Drug Offender is reference category

* Significant at $p < .05$

** Significant at $p < .01$

**Table 10. Results – Adjustment Actions
Odds Ratio and z Statistic**

| | Model (1) Demographics & Criminal History | Model (2) Demographics, Criminal History & SSS Score | Model (3) Demographics, Criminal History & SSS Components |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Age at Screening | 0.968 (3.38)** | 0.975 (2.52)* | 0.988 (1.07) |
| Gender (Male=1) | 1.032 (0.16) | 1.029 (0.14) | |
| Race (White=1) | 0.684 (2.11)* | 0.681 (2.11)* | 0.588 (2.87)** |
| Prior Times P&P | 0.991 (0.16) | 0.981 (0.35) | |
| Prior P&P Revocations | 0.999 (0.01) | 1.007 (0.07) | |
| Prior Periods Incarceration | 1.084 (1.40) | 1.039 (0.67) | 1.044 (0.83) |
| Felony Class Offense | 1.471 (1.89) | 1.507 (1.98)* | 1.526 (2.06)* |
| Person Offender ^a | 1.208 (0.58) | 1.161 (0.45) | 1.321 (1.10) |
| Property Offender ^a | 0.809 (0.70) | 0.791 (0.77) | |
| DUI/DWI Offender ^a | 0.523 (1.96) | 0.611 (1.46) | 0.696 (1.35) |
| VOP Offender ^a | 0.725 (1.04) | 0.694 (1.18) | 0.801 (0.94) |
| SSS Total Score | | 0.959 (3.31)** | |
| Personal Data | | | 0.829 (3.13)** |
| Failure Indicators | | | 0.928 (2.16)* |
| Observations | 600 | 598 | 600 |
| Pseudo R-Square | .0682 | .0829 | .0868 |
| Predicted Probability | 0.5043 | 0.5055 | 0.5064 |
| Log Likelihood | -387.50595 | -380.12872 | -379.75133 |
| Likelihood Ratio (χ^2) | Model 2 to Model 1 Model 3 to Model 1 Model 3 to Model 2 | | 14.75** 15.51** .75 |

^a Drug Offender is reference category

* Significant at $p < .05$

** Significant at $p < .01$

**Table 11. Results – Discharge Status
Odds Ratio and z Statistic**

| | Model (1) Demographics & Criminal History | Model (2) Demographics, Criminal History & SSS Score | Model (3) Demographics, Criminal History & SSS Components |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Age at Screening | 1.052 (3.08)** | 1.037 (2.19)* | 1.043 (2.76)** |
| Gender (Male=1) | 1.031 (0.10) | 1.024 (0.08) | |
| Race (White=1) | 1.647 (1.76) | 1.578 (1.58) | 1.417 (1.22) |
| Prior Times P&P | 0.966 (0.47) | 0.970 (0.41) | 0.929 (1.18) |
| Prior P&P Revocations | 0.897 (0.87) | 0.890 (0.91) | |
| Prior Periods Incarceration | 1.008 (0.09) | 1.058 (0.63) | |
| Felony Class Offense | 0.967 (0.12) | 0.958 (0.15) | |
| Person Offender ^a | 0.959 (0.10) | 1.065 (0.14) | |
| Property Offender ^a | 1.087 (0.19) | 1.143 (0.31) | |
| DUI/DWI Offender ^a | 1.883 (1.15) | 1.562 (0.80) | |
| VOP Offender ^a | 0.779 (0.59) | 0.834 (0.42) | 0.747 (1.01) |
| SSS Total Score | | 1.058 (2.75)** | |
| Employment History | | | 1.224 (3.10)** |
| Primary/Secondary “Big 6” | | | 1.110 (2.28)* |
| Observations | 600 | 598 | 598 |
| Pseudo R-Square | .0641 | .0820 | .0949 |
| Predicted Probability | 0.8947 | 0.8984 | .9023 |
| Log Likelihood | -211.5761 | -207.28898 | -204.36436 |
| Likelihood Ratio (χ^2) | Model 2 to Model 1 Model 3 to Model 1 Model 3 to Model 2 | | 8.57** 14.42** 5.85* |

^a Drug Offender is reference category

* Significant at $p < .05$

** Significant at $p < .01$

Appendices

Appendix A Selection Suitability Scale

MONTGOMERY COUNTY PRE-RELEASE SERVICES
SUITABILITY SELECTION SCALE

Applicant's Name: _____

Screener: _____

Place of Interview: _____

Date of Interview: _____

PREDICTION SCALE (60):

Score: Comments:

1. Criminal History (10)

- a. Prior number of arrests (0 1 2)
- b. Prior number of convictions (0 1 2 3)
- c. Prior number of incarcerations (0 1 2 3)
- d. Age at first conviction (0 1 2)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

2. Employment (10)

- a. Past work pattern (0 1 2)
- b. Job quality (0 1 2)
- c. Skill Level (0 1 3)
- d. Employment needs (0 1 3)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

3. Personal Data (8)

- a. Current age (0 2 4)
- b. Significant caring other (0 1 2)
- c. Family dependents (0 2)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

4. Failure Indicators (16)

- a. Instability of residence (0 1 2)
- b. Drug abuse (0 1 2 4)
- c. Alcohol abuse (0 1 2)
- d. Suicide attempt (0 1)
- e. Mental hospitalization (0 1 3)
- f. Past escape (0 1 2)
- g. None of the above (0 2)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

5. Identification of Specific Factors (6)

Primary/Secondary

- a. Unsocialized/Aggressive (0)
- b. Drug/Emotional Dysfunction (0)
- c. Emotional Dysfunction/Drug (0)
- d. Socialized Deviance/Drug (0)
- e. Inadequate/Immature/Drug (0)
- f. Socialized Deviance/Inadequate/Immature (0)
- g. None of the above (6)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

PREDICATION SCALE SCORE

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

SCREENER'S COMMENTS: _____

CLASSIFICATION SCALE (60):

Score: Comments:

1. Criminal History (10)
 a. Seriousness of offense (0 4 5 6)
 b. Crime-free period of time (0 1 2 3 4)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

2. Place of Residency (0 1 2 6)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

3. Situational Factors (6)

- a. Restitution/Court ordered payments (0 1 2)
- b. Financial contribution to household (0 1 2)
- c. Need for PRC treatment services (0 1 2)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

4. Revocation/Recidivism (8)

- a. Prior period of probation/parole supervision (0 1 2)
- b. Prior probation/parole violation (0 1 2)
- c. Prior work release (0 1 2)
- d. Prior work release revocation (0 1 2)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

5. Recommendations (14)

- a. Judge (0 2 4)
- b. Post Trial Coordinating Team or PSI Agent (0 2 4)
- c. Parole Commission (0 4)
- d. Institutional adjustment (0 1 2)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

6. Screener's Assessment (10)

- a. Acceptance of responsibility for own actions (0 1 2)
- b. Straightforwardness in screening process (0 1 2)
- c. Motivation to change (0 1 2)
- d. Assessment of probability for PRC success (0 1 2)
- e. Assessment of probability for recidivism (0 1 2)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

CLASSIFICATION SCALE SCORE

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

PREDICATION SCALE SCORE

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

COMBINED SCALE SCORE

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

RELEASE CONSIDERATION

Applicant within 120 days of release (0 10)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

7. Personality Assessment

- a. Impulsivity (NA 0 1 2)
- b. Maturity/Responsibility (NA 0 1 2)
- c. Need for change recognized (NA 0 1 2)
- d. Deviant value orientation (NA 0 1 2)
- e. Pathological test response pattern (NA 0 1 2)
- f. Concealing verses revealing (C A R)

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

_____ Re-testing _____ Psychological Interview

TOTAL SCORE

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| | | _____ |
| | | _____ |

Appendix B Definitions of PRC Behavioral Classification

DEFINITION OF PRC BEHAVIORAL CLASSIFICATION PATTERNS

I. Inadequate/Immature Pattern (II):

These individuals demonstrate a pattern of behavior reflecting little self-direction, limited self-control, and/or very poor judgment which many times, results in their deviant behavior. The individuals feel they have limited control over things that happen “to” them, and it is “others” or the “situation” that is responsible. They fail to appreciate their own role and responsibilities in their problems. Despite difficulties and conflicts in their past, they may face the future with high hopes, but without realistic plans. Rather than age-appropriate, goal-directed, problem-solving behavior, they act very impulsively, without thinking about the consequences of their actions. They frequently over-react, insisting that their way is fine, and wanting immediate gratification. Their behavior often appears shortsighted, self-defeating, and based upon judgment that has not developed past an early adolescent level.

II. Socialized Deviant Pattern (SD):

Individuals demonstrating this behavioral pattern have a deviant value system that is a result of growing up and learning activities through their family and/or peers groups which accept behaviors against the law as a way of life. These individuals adhere to the “code” of their own group, and will, typically, maintain this identification when interacting with authorities. Their behavior, many times, exhibits a failure to abide by mainstream social values, but the individual is not particularly anxious about it and appears well adjusted within the deviant value system. The family or peer group provides approval, belonging, attention, status, and self-identity, assisting in maintaining the deviant values and behaviors.

III. Alcohol Pattern (A): *OR AP*

Individuals demonstrating this pattern use, abuse or are dependent upon alcohol. This dependence leads to impaired judgment, a lack of impulse control and is often a controlling factor in the individual’s behavior/lifestyle. In such instances, the potential for criminality is significantly increased.

IV. Drug Pattern (D): *OR DP*

Individuals demonstrating this pattern use, abuse or are dependent upon drugs (generally a particular drug). This dependence leads to impaired judgment, a lack of impulse control and is often a controlling factor in the individuals’ behavior/lifestyle. In such instances, the potential for criminality is significantly increased. [Please note in parentheses the significant, controlling drug.]

V. Poly-substance Abuse Pattern (P, Pa, or Pd):

Individuals demonstrating this pattern use, abuse or are dependent upon a combination of drugs, of which alcohol is included. This dependence leads to impaired judgement, a lack of impulse control and is often a controlling factor in the individual’s behavior/lifestyle. In such instances, the potential for criminality is significantly increased. Such cases may be classified as “P”, indicating poly-substance abuse with no known or identified primary abuse, “Pa” for poly-substance abuse with alcohol identified as the primary substance of abuse, or “Pd” for poly-substance abuse with drugs (other than alcohol) identified as the primary substances of abuse.

DEFINITION OF PRC BEHAVIORAL CLASSIFICATION PATTERNS

Page 2

VI. Emotional Dysfunction Pattern (ED):

The deviant behavior of individuals demonstrating this pattern is directly attributable to significant emotional instability (overriding other possible factors such as inadequate/immature, etc.). Such individuals have a mental disorder (e.g. significant neurosis or psychosis which directly contributes to their criminal behavior), as assessed by a Clinical Psychologist.

VII. Unsocialized Aggressive Pattern (UA):

Individuals demonstrating this pattern have little or no identification, attachment, or loyalty to others, and, as such, they are loners who are out for themselves. They have little allegiance to an outside value system; however they are very independent, self-reliant and self-directed. Their lifestyle has the qualities of aggressiveness, manipulation and excitement. Typically they are defiant against authority figures, are very calculating in how they get their own way, and pay little attention to social mores or legal limits. They demonstrate little anxiety or guilt when they lie, or about their criminal or deviant behavior.

