

129725

REGISTRY OF RANDOMIZED CRIMINAL JUSTICE
EXPERIMENTS IN SANCTIONS

David Weisburd
Rutgers University
and Crime Control Institute

Lawrence Sherman
University of Maryland
and Crime Control Institute

and

Anthony J. Petrosino
Rutgers University
88-IJ-CX-007

September 1990

129725

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~material~~ material has been granted by
Public Domain/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction.....i
Criteria for Inclusion.....ii
Classification and Organization of the Experiments.....iii
Organization of the Registry and Abbreviations Used.....iv
Chronological List of the Experiments in the Sample.....iv
"A" Experiments.....1
"B" Experiments.....48
"C" Experiments.....59

"A"
Experiments

Introduction

In recent years there has been a growth of interest in randomized experiments in criminal justice. This registry was developed to provide a comprehensive view of the methods and problems that have to date dominated experimental research in this area. We have attempted to identify all experiments that could be located through English-language publications. The search was limited to studies that utilized criminal justice sanctions and measured individual recidivism.

Our definition of sanctions is very broad. For example, we include not only experiments that evaluated arrests or probation or parole interventions, but also those that were seen by researchers as primarily evaluations of criminal justice treatments added onto traditional sanctions. Although these latter experiments stretch the boundaries of what are commonly thought of as sanctions, because they were coercive and conducted by a criminal justice agent, we believed that they were in many ways similar to more traditional sanctioning studies. In any case, such experiments are separated from others we examined and may be excluded if the reader so desires. All the experiments included coercive conditions, but we identify in the registry cases where subjects could refuse a less harsh condition (for example, a half-way house as opposed to a prison).

Each entry in the registry provides articles in which the experiment is reported as well as reviews where it is discussed. There is also a brief description of the program evaluated and the basic research findings. Major methodological flaws are identified in the registry. Details about each of the experiments were coded in a data base that was developed along with the registry (see "Codebook for SPSS Data Set - Experiments in Sanctions," David Weisburd, Lawrence J. Sherman and Anthony J. Petrosino).

We would like to thank the National Institute of Justice for its support in developing this work (under NIJ grant # 88-IJ-CX-0007). The opinions and comments expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Criteria for Inclusion

- 1) Individuals as the unit of analysis
- 2) Random allocation of individuals (or random allocation of individuals within pairs or blocks)
- 3) Outcome measures addressing such issues as crime, prevalence, incidence, seriousness, time to failure, or other constructs, and including any of the following:
 - a) police field interrogation;
 - b) arrest or ticket in the field;
 - c) stationhouse arrest;
 - d) charging;
 - e) conviction;
 - f) violation of probation, parole or similar type of indicator
- 4) Independent variable (i.e., the "sanction" imposed) was:
 - a) governmentally imposed by a public criminal justice agent;
 - b) a coercive condition or experience; and
 - c) imposed:
 - i) in response to an act defined by the government as a crime; or
 - ii) in anticipation of a possible future crime
- 5) A minimum sample of 15 cases for at least two of the groups studied

Classification and Organization of the Experiments

- "A" - Experiments that compare a sanction with no sanction (e.g., prison with no prison or arrest versus no arrest) or a more severe sanction with a less severe sanction (e.g., more probation supervision versus less supervision or longer versus shorter prison terms)
- "B" - Experiments that measure the effects of various sanctions which are difficult to order in terms of severity (e.g., treatment groups in a juvenile facility or several different types of probation programs that do not involve differences in intensity of supervision)
- "C" - Experiments that measure the effects of coercive "treatments" which are added onto traditional sanctions (e.g., group counseling programs in a prison)

Organization of the Registry

- 1) Experiments are presented according to type (A, B, C).
- 2) Within each type, the experiments are in chronological order.

Abbreviations Used in this Registry

Within the descriptions of the experiments, the following abbreviations are used:

- "C" - control group
- "E" - experimental group
- "N" - number of subjects
- "P" - the significance or alpha level
- "PI" - the principal investigator of the study

Chronological List of the Experiments
(by year experiment began)

	<u>Page</u>
(1951) Copenhagen Short-Term Offender Experiment (C).....	60
(1953) California Special Intensive Parole Experiment - Phase I (A).....	2
(1955) California Pico Experiment (C).....	61
(1956) California Special Intensive Parole Experiment - Phase II (A).....	3
(1957) Fricot Ranch Delinquent Dormitory Experiment (B).....	49
(1959) California Short-Term Psychiatric Treatment Experiments(C).....	62
(1959) California Parole Research Project Experiment (A).....	4
(1959) English Psychopathic Delinquent Experiment (A).....	5
(1959) Utah Provo Experiment (A).....	6
(1960) California Paso Robles and Youth Training Center Group Counseling Experiments (C).....	63
(1961) California Juvenile CTP Phase I Experiments (A).....	8
(1961) California Group Counseling Prison Experiment (C).....	64
(1961) California Fremont Program Experiment (B).....	51
(1963) California Juvenile Probation and Group Counseling Experiment(C).....	65
(1963) English Police Cautioning Experiment (A).....	10
(1964) English Borstal Allocation Experiment (B).....	52
(1964) San Diego (CA) Chronic Drunk Offender Experiment (C).....	66
(1964) Kentucky Village Psychotherapy Experiment (C).....	67
(1964) Fairfield School for Boys Experiment (C).....	68
(1965) California Crofton House Experiment (A).....	11
(1965) California Parole Work Unit Experiment (A).....	12
(1965) English Juvenile Therapeutic Community Experiment (B).....	53
(1965) Los Angeles Silverlake Experiment (A).....	13
(1966) California Preston School Typology Experiment (B).....	54
(1966) Los Angeles Community Delinquency Control Project Experiment(A).....	14
(1968) California Juvenile Behavior Modification and Transactional Analysis Experiment (B).....	55
(1968) English Prison Intensive Social Work Experiment (C).....	69
(1968) Iowa Problem Driver Experiment (A) *.....	15
(1969) Denver Drunk Driving Sentencing Experiment (A).....	16
(1969) Florida Inmate Work Release Experiment (A).....	17
(1969) Ohio Juvenile Probationer Behavior Modification Experiment(C).....	70
(1970) California Reduced Prison Sentence Experiment (A).....	18

Chronological List of the Experiments (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
(1970) California Unofficial Probation Experiment (A).....	19
(1970) Minneapolis Informal Parole Experiment (A).....	20
(1970) Sacramento (CA) Juvenile 601 Diversion Experiment (A)....	21
(1971) California Ellsworth House Experiment (A).....	22
(1971) Illinois Volunteer Lawyer Parole Supervision Experiment(A).....	23
(1971) English Intensive Probation Experiments (A).....	24
(1971) Tacoma Juvenile Inmate Modeling and Group Discussion Experiment(C).....	71
(1972) Sacramento (CA) Juvenile 602 Diversion Experiment (A)....	25
(1973) Canadian I-Level Maturity Probation Experiment (B).....	56
(1973) English Intensive Welfare Experiment (C).....	72
(1973) San Fernando (CA) Juvenile Crisis Intervention Experiment(A).....	26
(1974) Juvenile Diversion and Labeling Paradigm Experiment (A)..	27
(1975) Leeds (UK) Truancy Experiment (B).....	57
(1975) San Pablo (CA) Adult Diversion Experiment (A).....	29
(1975) Pinellas County (FL) Juvenile Services Program Experiment(A).....	30
(1975) Washington, D.C., Pretrial Supervision Experiment (A)....	31
(1976) California Early Parole Discharge Experiment (A).....	32
(1976) California Summary Parole Experiment (A).....	33
(1976) Clark County (WA) Status Offender Deinstitution- alization Experiment (A).....	34
(1976) Florida Project Crest Experiment (C).....	73
(1976) Memphis Drunk Driving Sanctioning Experiments (A).....	35
(1976) North Carolina Butner Correctional Facility Experiment(A).....	36
(1977) Memphis Juvenile Diversion Experiment (A).....	37
(1977) Wayne County (MI) Project Start Experiment (A).....	38
(1977) Vera Institute (NY) Pretrial Adult Felony Offender Diversion Experiment (A).....	39
(1977) Hamilton (Canada) Juvenile Services Project Experiment(A).....	41
(1977) San Quentin (CA) Squires Program Experiment (C).....	74
(1978) Illinois Juvenile Tours Experiment (C).....	75
(1978) Michigan Juvenile Offenders Learn Truth (JOLT) Experiment(C).....	76
(1978) New Jersey Juvenile Awareness Program (Scared Straight) Experiment(C).....	77
(1980) National Juvenile Diversion Experiments (A) *.....	42

Chronological List of the Experiments (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
(1981) National Restitution Experiments (A).....	43
(1981) Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment (A).....	45
(1981) Ramsey County (MN) Community Assistance Program Experiment(C).....	78
(1983) Police Foundation Shoplifting Arrest Experiment (A).....	47
(1984) Ontario (Canada) Social Interaction Training Experiment(C).....	79

* These experiments have not been included in the data base ("SPSS Data Set - Experiments in Sanctions") due to insufficient information in published materials.

(1953) California Special Intensive Parole Experiment - Phase I - A

Report by Principal Investigators -

Reimer, E. and M. Warren (1957). "Special Intensive Parole Unit: Relationship between Violation Rate and Initially Small Caseload." National Probation and Parole Association Journal vol. 3 (3): 222-229.

Summary

Adult male parolees were randomly assigned to one of two groups: an experimental group or to a control group. The experimental group was placed under the supervision of the Special Intensive Parole Unit (SIPU) for six months with agents who had tri-monthly caseloads of 15. After six months, the experimental subjects received regular parole supervision. Control subjects received regular parole supervision for the entire exposure period with agents who had tri-monthly caseloads of 90.

Major arrests and parole suspension rates were reported for three time frames: the first 13 months, the second 10 months and the total 28-month period. During the first phase, the experimental group showed significantly lower recidivism [E: arrested = 13.1%, suspended = 16.5% (N = 823); C: arrested = 18.8%, suspended = 24.9% (N = 1126)]. After the second phase, the control group had significantly lower major arrest and suspension rates [E: arrested = 15.5%, suspended = 16.5% (N = 656); C: arrested = 12.7%, suspended = 15.1 (N = 1188)]. Overall, the experimental group showed lower parole suspension rates than the control group [E: arrested = 14.2%, suspended = 15.7% (N = 1479); C: arrested = 15.7%, suspended = 16.5% (N = 2314)]. *

* A difference of proportions test confirmed the PIs' statement that the difference was significant ($p < .001$).

(1956) California Special Intensive Parole Experiment -
Phase II - A

Report by Principal Investigators -

Reimer, E. and M. Warren (1958). Special Intensive Parole
Unit. Phase II. Thirty-Man Caseload Study. Sacramento:
California Department of Corrections.

Summary

In the second SIPU experimental study, parolees were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The experimental group received intensive parole supervision for six months with agents who had caseloads of thirty men (6 men per month). The subjects were then assigned to regular parole. Control group subjects received regular supervision throughout the entire exposure period. Control group parole agents had caseloads of ninety men (or 30 per month). Those in the experimental group received more contact with their agents than the control subjects received from their agents.

Two time frames were examined and no significant differences were reported between the groups on three measures: arrests [E: after 6 months - 39.6%, after 12 months - 54.5% (N = 1590); C: after 6 months - 39.8%, after 12 months - 56.7% (N = 2954)]; parole violations; and time to first arrest.

One problem cited by the PIs was the significant over-representation of first-time parolees allocated to the experimental group. In their opinion, this produced a biased sample because first-time parolees are considered better risks than other parolees. In addition, random allocation may have broken down at some points: the PIs stated that in certain months all subjects were sent to the experimental group due to shortages in the allocation sample.

