

The Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment

Process Evaluation

Phase Two

Report Submitted by:

Lisa M. Spruance, M.S.
Division of Criminal Justice
University of Cincinnati

Patricia Van Voorhis, Ph.D.
Division of Criminal Justice
University of Cincinnati

Shelley Johnson Listwan, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Nevada Las Vegas

Jennifer Pealer, M.S.
Division of Criminal Justice
University of Cincinnati

Renita Seabrook, M.S.
Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles

This study was funded through the Office of Justice Programs for the National Institution of Justice (Grant #98-CE-VX-0013) and by the Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles. The report reflects conclusions drawn by the authors and not the Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles or the National Institute of Justice.

The Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment

Process Evaluation

Phase II

Lisa M. Spruance, M.S.
Division of Criminal Justice
University of Cincinnati

Patricia Van Voorhis, Ph.D.
Division of Criminal Justice
University of Cincinnati

Shelley Johnson Listwan, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Nevada Las Vegas

Jennifer Pealer, M.S.
Division of Criminal Justice
University of Cincinnati

Renita Seabrook, M.S.
Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 1997, the Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles (GBPP) has undertaken an ambitious statewide implementation and evaluation of Ross and Fabiano's (1985) Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program (R&R). The state's adoption of R&R is supported by research indicating that programs most effective in reducing offender recidivism are those that seek to change the way offenders think (see Van Voorhis, Spruance, Listwan, Ritchey, Pealer, and Seabrook, 2001 for a review of the research). Recent evaluations of R&R reveal reductions in recidivism with both a pilot group and the nation-wide application of the program for probationers in Canada (see Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Services of Canada, 1991; Porporino, Fabiano, & Robinson, 1991; Robinson,

1995). While locations as varied as Spain, New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, and Great Britain use R&R, they do so primarily in probation and institutional settings. The Georgia Cognitive Skills Program is the first known statewide effort to employ cognitive skills training with parolees.

Implementation of R&R in Georgia involved the training of parole officers to perform as cognitive coaches. Beginning in 1997, Elizabeth Fabiano and Frank Porporino, authorities in cognitive skills programming, trained approximately 50 parole officers across the state of Georgia, with retrainings held as needed. Since then, a total of 30 parole districts and three correctional institutions administered R&R to offenders.

Evaluation of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program has proceeded in two phases. Phase I examined the impact of R&R on parolees' cognitive skills and attitudes, employment, technical violations, returns to prison and re-arrests. The Phase I evaluation randomly assigned 468 parolees to either an experimental group (N = 232) or a control group (N = 236) in 16 parole districts. The first phase concluded in July of 1998 and produced two reports: a process evaluation (Van Voorhis, Murphy, and Johnson, 1999) and an outcome evaluation (Van Voorhis et al., 2001).

Phase II is designed to improve our understanding of the conditions under which R&R works best. Ultimately this study seeks to identify individual and programmatic factors that enhance offenders' prospects for living prosocial lives. Phase II studies the impact of such offender attributes as race, sex, personality, as measured by the Jesness Inventory (Jesness, 1992), and risk of reoffending. This inquiry builds on the assumption that offenders are not all alike and that different correctional methods are needed to deal effectively with different individuals (Levinson, 1988).

In addition, the study examines programmatic characteristics in three ways. Similar to Phase I, Phase II examines coaches' impressions of the class sessions on such dimensions as clients' level of understanding, level of enjoyment, level of participation, application of skills, and group atmosphere. In an effort to move beyond the coaches'

critique of participant involvement in their own program group, Phase II also gathers information from the class participants themselves and from observations of class proceedings made by experienced cognitive coaches. Finally, programmatic differences pertaining to class size, attendance, and setting (institutional vs. community) are also explored.

A crucial first step in studying the impact of offender and implementation characteristics on program effectiveness is the description of said factors. This process study describes the Phase II programs according to their target population and characteristics of service delivery. To assess the implementation of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment, the process study responds to questions regarding the study participants and program characteristics stated below. A later outcome study will test the effects of these factors on offender recidivism and other post-program outcomes.

Research Methods

Phase II of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment employed an experimental design whereby 1193 offenders were randomly assigned to either the treatment (N = 609) or control group (N = 584). From July 1998 to April 2000, 28 sites across Georgia participated in Phase II: 25 parole districts and three correctional institutions. Program selection criteria screened out parolees with IQ scores lower than 80 as well as those with histories of sexual offending or debilitating substance abuse. High risk offenders were targeted for inclusion in the program. Data were collected by staff of the GBPP and sent to the University of Cincinnati for preparation and analysis. These data include measures that describe the study participants and program characteristics. Social demographic characteristics, criminal histories, and Jesness Inventory personality constructs describe the participants. Session evaluation forms, observer evaluation forms, and participant evaluation forms provide information on program characteristics.

As the purpose of this process evaluation is to present program characteristics of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program, most of the findings presented below are purely descriptive. Illustrations of study participants and program characteristics are based on frequencies, ranges, means, medians, and percentages. However, chi square analysis and T-tests are used to examine the following: a) faithfulness to the experimental design by testing whether statistically significant differences exist between the experimental and control groups and b) differential programmatic and individual effects on participants' evaluations of the program.

Results

Who did Phase II programs serve in terms of background social and demographic characteristics, personality types, and criminal histories?

Most of the participants are men (91.3%) and were between the ages of 18 and 35 (69.0%) at the beginning of the program, with an average age of 32. The partici-

pants may be further profiled as mostly nonwhite (68.5%). Of the 409 nonwhite participants, one is Native American and the rest are African American. Prison counselors at intake characterized 79.8% of the participants as maintaining at least a minimum standard of living. Self-reports of employment and educational achievement at prison intake indicate that 50.9% were not employed full time at the time of their arrest and 65.4% did not complete high school. A substantial portion of participants have minimal reading skills, as evidenced by 26.4% scoring below a fifth grade reading level on the WRAT reading assessment. The average IQ is 100.8, with 8.2% having IQs below 80. Most participants (60.8%) were single and slightly over half (56.8) were noted in Georgia's offender information tracking system (OTIS) files to have a history of substance abuse.

Half (49.2%) were classified by our risk score as medium/high risk. A slight majority (58.1%) had been incarcerated multiple times including their last incarceration experience, and nearly half (44.1%) have prior parole revocations in their history. Only one participant (.2%) had no felony convictions other than those leading to his last incarceration; 48% had three or more prior felony convictions. Of the various types of crimes committed by study participants prior to those that resulted in their last incarceration, property crime convictions were the most common (72.4%), followed by drug possession convictions (62.0%). Violent convictions (43.9%) and or drug sale convictions (42.0%) were also common. Despite screening criteria to exclude sex offenders, 18 participants (3.0%) had histories of sex crime convictions.

On an offender personality and maturity typology, program participants spanned each of the interpersonal maturity levels (I-level) and collapsed Jesness Inventory offender personality types. Very few members of the experimental group were classified as I-level 2s (4.9%); the majority are I-level 3s (55.2%). I-level 4s make up 40.0% of the experimental group. More of the experimental group are classified as Aggressives (32.2%) than the other three types. Dependents (27.9%) and situationals (22.4%) are represented in nearly equal proportions. Neurotics make up 17.5% of the experimental group.

Did the population served by the programs meet the selection criteria set forth by the study design? In other words, were study participants appropriate for the programs?

- Offenders were not screened into the program as carefully as they might have been.
- Low risk offenders constitute half (50.8%) of the experimental group. However, if the results from the Phase I outcome study (Van Voorhis et al. 2001) hold for Phase II, this may not be a detrimental oversight.
- Eighteen offenders (3.0%) in the experimental group had previously been convicted of sex crimes. Thirteen had only one sex crime conviction in their record, but others had up to 10.
- Available data do not afford a way of assessing the currency or severity of substance abuse. Substantial portions of the offenders showed prior histories of drug and alcohol-related offenses. However, we do not know the extent of the offenders' drug and alcohol usage.
- For 48 (8.2%) of the experimental group, IQs are low enough (i.e., below 80) to call into question the appropriateness of their inclusion in the study.
- With the exception of IQ, program screening was not aided by assessments pertaining to eligibility criteria. Especially with respect to offender risk, such assessments would greatly assist efforts to assure that the program was administered to appropriate individuals.

Were the randomization procedures implemented successfully, as evidenced by similarities between the experimental and comparison group?

- Analyses reveal great similarity between the two groups, confirming the integrity of the experimental design.
- Only one statistically significant difference exists between the experimental and control groups. Chi square analysis indicates that a greater proportion of the experimental group had eight or more prior property convictions (experimental = 23.3%; control = 19.0%; $p < .05$), but the median number of prior property convictions for both groups is two.
- Group distributions were nearly identical (i.e., differences less than four percent) on the remaining background characteristics: a) age, b) race, c) social class, d) substance abuse, e) IQ, f) reading level, g) prior incarcerations, h) felony convictions, i) violent convictions, j) drug sale convictions, k) drug possession convictions, and l) sex crime convictions.

Are class sizes appropriate for the program?

To facilitate coaches' management of program sessions and encourage active class participation, R&R courses are intended to be small (i.e., between four and six members) (Ross, Fabiano, and Ross, 1989).

- From six to 28 offenders were assigned to the program groups, with the typical size around 11 (mean = 12; median = 10). Thus, nearly all of the program groups created through the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program exceed the recommended class size.
- Some program groups were intentionally large in anticipation of individuals dropping out of the program. By session 30, classes reduced to between two to 20 participants. Even taking into consideration attrition, nearly half (40.4%) of the program groups exceeded the recommended class size of six.

What proportions of those assigned to the Cognitive Skills Program a) began the program and b) completed the program?

Whether program participants complete the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program has shown in Phase I to be an important predictor of later criminal involvement (Van Voorhis et al., 2001). It is therefore important to distinguish between those experimental group members who never were involved in the program, participated in only a portion of the course, and received the full dosage of treatment.

- Eighty (13.1%) of the offenders assigned to the program did not start.
- Of those that did begin the program, 24.1% were no longer participating in the program by the 30th class session.
- A total of 382 (62.7%) of the experimental group completed the course. This total completion rate is comparable to Phase I where 59.6% finished the program.
- Focusing only on those offenders who began the program, the completion rates range from 33% to 100% across program groups, with an average completion rate of around 72% (mean = 72.0%; median = 73.2%).

Based on assessments made by the cognitive skills coaches, to what degree did clients a) understand the material presented in the program, b) enjoy the program, c) participate during the classes, and d) apply the skills? Also, how did the coaches describe the group atmosphere of the classes?

The R&R facilitators' handbook (Ross, Fabiano, and Ross, 1989) suggests that gains from the program are most likely when the participants not only understand and apply the material, but also enjoy the classes and participate at high levels. Furthermore, a cohesive group atmosphere is proposed to be more conducive to the learning process. Georgia's implementation of R&R appears to have been fairly successful in terms of

creating cohesive units with high levels of offender participation, enjoyment, and understanding.

- Coaches' perceptions of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program were largely positive in terms of offenders' level of participation, enjoyment, and understanding.
- Coaches also tended to characterize the groups as being cohesive and agreeable.
- While the degree to which participants applied previously taught skills was somewhat low to begin with, application of skills increased as the program progressed.

Are there areas of strength or weakness that emerge from assessments made by trained observers of the program?

The observer evaluation data identify characteristics of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program that consistently met the expectations of the observers and also areas that can benefit from added attention. Patterns that emerged from the observer evaluation data include the following.

- Observers rated "sensitivity to participant's feelings" (e.g., respect for participants and skill in identifying participants' feelings, beliefs, thoughts, or attitudes) and "group participation" (e.g., engagement of most rather than some participants) as strengths of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program; there is substantial consistency in the presence of these qualities across program sites.
- Areas of implementation that vary the most from program to program are "general issues and class structure," "organization," and "delivery and response to

participant's use of skills." These three areas also were considered to have the most room for improvement.

- Improvements were noted in all five implementation areas from the first to second observations; the percent of program groups rated as below the mode, or most frequent score, at the second observation was lower than at the first observation on all five scales.

Do participant evaluations indicate that a) coaches adhered to social learning methods, b) the skills are personally relevant to the participants, and c) the group climate is positive?

The final measures of program implementation reflect the perceptions of participants who completed the cognitive skills program. Three scales, derived from 21 items, depict participants' experiences in the following areas: coaches' adherence to social learning methods, relevance of skills, and group climate. Additional items asked a) whether the coaches read from the program manual the majority of the class time, and b) how often participants met with their parole officers during the program.

- Participant scored the scales "adherence to social learning methods" and "relevance of skills to participants" higher on average than the "group climate" scale.
- Notwithstanding these positive assessments, 68.9% of the program participants indicated that the coaches read from the manual a good deal of the time.
- Attributes of the participants, such as risk level, race, personality type and I-level, are not related to participant evaluation scale scores. The setting of the program in either the community or an institution is unrelated to participant assessments, as well.

- Women, neurotics, situationals, and I-Level 4s were less likely to indicate that coaches read from the manual the majority of the class time.

Although client satisfaction does not appear to differ substantially by individual or programmatic conditions, individual and programmatic differences may nevertheless effect program outcomes. In fact, the greatest benefit of the participant evaluation data will surface later when they are used to explore differences in treatment effects. The variation in scale and item scores will allow for the examination of whether participants who rated the program more favorably reap the greatest benefits.

Recommendations

In conclusion, we offer several recommendations for the consideration of GBPP officials and staff. We put forward these recommendations against the following guidelines for R&R programming:

- Sex offenders and offenders with low IQ scores, debilitating substance abuse, and low risk scores should be screened out of the program.
- Classes should be small, between four and six members.
- Class sessions should incorporate behavioral processes including role modeling, role playing, graduated rehearsal, and reinforcement.
- Coaches should evidence skill in controlling the class sessions.
- Coaches should possess strong interpersonal skills.

Recommendation 1:

More careful attention to program screening criteria is warranted. Despite the presence of screening criteria, the study sample includes numerous offenders who were considered inappropriate for the program. Eight percent of the experimental group have IQs at or below 80, making it unlikely that they will be able to fully comprehend the material covered in the program. Sex offenders, some with extensive histories of sexually offending, are also represented in the sample (3%). Due to the inclusion of offenders with low cognitive ability and of sex offenders, 10.2% of the experimental group are inappropriate for the program. If the 299 low risk offenders are added to the pool of inappropriate participants, over half of the experimental group (54%) can be considered inappropriate. However, in Phase I of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment, low risk offenders benefited from the R&R program.

Recommendation 2:

The Georgia Cognitive Skills Program should consider reducing the size of the program groups. Even taking into consideration the proportion of experimental group members that did not begin the program (13.1%), the majority of classes (76.9%) exceeded the recommended maximum of six offenders per group at the beginning of the program. Program groups formed through random assignment ranged in size from six to 28 offenders, with the typical class having 11 members. Due to attrition, class sizes eventually reduced, but still 40.4% of the groups exceeded the appropriate class size at session 30.

Recommendation 3:

GBPP might benefit from the implementation of program attendance and completion requirements. Completion rates for Phase II were only slightly higher (62.7%) than for Phase I (59.6%), yet we learned in Phase I that program completion is a key component of program success.

Recommendation 4:

Observers' evaluations of class operations indicate room for improvement in coaches' structure of class sessions. Class structure was consistently rated less favorably than other dimensions of program implementation critiqued by observers. The area of

“general issues and class structure” was assessed as less than satisfactory for 41.3% of program groups at session 17 and 22.2% at session 30. Participant evaluations were consistent with these observations. Classroom climate was less likely to be favorably rated than other program characteristics. On a related note, a substantial proportion of the coaches were reported to be reading from the manual, indicating perhaps some discomfort or unfamiliarity with the course material.

In closing, several favorable observations should not be ignored. First, participants indicated that key clinical dimensions of this cognitive behavioral program were in evidence in the R&R classes. Programs successful in teaching offenders cognitive skills incorporate behavioral processes including role modeling, role playing, graduated rehearsal, and reinforcement. *Participants’ evaluation of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program suggest that coaches do employ such techniques and do so on a frequent basis.* These are the program characteristics that must be present in order for the program to be considered operating according to its underlying theoretical design.

Second, the interpersonal skills of coaches are also important to the success of a cognitive intervention. Because modeling is an essential component of the learning process, coaches should be cognizant of trainer characteristics that enhance its effectiveness. As such, coaches should demonstrate empathy, prosocial conflict resolution, and assertiveness. *According to observer evaluations, coaches demonstrated these prosocial interpersonal skills.* Observers reported that coaches in 78.3% of program groups at session 17 and 91.1% of program groups at session 30 meet expectations in this area. Third, also related to the effectiveness of classroom presentations, participants strongly endorsed the relevance of the lessons to their daily lives; 97.2% rated the classes as relevant or very relevant.

Table of contents

Introduction	18
Implementation expectations	22
DESCRIPTION OF THE REASONING AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM	22
DERIVATIVE EXPECTATIONS FOR THE GEORGIA COGNITIVE SKILLS PROGRAM	23
Methodology	25
RESEARCH DESIGN	25
DATA COLLECTION	29
MEASURES	31
ANALYSIS	43
Results	43
PARTICIPANT QUESTIONS	43
Who did Phase II programs serve in terms of background social and demographic characteristics and criminal histories?	43
Did the population served by the programs meet the selection criteria set forth by the study design? In other words, were study participants appropriate for the programs?	48
Were the randomization procedures implemented successfully, as evidenced by similarities between the experimental and comparison group?	49
What is the distribution of Jesness Inventory personality types among study participants?	54
PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS QUESTIONS	56
Are class sizes appropriate for the program?	56
What proportions of those assigned to the cognitive skills program a) began the program and b) completed the program?	61
Based on assessments made by the cognitive skills coaches, to what degree did clients a) understand the material presented in the program, b) enjoy the program, c) participate during the classes, and d) apply the skills? Also, how did the coaches describe the group atmosphere of the classes?	61
Are there areas of strength or weakness that emerge from assessments made by trained observers of the program?	65
Do participant evaluations indicate that a) coaches adhered to social learning methods, b) the skills addressed in the program are personally relevant to the participants and c) the group climate is	

positive? Furthermore, are participant characteristics (e.g., risk level, sex, race and personality type) and program setting (i.e., institution versus community sites) related to participants' evaluation of the program? 69

Discussion **77**

Screening of offenders for participation in the study 73

Class size 73

Class attrition 74

Use of social learning and behavioral techniques 74

Coaches' structure of class sessions 74

Coaches' interpersonal skills 75

Notes 68

References 70

Appendices 73

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Distribution of Phase II study participants across districts and study groups. _____	27
Figure 1. Summary of Interpersonal Maturity Levels (Harris, 1988; Jesness, 1988; Warren, 1966). _____	35
Figure 2. Summary of key personality constructs for the collapsed Jesness Inventory types (Van Voorhis, 1994). _____	36
Figure 3. Session evaluation measures. _____	38
Table 3. Participant evaluation scale items. _____	42
Table 4. Description of the experimental group across background social and demographic characteristics (collected at prison intake). _____	44
Table 5. Description of the experimental group across criminal background characteristics. ____	46
Table 6. Comparison of the experimental and control groups across background social and demographic characteristics ¹ (collected at prison intake). _____	50
Table 7. Comparison of the experimental and control groups across criminal background characteristics (collected at prison intake). _____	52
Table 8. Distribution of I-Level classifications and collapsed Jesness Inventory types (Van Voorhis 1994) within the experimental group. _____	55
Table 9. Class sizes and completion figures for program groups. _____	57
Table 10. Class session characteristics of the experimental group. _____	63
Table 12. Participant Evaluation scales descriptives. _____	71
Table 13. Participant evaluation results across subgroups of participants. _____	74

Introduction

Since 1997, the Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles (GBPP) has undertaken an ambitious statewide implementation and evaluation of Ross and Fabiano's (1985) Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program (R&R). The state's adoption of R&R is supported by research indicating that programs most effective in reducing offender recidivism are those that seek to change the way offenders think (see Van Voorhis, Spruance, Listwan, Ritchey, Pealer, and Seabrook, 2001 for a review of the research). Recent evaluations of R&R reveal reductions in recidivism with both a pilot group and the nation-wide application of the program for probationers in Canada (see Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Services of Canada, 1991; Porporino, Fabiano, & Robinson, 1991; Robinson, 1995). While locations as varied as Spain, New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, and Great Britain use R&R, they do so primarily in probation and institutional settings. The Georgia Cognitive Skills Program is the first known statewide effort to employ cognitive skills training with parolees.

Implementation of R&R in Georgia involved the training of parole officers to perform as cognitive coaches. Beginning in 1997, Elizabeth Fabiano and Frank Porporino, authorities in cognitive skills programming, trained approximately 50 parole officers across the state of Georgia, with retrainings held as needed. Since then, a total of 30 parole districts and three correctional institutions administered R&R to offenders.

Evaluation of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program has proceeded in two phases. Phase I examined the impact of R&R on parolees' cognitive skills and attitudes, employment, technical violations, returns to prison and re-arrests. The Phase I evaluation randomly assigned 468 parolees to either an experimental group (N = 232) or a control group (N = 236) in 16 parole districts. The first phase concluded in July of 1998 and produced two reports: a process evaluation and an outcome evaluation.

The process evaluation (Van Voorhis, Murphy, & Johnson, 1999) assessed components of program implementation and adherence to the experimental design of the research study. The report presented a) a description of the population served by Phase I, b) program completion figures, c) coaches' reports of participants' attendance, levels of

understanding, enjoyment and participation, and application of skills, d) figures pertaining to the program's adherence to the experimental design of the study, and e) cross district reports of the above. Recommendations and concerns raised in the process evaluation report pertained to screening procedures, subject retention, and accuracy of recording data¹. Analysis confirmed the integrity of random assignment.

The outcome evaluation of Phase I (Van Voorhis et al., 2001) found that participation in the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program produced reductions in recidivism. Although the 4% lower return to prison and re-arrest rates for the experimental group compared to the control group were not statistically significant, statistical models accounting for the effect of class completion (versus dropout status), yielded more pronounced differences in recidivism rates. Discrete time survival analysis, controlling for relevant background characteristics, produced statistically significant treatment effects of 17% on returns to prison and 19% on re-arrests for class completers compared to the control group. Dropouts consistently recidivated at the highest rates. Across configurations of the study groups (i.e., experimental group compared to control group or class completers compared to dropouts and control group), high-risk parolees were at an elevated risk of recidivating. However, analysis did not support the hypothesis that high-risk class participants would benefit from the program more than low risk participants.

The more favorable Phase I outcome results when considering class completion highlights the importance of closely examining the experiences of class participants assigned to the program. Parolees who failed to complete the R&R program include those who left for reasons other than criminal involvement. These offenders committed new offenses at faster and more prevalent rates than those completing the program. The indication is that R&R worked best when parolees received the full treatment. However, Phase I has little else to say about conditions under which the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program achieves optimal results.

To advance knowledge of what works in correctional treatment, program evaluations should incorporate the following dimensions in the study design: a) use random assignment, b) replicate previous studies, c) vary characteristics of earlier studies (e.g., setting or sample), d) analyze outcomes separately for different types of offenders, and e)

fully describe intervention processes and relate these to outcomes (Palmer, 1991). Phase II of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment meets these standards by a) employing an experimental design; b) reproducing the Phase I analysis on a new sample of parolees; c) varying circumstances of the Phase I study by adding three institutional sites and including female offenders in the sample; d) identifying personality subgroups of the sample to examine differential treatment effects; and e) collecting a host of information on program implementation from multiple sources.

Phase II is designed to improve our understanding of the conditions under which R&R works best. In addition to examining study members' background, historical characteristics, Phase II considers the impact that offender personality type, as determined by the Jesness Inventory (JI) (Jesness, 1992), may have on the efficacy of R&R. As part of a psychological classification typology approach, this inquiry builds on the assumption that offenders are not all alike and that different correctional methods are needed to deal effectively with different individuals (Levinson, 1988). The idea that individual factors such as personality type produce differential treatment effects exemplifies the responsivity principle set forth by Andrews, Bonta and Hoge (1990). For instance, a treatment program may minimally or negatively affect offenders with one personality type, yet yield strong positive results with a different subgroup of program participants.

Assessment of what takes place during the course of the Georgia's Cognitive Skills Program metaphorically takes the lid off of the "black box" that is characteristic of far too many programs (Van Voorhis, Cullen & Applegate, 1995). Failure to record the processes at work throughout a program leads to outcomes being noted, either positive or negative, without an indication of what program characteristics actually influenced the results. Such oversights mar efforts to improve programs or may lead to a conclusion that a program is ineffective when in reality the program never happened (Van Voorhis, Cullen & Applegate, 1995).

Phase II looks inside the "black box" in three ways. Similar to Phase I, Phase II examines coaches' impressions of the class sessions on such dimensions as clients' level of understanding, level of enjoyment, level of participation, application of skills, and group atmosphere. In an effort to move beyond the coaches' critique of participant involvement

in their own program group, Phase II also gathers information from the class participants themselves and from observations of class proceedings made by experienced cognitive coaches.

Eventually (i.e., in the outcome report) the procedural characteristics of a site or group will be related to program outcomes. For example, we will be able to explore whether a site with exceptional implementation yields lower recidivism rates than sites with less satisfactory implementation.

A crucial first step in studying the impact of subgroups of offenders and implementation characteristics on program effectiveness is the description of said factors. The present report offers such a description. To assess the implementation of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment, this process study will respond to the following questions about the study participants and program characteristics.

Participant Questions

- Who did Phase II programs serve in terms of background social and demographic characteristics and criminal histories?
- Did the population served by the programs meet the selection criteria set forth by the study design? In other words, were study participants appropriate for the program?
- Were the randomization procedures implemented successfully, as evidenced by similarities between the experimental and comparison group?
- What is the distribution of Jesness Inventory personality types among study participants?

Program Characteristics Questions

- Are class sizes appropriate for the program?
- What proportions of those assigned to the Cognitive Skills Program a) began the program and b) completed the program?
- Based on assessments made by the cognitive skills coaches, to what degree did clients a) understand the material presented in the program, b) enjoy the program, c) participate during the classes, and d) apply the skills? In addition, how did the coaches describe the group atmosphere of the classes?

- Are there areas of strength or weakness that emerge from assessments made by trained observers of the program?
- Do participant evaluations indicate that a) coaches adhered to social learning methods, b) the skills addressed in the program are personally relevant to the participants and c) the group climate is positive? Furthermore, are participant characteristics (e.g., risk level, sex, race and personality type) and program setting (i.e., institution versus community sites) related to participants' evaluations of the program?

Before responding to the above questions, it is necessary to present a more complete sketch of what R&R should look like when implemented well. The picture of R&R and the derivative expectations for the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program are followed by the methodology of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment. The findings of the process evaluation are then presented. The report concludes with an assessment of how well Phase II of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program met implementation expectations.

Implementation Expectations

Description of the Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program

R&R provides training to modify offenders' impulsive, egocentric, illogical and rigid thinking patterns. In doing so, R&R shares assumptions common to the larger field of cognitive-behavioral psychology, which currently is considered the dominant therapeutic paradigm in mental health (Dobson & Khatri, 2000). Cognitive psychology assumes that dysfunctional thought (cognitive) processes can lead to maladaptive behavior. Therefore, teaching offenders to recognize and change criminogenic thinking (e.g., Yochelson & Samenow, 1976) and to develop more mature thinking skills (Ross & Fabiano, 1985) should reduce their propensity to commit crimes. Specific objectives of the R&R program include improving offenders' interpersonal problem-solving, consequential thinking, means-end reasoning, social perspective-taking, critical and abstract reasoning, and creative thinking (Ross, Fabiano, and Ross, 1989). R&R focuses primarily on the processes involved in thinking as opposed to the content of thoughts (or *what* offenders actually think).