VIII. Situational Incident (SI):

Generally, well-integrated, organized individuals who basically follow established social values, confront a unique situation under stressful circumstances where their reaction becomes atypical of their normal behavior. This behavioral reaction results in criminal conviction but continued criminal behavior is highly unlikely, as are the circumstances which contributed to it.

IX. Organic Dysfunction Pattern (OD):

The criminal activities of these individuals within this pattern are attributed directly to their organic limitation or impairment as assessed by a Clinical Psychologist. Examples of these cases are the mentally retarded and significantly brain damaged alcohol and drug abusers.

Appendix C Psychological Screening/Personality Assessment

Appendix D Description of Selection Suitability Scale Point Allocation

Description of Selection Suitability Scale Point Allocation

There are four sections to the Selection Suitability Scale (SSS) – (1) the Prediction Scale, (2) the Classification Scale, (3) consideration of time to release and (4) the Psychological Screening/Personality Assessment which is scored by a clinical psychologist rather than the Intake Screener. Within the Prediction and Classification scales there are there are a total of 11 components comprised of groupings of individual items that are conceptually similar. When all scores are totaled, applicants can receive a total of 124 points.

Theoretically, the applicant can score a maximum of 50 points in the Prediction Scale, 54 points in the Classification Scale, 10 points for being within 120 days of a definite release date and 10 points in the Psychological Screening/Personality Assessment. However, the consideration of time to release component of the scale was not utilized during the study period. Further, since the most recent version of the Montgomery County Community Corrections Guidelines for Rating Items on the Suitability Selection Scale (“Suitability Rating Guidelines”) (MCPRC, 1989a), the personality assessment section of the Prediction Scale has also changed. While the Psychological Screening/Personality Assessment is still scored by a psychologist, the maturity/responsibility/impulsivity category has been split into two categories each with a maximum of 2 points, rather than a single category worth 4 points. With those exceptions, the SSS is still implemented according to the guidelines point allocation, summarized below from the Suitability Ratings Guidelines (MCPRC, 1989a).

Prediction Scale

The Prediction Scale is comprised of five areas totaling 50 points including criminal history (up to 10 points), employment (10 points), personal data (8 points), failure indicators (16 points), and identification of specific factors (6 points) -- a behavioral classification scheme which identifies the applicant’s primary and secondary factors for criminal behavior resulting in the instant offense.

Criminal History

For criminal history component, points are allotted based on the number of prior arrests, convictions, significant incarcerations and age at first conviction. Applicants receive between 0 and 2 points for number of prior arrests (including their juvenile record as reported by the applicant) – 0 points for 4 or more prior arrests, 1 point for 1 to 3 prior arrests, and 2 points for no prior arrest history. For number of prior convictions (including their juvenile history and probation before judgment(s)) applicants receive 0 points for 3 or more convictions, 1 point for 2 prior convictions, 2 points for 1 conviction and 3 points for no prior convictions. For prior number of significant incarcerations of 30 days or more, applicants receive 0 points for 3 or more adult prior incarcerations (with concurrent sentences counting as 1 incarceration and includes actual executed time served over 30 days), 1 point for 2 prior incarcerations, 2 points for 1 and 3 points for no prior incarceration. Applicants are rated 0 points if they were 15 or younger at the age of first conviction, 1 point if they were between 16 and 21 years old, and 2 points if their first conviction occurred when they were 22 or older.

Employment

The employment section reviews the applicant's work history prior to their incarceration. Applicants are given 0 to 2 points for maintaining steady employment for up to 24 months – 0 points if they were employed between 0 and 11 months, 1 point if they were employed 12 to 22 months, and 2 points if they were employed for 22 to 24 months prior to incarceration. There is also a measure of job quality which considers issues such as salary, level of responsibility, the type of employment and potential for upward mobility. Applicants are assessed 0 points if they were not employed, 1 point if the position was low-paying, requiring a low skill level, and 2 points if they had stable skilled employment in a position with a high salary with responsibility. Points are allotted for the highest level of skill attained by the applicant with 0 points if they are unskilled, 1 point if semi-skilled and 3 points if they are skilled or professional. Finally, applicants are assigned points based on their employer's needs -- 0 points if they are not employed, 1 point if they have a job but the employer is not in "critical need or very desirous of the applicant's services" (MCPRC, 1989a, p 2) and 3 points if the employer has a critical and immediate need, as evidenced by direct communication between the employer and the PRC.

Personal Data

The applicant can earn a total of 8 points based on their personal circumstances – the applicant's current age, the presence of significant others and dependents. They receive 0 to 4 points for their current age (those 20 or younger receive no points, those 21 to 25 years of age are given 2 points, while those older than 26 are allotted 4 points), they receive 0 points if they do not have any significant partners, 1 point if a significant caring other is present and provides support to the applicant, and 4 points for the presence of a relationship with a significant other who provides frequent and positive support to the applicant. Family dependents are coded such that if the applicant does not have any dependents they are coded as 0 and 2 points are given to those who have family dependents.

Failure Indicators

Within the area termed "Failure Indicators" there are 6 sub-parts -- instability of residence, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, suicide attempts, mental hospitalizations and past escapes. Instability of residence is accorded 0 points for two or more address changes in the last 12 months (excluding incarceration), 1 point for one address change and 2 points for residential stability. Drug abuse is allotted a total of 4 points – 0 for the chronic drug use, 1 for more than limited but not chronic use, 2 points for limited or experimental use, and 4 for no drug abuse history. Alcohol abuse is allocated 0 points for chronic abuse, 1 point for some abuse or a potential for abuse, and 2 for no alcohol problem as perceived by the Intake Screener. Applicants who have attempted suicide one or more times are given 0 points, 1 point for those who have no attempts. Those who have never been hospitalized for mental health reasons are allotted 3 points while those with a single hospitalization of less than 21 days are given 1 point and the remaining receive no points.

Finally, for past escapes applicants are given 0 points for an escape within the last 5 years or if there were two or more escapes, 1 point for 1 escape over 5 years ago and 2 points for no history of escape.

Identification of Specific Factors

The final section of the Prediction scale is “Identification of Specific Factors” and PRC applicants score either 0 or 6 points for this section. The assignment of the primary/secondary behavioral classification was described above in the review of the Mason 1979 study. During the intake interview the screener designates the applicant with a primary and secondary classification. Of all the possible primary/secondary combinations, six (the “SSS Big 6”) are viewed as the least suitable for selection into the PRC. These six combinations are not given any points while all other primary/secondary designations, deemed more suitable for the PRC, receive 6 points. The primary/secondary classifications deemed less suitable are Unsocialized/Aggressive, Drug/Emotional Dysfunction, Emotional Dysfunction/Drug Socialized Deviance/Drug, Inadequate/Immature/Drug and Socialized Deviance/Inadequate/Immature.

Classification Scale

The Classification Scale totals 54 points broken down into six areas including criminal history/behavior (up to 10 points), residency (6 points), situational factors (6 points), revocation and recidivism (8 points), criminal justice recommendations (14 points) and the intake screener’s assessment (10 points).

Criminal History

For criminal history/behavior component, the applicant is given between 0 and 6 points depending on the seriousness of the offense (and if a violation of probation the screener scores the original offense). The applicant is given 6 points for minor crimes such as prostitution, traffic cases, and destruction of property, and 5 points for shoplifting, larceny under \$500, welfare fraud, and possession of firearms. In more serious cases, applicants are scored 4 for concealing deadly weapon, forgery, manslaughter, extortion and larceny of \$500 and finally, the most serious offenses receive a score of 0, including murder, sexual assault, escape, and kidnapping. The crime history/behavior area also reviews the period of time the applicant has been crime free since the last conviction even when the applicant has not been released. Applicants can receive 4 points for remaining crime free for more than four years, 3 points for 3 to 4 years since the last offense, 2 points for more than 2 to 3 years, 1 point for more than 1 to 2 years and 0 for 1 year or less since the last offense.

Place of Residency

Place of residency operates under the assumption that those who have close ties to the community are more likely to succeed, thus preference is given to Montgomery County

residents who receive 6 points, Maryland residents receive 2 points, Washington metropolitan area residents receive 1 point, and all others receive no points.

Situational Factors

Situational factors are divided into 3 areas – restitution/court ordered payments, household contribution and need for treatment services for a total of 6 points. Restitution/court ordered payments is allotted 0 to 2 points – 2 points for payments of \$100 or more, 1 point for under \$100. Financial contribution to the household is 0 to 2 points – 2 points if the applicant is a responsible for a major financial contribution essential to the family/household, 1 point if the income provided is not essential and 0 if not working or makes no contribution. The need for treatment services receives 0 to 2 points – 2 for those who have a high need for vocational skills and rehabilitative services and are receptive to treatment, 1 point for those who seek to continue employment and other life roles but they are not highly motivated and 0 points when it appears that participation in a community corrections program may be counter-productive.

Revocation/Recidivism

Revocation and recidivism is broken into 4 parts (each ranging from 0 to 2 points and overall providing a total of 8 points to the scale) including number of periods of prior supervision, prior revocations, prior work release experience, and the number of prior work release revocations. Periods of prior adult probation/parole supervision is allotted 2 points for no prior supervision, 1 point for one prior period, and 0 for two or more periods of probation/parole supervision while revocations allot 2 points for no violations, 1 point for one violation and 0 points for two or more violations. Prior work release experience is coded as 2 points for no previous work release (of any type), 1 point for more than 2 years since the last release and 0 points for those who had participated in work release in the last 2 or fewer years. Revocations for work release mirror probation/parole revocation are coded as 2 points for no revocations, 1 point for one revocation over 3 years ago, and 0 points two or more revocations or for a revocation within the past 3 years.

Recommendations

The recommendations section allows for up to 14 points if an actor from the criminal justice system renders a recommendation at the time of completing the SSS. If a judge asserts they intend to sentence the applicant to the PRC (as evidenced by a phone call or letter) the applicant receives 4 points, if the judge has no objection to the applicant's participation they are awarded 2 points, and no points are given when there is no judicial recommendation. If a Pre-Sentence Investigator (PSI) makes a favorable recommendation the applicant is given 2 points, otherwise the absence of a PSI recommendation renders 0 points. A recommendation from the Parole Commission or if the applicant is paroled to the PRC they are awarded 4 points, otherwise no points are given. Up to 2 additional points are given based on information provided by the detention facility staff in reference to the applicant's adjustment to institutionalization.

If the applicant has 2 or more adjustment actions indicating a poor institutional performance, they receive 0 points. If they receive 1 adjustment, they are awarded 1 point, while those who exhibit a good institutional performance given 2 points.