(1959) California Parole Research Project Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigator -

Johnson, B.M. (1962). Parole Performance of the First Year's Releases: Parole Research Project: Evaluation of Reduced Caseloads. Research Report No. 27. Sacramento: California Youth Authority.

Johnson, B.M. (1962a). An Analysis of Predictions of Parole Performance and of Judgments of Supervision in the Parole Research Project. Research Report No. 32. Sacramento: California Youth Authority.

Summary

Male inmates paroled by the California Youth Authority were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 198) received supervision by agents with reduced caseloads. Each parole agent supervised 36 subjects. The assumption was that reduced caseloads would lead to intensive contact and supervision. The control group (N = 166) received supervision by agents with normal caseloads of 72 subjects.

There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups in outcome measures of parole failure after 6, 12 and 18 months. Differential effects were noted by the principal investigator: first commitments (those never released previously on parole) did much better in the experimental group than in the control group.

The strength and integrity of the intensive supervision was questioned in a later report (Johnson, 1962a). Some control subjects received more contact with their agents than experimental subjects received from theirs, despite the lower caseloads among the parole agents for the latter group. When the level of supervision was classified by actual intensity, a strong relationship was found between parole success and increased contact.

(1959) English Psychopathic Delinquent Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigators -

Craft, M., G. Stephenson and C. Granger (1964). "A
Controlled Trial of Authoritarian and Self-Governing
Regimes With Adolescent Psychopaths." American Journal of
Orthopsychiatry vol. 34: 543-554.

Summary

Fifty male delinquents, ages 13-25 years (IQ over 59), who were referred to Balderton Hospital for psychiatric treatment were randomly allocated to one of two wards: the experimental ward (N = 25) emphasized a "self-governed regime" with intensive group psychotherapy; the control ward (N = 25) used an "authoritarian regime" emphasizing strict discipline. The groups were exposed to the wards for one year.

Reconviction rates after 3 years were compared for the two groups. No statistical significance or test results were given, but the PIs stated that the control group had "significantly fewer offenses after release than the experimental group" (based on sample sizes - after death and reassignment - of 21 for the experimental group and 23 for the control group).

(1959) Utah Provo Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Empey, L.T. and J. Rabow (1961). "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation." American Sociological Review 26 (5): 679-696.

Empey, L.T. and M.L. Erickson (1972). The Provo Experiment. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co.

Review -

Lundman, R.J. (1984). Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Oxford University Press.

Summary

Male delinquents (described as habitual property and person offenders, mean age = 16.5 years) from working-class backgrounds were sentenced to either the state training school or to traditional probation. Once sentenced, they were randomly allocated to the experimental group or to their original disposition (the training school or probation).

The experimental group was designed to treat delinquency within the peer-group setting. No individual counseling sessions were held. A non-residential (boys went home at night) community-based facility with a strong emphasis on work was set up at Pinehills (the program center). Decisions for offenders at Pinehills were made by the residents. Guided group interaction (GGI) sessions were held weekly. The average exposure to the experimental setting was 5-6 months, after which attempts were made to find employment for subjects and continue linkage to a peer reference group.

The PIs noted that the caseflow level was not sufficient to randomize to the incarceration groups. To compensate, a comparison group of training school subjects was examined. As noted by Lundman (1984), only the outcomes for the Provo experimental and traditional probation groups followed true experimental guidelines.

Utah Provo Experiment (cont.)

There were no significant differences between the Provo experimental group (N = 62) and the traditional probation group (N = 69) in mean number of arrests per juvenile during the 4 years in which subjects were followed [Year 1: E = .55; probation = .70 - Year 2: E = .97; probation = .93 - Year 3: E = 1.24; probation = 1.01 - Year 4: E = 1.32; probation = 1.42].

(1961) California Juvenile CTP Phase I Experiments - A
- (includes two experiments) **

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Stark, H.G. (1963). "A Substitute for Institutionalization of Serious Delinquents. A California Youth Study Experiment." Crime and Delinquency 9: 242-248.

Warren, M.Q. (1967). "The Community Treatment Project: History and Prospects." Pp. 191-200 in S.A. Yefsky (ed.) Law Enforcement Science and Technology. Washington, D.C.: Thompson Book Company.

Palmer, T.B. (1971). "California's Community Treatment Program for Delinquent Adolescents." The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency vol. 8 (1): 74-92.

Palmer, T.B. (1974). "The Youth Authority's Community Treatment Project." Federal Probation vol. 38 (1): 3-14.

Reviews -

Glaser, D. (1965). "Correctional Research: An Elusive Paradigm." The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency vol. 2 (1) 1-11.

Lerman, P. (1968). "Evaluative Studies of Institutions for Delinquents: Implications for Research and Social Policy." Social Work (July): 55-64.

Summary

Male and female offenders committed to the California Youth Authority were deemed eligible for stratified random allocation in two separate experiments. In the Sacramento-Stockton area, eligible subjects were assigned to the experimental group (N = 396) under the auspices of the Community Treatment Program (CTP) or to the control group (N = 305) where the subjects were institutionalized and released to traditional parole. Once sent

** Each of the experiments included in these reports was analyzed separately in the data base ("SPSS Data Set - Experiments in Sanctions").

California Juvenile CTP Phase I Experiments (cont.)

to the experimental or CTP group, the subjects were classified according to their I-Level maturity levels and assigned to parole agents "matched" to that maturity level. Intensive community parole was utilized with an emphasis on treatment to meet the offenders' needs. The subjects in the two groups were not statistically different on any pretest comparison measures (i.e., age, IQ, socio-economic status of family, race, type of offense, etc.).

A two-year review of parole failure was provided for boys and girls in both groups [E: boys = 44%, girls = 34% ; C: boys = 64%, girls = 48%], with the experimental subjects performing better. No information about statistical significance was given.

In the San Francisco experiment, eligible subjects were randomly assigned to three groups. The experimental group (N = 125) was assigned to CTP. The control group (N = 23) received regular CYA institutionalization and parole. The third group (N = 165) was a community-based parole unit specializing in Guided Group Interaction (GGI). Again, the 24-month follow-up of parole failure demonstrated a lower percentage of experimental subjects failing when compared to either the GGI group or the control group [E: boys = 46%, girls = 33%; GGI: boys = 66%, girls = 59%; C: boys = 64%, girls = 0%¹

Lerman (1968) noted that the rate of serious offending in the CTP experiments was lower for control subjects. He speculated that the higher parole failure rate for controls was due to leniency on the part of experimental agents toward the minor violations committed by subjects under their supervision.

1 There were too few female cases in the control group in the San Francisco experiment to provide a meaningful comparison with the other groups.

(1963) English Police Cautioning Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigators -

Rose, G. and R.A. Hamilton (1970). "Effects of a Juvenile Liaison Scheme." British Journal of Criminology vol. 10 (1): 2-20.

Summary

This experiment randomly assigned 394 boys who had committed minor (first-time) offenses to one of two groups: a group (N = 200) which received a caution from the police and another group (N = 194) which received the same type of caution along with a six-month supervision period administered by a Juvenile Liaison Officer. The criteria for study inclusion were as follows: the offender had to admit guilt, the offender's family had to give full cooperation for the assignment and the complainant had to agree not to prosecute the case.

The PIs concluded that supervision showed no significant effect on recidivism rates in the 2 years following the treatments (i.e., recidivism rates at 24 months: caution group = 25.5%; supervision group = 26.8%). The PIs cited two problems which may have affected the findings: a) there was no way to know the quality of the supervision by the JLOs; and b) it was difficult to show that the treatment had an impact on the type of low-risk offenders examined here.

(1965) California Crofton House Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigator -

Kirby, B.C. (1969). "Crofton House: An Experiment With a County Halfway House." Federal Probation (Mar): 53-58.

Summary

Men assigned to incarceration at one of five San Diego rural camps were then randomly allocated to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 88) was assigned to the Crofton House, a community residential center where the men served their entire sentences. At Crofton, full-time employment, group counseling sessions and inmate self-government were emphasized. The control group (N = 85) stayed at the rural work camps and received custodial care with a rehabilitative focus.

Recidivism rates for the groups were not significantly different in post-release measures made at 3, 9 and 18 months. Summary statistics and failure criteria were not reported.

(1965) California Parole Work Unit Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigator -

Burkhart, W. (1969). "The Parole Work Unit Programme: An Evaluation." British Journal of Criminology: 125-147.

Summary

Parolees from California were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 302) received parole supervision from the Work Unit Programme in which offenders were classified as poor, medium and good risks. The parole agent then modified the extent of contact to meet the level of risk. Poor risks received 3-4 hours of monthly contact, medium risks received 1-2 hours of contact, while good risks received 0-1 hour of contact. The control group (N = 2688) was assigned to conventional parole supervision, which averaged 30 minutes of contact monthly between the agent and parolee.

Results were reported for 6, 12 and 24 months. No significant differences in subsequent felony commitments or returns to prison emerged. Two problems were noted by the PI: a) randomization was violated to satisfy caseload fluctuations (1969: 134); and b) control group agents viewed the experiment as a competition, affecting the delivery of services and inhibiting differences between the treatments from emerging.

(1965) Los Angeles Silverlake Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigators -

Empey, L.T. and S.G. Lubeck (1971). The Silverlake Experiment. Chicago: Aldine.

Review -

Lundman, R.J. (1984). Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Oxford University Press.

Summary

Male delinquents from working-class families (mean age = 16 years, 75% white) who had been sentenced to "Boys Republic" (an open institution with moderate concern for custody) were allocated randomly to experimental and control groups. The experimental group (N = 140) was reassigned to a group home in a middle-class residential neighborhood. Those living in the home participated in daily Guided Group Interaction (GGI) sessions, attended neighborhood public schools and performed housekeeping chores. On weekends they went home to their families. The experimental conditions were designed to provide the groups with "linkage" to the community (and law-abiding values). The control group (N = 121) went to the Boys Republic as originally sentenced. That facility stressed "citizenship, education, work and discipline" (Empey and Lubeck, 1971: 5).

The results of the experiment were reported for the 12-month period following program exposure for both groups. There was no significant difference between the groups in the percentage of subjects rearrested [Silverlake = 60%; Boys Republic = 56%].

Lundman (1984), in his review of the Silverlake experiment, noted that the opposition of the community and the schools to the group home caused serious compromises in the Silverlake program (e.g., the group home became more punitive to cater to the school's demand for greater control).

(1966) Los Angeles Community Delinquency Control Project
Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigator -

Pond, E.M. (1970). The Los Angeles Community Delinquency Control Project: An Experiment in the Rehabilitation of Delinquents in an Urban Community. Sacramento, CA: Department of the Youth Authority.

Summary

Delinquent males were randomly allocated to the experimental Community Delinquency Control Project (CDCP) parole group (N = 180) or to traditional California Youth Authority institutionalization and parole (N = 121). CDCP utilized an intensive community- and treatment-oriented approach with an average caseload per officer of 25. All subjects in the study had completed at least 15 months on parole.

No significant differences were found between the groups in the percentage of parole revocations after 15 months [E = 52.7%; C = 52.8%]. In addition, no differences were found between the groups on the following measures: percent rearrested [E = 22.7%; C = 24.7%]; mean months to first rearrest [E = 4.75; C = 5.4]; and mean days in custody [E = 59.2; C = 62.3].

(1968) Iowa Problem Driver Experiment - A *

Report by Principal Investigator -

Schuster, D.H. (1974). "The Effectiveness of Official Action Taken Against Problem Drivers: A Five-Year Follow-Up." Journal of Safety Research 6 (4): 171-176.

Summary

After interviewing a problem driver (i.e., one with moving violations or numerous accidents), the highway patrol examiner decided upon the normal course of action that he or she would have taken with that person. After that decision was made, the case was randomly assigned to one of three treatment conditions: "more severe," "normal," or "less severe."

