

THE CONCORD ACHIEVEMENT REHABILITATION
VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE: AN EVALUATION

Prepared by:

Faye Farrington &
Shari Wittenberg
Research Analysts

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Frank A. Hall
Commissioner

August, 1977

PUBLICATION:#9961-23-250-9/77-CR
Approved by: Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent

ABSTRACT

One aspect of Massachusetts' approach to Community reintegration of the offender is the State Hospital Program whereby inmates are released from the institution during the day to work in state hospitals. One such program is the Concord Achievement Rehabilitation Volunteer Experience (C.A.R.V.E.), which has been in existence since 1968. The purpose of the present study was to determine whether participants in the C.A.R.V.E. Program were less likely to be reincarcerated within 1 year after release than other releasees who had not participated in the program. Analysis revealed that the Recidivism Rate of C.A.R.V.E. participants (18%) was much lower than would have been expected (33%). Their Recidivism Rate was also lower than that of the General Releasee population of MCI-Concord (28%). A comparison of program completers versus non-completers showed a disproportionately high number of program completers who reported to have a skilled position before being incarcerated. This was the only statistically significant difference found between the two sub-samples. It was concluded that the C.A.R.V.E. Program was a positive rehabilitative experience for residents at MCI-Concord.

As part of its continuing commitment to the community reintegration approach to offender rehabilitation, the Massachusetts Department of Correction has implemented a variety of programs designed to ease the offender's transition to the community following institutionalization. Most of these programs, particularly the pre-release facility concept, furlough program and work and education release programs, were made possible by the Correctional Reform Act of 1972 (Chapter 777). However, years prior to the passage of this legislation, the Department implemented a highly innovative community correctional program generally referred to as the "State Hospital Program". Under the auspices of this program, inmates at MCI-Concord and MCI-Norfolk have been working daily at various state hospitals throughout the state. At these hospitals, the inmate provides volunteer care services, generally as ward attendants, to mentally retarded and multiple-handicapped persons. In addition, most of these programs offer an in-service training component in the area of mental retardation and patient care. Inmates who participate in these programs receive valuable work experience and academic instruction in the health services profession that will hopefully improve their post-release employment prospects.

The state hospital program differs from other pre-release programs such as work and education release in that an inmate is not actually released into the community, but is simply transferred from one state facility to another, working under the supervision of correctional officers. Therefore, the normal requirements of Chapter 777 programs are waived, and the inmate does not need to be within 18 months of his parole eligibility date. As a consequence, the program is especially suited for residents serving long-term sentences and provides these individuals with a constructive means of serving out their commitments.

The state hospital program presently involves six Massachusetts correctional facilities and five state hospitals. The table below indicates the participating state institutions.

Operational State Hospital Programs

<u>State Hospital</u>	<u>Participating MCI's</u>
Walter E. Fernald State School	MCI Concord Lancaster Pre-Release Center
Wrentham State Hospital	MCI Norfolk
Medfield State Hospital	Medfield Pre-Release Center
Lakeville Hospital	MCI Plymouth
Westboro State Hospital	MCI Framingham

C.A.R.V.E. Program

This evaluation is directly concerned with the state hospital program involving the Walter E. Fernald State School and MCI-Concord. This program is specifically referred to as the Concord Achievement Rehabilitation Volunteer Experience, hence C.A.R.V.E. The similarity of operation between the C.A.R.V.E. Program and the other state hospital programs allows for the generalization of study findings to these related programs.

The C.A.R.V.E. Program began in February, 1968 in response to a crucial need for additional staff at one of the adult units of the state school. At present, an average of ten to fifteen carefully screened inmates of MCI-Concord and Lancaster Pre-Release are bussed daily to the Fernald School where they provide direct care services to multiple-handicapped individuals. During the past five years over two hundred Concord inmates have participated in this program. Many of these inmates have continued their services to the Fernald School by becoming permanent employees of the school upon their release on parole from MCI-Concord.

In recent years the Concord volunteers have primarily been assigned to the Greene Blind Unit which houses profoundly retarded blind persons. Individual work assignments are varied and include such capacities as ward attendants, therapist aides, and para-professional teachers.

