MASTER BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH INDEX (MBRI) v3.0

Fully Populated Source-File Audit - Expanded Document Edition

File title: MASTER_BEHAVIORAL_RESEARCH_INDEX_MBRI_v3.0_FULLY_POPULATED

Purpose

This index is designed to be the master reference file for future questions about the project. It consolidates participant demographics, criminal-history indicators, behavioral clusters, referral patterns, reentry indicators, risk themes, and emerging findings from the structured source files. It is not a clinical diagnostic document. It is a non-clinical research and planning index based on self-reported assessment data and project-coded indicators.

Source hierarchy used in this version

1. Master Behavioral Research Database.xlsx - primary deduplicated participant-level source. 2. reentry_verified_audit_counts.csv - verified reentry audit statistics. 3. Raw community and reentry intake spreadsheets - offense text, first-arrest, and supporting fields. 4. Post-Program Behavior Change Tracking(Community).xlsx - 30/60/90-day tracking outcomes. 5. PDF files and pasted project findings - qualitative alignment and language for risk/insight themes. 6. Uploaded MBRI v2.0 - authoritative formatting and section blueprint for this expansion.

Important limitation: several fields are self-reported and some values are missing, duplicated across source files, or coded as capped categories such as "6 or more." For that reason, all conclusions should be treated as current project findings or emerging hypotheses, not final causal proof.

1. Source File Inventory and Data Quality

Source_File	Dataset	Source_Label	Rows_In_Workbook_After_Header	Participant_Rows_Parsed	Column_Count
step_one_20_community_version-d365c9b6-a151-44b4-b943-9131b879bc5f (1).xlsx	Community	Community Intake 20	999	29	74
community data_6_1.xlsx	Community	Community Intake 6_1	982	2	76
Post-Program Behavior Change Tracking(Community).xlsx	Community Tracking	Community Tracking	999	30	28
step_one_re_entry_20_incarcerate-5a0a29df-77d6-4a8c-9b43-2713edd1c8a5.xlsx	Reentry	Reentry Intake 20	999	42	79
Reentry Data_6_1.xlsx	Reentry	Reentry Data 6_1	993	13	81
reentry_verified_audit_counts.csv	Reentry Audit	Reentry Audit Counts	17	0	5

The deduplicated master database contains 90 participant records. Source audit shows 29 parsed participants from the first community intake file, 2 from the June community file, 30 community tracking rows, 42 from the first reentry intake file, and 13 from the June reentry file. The master database consolidates these into participant-level records and flags duplicate/linked source records.

Data quality flags: 33 flags are listed in the master database. Most are duplicate/linked source records or date anomalies. These flags do not invalidate the dataset, but they require caution when interpreting time-based results.

2. Participant Overview

Measure	Count	Percent/Notes
Total participant records in master database	90	100.0%
Community dataset records	31	34.4%
Community tracking-only records	4	4.4%
Reentry dataset records	55	61.1%
Justice-involved reported	78	86.7%
Any conviction reported	75	83.3% of all records; 78 records captured this field

3. Demographic Statistics

Age Groups

Age Group	Count	Percent of Total	Community	Community Tracking	Reentry
18-24	14	15.6%	13	1	0
25-34	17	18.9%	6	1	10
35-44	26	28.9%	4	0	22
45-54	27	30.0%	6	2	19
55+	6	6.7%	2	0	4

Age pattern: the reentry sample is older than the community sample. No reentry participants are in the 18-24 group in the master database, while most 18-24 participants are in the community sample. This matters when comparing criminal-history outcomes across groups because age and criminal-career stage affect arrest and incarceration exposure.

Gender

Category	Count	Percent
Male	84	93.3%
Female	6	6.7%

Race / Ethnicity

Category	Count	Percent
Black or African American	40	44.4%
White	38	42.2%
Hispanic or Latino	2	2.2%
Black or African American, White	2	2.2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	2.2%
Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino	2	2.2%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Black or African American	1	1.1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1.1%
Black or African American/Hispanic	1	1.1%
Middle Eastern or North African	1	1.1%

State and County Concentration

Category	Count	Percent
Ohio	70	77.8%
New York	10	11.1%
New york	3	3.3%
Ny	2	2.2%
NY	1	1.1%
ohio	1	1.1%
New yorjk	1	1.1%
Buffalo	1	1.1%
From Michigan but Convicted in Ohio	1	1.1%

County	Count	Percent
Erie	17	18.9%
Richland	13	14.4%
Wayne	7	7.8%
Cuyahoga	5	5.6%
Hamilton	4	4.4%
Stark	3	3.3%
Lorain	2	2.2%
Franklin	2	2.2%
Montgomery	2	2.2%
Clermont	2	2.2%
Lucas	2	2.2%
Miami	1	1.1%
Shelby	1	1.1%
Trumbull	1	1.1%
Huron	1	1.1%

Jurisdiction caution: Erie County/New York community participants should not be directly compared to Ohio reentry participants without accounting for age, local laws, diversion access, sentencing culture, supervision practices, and prosecution patterns.