The more-severe-condition subjects received a sanction harsher than the examiner's original course of action (N = 76). "Normal" condition subjects received the examiner's intended disposition (N = 95). "Less severe" subjects received a disposition less onerous than the originally intended course of action (N = 101).

No difference in subsequent moving violations was noticed in the 5-year analysis. Drivers who were given the less severe sanction, however, did have significantly higher involvement in accidents than the other two groups during the first year. Summary statistics were not reported.

Two methodological concerns were discussed by Schuster. Randomization may have been violated since there was some disparity between the groups on critical variables. Attrition from the groups was examined and found to be statistically insignificant.

* This experiment has not been included in the data base ("SPSS Data Set - Experiments in Sanctions") due to insufficient information in published materials.

(1969) Denver Drunk Driving Sentencing Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Ross, H.L. and M. Blumenthal (1974). "Sanctions for the Drinking Driver: An Experimental Study." The Journal of Legal Studies (3): 53-61.

Ross, H.L. and M. Blumenthal (1975). "Some Problems in Experimentation in a Legal Setting." The American Sociologist 10 (Aug): 150-155.

Summary

Drunk drivers were allocated, using an alternate-month scheme, to one of three groups by municipal court judges: the first group (N = 166) received fines, the second (N = 157) received conventional probation and the third (N = 164) received therapeutic probation (counseling and education programs stressed).

There were no significant differences between the groups on the following measures: violations; time to first arrest; and violation points.

The PIs cited one major problem in the way the study was implemented - assignment was overridden. The judges had agreed to allocate by month (i.e., all drunk drivers in January would go to the fine group, etc.), but in practice they often circumvented the process (after consultation with defense attorneys). In addition, defense attorneys would consistently file for continuances to postpone clients' cases until they were heard in the "fine" months.

(1969) Florida Inmate Work Release Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigators -

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

Summary

Subjects from an eligible pool of adult inmates were randomly assigned to the experimental work release group (N = 188) for a period of 2 to 6 months or to the control group (N = 93) regular correctional involvement.

A 46-month follow-up revealed no statistically significant differences between the groups on 18 measures of recidivism (e.g., percent arrested: E = 70.4%; C = 66.7%). The principal investigators concluded that "no more than chance differences can be observed in the experimental and control groups that have been arrested, booked, charged, convicted, or charged and convicted for a serious offense" (Waldo and Chiricos, 1977: 93). Significant differences in levels of recidivism were also not found for those who were exposed to the work release regime for less than 82 days compared to those exposed for more than 82 days.

(1970) California Reduced Prison Sentence Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigators ..

Berecochea, J.E. and D.R. Jaman (1981). Time Served in Prison and Parole Outcome: An Experimental Study. Report Number 2. Sacramento: California Department of Corrections Research Division.

Berecochea, J.E., D.R. Jaman, W.A. Jones (1973). Time Served in Prison and Parole Outcome: An Experimental Study. Report Number 1. Sacramento: California Department of Corrections Research Division.

Reanalysis -

Cook and Boswick (1988). Personal correspondence.

Summary

Adult male felons with at least 6 months remaining on their prison sentences were randomly assigned (following careful screening by the California Adult Authority) to two groups: an experimental group which received a 6-month-early release or to the control group which finished out the original sentence.

The follow-up time intervals of one and two years revealed no significant differences between the groups with regard to recidivism rates (i.e., a favorable parole outcome) [Year 1: E = 65.5% (N = 564); C = 71.8% (N = 574) and Year 2: E = 52.6% (N = 563); C = 60.5% (N = 572)].

Cook and Boswick (1988) argued that the chi square result, given for outcomes after two years, was misleading because it included "pending" cases. When the pending category (N = 11) was dropped from the chi-square analysis, a statistically significant deterrent effect emerged for the control group.

(1970) California Unofficial Probation Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigator -

Venezia, P.S. (1972). "Unofficial Probation: An Evaluation of its Effectiveness." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency vol. 9 (2): 149-170.

Summary

Juveniles eligible for unofficial probation as an alternative to adjudication (e.g., those who admitted guilt and whose families consented to the sanction) were randomly allocated to one of two groups: the experimental group (N = 65) which received "unofficial probation" or the control group (N = 58) which was counseled and released. "Unofficial probation" involved assignment to a probation officer with many of the same services available to formal probationers being made available to these subjects.

Three measures were used to assess differences between the groups after six months: percentage of group referred to probation [E = 18.5%; C = 27.6%]; mean number of days before first referral [E = 115.33; C = 82.08] and number of petitions filed [E = 5; C = 7]. The PI concluded that there were no statistically significant differences in the recidivism rates of the two groups.

(1970) Minneapolis Informal Parole Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Hudson, C.H. (1973). An Experimental Study of the Differential Effects of Parole Supervision for a Group of Adolescent Boys and Girls. Summary Report. Minneapolis: Minnesota Department of Corrections.

Hudson, J. and C.D. Hollister (1976). "An Experimental Study of Parole Supervision of Juveniles and Social Service Utilization." Iowa Journal of Social Work 4: 80-89.

Summary

Eligible youth parolees² under the supervision of the Minnesota Youth Commission were randomly assigned to "informal parole supervision" (experimental group, N = 120) or regular parole supervision (control group, N = 114). Informal parole was an assignment used by the PI to circumvent the restriction by the Commission that the experiment could not discharge youths from parole early. Informal parolees were given only two restrictions: a) obey the laws of the community and b) notify parole officers if they intended to move from the community. The PI stated that the experimental group "clearly understood no other contact with the parole officer was necessary" (1973: 3).

Post-release behavior was followed for 10 months. The PI noted a statistically significant reduction in parole revocation rates for the experimental boys only [E = 21%; C = 38%].

Hudson and Hollister (1976:88) questioned the view that parole supervision is needed to provide linkage between youths and community resources. They found that experimental subjects had had as many contacts with agencies as subjects had had in the supervised control group.

² Criteria for elimination from sample include the following:
a) officially known involvement in arson or rape;
b) diagnosis of severe emotional disturbance;
c) release would be to place other than legal parental home; and
d) consistent record of assaults.

(1970) Sacramento (CA) Juvenile 601 Diversion Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Baron, R., F. Feeney and W.E. Thornton (1972). Preventing Delinquency Through Diversion. The Sacramento County Probation Department 601 Diversion Project. A First Year Report. Sacramento: Sacramento County Probation Department.

Baron, R., F. Feeney and W. Thornton (1973). "Preventing Delinquency Through Diversion." Federal Probation vol. 37 (1): 13-18.

Summary

Juveniles defined as 601 status offenders (runaways, truants, or those beyond the control of parents) were randomly assigned to one of two groups: the experimental group (N = 558) which received the services of the 601 Diversion Project (family and individual counseling, etc.) and the control group (N = 803) which went through the Juvenile Court.

A 7-month analysis revealed lower rates for the experimental group on the percentage of the group "rebooked" for any offenses [E = 35%; C = 45.5%] and for status offenses only [E = 15.3%; C = 23.4%]. Statistical significance was not reported.

(1971) California Ellsworth House Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Lamb, H.R. and V. Goertzel (1974). "Ellsworth House: A Community Alternative to Jail." The American Journal of Psychiatry vol. 131 (1): 64-68.

Lamb, H.R. and V. Goertzel (1974). "A Community Alternative to County Jail: The Hopes and the Realities." Federal Probation 38 (1): 33-39.

Summary

Jailed inmates serving at least 4 months were randomly allocated to one of two groups: the experimental group which was sent to the Ellsworth House (a community rehabilitation center emphasizing therapeutic treatment) or to the control group which received continuations of the jail sentences previously imposed. The assignment to Ellsworth was non-coercive (inmate refusals to leave jail were permitted). Thirty-one percent of the jail population was excluded from the eligibility pool because they were found to be severe escape risks, heavy narcotics users, or to have records of uncontrollable physical violence.

Two time frames were used to assess the percentage of each group which recidivated (defined as having committed an offense resulting in jail or revocation): after 6 months [E = 27% (N = 52); C = 17% (N = 58)] and after 1 year [E = 35% (N = 31); C = 29% (N = 31)]. Measures of statistical significance were not reported.*

The PIs concluded optimistically that Ellsworth provided a worthy alternative to jail. They believed the higher recidivism rates for the experimental group were a function of "loose discipline" (Lamb and Goertzel, 1974: 67) at the house and infrequent staff support for the residents (i.e., an inadequate amount of individualized counseling).

* Our difference of proportions test confirmed the PIs' conclusion that the differences were not statistically significant.

(1971) Illinois Volunteer Lawyer Parole Supervision
Experiment - A

Reports From Principal Investigator -

Berman, J.J. (1975). "The Volunteer in Parole Program."
Criminology 13 (1): 111-113.

Berman, J.J. (1978). "An Experiment in Parole
Supervision." Evaluation Quarterly 2 (1): 71-90.

Summary

Illinois State parolees were randomly assigned to a group (the experimental group, N = 16), which received parole supervision from volunteer lawyers, or to the control group (N = 16), which received regular parole supervision. The volunteer lawyers were told to meet with their clients for six hours per month. The PI noted that "considering the usual amount of contact per month, six hours can be considered intensive supervision" (Berman, 1978: 73). The lawyers were told that their job was to befriend the parolees (i.e., help them find work, provide counseling, etc.) and not to "police" them.

A nine-month follow-up of post-release behavior was completed for the 32 parolees with no difference noted between the groups in post-release parole failure [E = 25%; C = 25%].

(1971) English Intensive Probation Experiments - A
- (includes four experiments) **

Report by Principal Investigators -

Folkard, M.S., A.J. Fowles, B.C. McWilliams, D.D.
Smith, D.E. Smith, and G.R. Walmsley (1974). IMPACT:
Intensive Matched Probation and After-Care Treatment.
Volume I. The Design of the Probation Experiment
and an Interim Evaluation. London: Her Majesty's
Stationery Office.

Folkard, M., D.E. Smith and D.D. Smith (1976). IMPACT:
Intensive Matched Probation and After-Care Treatment.
Volume II. The Results of the Experiment. London:
Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Summary

High-risk adult male probationers (17 years and older) were randomly allocated to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 528) received "intensive probation." Each probation officer had a caseload of 20 and was relieved of duties like court attendance to allow more time for the probationers. The control group (N = 473) received normal probation conditions (i.e., with officers having 45-man caseloads).

The 1-year follow-up revealed no significant differences between the groups in the percentage of subjects in each group who were reconvicted [E = 38.1%; C = 33.6%].

** Each of the experiments included in these reports was analyzed separately in the data base ("SPSS Data Set - Experiments in Sanctions").

(1972) Sacramento (CA) Juvenile 602 Diversion Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigators -

Baron, R. and F. Feeney (1976). Juvenile Diversion Through Family Counseling: A Program for the Diversion of Status Offenders in Sacramento County, California. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Summary

Juvenile offenders referred from police, state, or social agencies for 602 statute criminal offenses (e.g., petty theft, possession of narcotics, etc.) were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 111) received the services of a family-crisis counseling unit. The control group (N = 105) entered the criminal justice system. The crisis counseling was provided by probation officers who underwent special training.

Rebookings were studied for a 7-month post-release period with the experimental group having a significantly lower percentage of rebookings than the control group [E = 21.6%; C = 38.1%].

(1973) San Fernando (CA) Juvenile Crisis Intervention Experiment

- A

Report by Principal Investigator -

Stratton, J.G. (1975). "Effects of Crisis Intervention Counseling on Predelinquent and Misdemeanor Juvenile Offenders." Juvenile Justice 26 (4): 7-18.