Inmate volunteers receive minimal reimbursement for their services to Fernald School under the sponsorship of C.A.R.V.E. Inmates who are eligible for the Impact grant funds (i.e., Concord commitments) receive stipends of \$20.00 per week. Inmates ineligible for these funds, however, receive only the maximum inmate wage of \$7.50 per week.

In addition to the routine work assignment, C.A.R.V.E. program activities include weekly meetings of C.A.R.V.E. participants and a series of in-service training seminars.

Monthly progress reports on each volunteer are submitted to MCI-Concord and special letters of recommendation are provided as required. Many C.A.R.V.E. participants are paroled directly from the program. At parole hearings, a full performance evaluation and personal recommendation is submitted by the Program Director. Often employment and housing are arranged for exceptional participants and they are paroled directly to the Fernald School where housing is provided. A special Parole Officer is assigned to supervise these parolees.

In addition, the Massachusetts Parole Board has taken an unprecedented step by granting automatic one-month early parole considerations to individuals successfully completing two months service on the C.A.R.V.E. Program.

C.A.R.V.E. Eligibility

An inmate must meet the following requirements in order to be eligible to participate in the C.A.R.V.E. Program:

- (1) The applicant must be a resident of the Farm Dormitory or other minimum security section of the institution;
- (2) The applicant may not be serving time on a sex-related offense or have a prior record of such offense;
- (3) The applicant may not have outstanding warrants or detainers;
- (4) The applicant must have at least three months to serve prior to parole eligibility;
- (5) The applicant must be within eighteen months of parole eligibility date unless he is being considered for one of five special slots reserved for men with longer parole eligibility dates.

C.A.R.V.E. Selection Process

An inmate interested in applying for C.A.R.V.E. participation must notify his institutional case manager of his desire to apply. The case manager will determine the inmate's eligibility for the program and arrange the interview with the C.A.R.V.E. screening committee.

The screening committee, which meets once a month, is composed of a variety of individuals representing the two institutions involved, i.e., MCI-Concord and the Walter E. Fernald State School, as well as Central Office personnel of the Departments of Mental Health, Correction and Parole.

The official screening committee must include the presence of: one institutional social worker, one correction officer, one administrator or security official of Fernald (usually the Director of the Greene Blind Unit) and the Director of C.A.R.V.E. or a designee.

The screening committee first reviews the inmate's institutional folder, conducts a personal interview with the inmate and after a period of discussion, votes to approve, defer or deny the application. All approvals are subject to the final authorization of the superintendent of MCI-Concord.

Key considerations of the screening committee in making the decision are: the nature and circumstances of the offense; length of sentence and time served; parole eligibility date; prior criminal history; institutional record (specifically the nature and number of disciplinary infractions or other indicators of the inmate's institutional adjustment); furlough status and history; transfer possibility and history; drug and alcohol history; and, prior work and educational experience.

The basic policy of the screening committee is to select only those persons with high credentials and to deny those who are inappropriate for the program.

Approximately one month after the committee's decision, the accepted inmate can enter the C.A.R.V.E. Program. The program commences with a brief orientation on the first day and a personal interview with the C.A.R.V.E. Program counsellor who will provide counselling on an on-going basis.

Research Objectives

Although the C.A.R.V.E. Program has been in operation for over seven years, no overall research evaluation designed to assess the program's effectiveness in rehabilitating offenders has been undertaken. It is the purpose of this study to provide such an evaluation.

The ultimate goal of rehabilitative programs in corrections is the reduction of crime perpetrated by program participants following their release to the community. Because it is impossible to assess the actual extent of continued criminal activity engaged in by paroled or discharged offenders, accurate information regarding the commission of new offenses by previously incarcerated offenders cannot be obtained. However, it is possible to determine if an offender has been re-incarcerated following his/her release from prison and thereby obtain a valid and concrete indicator of an offender's resumed criminal activity. The general standard for measuring re-incarceration is the "recidivism rate" which is simply the percentage of a population of released offenders who are re-incarcerated within a given period of time.

The present study is designed to answer the following two research questions:

- 1) Are MCI-Concord inmates who have successfully completed the C.A.R.V.E. Program less likely to be reincarcerated within one year of their release than other Concord releaseses?
- 2) Are there any variables that distinguish those inmates who failed to successfully complete the C.A.R.V.E. Program from successful program completers?