The program is structured into 35 lessons that cover seven key components: problem-solving, creative thinking, social skills, management of emotions, negotiation skills, values enhancement, and critical reasoning. Each component is broken into sub-skills. For example, to improve offenders' problem-solving ability, participants engage in activities that target specific skills such as gathering information, conceptualizing dilemmas, alternative thinking, and assertive communication. The class sessions build on each other so that lessons present new skills along with opportunities to practice previously introduced skills. Activities include role-playing, thinking games, homework assignments, and group discussions.

The coaches' handbook (Ross, Fabiano, and Ross, 1989), in addition to their intensive training, attempts to foster consistency across program sites. The manual provides detailed lesson plans and techniques for running the program sessions. Included in these lessons are suggestions on how coaches may verbalize the material to the program participants, possible comments and questions, and scheduled activities for learning new skills and practicing previously introduced skills. Coaches use the manual as a guide and a preparation tool rather than reading from it throughout class sessions. The coaches are expected to possess the social and cognitive skills targeted through the program, providing models for the offenders to emulate. Furthermore, the coaches are instructed to reinforce participants' demonstration of skills as well as their effort. Class interaction is encouraged. The curriculum and qualities possessed by coaches are designed to cultivate an informal yet structured group atmosphere, with the participants engaging in lively, debate-like dialogues.

Derivative Expectations for the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program

Expectations about study participants' characteristics and program processes for the Georgia Cognitive Skills program derive from the picture of R&R illustrated above and extant research in correctional programming. Because participation in the program entails such activities as thinking games and written homework assignments, individuals with extremely low IQ scores, and or limited reading abilities, are unlikely to benefit from

R&R. Earlier studies of the R&R model support this contention (see Research & Statistics Branch, 1991; Robinson, 1995). The same studies on the effectiveness of R&R with probationers found that higher risk offenders experienced the greatest gains from the treatment. The findings regarding risk are consistent with the notion that intensive treatment programs such as R&R should target higher risk offenders (Andrews and Bonta, 1998). The Phase I outcome study, however, revealed that low risk parolees also benefit from R&R (Van Voorhis et al. 2001).

Other characteristics that speak to the inability of offenders to participate well in the R&R program are active, severe substance abuse and histories of sexual offending. While cognitive treatment often is effective for substance abusers (Prendergast, Anglin, & Wellisch, 1995), the concern for the Georgia program is with individuals impaired by their addiction to the extent that they fail to attend treatment regularly and or cannot focus on the program. Furthermore, treatment for substance abusers may require program components such as detoxification that are not addressed in R&R. The Georgia Cognitive Skills Program also excludes sex offenders. Not only does sexual offending necessitate some offense-specific treatment content, but also discussions of sexual offending behaviors are conducted more appropriately among other sex offenders. Cognitive interventions have, however, demonstrated a degree of effectiveness when the treatment groups are limited to sex offenders (Polizzi, MacKenzie, & Hickman, 1999).

Ross and Fabiano (1985) designed their R&R program to be behavioral in nature. As such, the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program should incorporate behavioral processes including modeling, role playing, graduated rehearsal, and reinforcement in order for offenders to master the cognitive skills. To facilitate high levels of participation and opportunities for the activities listed above, the coaches must effectively manage the class sessions, and class sizes should be small. Ross, Fabiano, and Ross (1989) specify that classes should range in size from four to six members. In addition to the ability to manage the class, coaches ought to possess strong interpersonal skills. The atmosphere of the class, skills of the coaches, and activities of the program foster offenders' participation, enjoyment and understanding.

In sum, the description of R&R and research on treatment effectiveness provide insights into what the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program should look like if implemented well.

- Study participants should not be intellectually limited.
- Nor should participants be afflicted with severe substance abuse.
- Sex offenders are also inappropriate for the program.
- The program should target higher risk offenders.
- Classes should be small, between four and six members.
- Class sessions should incorporate behavioral processes including role modeling, role playing, graduated rehearsal, and reinforcement.
- Coaches should evidence skill in managing the class sessions.
- Coaches should possess strong interpersonal skills.

While responding to the study questions set forth earlier in this report, this study will address the extent to which the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program meets these standards.

Methodology

Research Design

Phase II of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment employed an experimental design whereby 1193 offenders were randomly assigned to either the treatment (N = 609) or control group (N = 584)². The offenders assigned to the experimental condition of receiving the cognitive skills treatment, and the characteristics of the implemented program, are the focus of this report.

From July 1998 to April 2000, 28 sites across Georgia participated in Phase II: 25 parole districts and three correctional institutions. Parole officers and corrections officers at these locations compiled lists of offenders to participate in the study based on the

following criteria: high-risk for reoffending³, IQ scores of at least 80, no history of sexual offending, and absence of substance abuse problems so severe as to interfere with their ability to attend or comprehend the Cognitive Skills program. Finally, the study participants were to have at least 16 months remaining under supervision to ensure their having adequate time to complete the four-month program and to be monitored for an additional 12 months thereafter. After identifying offenders eligible for the study, parole and corrections officers sent the lists of study participants to the evaluation unit in Atlanta for random assignment to either the experimental or the comparison group.

Each of the 28 sites operated at least one Cognitive Skills course. Eighteen sites conducted two courses, and an additional eighteen ran three groups. One location, Whitworth Detention Center, held four groups. Hence, Phase II comprised a total of 52 groups of randomly assigned offenders. Table 1 presents the number of Cognitive Skills courses operated at each site and the number of experimental and control group members for each group.

During the time that Phase II was underway, 10 additional groups of classes across eight sites (N = 98) occurred that were not involved in the experimental design of the evaluation; parole officers selected parolees to participate in R&R without comparison groups. These groups are not a part of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment and will not be included in subsequent reports. They are, however, characterized in tables in the Appendices of this report. The right column of Table 1 identifies those districts that ran program groups without a comparison group, and the number of participants in each group.

Table 1. Distribution of Phase II study participants across districts and study groups.

Location	Group	<u>Experimental</u>		<u>Control</u>		<u>Total</u>		<u>Class with no Comparison Group</u>	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parole Districts:									
Marietta	Group 1	20	52.6	18	47.4	38	100.0		
	Group 2	11	35.5	20	64.5	31	100.0		
	Group 3	28	50.9	27	49.1	55	100.0		
Clarkeville	Group 1	8	50.0	8	50.0	16	100.0		
Dahlonega	Group 1	---	---	---	---	---	---	11	100.0
	Group 2	12	52.2	11	47.8	23	100.0		
Milledgeville	Group 1	10	50.0	10	50.0	20	100.0		
	Group 2	10	50.0	10	50.0	20	100.0		
Thomas	Group 1	10	50.0	10	50.0	20	100.0		
Savannah	Group 1	14	53.8	12	46.2	26	100.0		
Jesup	Group 1	7	58.3	5	41.7	12	100.0		
Waycross	Group 1	10	50.0	10	50.0	20	100.0		
	Group 2	7	46.7	8	53.3	15	100.0		
Fitzgerald	Group 1	---	---	---	---	---	---	11	100.0
Columbus	Group 1	---	---	---	---	---	---	8	100.0
	Group 2	16	50.0	16	50.0	32	100.0		
Jonesboro	Group 1	9	40.9	13	59.1	22	100.0		
	Group 2	9	50.0	9	50.0	18	100.0		
Lawrenceville	Group 1	9	50.0	9	50.0	18	100.0		
	Group 2	7	50.0	7	50.0	14	100.0		
Augusta	Group 1	12	50.0	12	50.0	24	100.0		
	Group 2	12	50.0	12	50.0	24	100.0		
	Group 3	12	52.2	11	47.8	23	100.0		
Brunswick	Group 1	10	50.0	10	50.0	20	100.0		
	Group 2	9	50.0	9	50.0	18	100.0		
	Group 3	10	50.0	10	50.0	20	100.0		
Cairo	Group 1	14	51.9	13	48.1	27	100.0		
North Fulton	Group 1	9	42.9	12	57.1	21	100.0		
	Group 2	16	50.0	16	50.0	32	100.0		
	Group 3	23	47.9	25	52.1	48	100.0		

Table 1. Continued.

Location	Group	<u>Experimental</u>		<u>Control</u>		<u>Total</u>		Class with no Comparison	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	<u>Group</u>	
LaGrange	Group 1	---	---	---	---	---	---	9	100.0
	Group 2	---	---	---	---	---	---	9	100.0
	Group 3	12	60.0	8	40.0	20	100.0		
Griffin	Group 1	12	50.0	12	50.0	24	100.0		
LaFayette	Group 1	6	50.0	6	50.0	12	100.0		
	Group 2	7	53.8	6	64.2	13	100.0		
Jefferson	Group 1	---	---	---	---	---	---	11	100.0
	Group 2	12	50.0	12	50.0	24	100.0		
South Dekalb	Group 1	16	51.6	15	47.4	31	100.0		
	Group 2	22	50.0	22	50.0	44	100.0		
Lyons	Group 1	---	---	---	---	---	---	12	100.0
	Group 2	---	---	---	---	---	---	10	100.0
	Group 3	9	50.0	9	50.0	18	100.0		
Statesboro	Group 1	10	52.6	9	47.4	19	100.0		
	Group 2	9	50.0	9	50.0	18	100.0		
	Group 3	8	50.0	8	50.0	16	100.0		
South Metro	Group 1	9	50.0	9	50.0	18	100.0		
	Group 2	12	46.2	14	53.8	26	100.0		
South Richmond	Group 1	10	45.5	12	54.5	22	100.0		
	Group 2	9	50.0	9	50.0	18	100.0		
Carrollton	Group 1	---	---	---	---	---	---	8	100.0
Douglas	Group 1	---	---	---	---	---	---	9	100.0
Hartwell	Group 1	9	90.0	1	10.0	10	100.0		
	Group 2	9	81.8	2	18.2	11	100.0		
Institutions:									
Coastal St. Prison	Group 1	12	52.2	11	47.8	23	100.0		
Whitworth Det. Cent.	Group 1	10	52.6	9	47.4	19	100.0		
	Group 2	10	83.3	2	16.7	12	100.0		
	Group 3	10	50.0	10	50.0	20	100.0		
	Group 4	10	50.0	10	50.0	20	100.0		
Metro St. Prison	Group 1	8	50.0	8	50.0	16	100.0		
	Group 2	17	53.1	15	46.9	32	100.0		
	<u>Group 3</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>54.0</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>46.0</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>100.0</u>		
Total		609	51.0	584	49.0	1193	100.0	98	100.0

Data Collection

Staff of the GBPP collected data for the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment by extracting data from Georgia's offender information tracking system (OTIS), administering questionnaires to the program participants, and recording observations of the program via session evaluation and observer evaluation forms. Researchers at the University of Cincinnati prepared and analyzed the data.

Participant Data

Participant background data. Information obtained during offenders' prison intake and diagnostic interviews, and subsequently entered into OTIS, provided background measures of social and demographic characteristics. OTIS also furnished data pertaining to the criminal histories of offenders, (e.g., prior incarcerations, prior felonies and prior violent offenses). Complete sets of social and demographic data derived from OTIS were available for 91.1% (N = 1087) of the randomly assigned sample. Criminal history data were available for 98.2% (N = 1171).⁴

Psychological classification data. Psychological classification of offenders into three levels of interpersonal maturity and four personality types was achieved using the Jesness Inventory (Jesness, 1992). GBPP staff administered the 155-item true/false inventories to the experimental and control groups at the beginning of the Cognitive Skills Program. Staff at the University of Cincinnati scored the inventories using The Jesness Inventory Computer Program Windows™ Version (1996) software. For the software to score the inventories, each item must have a valid response indicated. JIs were available for 541 (88.8%) of the experimental group members. Of these, two yielded "undetermined" personality types (0.04% of those received) and 82 (15.2% of those received) posed scoring problems due to missing or double responses on items.

In an effort to make use of the problematic inventories, scoring rules were created at the University of Cincinnati where staff would assign a response to items under specific conditions. First, inventories would remain unscored, and therefore not used, if four or more of the 155 items were not marked sufficiently. Second, the dimensions of the

personality types addressed by the specific items were taken into consideration. If multiple problematic items tapped into a single dimension, the inventory would remain unscored. Finally, for those inventories not excluded based on the above criteria, responses to the problematic items were selected that favored the more prosocial of the two possible options, true or false. The inventories could be scored using the software once each item was assigned a response. Fifty-six (68.3%) of the 82 problematic Jesness inventories could be fixed through this procedure. In the end, a total of 513 (84.2%) Jesness Inventories generated personality types.

Program Data

Session evaluation data. Descriptions of what took place during the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program derive from session evaluation forms, observer evaluation forms, and participant evaluation forms. At the end of each class session, coaches completed a “session evaluation form” for the group of participants. This form rates each parolee’s level of participation, level of enjoyment, level of understanding, and use of skills taught in earlier sessions; it also evaluates the group atmosphere for that day. For the purposes of the evaluation, GBPP staff sent to the University of Cincinnati session evaluation forms from five sessions (the same sessions for each group). The session forms collected span the full cognitive skills course, and represent five of the sections taught in the course (e.g., problem-solving, creative thinking, social skills, values enhancement, and critical reasoning). Although each of the 52 program groups provided the five session evaluation forms for analysis, session evaluations of at least two of the five sessions were available for only 486 (79.8%) program participants. Data were unavailable due to some participants not beginning the program, dropping out of the program, or being absent.

Observer evaluation data. At two points during the delivery of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program for each program group (sessions 17 and 30), observers attended class sessions to assess the effectiveness of the coaches. The group of observers consisted of 11 cognitive coaches who previously ran more than three groups of classes and attended in-service training related to the observation process. Coaches’ skills under examination

include class structure issues, organization of the class session, coaches' delivery and response to participant's use of skills, sensitivity to participants' feelings, and group participation. Of the 52 study groups, observers evaluated 46 (88.5%) of the 17th sessions and 45 (86.5%) of the 30th sessions.

Participant evaluation data. Upon completion of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program, offenders provided their own assessments of the program via a "participant evaluation form." Items on the survey tapped into the participants' perceptions of the coaches' teaching methods, the relevance of the class material to their own lives, and the climate of the class. Two hundred and sixty-two offenders (43.0% of those assigned to the experimental group, and 68.6% of those who completed the program⁵) contributed participant evaluation forms.

Measures

Participant Measures

Demographic and criminal history measures. Measures of social and demographic characteristics and criminal histories of the research participants are used in this evaluation to a) describe the program participants, b) assure that participants are appropriate for a cognitive intervention of this nature, c) assess adherence to program screening criteria, and d) critique the integrity of random assignment procedures. In later reports, this information will also allow us to identify offender characteristics associated with treatment effectiveness.

Study participants are described by several social and demographic characteristics, including their age at the beginning of the program, sex, race, and history of substance abuse. The Culture Fair Intelligence Test (Cattell & Cattell, 1973) was used to assess their IQ. Other measures reflect offenders' circumstances at the beginning of their prison term and prior to their participation in the Cognitive Skills program: a) self-reported employment status, b) social class as determined by a prison diagnostic counselor⁶, c) self-reported education, d) marital status, and e) reading level assessed using the Wide-Range

Achievement Test (Reid, 1986; Reynolds, 1986). Criminal history characteristics consist of the following: a) number of prior incarcerations, b) prior revocations, c) number of felony convictions, d) number of prior violent convictions, e) number of prior property, drug sale, drug possession, and or sex crime convictions.

Risk level measure. Previous research on cognitive interventions finds them more effective for medium to high risk offenders than for low risk offenders (Andrews & Bonta 1998; Robinson 1995; Research and Statistics Branch of Correctional Services of Canada 1991; but see Van Voorhis et al., 2001). In later reports on the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program, a measure of risk of reoffending will allow for the examination of whether outcomes are more favorable for higher compared to lower risk study participants.

The measure of risk available through OTIS contains a large amount of missing data (29.7%). Because the impact of risk on offender performance and outcomes remains an important research question, the research team at the University of Cincinnati created a risk score from individual variables available through OTIS, following the same procedure used in Phase I.

In composing our risk measure, the intention was to create as nearly as possible the Salient Factor Risk Score (SFS) (Hoffman 1994), a valid and widely used risk assessment instrument among parolees. In doing so, it was necessary to modify three of the seven variables contained in the Salient Factor Score. Whereas the SFS calls for inclusion of juvenile convictions, information available through OTIS pertains solely to the adult record. In addition, we were not able to obtain a measure of whether the offender been employed or attended school full-time for a total of at least six months during the two years preceding his or her imprisonment. Finally, our measure of alcohol or drug addiction does not mirror precisely the corresponding dimension of the SFS. The SFS calls for heroin/opiate dependence, and such a variable is not routinely collected by most correctional agencies. As an alternative measure, offenders are considered at higher risk if, via their diagnostic interviews in prison, they were characterized as abusing alcohol, abusing drugs, and or being addicted to narcotics.

While our risk measure is a modified estimate of the SFS, it does tap a number of factors known to be static predictors of reoffending (Van Voorhis & Brown 1996). In fact, our measure correlates strongly with the Georgia OTIS score among those offenders who have a risk score on record ($\gamma = .81, p < .001$ for Phase II; $\gamma = .71, p < .001$ for Phase I).

Psychological classification measures. Characterizing study participants in terms of psychological dimensions provides a valuable means of examining individual factors that may affect amenability to cognitive treatment. This report presents the distribution of psychological dimensions across the study sample, and looks at the impact of personality on participants' evaluations of the program. Subsequent reports will use the psychological characteristics in analyses predicting treatment effectiveness.

Study participants are portrayed according to two psychological dimensions of the JI system: I-level and personality subtypes. Building on the theoretically-derived I-level system developed by Warren and associates (Jesness & Wedge, 1983; Sullivan, Grant, & Grant, 1957; Warren et al., 1966), the JI places offenders into one of three levels of interpersonal maturity, I-level 2 through I-level 4. I-level assesses how individuals perceive the world, particularly in terms of emotions and motivations (Warren, 1983). Knowledge of a person's I-level provides insight regarding the maturity of one's world view. Movement to a higher level indicates increases in the complexity of thoughts and degree of interpersonal maturity. Figure 1 summarizes the interpersonal maturity levels. In addition, the JI contains 11 empirically-derived personality scales and nine subtype scales that can be collapsed into four personality types: aggressives, neurotics, dependents, and situationals (Van Voorhis 1994). Figure 2 describes the collapsed types. Appendix A presents the nine subtypes that make up the four collapsed personality types.

Figure 1. Summary of Interpersonal Maturity Levels (Harris, 1988; Jesness, 1988; Warren, 1966).

Construct	Definition	Relationship to Criminal Behavior
I-level 2	The primary concern of I-level 2s is whether or not their needs are being met. Other people serve merely as sources of gratification or are seen as barriers to their satisfaction. They are unable to understand or predict the behavior of others.	Criminal behavior may result from poor impulse control. Also, external pressures may lead to fear or anger. An inability to cope with the negative affect then results in delinquency.
I-level 3	The primary concern of I-level 3s focuses on sources of power. They are aware that their behaviors have consequences for others, yet they lack empathy. Their view of others is limited to stereotyped roles. They attempt to manipulate the environment to their favor, and typically engage in only short-term planning.	Criminal behavior result from attempts to gain peer approval, gratification of material needs, or an attempt to gain control in a situation via a “bad guy” role.
I-level 4	The primary concern of I-level 4s is developing their own individuality. They have internalized values and standards, and are rigid in their application of those standards when judging themselves and others. They feel guilt when they do not measure up to these standards, or feel conflict when admiring others’ behavior.	Criminal behavior may result in response to internal discord or situational tension that leads to acting out. These conflicts may yield internalized criminal standards and value systems.

Figure 2. Summary of key personality constructs for the collapsed Jesness Inventory types (Van Voorhis, 1994).

Construct	Definition	Relationship to Criminal Behavior
Aggressives (Aa, Cfc, Mp) ¹	Aggressives tend to be manipulative. Their behavior is unpredictable and negative. Aggressives feel alienated and hostile, and have antisocial values. They are not likely to possess prosocial values.	Aggressives have a high probability of criminal behavior.
Neurotics (Na and Nx)	Neurotics tend to be anxious and insecure. They are often cynical, hostile, and act inappropriately when anxious.	Neurotics have a high probability of criminal behavior when they are unable to cope with anxiety.
Dependents (Ap and Cfm)	Dependents tend to engage in conforming behavior. They often follow others, including criminals. This type is less clearly defined among adults than among juveniles.	Dependents are less likely to engage in criminal behavior than other types. When criminal behavior does occur it may be the result of the influence of others and their limited cognitive functioning.
Situationals (Se and Ci)	Situationals tend to view convention positively. They often maintain good relationships and be prosocial, but can be rigid.	Situationals are less likely to participate in criminal behavior, and such behavior is situational if it does occur.

¹ The abbreviations indicate which of the original nine personality types are included in the collapsed types. See Appendix A for a description of the original personality types.

Program measures

Programmatic constructs of interest in this report include whether study participants assigned to the experimental group received the full dosage of treatment; the size of the program groups; the extent to which they understood class material, enjoyed the program, participated during class sessions, and applied skills; and the quality of coaches' delivery of treatment (e.g., the use of behavioral techniques, relevance of the lessons, and group climate). Measures of these constructs derive from session evaluations, observer evaluations, and participant evaluations.

Program completion and class size measures. Consideration of whether offenders completed the Georgia Cognitive Skills program already has demonstrated its usefulness in Phase I (Van Voorhis et al. 2001). The measure pertaining to program completion is drawn from the session evaluation forms. The session evaluation forms include class lists indicating whether offenders are members of the cognitive class at the particular session. Based on this information, members of the experimental group are categorized as 1) never beginning the program, 2) beginning the program but not completing it, or 3) being in the program at the 30th class session (i.e., completed the program). Class size measures are drawn from the lists of study members assigned to the experimental group, and from the class lists from the 30th class session.

Session evaluation measures. Other measures derived from session evaluation forms represent coaches' reports of offenders' level of participation, level of enjoyment, level of understanding, use of previously taught skills, and group atmosphere during the class session. These data were collected at five different time periods (sessions 3, 9, 17, 22, and 30). A description of the session evaluation measures is presented in Figure 3. The participation, enjoyment, understanding, and group atmosphere ratings were averaged across the five sessions⁷. Hence, these measures represent mean scores for the five time periods, with greater scores indicating more favorable performance. The use of previous skills measure is reported individually for three of the sessions (sessions 3, 17, and 30).

Figure 3. Session evaluation measures.

Dimension	Value ¹	Description
Level of participation	1	Not attentive
	2	Attentiveness wavered
	3	Generally attentive, quiet and reluctant to answer
	4	Attentive, volunteers
	5	Attentive, volunteers
Level of enjoyment	1	Expressed strong dislike and was disruptive
	2	Expressed some dislike
	3	Were noncommittal
	4	Showed some enjoyment
	5	Expressed enjoyment and joined in willingly
Level of understanding	1	Is confused, resistant and quite
	2	Questions the concepts and applications
	3	Seems to understand but cannot apply
	4	Understands, cannot offer own examples but agrees with examples
	5	Understands and can offer examples of the skills
Group atmosphere	1	Divisive, quiet
	2	Some disagreement, not listening
	3	Listening, little active participation
	4	Agreeable, some participation
	5	Cohesive, participating
Use of previous skills	0	No, did not use previously taught skills
	1	Yes, used previously taught skills

¹ On the session evaluation form, more favorable responses were assigned lower values. The values and corresponding descriptions presented here reflect ratings after being reverse-coded.

Observer evaluation measures. While the measures from the session evaluation forms represent coaches' impressions of the performance of offenders in their own program group, the observer evaluations measures are intended to be independent assessments of program characteristics. Because the observer evaluations are designed to assess qualities of the cognitive coaches and the class rather than attributes of the individual participants, the results of the observer evaluations represent the group as a whole; the unit of analysis for these measures is the cognitive group rather than program participants.

Observers critiqued the program sessions using a three-point scale (0 = needs improvement, 1 = satisfactory, 2 = very satisfactory) on 45 items. The items form five scales: general issues and class structure; organization; delivery and response to participant's use of skills; sensitivity to participant's feelings; and group participation. Scales were computed by averaging the items addressing each area. Table 2 lists the items contained in the scales. Reliability analysis indicates high levels of internal consistency for each scale. (Chronbach's alpha > .80)⁸.

Table 2. Items comprising the Observer Evaluation scales.

Scale Name and Items	Alpha Obs. 1 ¹	Alpha Obs. 2 ²
General issues and class structure	.91	.93
Coaches' control over participants.		
Coaches' ability to manage and enforce the class rules.		
Evidence of rules and sanctions for missing group meetings.		
Evidence of enforcement of rules and sanctions for missing group meetings.		
Evidence of rules and sanctions for tardiness.		
Evidence of enforcement of rules and sanctions for tardiness.		
Evidence of rules and sanctions regarding classroom behavior.		
Evidence of enforcement of rules and sanctions regarding classroom behavior.		
Ability to deal with difficult participants (e.g., hostile, angry, dominant, disrespectful, non-participative members).		
Ability to deal with participants who dominate group discussions.		
Organization	.87	.92
Adherence to scheduled starting and ending time.		
Adherence to lesson plan for the day.		
Adequacy of preparation for the lesson.		
Clarity of presentations.		
Use of examples, illustrations, definitions, etc.		
Relevance of the examples, illustrations, definitions, etc.		
Use of variety of instructional strategies.		
Timely completion of the day's lesson (alternatively a conclusion which does not leave matters "in the air" or skip key issues of the lesson).		
Organization of the lesson.		
Review of points from the previous lesson.		
Pace, not too slow or too fast.		
Summary of the lesson at the end.		
Delivery and response to participant's use of skills	.91	.97
Coaches' skill in assisting participants to self-discovery.		
Objectivity/open-minded stance toward participants.		
Flexibility: ability to respond to where the group is.		
Enthusiasm.		
Attention to cognitive processes instead of content.		
Ability to recognize when participants do not understand lesson concepts.		
Coaches' feedback to participants on their performance.		
Balance between participants' and coaches' discussion.		
Attention to participants' need for opportunities to practice.		
Attention to participant's questions.		
Use of positive reinforcement.		
Participant's level of understanding by the end of the lesson.		

Table 2. Continued.

Scale Name and Items	Alpha Obs. 1	Alpha Obs. 2
Sensitivity to participant's feelings Ability to keep participants safe from ridicule from other participants. Skill in identifying participants' feelings, beliefs, thoughts, or attitudes. Ability to empathize with participants. Ability to confront participants without demeaning them. Respect for participants. Professional detachment (e.g., from personal issues, from taking participants' comments personally, etc.). Boundaries with participants (e.g., avoids inappropriate use of authority, yet keeps an appropriate leadership [not friendship] role with participants).	.94	.99
Group participation Level of cooperation between the coaches. Involvement of both coaches. Engagement of most rather than some participants. Level of group participation.	.81	.97

¹ Observation 1 took place during session 17.

² Observation 2 took place during session 30.

Participant evaluation measures. Program participants provided the final set of program characteristic measures. Participants responded whether they 1) “strongly agree,” 2) “agree,” 3) have “no opinion,” 4) “disagree,” or 5) “strongly disagree” with 37 statements. Factor analysis provided the basis for creating the scales by analyzing the interrelationships among items to reveal underlying themes (or factors) within the data (Hair, 1992)⁹. The factor analysis identified three factors among twenty-one items, which were used to create the following scales: a) coaches' adherence to social learning methods, b) relevance of the skills to the program participant, and c) group climate¹⁰. The scale scores reflect the mean values of the items in the scales, and higher scores indicate more positive perceptions of the program. Table 3 presents the items included in the scales and the scales' levels of internal consistency. The Chronbach's alpha for each scale is greater than .75. Additional items of interest that are not included in the scales pertain to a) coaches' reading from the program manual most of the time and b) how many times per month the program participant met with his or her parole officer during the program?”