Summary

Minors brought to the attention of the San Fernando (CA) Police (either through arrest or referral from schools, agencies, or families) were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The experimental group (N =30) received crisis intervention counseling supervised by specially trained counselors. The control group (N = 30) received traditional services from the police, including punitive solutions such as detention at the Youth Hall or a request for a petition to be filed with the Probation Department.

Crisis intervention counseling included utilization of the following techniques:

- 1) Immediacy and availability of counselors for youth and family;
- 2) Counselor's active involvement;
- 3) Emphasis on present problem;
- 4) Problem-solving approach;
- 5) Follow-up visits with family; and
- 6) Open-door policy after resolution of problem, allowing families to come in and talk, if necessary.

An examination of various indicators after six months demonstrated that the experimental crisis counseling group had fewer rearrests than the control subjects [$p < .05$]. Moreover, the control group spent more days incarcerated than the experimental group [$p < .01$]. The crisis counseling approach also represented a cost savings of 50% in comparison to traditional methods.

(1974) Juvenile Diversion and Labeling Paradigm Experiment
- A

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Klein, M.W. (1986). "Labeling Theory and Delinquency Policy: An Experimental Test." Criminal Justice and Behavior vol. 13 (1): 47-79.

Lincoln, C.M., M.W. Klein, K.S. Teilmann and S. Labin (No Date). Control Organizations and Labeling Theory: Official Versus Self-Reported Delinquency. Unpublished manuscript, University of Southern California.

Review -

Dennis, M.L. (1988). Implementing Randomized Field Experiments: An Analysis of Criminal and Civil Justice Research. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Northwestern University.

Summary

Following arrest and booking at a police station, juvenile delinquents, described as being drawn from a "more serious offender population," were randomly allocated to one of four conditions. The four conditions were: subsequent release (N = 82); referral to social services (N = 88); referral to social services with subsidies to cover costs (N = 55); and petition to juvenile court (N = 81). The social services were provided by community-based agencies and primarily involved family, individual and group counseling. The study was conducted to examine two issues: the effectiveness of the dispositions in reducing recidivism, and the extent to which penetration into the justice system further labeled delinquents and contributed to their delinquency.

Recidivism was measured after 6, 15 and 27 months using police arrest reports and self-report questionnaires. Significant differences were found between the groups when arrest data were used: after 15 months [released = 37%; referral = 45%; referral with subsidy = 58%; petition = 63%]. The self-report data yielded no significant differences between the groups.

Juvenile Diversion and Labeling Paradigm Experiment - (cont.)

Klein (1986) asserted that these results supported his theory of how "encapsulation" (the extent to which juveniles were exposed to the system and the extent to which others knew about it) contributes to delinquency. He discounted the possibility of selection bias as an explanation of his results (i.e., that differential assignment of higher SES offenders, girls, Anglos, and those without prior record to social agencies accounted for the effect he found) by pointing out that subjects had been assigned randomly to the different conditions. He did not question whether the process had been carried out as planned, despite the uneven distribution of subjects within the groups.

(1975) San Pablo (CA) Adult Diversion Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigator -

Austin, J.F. (1980). Instead of Justice: Diversion.
Doctoral dissertation, University of California. Ann Arbor:
University Microfilms International.

Summary

Adults arrested for an offense in which a complaint was filed were declared eligible for the experiment. Following review of the eligibility of each individual case by a committee consisting of local law enforcement officials, subjects were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The assignment process was designed to yield equal numbers of subjects in each group but was later modified when the number of defendants interested in the program decreased the pool of eligible subjects below expected levels. The experimental group (N = 138) received supervision and rehabilitative services from the San Pablo Adult Diversion Project (SPAD). The control group (N = 61) entered the criminal justice system.

Subjects in both groups were followed for thirty-six months, with no statistically significant difference between the groups emerging in their rearrest rates [E = 37.7%; C = 44.3%]. When conviction rates were used as a measure of recidivism, there were also no significant differences between the groups [E = 22.9%; C = 23.7%].

(1975) Pinellas County (FL) Juvenile Services Program Experiment
-A

Report by Principal Investigators -

Quay, H.C. and C.T. Love (1977). "The Effect of a Juvenile Diversion Program on Rearrests." Criminal Justice and Behavior vol. 4 (4): 377-396.

Review -

Mrad, D.F. (1979). "The Effect of a Differential Follow-Up on Arrests: A Critique of Quay and Love." Criminal Justice and Behavior vol. 6 (1): 23-29.

Reply -

Quay, H.C. and C.T. Love (1979). "Effects of a Juvenile Diversion Program on Rearrests: A Reply to Mrad." Criminal Justice and Behavior vol. 6 (1): 31-33.

Summary

Juveniles (ages 12-16 years) who had been adjudicated as delinquent or in need of supervision were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 436) received vocational counseling, job training and placement, academic tutoring and personal counseling through JSP (Juvenile Services Program). The control group (N = 132) was processed in the juvenile justice system. Both groups averaged a 90-day exposure period.

Recidivism rates were assessed after one year. The percentage of the experimental group which had been arrested was significantly lower than that for the control group [E = 32%; C = 45% - $p < .0004$]. This difference was also found when arrests occurring during program exposure were measured [E = 16%; C = 45% - actual measures of statistical significance were not reported).

Mrad argued that the differential follow-up periods used (which resulted because there were variations in the treatment exposure periods) violated the "necessary simultaneous and equal follow-up for experimentals" (1979: 28). The PIs responded to the criticism (Quay and Love, 1979) by reanalyzing the data and holding exposure times constant. They found that the results were still statistically significant [E = 30%; C = 40% - $p < .015$].

(1975) Washington, D.C., Pretrial Supervision Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigator -

Welsh, J.D. (1978). "Is Pretrial Performance Affected by Supervision?" Pp. 136-152 in D.A. Henry (ed.) Pretrial Services Annual Journal, 1978. Washington, D.C.: Pretrial Services Resource Center.

Summary

Arrestees released on their own recognizance were randomly assigned to one of three groups receiving different levels of pretrial supervision administered by the Washington, D.C., Bail Agency. Group 1 received "passive supervision" (N = 100), with defendants initiating their own contact with the agency. Group 2 consisted of "moderate supervision" (N = 100), with the agency taking on the actual role of contacting the defendant. Group 3 was given "intensive supervision" (N = 100), with the agency making outside contact with the defendant in the community.

There were no significant differences found between the groups on incidence of rearrests during the pretrial period. The intensive supervision group had a lower mean failure-to-appear rate than the other two groups. Summary statistics were not reported. Moreover, the intensive supervision group complied with court-ordered conditions of release at a higher rate than the other groups.

(1976) California Early Parole Discharge Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigator -

Jackson, P.C. (1978). The Bay Area Parole Study. Sacramento: Department of the Youth Authority.

Jackson, P.C. (1983). "Some Effects of Parole Supervision on Recidivism." British Journal of Criminology 23 (1): 17-34.

Summary

Parolees under the supervision of the California Youth Authority were randomly assigned to an experimental group (N = 98) which involved early discharge from parole or to a control group (N = 198) where subjects were retained under regular parole supervision.

A twenty-four month follow-up of post-release behavior was conducted. There were no significant differences between the groups on the following measures: percentage of the group rearrested [E = 84%; C = 81.8%]; percentage of the group convicted [E = 72.4%; C = 71.2%]; time to first offense; and time to first conviction. A slight increase in drug and alcohol convictions was observed for those discharged (the experimental group). The parolees (those in the control group) were slightly more likely to commit a serious offense. The PI concluded that "some parolees can be randomly discharged from parole without increased risk to the public" (Jackson, 1983: 29).

(1976) California Summary Parole Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigator -

Star, D. (1978). Summary Parole: A Six and Twelve Month Follow-up. Research Report No. 60. Sacramento: California Department of Corrections Research Unit.

Summary

Male inmates paroled by the California Department of Corrections were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 310) received "summary parole," a reduced level of parole supervision. Subjects on summary parole were required to meet with parole agents twice annually. This type of supervision was described as reactive rather than proactive (Star, 1978: 5). The control group (N = 317) received regular parole supervision.

No statistically significant differences were found between the two groups on outcome measures of rearrest and reconviction after 6 months [rearrests - E = 23.6%; C = 27.4% and reconvictions - E = 16.1%; C = 15.5%] and after 12 months [rearrests - E = 31.9%; C = 40.6% and reconvictions - E = 19%; C = 27.7%].

Problems noted by the principal investigator included the large number of excluded parolees from the experiment. Only 38% of the total parolee population was eligible for the study, limiting generalizability. Moreover, the PI found that a sample of experimental cases used to observe frequency and duration of contact between the parole agents and the subjects was not representative of the study sample.

(1976) Clark County (WA) Status Offender Deinstitutionalization Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigator -

Schneider, A.L. (1980). "Effects of Status Offender Deinstitutionalization: A Case Study." Pp. 122-142 in R. Roesch and R.R. Corrado (eds.) Evaluation and Criminal Justice Policy. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Review -

Dennis, M.L. (1988). Implementing Randomized Field Experiments: An Analysis of Criminal and Civil Justice Research. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Northwestern University.

Summary

This study involved one of 8 sites chosen for a national evaluation of the deinstitutionalization of status offenders (DSO) project. Nondelinquent status offenders were randomly allocated to the experimental DSO program (N = 362) or to a control group (N = 127) where they were to be processed by the traditional judicial system. The DSO group emphasized crisis counseling, family therapy and expanded hours for DSO probation officers. The expanded hours for the officers were meant to provide more opportunities for status offenders to be processed. Subjects in the control group were processed between 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday. Status offenders in the control group who arrived at other times had to be detained for the night or through the weekend. The DSO Program was designed to reduce the hours that status offenders spent in lock-up.

Following intervention, the DSO subjects were significantly less likely to be detained than were the control subjects [DSO = 28%; Control = 54%]. Recidivism rates (i.e., percentage rearrested) were compared for the two groups during a 4-month follow-up. Here also, the DSO group performed significantly better than the control group [DSO = 24.4%; Control = 37.9%].

(1976) Memphis Drunk Driving Sanctioning Experiments - A
- (includes two experiments) **

Reports by Principle Investigators -

Holden, R.T., L.T. Stewart, J.N. Rice and E. Manker (1981).
Tennessee DUI Probation Follow-Up Demonstration Project.
Final Report. (Dept. of Transportation Contract No. DOT
HS-5-01199). Springfield, VA.

Holden, R.T. (1982). Legal Reactions to Drunk Driving.
(Doctoral Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1981)
University Microfilms International 8200766.

Holden, R.T. (1983). "Rehabilitative Sanctions for Drunk
Driving: An Experimental Evaluation." Journal of
Research on Crime and Delinquency (20): 55-72.

Summary

First-time DUI offenders assigned to the Driver Improvement Project were first classified into two groups: social drinkers and problem drinkers. The social drinkers were randomly assigned to one of the following four groups: an education group (N = 627); traditional probation supervision (N = 632); probation along with an educational program (N = 633); or a control group with no legal contact (N = 613). The problem drinkers were randomly assigned to: education and therapy counseling (N = 398); probation (N = 396); probation along with education and therapy (N = 408); or a control group (N = 419).

No significant differences were found between the groups during a 2-year follow-up on measures of either DUI rearrests or non-DUI arrests. The PIs concluded that there was no evidence that swiftness and severity of punishment deters drunk drivers. They argued that the first-time offenders were probably deterred by the initial arrest - they saw treatment as a relief - while the more experienced offenders were simply not deterred or rehabilitated. The PIs also noted that the intensity and length of treatment were not severe enough to have an impact on DUI offenders.

** Each of the experiments included in these reports was analyzed separately in the data base ("SPSS Data Set - Experiments in Sanctions").

(1976) North Carolina Butner Correctional Facility Experiment

- A

Report By Principal Investigators -

Love, C.T., J.G. Allgood and F.P.S. Samples (1986). "The Butner Research Projects." Federal Probation 50 (4): 32-39.