Screener's Assessment

The final section on the classification scale is the screener's assessment -- a subjective assessment of the applicant by the Intake Screener. There are 5 areas in this section (each accorded 0 to 2 points) -- acceptance of responsibility for one's own actions, straightforwardness in screening process, motivation to change, probability for PRC success, and probability for recidivism. For acceptance of responsibility for one's own actions, applicants exhibiting a high degree of acceptance for their role in the situation and is highly concerned is given 2 points. An applicant who accepts responsibility but may justify their actions is given 1 point, while those who appear to lack concern or a sense of responsibility receive 0 points. For straightforwardness in the screening process, the screener accords 2 points for applicants who have been very open and willing to share information and appear truthful, while those who show a moderate amount of cooperation are given one point. Applicants who lie or contradict themselves receive no points. The applicant's motivation to change is scored a 2 if they portray a high level of motivation though a high degree of personal insight, and setting realistic goals, 1 point is given if the applicant admits to needing to change but has no realistic plan with which to implement a change, and those who exhibit little or no desire to make any changes is given 0 points.

The screener's assessment of the applicant's probability for success in the PRC indicates those who receive 2 points are believed to be a success; those given 1 point are expected to have numerous problems within the PRC setting, and those who receive 0 points are those the screener felt would not succeed in a community corrections setting. The assessment for recidivism is coded as a 2 if screener feels the applicant is not likely to recidivate, 1 point is given for those who will probably have some difficulties in readjusting after their period of incarceration and possibly will recidivate and finally, those who are regarded as likely to recidivate within 2 years from release are given 0 points.

Psychological Screening/Personality Assessment

The Psychological Screening/Personality Assessment is scored by a clinical psychologist based on the psychological tests and/or an interview. As previously noted, while the Psychological Screening/Personality Assessment is still scored by a psychologist, the maturity/responsibility/impulsivity category has been split into two categories each with a maximum of 2 points, rather than a single category worth 4 points. However, no documentation is available detailing the specifics of the point allocation, but for edification the original point allocations are noted. For this item, the applicant receives 0 points if they are extremely impulsive, under-controlled and immature, 1 point if they have marginal self-control with low stress tolerance, 2 points is they are immature yet still able to act in responsible and self-controlled manner under low to moderate stress, 3 points if they act responsibly and are under control most of the time, and 4 points if they

are under control and responsible even while under stress. The next item is whether or not the applicant recognizes their need for change. 0 points are given if the applicant does not recognize nor indicate a need for change, 1 point for some indication and 3 points if they clearly recognize a need for change. The deviant value orientation item point allocation is based on if the applicant disregards “right/wrong” norms of mainstream society – they receive 0 points if they do so systematically, 1 point if they sometimes disregard norms and 2 points if they seldom disregard prosocial values.

The final two questions (items 4 and 5) relate to the applicant’s behavior on the psychological testing. Item 4 rates the applicant’s test response pattern – 0 points if they were clearly pathological, 1 point if there was some indication of pathology and 2 points for no indication of pathology on testing. Item 5 is categorical and not included in the point values but is related to whether the applicant had a concealing (coded as “C”), average (“A”) or revealing (“R”) test response pattern.

Appendix E Description of Performance Ratings & Program Activities

Description of Performance Ratings and Program Activities

The monthly performance ratings are based on the PRC resident's observed behaviors and actions, and capture the PRC resident's engagement in programs and activities, interpersonal and problem solving skills, and adherence to rules. Ratings for the 18 performance areas are specifically defined and codified for each performance measure in detail in the Rating Standards for Resident Performance Manual (MCPRC, 2003b) while the descriptions of program activities below are summarized from the Montgomery County Pre-Release Center Guidebook (2003a).

The 18 performance areas are treatment plan, treatment group, accepts responsibility for own actions, daily problem solving skills, job/training performance, punctuality, accountability, interpersonal functioning with authority, interpersonal functioning with peers, interpersonal functioning with intimates, outside counseling, recovery program, educational participation, in-house responsibilities, responsible use of money, drug/alcohol free, suitable living conditions and constructive use of leisure time.

PRC residents score a rating from 1 to 5 (with higher values indicating better performance) on 13 of the 18 performance areas. In general, a 5 indicates the resident performs exceptionally and consistently exceeds expectations, a 4 indicates a very good performance and on occasion exceeds expectations and a rating of 3 means the resident consistently meets expectations and follows the rules of the facility. Those who receive a rating of 2 are performing poorly, sometimes below expectation, while a rating of 1 indicates an extremely poor performance where the resident is generally uncooperative and resistant to meeting the expectations and rules of the PRC. The rating categories of the remaining 5 performance areas vary; in the areas of accountability, education, in-house responsibility residents are coded as either satisfactory (5 points) or unsatisfactory (1 point). In the drug/alcohol free and suitable living conditions ratings include satisfactory (5 points), questionable (3 points), or unsatisfactory (1 point).

Treatment Plan

Treatment plan ratings are based on the resident's effort to identify the problem or problems that contributed to their criminal lifestyle, and their ability to set realistic goals and develop strategies to accomplish these goals. During the study period from 2001 to 2004, there were a number of program activities available to meet these identified needs and goals of PRC residents and attendance in these programs was based on the treatment plan. The treatment plan was developed with information from the intake instrument and the resident's self-assessment of what they wished to accomplish while residing at the PRC.

Issues identified through this process covered a vast range – including employment, education, English as a second language, alcohol and/or drug issues, deviant/criminal lifestyle, and the need for a positive support network. PRC residents also had issues related to peers, domestic violence, anger and stress management, problems with impulsivity, attention deficit hyper-activity disorder, depression, grief, trauma, an

inability to trust and co-dependency. Some residents required assistance with housing, parenting skills, and money management. After a discussion about their needs and creating a treatment plan with their Primary Counselor, residents signed a “program contract” agreeing to participate in the programs deemed necessary for their successful transition to the community (Mason, 1979).

The PRC Primary Counselor provided ongoing counseling to the resident by assisting in the development of a monthly budget and in helping to select and vet the resident’s home visitation sponsor. In addition, on a regular basis, the Primary Counselor and the resident met to discuss modifications to the treatment plan, the resident’s behavior, and their participation in programs and activities including group counseling, leisure activities and adjustment actions. The Primary Counselor also provided counseling in areas of problem and conflict resolution, stress management, crisis intervention, and “life responsibilities on a day to day basis” (p. 9). The Treatment Plan performance ratings reflect the identification process and compliance with the program contract and “progress will be evaluated by the successful completion of concrete and measurable strategies” (p. 5).

Treatment Group

Residents began their experience with Job Readiness and Retention and Life Skills program classes provided in-house at the PRC. During this first week, if the resident had a substance abuse issue, they also attended either a basic recovery or relapse prevention group.⁵⁹ Then, in accordance with the treatment plan, residents participated in special focus classes including stress management, anger management, parenting by example, domestic violence, wellness counseling, Moral Reconciliation Therapy and groups revolving around specific issues such as the “Problem Solving Group” and the “Peer Continuing Care Group”. Descriptions of the various groups are provided below.

The Life Skills program consisted of nine sessions, 3 hours in length, every weekday morning during the first two weeks of residency at the PRC. The Life Skills program was “designed to assist residents in developing skills for successful, independent living upon final release to the community”. Topics covered included “anger/stress management, values/lifestyles, decision making/conflict resolution, wellness, transactional analysis, and relationships” (p. 6). Participants engaged in role-playing, “group go-rounds and small task-oriented problem solving” and learned through “group support and participation” (p. 6).

The Parenting by Example seminar and domestic violence group were both six week programs. The parenting seminar was open to both the PRC resident and their intimate partner and focused on teaching parents to “understand age-appropriate expectations for their children and improve parenting skills” (p. 7). The domestic violence group challenged batterers to break through their denial and provided education to assist them in examining “beliefs about roles between the sexes, understand the cycle of violence,

⁵⁹ Beginning in late 2004 the Job Readiness/Retention, Basic Recovery and Relapse Prevention classes were combined into one week-long “Re-entry” class which combines these elements. Prior to that time these were offered as individual classes.

and develop skills to prevent battering” (p. 7). Female PRC residents also had a group counseling session where gender specific issues were addressed and the group was led and attended only by women.

The PRC wellness program was conducted by a nurse who encouraged PRC residents to develop a “less stressful, healthy oriented lifestyle” (MCPRC, 2003a, p.10). The nurse met with the residents individually and provided counseling and referrals to aid in developing a healthier lifestyle (p. 10). Discussions included a variety of health related issues including nutrition, stress management, general health issues (including “smoking cessation, weight management, medication management, exercise, [and] sleep” habits (p. 10)), as well as auto safety, medical care, and family health history .

Skill building groups were also available to PRC residents and included stress/anger management, defense tactics, and family communication. In addition to these specific group counseling activities, for those residents not working in the community, there was a daily (Monday through Friday) unit meeting which provided residents a venue to address staff and resident concerns as well as a forum to conduct ongoing group counseling sessions “designed to address “here and now” issues and assist in treatment planning/goal setting” (p. 7).

The resident’s Primary Counselor rated the treatment group performance area and this rating referred specifically to the resident’s participation in the Continuing Care, Problem Solving or Moral Reconciliation Therapy groups. While the special focus groups such as life skills, domestic violence and stress management counseling were not rated individually, attendance, punctuality, quality of participation and successful completion of the group was reflected in the overall rating in this performance area (p. 7).

Accepts Responsibility For Own Actions

Residents are evaluated on their willingness to accept responsibility for their own actions. This involves looking at the resident’s level of straightforwardness and truthfulness about their original crime and their current behavior. Resident’s are also measured on their “level of acceptance for the consequences of the resident’s own actions” (p. 9) including court and adjustment decisions.

Daily Problem Solving Skills

For Daily Problem Solving Skills the resident is rated on the degree to which they identify and resolve day to day issues, make plans to prevent problems and take action to behave accordingly.

Job/Training Performance

All resident are required to work (either inside or outside the PRC), to prepare for, or to seek work. “The fundamental Contract expectation of residents includes an approved day of full-time structured activities ... [which] may include part-time work and part-time

education or training or full-time work” (Montgomery County Pre Release center (MCPRC), 2003a, p. 7). To facilitate this expectation, PRC residents attended a four-day Job Readiness and Retention class conducted by the PRC Work Release Coordinators. The class provided assistance to residents in how to complete a job application and emphasized “interview skills, physical presentation, values, ethics and problem-solving in the workplace” (p. 7). When seeking employment, PRC residents were expected to disclose their current circumstances to prospective employers that they have a criminal record and are in the process of transitioning back to the community.

In addition to the Job Readiness/Retention program, PRC staff actively assisted residents by contacting prospective employers and requesting that they provide the PRC with a “fair job interview” (p. 7).⁶⁰ While the PRC staff “can get employers to open their doors” to a PRC resident, it is completely up to the resident to convince the prospective employer to hire and (then retain them) in the job. Employment resources included newspaper want ads, job banks, staff contact with employers, and when appropriate, contact with prior employers. PRC residents who were unemployed were expected to be actively engaged in job-seeking from 8:30 to 4:30 Monday through Friday unless the Work Release Coordinator released them to pursue other activities (e.g., educational or vocational training, counseling etc). Finally, if residents with “spare time ... [were] asked to work around the Center until they actually begin work on a job” (p. 7).

Once the resident found employment, the Work Release Coordinator confirmed the employer was aware of the resident’s circumstances and approved the position. Then the Work Release Coordinator and the PRC resident set up a plan that included the amount of time needed to travel to and from work and discussed the rule that the resident must take the most “direct route to and from work” (p. 8). Residents were limited to working 6 days a week and no more than 60 hours per week, and were expected to call their employer when unable to go to work due to injury or illness. Otherwise they were expected to go to work as scheduled and to be on time.