The inclusion of the participant profile in this study fulfills two purposes. First, it provides a ready description of all inmate participants. Second, it provides a dichotomization between the program completion group and the non-completion group

that has the potential of determining if certain characteristics are pre-disposed toward program success. Ideally, a participant characteristic analysis could ultimately result in the establishment of predictive indicators of success and failure that would aid administrators in decision-making processes regarding C.A.R.V.E. participants.

The participant profile provides statistics on the following types of offender characteristics: Criminal History Variables, Commitment Variables, Background Variables and C.A.R.V.E. Program variables. See Appendix A for an itemized variable listing.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Samples:

The participant profile sample consists of all C.A.R.V.E. participants who were admitted to the program subsequent to January 1, 1973 and who had terminated the program as of October 31, 1975. A total of 83 individuals were identified. Of these 83 individuals, 54 or 65% successfully completed the C.A.R.V.E. Program and the remaining 29 (35%) persons did not successfully complete the program. For the purposes of this study, persons who successfully completed the program will be referred to as "program completers" and those who did not as "program non-completers". A participant was adjudged to be a program completer, i.e., successful, if his termination from the program was a result of release on parole, discharge from sentence or transfer to a pre-release facility or work release program at MCI-Concord. Termination reasons for inclusion in the non-completer group were: voluntary resignation, institutional disciplinary action, dismissal by C.A.R.V.E. authorities, escape or medical impairment. The use of the terms "non-completers" and "completers" acknowledges the fact that a premature termination from the program does not necessarily result from unsatisfactory adjustment on the program but rather to a variety of negative and neutral causal factors.

Treatment Sample: Of the 54 individuals who successfully completed the C.A.R.V.E. Program, 34 had been released to the community for more than a year at the time of this study. These 34 persons comprised the treatment sample for the recidivism analysis. The remaining twenty program completers had not been in the community for a year and therefore, could not meet the time requirement for the recidivism follow-up.

Program non-completers were excluded from the recidivism analysis for the following reason. Since the non-completion group ended their participation in the C.A.R.V.E. Program at a premature date, they could not possibly have obtained the maximum benefit from participation in this program and therefore could not appropriately be included in the treatment sample.

Control Group: The control group consists of the 522 inmates released from MCI-Concord during 1971. Recidivism rates for the following year (1972) were available but were not utilized for this analysis because the 1972 data does not contain the required offender characteristic data necessary for the calculation of base expectancy tables.

Summary of Samples

	<u>Number</u>
Control Sample (1971 Releasees from MCI-Concord)	522
Treatment Sample	34
Participant Profile Sample	
Program Completers	54
Program Non-Completers	29
Total	83

Procedure

The recidivism follow-up was conducted by checking the Central Office Master Cards of the treatment sample to determine if the C.A.R.V.E. participant was continuing on parole in the community or had been re-incarcerated for thirty days or more in the year following his release from custody. Specifically, a recidivist is defined as any released offender who is re-confined in a federal, state, county or local correctional facility for thirty days or more. For the purposes of this study, the follow-up period will be exactly one year from the offender's release to the community on parole or discharge from sentence. It is important to note that offenders re-incarcerated for thirty days because of parole violation are included, in addition to offenders re-committed for the commission of a new offense. If the inmate had received his good conduct discharge, a criminal history check at the Department of Probation was conducted to determine if he had been re-incarcerated in a county correctional facility. The treatment sample thus was divided into recidivists and non-recidivists and recidivism rates were calculated.

Controlling for Selection Bias (Base Expectancy): As a result of the intensive screening process which chooses C.A.R.V.E. participants, it is highly possible that an influential selection bias may have occurred, thereby creating a high or low recidivism risk population at the outset. For example, if youthful offenders are high recidivism risks and C.A.R.V.E. screening panels consistently selected older inmates, the C.A.R.V.E. recidivism rates would appear to be very low although the low rate may be more directly attributable to the older age of the participants than to actual program effects. Since the purpose of this research is to determine the effects of the C.A.R.V.E. Program upon recidivism rates, it is necessary to control for existing selection biases. The

TABLE I
VALIDATED BASE EXPECTANCY TABLE

Control Group 1971 Concord Releasees RR = 28%	Four or More Arrests for Property Offenses	Length of Incar- ceration 32 Months or Less RR = 41%
	RR = 35%	Length of Incarceration 33 Months or More RR = 20%
	Three or Fewer Arrests for Property Offenses	Heroin Use RR = 28%
		No Heroin Use RR = 12%

TABLE II

BASE EXPECTANCY RELEASE CATEGORIES

Category Number	Description	Recidivism Rate
I	Four or More Property Offense Arrests, Incarcerated 32 Months or Less	41%
II	Four or More Property Offense Arrests, Incarcerated 33 Months or More	20%
III	Three or Fewer Property Offense Arrests, Heroin Use	28%
IV	Three or Fewer Property Offense Arrests, No Heroin Use	12%

methodological technique for this procedure will be "base expectancy".