Summary

Eligible male inmates in the Federal prison system* were randomly assigned to the Butner Correctional Facility (the experimental group) or to the institutions where they were currently assigned (the control group). The Butner Facility was set up to fit the Norval Morris prison model which featured:

- a) self-help programs which were offered but not required;
- b) prisoners with predetermined lengths of stay;
- c) gradual testing of prisoners' suitability for release; and
- d) prison life to mirror community life (e.g., private rooms, personal clothes, freedom of movement within the prison, etc.).

In addition, inmates assigned randomly to Butner had a chance to "opt-out" (go back to their original institution) after nine months at Butner.

Post-release behavior was monitored for 24 months. No differences were found between the two groups in the percentage of each group rearrested [Butner = 58%; other prisons = 52%].

* Eligibility criteria included: a) 18-35 years of age; b) 1 or more prior convictions or 1 violent conviction; c) a release date between 1 and 3 years from the selection date for the study; d) no involvement in notorious crimes or membership in a militant group; e) no need for any physical or mental care beyond that offered in the prison; and f) home residence in the Southeastern part of the United States.

(1977) Memphis Juvenile Diversion Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Severy, L.J. and J.M. Whitaker (1982). "Juvenile Diversion: An Experimental Analysis of Effectiveness." Evaluation Review vol. 6 (6): 753-774.

Severy, L.J. and J.M. Whitaker (1984). "Memphis-Metro Youth Diversion Project: Final Report." Child Welfare 63 (3): 269-277.

Whitaker, J.M and L.J. Severy (1984). "Service Accountability and Recidivism for Diverted Youth." Criminal Justice and Behavior 11: 47-73.

Whitaker, J.M., L.J. Severy and D.S. Morton (1984). "A Comprehensive Community-Based Youth Diversion Program." Child Welfare 63 (2): 175-181.

Summary

Delinquent youths (ages 8-17 years) who had charges which were serious enough to prevent diversion under normal circumstances were randomly allocated to one of three groups. The first group (with services - WS) received assistance from the Memphis-Metro North Youth Diversion Project, a broker for community services (N = 775). Those in the second group (without services - WOS) were told they were being diverted (N = 475). No further action was taken or contact made with these subjects. The third group was a "penetration" group (P) which went through normal juvenile court processing (N = 377).

Recidivism results were given at six months [WS = 22.1%; WOS = 31.6%; P = 21% - $p < .50$] and at 1 year [WS = 31.6%; WOS = 32.3%; P = 32.7% - $p < .92$] with no significant differences found between the groups. Since those in both the "with services" and the "without services" group were given the option to participate, a substantial number of refusals forced the PIs to control for these refusals by deleting them from the analysis - still no significant differences were found.

(1977) Wayne County (MI) Project Start Experiment - A

Report by Principal Investigators -

Lichtman, G.M. and S.M. Smock (1981). "The Effects of Social Services on Probational Recidivism." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency vol. 18 (1): 81-100.

Summary

Newly sentenced property offenders (males, ages 18-30 years, with no history of drug abuse) were randomly assigned through a coin toss to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 233) received intensive probation services under the direction of staff from Project Start - a needs-assessment center and broker for community services. The staff caseload was 60 subjects per officer. The control group (N = 197) received the traditional probationer services, with an individual officer caseload of 120.

Recidivism was examined using three different measures: the percentage of each group with no new charges [E = 50%; C = 54.3%]; the percentage of each group with felony charges [E = 41%; C = 42.1%]; and the percentage of each group with misdemeanor charges [E = 19.3%; C = 14.7%]. No significant differences between the groups were found on any of these measures of recidivism. Significant differences were also not found for type of charge, number of charges, number of convictions, or months before first offense. The significance tests reported were calculated with a comparison group of parolees, which also did not differ significantly from the experimental and control groups.

(1977) Vera Institute (NY) Pretrial Adult Felony Offender
Diversion Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Baker, S.H. and S. Sadd (1981). Diversion of Felony Arrests:
An Experiment in Pretrial Intervention: Evaluation of the
Court Employment Project. Summary Report. Washington,
DC: National Institute of Justice.

Baker, S.H. and O. Rodrigues (1979). "Random Time Quota
Selection: An Alternative to Random Selection in
Experimental Evaluation." in L. Sechrest (ed.),
Evaluation Studies Review Annual. Volume 4.
Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Baker S.H. and S. Sadd (1979). Court Employment Project:
Evaluation. Final Report. New York, NY: Vera
Institute of Justice.

Review -

Roesch, R. and R. Corrado (1983). "Criminal Justice System
Interventions." Pp. 385-407 in E. Seidman (ed.) Handbook
of Social Intervention. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Summary

Adult male defendants who had been arrested for felonies and brought before Brooklyn and Manhattan Criminal Court judges were randomly assigned (using random time frames) to one of two groups. Those assigned to the experimental group (N = 410) were diverted from the court process and received services under the direction of the Court Employment Project (CEP) staff. Services included counseling, remedial programs and help in finding jobs. The control group (N = 256) went through the normal court process.

During the 4 months in program treatment, the experimental group was arrested at a slightly higher rate than the control group, although the difference was not statistically significant [E = 19.8%; C = 16.5%]. The 1-year follow-up rates for the experimental and control groups were slightly different from each other but, again, not significantly different [E = 30%; C = 33%]. Significant differences were also not found in the severity of the offense charged or in the subsequent conviction rates.

Vera Institute (NY) Pretrial Adult Felony Offender Diversion
Experiment (cont.)

Roesch (1983) noted the net-widening nature of the experimental treatment, suggesting that many experimental subjects would have had charges dismissed if they had not had their cases diverted from the court process. Seventy percent of the control subjects received no sanction, compared with 80% of those in the experimental group; however, the experimental subjects were subject to CEP staff supervision.

(1977) Hamilton (Canada) Juvenile Services Project Experiment
- A

Report by Principal Investigators -

Byles, J.A. and A. Maurice (1979). "The Juvenile Services Project: An Experiment in Delinquency Control." Canadian Journal of Criminology (21): 155-165.

Summary

Delinquents (older than 14 years who were living with their families and had more than 2 previous police occurrence reports) were randomly allocated to one of two groups: the experimental group (N = 154) which received crisis-oriented family counseling designed to treat the underlying causes of delinquency or to the control group (N = 151) which received the traditional investigation from a Youth Bureau Officer.

The PIs found that the number of police occurrences filed for subjects in the two groups after 2 years was not significantly different for the groups [E = 62%; C = 55%] and that there also were no differences between the groups in the number of charges filed nor in offense seriousness, according to the Sellin-Wolfgang Scale.

One explanation for the failure of the experimental treatment to show an effect was its non-coercive character - the family could refuse to attend the counseling sessions. Sixty-five did just that, leaving only 70 experimental subjects who actually received the treatment. Significant differences were noted in the pretest between the groups and were controlled for in the analysis. The other 19 experimental subjects were "missed cases" who did not receive the treatment services (Byles and Maurice, 1979: 160).

(1980) National Juvenile Diversion Experiments - A *

Report by Principal Investigators -

Dunford, F.W., D.W. Osgood and H.F. Weichselbaum (1982).
National Evaluation of Diversion Projects. Washington,
D.C.: National Institute of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention.

Summary

Four of the eleven juvenile diversion projects funded by the Diversion Initiative were evaluated in four cities identified only by their regional locations: Midwest, Upper South, Lower South and the East. In each of these locations, offenders from a pool of eligible subjects were randomly allocated to one of three groups: diversion with services, release without services, or penetration into the juvenile justice system.

Interviews were held with the subjects at three different times (after disposition, 6 months later and again at 12 months) to assess negative labeling, social adjustment and self-reported delinquency. Official arrests was the only recidivism measure employed. The PIs concluded that there were no statistically significant differences between the groups on any of the measures, with one exception - in the Upper South, the penetration group showed a significantly lower arrest rate after 6 months.

Offenders could refuse diversion and the PIs cited the number of refusals as one problem in the experiment. Another problem cited was the lack of "group variability" - often subjects in the three groups would get identical treatment (i.e., counseling, education courses, etc.). In addition, the PIs stated that randomization may have been violated in the East city since a significant number of subjects with multiple prior convictions were assigned to the penetration group.

* These experiments have not been included in the data base ("SPSS Data Set - Experiments in Sanctions") due to insufficient information in published materials.

(1981) National Restitution Experiments - A
- (includes four experiments) **

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Schneider, P.R. and A.L. Schneider (1983). An Analysis of Recidivism Rates in Six Federally-Funded Restitution Projects in Juvenile Courts. A Statistical Summary. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Schneider, A.L. (1986). "Restitution and Recidivism Rates of Juvenile Offenders: Results From Four Experimental Studies." Criminology 24 (3): 533-552.

Summary

Four restitution experiments were implemented simultaneously nation-wide to evaluate the effects of restitution on recidivism. In Boise, youths sentenced to probation were randomly assigned to the experimental restitution group (N = 95) which involved either monetary restitution to the victim or symbolic restitution (community service). The control group (N = 86) received probation with weekend detention.

The Washington, D.C., experiment randomly assigned youths accused of felonies who had been recommended for probation (following the Pretrial Sentence Investigation) to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 274) took part in an offender-victim mediation and restitution program while on probation. The control group (N = 137) received regular probation supervision only.

The Clayton County, Georgia, experiment randomly allocated youths after their adjudication hearing to one of four groups. The first experimental group (N = 74) was ordered to make restitution and receive mental health counseling while on probation. The second experimental group (N = 73) was ordered to make restitution while on probation. The third experimental group (N = 55) received mental health counseling while on probation. The control group (N = 55) received probation supervision only.

** Each of the experiments included in these reports was analyzed separately in the data base ("SPSS Data Set - Experiments in Sanctions").

National Restitution Experiments (cont.)

The Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, experiment randomly assigned youths after adjudication and a fact-finding hearing to one of three groups. The first experimental group (N = 116) was ordered to make restitution on probation. The second experimental group (N = 104) was ordered to make restitution only. The control group (N = 78) received whatever sanction the judge thought appropriate, which in most cases was probation only (with some youths ordered to make restitution).

In all of the experiments, the judge was permitted to override random assignment. The follow-up periods, when measures of subsequent recidivism were taken, varied from between 22 and 35 months, with no statistically significant differences between the groups emerging.

(1981) Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Sherman, L.W. and R.A. Berk (1984). "The Deterrent Effects of Arrest for Domestic Assault." American Sociological Review vol. 49 (2): 261-272.

Sherman, L.W. and R.A. Berk (1984). The Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation Reports.

Sherman, L.W. and R.A. Berk (1985). "The Randomization of Arrest" Pp. 15-26 in R.F. Boruch and W. Wothke (eds.). Randomization and Field Experimentation, New Directions For Program Evaluation, Number 28.

Berk, R.A. and L.W. Sherman (1985). "Data Collection Strategies in the Minneapolis Domestic Assault Experiment", Pp. 35-48 in L. Burstein, H.E. Freeman and P.H. Rossi (eds.), Collecting Evaluation Data: Problems and Solutions. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage.

Berk, R.A. and L.W. Sherman (1988). "Police Responses to Family Violence Incidents: An Analysis of an Experimental Design With Incomplete Randomization." Journal of the American Statistical Association (83): 70-76.

Reviews -

Berk, R.A. and P.J. Newton (1985). "Does Arrest Really Deter Wife Battery? An Effort to Replicate the Findings of the Minneapolis Spouse Abuse Experiment." American Sociological Review (50): 253-262.

Lowery, J.K. (1986). The Impact of Arrest: A Discrete Failure-Time Analysis of Crime. Doctoral Dissertation (University of California). Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms.