Residents employed in the community are rated on their Job/Training Performance by the Work Release Coordinator (with feedback from their employer) on the resident’s job knowledge, dependability, attendance, productivity, quality of work, ability to work with others, willingness to take initiative, to learn new skills, level of motivation and their attitude towards work. Inside workers were rated on their job performance using the same standards as those employed in the community, but relevant treatment issues were considered.

If the resident was self-employed, they were rated as either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory on their ability to coordinate their business activities with the PRC and on sustaining their business. The rating for self-employed residents included their accountability, their

⁶⁰ In some cases, the PRC placed restrictions on the type of position PRC applicants could seek. Based on individual circumstances (often related to their criminal or substance abuse history), there were positions which were deemed inappropriate. For example, residents convicted of fraud were not allowed to obtain a job that would give them unfettered fiduciary access or similar responsibility. Likewise, residents with a history of substance abuse did not seek jobs in restaurants which served alcohol.

ability to meet financial obligations to the PRC and “the ability to operate an organized, structured as well as profitable and legitimate business which provides a steady and adequate income” (p. 14).

Unemployed residents were evaluated on their participation in the Job Readiness and Retention class and their job search. If attending the class, they were rated on attendance and punctuality, relationships and interaction with others in the class (including instructors) and the quality of their written and oral work. Those seeking employment were evaluated on their motivation and attitude toward work, their work ethic, on their daily efforts to obtain employment. This included being appropriately dressed, using time and resources effectively, and exhibiting the ability and “motivation to set realistic career goals ... and work independently toward those goals” (p. 17).

Punctuality

Punctuality was measured by adherence to schedules regarding all PRC activities including work, community passes, in-house activities (e.g., responding to calls for urine samples and clean-up assignments). Late was defined as “10 minutes or more beyond the prescribed time ... and lateness does not need to be documented as an informational or adjustment action to be considered in this rating” (p. 19).

Accountability

Residents were rated on accountability either as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. This performance area measured compliance with community pass rules and procedures.

Interpersonal Functioning – Authority, Peers & Intimates

Residents were rated in the Interpersonal Functioning/Authority performance area based on their compliance with supervision, directives and demonstrated respect to the authority of others. In addition, they were rated on the degree to which the resident complied without argument to the known rules and procedures of the PRC.

Interpersonal Functioning/Peers and Support Network measured the degree to which the resident appropriately interacted with others (neither “isolated nor group-dependent” (p.23)) with both peers in the PRC and in the community. Ratings reflected interaction with, and efforts to establish, relationships with positive peers and development of a support system.

The Interpersonal Functioning/Intimates ratings were based on “observable relationships between significant others and the degree to which that relationship(s) [was] functional, stable, emotionally satisfying and reduces stress for the resident and/or the other party” (p. 25). A satisfactory rating was used if these conditions existed and a numerical rating (1 to 5) was used only “when an observed problem exists (unsatisfactory) and becomes an area for improvement or when there are no “significant others” (p.25). Intimates were defined as family members and/or significant others (girlfriend, boyfriend, fiancée,

partner) (p.25)”. In this performance area, “Not applicable” (N/A) was used if the resident had no ability to establish family relationships, had no significant other and it was not considered beneficial to begin a relationship.

Outside Counseling

Residents were referred to counseling based on the individual resident’s treatment plan and participated in a number of group and/or individual therapeutic activities in the community including mental health, substance abuse and addictions treatment (including gambling and other addictions), family and/or marriage counseling, sexual offender treatment, pastoral or religious counseling, survivor groups, and anger/stress management. Referrals were also available for offenders and victims of domestic violence.⁶¹ For this performance area, residents were rated based on attendance and their level of participation in these activities.

Recovery Program

During the study period there were several in-house programs available to address substance abuse issues – Basic Recovery and Relapse Prevention counseling. The basic recovery program was for PRC residents who showed “a pattern of addictive behavior and who have not had prior treatment or recovery” (p. 6). This program focused on educating the resident about their “addictive and criminal thinking and behavior” (p. 6).

The Relapse Prevention program was for those who had experienced treatment and had attempted recovery in the past. This program was modeled on the Relapse Prevention Counseling program developed by Terence T. Gorski (J. Arp, MA, personal communication, October 2006) and focused on identifying “individual warning signs and relapse prevention plans” and framed criminal behavior within the context of their addiction (p.7). Both Basic Recovery and Relapse Prevention were two week programs which utilized “12-step programs including meetings, steps and sponsorship” (p. 6-7). Most residents also participated in a 12 step self-help groups (e.g., Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous).

Recovery Program performance ratings were based on attendance and level of participation in both the in-house PRC recovery programs and 12-step meetings (e.g., actively talking with members of the 12 step group or volunteering to set up or take down the tables and chairs). Those not involved with recovery programs were rated as Not Applicable (N/A) in this performance area.

⁶¹ PRC resident family members and intimate partners were also referred to services when appropriate. These services included Al-Anon and Alateen (12 step programs for families of alcoholics and drug addicts), crisis center referrals for emergency services, and abused persons program for family victims of domestic violence.

Educational Participation

PRC residents who had not completed high school or obtained a GED were required to engage in educational programs. These residents were given “reading and math skills tests to determine their functional level” (p. 8). Thereafter, residents had the option to participate in a number of different educational and/or vocational training programs (either full-time or part-time) including attending a high school, a vocational school or college. GED classes were provided weekly at the PRC and “volunteer tutors and self-instructional materials [were] available” (p. 8). Residents also enrolled in basic education classes provided in the evening at the local high school. PRC residents were encouraged to pursue hobbies (e.g., “computer courses, photography, arts/crafts”) and were allowed to attend classes provided by the county Recreation and Adult Education departments (p.8).

Residents requiring special vocational training were placed within community agencies such as “Division of Rehabilitation Services, Outpatient Addiction Services, and the Salvation Army” (p. 8). Residents participating in educational programs were rated either satisfactory or unsatisfactory based on attendance, punctuality, cooperation, effort, attention or interest and progress (relative to their individual capacity to learn). Those not involved with educational activities were rated as Not Applicable (N/A) in this performance area.

In-House Responsibilities

Residents were rated on their behavior in terms of In-House Responsibilities. They received either a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating on neatness and cleanliness of room, completion of in-house cleaning assignments, and personal hygiene (in the event their hygiene “causes a social problem” (p. 30)).

Responsible Use of Money

For those residents who were employed, the responsible management of money performance ratings captured the resident’s abilities to plan, expend and save money. This performance area also measured if the resident met outside financial obligations, developed a budget and set realistic financial goals. Residents that were unemployed or classified as inside workers were rated as Not Applicable (N/A) in this performance area.

Drug/Alcohol Free

Residents were required to remain drug and alcohol-free and they are rated satisfactory, questionable or unsatisfactory on their abstention from substance use or possession of alcohol or unauthorized drugs. Residents were rigorously monitored – many offenders were subject to Alcosensors administered thrice daily, and all were subject to urinalysis testing three times a week.

Suitable Living Conditions

In anticipation of release, residents were rated on the suitability of their living conditions and could receive a rating of satisfactory, questionable or unsatisfactory. In those cases where the anticipated living situation upon release was not conducive to a crime-free way of living, residents worked with staff to plan for alternative living arrangements once released.

Constructive Use of Leisure Time

One of the goals of the PRC is to assist the resident in structuring pro-social activities in which to engage in their spare time both while in the PRC and once they transition to the community. Working with the Community Release Coordinator, residents were required to engage in two leisure activities every month. Residents were encouraged to fulfill this leisure activity requirement while on a home visitation pass, but the Community Release Coordinator could approve the activity at other times. Residents could attend classes (e.g., including hobby activities, self-improvement and bible study) participate in a sports league or in volunteer activities, and/or attend PRC recreational trips that were coordinated by PRC interns. PRC recreational trips included a variety of cultural and sporting activities such as theater, museum exhibits, fairs and festivals, bowling, roller skating, and hiking (while specifically excluding shopping and dating as acceptable activities). PRC residents were also required to complete two hours of community service within their first 60 days at the PRC. They were placed into a volunteer organization by PRC staff, and once they fulfilled this requirement, they could continue to volunteer and count this as a leisure activity.

Residents were rated on their use of leisure time and included the resident's recognition of the necessity of structuring constructive leisure time in order to "develop new and appropriate ways of relaxing, reducing stress, and finding a positive and supportive social network (p. 34). Ratings included the development of on-going interests and participation in new and staff sponsored activities.

Appendix F Case Summary Card

CASE SUMMARY — MONTGOMERY COUNTY PRE-RELEASE CENTER

CART: A B C D

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------|---|----------------|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------|--|----------|--|
| NAME: | | ADDRESS: | | PHONE: | | RECEIVED FROM: | | MCDC NO.: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> STATE <input type="checkbox"/> MCDC <input type="checkbox"/> FEDERAL <input type="checkbox"/> PROBATION <input type="checkbox"/> PRE-TRIAL | | MCPID: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | PRC NO.: | | | | | | | | |
| CURRENT CHARGE(S): | | CASE NO.: | | SENTENCE: | | BEGINS: | | RECEIVED PRC: | | JUDGE/COURT: | | | | | | |
| 1. | | 1. | | 1. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | | 2. | | 2. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | | 3. | | 3. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| COURT (CHARGES OR RECON): | | | CT DATE: | | CT/PAROLE REC: | | | HRG. DATE: | | OUTCOME: | | RELEASE DATE: | | | | |
| AGE: | | EDUCATION: | | YRS. | | SKILLS: | | MEDICAL ISSUES: | | FINES/RESTITUTION: | | SUPPORT PAYMENT: | | | | |
| DOB: | | LITERATE: | | <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES | | | | | | DEBTS: | | SAVINGS: | | | | |
| JOB/EDUCATION PLACEMENT: | | | ADDRESS: | | | PHONE: | | SUPERVISOR: | | WORKING HOURS/DAYS: | | | WAGES: | | STARTED: | |
| S. S. #: | | | JOB TITLE: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LEISURE INTERESTS: | | | | | | DONE WITH: | | | TRANSPORTATION: | | DRIVER'S LICENSE: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | ON-GOING: | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | ACTIVITY: | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PRIOR INCARCERATION | | <input type="checkbox"/> PSYCHIATRIC CARE | | FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS: <input type="checkbox"/> SIN. <input type="checkbox"/> MAR. <input type="checkbox"/> SEP. <input type="checkbox"/> DIV. <input type="checkbox"/> G.F./DEP. CLOSEST TO: _____ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DRUGS | | <input type="checkbox"/> MENTAL HOSPITAL | | HOME VISITATION WITH: _____ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ALCOHOL | | <input type="checkbox"/> ESCAPED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SUICIDE ATTEMPT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> VA PROBATION OFFICER: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PRIMARY COUNSELOR: | | | EMERGENCY CALL: | | | SELF-REPORT/ISSUES: | | | | | | | | | | |