Table 3. Participant evaluation scale items.

Scale Name and Items	Factor Loading
Factor 1: Adherence to social learning methods	
The coaches gave me suggestions for how to improve the way I handled problems.	.63
Sometimes we “role played” parts of the lesson.	.56
Sometimes we got some good discussions going.	.56
I felt that the coaches understood where I was coming from.	.57
Coaches used examples (video, pictures, or practice sessions) to help us understand the skills.	.67
I felt comfortable stating my own opinions in the classes.	.70
I think I participated a lot in these classes.	.68
I had several chances to practice the skills during group meetings.	.67
Eigenvalue	4.68
Percentage of variance explained	12.64
Internal consistency (Chronbach’s Alpha)	.85
Factor 2: Relevance of skills to participant	
My thoughts and feelings seem clearer to me now than they were before I participated in this class.	.71
In the end, I enjoyed going to class.	.62
By using the skills I have learned, I will know how to get out of a bad situation.	.75
The skills and examples seemed pretty realistic.	.66
The coaches were easy to talk to.	.57
The exercises were helpful.	.66
The coaches seemed enthusiastic about teaching the class.	.51
Eigenvalue	3.92
Percentage of variance explained	10.60
Internal consistency (Chronbach’s Alpha)	.82
Factor 3: Group climate	
Other group members did not seem to respect what I had to say.	.57
Group members often did not cooperate well with the coach.	.71
The group members seemed to have trouble understanding the skills.	.56
Sometimes group members were teased and the coaches did not do anything about it.	.58
Just a few people seemed to do most of the talking.	.62
Most group members did not seem to be taking the classes seriously.	.70
Eigenvalue	3.59
Percentage of variance explained	9.70
Internal consistency (Chronbach’s Alpha)	.78

Analysis

As the purpose of this process evaluation is to present characteristics of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program, most of the findings discussed below are purely descriptive. Illustrations of study participants and program characteristics are based on frequencies, ranges, means, medians, modes, and percentages. However, chi square analysis and T-tests are used to examine a) faithfulness to the experimental design by testing whether statistically significant differences exist between the experimental and control groups and b) whether subgroups of participants evaluate the program differently.

Results

Participant Questions

Who did Phase II programs serve in terms of background social and demographic characteristics and criminal histories?

Background social and demographic characteristics of the experimental group are presented in Table 4. Most of the participants are men (91.3%) and were between the ages of 18 and 35 (69.0%) at the beginning of the program, with an average age of 32¹¹. The participants are further described as mostly nonwhite (68.5%). Of the 409 nonwhite participants, one is Native American and the rest are African American. Prison counselors characterized 79.8% of the participants as maintaining at least a minimum standard of living. Self-reported employment and educational achievement at prison intake indicate that 50.9% were not employed full time at the time of their arrest and 65.4% did not complete high school. A substantial portion of participants have minimal reading skills, as evidenced by 26.4% scoring below a fifth grade reading level on the WRAT reading assessment. The average IQ is 100.8, with 8.2% having IQs below 80. Most participants (60.8%) were single and slightly over half (56.8) were noted in OTIS files to have a history of substance abuse. Appendix B presents the distribution of these characteristics for each district in the study. Figures for the groups not involved in the experimental design of the study are found in Appendices C and D .

Table 4. Description of the experimental group across background social and demographic characteristics (collected at prison intake).

Characteristic		N	%
Age:	18-25	162	27.1
	26-36	250	41.9
	36-50	162	27.1
	<u>50+</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>3.9</u>
	Total	597	100.0
Average Age:		32.2	
Race:	White	188	31.5
	<u>Nonwhite</u>	<u>409</u>	<u>68.5</u>
	Total	597	100.0
Sex:	Male	545	91.3
	<u>Female</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>8.7</u>
	Total	597	100.0
Employment status:			
	Employed full time	289	49.1
	Employed part time	59	10.0
	Unemployed < 6 mo.	91	15.4
	Unemployed for 6+ mo.	97	16.5
	Never worked but capable	20	3.4
	Student	3	0.5
	Incapable of work	14	2.4
	<u>Other</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>2.7</u>
	Total	589	100.0
Social class:			
	Welfare	53	9.1
	Occasionally employed	65	11.1
	Minimum standard	231	39.6
	<u>Middle class</u>	<u>235</u>	<u>40.2</u>
	Total	584	100.0
Education:			
	Less than high school	51	8.6
	Some high school	336	56.8
	High school	133	22.5
	At least some technical school	19	3.2
	<u>At least some college</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>9.0</u>
	Total	592	100.1

Table 4. Continued.

Characteristic	N	%
Marital status:		
Single (never married)	360	60.8
Married	63	10.6
Separated	34	5.7
Divorced (not remarried)	63	10.6
Widowed	7	1.2
<u>Common law marriage</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>11.0</u>
Total	592	99.9
Substance abuse:		
History of substance abuse	339	56.8
<u>No history of substance abuse</u>	<u>258</u>	<u>43.2</u>
Total	597	100.0
IQ:		
50 to 80	48	8.2
81 to 99	202	34.5
100 to 115	253	43.2
<u>116 to 139</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>14.2</u>
Total	586	100.1
Average IQ:	100.8	
Reading level:		
Below 5 th grade	154	26.4
<u>5th grade or above</u>	<u>430</u>	<u>73.6</u>
Total	584	100.0

Table 5 describes the experimental group's criminal histories. Half (49.2%) were classified as medium/high risk. A slight majority (58.1%) had multiple prior incarcerations, and nearly half (44.1%) have prior parole revocations. Only one participant (.2%) had no prior felony convictions; forty-eight percent had three or more. Of the various types of crimes committed by participants prior to their last incarceration, property crime convictions were the most common (72.4%), followed by drug possession convictions (62.0%). Violent convictions (43.9%) and drug sale convictions (42.0%) were also common. Despite screening criteria to exclude sex offenders, 18 participants (3.0%) had histories of sex crime convictions. Appendix E presents criminal histories by district. Refer to Appendix F and G for a description of the districts not in the experimental study.

Table 5. Description of the experimental group across criminal background characteristics.

Characteristic		N	%
Risk:	Low	299	50.8
	<u>Medium/High</u>	<u>290</u>	<u>49.2</u>
	Total	589	100.0
Number of prior incarcerations:			
	None	250	41.9
	One	161	27.0
	Two	86	14.4
	Three	43	7.2
	Four	34	5.7
	<u>Five or more</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>3.9</u>
	Total	597	100.1
	Mean	1.2	
	Median	1.0	
Prior parole revocation:			
	No	334	55.9
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>263</u>	<u>44.1</u>
	Total	597	100.0
Number of prior felony convictions:			
	None	1	0.2
	One	148	24.8
	Two	161	27.0
	Three	111	18.6
	Four	71	11.9
	<u>Five or more</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>17.6</u>
	Total	597	100.1
	Mean	2.9	
	Median	2.0	
Number of prior violent convictions:			
	None	335	56.1
	One	97	16.2
	Two	60	10.1
	Three	34	5.7
	Four	23	3.9
	<u>Five or more</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>8.0</u>
	Total	597	100.0

Table 5. Continued.

Characteristic	N	%
Number of prior violent convictions, continued:		
Mean	1.3	
Median	0.0	
Number of prior drug sale convictions:		
None	346	58.0
One	140	23.5
<u>Two or more</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>18.6</u>
Total	597	100.1
Mean	0.7	
Median	0.0	
Number of prior property convictions:		
None	165	27.6
One	83	13.9
Two	77	12.9
Three	36	6.0
Four	28	4.7
Five	27	4.5
Six	24	4.0
Seven	18	3.0
<u>Eight or more</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>23.3</u>
Total	597	99.9
Mean	4.8	
Median	2.0	
Number of prior drug possession convictions:		
None	227	38.0
One	95	15.9
Two	80	13.4
Three	57	9.5
Four	46	7.7
<u>Five or more</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>15.4</u>
Total	597	99.9
Mean	2.2	
Median	1.0	

Table 5. Continued.

Characteristic	N	%
Number of prior sex crime convictions:		
None	579	97.0
One	13	2.2
<u>Two or more</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0.8</u>
Total	597	100.0
	Median	0.0
	Mean	0.1

Did the population served by the programs meet the selection criteria set forth by the study design? In other words, were study participants appropriate for the programs?

The screening criteria for the Georgia Cognitive Skills are consistent with extant research and Georgia's application of R&R to address general criminal behavior, as opposed to specifically targeting substance abuse or sex offending. The program is to exclude offenders who a) are low risk, b) have sex crime histories, c) are afflicted by severe substance abuse, and d) have IQs below 80. As illustrated in Tables 4 and 5, *offenders were not screened into the program as carefully as they might have been*¹².

Low risk offenders constitute half (50.8%) of the experimental group. The large proportion of low risk offenders is not surprising given that program screening was not aided by an actuarial risk assessment tool. However, if the results from the Phase I outcome study (Van Voorhis et al. 2001) hold for Phase II, this may not be a detrimental oversight. Rather than finding a "risk effect" where higher risk offenders reap significantly greater benefits from a treatment than do low risk offenders, the Phase I study found that low and medium/high risk participants performed equally better than their control group counterparts. Van Voorhis et al. (2001) offer that perhaps the low risk parolees of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program are actually at an elevated risk compared to other samples that evidence a "risk effect", e.g., probationers¹³.

Although research suggests that cognitive interventions can be effective for sex offenders and substance abusers, they were to be excluded from the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program for reasons explained earlier. However, 18 offenders (3.0%) in the experimental

group had previous sex crime convictions; thirteen had only one sex crime conviction in their record, but others had up to 10.

Determining the extent of adherence to the substance abuse screening criteria is somewhat problematic. To be excluded from the program, the offenders' substance abuse was to be current and severe enough to impede their participation in the program. However, available measures reflect prior rather than current substance use and do not systematically address severity. OTIS does note that substance abuse, drug abuse, or narcotic addiction were indicated during incarceration to be problem areas for 56.8% of the experimental group. OTIS data also state that 403 (66.1%) members of the experimental group had drug possession and or drug sale convictions. While the measures from OTIS do not include the currency or severity of abuse, they do indicate that for many offenders assigned to the program, involvement with drugs and or alcohol has been prevalent enough to come to the attention of the criminal justice system.

For 48 (8.2%) of the experimental group, IQs are low enough (i.e., below 80) to call into question the appropriateness of their inclusion in the study. The reading level of participants, while not a screening criterion, may also hinder success in the program. One hundred and fifty-four (26.4%) participants could not read at a fifth grade level. As such, they were likely to have difficulty with written assignments and reading the blackboard.

Were the randomization procedures implemented successfully, as evidenced by similarities between the experimental and comparison group?

To determine whether the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment adhered to the randomization procedures, Chi square and T-test analyses were run comparing the control and experimental groups on each of the background characteristics used to describe the study participants. As can be seen in Table 6, *there is great similarity between the two groups, confirming the integrity of the experimental design.*

Slightly more of the control group were single (experimental = 60.7%; control = 65.7%), employed full time (experimental = 49.1%; control = 54.8%) or had no high school education (experimental = 8.6%; control = 12.2%). However, none of these differences are statistically significant.

Table 6. Comparison of the experimental and control groups across background social and demographic characteristics¹ (collected at prison intake).

Characteristic		Experimental		Control		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Age:	18-25	162	27.1	143	24.9	305	26.0
	26-36	250	41.9	259	45.1	509	43.5
	36-50	162	27.1	153	26.7	315	26.9
	<u>50+</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>3.6</u>
	Total	597	100.0	574	100.0	1171	100.0
Average Age:		32.2		32.0		32.1	
Race:	White	188	31.5	172	30.0	360	30.7
	<u>Nonwhite</u>	<u>409</u>	<u>68.5</u>	<u>402</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>811</u>	<u>69.3</u>
	Total	597	100.0	574	100.0	1171	100.0
Sex:	Male	545	91.3	528	92.0	1073	91.6
	<u>Female</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>8.7</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>8.4</u>
	Total	597	100.0	576	100.0	1171	100.0
Employment status:							
	Employed full time	289	49.1	308	54.8	597	51.9
	Employed part time	59	10.0	52	9.3	111	9.6
	Unemployed < 6 mo.	91	15.4	65	11.6	156	13.6
	Unemployed for 6+ mo.	97	16.5	88	15.7	185	16.1
	Never worked but capable	20	3.4	18	3.2	38	3.3
	Student	3	0.5	1	0.2	4	0.3
	Incapable of work	14	2.4	11	2.0	25	2.2
	<u>Other</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>3.0</u>
	Total	589	100.0	562	100.2	1151	100.0
Social class:							
	Welfare	53	9.0	46	8.3	99	8.7
	Occasionally employed	65	11.1	49	8.8	114	10.0
	Minimum standard	231	39.4	229	41.3	460	40.3
	Middle class	235	40.0	226	40.7	461	40.4
	<u>Other</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0.9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.7</u>
	Total	587	100.0	555	100.0	1142	100.1
Education:							
	Less than high school	51	8.6	70	12.2	121	10.4
	Some high school	336	56.7	311	54.3	647	55.5
	High school	133	22.4	139	24.3	272	23.3
	At least some technical school	19	3.2	14	2.4	33	2.8
	At least some college	53	8.9	39	6.8	92	7.9
	<u>Other</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.1</u>
	Total	593	100.0	573	100.0	1166	100.0

Table 6. Continued

Characteristic	Experimental		Control		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Marital status:						
Single (never married)	360	60.7	376	65.7	736	63.2
Married	63	10.6	65	11.4	128	11.0
Separated	34	5.7	37	4.7	61	5.2
Divorced (not remarried)	63	10.6	43	7.5	106	9.1
Widowed	7	1.2	7	1.2	14	1.2
Common law marriage	65	11.0	54	9.4	119	10.2
<u>Other</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.1</u>
Total	593	100.0	572	99.9	1165	100.0
Substance abuse:						
History of substance abuse	339	56.8	321	55.9	660	56.4
No history of substance abuse	258	43.2	253	44.1	511	43.6
Total	597	100.0	574	100.0	1171	100.0
IQ:						
50 to 80	48	8.2	41	7.3	89	7.7
81 to 99	202	34.5	211	37.5	413	35.9
100 to 115	253	43.2	226	40.1	479	41.7
<u>116 to 139</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>14.2</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>15.1</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>14.6</u>
Total	586	100.1	563	100.0	1149	99.9
Average IQ:	100.8		101.0		100.9	
Reading level:						
Below 5 th grade	154	26.4	159	28.2	313	27.3
<u>5th grade or above</u>	<u>430</u>	<u>73.6</u>	<u>405</u>	<u>71.8</u>	<u>835</u>	<u>72.7</u>
Total	584	100.0	564	100.0	1148	100.0

¹ None of the differences between the experimental and control groups are statistically significant.

Differences in criminal histories across the study groups are presented in Table 7. Proportionately more of the experimental group are medium/high risk (experimental = 49.2%; control = 44.8%), but this difference is not statistically significant. The only significant difference pertains to prior property convictions. Twenty-three percent of the experimental group had eight or more prior property convictions, compared to 19.0% of the control group; the median number of prior property convictions for both groups is two.

Group distributions were nearly identical¹⁴ on the remaining background characteristics: a) age, b) race, c) social class, d) substance abuse, e) IQ, f) reading level, g) prior incarcerations, h) felony convictions, i) violent convictions, j) drug sale convictions, k) drug possession convictions, and l) sex crime convictions.

Table 7. Comparison of the experimental and control groups across criminal background characteristics (collected at prison intake).

Characteristic		Experimental		Control		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Risk:	Low	299	50.8	310	55.2	609	52.9
	<u>Medium/High</u>	<u>290</u>	<u>49.2</u>	<u>252</u>	<u>44.8</u>	<u>542</u>	<u>47.1</u>
	Total	589	100.0	562	100.0	1151	100.0
Number of prior incarcerations:							
	None	250	41.9	239	41.6	489	41.8
	One	161	27.0	157	27.4	318	27.2
	Two	86	14.4	73	12.7	159	13.6
	Three	43	7.2	52	9.1	95	8.1
	Four	34	5.7	26	4.5	60	5.1
	<u>Five or more</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>4.3</u>
	Total	597	100.1	574	100.0	1171	100.1
	Mean	1.2		1.2		1.2	
	Median	1.0		1.0		1.0	
Number of prior felony convictions:							
	None	1	0.2	2	0.3	3	0.3
	One	148	24.8	145	25.3	293	25.0
	Two	161	27.0	145	25.3	306	26.1
	Three	111	18.6	123	21.4	234	20.0
	Four	71	11.9	70	12.2	141	12.0
	<u>Five or more</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>17.6</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>15.5</u>	<u>194</u>	<u>16.6</u>
	Total	597	100.1	574	100.0	1171	100.0
	Mean	2.9		2.9		2.9	
	Median	2.0		2.0		2.0	
Number of prior violent convictions:							
	None	335	56.1	321	55.9	656	56.0
	One	97	16.2	90	15.7	187	16.0
	Two	60	10.1	65	11.3	125	10.7
	Three	34	5.7	35	6.1	69	5.9
	Four	23	3.9	18	3.1	41	3.5
	<u>Five or more</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>7.9</u>
	Total	597	100.0	574	99.9	1171	100.0
	Mean	1.3		1.2		1.2	
	Median	0.0		0.0		0.0	
Number of prior property convictions*:							
	None	165	27.6	161	28.0	326	27.8
	One	83	13.9	84	14.6	167	14.3
	Two	77	12.9	46	8.0	123	10.5
	Three	36	6.0	56	9.8	92	7.9
	Four	28	4.7	40	7.0	68	5.8

Table 7. Continued.

Characteristic	Experimental		Control		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior property convictions, continued						
Five	27	4.5	27	4.7	54	4.6
Six	24	4.0	30	5.2	54	4.6
Seven	18	3.0	21	3.7	39	3.3
<u>Eight or more</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>23.3</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>19.0</u>	<u>248</u>	<u>21.2</u>
Total	597	99.9	574	100.0	1171	100.0
	Mean	4.8	4.5		4.6	
	Median	2.0	2.0		2.0	
Number of prior drug sale convictions:						
None	346	58.0	325	56.6	671	57.3
One	140	23.5	130	22.6	270	23.1
<u>Two or more</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>18.6</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>20.7</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>19.6</u>
Total	597	100.1	574	100.1	1171	100.0
	Mean	0.7	0.8		0.8	
	Median	0.0	0.0		0.0	
Number of prior drug possession convictions:						
None	227	38.0	211	36.8	438	37.4
One	95	15.9	104	18.1	199	17.0
Two	80	13.4	69	12.0	149	12.7
Three	57	9.5	61	10.6	118	10.1
Four	46	7.7	43	7.5	89	7.6
<u>Five or more</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>15.4</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>15.0</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>15.2</u>
Total	597	99.9	574	100.0	1171	100.0
	Mean	2.2	2.1		2.1	
	Median	1.0	1.0		1.0	
Number of prior sex crime convictions:						
None	579	97.0	549	95.6	1128	96.3
One	13	2.2	12	2.1	25	2.1
<u>Two or more</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>1.5</u>
Total	597	100.0	574	100.0	1171	99.9
	Mean	0.1	0.1		0.1	
	Median	0.0	0.0		0.0	

* Significance of $X^2 < .05$

Despite the favorable results of the analyses comparing characteristics of the experimental and control groups, differences in the size of the experimental group and control group in several sites raises concerns. One would expect random assignment to yield equally sized experimental and control groups. As can be seen by turning back to Table 1, 25 of the 52 sets of experimental and control groups in the study were not the same size. In several instances the lists of study participants sent to the GBPP contained odd numbers of offenders, which naturally lead to either the experimental or control group having an extra member. This scenario accounts for 10 of the unequally sized sets of experimental and control groups. More troublesome are the 15 occasions where one group had two or more members than the other group. While this appears to indicate a problem with randomization procedures, Georgia staff indicated that participants were assigned to control groups at random. The need for sufficient experimental group size caused staff to assign offenders to groups according to a higher ratio than fifty percent. Even so, in the outcome evaluation report, analyses will be run both with and without the 15 sites with unequal experimental and control groups to determine if they affect the results.

What is the distribution of Jesness Inventory personality types among study participants?

Each of the interpersonal maturity levels (I-level) and collapsed Jesness Inventory types are represented in the experimental group. However, because so few participants are classified as I-Level 2s, (4.9%), I-Levels 2 and 3 are presented together. I-level 3s constitute 55.2% of the experimental group. As can be seen in Table 8, The combined group of I-Levels 2 and 3 make up 60.0% of the experimental group. Table 8 also presents the distribution of collapsed JI personality types. More of the experimental group are classified as Aggressives (32.2%) than the other three types. Dependents (27.9%) and situationals (22.4%) are represented in nearly equal proportions. Neurotics make up 17.5% of the experimental group. These distributions are very similar to those found in a sample of male federal penitentiary inmates (Van Voorhis, 1994). The distribution of personality types and I-level across the experimental districts is located in Appendix H. Appendices I and J present personality characteristics of the program groups without comparison groups.

Knowledge regarding the specific differential effects of personality constructs on the efficacy of cognitive treatment is not well established. As such, later analysis (i.e., in the outcome study) examining how personality characteristics impact offenders' responsivity to treatment will be particularly valuable.

Table 8. Distribution of I-Level classifications and collapsed Jesness Inventory types (Van Voorhis 1994) within the experimental group.

Characteristic	N	%
I-Level:		
I-levels 2 and 3	308	60.0
<u>I-level 4</u>	<u>205</u>	<u>40.0</u>
Total	513	100.0
Collapsed Jesness Inventory type:		
Aggressives	165	32.2
Neurotics	90	17.5
Dependents	143	27.9
<u>Situationals</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>22.4</u>
Total	513	100.0

Program Characteristics Questions

Are class sizes appropriate for the program?

To facilitate coaches' management of program sessions and encourage active class participation, R&R courses are intended to be small (i.e., between four and six members) (Ross, Fabiano, and Ross, 1989). The "total" row of Table 9 presents the number of offenders assigned to participate in the Cognitive Skills Program for each program group. From six to 28 offenders were assigned to the program groups, with the typical size around 11 (mean = 12; median = 10). Thus, *nearly all of the program groups created through the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program exceed the recommended class size.*

Some program groups were intentionally large in anticipation of individuals dropping out of the program. Not all of the offenders assigned to the program began the course, and others began but did not complete the program. The "still in at session 30" row of Table 9 gives a clearer picture of the class sizes during the program. By session 30, classes reduced to between two to 20 participants. *Even taking into consideration attrition, nearly half (40.4%) of the program groups exceeded the recommended class size of six.*

Table 9. Class sizes and completion figures for program groups.

	Marietta				Clarkesville				Dahlonega			
	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 1		Group 1*		Group 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never began	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	17.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	25.0
Did not complete	7	35.0	6	54.5	3	10.7	4	50.0	5	45.5	2	16.7
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>65.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>71.4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>54.5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>58.3</u>
Total	20	100.0	11	100.0	28	100.0	8	100.0	11	100.0	12	100.0

Table 9. Continued.

	Milledgeville				Thomas		Savannah		Jesup		Waycross	
	Group 1		Group 2		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never began	3	30.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	7	50.0	2	28.6	0	0.0
Did not complete	3	30.0	4	40.0	3	30.0	3	21.4	3	42.9	3	30.0
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>70.0</u>
Total	10	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.1	10	100.0

Table 9. Continued.

	Waycross		Fitzgerald		Columbus				Jonesboro			
	Group 1		Group 1*		Group 1*		Group 2		Group 1		Group 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never began	0	0.0	2	18.2	1	12.5	5	31.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did not complete	4	57.1	1	9.1	1	12.5	5	31.3	1	11.1	4	44.4
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>42.9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>72.7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>88.9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>55.6</u>
Total	7	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.1	9	100.0	9	100.0

* These groups do not have comparison groups, and therefore are not part of the experimental evaluation

Table 9. Continued.

	Lawrenceville				Augusta				Brunswick			
	Group 1		Group 2		Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never began	3	33.3	0	0.0	7	58.3	0	0.0	3	25.0	0	0.0
Did not complete	1	11.1	1	14.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	6	60.0
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>85.7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>91.7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>40.0</u>
Total	9	100.0	7	100.0	12	99.9	12	100.0	12	100.0	10	100.0

Table 9. Continued.

	Brunswick				Cairo		North Fulton					
	Group 2		Group 3		Group 1		Group 1		Group 2		Group 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never began	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	35.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	43.5
Did not complete	2	22.2	3	30.0	1	7.1	1	11.1	3	18.8	1	4.3
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>77.8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>88.9</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>81.3</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>52.2</u>
Total	9	100.0	10	100.0	14	99.9	9	100.0	16	100.1	23	100.0

Table 9. Continued.

	LaGrange				Griffin				LaFayette			
	Group 1*		Group 2*		Group 3		Group 1		Group 1		Group 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never began	0	0.0	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3
Did not complete	0	0.0	1	11.1	3	25.0	2	16.7	0	0.0	2	28.6
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>77.8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>83.3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>57.1</u>
Total	9	100.0	9	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0

Table 9. Continued.

	Jefferson				South Dekalb				Lyons			
	Group 1*		Group 2		Group 1		Group 2		Group 1*		Group 2*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never began	0	0.0	2	16.7	4	25.0	9	40.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did not complete	1	9.1	2	16.7	4	25.0	7	31.8	3	25.0	0	0.0
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	11	100.0	12	100.1	16	100.0	22	100.0	12	100.0	10	100.0

Table 9. Continued.

	Lyons				Statesboro				South Metro			
	Group 3		Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 1		Group 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never began	0	0.0	4	40.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did not complete	4	44.4	1	10.0	4	44.4	2	25.0	3	33.3	4	33.3
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>66.7</u>
Total	9	100.0	10	100.0	9	100.0	8	100.0	9	100.0	12	100.0

Table 9. Continued.

	South Richmond				Carrollton		Douglas		Hartwell			
	Group 1		Group 2		Group 1*		Group 1*		Group 1		Group 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never began	3	30.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did not complete	2	20.0	2	22.2	2	25.0	2	22.2	0	0.0	2	22.2
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>77.8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>77.8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>77.8</u>
Total	10	100.0	9	100.0	8	100.0	9	100.0	9	100.0	9	100.0

Table 9. Continued.

	Coastal St. Prison				Whitworth Detention Center						Metro St. Prison	
	Group 1		Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4		Group 1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never began	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did not complete	1	8.3	1	10.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	62.5
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>91.7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>90.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>90.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>37.5</u>
Total	12	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0	8	100.0

Table 9. Continued.

	Metro St. Prison			
	Group 2		Group 3	
	N	%	N	%
Never began	2	11.8	0	0.0
Did not complete	10	58.8	8	29.6
<u>Still in at session 30</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>29.4</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>70.4</u>
Total	17	100.0	27	100.0

What proportions of those assigned to the Cognitive Skills Program a) began the program and b) completed the program?

Not surprisingly, whether program participants complete the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program has shown in Phase I to be an important predictor of later criminal involvement (Van Voorhis et al., 2001). It is therefore important to distinguish between those experimental group members who never were involved in the program, participated in only a portion of the course, and received the full dosage of treatment. The data presented in Table 10 show that 80 (13.1%) of the offenders assigned to the program did not start. Of those that did begin the program, 24.1% were no longer participating in the program by the 30th class session. A total of 382 (62.7%) of the experimental group completed the course. This total completion rate is comparable to Phase I where 59.6% finished the program.