Binder, A. and J.W. Meeker (1988). "Experiments as Reforms." Journal of Criminal Justice 16: 347-358.

Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment (cont.)

Summary

Police officers, through a lottery system, randomly allocated misdemeanor domestic violence suspects to one of three outcomes: arrest (N = 92); advise (N = 108), where the officer offered discretionary mediation; or "send" (N = 114), where the officer sent suspects from the home for 8 hours. The pool of eligible cases included only those calls where both the suspect and the victim were present and where the assault had occurred within 4 hours of the call to the police.

Official police records and self-reports from the victims were used to assess recidivism rates after six months. The PIs found that arrest significantly reduced recidivism [Arrest = 10%; Advise = 19%; and Send = 24%].

Binder and Meeker (1988) criticized the impact that the experiment has had on policy - many police departments have adopted arrest as the principal response to domestic violence incidents. Their criticisms included the following:

- a) random assignment was violated on numerous occasions;
- b) there was no statistical analysis of why 3 officers produced 28% of the cases;
- c) there were peculiar aspects of the study sample which constrict generalizability to other sites;
- d) the self-report interview completion rate was under 50%; and
- e) there was PI selection bias - they only chose to compare the conditions that were significantly different from arrest (e.g., in the analysis of recidivism, arrest and separation were compared while, with the interview data, arrest and mediation were compared).

(1983) Police Foundation Shoplifting Arrest Experiment - A

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Glick, B., E. Hamilton and B. Forst (1986). Shoplifting: An Experiment in Lesser Crimes and Punishments. Draft Final Report. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Sherman, L.W. and P.R. Gartin (1986). "Differential Recidivism: A Field Experiment of the Specific Sanction Effects of Arrest for Shoplifting." Unpublished paper presented at the American Society of Criminology Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Williams, H., B. Forst and E.E. Hamilton (1987). "Stop! Should You Arrest that Person?" Security Management (September): 52-58.

Summary

Shoplifters from nine stores (one major retail chain) in a large unnamed American city were randomly allocated to one of two groups: arrest (N = 679) or release (N = 667). The arrest group was taken into store security custody and transferred to the police for possible prosecution while the release group was taken into custody by the store staff and then released.

While overall differences were not found between the experimental and control groups, differential effects between different types of subjects were noted by the PIs. Among subjects who were 6-16 years old, those who were arrested had a significantly lower rate of commission of non-shoplifting crimes than was found among those who had been released [Arrested = 4%, Released = 10% - $p < .02$]. Among those who were 17 years or older, the reverse was true. Those in the release condition committed significantly fewer non-shoplifting crimes than those in the arrest group [Arrested = 16%; Released = 8% - $p < .01$].

"B"
Experiments

(1957) Fricot Ranch Delinquent Dormitory Experiment - B

Reports by Principal Investigator -

Jesness, C.F. (1965). The Fricot Ranch Study. Sacramento, CA: California Youth Study.

Jesness, C.F. (1971). "Comparative Effectiveness of Two Institutional Treatment Programs for Delinquents." Child Care Quarterly (1): 119-130.

Reviews -

Lerman, P. (1968). "Evaluative Studies of Institutions for Delinquents: Implications for Research and Social Policy." Social Work (July): 55-64.

Farrington, D.P. (1983). "Randomized Experiments on Crime and Justice." Pp. 257-308 in M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.) Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research. Volume IV. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Summary

A total of 281 male delinquents were randomly assigned to the experimental 20-bed dormitory (N = 95) or to the control 50-bed dormitory (N = 186).

Parole revocation rates were analyzed during a five-year follow-up with no significant differences reported between the groups [E = 82%; C = 90%]. However, significantly lower revocation rates were noted for the 20-bed subjects after both the first year and the second year.

Farrington (1983) pointed out that the larger staff-inmate ratio in the 20-bed dormitory may have allowed for closer contact between staff and inmates there than at the 50-bed dormitory. As a result, the staff may have compensated for this smaller ratio by exerting punitive controls. Thus, the Jesness study may have been testing the effects of different facility managerial styles (therapeutic versus authoritarian) on recidivism and not the effects of different levels of dormitory capacity per se.

Fricot Ranch Delinquent Dormitory Experiment (cont.)

Lerman (1968) noted that there were significant differences between the groups on pretest measures of group comparability, with the control group having more high-risk characteristics than the experimental group. For example, among the experimental group, 73% were white, 35% were from poor homes, and 67% had a father as the main provider. In the control group, 55% were white, 50% were from the poorest homes, and 52% had a father as the main provider.

(1961) California Fremont Program Experiment - B

Report by Principal Investigator -

Seckel, J.P. (1967). The Fremont Experiment: Assessment of Residential Treatment at a Youth Authority Reception Center.
Sacramento: Youth Authority Research Division.

Summary

Male juveniles admitted for short terms were screened for program eligibility at a reception center and then randomly assigned, through use of a random numbers table, to the experimental group (N = 75) or to the control group (N = 54). The experimental group was assigned to the Fremont Program, a residential treatment facility which emphasized the "therapeutic community" approach. The control group was assigned to regular Youth Authority institutions and camps. The screening criteria for eligibility for the experiment included: a minimum age of 16 years, a minimum grade level of 7, evidence of a willingness to accept work responsibility, and no history of drug or sexual offenses.

No significant differences in reconviction rates for the two groups were detected after 15 months [E = 32%; C = 31.5%] or after 24 months [E = 44%; C = 38.9%]. The PI cited one problem with the study: despite randomization, the control group's average length of stay was significantly higher than that for the experimental group (8.8 months compared to 5 months), perhaps biasing the results.

(1964) English Borstal Allocation Experiment - B

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Williams, M. (1970). A Study of Some Aspects of Borstal Allocation. London: Home Office Prison Department. Office of the Chief Psychologist.

Williams, M. (1975). "Aspects of the Psychology of Imprisonment." Pp. 32-42 in S. McConville (ed.) The Use of Imprisonment: Essays in the Changing State of English Penal Policy. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Review -

Cornish, D.B. and R.V.G. Clarke (1975). Residential Treatment and Its Effects on Delinquency. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Summary

Six hundred ten institutionalized youths (ages 16-18 years who were in the upper 70% of the borstal population in IQ) were randomly allocated to three borstal institutions. The "case-work" regime (32% of the sample) emphasized therapeutic individualized counseling; the "group-counseling" regime (36% of the sample) utilized therapeutic group counseling; and the "traditional" regime (32% of the sample) used hard work and paternalistic control (to mold self-discipline).

The case-work regime showed a significantly lower reconviction rate than the other groups in the two-year follow-up [case-work = 51%; group counseling = 63%; traditional = 63%, $p < .05$]. The principal investigator cited the high rate of subject transfer and the staff turnover rate as two obstacles to the experiment.

Cornish and Clarke (1975) noted that the significance claimed by the PI might have been a function of the transfers not being included in the final analysis. They suggested (but did not do) a reanalysis of the reconviction rates for the three groups using those admitted to the program rather than those who stayed throughout the program.

(1965) English Juvenile Therapeutic Community Experiment - B

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Clarke, R.V.G. and D.B. Cornish (1972). The Controlled Trial in Institutional Research - Paradigm or Pitfall for Penal Evaluators? London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Cornish, D.B. and R.V.G. Clarke (1975). Residential Treatment and Its Effects on Delinquency. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Cornish, D.B. (1987). "Evaluating Residential Treatments for Delinquents: A Cautionary Tale." Pp. 333-346 in K. Hurrelmann, F. Kaufmann and F. Losel (eds.) Social Intervention: Potential and Constraints. Berlin: Gruyter.

Summary

Male delinquents (ages 13-15 years, IQ over 90, mean number of previous contacts = 3.1) who had been sent to Kingswood Training School were randomly allocated to one of two housing units. The experimental house (N = 86) emphasized the therapeutic community, employing psychotherapeutic methods. The control house (N = 87) employed traditional training.

A two-year follow-up revealed no significant differences in the percentage of subjects in each group who were reconvicted [E = 70%; C = 69%]. A ten-year follow-up of the Kingswood School subjects (Cornish, 1987) also revealed no significant differences between the groups in rates of recidivism [percent reconvicted: E = 91%; C = 86%].

(1966) California Preston School Typology Experiment - B

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Jesness, C.F. (1971). "The Preston Typology Study." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency (8): 38-52.

Reanalysis -

Austin, R.L. (1977). "Differential Treatment in an Institution: Reexamining the Preston Study." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency (July): 177-194.

Summary

An experiment initiated at the Preston School of Industry randomly assigned institutionalized boys (ages 16-20, average stay = 8.4 months) to one of two treatment groups. In the experimental group (N = 655), the boys were classified according to their I-Level Maturity (Interpersonal Maturity Scale) and placed into the living units designed to accommodate that personality type (one of five units). Those in the control group (N = 518) were classified and assigned into one of the five regular living units which was using existing correctional policy.

Parole violations for the groups were assessed at 2 periods: at 15 months [E = 54%; C = 64.7%] and at 24 months [E = 64.6%; C = 64.7%]. The PI concluded that the groups were the same; no significant differences were found for the I-level-classified living units.

Austin (1977) disagreed with the PI's conclusion that the experiment offered no support for the I-Level classification. A specially selected psychiatric unit (not part of the random assignment) showed interaction effects between I-Level classification and treatment, after selection factors were controlled. Austin argued that there was evidence that treatment strategies were better developed in this unit and that, therefore, this unit provided a real test of whether the treatment was effective on certain types of subjects (1977: 177).

(1968) California Juvenile Behavior Modification and Transactional Analysis Experiment - B

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Jesness, C.F., W.J. DeRisi, P.M. McCormick and R.F. Wedge (1972). The Youth Center Research Project. Sacramento: California Youth Authority.

Jesness, C.F. (1975). "Comparative Effectiveness of Behavior Modification Transactional Analysis Programs for Delinquents." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology vol. 43: 758-779.

Jesness, C.F. (19__). "The Youth Center Project: Transactional Analysis and Behavior Modification Programs for Delinquents." Behavioral Disorders 1 (1): 27-36.

Summary

A total of 904 male delinquents, ages 15-17 years, were randomly allocated to one of two different juvenile residential schools: the Holton School emphasized behavior modification techniques (BMT); the Close School used transactional analysis methods (TAM).

Parole violation rates were examined at 15 months [BMT = 38.7%; TA = 35.5%], with no significant differences between the groups found.

The principal investigators did not randomly allocate subjects to a control group in a non-treatment institution. The "comparison" group of parolees from other residences used in the analysis was a matched group (not randomly assigned). The PI noted that the higher post-release failure rate for the comparison group was statistically significant.

(1973) Canadian I-Level Maturity Probation Experiment - B

Report by Principal Investigator -

Barkwell, L.J. (1976). "Differential Treatment of Juveniles on Probation: An Evaluative Study." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections 18 (4): 363-378.

Summary

Male delinquents who received a court supervision order from the Winnipeg and St. Boniface Juvenile Courts were randomly assigned to one of three groups. Experimental group 1 (N = 16), the "I-Level treatment" group, was classified according the I-Level Maturity Scale and assigned to a probation officer believed to represent the supervisory style from which the boy would most benefit. Experimental group 2 (N = 16), the "alternate treatment" group, was assigned to probation officers without the influence of the I-Level Scale. Here, the casework consultation was usually provided by Forensic Services (involving a psychiatrist and psychologist). Experimental group 3 (N = 16), the "surveillance group," received no treatment services and was exposed to probation officers who had larger caseloads than the other two groups.

A fifteen-month follow-up of recidivism revealed that the I-Level group performed much better than the other groups on a delinquency reduction score* [p < .01].

* The PI did not explain how this score was obtained.