CIRCUMSTANCES OF CURRENT CHARGES: _____

PRIOR CHARGES: _____

PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: _____

PRED. SCORE: _____ CLASS SCORE: _____
 PRIMARY: _____ SECONDARY: _____

SPONSOR: _____
 FAMILY: _____

ALCOHOL & DRUG USE: _____

EMPLOYMENT HX: _____

PRIOR TX: _____

STAFF ASSESSMENT: _____

MAJOR ISSUES:

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____
 4. _____ 5. _____ 6. _____

DATE:

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. TREATMENT PLAN | | | | | | |
| 2. TREATMENT GROUP | | | | | | |
| 3. ACCEPTS RESPONSIBILITY FOR OWN ACTIONS | | | | | | |
| 4. DAILY PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS | | | | | | |
| 5. JOB/TRAINING PERFORMANCE | | | | | | |
| 6. PUNCTUALITY | | | | | | |
| 7. ACCOUNTABILITY | | | | | | |
| 8. INTERPERSONAL FUNCTIONING/AUTHORITY | | | | | | |
| 9. INTERPERSONAL FUNCTIONING/PEERS | | | | | | |
| 10. INTERPERSONAL FUNCTIONING/INTIMATES | | | | | | |
| 11. OUTSIDE COUNSELING | | | | | | |
| 12. RECOVERY PROGRAM | | | | | | |
| 13. EDUCATIONAL PARTICIPATION | | | | | | |
| 14. IN-HOUSE RESPONSIBILITIES | | | | | | |
| 15. RESPONSIBLE USE OF MONEY | | | | | | |
| 16. DRUG/ALCOHOL FREE | | | | | | |
| 17. SUITABLE LIVING CONDITIONS | | | | | | |
| 18. CONSTRUCTIVE USE OF LEISURE TIME | | | | | | |

DISCHARGE STATUS: T/S _____ PAROLE _____ REVOKED _____ WALK-OFF _____

RECLASSIFIED _____ OTHER: _____

DISCHARGE DATE: _____

ADDRESS: _____

TELEPHONE NO.: _____

ALERT: _____

DATE:

ADJUSTMENT ACTION

HOME VISITATION PASSES

| | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| _____ | MO. | | | | | |
| _____ | | | | | | |
| _____ | | | | | | |
| _____ | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-------|--------|----|-----|----|
| _____ | PHASES | | | |
| _____ | I | II | III | IV |
| _____ | | | | |
| _____ | | | | |

UNIT PROBATION: ON: _____ OFF: _____

0. COUNSELING: _____

BASIC RECOVERY: _____

RELAPSE PREVENTION: _____

JOB READINESS/RETENTION: _____

STRESS: _____

PARENTING: _____

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: _____

MRT: _____

OTHER: _____

COURT DATE: _____

FURTHER PSYCH. ASSESS: _____

EDUCATIONAL ASSESS: _____

VOCATIONAL ASSESS: _____

TRANSPORTATION: _____

MEDICAL NEEDS: _____

OTHER NEEDS: _____

COMMUNITY SERVICE: _____

CART ISSUES: _____

Appendix G Correlation Matrices

Correlations

| | | Mean Z Scale PR Scale | Any Adjustments in PRC? | Successfully Discharged? | Male? | Age at Screening | Race | No. of Prior P&P | No. of Prior P&P Revocations | No. of Prior Incarcerations >30 Days (adult time only) | Felony Most Ser | Person Off NO DUI Most Serious Instant | Drug Off Most Serious Instant | Property Off Most Serious Instant | DUI Off Most Serious Instant | VOP ONLY Instant Offense | Total SSS NO crime with psych |
|--|--|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Mean Z Scale PR Scale | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | 1 .000 548 | -.362** .000 548 | .312** .000 548 | -.094* .000 548 | -.215** .000 548 | -.169** .000 548 | -.180** .000 548 | -.144** .001 548 | .076 .076 548 | -.034 .428 548 | -.058 .177 548 | .068 .432 548 | -.085* .047 548 | .034 .432 548 | .058 .174 548 | -.131** .002 546 |
| Any Adjustments in PRC? | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | -.362** .000 548 | 1 .000 600 | -.354** .000 600 | .039 .334 600 | -.207** .000 600 | -.140** .001 600 | -.052 .200 600 | .031 .450 600 | .051 .215 600 | .168** .000 600 | -.138** .001 600 | .059 .338 600 | .039 .000 600 | -.202** .000 600 | -.013 .744 600 | -.228** .000 598 |
| Successfully Discharged? | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | .312** .000 548 | -.354** .000 600 | 1 .000 600 | -.029 .475 600 | -.167** .000 600 | -.103* .011 600 | .001 .988 600 | -.057 .164 600 | -.003 .946 600 | -.056 .173 600 | -.044 .281 600 | -.020 .631 600 | .011 .781 600 | -.117** .004 600 | -.074 .071 600 | -.183** .000 598 |
| Male? | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | -.094* .027 548 | .039 .334 600 | -.029 .475 600 | 1 .000 600 | -.166** .000 600 | -.088* .030 600 | .083* .042 600 | .045 .269 600 | .019 .638 600 | -.036 .383 600 | .119** .004 600 | .002 .959 600 | -.140** .001 600 | .074 .070 600 | -.037 .369 600 | -.038 .351 598 |
| Age at Screening | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | .215** .000 548 | -.207** .000 600 | .167** .000 600 | -.166** .000 600 | 1 .000 600 | .144** .000 600 | .217** .000 600 | .005 .893 600 | .198** .000 600 | -.214** .000 600 | -.189** .126 600 | -.063 .725 600 | .014 .000 600 | .234** .000 600 | -.025 .535 600 | -.282** .000 598 |
| Race | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | -.169** .000 548 | -.140** .001 600 | .103* .011 600 | -.088* .030 600 | -.144** .000 600 | 1 .001 600 | .129** .191 600 | .053 .081 600 | -.071 .364 600 | -.037 .153 600 | -.058 .444 600 | -.031 .224 600 | -.050 .000 600 | .211** .000 600 | -.081* .048 600 | -.130** .001 598 |
| No. of Prior P&P | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | .180** .000 548 | -.052 .200 600 | .001 .988 600 | .083* .042 600 | .217** .000 600 | .129** .001 600 | 1 .000 600 | .526** .000 600 | .398** .000 600 | -.135** .002 600 | -.128** .318 600 | .041 .147 600 | -.059 .000 600 | .068 .095 600 | .083* .041 600 | -.065 .114 598 |
| No. of Prior P&P Revocations | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | -.144** .001 548 | .031 .450 600 | -.057 .164 600 | .045 .269 600 | .005 .893 600 | .053 .191 600 | .526** .000 600 | 1 .000 600 | .423** .000 600 | .030 .460 600 | -.011 .785 600 | .087* .033 600 | -.055 .178 600 | -.117** .004 600 | .121** .003 600 | -.142** .000 598 |
| No. of Prior Incarcerations >30 Days (adult time only) | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | .076 .076 548 | .051 .215 600 | -.003 .946 600 | .019 .638 600 | .198** .000 600 | -.071 .081 600 | .398** .000 600 | .423** .000 600 | 1 .761 600 | -.012 .252 600 | -.047 .252 600 | .048 .236 600 | .092* .024 600 | -.185** .000 600 | .094* .021 600 | -.215** .000 598 |
| Felony Most Ser | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | -.034 .428 548 | -.168** .000 600 | -.056 .173 600 | -.036 .383 600 | -.214** .000 600 | -.037 .364 600 | -.135** .001 600 | .030 .460 600 | -.012 .761 600 | 1 .000 600 | .160** .000 600 | .032 .428 600 | .286** .000 600 | -.386** .000 600 | -.094* .022 600 | -.089* .029 598 |
| Person Off NO DUI Most Serious Instant | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | -.058 .177 548 | .138** .001 600 | -.044 .281 600 | .119** .004 600 | -.189** .000 600 | -.058 .153 600 | -.128** .002 600 | -.011 .785 600 | -.047 .252 600 | .160** .000 600 | 1 .000 600 | -.171** .000 600 | -.284** .000 600 | -.251** .000 600 | -.245** .000 600 | -.121** .003 598 |
| Drug Off Most Serious Instant | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | .068 .112 548 | .059 .151 600 | -.020 .631 600 | .002 .959 600 | -.063 .126 600 | -.031 .444 600 | .041 .318 600 | .087* .033 600 | .048 .236 600 | .032 .428 600 | -.171** .000 600 | 1 .000 600 | -.219** .000 600 | -.194** .000 600 | -.189** .000 600 | -.042 .302 598 |
| Property Off Most Serious Instant | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | -.085* .047 548 | .039 .338 600 | .011 .781 600 | -.140** .001 600 | .014 .725 600 | -.050 .224 600 | -.059 .147 600 | -.055 .178 600 | .092* .024 600 | .286** .000 600 | -.284** .000 600 | -.219** .000 600 | 1 .000 600 | -.322** .000 600 | -.314** .000 600 | -.042 .308 598 |
| DUI Off Most Serious Instant | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | .034 .432 548 | -.202** .000 600 | .117** .004 600 | .074 .070 600 | .234** .000 600 | .211** .000 600 | .068 .095 600 | -.117** .004 600 | -.185** .000 600 | -.386** .000 600 | -.251** .000 600 | -.194** .000 600 | -.322** .000 600 | 1 .000 600 | -.278** .000 600 | .329** .000 598 |
| VOP ONLY Instant Offense | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | .058 .174 548 | -.013 .744 600 | -.074 .071 600 | -.037 .369 600 | -.025 .535 600 | -.081* .048 600 | .083* .041 600 | .121** .003 600 | .094* .021 600 | -.094* .022 600 | -.245** .000 600 | -.189** .000 600 | -.314** .000 600 | -.278** .000 600 | 1 .000 600 | -.142** .000 598 |
| Total SSS NO crime with psych | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | .131** .002 546 | -.228** .000 598 | .183** .000 598 | -.038 .351 598 | .282** .000 598 | .130** .001 598 | -.065 .114 598 | -.142** .000 598 | -.215** .000 598 | -.089* .029 598 | -.121** .003 598 | -.042 .302 598 | -.042 .308 598 | .329** .000 598 | -.142** .000 598 | 1 .000 598 |