Focusing only on those offenders who began the program, the completion rates range from 33% to 100% across program groups, with an average completion rate of around 72% (mean = 72.0%; median = 73.2%). Compared to the completion rates for Phase I, Phase II rates are more widely varied across program groups and higher on average.¹⁵ Proportions of program groups that never began, dropped out, and completed the treatment are located in Table 9

Based on assessments made by the cognitive skills coaches, to what degree did clients a) understand the material presented in the program, b) enjoy the program, c) participate during the classes, and d) apply the skills? Also, how did the coaches describe the group atmosphere of the classes?

The R&R facilitators' handbook (Ross, Fabiano, and Ross, 1989) suggests that gains from the program are most likely when the participants not only understand and apply the material, but also enjoy the classes and participate at high levels. Furthermore, a cohesive group atmosphere is proposed to be more conducive to the learning process.

As Table 10 illustrates, Georgia's implementation of R&R appears to have been fairly successful in terms of creating cohesive units with high levels of offender participation, enjoyment, and understanding. Approximately three-fourths of program participants

averaged scores in the two highest categories of level of participation (i.e., attentive, responsive and attentive, volunteers; 75.5%), enjoyment (i.e., expressed come enjoyment and expressed strong enjoyment; 70.4%), and understanding i.e., (understands, cannot offer examples and understands, can offer examples; 76.8%). However, unlike Phase I results where no participants averaged negative assessments on these dimensions, a small portion of Phase II participants fell below neutral on average level of participation (i.e., not attentive and attentive, yet wavered; 6.4%), enjoyment (i.e., expressed strong dislike and expressed some dislike; 5.7%), and understanding (i.e., confused and resistant and questions the concepts; 4.1%).

According to coaches, the typical group atmosphere for 60.8% of the groups was “cohesive,” and 27.5% of the groups were characterized as “agreeable with some participation.” Although no groups were described as typically being “divisive, quiet” or as “some disagreement, not listening,” 11.8% averaged the neutral rating of “listening, little active participation.”

The proportion of program participants reported to be using previously taught skills increased throughout the program from 71.0% at time 1 to 94.3% at time 5. The increased proportions in use of skills from time 1 to time 5 are not an artifact of attrition. There are no statistically significant differences in the application of skills early on in the program for those who eventually dropped out compared to those who completed the program; participants who did not apply the skills early in the program did not self-select themselves out of the program. Hence, it appears that participants improved in their application of skills over the course of the program.

Table 10. Class session characteristics of the experimental group.

Characteristic	N	%
Completion:		
Never began	80	13.1
Did not complete	147	24.1
<u>Still in at class 30</u>	<u>382</u>	<u>62.7</u>
Total	609	99.9
Average level of participation ^a :		
Not attentive	4	0.8
Attentive, yet wavered	27	5.6
Generally attentive	88	18.1
Attentive, responsive	192	39.5
<u>Attentive, volunteers</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>36.0</u>
Total	486	100.0
Average level of enjoyment ^a :		
Expressed strong dislike	3	0.6
Expressed some dislike	25	5.1
Non-committal	116	23.9
Expressed some enjoyment	202	41.6
<u>Expressed strong enjoyment</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>28.8</u>
Total	486	100.0
Average level of understanding ^a :		
Confused and resistant	3	0.6
Questions the concepts	17	3.5
Understands, cannot apply	93	19.1
Understands, cannot offer examples	205	42.2
<u>Understands, can offer examples</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>34.6</u>
Total	486	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 1 ^b :		
No	113	29.0
<u>Yes</u>	<u>276</u>	<u>71.0</u>
Total	389	100.0

^a The N for average level of participation, enjoyment, and understanding includes parolees who attended at least one of the five class sessions used to calculate the mean.

^b The N for use of skills includes parolees who attended the particular session.

Table 10. Continued.

Characteristic	N	%
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 3:		
No	26	7.3
<u>Yes</u>	<u>328</u>	<u>92.7</u>
Total	354	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 5:		
No	18	5.7
<u>Yes</u>	<u>296</u>	<u>94.3</u>
Total	314	100.0
Average group atmosphere ^c :		
Divisive, quiet	0	0.0
Some disagreement, not listening	0	0.0
Listening, little active participation	6	11.8
Agreeable, some participation	14	27.5
<u>Cohesive, participating</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>60.8</u>
Total	51	100.1

^cThe unit of analysis for the average group atmosphere is class or group. A total of 52 experimental groups participated in Phase II of the evaluation. One group did not report on group atmosphere.

There are limitations of the session evaluation data that warrant discussion. First, data such as these are vulnerable to reporting fluctuations, reflecting variable standards and expectations of the raters/coaches as much as they might reflect the client characteristics being evaluated. Although all of the coaches received training on how to evaluate the participants, checks were not in place to ensure inter-rater reliability or consistency over time. Hence, we do not know the extent to which coaches across districts rated participants similarly, nor are we aware of whether coaches assessed participants the same over time. Second, some coaches rated all class participants in the group the same, as evidenced by all offenders in a group having the same average scores on a session characteristic. Examples of this can be observed by turning to Appendix K, which presents session evaluation characteristics across districts. While it is possible that all of the participants in a group performed similarly at a given time, doing so throughout the program is unlikely. Third, it appears that in many instances coaches did not discriminate between items

pertaining to understanding, enjoyment, and participation. Again referring to Appendix K, one can see that in some districts the coaches rated participants the same on each of the dimensions. Appendices L and M present session evaluation results for the program groups without comparison groups.

The statements below summarize coaches' perceptions of the Georgia Cognitive Skills program. These observations are made in light of the aforementioned limitations of the data.

- Coaches' perceptions of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program were largely positive in terms of offenders' level of participation, enjoyment, and understanding.
- Coaches also tended to characterize the groups as being cohesive and agreeable.
- While the degree to which participants applied previously taught skills was somewhat low to begin with, application of skills increased as the program progressed.

Are there areas of strength or weakness that emerge from assessments made by trained observers of the program?

The observer evaluation data identify characteristics of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program that consistently met the expectations of the observers and also areas that can benefit from added attention. Because the instrument used for the evaluation of the program sessions has not been normed, and hence established cutoff points indicating the level of proficiency required to translate into more effective program outcomes have not been determined¹⁶, the following discussion speaks only to how observations of the program sessions compare to what was found to be typical for the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program.

Patterns that emerged from the observer evaluation data include the following.

- Observers rated "sensitivity to participant's feelings" (e.g., respect for participants and skill in identifying participants' feelings, beliefs, thoughts, or attitudes) and "group participation" (e.g., engagement of most rather than some participants) as strengths of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program; there is substantial consistency in the presence of these qualities across program sites.

- Areas of implementation that vary the most from program to program are “general issues and class structure,” “organization,” and “delivery and response to participant’s use of skills.” These three areas also were considered to have the most room for improvement.
- Improvements were noted in all five implementation areas from the first to second observations; the percent of program groups rated below the modal, or most frequent score at the second observation was lower than at the first observation on all five scales.

The above conclusions are drawn from information presented in Table 11. The ratings available to the observers included 0 = needs improvement, 1 = satisfactory, and 2 = very satisfactory. For a scale to have a value of 2, the observer must have scored the coach/session “very satisfactory” on all of the items in that scale. Most groups received this rating on the scales; between 43.5% and 91.1% of the program groups received the highest possible ratings. Hence, the rating of 2 is the modal, or most frequent score. This distribution of values suggests that the “very satisfactory” category was the standard rather than the exceptional case. Appendix N presents the distribution of scale scores for the non-experimental groups.

The percent of groups rated below the mode (i.e., scale scores below 2) illustrate the degree of consistency observed in the various program characteristics across groups. The “percent rated below the modal score” column of Table 11 indicates that at session 17 around half of the program groups were in need of improvement in the areas of “general issues and class structure” (41.3%), “organization” (56.5%), and “delivery and response to participant’s use of skills” (41.3%). In contrast, less than a quarter of the groups fell below the mode on the dimensions of “sensitivity to participant’s feelings” (21.7%) and “group participation” (19.6%). By session 30 over three-fourths of the groups met observers’ standards on “general issues and class structure,” “organization,” and “delivery and response to participant’s use of skills.” The vast majority of the groups reached observers’ standards for “sensitivity to participant’s feelings” (82.2%) and “group participation” (91.1%) by the end of the program. This information suggests that of the five dimensions of program implementation evaluated, the areas of sensitivity to participant’s feelings and group participation most commonly meet the expectations of the observers.

Table 11. Observer Evaluation scales and corresponding reliabilities and descriptives.

Scale	Range ¹	Median ²	Percent rated below the modal score ³	N ⁴
<u>Observation 1⁵</u>				
General issues and class structure	0.7-2.0	2.0	41.3	46
Organization	0.8-2.0	1.9	56.5	46
Delivery and response to participant's use of skills	0.8-2.0	2.0	41.3	46
Sensitivity to participants' feelings	1.0-2.0	2.0	21.7	46
Group participation	0.5-2.0	2.0	19.6	46
<u>Observation 2⁶</u>				
General issues and class structure	0.2-2.0	2.0	22.2	45
Organization	1.0-2.0	2.0	17.8	45
Delivery and response to participant's use of skills	1.0-2.0	2.0	17.8	45
Sensitivity to participants' feelings	1.0-2.0	2.0	8.9	45
Group participation	1.0-2.0	2.0	17.8	45

¹ The possible ratings available to the observers included 0 = needs improvement, 1 = satisfactory, and 2 = very satisfactory.

² Because the scale scores are highly skewed, the median more accurately reflects the typical case than the mean. The median is the middle score when the data are ordered from lowest to highest values.

³ The modal, or most frequent rating given to groups is a 2. A scale score of 2 indicates that all items in the scale were rated the highest possible value.

⁴ Six program groups were not observed at session 17. Seven program groups were not observed at session 30.

⁵ Observation 1 took place during session 17.

⁶ Observation 2 took place during session 30.

The interpretation of the observation evaluation data rests on some assumptions. First, not all program groups were evaluated. Six groups (11.5%) were not observed at session 17, and seven (13.5%) were not observed at session 30. While having implementation assessments for as many as 46 program groups greatly exceeds the typical evaluation study, the number is still small enough mathematically to render the scales somewhat vulnerable to fluctuations. Not knowing precisely how the missing data would have affected the results, the discussion above assumes that the groups that were not observed were similar to those that were.

Second, focusing on the typical (i.e., modal) scores and deviations from those standards assumes that the deviations reflect real differences in how well groups performed in an area. As there are no measures of inter-observer reliability, we must acknowledge that it is possible that the variation in scores reflect differences in how observers assessed the groups. On one hand, it is encouraging that one of the 11 observers performed the majority of the evaluations because that individual probably was consistent in her scoring. However, chi square analysis comparing the proportion of groups that a) rated perfect scores and were evaluated by that one observer to those groups that b) received perfect scores and were evaluated by the combined group of all of the other observers yields statistically significant differences. In other words, program groups evaluated by one particular observer were statistically more likely to receive very high scores. This does not rule out the possibility that those groups actually did perform better.

With these caveats noted, the descriptive statistics of the observer evaluation data suggest the following.

- “Sensitivity to participant’s feelings” and “group participation” surfaced as strong areas for a substantial majority of the groups at both observation periods.
- Approximately half of the program groups were rated below the modal score of “2” on the dimensions of “general issues and class structure,” “organization,” and “delivery and response to participant’s use of skills” at session 17. However, over three-fourths met observers’ expectations by session 30. It is on these three scales that the greatest amount of variation across program groups exists.

- Despite larger proportions of the groups reaching observers' standards by the end of the programs, at both observation periods for each scale there are groups that performed below the modal score.

Do participant evaluations indicate that a) coaches adhered to social learning methods, b) the skills addressed in the program are personally relevant to the participants and c) the group climate is positive? Furthermore, are participant characteristics (e.g., risk level, sex, race and personality type) and program setting (i.e., institution versus community sites) related to participants' evaluation of the program?

The final measures of program implementation reflect the perceptions of participants who completed the cognitive skills program. Participants rated the program 1 through 5, with higher scores reflecting more positive responses, on 37 items. A score of 3 is considered neutral. Three scales that derived from 21 of the items depict participants' experiences in the following areas: coaches' adherence to social learning methods, relevance of skills, and group climate. Additional items asked a) whether the coaches read from the program manual the majority of the class time, and b) how often participants met with their parole officers during the program.

The descriptive statistics for the participant evaluation scales are presented in Table 12¹⁷. Focusing on the scale means, "adherence to social learning methods," and "relevance of skills to participant" scored more favorably (means = 4.3 and 4.2, respectively) than the "group climate" scale (mean = 3.9). These high mean scores suggest that the group of coaches as a whole a) incorporated techniques such as role playing and practice into the class sessions and b) related the course content to the participants in a manner that they found realistic and helpful. The slightly lower mean score on the "group climate" scale suggests room for coaches to improve upon their class management skills, as items in the scale address group members teasing each other and whether some participants seemed to dominate the class.

Notwithstanding these positive assessments, 68.9% of the program participants indicated that the coaches read from the manual most of the time. The meaning of this high proportion is not clear. It is appropriate for coaches to refer to the manual often during a class session. However, reading directly from it throughout the entire session is to be avoided. Neglecting to reference the manual at all is equally undesirable. The large

proportion of participant responses indicating that coaches read from the manual most of the time may include appropriate and inappropriate use of the manual. Furthermore, responses that coaches did not read from the manual most of the time likely include instances where the coach should have referred to the manual more often. Due to the lack of clarity in what exactly the item is measuring, analysis pertaining to the item should be interpreted with caution.

The results of the participant evaluations across districts are presented in Appendix O. Appendices P and Q refer to the non-experimental program groups.

Table 12. Participant Evaluation scales descriptives.

Constructs	Range ¹	Mean	S. D.	Percent above neutral ²	N ³
<u>Scales</u>					
Adherence to social learning methods	2.6-5.0	4.3	0.5	98.7	315
Relevance of skills to participant	1.0-5.0	4.2	0.5	97.2	327
Group climate	2.0-5.0	3.9	0.6	90.0	320
<u>Items⁴</u>					
Coaches read from the program manual the majority of the class time.	1.0-5.0	2.6	1.1	31.1	325
Not including the Cognitive Skills meetings, how many times per month did you meet with your supervising parole officer while you were in the Cognitive Skills program?	0-4	1.9	1.0	---	301

¹ Higher values indicate more positive assessments.

² Scores above 3.0 are considered to be “above neutral,” as the value “3” corresponds with “no opinion” and high scores indicate more positive assessments.

³ Scores for the scales were computed only for participants who responded to each of the items that made up the particular scales; cases with data missing on an item that comprises the scale are not represented in the results.

⁴ The statistics for the single items are less reliable than the scales because they are more prone to random error. When individual items are combined to create a scale, the error tends to average out, making the scale more reliable (McIver and Carmines, 1981).

An additional set of analyses explore whether participant evaluation results are different for subgroups of offenders. The three participant evaluation scales (adherence to social learning methods, relevance of skills to participants, and group climate) and the item “coaches read from manual the majority of class” are examined across categories of the following subgroups: sex¹⁸, race (white, nonwhite), setting (parole district, institution), risk level (low risk, medium/high risk), personality type (aggressives, neurotics, dependents, situationals), and I-Level (I-Levels 2 and 3, I-Level 4).

Although these analyses are exploratory rather than testing specific hypotheses, logic points to possible outcomes. If any differences are to be found in participant evaluations across subgroups, they are least probable on assessments of “adherence to social learning methods” and the item “coaches read from manual majority of class,” as these measures reflect participants’ simple observations of the coaches’ behavior. For example, it seems unlikely that participants’ characteristics, such as race, risk level, or personality, would affect reports of coaches’ use of particular teaching methods. Assessments of “group climate” also reflect observations of what takes place during the class, but may be tempered by individual differences. For instance, in the same class, participants who are neurotic may feel as though individuals are being teased or that particular classmates dominate the discussion, while aggressives may not interpret the climate of the class the same. For this reason, differences may be found across subgroups on this scale. Differences may be found on the “relevance of skills to participants” scale because this area requires participants to assess how meaningful the program was for them personally, and their impressions may be tied to such factors as their personality or level of risk.

Table 13 presents results from the two methods used in the subgroup analyses. First, participant evaluation scores are collapsed into two categories: a) neutral and below and b) above neutral¹⁹. Chi square analysis compares whether proportions of the subgroups to score a scale or item above neutral differ significantly. Second, difference of means analyses (i.e., t-test and ANOVA) test whether the average scores for a subgroup differ significantly from the average scores of the other category of the subgroup. *These analyses reveal no statistically significant differences in participant evaluation scale scores across categories of subgroups.* Individual characteristics and setting are unrelated

to participant's evaluation of coaches' use of social learning methods, the relevance of the skill, or the group climate.

The only differences to emerge pertain to the single item "coaches read from manual majority of class." Women responded more favorable to this item; 64.0% of women and 19.6% of men indicated that coaches did not read from the manual the majority of the class time²⁰. Personality constructs were related to differences in reports of coaches reading from the manual. Neurotics and situationals were more likely (40.4% and 39.1%, respectively) to indicate that coaches did not read from the manual the majority of class time, compared to 26.9% of aggressives and 20.3% of dependents. Forty percent of I-Levels 4s responded that coaches did not read from the manual the majority of the class time, while 23.8% of I-Levels 2 and 3 did so. The result of the participant evaluation analyses can be summarized as follows:

- Participants scored the scales "adherence to social learning methods" and "relevance of skills to participants" higher on average than the "group climate" scale.
- Attributes of the participants, such as risk level, race, personality type and I-level, are not related to participant evaluation scale scores. The setting of the program in either the community or an institution is unrelated to participant assessments, as well.
- Women, neurotics, situationals, and I-Level 4s were more likely to indicate that coaches did not read from the manual the majority of the class time.

The greatest benefit of the participant evaluation data will surface later when they are used to explore differences in treatment effects. The variation in scale and item scores will allow for the examination of whether participants who rated the program more favorably reap the greatest benefits.

Table 13. Participant evaluation results across subgroups of participants.

Construct	Sex				Race				Setting			
	Male ¹		Female		White		Nonwhite		Parole District		Institution	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adherence to social learning methods												
Neutral and below	1	2.2	2	8.0	1	1.0	3	1.4	1	0.4	3	4.2
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>97.8</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>92.0</u>	<u>101</u>	<u>99.0</u>	<u>205</u>	<u>98.6</u>	<u>243</u>	<u>99.6</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>95.8</u>
Total	46	100.0	25	100.0	102	100.0	208	100.0	244	100.0	71	100.0
Mean		4.3		4.2		4.3		4.3		4.3		4.2
Relevance of skills to participants												
Neutral and below	3	6.5	1	3.8	4	3.8	5	2.3	5	2.0	4	5.6
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>93.5</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>96.2</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>96.2</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>97.7</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>98.0</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>94.4</u>
Total	46	100.0	26	100.0	106	100.0	215	100.0	255	100.0	72	100.0
Mean		4.1		4.4		4.2		4.2		4.2		4.2
Group climate												
Neutral and below	6	13.0	3	11.5	12	11.7	20	9.4	23	9.3	9	12.5
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>87.0</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>88.5</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>88.3</u>	<u>192</u>	<u>90.6</u>	<u>225</u>	<u>90.7</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>87.5</u>
Total	46	100.0	26	100.0	103	100.0	212	100.0	248	100.0	72	100.0
Mean		3.7		3.9		3.8		3.9		3.9		3.8
Coaches read from manual majority of class ²												
Neutral and below	37*	80.4	9	36.0	71	67.0	149	70.0	178	70.1	46	64.8
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>19.6</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>64.0</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>33.0</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>30.0</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>29.9</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>35.2</u>
Total	46	100.0	25	100.0	106	100.0	213	100.0	254	100.0	71	100.0
Mean		2.5*		3.4		2.8		2.6		2.6		2.8

¹ Women participated in the program primarily in an institutional setting. For this reason, comparisons across sexes are limited to male participants in institutional settings.

² The statistics for the single item is less reliable than the scales because it is more prone to random error. When individual items are combined to create a scale, the error tends to average out, making the scale more reliable (McIver and Carmines, 1981)

* Differences across subgroups of participants are significant; p<.05. Chi square analyses are used to determine differences in the percent above neutral. T-tests and ANOVA are used to determine differences in mean scores

Table 13. Continued.

Construct	Risk Level				Personality Type							
	Low Risk		Medium/high Risk		Aggressives		Neurotics		Dependents		Situationals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adherence to social learning methods												
Neutral and below	1	0.6	3	2.1	1	1.1	1	1.9	2	2.6	0	0.0
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>99.4</u>	<u>137</u>	<u>97.9</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>98.9</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>98.1</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>97.4</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	164	100.0	140	100.0	90	100.0	52	100.0	78	100.0	66	100.0
Mean		4.3		4.3		4.3		4.3		4.2		4.3
Relevance of skills to participants												
Neutral and below	3	1.8	6	4.1	1	1.1	3	5.6	3	3.8	0	0.0
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>167</u>	<u>98.2</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>95.9</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>98.9</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>94.4</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>96.2</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	170	100.0	145	100.0	93	100.0	54	100.0	79	100.0	69	100.0
Mean		4.2		4.2		4.2		4.3		4.2		4.2
Group climate												
Neutral and below	14	8.5	18	12.4	10	11.0	4	7.5	10	12.8	4	6.0
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>91.5</u>	<u>127</u>	<u>87.6</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>89.0</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>92.5</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>87.2</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>94.0</u>
Total	164	100.0	145	100.0	91	100.0	53	100.0	78	100.0	67	100.0
Mean		3.9		3.8		3.9		3.8		3.9		3.9
Coaches read from manual majority of class												
Neutral and below	110	64.7	105	73.4	68*	73.1	31	59.6	63	79.7	42	60.9
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>35.3</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>26.6</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>26.9</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>40.4</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>20.3</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>39.1</u>
Total	170	100.0	143	100.0	93	100.0	52	100.0	79	100.0	69	100.0
Mean		2.8		2.6		2.5*		2.9		2.5		2.9

Table 13. Continued.

Construct	I-Level			
	I-Levels 2 and 3		I-Level 4	
	N	%	N	%
Adherence to social learning methods				
Neutral and below	3	1.8	1	0.8
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>98.2</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>99.2</u>
Total	168	100.0	118	100.0
Mean		4.3		4.3
Relevance of skills to participants				
Neutral and below	4	2.3	3	2.4
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>97.7</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>97.6</u>
Total	172	100.0	123	100.0
Mean		4.2		4.2
Group climate				
Neutral and below	20	11.8	8	6.7
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>149</u>	<u>88.2</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>93.3</u>
Total	169	100.0	120	100.0
Mean		3.9		3.9
Coaches read from manual majority of class				
Neutral and below	131*	76.2	73	60.3
<u>Above neutral</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>23.8</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>39.7</u>
Total	172	100.0	121	100.0
Mean		2.5*		2.9

Discussion

The Phase II process evaluation is considerably more descriptive of program quality compared to Phase I. In addition to describing the study participants by their background, historical characteristics, Phase II considers participants' psychological attributes that are likely to impact responsiveness to treatment. Program processes are also more closely examined through multiple data sources that tap into a host of implementation areas.

Earlier in this report, a description of what R&R programs look like when implemented well was presented. Such programs meet the following standards.

- Study participants should not be intellectually limited.
- Nor should participants be afflicted with severe substance abuse.
- Sex offenders are also inappropriate for the program.
- The program should target higher risk offenders.
- Classes should be small, between four and six members.
- Class sessions should incorporate behavioral processes including role modeling, role playing, graduated rehearsal, and reinforcement.
- Coaches should evidence skill in controlling the class sessions.
- Coaches should possess strong interpersonal skills.

Having described characteristics of program participants and program groups throughout this report, conclusions can now be drawn regarding how well the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program was implemented.

Screening of offenders for participation in the study

More careful attention to program screening criteria is warranted. Despite the presence of screening criteria, the study sample includes numerous offenders who were considered inappropriate for the program. Eight percent of the experimental group have IQs at or below 80, making it unlikely that they will be able to fully comprehend the material covered in the program. Sex offenders, some with extensive histories of sexually offending, are also represented in the sample (3%). Due to the inclusion of offenders with low cognitive ability and of sex offenders, 10.2% of the experimental group are inappropriate for the program. If the 299 low risk offenders are added to the pool of inappropriate participants, over half of the experimental group (54%) can be considered inappropriate. However, in Phase I of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment, low risk offenders benefited from the R&R program.

With the exception of IQ, program screening was not aided by assessments pertaining to eligibility criteria. Especially with respect to offender risk, such assessments would greatly assist efforts to assure that the program was administered to the appropriate individuals.

Fortunately, the experimental group is no more or less likely than the control group to include offenders deemed inappropriate for the program. In fact, comparisons of the experimental and control group on several areas of demographic, social, and criminal history characteristics yielded only one statistically significant difference. *These analyses support the conclusion that the randomization procedures were employed successfully, with a caveat pertaining to some sites having unequally sized experimental and control groups.*

Class size

The Georgia Cognitive Skills Program should consider reducing the size of the program groups. Even taking into consideration the proportion of experimental group members that did not begin the program (13.1%), the majority of classes (76.9%) exceeded the recommended maximum of six offenders per group at the beginning of the program. Program groups formed through random assignment ranged in size from six to 28 offenders, with the typical class having

11 members. Due to attrition, class sizes eventually reduced, but still 40.4% of the groups exceeded the appropriate class size at session 30.

These large classes can impede coaches' management of program sessions and discourage active class participation. And, as will be addressed below, structure of class sessions appears to be an area in need of improvement. Improvements in screening of offenders for inclusion into the program (see above) can have the added benefit of reducing the size of program groups.

Class Attrition

GBPP might benefit from the implementation of program attendance and completion requirements. Completion rates for Phase II were only slightly higher (62.7%) than those for Phase I (59.6%). Given that the outcome study for Phase I found program completion to be a key component of program success, we continue to recommend consideration of stronger program attendance requirements.

Use of social learning and behavioral techniques

Programs successful in teaching offenders cognitive skills incorporate behavioral processes including role modeling, role playing, graduated rehearsal, and reinforcement.

Participants' evaluation of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program suggest that coaches do employ such techniques. Of the three scales formed from the participant evaluation data, "adherence to social learning methods" had the most favorable responses. Nearly 99% of participants rated coaches above neutral on this scale, which encompasses the use of role playing and opportunities to practice skills during class meetings. It is also important to note that it is widely agreed that learning is greatly enhanced by the students' favorable perception of the relevance of the lesson. R&R received very favorable assessments in this regard; 97% of the participants rated the classes as relevant or very relevant.

Coaches' structure of class sessions

Observers' evaluations of class operations indicate room for improvement in coaches' structure of class sessions. Class structure consistently was rated less favorably than other dimensions of program implementation critiqued by observers. Observers assessed the area of

“general issues and class structure” as below the mode, or most frequent value, for 41.3% of program groups at session 17 and 22.2% at session 30. Participant evaluations were consistent with these observations. Classroom climate was less likely to be rated favorably than other program characteristics. On a related note, a substantial proportion of the coaches were reported to be reading from the manual a good deal of the time; 68.9% of participants indicated that coaches read from the manual the majority of class time. This may indicate some level of discomfort with their role or perhaps a lack of familiarity with the material.