The base expectancy method consists of three essential steps. First, low and high risk offender characteristics are identified from the control population. Secondly, using appropriate statistical techniques, these high and low risk categories are applied to the sample population and Expected Recidivism Rates which account for the high and low risk characteristics are constructed. Thirdly, the expected recidivism rates are in turn compared to the Actual Recidivism Rates of the treatment sample and the control group. Statistical tests of significance are conducted to determine the exact nature of the inter-relationship between the C.A.R.V.E. Program and positive adjustment in the community.

Results

Base Expectancy Analysis

As previously discussed, a valid comparison of recidivism rates must account for possible selection biases in the sample population. To determine if low-risk individuals were in fact selected into the C.A.R.V.E. Program, base expectancy tables were constructed for the control group (i.e., 1971 Concord Releasees). From these tables, low and high risk categories were developed and were applied to the C.A.R.V.E. Treatment Group.

Table I contains the validated base expectancy table, and Table II establishes the four base expectancy risk categories that were derived.

Recidivism Analysis

Of the 34 individuals who successfully completed the C.A.R.V.E. Program only 6 were re-incarcerated within the year following their release. The C.A.R.V.E. recidivism rate therefore is 18%.

The recidivism figures are summarized below in Table III.

TABLE III

CARVE RECIDIVISM RATES, 1974

Number of C.A.R.V.E. Releases	34
Number of Recidivists	6
RECIDIVISM RATE	18%

The C.A.R.V.E. recidivism rate is relatively low when compared to the 1971 recidivism rates for MCI-Concord releasees. During that year, 522 individuals were released and a total of 146 persons were re-incarcerated, for a recidivism rate of 28% (Table IV). The C.A.R.V.E. rate of 18% therefore compares favorably to the 1971 Concord rate of 28%. Although this difference appears large, it was not found to be statistically significant.*

TABLE IV

MCI-CONCORD RECIDIVISM RATE FOR 1971 RELEASEES

Number of Releasees	522
Number of Recidivists	146
Recidivism Rate	28%

The application of base expectancy risk categories to the C.A.R.V.E. treatment sample yielded an Expected Recidivism Rate of 33%. In other words, given the frequency of the high risk persons in the C.A.R.V.E. population, eleven recidivists would have been expected for a 33% recidivism rate (Table V). In fact, however, the recidivism rate was only 18%, further lending support to the conclusion that the C.A.R.V.E. Program is a beneficial experience in terms of reducing post-release recidivism. It should be noted that even though the actual recidivism rate is far below the expected recidivism rate, this difference is not statistically significant.**

TABLE V

EXPECTED RATES OF RECIDIVISM, C.A.R.V.E. POPULATION

Number of Releases	34
Number of Expected Recidivists	11
Expected Recidivism Rate	33%

* $\chi^2 = 1.71$, 1df, $p > .05$

** $\chi^2 = 3.62$, 1df, $p > .05$

In Table VI, the differential recidivism rates for the three samples are summarized. It is evident that the C.A.R.V.E. Program completers (treatment sample) have been considerably more successful (RR = 18%) in remaining out of correctional institutions following their release from MCI-Concord than the overall Concord releasee population (RR = 28%). In addition, since the background characteristics of the treatment sample contributed to an even higher expected recidivism rate (RR = 33%), the success of the C.A.R.V.E. participants is even more striking.