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

| | | Mean Z Scale PR Scale | Any Adjustments in PRC? | Successfully Discharged? | Psy Total Score | Pred Employment | Pred Personal Data | Pred Failure Indicators | Big 6 Prim/Sec Group 6 = NOT big 6; 0 = Big 6 | Class Residency | Class Situational Factors | Class Recommen- dations | Class Screener Assessment | Total SSS NO crime with psych |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Mean Z Scale PR Scale | Pearson Correlation | 1 | -.362** | .312** | .029 | .150** | .218** | -.046 | .076 | -.038 | .046 | -.048 | .104* | .131** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 | .000 | .495 | .000 | .000 | .281 | .075 | .376 | .283 | .259 | .015 | .002 |
| | N | 548 | 548 | 548 | 548 | 548 | 548 | 548 | 546 | 548 | 548 | 548 | 548 | 546 |
| Any Adjustments in PRC? | Pearson Correlation | -.362** | 1 | -.354** | -.119** | -.207** | -.244** | -.110** | -.060 | -.049 | -.138** | .059 | -.030 | -.228** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | . | .000 | .003 | .000 | .000 | .007 | .143 | .228 | .001 | .149 | .463 | .000 |
| | N | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 |
| Successfully Discharged? | Pearson Correlation | .312** | -.354** | 1 | .106** | .187** | .165** | .084* | .120** | -.022 | .084* | -.025 | -.029 | .183** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | . | .009 | .000 | .000 | .040 | .003 | .590 | .040 | .533 | .485 | .000 |
| | N | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 |
| Psy Total Score | Pearson Correlation | .029 | -.119** | .106** | 1 | .389** | .207** | .342** | .048 | -.033 | .224** | -.088* | .223** | .499** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .495 | .003 | .009 | . | .000 | .000 | .000 | .244 | .420 | .000 | .031 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 |
| Pred Employment | Pearson Correlation | .150** | -.207** | .187** | .389** | 1 | .388** | -.298** | .058 | .037 | .403** | -.196** | .117** | .667** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | . | .000 | .000 | .155 | .367 | .000 | .000 | .004 | .000 |
| | N | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 |
| Pred Personal Data | Pearson Correlation | .218** | -.244** | .165** | .207** | .388** | 1 | .137** | .114** | .000 | .315** | -.130** | .001 | .505** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | . | .001 | .005 | .998 | .000 | .001 | .974 | .000 |
| | N | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 |
| Pred Failure Indicators | Pearson Correlation | -.046 | -.110** | .084* | .342** | .298** | .137** | 1 | -.021 | -.100* | .241** | -.107** | .179** | .540** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .281 | .007 | .040 | .000 | .000 | .001 | . | .602 | .015 | .000 | .008 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 |
| Big 6 Prim/Sec Group 6 = NOT big 6; 0 = Big 6 | Pearson Correlation | .076 | -.060 | .120** | .048 | .058 | .114** | -.021 | 1 | .028 | -.083* | -.065 | -.003 | .358** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .075 | .143 | .003 | .244 | .155 | .005 | .602 | . | .494 | .042 | .110 | .938 | .000 |
| | N | 546 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 |
| Class Residency | Pearson Correlation | -.038 | -.049 | -.022 | -.033 | .037 | .000 | -.100* | .028 | 1 | .030 | -.034 | -.025 | .232** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .376 | .228 | .590 | .420 | .367 | .998 | .015 | .494 | . | .461 | .405 | .546 | .000 |
| | N | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 |
| Class Situational Factors | Pearson Correlation | .046 | -.138** | .084* | .224** | .403** | .315** | .241** | -.083* | .030 | 1 | .006 | .195** | .531** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .283 | .001 | .040 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .042 | .461 | . | .878 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 |
| Class Recommendations | Pearson Correlation | -.048 | .059 | -.025 | -.088* | -.196** | -.130** | -.107** | -.065 | -.034 | .006 | 1 | .076 | .097* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .259 | .149 | .533 | .031 | .000 | .001 | .008 | .110 | .405 | .878 | . | .062 | .018 |
| | N | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 |
| Class Screener Assessment | Pearson Correlation | .104* | -.030 | -.029 | .223** | .117** | .001 | .179** | -.003 | -.025 | .195** | .076 | 1 | .426** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .015 | .463 | .485 | .000 | .004 | .974 | .000 | .938 | .546 | .000 | .062 | . | .000 |
| | N | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 598 |
| Total SSS NO crime with psych | Pearson Correlation | .131** | -.228** | .183** | .499** | .667** | .505** | .540** | .358** | .232** | .531** | .097* | .426** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .002 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .018 | .000 | . |
| | N | 546 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 |

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix H Supplemental Analysis for Discussion Chapter

Table H-1. Partial Correlations - Performance Ratings and Number of Times on Parole & Probation, Controlling for Age

Correlations

| Control Variables | | | Mean Z Scale PR Scale | No. of Prior P&P |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Age at Screening | Mean Z Scale PR Scale | Correlation | 1.000 | .140 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | . | .001 |
| | | df | 0 | 545 |
| | No. of Prior P&P | Correlation | .140 | 1.000 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .001 | . |
| | | df | 545 | 0 |

Table H-2. Partial Correlations - Performance Ratings and Number of Times Revoked from Parole & Probation, Controlling for Age

Correlations

| Control Variables | | | Mean Z Scale PR Scale | No. of Prior P&P Revocations |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Age at Screening | Mean Z Scale PR Scale | Correlation | 1.000 | .146 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | . | .001 |
| | | df | 0 | 545 |
| | No. of Prior P&P Revocations | Correlation | .146 | 1.000 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .001 | . |
| | | df | 545 | 0 |

Table H-3. Comparison DUI/DWI Offends versus Other Offender Types

| | DUI/DWI Offenders | | | Other Offender Types | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------|----------------|----------------------|----------|----------------|
| | N | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD |
| Race (White vs. Non-White) | 133 | .62 | .48 | 467 | .37** | .48 |
| Male | 133 | .77 | .42 | 467 | .69+ | .46 |
| Age at Screening | 133 | 37.21 | 8.72 | 467 | 31.55** | 10.08 |
| Currently in Relationship | 133 | .59 | .49 | 467 | .54 | .50 |
| Years in Relationship | 78 | 7.69 | 8.01 | 253 | 5.18* | 5.79 |
| Parent? | 133 | .57 | .50 | 467 | .67+ | .47 |
| Number of Children | 76 | 2.03 | 1.25 | 311 | 2.16 | 1.43 |
| Number of Children Lives With | 76 | .96 | 1.24 | 311 | .56* | .94 |
| Prior Times P&P | 133 | 2.47 | 1.54 | 467 | 2.14+ | 2.12 |
| Prior P&P Revocations | 133 | .39 | .86 | 467 | .71** | 1.20 |
| Prior Periods Incarceration | 133 | .39 | .87 | 467 | 1.21** | 1.99 |
| SSS Employment Score | 133 | 5.02 | 2.61 | 467 | 2.28** | 2.41 |
| Length of Stay (Days) | 133 | 68.38 | 49.09 | 467 | 100.04** | 51.49 |
| | | | Percent | | | Percent |
| Identified as SSS Big 6 | 133 | 14 | 11% | 467 | 135 | 29% |

⁺ Difference is significant, $p < .10$

* Difference is significant at $p < .05$

** Difference is significant at $p < .01$

Table H-4. Those Unsuccessfully Discharged, Reasons for Revocation

| Reasons for Revocation | N | % |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| N=75** | | |
| Broke Rules | 44 | 62% |
| Not Drug/Alcohol Free | 18 | 25% |
| Unaccountable in Community | 8 | 11% |
| Other (Unstable, Released on Bond, Detainer) | 1 | 1% |
| | 71 | 100% |

(**4 cases missing data)

Table H-5. SSS Seriousness of Instant Offense Item Score by Offender Type

| Offender Type by Most Serious Offense | Seriousness of Instant Offense SSS Item Score | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| | 0 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | | |
| N=600 | N | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | |
| Person (Non-DUI) Offender | 109 | 28 | 26% | 51 | 47% | 23 | 21% | 7 | 6% | |
| DUI/DWI Offender | 133 | 0 | 0% | 4 | 3% | 51 | 38% | 78 | 59% | |
| Property Offender | 160 | 2 | 1% | 94 | 59% | 43 | 27% | 21 | 13% | |
| Drug Offender | 70 | 1 | 1% | 55 | 79% | 10 | 14% | 4 | 6% | |
| VOP Only Offender | 128 | 4 | 3% | 57 | 45% | 44 | 34% | 23 | 18% | |
| Total | 600 | 35 | 6% | 261 | 44% | 171 | 29% | 133 | 22% | |

SSS Score Key

- 0: Murder, violent sex crime, sex assaults on children, armed robbery, arson, kidnapping, escape
- 4: Manslaughter, assault & battery (more serious cases), child abuse, breaking and entering, strong arm robbery, burglary, non-violent sex crimes, larceny over \$500, blackmail, vehicle theft, forgery, tax evasion.
- 5: Possession of firearms, assault & battery (less serious cases), shoplifting, perjury, receiving stolen goods, larceny under \$500, welfare fraud, rogue and vagabond
- 6: Non-support, destruction of property, traffic cases, trespassing, disorderly conduct, prostitution, contempt

Table H-6. Partial Correlations – DUI/DWI Offenders, Performance Ratings and SSS Components, Controlling for Age

Correlations

| Control Variables | | | DUI Off Most Serious Instant | Mean Z Scale PR Scale | Psy Total Score | Pred Employment | Pred Personal Data | Pred Failure Indicators | Big 6 Prim/Sec Group 6 = NOT big 6; 0 = Big 6 | Class Residency | Class Situational Factors | Class Recommendations | Class Screener Assessment |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Age at Screening | DUI Off Most Serious Instant | Correlation | 1.000 | -.014 | .300 | .376 | .140 | .094 | .168 | .091 | .149 | -.232 | -.015 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | . | .752 | .000 | .000 | .001 | .028 | .000 | .034 | .000 | .000 | .729 |
| | | df | 0 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 |
| | Mean Z Scale PR Scale | Correlation | -.014 | 1.000 | -.006 | .104 | .115 | -.066 | .057 | -.031 | .033 | -.023 | .114 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .752 | . | .881 | .015 | .007 | .125 | .183 | .464 | .443 | .589 | .008 |
| | | df | 543 | 0 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 |
| | Psy Total Score | Correlation | .300 | -.006 | 1.000 | .335 | .121 | .334 | .045 | -.044 | .210 | -.052 | .232 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .000 | .881 | . | .000 | .005 | .000 | .292 | .310 | .000 | .222 | .000 |
| | | df | 543 | 543 | 0 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 |
| | Pred Employment | Correlation | .376 | .104 | .335 | 1.000 | .305 | .278 | .031 | .030 | .398 | -.183 | .129 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .000 | .015 | .000 | . | .000 | .000 | .464 | .491 | .000 | .000 | .003 |
| | | df | 543 | 543 | 543 | 0 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 |
| | Pred Personal Data | Correlation | .140 | .115 | .121 | .305 | 1.000 | .100 | .070 | .002 | .315 | -.094 | .034 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .001 | .007 | .005 | .000 | . | .020 | .105 | .957 | .000 | .028 | .423 |
| | | df | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 0 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 |
| | Pred Failure Indicators | Correlation | .094 | -.066 | .334 | .278 | .100 | 1.000 | -.032 | -.101 | .237 | -.094 | .167 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .028 | .125 | .000 | .000 | .020 | . | .458 | .018 | .000 | .028 | .000 |
| | | df | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 0 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 |
| | Big 6 Prim/Sec Group 6 = NOT big 6; 0 = Big 6 | Correlation | .168 | .057 | .045 | .031 | .070 | -.032 | 1.000 | .034 | -.111 | -.059 | -.003 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .000 | .183 | .292 | .464 | .105 | .458 | . | .428 | .010 | .169 | .952 |
| | | df | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 0 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 |
| | Class Residency | Correlation | .091 | -.031 | -.044 | .030 | .002 | -.101 | .034 | 1.000 | .031 | -.035 | -.002 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .034 | .464 | .310 | .491 | .957 | .018 | .428 | . | .469 | .415 | .968 |
| | | df | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 0 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 |
| | Class Situational Factors | Correlation | .149 | .033 | .210 | .398 | .315 | .237 | -.111 | .031 | 1.000 | .002 | .212 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .000 | .443 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .010 | .469 | . | .968 | .000 |
| | | df | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 0 | 543 | 543 | 543 |
| | Class Recommendations | Correlation | -.232 | -.023 | -.052 | -.183 | -.094 | -.094 | -.059 | -.035 | .002 | 1.000 | .060 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .000 | .589 | .222 | .000 | .028 | .028 | .169 | .415 | .968 | . | .160 |
| | | df | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 0 | 543 | 543 |
| | Class Screener Assessment | Correlation | -.015 | .114 | .232 | .129 | .034 | .167 | -.003 | -.002 | .212 | .060 | 1.000 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .729 | .008 | .000 | .003 | .423 | .000 | .952 | .968 | .000 | .160 | . |
| | | df | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 543 | 0 | 0 |