(1975) Leeds (UK) Truancy Experiment - B

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Berg, I., M. Consterdine, R. Hullin, R. McGuire and S. Tyrer (1978). "The Effect of Two Randomly Allocated Court Procedures on Truancy." British Journal of Criminology vol. 18 (3): 232-244.

Berg, I., R. Hullin, R. McGuire and S. Tyrer (1978). "Truancy and the Courts: Research Note." Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology (18): 359-365.

Berg, I., R. Hullin and R. McGuire (1979). "A Randomly Controlled Trial of Two Court Procedures in Truancy." Pp. 143-151 in D.P. Farrington, K. Hawkins and S.M. Lloyd-Bostock (eds.) Psychology, Law and Legal Processes. NJ: Humanities Press.

Review -

Pratt, J.D. (1983). "Folk-Lore and Fact in Truancy Research." British Journal of Criminology 23 (4): 336-357.

Summary

Ninety-six truants (mean age = 13 years) were randomly assigned by magistrates to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 45) was allocated to adjournment - subjects were repeatedly brought back to the magistrate to assess school performance. The control group (N = 51) received routine supervision from the social services department.

In a six-month follow-up, the adjournment group was found to be significantly less truant than the control group [mean number of days absent: E = 67; C = 97 - $p < .01$]. Those in the experimental group also committed fewer offenses per youth than did those in the control group [$E = .2$; $C = .9$ - $F = 5.5$, $p < .05$].

Pratt (1983) reexamined the experiment and stated that the exclusion criteria used eliminated "entrenched truants" (those who were not likely to be affected by an adjournment process). Moreover, he found that the social services supervisors for the

Leeds (UK) Truancy Experiment (cont.)

control group were told to monitor truancy more closely during the experimental period, resulting in a greater number of court orders for truancy being issued to control subjects. Pratt also questioned the legality of the adjournment process as well as its ethicality.

"C"
Experiments

(1951) Copenhagen Short-Term Offender Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigators -

Berntsen, K. and K.O. Christiansen (1965). "A Resocialization Experiment with Short-Term Offenders." Pp. 35-54 in K.O. Christiansen (ed.) Scandinavian Studies in Criminology. Volume I. London: Tavistock.

Review -

Cornish, D.B. and R.V.G. Clarke (1975). Residential Treatment and its Effect on Delinquency. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Summary

A total of 252 adult male prisoners serving sentences of less than six months were randomly assigned to one of two groups while in custody. The experimental group (N = 126) received a psychological examination, interviews with social workers and an individualized treatment plan geared towards resocialization. The control group (N = 126) received the services available in routine custody.

A six-year follow-up revealed recidivism rates to be significantly lower for those in the experimental group than for control subjects [E = 41%; C = 58% - $p < .01$]. The measure of recidivism used was having received a subsequent prison sentence or special penalty (e.g., being sent to the workhouse). Those receiving fines or simple detention were classified as non-recidivists.

Cornish and Clarke (1975) argued that the use of reconviction per se (as the criterion for recidivism) lead to a finding of no significant differences between the groups.

(1955) California Pico Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigator -

Adams, S. (1970). "The Pico Project." Pp. 548-561 in
N.B. Johnston, L. Savitz and M.E. Wolfgang (eds.)
The Sociology of Punishment and Correction. New York:
John Wiley and Sons.

Summary

Delinquent males (ages 17-23 years, described as the most "normal" inmates) were clinically diagnosed as being either amenable or non-amenable to treatment and then were randomly assigned to one of four groups: treatment amenable (TA); treatment non-amenable (TN); control amenable (CA); or control non-amenable (CN). The experimental (or treatment) groups received 4-8 intensive individual counseling sessions per month. There were 100 subjects in each group.

The percentage of time the groups spent locked up was studied for 6 time frames (after 6, 12, 18, 24, 30 and 33 months). After 33 months the treatment amenable group was significantly different from the other groups [TA = 6.2%; TN = 16.7%; CA = 14.5% and CN = 14.6%]. On the measure of unfavorable discharges, the treatment amenable group again fared better than the other groups [TA = 29%; CA = 36%; CN = 40%; and TN = 45%]. The high recidivism rates for the treatment non-amenable group supported Adams' theory of differential effects of treatment on subjects with different characteristics.

(1959) California Short-Term Psychiatric Treatment Experiments - C - (includes two experiments)

Report by Principal Investigator -

Guttman, E. (1963). Effects of Short-Term Psychiatric Treatment on Boys in Two California Youth Authority Institutions. Research Report No. 36. Sacramento: California Department of Youth Authority.

Summary

Offenders with severe emotional and psychological problems who had been institutionalized at the Preston School of Industry and the Nelles School for Boys were randomly assigned to two groups, separately for each institution. The experimental subjects (N = 106 at Preston and N = 62 at Nelles) received individual psychiatric therapy twice per week. No exposure time or length of treatment was indicated. The control subjects (N = 109 at Preston and N = 61 at Nelles) received normal institutional services.

At Preston, experimental subjects performed significantly worse on parole than control subjects [failure on parole: E = 59%; C = 48%].

At Nelles, the experimental subjects performed better on parole than the control subjects, but the difference was not statistically significant [failure on parole: E = 60%; C = 74%].

The principal investigator pointed out that the Nelles subjects were 2 years younger on average than Preston School subjects, and that the effect of psychiatric therapy is less effective with older offenders. The staff morale and efficiency at the Preston School was also questioned.

** Each of the experiments included in this report was analyzed separately in the data base ("SPSS Data Set - Experiments in Sanctions").

(1960) California Paso Robles and Youth Training School Group Counseling Experiments - C - (includes two experiments) **

Report by Principal Investigator -

Seckel, J.P. (1965). Experiments in Group Counseling at Youth Authority Institutions. Sacramento: Youth Authority Division of Research.

Summary

Two separate experiments were conducted to determine the effectiveness of counseling programs in juvenile institutions.

At Paso Robles, boys were randomly assigned to one of four living units: small-group counseling unit (N = 68); large community meeting unit (N = 68); a unit combining both small-group and community meeting (N = 72); and the control group which received no treatment (N = 87).

In a 30-month follow-up undertaken to assess parole violations among the subjects from Paso Robles, no significant differences were found among any of the groups when parole violations and subsequent incarceration were measured.

At the Youth Training School, boys were randomly assigned to one of two experimental counseling groups (N = 50, N = 46) or to one of two control groups (N = 50, N = 46) which did not receive the counseling. Again, no differences were detected between groups in the 30-month follow-up on the measures of recidivism.

** Each of the experiments included in this report was analyzed separately in the data base ("SPSS Data Set - Experiments in Sanctions").

(1961) California Group Counseling Prison Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigators -

Kassebaum, G., D. Ward and D. Wilner (1971). Prison Treatment and Parole Survival. New York: Wiley.

Review -

Quay, H.C. (1977). "The Three Faces of Evaluation: What Can Be Expected to Work?" Criminal Justice and Behavior (4): 341-354.

Summary

Eighteen hundred men were randomly allocated within a newly constructed medium security prison to one of three "quads" (facility units). Once assigned to the quads, the men were assigned to one of five groups: 1) a mandatory control group; 2) a voluntary control group consisting of those assigned to treatment who had refused; 3) a mandatory group counseling group which consisted of 50 men meeting 4 times per week who also met in smaller sessions once each week; 4) a mandatory small-group counseling group which consisted of 10 men meeting for 2 hours each week; and 5) a voluntary small-group counseling group made up of men who were assigned to the control condition but who wished to be in a counseling group. To be eligible for post-therapy follow-up, the subjects had to have spent 6 months in the prison and have been under age 65. Only 968 of the 1800 inmates met these conditions.

Parole follow-up was conducted for 3 years and no significant differences were found between the groups for "time spent in jail during parole" and most "serious dispositions after 36 months." Again, for parole outcome, no significant differences between the groups were found.

The PIs cited two major problems: the inmate code and the counteracting effect of the prison. Quay (1977), primarily as an answer to Martinson (1974), stated that the breakdown of program integrity (e.g., only 40% of the experimental counselors believed that counseling had an impact and the quality of program staff training was poor) explains the finding of no differences between the groups.

(1963) California Juvenile Probation and Group Counseling Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigators -

Adams, S. (1965). "An Experimental Assessment of Group Counseling With Juvenile Probationers." Journal of the California Probation, Parole and Correctional Association 2 (Spring): 19-25.

Summary

Juvenile male probationers under the jurisdiction of the Long Beach (CA) probation office were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The experimental group subjects (N = 48) were given one 90-minute counseling session each week for six months. The control group (N = 48) did not receive the counseling.

Outcome criteria were followed during the six-month exposure period. The experimental group subjects showed significantly fewer police contacts than did the control boys [E = 16; C = 32]. The PI also reported that the offenses committed by the experimental boys were less serious in nature and resulted in less detention time than those committed by the boys in the control group, although these differences were not statistically significant.

(1964) San Diego (CA) Chronic Drunk Offender Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigators -

Ditman, K.S., G.G. Crawford, E.W. Forgy, H. Moskowitz and C. Macandrew (1967). "A Controlled Experiment on the Use of Court Probation for Drunk Arrests." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry (124): 160-163.

Summary

Chronic drunk offenders (males, median age = 45 years, mean prior drunk arrests = 12) were defined as "chronic" if they had 2 arrests in the previous 3 months or 3 in the previous year. If found guilty, these offenders were fined \$25 and given a 30-day suspended jail sentence with one year of probation. They were then randomly assigned by judges to one of three groups: an experimental group (N = 86) which attended Alcoholics Anonymous meetings; another experimental group (N = 82) which went to an alcohol clinic; and a control group (N = 73) which received no treatment.

No significant differences was found between the groups when the percentage not arrested in each group was measured after 1 year [Alcoholics Anonymous = 32%; Alcohol Clinic = 31%; Control = 44% -p > .05]. The results were similar when the PIs merged the Alcoholic Anonymous and alcohol clinic groups into one experimental group and compared them with the control subjects.

(1964) Kentucky Village Psychotherapy Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigators -

Truax, C.B., D.G. Wargo and L.D. Silber (1966). "Effects of Group Psychotherapy with High Accurate Empathy and Non-Possessive Warmth Upon Female Institutionalized Delinquents." Journal of Abnormal Psychology vol. 71 (4): 267-274.

Summary

Seventy girls were randomly assigned to therapy (N = 40) or to control conditions (N = 30) at Kentucky Village, an institution for delinquent girls. The subjects, ages 14-18 years, were predominantly from lower-class backgrounds. The psychotherapy group met biweekly over a 3-month period with a therapist who had previously demonstrated high "accurate empathy" and "nonpossessive warmth."

A one-year follow-up revealed that the therapy group spent significantly more time out of the institution than the control group [E = 57.4%; C = 40% - $p < .001$].

(1964) Fairfield School For Boys Experiment - C

Reports by Principal Investigator -

Persons, R.W. (1966). "Psychological and Behavioral Change in Delinquents Following Psychotherapy." Journal of Clinical Psychology 22: 337-340.

Persons, R.W. (1967). "Relationship Between Psychotherapy With Institutionalized Boys and Subsequent Community Adjustment." Journal of Consulting Psychology 31 (2): 137-141.

Summary

Males (ages 15-19 years) incarcerated at the Fairfield School Reformatory were matched on 8 variables and then randomly assigned to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 41) received 20 weeks of psychotherapy sessions. Each session lasted 1-2 hours and there were 2 sessions per week. The control group (N = 41) received regular custodial care.

The therapy group performed significantly better on several outcome measures after a follow-up described as "9.5 months on average" (1967:138). Compared with the control subjects, fewer therapy subjects were reinstitutionalized [E = 13; C = 25] or violated parole [E = 20; C = 32]. The mean offense rate was also lower for the therapy subjects than for the controls [E = 1.94; C = 3.07]. All of these differences were statistically significant ($p < .05$).