TABLE VI
DIFFERENTIAL RECIDIVISM RATES FOR
TREATMENT AND CONTROL SAMPLES

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Recidivists</u>	<u>Non Recidivists</u>	<u>Recidivism Rate</u>
C.A.R.V.E. Completers	34	6	28	18%
Control Group	522	146	376	28%
C.A.R.V.E. Expected	34	11	23	33%

Participant Profile:

Between January 1, 1973 and October 31, 1975, 83 inmates participated in the C.A.R.V.E. Program. A total of 54 individuals, or 65% of that sample, successfully terminated the C.A.R.V.E. Program, while 29 (35%) inmates were classified as program non-completers. A multivariate analysis of the entire sample was carried out to determine whether there were any specific characteristics that differed between program completers and program non-completers. The analysis included commitment variables, personal background variables and criminal history variables, as well as variables pertinent to participation in the C.A.R.V.E. Program (for a complete statistical breakdown, see Appendix B).

A statistical comparison of these variables, however, produced only one significant difference between members of each sub-sample. Analysis of the variable Previous Occupation revealed a significantly higher proportion of skilled workers in the program completers than in the program non-completers. Forty-three percent of the program completers reported their previous occupation to be skilled or semi-skilled in contrast to only twenty-one percent of the non-completers.* The lack of any other statistically significant differences between characteristics in the two sub-samples is probably due to the relatively small size of the sample.

* $\chi^2 = 3.98$, 1df, $p < .05$.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the State Hospital Program's ability to facilitate the reintegration of the offender back into the community. In particular, attention was focused on the C.A.R.V.E. Program which, since 1968, has allowed inmates from MCI-Concord and Lancaster Pre-Release to be released during the day to work under supervision at the Walter E. Fernald State School. The following two questions were posed as a basis for the research design:

- 1) Are MCI-Concord inmates who have successfully completed the C.A.R.V.E. Program less likely to be reincarcerated within one year of their release than other Concord releasees?
- 2) Are there any variables that distinguish those inmates who failed to successfully complete the C.A.R.V.E. Program from successful program completers?

In answer to the first question, after controlling for the possibility of a selection bias on the basis of background characteristics of the C.A.R.V.E. participants, analysis revealed that the recidivism rate of program participants (18%) was much lower than would have been expected (33%). Although this difference approached statistical significance, it was not found to be significant at the .05 significance level. When compared to the recidivism rate of the overall Concord releasee population (28%), it is evident that the C.A.R.V.E. Program completers have been reincarcerated much less frequently after their release from correctional facilities.

When the 54 program completers were compared statistically to the 29 non-completers on the basis of background characteristics, only one variable produced a statistically significant difference. The fact that program completers tended to have previous experience as skilled workers could possibly be taken into consideration in future participant selection.

It can be concluded therefore, that these preliminary research findings suggest that the C.A.R.V.E. Program is a positive rehabilitative experience for residents at MCI-Concord. These findings lend strong support to the Department of Corrections present efforts at the expanding of the State Hospital Program to include additional correctional facilities and participating state hospitals.

APPENDIX A
VARIABLE LIST

I. COMMITMENT VARIABLES

- A. Original Commitment Institution
- B. Offense (General)
- C. Offense (Specific)
- D. Minimum Sentence
- E. Age at Commitment

II. BACKGROUND VARIABLES

- A. Race
- B. Marital Status
- C. Military Background
- D. Highest Educational Achievement
- E. Previous Occupation
- F. Length of Time at Most Skilled Position
- G. Longest Period of Employment at Anyone Job
- H. History of Prior Drug Use
- I. Last Civilian Address
- J. Emergency Addressee

III. CRIMINAL HISTORY VARIABLES

- A. Total Number of Arrests
- B. Number of Arrests for Offenses Against the Person
- C. Number of Arrests for Property Offenses
- D. Number of Arrests for Sex Offenses
- E. Number of Arrests for Narcotic Offenses
- F. Number of Arrests for Drunkenness
- G. Number of Arrests for Escape
- H. History of Prior Incarceration
- I. Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations
- J. Number of Prior County House of Correction Incarcerations
- K. Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations
- L. Number of Prior Adult Paroles
- M. Number of Adult Parole Violations
- N. Number of Prior Juvenile Paroles
- O. Number of Prior Juvenile Parole Violations

IV. C.A.R.V.E. PROGRAM VARIABLES

- A. Length of Time Incarcerated Until Admission to C.A.R.V.E. Program
- B. Age at Start of C.A.R.V.E. Program
- C. Length of Time Participated in C.A.R.V.E. Program
- D. Reason for Termination of C.A.R.V.E. Program