Table H-7. Attendance At Least One 12-Step Meeting Weekly by Offender Type

| Type by Most Serious Offense | N | Attended at Least One 12-Step Meeting Weekly | | Did Not Attend 12-Step Meetings Weekly | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|---|------------|---|------------|
| | | N | % | N | % |
| N=600** | | | | | |
| Person (Non-DUI) Offender | 109 | 89 | 82% | 20 | 18% |
| DUI/DWI Offender | 133 | 119 | 90% | 14 | 10% |
| Property Offender | 159 | 114 | 72% | 45 | 28% |
| Drug Offender | 70 | 68 | 97% | 2 | 3% |
| VOP Only Offender | 125 | 111 | 89% | 14 | 11% |
| Total | 596 | 501 | 84% | 95 | 16% |

(**4 cases missing data)

Table H-8 Test of SSS Employment Component Score and By Item Performance Rating Z-Score Scale: Coefficients and T Statistic Adjustment Actions and Discharge Status: Log Odds and Z Statistic

| | Model (1) Performance Ratings | Model (2) Performance Ratings | Model (1) Adjustment Actions | Model (2) Adjustment Actions | Model (1) Discharge Status | Model (2) Discharge Status |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Age at Screening | 0.008 (3.90)** | 0.007 (3.47)** | 0.968 (3.66)** | 0.967 (3.58)** | 1.041 (2.77)** | 1.046 (2.99)** |
| Gender (Male=1) | -0.067 (1.48) | -0.065 (1.43) | 1.081 (0.41) | 1.146 (0.70) | 0.945 (0.19) | 0.881 (0.42) |
| Race (White=1) | 0.118 (2.84)** | 0.110 (2.63)** | 0.706 (1.98)* | 0.698 (2.01)* | 1.392 (1.17) | 1.466 (1.32) |
| SSS Employment | 0.016 (2.01)* | | 0.887 (3.55)** | | 1.248 (3.43)** | |
| Work History | | 0.005 (0.16) | | 0.710 (2.44)* | | 1.922 (2.71)** |
| Job Quality | | 0.007 (0.16) | | 0.770 (1.39) | | 1.673 (1.40) |
| Job Skill | | 0.045 (1.92) | | 0.981 (0.19) | | 0.865 (0.86) |
| Employer Need | | -0.009 (0.26) | | 1.223 (1.41) | | 0.823 (0.66) |
| Constant | -0.309 (3.83)** | -0.294 (3.61)** | | | | |
| Observations | 548 | 548 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 |
| Adjusted or Pseudo R-square | 0.0689 | 0.0674 | 0.0562 | 0.0660 | 0.0797 | 0.0986 |
| Predicted Prob. | | | .5043 | .5044 | .8998 | .9051 |

* Significant at $p < .05$

** Significant at $p < .01$

References

- Acevedo, K.C. & T. Bakken (2003). Women Adjusting to Prison: Disciplinary Behavior and the Characteristics of Adjustment. Journal of Health & Social Policy, 17, (4), 37-60.
- Allison, P.D. (1999). Multiple Regression: A Primer Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Andrews, D.A., J. Bonta, & J.S. Wormith (2006). The Recent Past and Near Future of Risk and/or Need Assessment. Crime & Delinquency, 52, (1), 7-27.
- Bachman, R., & R. Paternoster (1997). Statistical Methods for Criminology & Criminal Justice New York; McGraw-Hill
- Blumstein, A., J. Cohen, S. Das & S.D. Moitra (1988). Specialization and Seriousness during Adult Criminal Careers. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 4, (4), 303-345.
- Bonta, J., (1996). Risk-Needs Assessment and Treatment in Choosing Correctional Options that Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply, Alan T. Harland (ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Bonta, J., M. Law & K. Hanson (1998). The Prediction of Criminal and Violent Recidivism Among Mentally Disordered Offenders: A Meta-Analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 123, (2), 123-142.
- Boone, H.N. & B.A. Fulton (1996). Implementing Performance-Based Measures in Community Corrections. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 158836.
- Boothby, J.L. & T.W. Durham (1999). Screening For Depression in Prisoners Using the Beck Depression Inventory. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 26, (1), 107-124.
- Bottoms, A.E. (1999). Interpersonal Violence and Social Order in Prisons in Prisons. Michael Tonry & Joan Petersilia (eds). Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Brumbaugh, S., & D.M. Steffey (2005). The Importance of Constructing and Validating Risk Assessment Instruments in Community Corrections Settings. Justice Research and Policy, 7 (2), 57-85.
- Bushway, S.D. & A. M. Piehl, (2001) Judging Judicial Discretion: Legal Factors and Racial Discrimination in Sentencing Law & Society Review, 35 (4), 733-764.

Butzin, C.A., S.S. Martin & J.A. Inciardi (2005). Treatment During Transition from Prison to Community And Subsequent Illicit Drug Use. Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 28, 351-358.

Camp, S.D., G.G. Gaes, N.P. Langan, & W.G. Saylor (2003). The Influence of Prisons on Inmate Misconduct: A Multilevel Investigation. Justice Quarterly, 20, (3), 501-533.

Carbonell, J.L., & R. Perkins (2000). Diagnosis and Assessment of Criminal Offenders in Correctional Counseling and Rehabilitation, 4th Ed. Patricia Van Voorhis, Michael Braswell & David Lester (eds). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.

Clear, T.R., & H.R. Dammer (2003). The Offender in the Community, 2nd Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Cohen, L.E. & Vila, B.J. (1996). Self-Control and Social Control: An Exposition of the Gottfredson-Hirschi/Sampson-Laub Debate. Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention, 5, 125-150.

Collie, R.M & D.L.L. Polaschek (2003). Sorting Women's Risk: New Zealand Women Prisoners' Misconducts and Internal Security Risk. New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 32, (2) 101-109.

Decision Research Associates (Undated). Correctional Classification Decisions: Maryland Division of Correction Subcontractor's Final Report. Gary D. Gottfredson.

Doeren, S.E. & M.J. Hageman (1982). Community Corrections Cincinnati, Oh: Anderson Publishing Co.

Egan, V., J. Auty, R. Miller, S. Ahmadi, C. Richardson & I. Gargan (1999). Sensational Interests and General Personality Traits. Journal of Forensic Psychiatry, 10, (3), 567-582.

Farr, K.A. (2000). Classification for Female Inmates: Moving Forward. Crime and Delinquency, 26, (1), 3-17.

Farrington, D. P. (1987). Predicting Individual Crime Rates in Prediction and Classification Criminal Justice Decision Making Don M. Gottfredson & Michael Tonry (eds). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Farrington, D.P. & R.Tarling (1985). Criminological Prediction: The Way Forward in Prediction in Criminology David P. Farrington and Roger Tarling, (eds.) Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Flanagan, T.J. (1983). Correlates of Institutional Misconduct Among State Prisoners: A Research Note. Criminology 21, (1), 29-39.

Gendreau, P. & C. Goggin (1996). Principles of Effective Assessment for Community Corrections. Federal Probation, 50, (3), 64-71.

Gendreau, P., T. Little, & C. Goggin (1996). A Meta-Analysis of the Predictors of Adult Offender Recidivism: What Works! Criminology, 34, (4), 575-607.

Glaser, D. (1987). Classification for Risk in Prediction and Classification Criminal Justice Decision Making Don M. Gottfredson & Michael Tonry (eds). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Goodstein, L. (1979). Inmate Adjustment to Prison and the Transition to Community Life. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 16, (2), 246-272

Goodstein, L. & K.N. Wright (1989). Inmate Adjustment to Prison. The American Prison: Issues in Research and Policy. L. Goodstein and D. MacKenzie (eds) N.Y.: Plenum

Gottfredson, M., R., & T. Hirschi (1990). A General Theory of Crime, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gottfredson, S. D. (1987). Prediction: An Overview of Selected Methodological Issues in Prediction and Classification Criminal Justice Decision Making Don M. Gottfredson & Michael Tonry (eds). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Gottfredson, S.D., & D.M. Gottfredson (1994). Behavioral Prediction and the Problem of Incapacitation. Criminology, 32 (3), 441-474.

Gottfredson, S.D. & L.J. Moriarty (2006). Statistical Risk Assessment: Old Problems and New Applications. Crime & Delinquency, 52, (1), 178-200.

Gover, A.R., D.L. MacKenzie, & G.S. Armstrong (2000). Importation and Deprivation Explanations of Juveniles' Adjustment to Correctional Facilities. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 44, (4), 450-467.

Harris, P., & S. Smith (1996). Developing Community Corrections: An Implementation Perspective in Choosing Correctional Options That Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply. Alan T. Harland (ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Harrison, L.D. (2001). The Revolving Prison Door for Drug-Involved Offenders: Challenges and Opportunities. Crime & Delinquency, 47, (3), 462-485.

Heimer, K. & S. De Coster (1999). The Gendering of Violent Delinquency. Criminology, 37, (2), 277-318.

Hemmens, C. & J. W. Marquart (2000). Friend or Foe? Race, Age, and Inmate Perceptions of Inmate-Staff Relations. Journal of Criminal Justice, 28, 297-312.

Hemphill, J.F., & S.D. Hart (2002). Motivating the Unmotivated: Psychopathy, Treatment, and Change in Motivating Offenders to Change: A Guide to Enhancing Engagement in Therapy. Mary McMurrin, (ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Hill, G. (1985). Predicting Recidivism Using Institutional Measure in Prediction in Criminology David P. Farrington and Roger Tarling, (eds.) Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Holsinger, A.M., A.J. Lurigio, & E.J. Latessa (2001). Practitioner's Guide to Understanding the Basis of Assessing Offender Risk. Federal Probation, 65, (1).

Hubbard, D.A. & T.C. Pratt (2002). A Meta-Analysis of the Predictors of Delinquency in Girls. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 34, (3), 1-13.

Hughes, E.C. (1996). The Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation Pre-Release Services Program: The Monitoring and Impact Assessment of a Community Corrections Program Unpublished Masters Thesis University of Maryland, College Park.

Inciardi, J.A., S.S. Martin & C.A. Butzin (2004). Five-Year Outcomes of Therapeutic Community Treatment of Drug-Involved Offenders After Release From Prison. Crime & Delinquency, 50, (1), 88-107.