(1968) English Prison Intensive Social Work Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigator -

Shaw, M. (1974). Social Work in Prison. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Review -

Cornish, D.B. and R.V.G. Clarke (1975). Residential Treatment and its Effects on Delinquency. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Summary

Adult male inmates in the last 6 months of their sentences were randomly allocated to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 75) received more intensive "social work" contact with the prison welfare officers who attempted to coordinate services with the aftercare officer. Experimental subjects also had a one-hour individual counseling session each week with the welfare officer. The control group (N = 75) received normal contact with the prison welfare officer.

A 2-year follow-up revealed significantly lower reconviction rates for the experimental subjects compared with the controls [E = 57.3%; C = 76% - $p < .01$].

One problem noted by the PI was the voluntary nature of the weekly sessions. Cornish and Clarke (1975) also pointed out that when the reconviction rates for the 2 prisons in the study were isolated, rather than merged as the PI had done, the differences between the experimental and control groups did not reach statistical significance.

(1969) Ohio Juvenile Probationer Behavior Modification Experiment
- C

Report by Principal Investigators -

Ostrom, T.M., C.M. Steele, L.K. Rosenblood and H.L. Mirels
(1971). "Modification of Delinquent Behavior." Journal of Applied Social Psychology 1 (2): 118-136.

Summary

Male probationers from Franklin County, Ohio, were matched on several socio-economic variables and then randomly assigned to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 19) attended behavioral modification therapy sessions directed by non-professionals. These sessions lasted approximately 2 hours. Each experimental subject attended 7 sessions over a 2-month period. The control group (N = 19) remained on regular probation and did not attend the sessions.

The experimental subjects performed significantly better on measures of post-release arrests than the control subjects [E = 26.3%; C = 47.7%]. Further analysis revealed strong treatment effects in the first 2-4 months yet no statistically significant difference between the groups in the last six months.

(1971) Tacoma Juvenile Inmate Modeling and Group Discussion Experiment - C

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Sarason, I.G. and V.J. Ganzer (1973). "Modeling and Group Discussion in the Rehabilitation of Juvenile Delinquents." Journal of Counseling Psychology (20): 442-449.

Sarason, I.G. (1978). "A Cognitive Social Learning Approach to Juvenile Delinquency" Pp. 299-317 in R.D. Hare and D. Schalling (eds.) Psychopathic Behavior: Approaches to Research. Chichester: Wiley.

Summary

One hundred ninety-two juvenile males (first-time offenders, ages 15-18 years) were randomly assigned to one of three groups. For those in the modeling group (N = 64), 16 sessions of group discussion centering on different interpersonal themes (i.e., how to avoid anti-social behavior) were held. At each session, the leader or "model" acted out optimal behavior in a hypothetical scene in front of the class. For those in the discussion group (N = 64), there were sessions where these same interpersonal themes were discussed, but no acting out or modeling took place. The control group (N = 64) received neither discussion nor modeling techniques.

The number of recidivists (defined as those who were either returned to a juvenile institution, convicted in court, or confined in an adult institution) were reported after three time periods. Significantly lower recidivism rates were found for the modeling and discussion groups for three follow-up period - reported as the total number of recidivating subjects in each group, after 33 months [M (modeling) = 12; D (discussion) = 9; and C (control) = 22]; 4 years [M = 13; D = 11; and C = 26]; and 5 years [M = 15; D = 15; and C = 31].

One problem cited by the PIs was that the randomization procedure was influenced by the admission rates - if the number of eligible subjects was too low, everyone was sent to the control group.

(1973) English Intensive Welfare Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigator -

Fowles, A.J. (1978). Prison Welfare. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Summary

Adult male inmates serving short terms (sentences between 2 and 12 months) were randomly allocated in a local Liverpool prison to one of two groups: an experimental group (N = 145) which received intensive prison welfare services or a control group (N = 145) which received the usual prison welfare service. Subjects in the experimental group received more contact with their prison welfare officers than did those in the control condition. In addition, the officers in the experimental condition attempted to contact the prisoner's family, friends and any community agencies which would be able to assist the offender once released.

After 1 year, no significant differences in the percentage reconvicted in each group emerged from the comparison made by the PI [E = 38.6%; C = 42.8%]. Significant differences between groups were also not found in the time-to-first-reconviction measure.

(1976) Florida Project Crest Experiment - C

Reports by Principal Investigators -

Lee, R. and N.M. Haynes (1978). "Counseling Juvenile Offenders: An Experimental Evaluation of Project Crest." Community Mental Health Journal vol. 14 (4): 267-271.

Lee, R. and N.M. Haynes (1980). "Project Crest and the Dual-Treatment Approach to Delinquency: Methods and Research Summarized." Pp. 171-184 in R.R. Ross and P. Gendreau (eds.) Effective Correctional Treatment. Toronto: Butterworths.

Summary

Sixty-four juvenile delinquents were randomly allocated to one of two groups. The experimental group (N = 30) received the services of Project Crest (which included counseling services) and six months probation. The control group (N = 34) received only probation.

After six months, the experimental group committed significantly fewer acts of misconduct [E = decrease of 79%; C = decrease of 4% - $p < .05$] and had a lower monthly rate of misconduct than the controls [$p < .025$]. Despite randomization, the experimental group had a lower mean age and included significantly more females than the control group.

(1977) San Quentin (CA) Squires Program Experiment - C

Reports by Principal Investigator -

Lewis, R.V. (1979). The Squires of San Quentin. Preliminary Findings on an Experimental Study of Juvenile Visitation at San Quentin Prison. Sacramento: Department of the Youth Authority. Division of Research.

Lewis, R.V. (1981). The Squires of San Quentin. An Evaluation of a Juvenile Awareness Program. Sacramento: Department of the Youth Authority. Division of Research.

Lewis, R.V. (1983). "Scared Straight - California Style." Criminal Justice and Behavior vol. 10 (2): 209-226.

Summary

One hundred eight delinquent males (ages 16-17 years with a record of delinquency) were randomly assigned to an experimental group (N = 53) or to a control group (N = 55). Those assigned to the experimental group attended 3 sessions of the San Quentin Squires Program which involved confrontational rap sessions between the prisoners and the delinquents, guided prison tours and a pictorial segment on prison violence. Those in the control group did not attend the sessions.

After 1 year, no significant differences between the groups emerged on the following measures of recidivism: mean number of subsequent arrests per youth [E = 2.1; C = 2.2] and mean number of subsequent charges per youth [E = 2.9; C = 2.9]. The only finding of a significant difference between the groups was on the time-to-first-arrest measure [E = 4.1 months; C = 3.3 months - $p < .05$].

The preliminary report indicated that experimental subjects responded more favorably to attitudinal measures of crime and delinquency involvement than did the control group (Lewis, 1979).

(1978) Illinois Juvenile Tours Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigators -

Greater Egypt Regional Planning and Development Commission
(1979). Menard Correctional Center Juvenile Tours Impact
Study. Carbondale, IL: Greater Egypt Regional Planning
and Development Commission.

Summary

A total of 161 adolescent males were randomly assigned to an experimental group (N = 94) which participated in a tour of Menard Correctional Facility or to a control group (N = 67) which did not participate in the tour. The tours featured graphic and confrontational sessions between inmates and the boys; the inmates were predominantly felons serving minimums of 20 years.

During the follow-up period which ranged from between 5 and 15 months after the tour, there were no significant differences between the groups in the number of police contacts.

(1978) Michigan Juvenile Offenders Learn Truth (JOLT)
Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigator -

Yarborough, J.C. (1979). "Evaluation of JOLT as a Deterrence Program." Lansing, MI: Michigan Department of Corrections.

Review -

Lundman, R.J. (1984). Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Oxford University Press.

Summary

Delinquent males (mean age = 15.45 years, 50% black) from 3 Michigan counties were randomly assigned to: the experimental group (N = 79) which visited the Southern Michigan State Prison and participated in an intensive confrontation session with prison inmates or the control group (N = 90) which did not make the visit. The entire visit lasted approximately 2.5 hours.

There were no statistically significant differences between the groups on the percentage of subjects in each group with subsequent criminal charges after 3 months [E = 20.3%; C = 18.9%] or after 6 months [E = 30.8%; C = 28.9%].

(1978) New Jersey Juvenile Awareness Program (Scared Straight) Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigator -

Finckenauer, J.O. (1982). Scared Straight. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Review -

Lundman, R.J. (1984). Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Oxford University Press.

Summary

Originally this experiment was designed to randomly allocate 100 delinquent boys to one of two study groups. The experimental group (N = 46) was assigned to attend the Juvenile Awareness Program which was run by those serving life sentences at maximum security adult male prisons ("lifers"). Those assigned to this group received 3 hours of exhortation and lecturing by the lifers on the "horrors of prison." The control group (N = 35) did not attend the sessions. The PI noted that there was a breakdown in the randomization process because the referral agencies did not implement the program design. As a result, this research is often referred to as a quasi-experiment.

The six-month follow-up analysis assessed recidivism rates for subjects in both groups, with the control group achieving a significantly lower failure rate than those in the experimental group [E = 41.3%; C = 11.4% - $p < .01$].

The PI also stated that, despite popular belief, not all of the youths assigned to the experimental group were delinquents - they were probably best classified as problem youths. Referrals to the program came from agencies like the YMCA - only 2 had a law enforcement orientation. Also, in some instances, depending upon the type of referral agency, program attendance was non-coercive.

(1981) Ramsey County (MN) Community Assistance Program
Experiment - C

Report by Principal Investigators -

Owen, G. and P.W. Mattessich (1987). Community Assistance Program: Results of a Control Study of the Effects of Non-Residential Corrections on Adult Offenders in Ramsey County. St. Paul: Wilder Foundation.

Summary

Misdemeanants from the Ramsey County Municipal Court (and also from Project Remand, a diversion agency) were put into a pool of eligible subjects for admission to the experiment. Random allocation was made from the pool to either an experimental group (N = 124) or the control group (N = 54). The experimental group received the assistance of the Community Assistance Program (CAP), a community-centered probation program which included a variety of counseling services (for education, finances, and vocational training). The control group was assigned to a regular probation unit in which no CAP services were provided.

Results were given, after a 2-year follow-up, for two measures of recidivism: percentage of each group with no new charges [E = 65.3%; C = 57.4% - p = .315] and percentage of each group with new convictions [E = 27.4%; C = 37% - p = .20]. The PIs noted that attendance in the CAP program could not be enforced (raising questions about whether the experimental group really received different treatment than the control group).

(1984) Ontario (Canada) Social Interaction Training Experiment

- C

Report by Principal Investigators

Shivrattan, J.L. (1988). "Social Interactional Training and Incarcerated Juvenile Delinquents." Canadian Journal of Criminology 30 (2): 145-163.

Summary

Male juvenile delinquents incarcerated at the Sprucedale School in Ontario, Canada, were randomly assigned to one of three groups. Experimental group 1 (N = 15) received "social interaction" training, emphasizing recall of past aversive behavior. New behavioral approaches to past situations were stressed, with additional lessons on language use, emotions and actions. The subjects attended 8 one-hour lessons. Experimental group 2 (N = 15) was assigned to a "stress management" condition which emphasized relaxation as the method for relieving stress. The sessions were also one-hour long, with each subject attending eight sessions. The control group (N = 15) received regular custodial care and did not receive either of the first two treatments.

A follow-up measure of community adjustment was made for a period described by the PI as "12-15 months" ((Shivrattan, 1988: 152). The social interaction training group performed significantly better on the outcome measure of "successful community adjustment" than either the stress management subjects or the control subjects [E1 = 62%; E2 = 43%; and C = 40%]. Successful community adjustment included: a) no prior police contact; b) no apprehensions or chargings; and c) successful adjustment at school, home, or work.