APPENDIX B

C.A.R.V.E. PROGRAM

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>COMMITMENT VARIABLES</u>					
	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>TOTAL SAMPLE</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Original Commitment Institution</u>						
Walpole	4	(7.4)	4	(13.8)	8	(9.6)
Concord	50	(92.6)	25	(86.2)	75	(90.4)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Offense (General)</u>						
Offense against the Person	40	(74.1)	21	(72.4)	61	(73.5)
Sex Offenses	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)
Property Offenses	12	(22.2)	7	(24.1)	19	(22.9)
Drug Offenses	2	(3.7)	1	(3.4)	3	(3.6)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Specific Person Offense</u>						
Murder, 2nd Degree	0	(0.0)	1	(3.4)	1	(1.2)
Manslaughter	2	(3.7)	2	(6.9)	4	(4.8)
Armed Robbery	27	(50.0)	15	(51.7)	42	(50.6)
Unarmed Robbery	6	(11.1)	1	(3.4)	7	(8.4)
Assault Intent to Rob	2	(3.7)	0	(0.0)	2	(2.4)
Putting in Fear, Purpose to Steal	0	(0.0)	1	(3.4)	1	(1.2)
Assault Deadly Weapon	3	(5.6)	1	(3.4)	4	(4.8)
SUB-TOTAL	40	(74.1)	21	(72.4)	61	(73.5)
<u>Specific Type-Drug Offense</u>						
Poss. of Narcotic Drugs	1	(1.9)	1	(3.4)	2	(2.4)
Sale of Heroin	1	(1.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(1.2)
SUB-TOTAL	2	(3.7)	1	(3.4)	3	(3.6)
<u>Specific Type-Property Offense</u>						
Arson	1	(1.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(1.2)
Burglary	7	(13.0)	6	(20.7)	13	(15.7)
Poss. Burglary Implements	1	(1.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(1.2)
Theft of Motor Vehicle	2	(3.7)	0	(0.0)	2	(2.4)
Forgery and Uttering	1	(1.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(1.2)
Receiving Stolen Goods	0	(0.0)	1	(3.4)	1	(1.2)
SUB-TOTAL	12	(22.2)	7	(24.1)	19	(22.9)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)

APPENDIX B

C.A.R.V.E. PROGRAM

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>COMMITMENT VARIABLES</u>					
	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>TOTAL SAMPLE</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Minimum Sentence</u>						
Indeterminate	49	(90.7)	24	(82.8)	73	(88.0)
3-5 Years	3	(5.6)	0	(0.0)	3	(3.6)
6-10 Years	2	(3.7)	4	(13.8)	6	(7.2)
Life	0	(0.0)	1	(3.4)	1	(1.2)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Age At Commitment</u>						
16 to 18	5	(9.3)	6	(20.7)	11	(13.3)
19 to 21	24	(44.4)	13	(44.8)	37	(44.6)
22 to 24	17	(31.5)	6	(20.7)	23	(27.7)
25 or older	8	(14.8)	4	(13.8)	12	(14.5)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)

APPENDIX B

C.A.R.V.E. PROGRAM

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>BACKGROUND VARIABLES</u>					
	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>TOTAL SAMPLE</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Race</u>						
White	37	(68.5)	21	(72.4)	58	(69.9)
Black	17	(31.5)	8	(27.6)	25	(30.1)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Marital Status</u>						
Single	42	(77.8)	23	(79.3)	65	(78.3)
Married	7	(13.0)	4	(13.8)	11	(13.3)
Divorced, Separated	5	(9.3)	1	(3.4)	6	(7.2)
Widowed	0	(0.0)	1	(3.4)	1	(1.2)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Military Background</u>						
No Military Service	44	(81.5)	24	(82.8)	68	(81.9)
Honorable Discharge	0	(0.0)	1	(3.4)	1	(1.2)
Bad Conduct Discharge	0	(0.0)	1	(3.4)	1	(1.2)
Unknown	10	(18.5)	3	(10.3)	13	(15.7)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Highest Educational Achievement</u>						
Elementary School(grades 1-6)	6	(11.1)	2	(6.9)	8	(9.6)
Junior High(Grades 7-9)	26	(48.1)	11	(37.9)	37	(44.6)
High School (Grades 10-11)	13	(24.1)	9	(31.0)	22	(26.5)
High School Graduate	8	(14.8)	7	(24.1)	15	(18.1)
Some College	1	(1.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(1.2)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Previous Occupation</u>						
Unemployed or Unknown	4	(7.4)	4	(13.8)	8	(9.6)
Business	1	(1.9)	2	(6.8)	3	(3.6)
Clerical/Sales	4	(7.4)	2	(6.8)	6	(7.2)
Skilled, Semi-Skilled Manual	23	(42.6)	6	(20.7)	29	(34.9)
Unskilled Manual	7	(13.0)	3	(10.3)	10	(12.0)
Service	13	(24.1)	9	(31.0)	22	(26.5)
Student	2	(3.7)	3	(10.3)	5	(6.0)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)