Coaches’ interpersonal skills

The interpersonal skills of coaches are important to the success of a cognitive intervention. Because modeling is an essential component of the learning process, coaches must be cognizant of the trainer characteristics which enhance its effectiveness. As such, coaches should demonstrate empathy, prosocial conflict resolution, and assertiveness. *According to observer evaluations, coaches demonstrated prosocial interpersonal skills.* The observer evaluation scale “sensitivity to participants’ feeling” taps into coaches’ skills related to empathy with participants, confrontation without demeaning participants, and leadership. Observers reported that coaches in 78.3% of program groups at session 17 and 91.1% of program groups at session 30 meet expectations in this area. As such, observers rated “sensitivity to participants’ feelings” as a strength of the program.

In closing, it is important to underscore that one of the most difficult accomplishments of implementing a cognitive behavioral program appears to have been achieved. Overall, the participants observed the programs to be following sound principles of social learning. That the program was rated high on its adherence to modeling, reinforcement, practice, and interpersonal sensitivity strongly suggests that R&R was administered according to its underlying theoretical design. Unfortunately, the history of correctional programming finds that most programs are not designed according to a strong theoretical model, or if they are, they are not administered according to their original design (Van Voorhis, Cullen & Applegate, 1995). The Georgia Cognitive Skills Program is exceptional in this regard.

Finally, a conclusive interpretation of the programmatic data is not entirely possible until they are linked to outcomes; the different levels of implementation must be examined in

conjunction with follow up data to determine precisely what scale scores, for example, translate into better program. Even so, the session, observer, and participant evaluation data suggest areas that are more or less consistently implemented and or perceived favorably by raters.

References

- Andrews, D. & Bonta, J. (1994). The Psychology of Criminal Conduct. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Press.
- Andrews, D., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R.,. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17, 19-52.
- Carmines, E. & Zeller, R. (1979) Reliability and Validity Assessment. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Cattell, R. and A. Cattell (1973) Measuring Intelligence with the Culture Fair Tests. Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Inc.
- Dodson, K. & Khatri, N. (2000). Cognitive Therapy: Looking Backward, Looking Forward. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56, 907-923.
- Harris, P. (1988). The Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification System I-Level, Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15 (1), 58-77.
- Jesness, C. F. (1988). The Jesness Inventory Classification System. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15(1), 78-91.
- Jesness, C. (1992) The Jesness Inventory (Form G). Multi-Health Systems, Inc. North Tonawanda, NY and Toronto, Ontario.
- Jesness Inventory Computer Program Windows™ Version (1996) North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.
- Jesness, C. F., & Wedge, R. (1983). Classifying Offenders: The Jesness Inventory Classification System. Sacramento: CA: California Youth Authority.
- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., and Black, W. (1992) Multivariate Data Analysis. (3rd ed.) New York: Macmillan.
- Hoffman, P. (1994). Twenty Years of Operational Use of a Risk Prediction Instrument: The United States Parole Commission's Salient Factor Score. Journal of Criminal Justice, 22. 477-494.
- Levinson, R.. (1988). Developments in the classification process: Quay's aims approach. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15(1), 24-38.
- McIver, J.& Carmines, E. (1981) Unidimensional Scaling. Newbury Park, CA. Sage Publications, Inc.

- Meichenbaum, D. & Jaremko, M. (1982). Stress Prevention and Management: A Cognitive Behavioral Approach. New York: Plenum.
- Palmer, T. (1991) The Effectiveness of Intervention: Recent Trends and Current Issues, Crime & Delinquency. 37(3):330-46.
- Prendergast, M., Anglin, M., and Wellisch, J (1995) Treatment for Drug-Abusing Offenders Under Community Supervision, Up to Speed. 59(4): 66-75.
- Polizzi, D., MacKenzie, D., and Hickman, L. (1999) What Works in Adult Sex Offender Treatment? A Review of Prison- and Non-Prison-Based Treatment Programs, International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology. 43(3): 357-75.
- Porporino, F., Fabiano, E. & Robinson, D. (1991). Focusing on Successful Reintegration: Cognitive Skills Training for Offenders, Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Services of Canada, R-19.
- Reid, N. (1986) Wide-Range Achievement Test – 1984 Revised Edition, Journal of Counseling and Development. 64(8):538-39.
- Research and Statistics Branch of Correctional Services of Canada (1991) Effectiveness of the Cognitive Skills Training Program: From Pilot to National Implementation, Ottawa: Correctional Services of Canada, R-07.
- Reynolds, C. (1986) Wide-Range Achievement Test (WRAT-R), 1984 Edition, Journal of Counseling and Development. 64(8):54-41
- Robinson, D. (1995). The Impact of Cognitive Skills Training on Post-Release Recidivism among Canadian Federal Offenders. Ottawa: Correctional Services of Canada, R-41.
- Ross, R. & Fabiano, E. (1985). Time to Think: A Cognitive Model of Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation, Ottawa, Ontario: Air Training and Publications.
- Ross, R. & Fabiano, E., Ewles, C. (1988). Reasoning and Rehabilitation. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology. 32(1): 29-35.
- Ross, R. & Fabiano, E., and Ross, R. (1989) Reasoning and Rehabilitation: A Handbook for Teaching Cognitive Skills. Ottawa, Ontario: Flix Desktop Services.
- Sullivan, C., Grant, M. Q., & Grant, D. (1957). The Development of Interpersonal Maturity: An Application to Delinquency. Psychiatry, 20, 373-386.
- Van Voorhis, P. and Brown, K. (1996). Risk Classification in the 1990s. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Van Voorhis, P. Cullen, F. & Applegate, B. (1995). Evaluating Interventions with Violent Offenders: A Guide from Practitioners and Policy Makers. Federal Probation, 59, 17-28.

Van Voorhis, P., Johnson, S., Spruance, S., and Sutherland, J. (forthcoming). The Need to Measure Intermediate Outcomes, The ICCA Journal on Community Corrections.

Van Voorhis, P., Murphy, L., and Johnson, S. (1999). Process Evaluation of the Georgia Cognitive Skills Program: Phase I. Unpublished Manuscript. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati.

Van Voorhis, P., Spruance, L., Listwan, S., Ritchey, P., Pealer, J., and Seabrook, R. (2001) The Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment Outcome Evaluation: Phase I. Unpublished Manuscript. Cincinnati, OH. University of Cincinnati.

Warren, M. (1966). Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification: Diagnosis and Treatment of Low, Middle, and High Maturity Delinquents. Sacramento: California Youth Authority.

Warren, M. (1983). "Application of Interpersonal Maturity Theory to Offender Population." In W. Laufer and J. Day (eds.) Personality Theory, Moral Development, and Criminal Behavior. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Yochelson, S. & Samenow, S. (1976). The Criminal Personality (vol 1): A Profile for Change. New York, NY: Jason Aronson.

Appendices

Appendix A. Summary of key personality constructs for the original Jesness Inventory personality types (Jesness, 1962).¹

Construct	Definition	Relationship to Criminal Behavior
I-Level 2		
Unsocialized aggressive (Aa)	Displays negative attitudes toward convention. Behavior is unpredictable, aggressive, and antisocial.	High self reported criminal behavior.
Unsocialized passive (Ap)	Displays negative attitudes toward convention. Behaves in inappropriate and often bizarre ways. Has a negative self concept.	Probability of criminal behavior average.
I-Level 3		
Immature conformist (Cfm)	Displays positive attitudes toward convention. Behavior is conforming and dependent (i.e., follower).	Low self reported criminal behavior. Peers may be especially important explanation of criminal involvement.
Cultural conformist (Cfc)	Displays low motivation and negative attitudes toward convention. Feels alienated and hostile toward authority.	High self reported behavior. Above average violent activity.
Manipulator/pragmatist (Mp)	Shows positive attitudes toward convention. Behaves in manipulative and obtrusive ways.	Low self reported criminal behavior but official record indicates high probability. Especially prone to property crimes.
Construct	Definition	Relationship to Criminal Behavior

¹ These nine subtypes are used to create the four collapsed types (Van Voorhis, 1994) used in this study (see Table 2).

I-Level 4

Neurotic acting out (Na)

Displays negative attitudes toward convention. Experiences conflicts in relationships. See themselves as somewhat cynical and disenchanted, often exhibiting outspoken and non-conforming behavior.

High self reported criminal behavior. More apt to use drugs.

Neurotic anxious (Nx)

Mostly positive attitudes toward convention. Conforming but also dependent, anxious, and insecure. Do not have criminal orientation.

Low self reported criminal behavior.

Situational emotional reaction (Se)

Positive attitudes toward convention. They are confident, but naïve, rigid, and conforming.

Low reports of criminal behavior. Expect to be caught if he or she breaks the law.

Cultural identified/adaptive (Ci)

High verbal aptitude and positive toward convention. Maintains good interpersonal relationships.

Low reports of criminal behavior.

Appendix B. Description of the experimental group across background social and demographic characteristics (collected at prison intake) and districts.

Characteristic	Marietta		Clarkesville		Dahlonega		Milledgeville		Thomas		Savannah	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age:												
18-25	22	40.0	1	14.3	2	16.7	6	30.0	2	20.0	6	42.9
26-36	23	41.8	2	28.6	4	33.3	12	60.0	5	50.0	6	42.9
36-50	8	14.5	4	57.1	4	33.3	2	10.0	2	20.0	2	14.3
50+	<u>2</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	55	99.9	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.1
Average Age ¹ :	29.5		37.1		36.9		29.4		32.5		29.0	
Race:												
White	23	41.8	5	71.4	12	100.0	2	10.0	2	20.0	1	7.1
Nonwhite	<u>32</u>	<u>58.2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>90.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>80.0</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>92.9</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0
Sex:												
Male	55	100.0	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0
Female	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0
Employment status:												
Employed full time	30	56.6	4	57.1	7	58.3	10	50.0	1	10.0	3	21.4
Employed part time	4	7.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	2	20.0	2	14.3
Unemployed < 6 mo.	5	9.4	2	28.6	4	33.3	1	5.0	3	30.0	5	35.7
Unemployed 6+ mo.	9	17.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	6	30.0	3	30.0	3	21.4
Never worked but capable	1	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	0	0.0	1	7.1
Student	2	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Incapable of work	1	1.9	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	53	100.0	7	100.0	12	99.9	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	99.9
Social class:												
Welfare	6	11.3	1	14.3	1	8.3	0	0.0	2	22.2	1	7.7
Occasionally employed	7	13.2	0	0.0	1	8.3	5	25.0	1	11.1	2	15.4
Minimum standard	14	26.4	4	57.1	6	50.0	6	30.0	4	44.4	7	53.8
<u>Middle class</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>49.1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>45.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>23.1</u>
Total	53	100.0	7	100.0	12	99.9	20	100.0	9	99.9	13	100.0

Characteristic	<u>Marietta</u>		Clarkesville		<u>Dahlonega</u>		<u>Milledgeville</u>		<u>Thomas</u>		<u>Savannah</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Education:												
Less than high school	4	7.3	1	14.3	1	8.3	3	15.0	1	10.0	1	7.1
Some high school	30	54.5	3	42.9	8	66.7	12	60.0	4	40.0	7	50.0
High school	13	23.6	2	28.6	2	16.7	2	10.0	2	20.0	5	35.7
At least some technical school	3	5.5	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	30.0	1	7.1
<u>At least some college</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.1	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	99.9
Marital status:												
Single (never married)	38	71.7	4	57.1	2	16.7	11	55.0	5	50.0	12	85.7
Married	4	7.5	0	0.0	4	33.3	4	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Separated	2	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Divorced (not remarried)	4	7.5	2	28.6	4	33.3	1	5.0	2	20.0	1	7.1
Widowed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
<u>Common law marriage</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>9.4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.1</u>
Total	53	99.9	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	99.9
Substance Abuse:												
No history of abuse	26	47.3	6	85.7	8	66.7	7	35.0	8	80.0	6	42.9
<u>History of abuse</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>52.7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>65.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>57.1</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0
IQ:												
50 to 80	3	5.6	0	0.0	1	9.1	1	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
81 to 99	13	24.1	2	28.6	1	9.1	6	30.0	4	40.0	6	42.9
100 to 115	24	44.4	3	42.9	7	63.6	13	65.0	6	60.0	4	28.6
<u>116 to 139</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>25.9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>28.6</u>
Total	54	100.0	7	100.1	11	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.1
Average IQ:	105.3		106.6		105.5		98.5		98.7		104.2	
Reading level:												
Below 5 th grade	7	13.0	2	28.6	2	18.2	11	55.0	5	50.0	3	21.4
<u>5th grade or above</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>87.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>71.4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>81.8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>45.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>78.6</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.0	11	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0

Appendix B. Continued.

Characteristic	Jesup		Waycross		Columbus		Jonesboro		Lawrenceville		Augusta	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age:												
18-25	0	0.0	4	23.5	2	12.5	9	50.0	2	13.3	11	31.4
26-36	5	71.4	6	35.3	6	37.5	7	38.9	6	40.0	17	48.6
36-50	1	14.3	5	29.4	8	50.0	2	11.1	7	46.7	7	20.0
50+	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	7	100.0	17	100.0	16	100.0	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.0
Average Age:	33.8		35.2		34.5		28.0		35.0		29.6	
Race:												
White	1	14.3	7	41.2	7	43.8	6	33.3	9	60.0	8	22.9
<u>Nonwhite</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>85.7</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>58.8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>56.3</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>77.1</u>
Total	7	100.0	17	100.0	16	100.1	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.0
Sex:												
Male	7	100.0	17	100.0	16	100.0	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.0
<u>Female</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	7	100.0	17	100.0	16	100.0	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.0
Employment status:												
Employed full time	2	28.6	7	43.8	8	50.0	10	55.6	10	66.7	18	51.4
Employed part time	1	14.3	2	12.5	2	12.5	2	11.1	1	6.7	5	14.3
Unemployed < 6 mo.	2	28.6	1	6.3	0	0.0	2	11.1	3	20.0	4	11.4
Unemployed 6+ mo.	2	28.6	3	18.8	5	31.3	2	11.1	1	6.7	7	20.0
Never worked but capable	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Student	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Incapable of work	0	0.0	2	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Other</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.9</u>
Total	7	100.1	16	100.2	16	100.1	18	100.1	15	100.1	35	100.0
Social class:												
Welfare	0	0.0	1	6.3	2	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.6
Occasionally employed	1	14.3	0	0.0	2	12.5	2	11.1	0	0.0	6	17.1
Minimum standard	4	57.1	13	81.3	3	18.8	5	27.8	6	40.0	13	37.1
<u>Middle class</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>56.3</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>61.1</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>60.0</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>37.1</u>
Total	7	100.0	16	100.1	16	100.1	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	99.9

Characteristic	<u>Jesup</u>		<u>Waycross</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>Jonesboro</u>		<u>Lawrenceville</u>		<u>Augusta</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Education:												
Less than high school	1	14.3	2	11.8	1	6.3	1	5.6	0	0.0	2	5.7
Some high school	4	57.1	12	70.6	12	75.0	10	55.6	8	53.3	26	74.3
High school	2	28.6	1	5.9	2	12.5	3	16.7	5	33.3	5	14.3
At least some technical school	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
<u>At least some college</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6.7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5.7</u>
Total	7	100.0	17	100.1	16	100.1	18	100.1	15	100.0	35	100.0
Marital status:												
Single (never married)	5	71.4	9	56.3	6	37.5	11	61.1	7	46.7	27	77.1
Married	2	28.6	2	12.51	1	6.3	4	22.2	4	26.7	2	5.7
Separated	0	0.0	0	0.04	4	25.0	1	5.6	0	0.0	1	2.9
Divorced (not remarried)	0	0.0	2	12.5	1	6.3	1	5.6	1	6.7	2	5.7
Widowed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Common law marriage</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8.6</u>
Total	7	100.0	16	100.1	16	100.1	18	100.1	15	100.1	35	100.0
Substance Abuse:												
No history of abuse	4	57.1	13	76.5	10	62.5	9	50.0	11	73.3	17	48.6
<u>History of abuse</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>42.9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>23.5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>26.7</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>51.4</u>
Total	7	100.0	17	100.0	16	100.0	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.0
IQ:												
50 to 80	2	28.6	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9
81 to 99	2	28.6	6	35.3	6	37.5	3	16.7	7	46.7	14	41.2
100 to 115	2	28.6	9	52.9	8	50.0	10	55.6	1	6.7	15	44.1
<u>116 to 139</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>27.8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>46.7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11.8</u>
Total	7	100.1	17	100.0	16	100.1	18	100.1	15	100.1	34	100.0
Average IQ:	95.0		103.2		99.3		110.1		106.3		101.3	
Reading level:												
Below 5 th grade	4	57.1	3	17.6	6	37.5	3	16.7	1	7.1	11	32.4
<u>5th grade or above</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>42.9</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>82.4</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>83.3</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>92.9</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>67.6</u>
Total	7	100.0	17	100.0	16	100.0	18	100.0	14	100.0	34	100.0

Appendix B. Continued.

Characteristic	Brunswick		Cairo		North Fulton		LaGrange		Griffin		LaFayette	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age:												
18-25	9	31.0	5	35.7	8	17.4	7	58.3	1	8.3	3	23.1
26-36	16	55.2	5	35.7	19	41.3	2	16.7	4	33.3	8	61.5
36-50	4	13.8	4	28.6	18	39.1	3	25.0	7	58.3	1	7.7
50+	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.7</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	100.0	46	100.0	12	100.0	12	99.9	13	100.0
Average Age:	29.2		31.2		35.6		28.2		36.9		30.5	
Race:												
White	3	10.3	3	21.4	6	13.0	1	8.3	4	33.3	11	84.6
<u>Nonwhite</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>89.7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>78.6</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>87.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>91.7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>15.4</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	100.0	46	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.0
Sex:												
Male	29	100.0	14	100.0	46	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.0
<u>Female</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	100.0	46	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.0
Employment status:												
Employed full time	16	55.2	9	64.3	23	50.0	3	25.0	6	50.0	9	69.2
Employed part time	5	17.2	2	14.3	7	15.2	3	25.0	1	8.3	0	0.0
Unemployed < 6 mo.	5	17.2	0	0.0	7	15.2	2	16.7	2	16.7	2	15.4
Unemployed 6+ mo.	3	10.3	1	7.1	6	13.0	2	16.7	3	25.0	1	7.7
Never worked but capable	0	0.0	1	7.1	1	2.2	2	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Student	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Incapable of work	0	0.0	1	7.1	1	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Other</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.7</u>
Total	29	99.9	14	99.9	46	100.0	12	100.1	12	100.0	13	100.0
Social class:												
Welfare	2	7.1	1	7.1	6	13.6	3	25.0	2	16.7	3	23.1
Occasionally employed	8	28.6	3	21.4	3	6.8	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Minimum standard	15	53.6	5	35.7	15	34.1	4	33.3	3	25.0	2	15.4
<u>Middle class</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10.7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>35.7</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>58.3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>61.5</u>
Total	28	100.0	14	99.9	44	100.0	12	99.9	12	100.0	13	100.0

Characteristic	<u>Brunswick</u>		<u>Cairo</u>		<u>North Fulton</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Griffin</u>		<u>LaFayette</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Education:												
Less than high school	2	6.9	1	7.1	3	6.8	3	25.0	1	8.3	0	0.0
Some high school	15	51.7	9	64.3	17	38.6	9	75.0	7	58.3	10	76.9
High school	10	34.5	3	21.4	16	36.4	0	0.0	3	25.0	2	15.4
At least some technical school	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.5	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0
<u>At least some college</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>13.6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.7</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	99.9	44	99.9	12	100.0	12	99.9	13	100.0
Marital status:												
Single (never married)	19	65.5	9	64.3	27	58.7	10	83.3	3	27.3	7	53.8
Married	5	17.2	3	21.4	3	6.5	2	16.7	2	18.2	2	15.4
Separated	3	10.3	1	7.1	3	6.5	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0
Divorced (not remarried)	0	0.0	1	7.1	5	10.9	0	0.0	2	18.2	1	7.7
Widowed	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Common law marriage</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>15.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>23.1</u>
Total	29	99.9	14	99.9	46	100.0	12	100.0	11	100.1	13	100.0
Substance Abuse:												
No history of abuse	18	62.1	6	42.9	26	56.5	2	16.7	8	66.7	9	69.2
<u>History of abuse</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>37.9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>43.5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>83.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>30.8</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	100.0	46	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0
IQ:												
50 to 80	3	11.1	2	14.3	7	16.3	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
81 to 99	9	33.3	5	35.7	12	27.9	8	66.7	6	54.5	2	15.4
100 to 115	12	44.4	7	50.0	18	41.9	3	25.0	3	27.3	7	53.8
<u>116 to 139</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>14.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>30.8</u>
Total	27	99.9	14	100.0	43	100.1	12	100.0	11	100.0	13	100.0
Average IQ:	99.2		96.5		98.4		93.5		100.7		110.2	
Reading level:												
Below 5 th grade	8	29.6	8	57.1	13	31.0	4	33.3	3	27.3	1	7.7
<u>5th grade or above</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>70.4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>42.9</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>69.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>72.7</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>92.3</u>
Total	27	100.0	14	100.0	42	100.0	12	100.0	11	100.0	13	100.0

Appendix B. Continued.

Characteristic	Jefferson		South Dekalb		Lyons		Statesboro		South Metro		South Richmond	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age:												
18-25	3	25.0	6	15.8	4	44.4	11	40.7	4	20.0	10	52.6
26-36	4	33.3	17	44.7	1	11.1	12	44.4	11	55.0	5	26.3
36-50	5	41.7	11	28.9	3	33.3	4	14.8	5	25.0	4	21.1
50+	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	99.9	9	99.9	27	99.9	20	100.0	19	100.0
Average Age:	31.1		34.9		32.5		28.8		31.6		29.1	
Race:												
White	7	58.3	5	13.2	1	11.1	5	18.5	2	10.0	4	21.1
<u>Nonwhite</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>41.7</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>86.8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>88.9</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>81.5</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>90.0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>78.9</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	20	100.0	19	100.0
Sex:												
Male	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	20	100.0	19	100.0
<u>Female</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	20	100.0	19	100.0
Employment status:												
Employed full time	9	75.0	20	52.6	6	66.7	9	33.3	8	40.0	12	63.2
Employed part time	0	0.0	2	5.3	1	11.1	3	11.1	4	20.0	3	15.8
Unemployed < 6 mo.	2	16.7	4	10.5	1	11.1	9	33.3	2	10.0	1	5.3
Unemployed 6+ mo.	0	0.0	9	23.7	1	11.1	3	11.1	5	25.0	1	5.3
Never worked but capable	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.4	1	5.0	1	5.3
Student	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Incapable of work	0	0.0	2	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Other</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.3</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	99.9	20	100.0	19	100.2
Social class:												
Welfare	1	8.3	2	5.3	1	11.1	0	0.0	2	10.0	1	5.3
Occasionally employed	3	25.0	1	2.6	3	33.3	5	20.0	3	15.0	3	15.8
Minimum standard	2	16.7	15	39.5	4	44.4	12	48.0	9	45.0	8	42.1
<u>Middle class</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>52.6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>32.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>30.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>36.8</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	99.9	25	100.0	20	100.0	19	100.0

Characteristic	<u>Jefferson</u>		<u>South Dekalb</u>		<u>Lyons</u>		<u>Statesboro</u>		<u>South Metro</u>		<u>South Richmond</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Education:												
Less than high school	3	25.0	2	5.3	1	11.1	2	7.4	2	10.5	1	5.3
Some high school	8	66.7	17	44.7	6	66.7	18	66.7	10	52.6	13	68.4
High school	1	8.3	11	28.9	1	11.1	4	14.8	6	31.6	4	21.1
At least some technical school	0	0.0	2	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>At least some college</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>15.8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.3</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	19	100.0	19	100.1
Marital status:												
Single (never married)	4	33.3	23	60.5	4	44.4	22	81.5	12	63.2	14	73.7
Married	2	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	11.1	1	5.3	0	0.0
Separated	1	8.3	3	7.9	2	22.2	1	3.7	1	5.3	2	10.5
Divorced (not remarried)	4	33.3	4	10.5	2	22.2	0	0.0	1	5.3	2	10.5
Widowed	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Common law marriage</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>21.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>21.1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.3</u>
Total	12	99.9	38	100.0	9	99.9	27	100.0	19	100.2	19	100.0
Substance Abuse:												
No history of abuse	6	50.0	18	47.4	6	66.7	15	55.6	10	50.0	8	42.1
<u>History of abuse</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>52.6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>57.9</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	20	100.0	19	100.0
IQ:												
50 to 80	1	8.3	3	7.9	1	11.1	1	3.7	0	0.0	2	10.5
81 to 99	7	58.3	12	31.6	4	44.4	14	51.9	4	22.2	6	31.6
100 to 115	4	33.3	18	47.4	4	44.4	7	25.9	12	66.7	7	36.8
<u>116 to 139</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>13.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>18.5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>21.1</u>
Total	12	99.9	38	100.1	9	99.9	27	100.0	18	100.0	19	100.0
Average IQ:	97.9		101.5		99.0		101.8		105.5		102.0	
Reading level:												
Below 5 th grade	3	25.0	10	26.3	3	33.3	7	25.9	6	33.3	6	31.6
<u>5th grade or above</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>73.7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>74.1</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>68.4</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	18	100.0	19	100.0

Appendix B. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Hartwell</u>		<u>Coastal St. Prison</u>		<u>Whitworth Detention Center</u>		<u>Metro St. Prison</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age:								
18-25	1	6.3	4	33.3	9	22.5	10	19.2
26-36	5	31.3	3	25.0	17	42.5	22	42.3
36-50	8	50.0	4	33.3	13	32.5	16	30.8
<u>50+</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7.7</u>
Total	16	100.1	12	99.9	40	100.0	52	100.0
Average Age:	37.5		32.3		31.9		34.4	
Race:								
White	12	75.0	2	16.7	18	45.0	21	40.4
<u>Nonwhite</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>83.3</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>55.0</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>59.6</u>
Total	16	100.0	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.0
Sex:								
Male	16	100.0	12	100.0	40	100.0	0	0.0
<u>Female</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	16	100.0	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.0
Employment status:								
Employed full time	10	62.5	7	63.6	18	48.6	14	27.5
Employed part time	2	12.5	0	0.0	1	2.7	3	5.9
Unemployed < 6 mo.	2	12.5	1	9.1	12	32.4	7	13.7
Unemployed 6+ mo.	0	0.0	2	18.2	4	10.8	14	27.5
Never worked but capable	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	5	9.8
Student	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Incapable of work	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	7.8
<u>Other</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7.8</u>
Total	16	100.1	11	100.0	37	99.9	51	100.0
Social class:								
Welfare	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	7.7	9	17.6
Occasionally employed	2	13.3	1	8.3	2	5.1	0	0.0
Minimum standard	2	13.3	8	66.7	15	38.5	27	52.9
<u>Middle class</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>73.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>48.7</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>29.4</u>
Total	15	99.9	12	100.0	39	100.0	51	99.9

Characteristic	<u>Hartwell</u>		<u>Coastal St. Prison</u>		<u>Whitworth Detention Center</u>		<u>Metro St. Prison</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Education:								
Less than high school	2	13.3	2	16.7	2	5.1	6	11.5
Some high school	4	26.7	6	50.0	23	59.0	28	53.8
High school	7	46.7	1	8.3	10	25.6	10	19.2
At least some technical school	1	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.8
<u>At least some college</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6.7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>9.6</u>
Total	15	100.1	12	100.0	39	100.0	52	99.9
Marital status:								
Single (never married)	7	43.8	9	75.0	22	55.0	31	59.6
Married	3	18.8	0	0.0	4	10.0	6	11.5
Separated	2	12.5	0	0.0	2	5.0	3	5.8
Divorced (not remarried)	3	18.8	3	25.0	8	20.0	6	11.5
Widowed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.8
<u>Common law marriage</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5.8</u>
Total	16	100.2	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.0
Substance Abuse:								
No history of abuse	9	56.3	8	66.7	29	72.5	36	69.2
<u>History of abuse</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>43.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>30.8</u>
Total	16	100.1	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.0
IQ:								
50 to 80	1	6.3	0	0.0	3	7.5	14	26.9
81 to 99	6	37.5	6	50.0	6	15.0	25	48.1
100 to 115	7	43.8	6	50.0	28	70.0	8	15.4
<u>116 to 139</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7.5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>9.6</u>
Total	16	100.1	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.0
Average IQ:	100.8		101.4		104.3		89.0	
Reading level:								
Below 5 th grade	6	37.5	4	33.3	2	5.0	12	23.1
<u>5th grade or above</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>95.0</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>76.9</u>
Total	16	100.0	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.0

¹When the Ns are small, means are subject to fluctuation.