Jiang, S. (2005). Impact of Drug Use on Inmate Misconduct: A Multilevel Analysis. Journal of Criminal Justice, 33, 153-163.

Jones, P.R. (1996) Risk Prediction in Criminal Justice in Choosing Correctional Options That Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply. Alan T. Harland (ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Katz, J.F. & S.H. Decker (1982). An Analysis of Work Release: The Institutionalization of Unsubstantiated Reforms. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 9, (10), 229-250.

Kerlinger, F.N. & Lee, H.B. (2000). Foundations of Behavioral Research, 4th Edition Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.

Kinlock, T.W., K.E. O'Grady, & T.E. Hanlon (2003). The Effects of Drug Treatment on Institutional Behavior. The Prison Journal, 83, (3), 257-276.

Knight, K., B.R. Garner, D.D. Simpson, J.T. Morey & P.M. Flynn (2006). An Assessment for Criminal Thinking, Crime & Delinquency, 52, (1), 159-177.

Kruttschnitt, C., & R. Gartner (2005). Marking Time in the Golden State: Women's Imprisonment in California Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Latessa, E.J. (2005). The Classification and Assessment of Offenders: The Engine that Drives Effective Correctional Practices and Interventions. Presentation at the International Conference on Community Corrections, Dalian, China July 2005

Latessa, E.J. & L. F. Travis III (1992). Residential Community Correctional Programs (CCP). In Smart Sentencing: The Emergence of Intermediate Sanctions. James M. Byrne, Arthur J. Lurigio and Joan Petersilia (eds). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Liebling, A. (1999). Prison Suicide and Prisoner Coping. In Prisons. Michael Tonry & Joan Petersilia (eds). Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Light, S.C. (1990). Measurement Error in Official Statistics: Prison Rule Infraction Data. Federal Probation, 54, (4), 63-69.

Long, J. S. (1997). Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables Advanced Quantitative Techniques in the Social Sciences Series. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Loper, A. B. (2003). The Relationship of Maladaptive Beliefs to Personality and Behavioral Adjustment Among Incarcerated Women. . Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly, 17, (3), 253-266.

Lowenkamp, C.T., & E.J. Latessa (2005). Increasing the Effectiveness of Correctional Programming Through the Risk Principle: Identifying Offenders for Residential Placement. Criminology & Public Policy, 4, (2), 263-290.

Lowenkamp, C.T., E.J. Latessa & A.M. Holsinger (2006). The Risk Principle in Action: What Have we Learned From 13,676 Offenders and 97 Correctional Programs? Crime & Delinquency, 52, (1), 77-93.

MacKenzie, D.L. (2002). Reducing the Criminal Activities of Known Offenders and Delinquents: Crime Prevention in the Courts and Corrections in Evidence-Based Crime Prevention. Lawrence W. Sherman, David P. Farrington, Brandon C. Welsh and Doris Layton MacKenzie (eds). New York: Rutledge.

_____. (2001) Sentencing and Corrections in the 21st Century: Setting the Stage for the Future Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 189089.

Marowitz, L.A., (1998). Predicting DUI Recidivism: Blood Alcohol Concentration and Driver Record Factors. Accident Analysis and Prevention, 30, (4), 545-554.

Marion, N. (2002). Effectiveness of Community-Based Correctional Programs: A Case Study. The Prison Journal, 82, (4), 478-497.

Mason K.W. (1979). Refinement of the Montgomery County Pre-Release Center Program: The Relationship between Offender Behavior Patterns and Performance Outcomes. Montgomery County Pre-Release Center

McCarthy, B.R., & B.J. McCarthy, Jr. (1984). Community-Based Corrections Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company

McCorkle, R.C. (1995). Gender, Psychopathology, and Institutional Behavior: A Comparison of Male and Female Mentally Ill Prison Inmates. Journal of Criminal Justice, 23, (1), 53-61.

Meehl, P.E., & A. Rosen (1955). Antecedent Probability and the Efficiency of Psychometric Signs, Patterns, or Cutting Scores. Psychological Bulletin, 52, (3), 194-216.

Million, T., C. Million, R. Davis & S. Grossman (2006) Pearson Assessments http://www.pearsonassessments.com/tests/mcmmi_3.htm Retrieved February 3, 2006.

Mitchell, O., & D.L. MacKenzie (2006). The Stability and Resiliency of Self-Control in a Sample of Incarcerated Offenders. Crime & Delinquency, 52, (3), 432-449.

Moffitt, T.E., A. Caspi, M. Rutter, & P.A. Silva (2001) Sex Differences in Antisocial Behavior: Conduct Disorder, Delinquency and Violence in the Dunedin Longitudinal Study Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Montgomery County Pre-Release Center (2003a) Guidebook, Fall 2003.

_____. (2003b) Rating Standards for Resident Performance, May 2003 Revision Developed 1973 Revised 1974, 1977, 1981, 1986, 1997, 2003.

_____. (1989a) Montgomery County Community Corrections Guidelines for Rating Items on the Suitability Selection Scale (“Suitability Rating Guidelines”) Revised June 21, 1989, Effective July 1, 1989.

_____. (1989b) General Community Corrections Applicant Groups Based on Suitability Selection Scale Scores for Eligible Candidates Revised June 21, 1989, Effective July 1, 1989.

_____. (1989c) Definition of PRC Behavioral Classification Patterns Revised June 21, 1989, Effective July 1, 1989.

Mustard (2001) Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Disparities in Sentencing: Evidence from the U.S. Federal Courts Journal of Law & Economics, 44, (1), 285-314.

Nagin, D., & R. Paternoster (2000). Population Heterogeneity and State Dependence: State of the Evidence and Directions for Future Research. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 16, (2), 117-144.

O'Connor, F.W., D. Lovell, & L. Brown (2002). Implementing Residential Treatment for Prison Inmates with Mental Illness. Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, Vol. XVI, (5), 232-238.

Peters, R.H. (1993). Drug Treatment in Jails and Detention Settings in Drug Treatment and Criminal Justice James A. Inciardi (ed). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Petersilia, J. (2003). When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry Oxford: University Press.

_____. (2002) Community Corrections in Crime: Public Policies for Crime Control. James Q. Wilson and Joan Petersilia (eds). San Francisco, CA: ICS Press Institute for Contemporary Studies.

_____. (1998). Probation and Parole. In The Handbook of Crime & Punishment M. Tonry (Ed) 563-588. New York: Oxford University Press.

Petersilia, J & S. Turner (1987). Guideline-based Justice: Prediction and Racial Minorities in Prediction and Classification Criminal Justice Decision Making Don M. Gottfredson & Michael Tonry (eds). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Piehl, A.M., & S.D. Bushway (2007). Measuring and Explaining Charge Bargaining. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 23, 103-125.

Piven, F.P. & Cloward, R.A. (1993). Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare. New York: Random House.

Pritchard, D.A. (1979). Stable Predictors of Recidivism: A Summary. Criminology, 17, (1), 15-21.

Reiss, Jr., A.J. (1951). The Accuracy, Efficiency, and Validity of a Prediction Instrument. The American Journal of Sociology, 56 (6), 552-561

Robbins, L., (1978). Aetiological Implications in Studies of Childhood Histories Related to Antisocial Personality” in Psychopathic Behavior, R. Hard & D. Schalling (eds). New York: Wiley.

Salekin, R.T., R. Rogers, K.L. Ustad & K.W. Sewell (1998). Psychopathy and Recidivism among Female Inmates. Law and Human Behavior, 22, (1), 109-128.

Sampson R.J. & Laub, J.H. (1993). Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Scull, A.T. (1984). Decarceration: Community Treatment and the Deviant - A Radical View. (2nd ed.) New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press

Smith, D.A., (1986). The Plea Bargaining Controversy. The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 77, (3), 949-968

Smith, D.A. & C. A. Visher (1981). Street-Level Justice: Situational Determinants of Police Arrest Decisions. Social Problems, 29, (2), 167-177.

Spohn, C.J., (2000). Thirty Years of Sentencing Reform: The Quest for a Racially Neutral Sentencing Process." In Policies, Processes, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System. National Institute of Justice: Criminal Justice 2000. Washington, DC: National Institution of Justice

Spohn, C. & J. Cederblom, (1991) Race and Disparities in Sentencing: A Test of the Liberation Hypothesis. Justice Quarterly, 8, (3), 305-327

Steffensmeier, D. & S. Demuth (2000) Ethnicity and Sentencing Outcomes in U.S. Federal Courts: Who is Punished More Harshly? American Sociological Review, 65, (5), 705-729.

Sullivan, C.J., J.M. McGloin, T.C. Pratt, A.R. Piquero (2006). Rethinking the "Norm" of Offender Generality: Investigating Specialization in the Short-Term. Criminology, 44, (1), 199-233.

Toch, H., K. Adams, & R. Greene (1987). Ethnicity, Disruptiveness, and Emotional Disorder Among Prison Inmates. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 14, (1), 93-109.

Toch, H., & K. Adams, (1986). Pathology and Disruptiveness Among Prison Inmates. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 23, (1), 7-21.

Tonigan, J.S., Miller, W.R., & Connors, G.J. (2000). Project MATCH Client Impressions about Alcoholics Anonymous: Measurement Issues and relationship to Treatment Outcomes. Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly, 18 (1) p. 25-41.

Tonry, M. (1996). Sentencing Matters. New York: Oxford University Press

_____. (1987). Prediction and Classification: Legal and Ethical Issues in Prediction and Classification Criminal Justice Decision Making Don M. Gottfredson & Michael Tonry (eds.) Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Turner, S. & J. Petersilia (1996). Work Release: Recidivism and Corrections Costs in Washington State. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 163706.

Uggen, C. (2000). Work as a Turning Point in the Life Course of Criminals: A Duration Model of Age, Employment and Recidivism. American Sociological Review, 67, 529-546.

U.S. Department of Justice. (1999). Women in Criminal Justice: A Twenty Year Update. Retrieved January 2006 from www.ojp.usdoj.gov/reports/98Guides/wcjs98/wcjspdf.pdf

Van Voorhis, P. (1993). Psychological Determinants of the Prison Experience. The Prison Journal, 73, (1), 72-102.

Waldo, G.P., & T.G. Chiricos, (1977). Work Release and Recidivism: An Empirical Evaluation of a Social Policy. Evaluation Quarterly, 1, 87-108.

Waldo, G.P., T.G. Chiricos & L.E. Dobrin, (1973). Community Contact and Inmate Attitudes: An Experimental Assessment of Work Release. Criminology, 11, 345-381.

Warren, M.Q. (1971). Classification of Offenders as an Aid to Efficient Management and Effective Treatment. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 62, 239-258.

Wilkins, L.T. (1985). The Politics of Prediction in Prediction in Criminology David P. Farrington and Roger Tarling, (eds.) Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wright, K.N., T.R. Clear, & P. Dickson (1984). Universal Applicability of Probation Risk=Assessment Instruments. Criminology, 22, 113-134.

Zatz, M. (2000) The Convergence of Race, Ethnicity, Gender, and Class on Court Decisionmaking: Looking Toward the 21st Century in Criminal Justice 2000, Volume 3. Policies, Processes, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System Washington DC: National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice Retrieved January 2, 2006 from www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/criminal_justice2000/vol3_2000.html