APPENDIX B

C.A.R.V.E. PROGRAM

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>BACKGROUND VARIABLES</u>					
	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>TOTAL SAMPLE</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Length of Time at Most Skilled Position</u>						
Less than 3 months	15	(27.8)	3	(10.3)	18	(21.7)
3 to 6 months	16	(29.6)	13	(44.8)	29	(34.9)
7 to 12 months	5	(9.3)	1	(3.4)	6	(7.2)
Over one year	11	(20.4)	5	(17.2)	16	(19.3)
Unknown	7	(13.0)	7	(24.1)	14	(16.9)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Longest Period of Employment at Any One Job</u>						
Less than 3 months	13	(24.1)	3	(10.3)	16	(19.3)
3 to 6 months	15	(27.8)	12	(41.3)	27	(32.5)
7 to 12 months	7	(13.0)	1	(3.4)	8	(9.6)
Over one year	12	(22.2)	6	(20.6)	18	(21.7)
Unknown	7	(13.0)	7	(24.1)	14	(16.9)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>History of Prior Drug Use</u>						
No known Drug Use	18	(33.3)	12	(41.4)	30	(36.1)
Drug Use (Type Unknown)	4	(7.4)	2	(6.9)	6	(7.2)
Drug Use (Heroin)	26	(48.1)	10	(34.5)	36	(43.3)
Drug Use (Other than Heroin or Marijuana)	4	(7.4)	5	(17.2)	9	(10.8)
Unknown	2	(3.7)	0	(0.0)	2	(2.4)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Last Civilian Address</u>						
Boston	23	(42.6)	11	(37.9)	34	(41.0)
Cambridge	2	(3.7)	0	(0.0)	2	(2.4)
Quincy	2	(3.7)	0	(0.0)	2	(2.4)
Lowell-Lawrence Area	1	(1.9)	1	(3.4)	2	(2.4)
New Bedford-Fall River	2	(3.7)	1	(3.4)	3	(3.6)
Springfield Area	3	(5.6)	3	(10.3)	6	(7.2)
Worcester Area	5	(9.3)	1	(3.4)	6	(7.2)
Other Massachusetts Areas	15	(24.1)	11	(37.9)	26	(28.9)
Outside of Massachusetts	1	(1.9)	1	(3.4)	2	(2.4)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)

APPENDIX B

C.A.R.V.E. PROGRAM

<u>VARIABLES</u>	<u>BACKGROUND VARIABLES</u>				<u>TOTAL SAMPLE</u>	
	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>		
<u>Emergency Addressee</u>						
Father	10	(18.5)	6	(20.7)	16	(19.3)
Mother	30	(55.6)	13	(44.8)	43	(51.8)
Spouse	1	(1.9)	1	(3.4)	2	(2.4)
Other Relative	8	(14.8)	3	(10.3)	11	(13.3)
Non-Relative	1	(1.9)	1	(3.4)	2	(2.4)
None	4	(7.4)	5	(17.2)	9	(10.8)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)