Appendix C. Description of program groups without comparison groups across background social and demographic characteristics (collected at prison intake).

Characteristic	N	%
Age: 18-25	37	38.1
26-36	37	38.1
36-50	22	22.7
<u>50+</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>
Total	97	99.9
Average Age:	29.6	
Race: White	30	30.9
<u>Nonwhite</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>69.1</u>
Total	97	100.0
Sex: Male	89	91.8
<u>Female</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8.2</u>
Total	97	100.0
Employment status:		
Employed full time	46	47.9
Employed part time	7	7.3
Unemployed < 6 mo.	17	17.7
Unemployed for 6+ mo.	10	10.4
Never worked but capable	10	10.4
Student	2	2.1
Incapable of work	2	2.1
<u>Other</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2.1</u>
Total	96	100.0
Social class:		
Welfare	9	9.4
Occasionally employed	11	11.5
Minimum standard	39	40.6
<u>Middle class</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>38.5</u>
Total	96	100.0
Education:		
Less than high school	13	13.4
Some high school	63	64.9
High school	17	17.5
At least some technical school	1	1.0
<u>At least some college</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3.1</u>
Total	97	99.9

Characteristic	N	%
Marital status:		
Single (never married)	64	66.0
Married	6	6.2
Separated	3	3.1
Divorced (not remarried)	9	9.3
Widowed	0	0.0
<u>Common law marriage</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15.5</u>
Total	97	100.1
Substance abuse:		
History of substance abuse	44	45.4
<u>No history of substance abuse</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>54.6</u>
Total	97	100.0
IQ:		
50 to 80	12	12.5
81 to 99	27	28.1
100 to 115	42	43.8
<u>116 to 139</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15.6</u>
Total	96	100.0
Average IQ:	101.1	
Reading level:		
Below 5 th grade	27	28.1
<u>5th grade or above</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>71.9</u>
Total	96	100.0

Appendix D. Description of program groups without comparison groups across background social and demographic characteristics (collected at prison intake) and districts.

Characteristic	Dahlonega		Fitzgerald		Columbus		LaGrange		Jefferson		Lyons	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age:												
18-25	1	9.1	4	36.4	1	12.5	8	47.1	2	18.2	11	50.0
26-36	6	54.5	6	54.5	5	62.5	6	35.3	3	27.3	6	27.3
36-50	4	36.4	1	9.1	2	25.0	3	17.6	5	45.5	5	22.7
50+	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0			11	100.1	22	100.0
Average Age:	33.4		27.8		31.3		29.1		34.1		28.1	
Race:												
White	11	100.0	3	27.3	1	12.5	3	17.6	6	54.5	2	9.1
Nonwhite	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>72.7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>87.5</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>82.4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>90.9</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0
Sex:												
Male	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	9	52.9	11	100.0	22	100.0
Female	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>47.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0
Employment status:												
Employed full time	7	63.6	3	27.3	4	50.0	6	35.3	11	100.0	7	31.8
Employed part time	2	18.2	2	18.2	0	0.0	1	5.9	0	0.0	1	4.5
Unemployed < 6 mo.	1	9.1	2	18.2	1	12.5	4	23.5	0	0.0	7	31.8
Unemployed 6+ mo.	1	9.1	3	27.3	1	12.5	2	11.8	0	0.0	1	4.5
Never worked but capable	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	3	17.6	0	0.0	4	18.2
Student	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
Incapable of work	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.1	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	99.8
Social class:												
Welfare	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9	1	9.1	2	9.1
Occasionally employed	0	0.0	3	27.3	0	0.0	1	5.9	0	0.0	4	18.2
Minimum standard	2	18.2	4	36.4	6	75.0	9	52.9	4	36.4	11	50.0
<u>Middle class</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>72.7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>36.4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>35.3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>54.5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>22.7</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.1	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0

Characteristic	<u>Dahlonega</u>		<u>Fitzgerald</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Jefferson</u>		<u>Lyons</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Education:												
Less than high school	1	9.1	2	18.2	3	37.5	3	17.6	1	9.1	3	13.6
Some high school	8	72.7	5	45.5	4	50.0	11	64.7	7	63.6	12	54.5
High school	2	18.2	4	36.4	1	12.5	2	11.8	3	27.3	4	18.2
At least some technical school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
<u>At least some college</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9.1</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.1	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	99.9
Marital status:												
Single (never married)	4	36.4	11	100.0	6	75.0	11	64.7	6	54.5	17	77.3
Married	2	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	2	9.1
Separated	2	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
Divorced (not remarried)	2	18.2	0	0.0	1	12.5	3	17.6	0	0.0	2	9.1
Widowed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Common law marriage</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>36.4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4.5</u>
Total	11	100.1	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0
Substance Abuse:												
No history of abuse	2	18.2	7	63.6	6	75.0	9	52.9	6	54.5	12	54.5
<u>History of abuse</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>81.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>36.4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>47.1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>45.5</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0
IQ:												
50 to 80	0	0.0	2	18.2	0	0.0	4	23.5	0	0.0	3	13.6
81 to 99	5	45.5	3	27.3	0	0.0	5	29.4	3	27.3	6	27.3
100 to 115	3	27.3	4	36.4	6	75.0	5	29.4	7	63.6	10	45.5
<u>116 to 139</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>17.6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13.6</u>
Total	11	100.1	11	100.1	8	100.0	17	100.1	11	100.0	22	100.0
Average IQ:	102.7		101.1		110.1		96.3		104.8		100.4	
Reading level:												
Below 5 th grade	3	27.3	1	9.1	2	25.0	5	29.4	1	9.1	10	45.5
<u>5th grade or above</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>72.7</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>70.6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>54.5</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0

Appendix D. Continued.

Characteristic	Carrollton		Douglas	
	N	%	N	%
Age:				
18-25	8	100.0	2	22.2
26-36	0	0.0	5	55.6
36-50	0	0.0	2	22.2
<u>50+</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0
Average Age:	23.7		30.4	
Race:				
White	0	0.0	4	44.4
<u>Nonwhite</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>55.6</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0
Sex:				
Male	8	100.0	9	100.0
<u>Female</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	10.00
Employment status:				
Employed full time	4	57.1	4	44.4
Employed part time	1	14.3	0	0.0
Unemployed < 6 mo.	1	14.3	1	11.1
Unemployed 6+ mo.	0	0.0	2	22.2
Never worked but capable	0	0.0	2	22.2
Student	0	0.0	0	0.0
Incapable of work	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Other</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	7	100.0	9	99.9
Social class:				
Welfare	3	37.5	1	12.5
Occasionally employed	1	12.5	2	25.0
Minimum standard	1	12.5	2	25.0
<u>Middle class</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>37.5</u>
Total	8	100.0	8	100.0

Characteristic	<u>Carrollton</u>		<u>Douglas</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Education:				
Less than high school	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some high school	8	100.0	8	88.9
High school	0	0.0	1	11.1
At least some technical school	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>At least some college</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0
Marital status:				
Single (never married)	3	37.5	6	66.7
Married	0	0.0	1	11.1
Separated	0	0.0	0	0.0
Divorced (not remarried)	0	0.0	1	11.1
Widowed	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Common law marriage</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11.1</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0
Substance Abuse:				
No history of abuse	7	87.5	4	44.4
<u>History of abuse</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>55.6</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0
IQ:				
50 to 80	2	25.0	1	12.5
81 to 99	1	12.5	4	50.0
100 to 115	5	62.5	2	25.0
<u>116 to 139</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12.5</u>
Total	8	100.0	8	100.0
Average IQ:				
	96.5		101.5	
Reading level:				
Below 5 th grade	4	50.0	1	12.5
<u>5th grade or above</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>87.5</u>
Total	8	100.0	8	100.0

Appendix E. Description of experimental group across criminal history characteristics (collected at prison intake) and districts.

Characteristic	<u>Marietta</u>		<u>Clarkesville</u>		<u>Dahlonega</u>		<u>Milledgeville</u>		<u>Thomas</u>		<u>Savannah</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Risk level:												
Low	42	79.2	3	42.9	8	66.7	7	35.0	2	20.0	7	50.0
<u>Medium/high</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>20.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>65.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>80.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>50.0</u>
Total	53	100.0	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0
Number of prior incarceration:												
None	37	67.3	4	57.1	7	58.3	6	30.0	1	10.0	7	50.0
One	13	23.6	0	0.0	3	25.0	5	25.0	7	70.0	4	28.6
Two	4	7.3	2	28.6	0	0.0	5	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Three	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	2	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Four	1	1.8	1	14.3	1	8.3	1	5.0	2	20.0	2	14.3
Five or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.1</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.0	12	99.9	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0
Mean	0.5		1.1		0.8		1.7		1.5		1.2	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.0		1.0		1.0		0.5	
Prior parole revocation:												
No	46	83.6	6	85.7	9	75.0	6	30.0	3	30.0	9	64.3
<u>Yes</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>16.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>35.7</u>
Total	55	100.1	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0
Number of prior felony convictions:												
None	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
One	14	25.5	1	14.3	3	25.0	1	5.0	4	40.0	3	21.4
Two	19	34.5	2	28.6	4	33.3	9	45.0	4	40.0	7	50.0
Three	11	20.0	1	14.3	1	8.3	4	20.0	2	20.0	1	7.1
Four	7	12.7	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.1
Five or more	<u>4</u>	<u>7.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>30.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14.3</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.1	12	99.9	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	99.9
Mean	2.6		4.1		3.0		3.3		1.8		2.5	
Median	2.0		3.0		2.0		2.5		2.0		2.0	

Characteristic	<u>Marietta</u>		<u>Clarkeville</u>		<u>Dahlonega</u>		<u>Milledgeville</u>		<u>Thomas</u>		<u>Savannah</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior violent convictions:												
None	36	65.5	4	57.1	9	75.0	13	65.0	6	60.0	10	71.4
One	6	10.9	1	14.3	1	8.3	1	5.0	0	0.0	3	21.4
Two	6	10.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.0	2	20.0	0	0.0
Three	5	9.1	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	5.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
Four	1	1.8	1	14.3	0	0.0	3	15.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Five or more	<u>1</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.1</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.0	12	99.9	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	99.9
Mean	0.8		1.9		0.8		1.0		1.3		0.7	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	
Number of prior property convictions:												
None	15	27.3	0	0.0	7	58.3	4	20.0	4	40.0	8	57.1
One	11	20.0	1	14.3	1	8.3	3	15.0	0	0.0	1	7.1
Two	7	12.7	2	28.6	1	8.3	3	15.0	2	20.0	2	14.3
Three	4	7.3	2	28.6	0	0.0	1	5.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
Four	1	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	1	7.1
Five	1	1.8	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Six	3	5.5	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Seven	3	5.5	0	0.0	2	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Eight or more	<u>10</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14.3</u>
Total	55	100.1	7	100.1	12	99.9	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	99.9
Mean	4.0		5.0		1.8		6.2		2.3		3.1	
Median	2.0		3.0		0.0		2.5		2.0		0.0	
Number of prior drug sale convictions:												
None	32	58.2	5	71.4	6	50.0	12	60.0	7	70.0	5	35.7
One	6	10.9	1	14.3	1	8.3	3	15.0	2	20.0	6	42.9
Two or more	<u>17</u>	<u>30.9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>41.7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>21.4</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0
Mean	0.9		0.4		1.7		0.7		0.4		0.9	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.5		0.0		0.0		1.0	

Characteristic	<u>Marietta</u>		<u>Clarkeville</u>		<u>Dahlonega</u>		<u>Milledgeville</u>		<u>Thomas</u>		<u>Savannah</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior drug possession convictions:												
None	17	30.9	3	42.9	4	33.3	8	40.0	4	40.0	5	35.7
One	10	18.2	1	14.3	4	33.3	3	15.0	2	20.0	3	21.4
Two	8	14.5	0	0.0	3	25.0	2	10.0	3	30.0	0	0.0
Three	4	7.3	2	28.6	0	0.0	3	15.0	0	0.0	5	35.7
Four	5	9.1	0	0.0	1	8.3	3	15.0	1	10.0	1	7.1
Five or more	<u>11</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.1	12	99.9	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	99.9
Mean	2.5		1.7		1.2		1.7		1.2		1.6	
Median	2.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0	
Number of prior sex crime convictions:												
None	53	96.4	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	13	92.9
One	1	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.1
Two or more	<u>1</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	55	100.0	7	100.0	12	100.0	20	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0
Mean	0.1		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.1	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	

Appendix E. Continued

Characteristic	<u>Jesup</u>		<u>Waycross</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>Jonesboro</u>		<u>Lawrenceville</u>		<u>Augusta</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Risk level:												
Low	3	42.9	2	12.5	5	31.3	11	61.1	9	60.0	17	48.6
<u>Medium/high</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>87.5</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>68.8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>38.9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>51.4</u>
Total	7	100.0	16	100.0	16	100.1	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.0
Number of prior incarceration:												
None	3	42.8	2	11.8	1	6.3	9	50.0	7	46.7	16	45.7
One	1	14.3	8	47.1	7	43.8	4	22.2	6	40.0	8	22.9
Two	1	14.3	0	0.0	4	25.0	4	22.2	1	6.7	9	25.7
Three	1	14.3	2	11.8	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9
Four	1	14.3	3	17.6	1	6.3	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Five or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6.7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.9</u>
Total	7	100.0	17	100.0	16	100.2	18	100.0	15	100.1	35	100.1
Mean	1.4		2.3		2.1		0.9		0.9		1.0	
Median	1.0		1.0		1.5		0.5		1.0		1.0	
Prior parole revocation:												
No	5	71.4	3	17.6	7	43.8	11	61.1	11	73.3	18	51.4
<u>Yes</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>82.4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>56.3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>38.9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>26.7</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>48.6</u>
Total	7	100.0	17	100.0	16	100.1	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.0
Number of prior felony convictions:												
None	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
One	2	28.6	3	17.6	2	12.5	5	27.8	4	26.7	3	8.6
Two	1	14.3	1	5.9	5	31.3	5	27.8	2	13.3	13	37.1
Three	1	14.3	2	11.8	1	6.3	2	11.1	2	13.3	12	34.3
Four	2	28.6	6	35.3	4	25.0	4	22.2	2	13.3	5	14.3
Five or more	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>29.4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5.7</u>
Total	7	100.1	17	100.0	16	100.1	18	100.0	15	99.9	35	100.0
Mean	2.9		3.8		3.2		2.7		3.5		2.7	
Median	3.0		4.0		3.5		2.0		3.0		3.0	

Characteristic	<u>Jesup</u>		<u>Waycross</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>Jonesboro</u>		<u>Lawrenceville</u>		<u>Augusta</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior violent convictions:												
None	2	28.6	8	47.1	6	37.5	9	50.0	6	40.0	27	77.1
One	2	28.6	4	23.5	4	25.0	3	16.7	4	26.7	4	11.4
Two	2	28.6	1	5.9	2	12.5	1	5.6	0	0.0	2	5.7
Three	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.6	2	13.3	1	2.9
Four	0	0.0	2	11.8	0	0.0	1	5.6	2	13.3	0	0.0
Five or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6.7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.9</u>
Total	7	100.0	17	100.0	16	100.0	18	100.2	15	100.0	35	100.0
Mean	1.3		1.5		2.8		1.6		1.7		0.5	
Median	1.0		1.0		1.0		0.5		1.0		0.0	
Number of prior property convictions:												
None	2	28.6	2	11.8	1	6.3	3	16.7	5	33.3	8	22.9
One	1	14.3	2	11.8	3	18.8	5	27.8	3	20.0	5	14.3
Two	0	0.0	3	17.6	2	12.5	4	22.2	1	6.7	8	22.9
Three	1	14.3	3	17.6	1	6.3	0	00.0	1	6.7	2	5.7
Four	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.3	2	11.1	1	6.7	3	8.6
Five	0	0.0	1	5.9	1	6.3	1	5.6	2	13.3	1	2.9
Six	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	12.5	1	5.6	0	0.0	2	5.7
Seven	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Eight or more	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>35.3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>31.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>17.1</u>
Total	7	100.1	17	100.0	16	100.3	18	100.1	15	100.0	35	100.1
Mean	5.0		7.6		5.8		3.4		4.6		3.4	
Median	3.0		3.0		4.5		2.0		1.0		2.0	
Number of prior drug sale convictions:												
None	1	14.3	11	64.7	10	62.5	13	72.2	8	53.3	22	62.9
One	2	28.6	3	17.6	5	31.3	3	16.7	3	20.0	10	28.6
Two or more	<u>4</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>17.6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>26.7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8.6</u>
Total	7	100.0	17	99.9	16	100.1	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.1
Mean	1.6		0.7		0.5		0.4		0.8		0.5	
Median	2.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	

Characteristic	<u>Jesup</u>		<u>Waycross</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>Jonesboro</u>		<u>Lawrenceville</u>		<u>Augusta</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior drug possession convictions:												
None	2	28.6	8	47.1	9	56.3	4	22.2	7	46.7	15	42.9
One	1	14.3	3	17.6	1	6.3	4	22.2	3	20.0	4	11.4
Two	1	14.3	2	11.8	3	18.8	6	33.3	2	13.3	6	17.1
Three	1	14.3	1	5.9	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.7
Four	1	14.3	2	11.8	0	0.0	1	5.6	1	6.7	0	0.0
Five or more	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>22.9</u>
Total	7	100.1	17	100.1	16	100.2	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.0
Mean	2.1		1.8		1.4		2.4		2.1		2.5	
Median	2.0		1.0		0.0		2.0		1.0		1.0	
Number of prior sex crime convictions:												
None	6	85.7	17	100.0	15	93.8	17	94.4	15	100.0	35	100.0
One	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	6.3	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Two or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	7	100.0	0	0.0	16	100.1	18	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.0
Mean	0.1		0.0		0.1		0.1		0.0		0.0	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	

Appendix E. Continued.

Characteristic	Brunswick		Cairo		North Fulton		LaGrange		Griffin		LaFayette	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Risk level:												
Low	14	48.3	9	64.3	28	60.9	5	41.7	4	33.3	8	61.5
<u>Medium/high</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>51.7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>35.7</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>37.1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>58.3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>38.5</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	100.0	46	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.0
Number of prior incarceration:												
None	12	41.4	8	57.1	21	45.7	4	33.3	4	33.3	5	38.5
One	10	34.5	3	21.4	10	21.7	2	16.7	1	8.3	4	30.8
Two	6	20.7	1	7.1	6	13.0	2	16.7	1	8.3	2	15.4
Three	1	3.4	1	7.1	3	6.5	2	16.7	1	8.3	2	15.4
Four	0	0.0	1	7.1	3	6.5	1	8.3	2	16.7	0	0.0
Five or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	99.8	46	99.9	12	100.0	12	99.9	13	100.1
Mean	0.9		0.9		1.3		1.8		2.4		1.1	
Median	1.0		0.0		1.0		1.5		2.5		1.0	
Prior parole revocation:												
No	13	44.8	9	64.3	31	67.4	6	50.0	6	50.0	7	53.8
<u>Yes</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>55.2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>35.7</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>32.6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>46.2</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	100.0	46	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.0
Number of prior felony convictions:												
None	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
One	11	37.9	5	35.7	13	28.3	5	41.7	1	8.3	4	30.8
Two	8	27.6	4	28.6	9	19.6	2	16.7	0	0.0	2	15.4
Three	5	17.2	5	35.7	9	19.6	2	16.7	4	33.3	3	23.1
Four	2	6.9	0	0.0	4	8.7	0	0.0	2	16.7	2	15.4
Five or more	<u>3</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>23.9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>41.7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>15.4</u>
Total	29	99.9	14	100.0	46	100.1	12	100.1	12	100.0	13	100.1
Mean	2.3		2.0		3.2		2.9		4.4		2.8	
Median	2.0		2.0		3.0		2.0		4.0		3.0	

Characteristic	<u>Brunswick</u>		<u>Cairo</u>		<u>North Fulton</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Griffin</u>		<u>LaFayette</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior violent convictions:												
None	16	55.2	12	85.7	18	39.1	9	75.0	5	41.7	8	61.5
One	7	24.1	1	7.1	7	15.2	2	16.7	0	0.0	4	30.8
Two	3	10.3	0	0.0	10	21.7	1	8.3	2	16.7	0	0.0
Three	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.5	0	0.0	3	25.0	1	7.7
Four	2	6.9	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0
Five or more	<u>1</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>17.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	99.9	46	99.9	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.0
Mean	0.9		0.4		1.9		0.3		2.4		0.5	
Median	0.0		0.0		1.0		0.0		2.0		0.0	
Number of prior property convictions:												
None	18	62.1	6	42.9	7	15.2	4	33.3	2	16.7	5	38.5
One	3	10.3	2	14.3	8	17.4	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	7.7
Two	1	3.4	0	0.0	6	13.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	4	30.8
Three	1	3.4	1	7.1	3	6.5	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Four	1	3.4	1	7.1	1	2.2	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Five	1	3.4	2	14.3	3	6.5	1	8.3	1	8.3	0	0.0
Six	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.3	2	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Seven	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.5	0	0.0	2	16.7	0	0.0
Eight or more	<u>4</u>	<u>13.8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>28.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>41.7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>23.1</u>
Total	29	99.8	14	100.0	46	99.9	12	99.9	12	100.0	13	100.1
Mean	1.9		3.6		6.7		5.7		9.3		3.8	
Median	0.0		1.0		3.0		4.5		7.0		2.0	
Number of prior drug sale convictions:												
None	7	24.1	8	57.1	25	54.3	3	25.0	7	58.3	6	46.2
One	15	51.7	4	28.6	13	28.3	7	58.3	3	25.0	6	46.2
Two or more	<u>7</u>	<u>24.1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>17.4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.7</u>
Total	29	99.9	12	100.0	46	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.1
Mean	1.1		0.7		0.7		1.2		0.6		0.8	
Median	1.0		0.0		0.0		1.0		0.0		1.0	

Characteristic	<u>Brunswick</u>		<u>Cairo</u>		<u>North Fulton</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Griffin</u>		<u>LaFayette</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior drug possession convictions:												
None	9	31.0	5	35.7	21	45.7	2	16.7	4	33.3	5	38.5
One	1	3.4	2	14.3	5	10.9	1	8.3	2	16.7	3	23.1
Two	8	27.6	3	21.4	1	2.2	4	33.3	1	8.3	2	15.4
Three	1	3.4	2	14.3	3	6.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.7
Four	4	13.8	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	2	16.7	2	15.4
Five or more	<u>6</u>	<u>20.7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>28.3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>41.7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	29	99.9	14	100.0	46	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.1
Mean	2.4		1.7		3.3		4.9		2.4		1.4	
Median	2.0		1.5		1.0		2.0		1.5		1.0	
Number of prior sex crime convictions:												
None	28	96.6	14	100.0	45	97.8	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.0
One	1	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Two or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	100.0	46	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.0
Mean	0.0		0.0		0.2		0.0		0.0		0.0	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	

Appendix E. Continued.