APPENDIX B

C.A.R.V.E. PROGRAM

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>CRIMINAL HISTORY VARIABLES</u>					
	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>TOTAL SAMPLE</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Total Number of Arrests</u>						
One (Present Offense)	0	(0.0)	2	(6.9)	2	(2.4)
Two to five	11	(20.4)	6	(20.7)	17	(20.5)
Six to Eleven	23	(42.6)	9	(31.0)	32	(38.6)
Twelve to Twenty	18	(33.3)	8	(27.6)	26	(31.3)
Over Twenty	2	(3.7)	4	(13.8)	6	(7.2)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Arrests for Offense Against the Person</u>						
None	8	(14.8)	2	(6.9)	10	(12.0)
One	9	(16.7)	6	(20.7)	15	(18.2)
Two	6	(11.1)	7	(24.1)	13	(15.7)
Three	7	(13.0)	5	(17.2)	12	(14.5)
Four	10	(18.5)	7	(24.1)	17	(20.5)
Five or More	14	(26.0)	8	(27.5)	22	(26.5)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Arrests for Property Offense</u>						
None	4	(7.4)	4	(13.8)	8	(9.6)
One	6	(11.1)	3	(10.3)	9	(10.8)
Two	4	(7.4)	3	(10.3)	7	(8.4)
Three	5	(9.3)	2	(6.9)	7	(8.4)
Four	2	(3.7)	0	(0.0)	2	(2.4)
Five or More	33	(61.1)	17	(58.6)	50	(60.2)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Arrests for Sex Offenses</u>						
None	53	(98.2)	27	(93.1)	80	(96.4)
One or More	1	(1.9)	2	(6.8)	3	(3.6)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Arrests for Narcotic Offenses</u>						
None	31	(57.4)	17	(58.6)	48	(57.8)
One	5	(9.3)	2	(6.9)	7	(8.4)
Two	7	(13.0)	2	(6.9)	9	(10.8)
Three or More	11	(20.4)	8	(27.6)	19	(22.9)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)

APPENDIX BC.A.R.V.E. PROGRAM

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>CRIMINAL HISTORY VARIABLES</u>					
	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>TOTAL SAMPLE</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of Arrests for Drunkenness</u>						
None	31	(57.4)	18	(62.1)	49	(59.0)
One	12	(22.2)	6	(20.7)	18	(21.7)
Two	3	(5.6)	2	(6.9)	5	(6.0)
Three or More	8	(14.8)	3	(10.3)	11	(13.3)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Arrests for Escape</u>						
None	48	(88.9)	26	(89.7)	74	(89.2)
One or More	6	(11.1)	3	(10.3)	9	(10.8)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>History of Prior Incarceration</u>						
No Prior Incarcerations	24	(44.4)	10	(34.5)	34	(41.0)
One or More Prior Incarcerations	30	(55.6)	19	(65.5)	49	(59.0)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations</u>						
None	30	(55.6)	12	(41.4)	42	(50.6)
One	14	(25.9)	8	(27.6)	22	(26.5)
Two or More	10	(18.5)	9	(31.0)	19	(22.9)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Prior County House of Correction Incarcerations</u>						
None	39	(72.2)	17	(58.6)	56	(67.5)
One	10	(18.5)	6	(20.7)	16	(19.3)
Two or More	5	(9.3)	6	(20.7)	11	(13.2)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)

APPENDIX B

C.A.R.V.E. PROGRAM

CRIMINAL HISTORY VARIABLES

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>TOTAL SAMPLE</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations</u>						
None	38	(70.4)	19	(65.5)	57	(68.7)
One	7	(13.0)	5	(17.2)	12	(14.5)
Two or More	9	(16.7)	5	(17.2)	14	(16.9)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Prior Adult Paroles</u>						
Never Paroled	45	(83.3)	22	(75.9)	67	(80.7)
One to Two	9	(16.7)	7	(24.1)	16	(19.3)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Adult Parole Violations</u>						
Never Paroled	45	(83.3)	22	(75.9)	67	(80.7)
None	6	(11.1)	3	(10.3)	9	(10.8)
One to Two	3	(5.6)	4	(13.7)	7	(8.4)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Prior Juvenile Paroles</u>						
None	41	(75.9)	21	(72.4)	62	(74.7)
One	6	(11.1)	3	(10.3)	9	(10.8)
Two or More	7	(13.0)	5	(17.2)	12	(14.5)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)
<u>Number of Prior Juvenile Parole Violations</u>						
Never Paroled	41	(74.9)	21	(72.4)	62	(74.7)
None	7	(13.0)	2	(6.9)	9	(10.8)
One or More	6	(11.1)	6	(20.7)	12	(14.5)
TOTAL	54	(100.0)	29	(100.0)	83	(100.0)