Characteristic	Jefferson		South Dekalb		Lyons		Statesboro		South Metro		South Richmond	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Risk level:												
Low	7	58.3	22	57.9	4	44.4	10	37.0	11	55.0	9	47.4
<u>Medium/high</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>41.7</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>42.1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>63.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>45.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>52.6</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	20	100.0	19	100.0
Number of prior incarceration:												
None	6	50.0	18	47.4	1	11.1	8	29.6	10	50.0	8	42.1
One	1	8.3	8	21.1	6	66.7	12	44.4	4	20.0	6	31.6
Two	3	25.0	3	7.9	1	11.1	6	22.2	3	15.0	3	15.8
Three	2	16.7	5	13.2	1	11.1	1	3.7	2	10.0	1	5.3
Four	0	0.0	1	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	1	5.3
Five or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.1	9	100.0	27	99.9	20	100.0	19	100.1
Mean	1.1		1.3		1.2		1.0		1.0		1.0	
Median	0.5		1.0		1.0		1.0		0.5		1.0	
Prior parole revocation												
No	8	66.7	25	65.8	2	22.2	11	40.7	11	55.0	9	47.4
<u>Yes</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>34.2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>77.8</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>59.3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>45.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>52.6</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	20	100.0	19	100.0
Number of prior felony convictions:												
None	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
One	4	33.3	7	18.4	3	33.3	6	22.2	6	30.0	8	42.1
Two	2	16.7	9	23.7	3	33.3	12	44.4	5	25.0	6	31.6
Three	0	0.0	8	21.1	2	22.2	2	7.4	2	10.0	2	10.5
Four	3	25.0	3	7.9	0	0.0	4	14.8	3	15.0	2	10.5
Five or more	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>28.9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.3</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	99.9	27	99.9	20	100.0	19	100.0
Mean	3.2		3.5		1.7		2.7		3.0		2.1	
Median	3.0		3.0		2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0	

Characteristic	<u>Jefferson</u>		<u>South Dekalb</u>		<u>Lyons</u>		<u>Statesboro</u>		<u>South Metro</u>		<u>South Richmond</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior violent convictions:												
None	8	66.7	15	39.5	6	66.7	14	51.9	7	35.0	14	73.7
One	0	0.0	6	15.8	1	11.1	9	33.3	2	10.0	4	21.1
Two	1	8.3	8	21.1	2	22.2	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Three	2	16.7	4	10.5	0	0.0	1	3.7	2	10.0	1	5.3
Four	1	8.3	1	2.6	0	0.0	1	3.7	2	10.0	0	0.0
Five or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>35.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	20	100.0	19	100.1
Mean	1.0		1.9		0.6		0.9		3.3		0.4	
Median	0.0		1.0		0.0		0.0		3.0		0.0	
Number of prior property convictions:												
None	3	25.0	10	26.3	3	33.3	13	48.1	4	20.0	3	15.8
One	1	8.3	5	13.2	0	0.0	4	14.8	7	35.0	4	21.1
Two	2	16.7	3	7.9	4	44.4	1	3.7	0	0.0	4	21.1
Three	1	8.3	1	2.6	0	0.0	1	3.7	2	10.0	1	5.3
Four	0	0.0	1	2.6	0	0.0	1	3.7	2	10.0	1	5.3
Five	1	8.3	1	2.6	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	3	15.8
Six	2	16.7	3	7.9	0	0.0	1	3.7	1	5.0	0	0.0
Seven	0	0.0	3	7.9	0	0.0	1	3.7	1	5.0	0	0.0
Eight or more	<u>2</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>28.9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>14.8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15.8</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	99.9	9	99.9	27	99.9	20	100.0	19	100.2
Mean	3.7		5.9		3.9		2.7		3.4		3.6	
Median	2.5		3.5		2.0		1.0		1.0		2.0	
Number of prior drug sale convictions:												
None	7	58.3	24	63.2	5	55.6	15	55.6	8	40.0	16	84.2
One	2	16.7	7	18.4	3	33.3	4	14.8	8	40.0	0	0.0
Two or more	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>18.4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>29.6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15.8</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	20	100.0	19	100.0
Mean	1.0		0.6		0.6		1.0		0.9		0.8	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		1.0		0.0	

Characteristic	<u>Jefferson</u>		<u>South Dekalb</u>		<u>Lyons</u>		<u>Statesboro</u>		<u>South Metro</u>		<u>South Richmond</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior drug possession convictions:												
None	4	33.3	15	39.5	0	0.0	8	29.6	7	35.0	7	36.8
One	0	0.0	7	18.4	3	33.3	4	14.8	3	15.0	5	26.3
Two	1	8.3	1	2.6	1	11.1	4	14.8	2	10.0	3	15.8
Three	3	25.0	4	10.5	2	22.2	6	22.2	1	5.0	2	10.5
Four	0	0.0	3	7.9	3	33.3	1	3.7	0	0.0	1	5.3
Five or more	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>21.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>14.8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>35.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.3</u>
Total	12	99.9	38	100.0	9	99.9	27	99.9	20	100.0	19	100.0
Mean	3.2		2.7		2.6		2.0		2.8		1.6	
Median	3.0		1.0		3.0		2.0		1.5		1.0	
Number of prior sex crime convictions:												
None	12	100.0	35	92.1	9	100.0	25	92.6	20	100.0	19	100.0
One	0	0.0	3	7.9	0	0.0	2	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Two or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	20	100.0	19	100.0
Mean	0.0		0.1		0.0		0.1		0.0		0.0	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	

Appendix E. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Hartwell</u>		<u>Coastal St. Prison</u>		<u>Whitworth Detention Center</u>		<u>Metro St. Prison</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Risk level:								
Low	10	62.5	4	36.4	14	37.8	24	47.1
<u>Medium/high</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>63.6</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>62.2</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>52.9</u>
Total	16	100.0	11	100.0	37	100.0	51	100.0
Number of prior incarceration:								
None	6	37.5	4	33.3	12	30.0	23	44.2
One	6	37.5	3	25.0	10	25.0	9	17.3
Two	2	12.5	2	16.7	5	12.5	10	19.2
Three	1	6.3	0	0.0	6	15.0	6	11.5
Four	1	6.3	2	16.7	5	12.5	2	3.8
Five or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3.8</u>
Total	16	100.1	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	99.8
Mean	1.1		1.7		1.8		1.3	
Median	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0	
Prior parole revocation:								
No	9	56.3	6	50.0	16	40.0	31	59.6
<u>Yes</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>43.8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>60.0</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>40.4</u>
Total	16	100.1	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.0
Number of prior felony convictions:								
None	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
One	5	31.3	2	16.7	9	22.5	14	26.9
Two	6	37.5	2	16.7	8	20.0	11	21.2
Three	2	12.5	4	33.3	9	22.5	12	23.1
Four	1	6.3	1	8.3	7	17.5	5	9.6
Five or more	<u>2</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>17.5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>19.2</u>
Total	16	100.1	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.0
Mean	2.6		3.2		3.1		3.1	
Median	2.0		3.0		3.0		3.0	

Characteristic	<u>Hartwell</u>		<u>Coastal St. Prison</u>		<u>Whitworth Detention Center</u>		<u>Metro St. Prison</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior violent convictions:								
None	11	68.8	8	66.7	24	60.0	24	46.2
One	2	12.5	2	16.7	9	22.5	8	15.4
Two	1	6.3	1	8.3	5	12.5	7	13.5
Three	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.5	3	5.8
Four	1	6.3	0	0.0	1	2.5	2	3.8
Five or more	<u>1</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>15.4</u>
Total	16	100.2	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.1
Mean	0.9		1.2		0.7		1.8	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.0		1.0	
Number of prior property convictions:								
None	8	50.0	4	33.3	7	17.5	9	17.3
One	2	12.5	2	16.7	4	10.0	3	5.8
Two	0	0.0	2	16.7	6	15.0	8	15.4
Three	2	12.5	0	0.0	3	7.5	3	5.8
Four	2	12.5	0	0.0	3	7.5	3	5.8
Five	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	7.7
Six	0	0.0	1	8.3	2	50.0	1	1.9
Seven	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.5	1	1.9
Eight or more	<u>2</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>35.0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>38.5</u>
Total	16	100.0	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.1
Mean	2.0		4.7		6.8		7.0	
Median	0.5		1.5		3.5		4.5	
Number of prior drug sale convictions:								
None	12	75.0	5	41.7	25	62.5	41	78.8
One	1	6.3	4	33.3	9	22.5	9	17.3
Two or more	<u>3</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>15.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2.8</u>
Total	16	100.1	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	99.9
Mean	0.7		0.8		0.6		0.3	
Median	0.0		1.0		0.0		0.0	

Characteristic	<u>Hartwell</u>		<u>Coastal St. Prison</u>		<u>Whitworth Detention Center</u>		<u>Metro St. Prison</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior drug possession convictions:								
None	8	50.0	2	16.7	17	42.5	27	51.9
One	4	25.0	3	25.0	7	17.5	6	11.5
Two	1	6.3	2	16.7	3	7.5	7	13.5
Three	1	6.3	3	25.0	6	15.0	3	5.8
Four	1	6.3	2	16.7	3	7.5	5	9.6
Five or more	<u>1</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7.7</u>
Total	16	100.2	12	100.1	40	100.0	52	100.0
Mean	1.5		2.0		1.9		1.6	
Median	0.5		2.0		1.0		0.0	
Number of prior sex crime convictions:								
None	16	100.0	12	100.0	38	95.0	49	94.2
One	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.0	0	0.0
Two or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5.8</u>
Total	16	100.0	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	100.0
Mean	0.0		0.0		0.1		0.3	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	

Appendix F. Description of program groups without comparison groups across criminal background characteristics.

Characteristic	N	%
Risk:		
Low	56	58.3
<u>Medium/High</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>41.7</u>
Total	96	100.0
Number of prior incarcerations:		
None	39	40.2
One	30	30.9
Two	15	15.5
Three	4	4.1
Four	5	5.2
<u>Five or more</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4.1</u>
Total	97	100.0
	Mean	1.2
	Median	1.0
Prior parole revocation:		
No	47	48.5
<u>Yes</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>51.5</u>
Total	97	100.0
Number of prior felony convictions:		
None	0	0.0
One	25	25.8
Two	31	32.0
Three	18	18.6
Four	10	10.3
<u>Five or more</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>13.4</u>
Total	97	100.1
	Mean	2.7
	Median	2.0
Number of prior violent convictions		
None	60	61.9
One	18	18.6
Two	7	7.2
Three	5	5.2
Four	2	2.1
<u>Five or more</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5.2</u>
Total	97	100.2
	Mean	0.9
	Median	0.0

Characteristic	N	%
Number of prior property convictions:		
None	33	34.0
One	11	11.3
Two	11	11.3
Three	2	2.1
Four	11	11.3
Five	2	2.1
Six	2	2.1
Seven	0	0.0
<u>Eight or more</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>25.8</u>
Total	97	100.0
	Mean	4.4
	Median	2.0
Number of prior drug sale convictions:		
None	46	47.4
One	23	23.7
<u>Two or more</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>28.9</u>
Total	97	100.0
	Mean	1.0
	Median	1.0
Number of prior drug possession convictions:		
None	31	32.0
One	18	18.6
Two	16	16.5
Three	8	8.2
Four	14	14.4
<u>Five or more</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10.3</u>
Total	97	100.0
	Mean	1.9
	Median	1.0
Number of prior sex crime convictions:		
None	92	94.8
One	5	5.2
<u>Two or more</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	97	100.0
	Mean	0.1
	Median	0.0

Appendix G. Description of program groups without comparison groups across criminal history characteristics (collected at prison intake) and districts.

Characteristic	Dahlonaga		Fitzgerald		Columbus		LaGrange		Jefferson		Lyons	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Risk level:												
Low	4	36.4	10	90.9	3	37.5	11	64.7	8	72.7	9	40.9
Medium/high	7	<u>63.6</u>	1	<u>9.1</u>	5	<u>62.5</u>	6	<u>35.3</u>	3	<u>27.3</u>	13	<u>59.1</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0
Number of prior incarceration:												
None	2	18.2	8	72.7	3	37.5	8	47.1	3	27.3	6	27.3
One	4	36.4	2	18.2	1	12.5	7	41.2	2	18.2	10	45.5
Two	2	18.2	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	5.9	4	36.4	4	18.2
Three	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	25.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	1	4.5
Four	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	12.5	1	5.9	1	9.1	0	0.0
Five or more	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4.5</u>
Total	11	100.1	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.1	11	100.1	22	100.0
Mean	2.0		0.4		2.1		0.8		1.5		1.2	
Median	1.0		0.0		2.0		1.0		2.0		1.0	
Prior parole revocation:												
No	5	45.5	8	72.7	3	37.5	9	52.9	6	54.5	7	31.8
Yes	<u>6</u>	<u>54.5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>47.1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>68.2</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0
Number of prior felony convictions:												
None	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
One	1	9.1	6	54.6	1	12.5	4	23.5	2	18.2	5	22.7
Two	1	9.1	3	27.3	2	25.0	7	41.2	3	27.3	8	36.4
Three	3	27.3	2	18.2	0	0.0	4	23.5	2	18.2	6	27.3
Four	3	27.3	0	0.0	1	12.5	2	11.8	0	0.0	3	13.6
Five or more	<u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>36.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	11	100.1	11	100.1	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.1	22	100.0
Mean	4.0		1.6		3.8		2.2		3.8		2.3	
Median	4.0		1.0		4.5		2.0		3.0		2.0	

Characteristic	<u>Dahlonega</u>		<u>Fitzgerald</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Jefferson</u>		<u>Lyons</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior violent convictions:												
None	5	45.5	4	36.4	2	25.0	10	58.8	10	90.9	17	77.3
One	3	27.3	3	27.3	3	37.5	2	11.8	0	0.0	5	22.7
Two	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	23.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Three	1	9.1	2	18.2	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Four	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
Five or more	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	11	100.1	11	100.1	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0
Mean	1.3		1.6		2.4		0.8		0.9		0.2	
Median	1.0		1.0		1.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	
Number of prior property convictions:												
None	0	0.0	4	36.4	1	12.5	6	35.3	2	18.2	10	45.5
One	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	12.5	1	5.9	0	0.0	5	22.7
Two	3	27.3	2	18.2	1	12.5	2	11.8	1	9.1	0	0.0
Three	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
Four	1	9.1	1	9.1	1	12.5	3	17.6	1	9.1	3	13.6
Five	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
Six	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0
Seven	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Eight or more	<u>5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>17.6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>54.6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>18.2</u>
Total	11	100.1	11	100.1	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.1	22	100.0
Mean	9.1		3.5		7.1		3.6		7.5		3.3	
Median	5.0		2.0		6.0		2.0		8.0		1.0	
Number of prior drug sale convictions:												
None	9	81.8	8	72.7	2	25.0	8	47.1	7	63.6	7	31.8
One	0	0.0	2	18.2	3	37.5	3	17.6	2	18.2	10	45.5
Two or more	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>35.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>22.7</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0
Mean	0.4		0.5		1.9		1.1		0.9		1.0	
Median	0.0		0.0		1.0		1.0		0.0		1.0	

Characteristic	<u>Dahlonega</u>		<u>Fitzgerald</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Jefferson</u>		<u>Lyons</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of prior drug possession convictions:												
None	5	45.5	6	54.5	2	25.0	3	17.6	4	36.4	7	31.8
One	3	27.3	2	18.2	0	0.0	3	17.6	2	18.2	4	18.2
Two	0	0.0	2	18.2	0	0.0	4	23.5	0	0.0	8	36.4
Three	2	18.2	1	9.1	0	0.0	2	11.8	0	0.0	1	4.5
Four	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	62.5	3	17.6	2	18.2	2	9.1
Five or more	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	11	100.1	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	99.9	11	100.1	22	100.0
Mean	1.3		0.8		3.1		2.4		2.3		1.4	
Median	1.0		0.0		4.0		2.0		1.0		1.5	
Number of prior sex crime convictions:												
None	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	14	82.4	11	100.0	22	100.0
One	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	17.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Two or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	11	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	22	100.0
Mean	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.2		0.0		0.0	
Median	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	

Appendix G. Continued

Characteristic	<u>Carrollton</u>		<u>Douglas</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Risk level:				
Low	6	85.7	5	55.6
<u>Medium/high</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44.4</u>
Total	7	100.0	9	100.0
Number of prior incarceration:				
None	4	50.0	5	55.6
One	2	25.0	2	22.2
Two	2	25.0	1	11.1
Three	0	0.0	0	0.0
Four	0	0.0	1	11.1
Five or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0
Mean	0.8		0.9	
Median	0.5		0.0	
Prior parole revocation:				
No	4	50.0	5	55.6
<u>Yes</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44.4</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0
Number of prior felony convictions:				
None	0	0.0	0	0.0
One	4	50.0	2	22.2
Two	4	50.0	3	33.3
Three	0	0.0	1	11.1
Four	0	0.0	1	11.1
Five or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>22.2</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	99.9
Mean	1.5		2.9	
Median	1.5		2.0	

Characteristic	<u>Carrolton</u>		<u>Douglas</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Number of prior violent convictions:				
None	7	87.5	5	55.6
One	1	12.5	1	11.1
Two	0	0.0	2	22.2
Three	0	0.0	1	11.1
Four	0	0.0	0	0.0
Five or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0
Mean	0.1		0.9	
Median	0.0		0.0	
Number of prior property convictions:				
None	6	75.0	4	44.4
One	1	12.5	2	22.2
Two	1	12.5	1	11.1
Three	0	0.0	1	11.1
Four	0	0.0	1	11.1
Five	0	0.0	0	0.0
Six	0	0.0	0	0.0
Seven	0	0.0	0	0.0
Eight or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	99.9
Mean	0.4		1.2	
Median	0.0		1.0	
Number of prior drug sale convictions:				
None	2	25.0	3	33.3
One	1	12.5	2	22.2
Two or more	<u>5</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44.4</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	99.9
Mean	1.5		1.6	
Median	2.0		1.0	

Characteristic	<u>Carrolton</u>		<u>Douglas</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Number of prior drug possession convictions:				
None	1	12.5	3	33.3
One	2	25.0	2	22.2
Two	1	12.5	1	11.1
Three	1	12.5	1	11.1
Four	1	12.5	1	11.1
Five or more	<u>2</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11.1</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	99.9
Mean	3.3		1.8	
Median	2.5		1.0	
Number of prior sex crime convictions:				
None	8	100.0	7	77.8
One	0	0.0	2	22.2
Two or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0
Mean	0.0		0.2	
Median	0.0		0.0	

Appendix H. Experimental group I-Level and collapsed Jesness Inventory types (Van Voorhis 1994) by district.

Characteristic	<u>Marietta</u>		<u>Clarksville</u>		<u>Dahlonega</u>		<u>Milledgeville</u>		<u>Thomas</u>		<u>Savannah</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I-Level:												
I-levels 2 and 3	29	53.7	3	37.5	6	54.5	13	76.5	4	66.7	7	70.0
<u>I-level 4</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>46.3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>23.5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>30.0</u>
Total	54	100.0	8	100.0	11	100.0	17	100.0	6	100.0	10	100.0
Collapsed Jesness Inventory type:												
Aggressives	19	35.2	1	12.5	1	9.1	8	47.1	2	33.3	5	50.0
Neurotics	7	13.0	1	12.5	3	27.3	2	11.8	1	16.7	0	0.0
Dependents	10	18.5	2	25.0	5	45.5	5	29.4	2	33.3	2	20.0
<u>Situationals</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>30.0</u>
Total	54	100.0	8	100.0	11	100.1	17	100.1	6	100.0	10	100.0

Appendix H. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Jesup</u>		<u>Waycross</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>Jonesboro</u>		<u>Lawrenceville</u>		<u>Augusta</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I-Level:												
I-levels 2 and 3	4	80.0	9	64.3	10	62.5	9	64.3	6	46.2	22	78.6
<u>I-level 4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>35.7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>35.7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>53.8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>21.4</u>
Total	5	100.0	14	100.0	16	100.0	14	99.9	13	100.0	28	99.9
Collapsed Jesness Inventory type:												
Aggressives	1	20.0	2	14.3	4	25.0	7	50.0	3	23.1	17	60.7
Neurotics	1	20.0	2	14.3	3	18.8	2	14.3	1	7.7	1	3.6
Dependents	3	60.0	7	50.0	6	37.5	2	14.3	3	23.1	5	17.9
<u>Situationals</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>21.4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>21.4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>46.2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>17.9</u>
Total	5	100.0	14	100.0	16	100.1	14	100.0	13	100.1	28	100.1

Appendix H. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Brunswick</u>		<u>Cairo</u>		<u>North Fulton</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Griffin</u>		<u>LaFayette</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I-Level:												
I-levels 2 and 3	16	64.0	6	54.5	25	69.4	8	66.7	7	70.0	4	44.4
<u>I-level 4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>36.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>30.6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>30.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>55.6</u>
Total	25	100.0	11	100.0	36	100.0	12	100.0	10	100.0	9	100.0
Collapsed Jesness												
Inventory type:												
Aggressives	10	40.0	2	18.2	13	36.1	4	33.3	3	30.0	3	33.3
Neurotics	2	8.0	2	18.2	3	8.3	1	8.3	1	10.0	0	0.0
Dependents	6	24.0	4	36.4	12	33.3	4	33.3	4	40.0	1	11.1
<u>Situationals</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>28.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>55.6</u>
Total	25	100.0	11	100.1	36	99.9	12	99.9	10	100.0	9	100.0

Appendix H. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Jefferson</u>		<u>South Dekalb</u>		<u>Lyons</u>		<u>Statesboro</u>		<u>South Metro</u>		<u>South Richmond</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I-Level:												
I-levels 2 and 3	7	63.6	20	64.5	4	57.1	15	71.4	10	58.8	11	68.8
<u>I-level 4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>36.4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>35.5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>42.9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>41.2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>31.3</u>
Total	11	100.0	31	100.0	7	100.0	21	100.0	17	100.0	16	100.0
Collapsed Jesness												
Inventory type:												
Aggressives	3	27.3	12	38.7	1	14.3	8	37.1	4	23.5	4	25.0
Neurotics	2	18.2	4	12.9	2	28.6	3	14.3	3	17.6	4	25.0
Dependents	4	36.4	8	25.8	3	42.9	7	33.3	6	35.3	7	43.8
<u>Situationals</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>22.6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>23.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6.3</u>
Total	11	100.1	31	100.0	7	100.1	21	100.0	17	99.9	16	100.1

Appendix H. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Hartwell</u>		<u>Coastal St. Prison</u>		<u>Whitworth Detention Center</u>		<u>Metro St. Prison</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I-Level:								
I-levels 2 and 3	7	38.9	7	63.6	18	51.4	21	44.7
<u>I-level 4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>61.1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>36.4</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>48.6</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>55.3</u>
Total	18	100.0	11	100.0	35	100.1	47	100.0
Collapsed Jesness								
Inventory type:								
Aggressives	2	11.1	4	36.4	13	37.1	9	19.1
Neurotics	2	11.1	2	18.2	13	37.1	22	46.8
Dependents	5	27.8	3	27.3	5	14.3	12	25.5
<u>Situationals</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11.4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8.5</u>
Total	18	100.0	11	100.1	35	99.9	47	99.9

Appendix I. Distribution of I-Level classifications and collapsed Jesness Inventory types (Van Voorhis 1994) among the program groups without comparison groups.

Characteristic	N	%
I-Level:		
I-levels 2 and 3	53	66.3
<u>I-level 4</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>33.8</u>
Total	80	100.1
Collapsed Jesness Inventory type:		
Aggressives	32	40.0
Neurotics	16	20.0
Dependents	21	26.3
<u>Situationals</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>13.8</u>
Total	80	100.1

Appendix J. Program groups without comparison groups I-Level and collapsed Jesness Inventory types (Van Voorhis 1994) by district.

Characteristic	<u>Dahlonega</u>		<u>Fitzgerald</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Jefferson</u>		<u>Lyons</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I-Level:												
I-levels 2 and 3	0	0.0	7	63.6	6	75.0	13	81.3	5	50.0	10	50.0
<u>I-level 4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>36.4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>50.0</u>
Total	1	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.1	10	100.0	20	100.0
Collapsed Jesness Inventory type:												
Aggressives	0	0.0	2	18.2	5	62.5	6	37.5	4	40.0	6	30.0
Neurotics	0	0.0	3	27.3	1	12.5	2	12.5	2	20.0	8	40.0
Dependents	0	0.0	5	45.5	1	12.5	7	43.8	1	10.0	4	20.0
<u>Situationals</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>30.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10.0</u>
Total	1	100.0	11	100.1	8	100.0	16	100.1	10	100.0	20	100.0

Appendix J. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Carrollton</u>		<u>Douglas</u>	
	N	%	N	%
I-Level:				
I-levels 2 and 3	6	100.0	6	75.0
<u>I-level 4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>25.0</u>
Total	6	100.0	8	100.0
Collapsed Jesness Inventory type:				
Aggressives	4	66.7	5	62.5
Neurotics	0	0.0	0	0.0
Dependents	2	33.3	1	12.5
<u>Situationals</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>25.0</u>
Total	6	100.0	8	100.0

Appendix K. Class session characteristics of the experimental group by district.

Characteristic	Marietta		Clarkesville		Dahlonega		Milledgeville		Thomas		Savannah	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Completion:												
Never began	5	8.5	0	0.0	3	25.0	4	20.0	0	0.0	7	50.0
Did not complete	16	27.1	4	50.0	2	16.7	7	35.0	3	30.0	3	21.4
<u>Still in at class 30</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>64.4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>58.3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>45.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>28.6</u>
Total	59	100.0	8	100.0	12	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0	14	100.0
Average level of participation ² :												
Not attentive	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Attentive, yet wavered	1	2.0	2	28.6	0	0.0	3	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Generally attentive	7	14.3	5	71.4	0	0.0	2	13.3	1	11.1	3	50.0
Attentive, responsive	29	59.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	40.0	6	66.7	3	50.0
<u>Attentive, volunteers</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>22.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>26.7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>22.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	49	99.9	7	100.0	8	100.0	15	100.0	9	99.9	6	100.0
Average level of enjoyment ¹ :												
Expressed strong dislike	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Expressed some dislike	1	2.0	2	28.6	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Non-committal	10	20.4	5	71.4	0	0.0	6	40.0	2	22.2	0	0.0
Expressed some enjoyment	29	59.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	53.3	6	66.7	4	66.7
Expressed strong enjoyment	9	18.4	0	0.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	2	33.3
Total	49	100.0	7	100.0	8	100.0	15	100.0	9	100.0	6	100.0
Average level of understanding ¹ :												
Confused and resistant	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Questions the concepts	2	4.1	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Understands, cannot apply	6	12.2	6	85.7	0	0.0	4	26.7	0	0.0	2	33.3
Understands, cannot offer examples	31	63.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	53.3	4	44.4	4	66.7
Understands, can offer examples	10	20.4	0	0.0	8	100.0	3	20.0	5	55.6	0	0.0
Total	49	100.0	7	100.0	8	100.0	15	100.0	9	100.0	6	100.0

² The N for average level of participation, enjoyment, and understanding includes subjects who attended at least one of the five class sessions used to calculate the mean.

Characteristic	<u>Marietta</u>		<u>Clarksville</u>		<u>Dahlonega</u>		<u>Milledgeville</u>		<u>Thomas</u>		<u>Savannah</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 1 ³ :												
No	10	47.6	3	42.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Yes	<u>11</u>	<u>52.4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	21	100.0	7	100.0	7	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	4	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 3 ² :												
No	0	0.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7
Yes	<u>29</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
Total	29	100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	10	100.0	8	100.0	3	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 5 ² :												
No	2	6.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Yes	<u>27</u>	<u>93.1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	29	100.0	3	100.0	4	100.0	9	100.0	5	100.0	4	100.0
Average group atmosphere for the program group(s) held in the district ⁴ :												
Divisive, quiet	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some disagreement, not listening	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Listening, little active participation	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agreeable, some participation	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Cohesive, participating	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	3	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0

³ The N for use of skills includes subjects who attended the particular session.

⁴ The unit of analysis for the average group atmosphere is class or group. A total of 52 groups participated in the experimental design of Phase 2 of the evaluation. One group did not report on group atmosphere.

Appendix K. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Jesup</u>		<u>Waycross</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>Jonesboro</u>		<u>Lawrenceville</u>		<u>Augusta</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Completion:												
Never began	2	28.6	0	0.0	5	31.3	0	0.0	3	18.8	10	27.8
Did not complete	3	42.9	7	41.2	5	31.3	5	27.8	2	12.5	3	8.3
<u>Still in at class 30</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>58.8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>72.2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>68.8</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>63.9</u>
Total	7	100.1	17	100.0	16	100.1	18	100.0	16	100.1	36	100.0
Average level of participation:												
Not attentive	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3
Attentive, yet wavered	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Generally attentive	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	12.5	0	0.0	2	8.7
Attentive, responsive	3	100.0	3	18.8	0	0.0	4	25.0	1	9.1	9	39.1
<u>Attentive, volunteers</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>81.3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>47.8</u>
Total	3	100.0	16	100.1	8	100.0	16	100.0	11	100.0	23	99.9
Average level of enjoyment:												
Expressed strong dislike	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3
Expressed some dislike	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3
Non-committal	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	18.6	0	0.0	2	8.7
Expressed some enjoyment	3	100.0	2	12.5	0	0.0	6	37.5	1	9.1	8	34.8
<u>Expressed strong enjoyment</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>87.5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>43.8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>47.8</u>
Total	3	100.0	16	100.0	8	100.0	16	99.9	11	100.0	23	99.9
Average level of understanding:												
Confused and resistant	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3
Questions the concepts	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3
Understands, cannot apply	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	12.5	0	0.0	1	4.3
Understands, cannot offer examples	3	100.0	2	12.5	0	0.0	6	37.5	1	9.1	11	47.8
<u>Understands, can offer examples</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>87.5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>39.1</u>
Total	3	100.0	16	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	11	100.0	23	99.8

Characteristic	<u>Jesup</u>		<u>Waycross</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>Jonesboro</u>		<u>Lawrenceville</u>		<u>Augusta</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 1:												
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	46.7	3	33.3	9	40.9
Yes	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>53.3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>59.1</u>
Total	3	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0	15	100.0	9	100.0	22	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 3:												
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Yes	<u>2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>60.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	2	100.0	11	100.0	4	100.0	10	100.0	11	100.0	16	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 5:												
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Yes	<u>2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>60.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	2	100.0	9	100.0	4	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0	12	100.0
Average group atmosphere for the program group(s) held in the district:												
Divisive, quiet	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some disagreement, not listening	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Listening, little active participation	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agreeable, some participation	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Cohesive, participating	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	1	100.0	2	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	3	100.0

Appendix K. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Brunswick</u>		<u>Cairo</u>		<u>North Fulton</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Griffin</u>		<u>LaFayette</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Completion:												
Never began	0	0.0	5	35.7	10	20.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.7
Did not complete	11	37.9	1	7.3	5	10.4	3	25.0	2	16.7	2	15.4
<u>Still in at class 30</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>62.1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>68.8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>83.3</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>76.9</u>
Total	29	100.0	14	100.1	48	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	13	100.0
Average level of participation:												
Not attentive	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Attentive, yet wavered	1	3.8	0	0.0	6	15.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
Generally attentive	3	11.5	4	44.4	3	7.9	0	0.0	8	66.7	4	33.3
Attentive, responsive	10	38.5	4	44.4	13	34.2	5	41.7	4	33.3	7	58.3
<u>Attentive, volunteers</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>46.2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>42.1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>58.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	26	100.0	9	99.9	38	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	12	99.9
Average level of enjoyment:												
Expressed strong dislike	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Expressed some dislike	1	3.8	0	0.0	2	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Non-committal	6	23.1	2	22.2	9	23.7	0	0.0	9	75.0	6	50.0
Expressed some enjoyment	11	42.3	6	66.7	15	39.4	5	41.7	3	25.0	5	41.7
Expressed strong enjoyment	8	30.8	1	11.1	12	31.6	7	58.3	0	0.0	1	8.3
Total	26	100.0	9	100.0	38	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0
Average level of understanding:												
Confused and resistant	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Questions the concepts	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
Understands, cannot apply	4	15.4	0	0.0	9	23.7	0	0.0	8	66.7	5	41.7
Understands, cannot offer examples	9	34.6	8	88.9	12	31.6	5	41.7	4	33.3	5	41.7
Understands, can offer examples	13	50.0	1	11.1	17	44.7	7	58.3	0	0.0	1	8.3
Total	26	100.0	9	100.0	38	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0

Characteristic	<u>Brunswick</u>		<u>Cairo</u>		<u>North Fulton</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Griffin</u>		<u>LaFayette</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 1:												
No	1	5.0	0	0.0	10	34.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	18.2
Yes	<u>19</u>	<u>95.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>65.5</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>81.8</u>
Total	20	100.0	9	100.0	29	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	11	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 3:												
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0
Yes	<u>19</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>90.0</u>
Total	19	100.0	8	100.0	28	100.0	12	100.0	12	100.0	10	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 5:												
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0
Yes	<u>17</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>90.0</u>
Total	17	100.0	8	100.0	21	100.0	9	100.0	9	100.0	10	100.0
Average group atmosphere for the program group(s) held in the district:												
Divisive, quiet	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some disagreement, not listening	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Listening, little active participation	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agreeable, some participation	0	0.0	1	100.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
Cohesive, participating	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	3	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0

Appendix K. Continued.

Characteristic	Jefferson		South Dekalb		Lyons		Statesboro		South Metro		South Richmond	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Completion:												
Never began	2	16.7	13	34.2	0	0.0	5	18.5	0	0.0	3	15.8
Did not complete	2	16.7	11	28.9	4	44.4	7	25.9	7	33.3	4	21.1
<u>Still in at class 30</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>36.8</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>63.2</u>
Total	12	100.1	38	99.9	9	100.0	27	100.0	21	100.0	19	100.1
Average level of participation:												
Not attentive	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.1
Attentive, yet wavered	1	12.5	4	17.4	0	0.0	3	15.0	0	0.0	3	21.4
Generally attentive	7	87.5	5	21.7	2	25.0	5	25.0	8	44.4	1	7.1
Attentive, responsive	0	0.0	10	43.5	6	75.0	6	30.0	6	33.3	6	42.9
<u>Attentive, volunteers</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>17.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>30.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>21.4</u>
Total	8	100.0	23	100.0	8	100.0	20	100.0	18	99.9	14	100.0
Average level of enjoyment:												
Expressed strong dislike	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Expressed some dislike	3	37.5	2	8.7	0	0.0	3	15.0	0	0.0	4	28.6
Non-committal	5	62.5	7	30.4	2	25.0	6	30.0	9	50.0	3	21.4
Expressed some enjoyment	0	0.0	14	60.9	6	75.0	5	25.0	3	16.7	7	50.0
Expressed strong <u>enjoyment</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>30.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	8	100.0	23	100.0	8	100.0	20	100.0	18	100.0	14	100.0
Average level of understanding:												
Confused and resistant	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.1
Questions the concepts	2	25.0	3	13.0	0	0.0	4	20.0	0	0.0	1	7.1
Understands, cannot apply	6	75.0	2	8.7	2	25.0	5	25.0	6	33.3	5	35.7
Understands, cannot offer examples	0	0.0	17	73.9	6	75.0	5	25.0	6	33.3	6	42.9
Understands, can offer <u>examples</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>30.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.1</u>
Total	8	100.0	23	99.9	8	100.0	20	100.0	18	99.9	14	99.9

Characteristic	<u>Jefferson</u>		<u>South Dekalb</u>		<u>Lyons</u>		<u>Statesboro</u>		<u>South Metro</u>		<u>South Richmond</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 1:												
No	2	33.3	20	100.0	1	12.5	2	13.3	4	23.5	7	58.3
Yes	<u>4</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>87.5</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>86.7</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>76.5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>41.7</u>
Total	6	100.0	20	100.0	8	100.0	15	100.0	17	100.0	12	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 3:												
No	2	33.3	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	18.2
Yes	<u>4</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>81.8</u>
Total	6	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	14	100.0	12	100.0	11	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 5:												
No	0	0.0	2	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	23.1	2	25.0
Yes	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>83.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>76.9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>75.0</u>
Total	8	100.0	12	100.0	4	100.0	13	100.0	13	100.0	8	100.0
Average group atmosphere for the program group(s) held in the district:												
Divisive, quiet	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some disagreement, not listening	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Listening, little active participation	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agreeable, some participation	1	100.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0
Cohesive, participating	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	1	100.0	2	100.0	1	100.0	3	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0

Appendix K. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Hartwell</u>		<u>Coastal St. Prison</u>		<u>Whitworth Detention Center</u>		<u>Metro St. Prison</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Completion:								
Never began	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.8
Did not complete	2	11.1	1	8.3	2	5.0	23	44.2
Still in at class 30	<u>16</u>	<u>88.9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>91.7</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>95.0</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>51.9</u>
Total	18	100.0	12	100.0	40	100.0	52	99.9
Average level of participation:								
Not attentive	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Attentive, yet wavered	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	2.2
Generally attentive	1	5.6	5	41.7	5	12.8	5	10.9
Attentive, responsive	8	44.4	5	41.7	21	53.8	17	37.0
<u>Attentive, volunteers</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>50.0</u>
Total	18	100.0	12	100.0	39	99.9	46	100.1
Average level of enjoyment:								
Expressed strong dislike	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	2.6	0	0.0
Expressed some dislike	0	0.0	2	16.7	2	5.1	1	2.2
Non-committal	1	5.6	8	66.7	9	23.1	6	13.0
Expressed some enjoyment	12	66.7	1	8.3	24	61.5	18	39.1
Expressed strong <u>enjoyment</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>27.8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>45.7</u>
Total	18	100.1	12	100.0	39	100.0	46	100.0
Average level of understanding:								
Confused and resistant	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Questions the concepts	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	2.2
Understands, cannot apply	3	16.7	8	66.7	4	10.3	5	10.9
Understands, cannot offer examples	1	5.6	2	16.7	33	84.6	16	34.8
Understands, can offer <u>examples</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>77.8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>52.2</u>
Total	18	100.1	12	100.0	39	100.0	46	100.1

Characteristic	<u>Hartwell</u>		<u>Coastal St. Prison</u>		<u>Whitworth</u>		<u>Metro St. Prison</u>	
	N	%	N	%	<u>Detention Center</u>	N	%	
					N	%		
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 1:								
No	0	0.0	4	36.4	27	71.1	1	5.3
Yes	<u>18</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>63.6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>28.9</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>94.7</u>
Total	18	100.0	11	100.0	38	100.0	19	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 3:								
No	0	0.0	4	33.3	2	5.3	6	21.4
Yes	<u>14</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>94.7</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>78.6</u>
Total	14	100.0	12	100.0	38	100.0	28	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 5:								
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	19.0
Yes	<u>12</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>81.0</u>
Total	12	100.0	10	100.0	38	100.0	21	100.0
Average group atmosphere for the program group(s) held in the district:								
Divisive, quiet	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some disagreement, not listening	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Listening, little active participation	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agreeable, some participation	2	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	0	0.0
Cohesive, participating	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	2	100.0	1	100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0

Appendix L. Class session characteristics of program groups without comparison groups.

Characteristic	N	%
Completion:		
Never began	4	4.1
Did not complete	16	16.3
<u>Still in at class 30</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>79.6</u>
Total	98	100.0
Average level of participation ^a :		
Not attentive	1	1.1
Attentive, yet wavered	1	1.1
Generally attentive	15	16.7
Attentive, responsive	32	35.6
<u>Attentive, volunteers</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>45.6</u>
Total	90	100.1
Average level of enjoyment ^a :		
Expressed strong dislike	1	1.1
Expressed some dislike	2	2.2
Non-committal	17	18.9
Expressed some enjoyment	33	36.7
<u>Expressed strong enjoyment</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>41.1</u>
Total	90	100.0
Average level of understanding ^a :		
Confused and resistant	0	0.0
Questions the concepts	2	2.2
Understands, cannot apply	16	17.8
Understands, cannot offer examples	29	32.2
<u>Understands, can offer examples</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>47.8</u>
Total	90	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 1 ^b :		
No	16	19.8
<u>Yes</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>80.2</u>
Total	81	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 3 ^b :		
No	8	13.3
<u>Yes</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>86.7</u>
Total	60	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 5 ^b :		
No	4	5.6
<u>Yes</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>94.4</u>
Total	71	100.0

Characteristic	N	%
Average group atmosphere ^c :		
Divisive, quiet	0	0.0
Some disagreement, not listening	0	0.0
Listening, little active participation	0	0.0
Agreeable, some participation	3	30.0
<u>Cohesive, participating</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>70.0</u>
Total	10	100.0

^a The N for average level of participation, enjoyment, and understanding includes parolees who attended at least one of the five class sessions used to calculate the mean.

^b The N for use of skills includes parolees who attended the particular session.

^c The unit of analysis for the average group atmosphere is class or group. A total of 52 experimental groups participated in Phase II of the evaluation. One group did not report on group atmosphere.

Appendix M. Class session characteristics of the program groups without comparison groups by district.

Characteristic	Dahlonega		Fitzgerald		Columbus		LaGrange		Jefferson		Lyons	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Completion:												
Never began	0	0.0	2	18.2	1	12.5	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did not complete	5	45.5	1	9.1	1	12.5	1	5.6	1	9.1	3	13.6
<u>Still in at class 30</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>54.4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>72.7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>88.9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>86.4</u>
Total	11	99.9	11	100.0	8	100.0	18	100.1	11	100.0	22	100.0
Average level of participation ⁵ :												
Not attentive	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
Attentive, yet wavered	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
Generally attentive	2	22.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	11	50.0
Attentive, responsive	0	0.0	5	55.6	3	42.9	2	12.5	4	36.4	9	40.9
<u>Attentive, volunteers</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>77.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>87.5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>54.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	9	100.0	9	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	11	100.0	22	99.9
Average level of enjoyment ¹ :												
Expressed strong dislike	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Expressed some dislike	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1
Non-committal	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	9.1	11	50.0
Expressed some enjoyment	1	11.1	5	55.6	6	85.7	2	12.5	5	45.5	9	40.9
<u>Expressed strong enjoyment</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>77.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>87.5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	9	100.0	9	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	11	100.1	22	100.0
Average level of understanding ¹ :												
Confused and resistant	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Questions the concepts	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1
Understands, cannot apply	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	11	50.0
Understands, cannot offer examples	0	0.0	3	33.3	7	100.0	1	6.3	5	45.5	9	40.9
<u>Understands, can offer examples</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>93.8</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	9	100.0	9	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.1	11	100.1	22	100.0

⁵ The N for average level of participation, enjoyment, and understanding includes subjects who attended at least one of the five class sessions used to calculate the mean.

Characteristic	<u>Dahlonaga</u>		<u>Fitzgerald</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Jefferson</u>		<u>Lyons</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 1 ⁶ :												
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	100.0	0	0.0	5	55.6	3	14.3
Yes	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>85.7</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0	7	100.0	15	100.0	9	100.0	21	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 3 ² :												
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7
Yes	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>93.3</u>
Total	8	100.0	8	100.0	4	100.0	11	100.0	0	0.0	15	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 5 ² :												
No	0	0.0	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Yes	<u>6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>87.5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	6	100.0	8	100.0	5	100.0	13	100.0	10	100.0	17	100.0
Average group atmosphere for the program group(s) held in the district ⁷ :												
Divisive, quiet	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some disagreement, not listening	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Listening, little active participation	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agreeable, some participation	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
Cohesive, participating	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0

⁶ The N for use of skills includes subjects who attended the particular session.

⁷ The unit of analysis for the average group atmosphere is class or group. There are a total of 10 program groups without comparison groups across eight districts in Phase 2 of the evaluation.

Appendix M. Continued.

Characteristic	<u>Carrollton</u>		<u>Douglas</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Completion:				
Never began	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did not complete	2	25.0	2	22.2
<u>Still in at class 30</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>77.8</u>
Total	8	100.0	9	100.0
Average level of participation:				
Not attentive	0	0.0	0	0.0
Attentive, yet wavered	0	0.0	0	0.0
Generally attentive	1	14.3	0	0.0
Attentive, responsive	6	85.7	3	33.3
<u>Attentive, volunteers</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>66.7</u>
Total	7	100.0	9	100.0
Average level of enjoyment:				
Expressed strong dislike	0	0.0	0	0.0
Expressed some dislike	0	0.0	0	0.0
Non-committal	4	57.1	0	0.0
Expressed some enjoyment	3	42.9	2	22.2
Expressed strong <u>enjoyment</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>77.8</u>
Total	7	100.0	9	100.0
Average level of understanding:				
Confused and resistant	0	0.0	0	0.0
Questions the concepts	0	0.0	0	0.0
Understands, cannot apply	4	57.1	0	0.0
Understands, cannot offer examples	3	42.9	1	11.1
Understands, can offer <u>examples</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>88.9</u>
Total	7	100.0	9	100.0

Characteristic	<u>Carrollton</u>		<u>Douglas</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 1:				
No	0	0.0	1	14.3
Yes	<u>5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>85.7</u>
Total	5	100.0	7	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 3:				
No	6	100.0	0	0.0
Yes	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	6	100.0	8	100.0
Parolees reported to be using skills at time 5:				
No	3	60.0	0	0.0
Yes	<u>2</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	5	100.0	7	100.0
Average group atmosphere for the program group(s) held in the district:				
Divisive, quiet	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some disagreement, not listening	0	0.0	0	0.0
Listening, little active participation	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agreeable, some participation	0	0.0	0	0.0
Cohesive, participating	<u>0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	1	100.0	1	100.0

Appendix N. Observer Evaluation scales and corresponding reliabilities and descriptives for program groups without comparison groups.

Scale	Range	Median ¹	Percent rated as substandard	N ³
<u>Observation 1⁴</u>				
General issues and class control	0.90-2.0	1.7	75.0	8
Organization	1.67-2.0	1.9	75.0	8
Delivery and response to participant's use of skills	1.25-2.0	1.8	75.0	8
Sensitivity to participants' feelings	1.71-2.0	2.0	37.5	8
Group participation	0.5-2.0	2.0	37.5	8
<u>Observation 2⁵</u>				
General issues and class control	0.0-2.0	1.9	50.0	10
Organization	0.2-2.0	2.0	30.0	10
Delivery and response to participant's use of skills	0.0-2.0	1.9	70.0	10
Sensitivity to participants' feelings	0.0-2.0	2.0	40.0	10
Group participation	0.0-2.0	2.0	20.0	10

¹ Because the scale scores are highly skewed, the median more accurately reflects the typical case than the mean. The median is the middle score when the data are ordered from lowest to highest values.

² The standard rating given to groups is a 2. A scale score of 2 indicates that all items in the scale were rated the highest possible value.

³ Two groups were not able to be observed at session 17.

⁴ Observation 1 took place during session 17.

⁵ Observation 2 took place during session 30.

Appendix O. Participant Evaluation responses by district.⁸

Scale	Marietta		Clarkeville		Dahlonega		Milledgeville		Thomas		Savannah	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adherence to social learning methods												
Below average	1	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Average ⁹	24	77.4	4	100.0	5	83.3	7	77.8	2	50.0	4	100.0
<u>Above average</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>19.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	31	100.0	4	100.0	6	100.0	9	100.0	4	100.0	4	100.0
Relevance of skills												
Below average	2	6.5	1	25.0	1	16.7	2	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Average	28	90.3	3	75.0	5	83.3	5	55.6	4	80.0	2	50.0
<u>Above average</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>50.0</u>
Total	31	100.0	4	100.0	6	100.0	9	100.0	5	100.0	4	100.0
Group climate												
Below average	2	6.7	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
Average	24	80.0	4	100.0	5	83.3	6	66.7	3	60.0	4	100.0
<u>Above average</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	30	100.0	4	100.0	6	100.0	9	100.0	5	100.0	4	100.0

⁸ Included in this table are responses made by experimental group members who completed the program.

⁹ The “average” category is defined as the values that fall within one standard deviation of the mean of the scale for all of the districts combined.

Appendix O. Continued.

Scale	<u>Jesup</u>		<u>Waycross</u>		<u>Columbus</u>		<u>Jonesboro</u>		<u>Lawrenceville</u>		<u>Augusta</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adherence to social learning methods												
Below average	0	0.0	2	22.2	2	40.0	1	11.1	3	42.9	2	14.3
Average	2	100.0	5	55.6	3	60.0	6	66.7	3	42.9	8	57.1
<u>Above average</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>28.6</u>
Total	2	100.0	9	100.0	5	100.0	9	100.0	7	100.1	14	100.0
Relevance of skills												
Below average	1	50.0	1	10.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	5	45.5	2	14.3
Average	1	50.0	8	80.0	4	80.0	9	90.0	6	54.5	11	78.6
<u>Above average</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.1</u>
Total	2	100.0	10	100.0	5	100.0	10	100.0	11	100.0	14	100.0
Group climate												
Below average	0	0.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	1	14.3	1	7.1
Average	2	100.0	8	80.0	5	100.0	6	66.7	6	85.7	12	85.7
<u>Above average</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.1</u>
Total	2	100.0	10	100.0	5	100.0	9	100.0	7	100.0	14	99.9

Appendix O. Continued.

Scale	<u>Brunswick</u>		<u>Cairo</u>		<u>North Fulton</u>		<u>LaGrange</u>		<u>Griffin</u>		<u>LaFayette</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adherence to social learning methods												
Below average	1	7.7	2	25.0	3	11.5	2	22.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Average	12	92.3	6	75.0	19	73.1	3	33.3	7	100.0	5	62.5
<u>Above average</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>15.4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>37.5</u>
Total	13	100.0	8	100.0	26	100.0	9	99.9	7	100.0	8	100.0
Relevance of skills												
Below average	2	13.3	1	12.5	3	11.5	2	22.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Average	11	73.3	7	87.5	19	73.1	3	33.3	7	100.0	9	100.0
<u>Above average</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>15.4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	15	99.9	8	100.0	26	100.0	9	99.9	7	100.0	9	100.0
Group climate												
Below average	2	14.3	1	12.5	7	26.9	3	33.3	2	28.6	0	0.0
Average	9	64.3	7	87.5	14	53.8	3	33.3	5	71.4	8	88.9
<u>Above average</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>21.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>19.2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11.1</u>
Total	14	100.0	8	100.0	26	99.9	9	99.9	7	100.0	9	100.0

Appendix O. Continued.

Scale	Jefferson		South Dekalb		Lyons		Statesboro		South Metro		South Richmond	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adherence to social learning methods												
Below average	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1
Average	6	75.0	10	76.9	4	100.0	6	75.0	6	50.0	7	77.8
<u>Above average</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>23.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11.1</u>
Total	8	100.0	13	100.0	4	100.0	8	100.0	12	100.0	9	100.0
Relevance of skills												
Below average	1	12.5	3	23.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1
Average	7	87.5	8	61.5	4	100.0	6	75.0	9	69.2	7	77.8
<u>Above average</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>15.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>30.8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11.1</u>
Total	8	100.0	13	100.0	4	100.0	8	100.0	13	100.0	9	100.0
Group climate												
Below average	2	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.7	3	33.3
Average	6	75.0	10	76.9	3	75.0	8	100.0	6	46.2	6	66.7
<u>Above average</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>23.1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>46.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	8	100.0	13	100.0	4	100.0	8	100.0	13	100.1	9	100.0

Appendix O. Continued.

Scale	<u>Hartwell</u>		<u>Coastal St. Prison</u>		<u>Whitworth Detention Center</u>		<u>Metro St. Prison</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adherence to social learning methods								
Below average	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.6	3	12.0
Average	8	53.3	7	70.0	30	83.3	13	52.0
<u>Above average</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>46.7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>30.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>36.0</u>
Total	15	100.0	10	100.0	36	100.0	25	100.0
Relevance of skills								
Below average	0	0.0	1	10.0	7	19.4	2	7.7
Average	10	66.7	5	50.0	25	69.4	14	53.8
<u>Above average</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>38.5</u>
Total	15	100.0	10	100.0	36	99.9	26	100.0
Group climate								
Below average	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	25.0	4	15.4
Average	12	80.0	6	60.0	24	66.7	17	65.4
<u>Above average</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>19.2</u>
Total	15	100.0	10	100.0	26	100.0	26	100.0

Appendix P. Participant Evaluation scales descriptives for program groups without comparison groups.

Scales ¹	Range	Mean	S. D.	Percent above neutral ²	N ³
Adherence to social learning methods	2.9-5.0	4.9	0.5	96.9	64
Relevance of skills to participant	3.0-5.0	4.2	0.5	96.0	75
Group climate	2.0-5.0	4.0	0.6	89.1	64
Not including the Cognitive Skills meetings, how many times per month did you meet with your supervising parole officer while you were in the Cognitive Skills program?	1.0-4.0	2.1	1.2		

¹ Higher values indicate more positive assessments.

² Scores above 3.0 are considered to be “above neutral,” as the value “3” corresponds with “no opinion” and high scores indicate more positive assessment.

³ Scores for the scales were computed only for cases with responses to each of the items that made up the particular scales; cases with data missing on an item that comprises the scale are not represented in the results.

Appendix Q. Participant Evaluation responses from groups without comparison groups by district.¹⁰

Scale	Dahlonaga		Fitzgerald		Columbus		LaGrange		Jefferson	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adherence to social learning methods										
Below average	2	28.6	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	7.1	0	0.
Average ¹¹	5	71.4	4	50.0	6	85.7	11	78.6	0	0.
<u>Above average</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.</u>
Total	7	100.0	8	100.0	7	100.0	14	100.0	0	0.
Relevance of skills										
Below average	1	14.3	0	0.0	2	28.6	1	6.7	4	40.
Average	6	85.7	7	87.5	5	71.4	10	66.7	3	30.
<u>Above average</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>26.7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>30.</u>
Total	7	100.0	8	100.0	7	100.0	15	100.1	10	100.
Group climate										
Below average	2	28.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	14.3	0	0.
Average	4	57.1	5	62.5	6	85.7	8	57.1	0	0.
<u>Above average</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.</u>
Total	7	100.0	8	100.0	7	100.0	14	100.0	0	0.

¹⁰ Included in this table are responses made by group members who completed the program.

¹¹ The “average” category is defined as the values that fall within one standard deviation of the mean of the scale for all of the districts combined.

Appendix Q. Continued.

Scale	<u>Carrolton</u>		<u>Douglas</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Adherence to social learning methods				
Below average	0	0.0	0	0.0
Average ¹²	3	60.0	5	71.4
<u>Above average</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>
Total	5	100.0	7	100.0
Relevance of skills				
Below average	0	0.0	0	0.0
Average	3	60.0	5	71.4
<u>Above average</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>
Total	5	100.0	7	100.0
Group climate				
Below average	1	20.0	0	0.0
Average	4	80.0	5	71.4
<u>Above average</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>
Total	5	100.0	7	100.0

¹² The “average” category is defined as the values that fall within one standard deviation of the mean of the scale for all of the districts combined.

Notes.

¹ The Phase I process report noted that offenders were not as carefully screened into the pool of study participants as they might have been. Study participants included a high proportion of low risk offenders, several offenders with low IQs, and some sex offenders. The concern about subject retention was raised because 8% of the experimental group never began the program, and 40% did not complete the program. Problems with the accuracy of recording data were evidenced by a high instance of missing data and some indication of response sets, where ratings were the same on all variables for each client on the Session Evaluation data.

² The experimental group has 25 more members than the comparison group for two reasons. First, odd numbers of individuals on 13 lists of offenders submitted to the parole board central office to be randomly assigned resulted in 10 study groups having one more person in the experimental rather than comparison group. Three study groups had an extra person in the comparison group. Second, six study groups had larger experimental than comparison groups in an effort to create suitable class sizes. For instance, a particular parole district submitted a list of 12 offenders to be randomly assigned. Seven of those offenders were assigned through randomized procedures to the experimental group so that the class size would be adequate, allowing for the likelihood of individuals dropping out of the program.

³ Identification of high risk offenders to be included in the study was based on parole officer and corrections officer impressions rather than through the use of an actuarial assessment of risk.

⁴ Unlike other data sources for which the availability of data refer to only the experimental group, the background measures and social and demographic characteristics and criminal history data collected refer to both the experimental and control group. This is necessary as these data for the control group are used to test the adherence to the experimental design.

⁵ Of the 52 groups participating in the study, 22 (42.3%) submitted full sets of participant evaluation data for those who completed the course. Eleven groups were missing 25% or more participant evaluation forms for the class completers, including one group that did not submit any participant evaluations.

⁶ No established index of social class was used for this purpose. The prison diagnostic counselors were guided by criteria for each of the categories. These are as follows: a) welfare (receiving some form of public assistance at the time of incarceration, regardless of other income), b) occasionally employed (occasionally employed), c) minimum standard (annual income meets the government's Minimum Standard of Living for a family of 4), d) middle class (making more than the Minimum Standard of Living and having some resources, such as property, savings or investments).

⁷ To be included in the measures of average level of participation, enjoyment, and understanding, parolees must have attended at least one of the five sessions from which these data derive. The unit of analysis for the average group atmosphere is class or group. A total of 52 experimental groups participated in Phase II of the evaluation. One group did not report on group atmosphere.

⁸ Typically, scales with Chronbach's alphas of at least .80 are considered reliable (Carmines and Zeller, 1979).

⁹ The factor analysis used principal components extraction and varimax rotation.

¹⁰ The items used to create the three scales all have factor loadings of at least .05 on factors with total rotated sums of squares loadings greater than three.

¹¹ The participants in Phase II are older than those in Phase I. In Phase I, 80% of the experimental group were between the ages of 18 and 35, with a median age of 27 years.

¹² The level of adherence to the screening criteria for Phase II is similar to Phase I, with the exception that fewer low-risk offenders participated in Phase II. Sixty-seven percent of Phase I study participants were low risk.

¹³ The necessary use of a non-standardized risk measure for the Georgia studies would make this possibility more likely. In Phase I the risk measure was predictive of recidivism, but the cutoff between categories may be higher than other, validated risk assessments.

¹⁴ Group distributions are considered to be “nearly identical” if differences are less than four percent.

¹⁵ In Phase I, the completion rates ranged from 42% to 80% across districts. The average completion rate was 60%.

¹⁶ The outcome study will indicate the observer evaluation ratings that translate into better program outcomes.

¹⁷ The analysis of the participant evaluation scales include responses made by participants who completed the program and filled out the participant evaluation survey.

¹⁸ Women participated in the program primarily in an institutional setting. For this reason, comparisons across sexes are limited to male participants in institutional settings.

¹⁹ Scores above 3.0 are considered to be “above neutral,” as the value “3” corresponds with “no opinion” and high scores indicate more positive assessment.

²⁰ Due to the small number of offenders included in the comparisons across sexes, the proportions presented here are sensitive to fluctuations.