4. Education, Employment, Support, and Program Access

Measure	Count	Percent	Interpretation
HS/GED or higher indicator	67	74.4%	Credential or education/training indicator present
No high school/GED flag	20	22.2%	Selected no high school/GED at least once
Education missing/not captured	4	4.4%	Missing in master record
Employed before assessment/incarceration	61	67.8%	Self-reported employment status yes
Family/community support	52	57.8%	Mostly captured in reentry records; missing for some community records
Reentry plan	39	43.3%	Mostly reentry relevant
Support letters	25	27.8%	Mostly reentry relevant
Programs completed field known	53	58.9%	Mostly reentry/program records

Program Completion Categories

Category	Count	Percent
Missing/Not captured	37	41.1%
1-2	27	30.0%
3-5	14	15.6%
More than 15	8	8.9%
6-9	4	4.4%

Verified Reentry Audit - Opportunity and Stability Markers

Metric	Count	Denominator	Percent	Definition
Mental health referral	12	55	21.8%	I was Referred to Mental Health = Yes
Substance abuse referral	18	55	32.7%	I was Referred to Substance Abuse Treatment = Yes
Employed before incarceration	41	55	74.5%	Employed = Yes
Stable work history	37	55	67.3%	Work History states no quit/fired in prior 12 months
High school/GED or higher	44	55	80.0%	Education includes HS/GED/college; No HS/GED selection overrides
No high school/GED	11	55	20.0%	Education counted as No HS/GED
3+ incarcerations	29	55	52.7%	Number of Incarcerations is 3, 4, 5, or 6+
6+ arrests	29	55	52.7%	Number of Arrests = 6 or more
Completed any programs	47	55	85.5%	Programs Completed is not None/blank
Denied programs/work/education	12	55	21.8%	While Incarcerated includes denied programs/work/education
No RIB tickets	45	55	81.8%	Rule Infractions = None
Reentry plan	39	55	70.9%	Reentry Plan = Yes
Family/community support	52	55	94.5%	Family or Community Support = Yes
Focus/learning indicator	23	55	41.8%	Personal Challenges includes attention, sitting still, learning, thinking, or memory items
Emotional regulation indicator	41	55	74.5%	About Me/Challenges/Needs include anxiety, depression, sleep, anger, nervousness, grief, self-harm, or holds things inside
Substance-related indicator	43	55	78.2%	About Me/Happened/Needs/Criminal History/referral includes drug/alcohol use, offense, treatment, recovery, or related struggle
Financial pressure indicator	55	55	100.0%	Debt, money problems, bills, child support, budgeting, overspending, borrowing, or financial pressure

Key verified reentry finding: 44 of 55 reentry participants (80.0%) had high school/GED or higher, 41 of 55 (74.5%) were employed before incarceration, 47 of 55 (85.5%) completed at least one program, and 52 of 55 (94.5%) reported family/community support. Yet 29 of 55 (52.7%) reported 6+ arrests and 29 of 55 (52.7%) reported 3+ incarcerations. This supports the opportunity-outcome gap finding.

5. Criminal History Statistics

Measure	Captured N	Count/Value	Notes
Arrests captured	71	Mean 4.04; median 4.0	6+ is capped as 6 for numeric summary
6+ arrests	71	30 of 71 (42.3%)	Capped high-frequency category
Incarcerations captured	60	Mean 3.08; median 3.0	6+ is capped as 6 for numeric summary
3+ incarcerations	60	31 of 60 (51.7%)	Repeat incarceration marker
Any conviction yes	78	75 of 78 (96.2%)	Self-reported

Arrest Distribution

Category	Count	Percent
6 or more	29	32.2%
Missing/Not captured	19	21.1%
1	12	13.3%
4	10	11.1%
3	7	7.8%
2	7	7.8%
5	4	4.4%
6 or More	1	1.1%
Never been arrested	1	1.1%

Incarceration Distribution

Category	Count	Percent
Missing/Not captured	30	33.3%
1	19	21.1%
6 or more	11	12.2%
2	10	11.1%
5	7	7.8%
3	7	7.8%
4	6	6.7%

First Arrest Distribution - Raw Intake Records

First Arrest Category	Count	Percent of captured
15-17	8	27.6%
18-20	8	27.6%
21-25	6	20.7%
Under 15	3	10.3%
26 or Older	2	6.9%
under 15	1	3.4%

First Arrest Category	Count	Percent of captured
I have never been arrested before	1	3.4%

First-arrest field was captured for 29 participant records in the raw intake mapping. Missing first-arrest information should not be interpreted as no first arrest.

Offense and Criminal-History Indicators - Raw Criminal History Text

Criminal-history indicator	Count	Percent of captured criminal-history text N=73
Drug/alcohol offense	40	54.8%
Probation/supervision/court-order violation	34	46.6%
Weapons charge	14	19.2%
Property offense	6	8.2%
Robbery	4	5.5%
Burglary	3	4.1%
Assault	3	4.1%
Theft/receiving stolen property	2	2.7%
Domestic violence	1	1.4%
Fraud/financial crime	1	1.4%
Felony conviction	53	72.6%
Four or more convictions	15	20.5%
Under 18 at conviction	16	21.9%
18-24 at conviction	35	47.9%
25 or older at conviction	41	56.2%
Employed at conviction	42	57.5%
Unemployed at conviction	14	19.2%
Court fees	9	12.3%

Offense indicators were parsed from self-reported criminal-history text. A single participant can appear in multiple categories. These are not official criminal-record counts.

6. Behavioral Cluster Index

Cluster / Indicator	All N=90	Community N=31	Tracking N=4	Reentry N=55	Interpretation
Regulation cluster	55 of 90 (61.1%)	20 of 31 (64.5%)	0 of 4 (0.0%)	35 of 55 (63.6%)	Emotional regulation, stress response, anxiety/anger/sleep/overload indicators
Responsibility gap cluster	70 of 90 (77.8%)	17 of 31 (54.8%)	0 of 4 (0.0%)	53 of 55 (96.4%)	Positive self-presentation does not fully match behavior history
Externalizing cluster	52 of 90 (57.8%)	17 of 31 (54.8%)	0 of 4 (0.0%)	35 of 55 (63.6%)	Anger, conflict, aggression, rule-breaking, or outward behavior indicators
Substance cluster	43 of 90 (47.8%)	9 of 31 (29.0%)	0 of 4 (0.0%)	34 of 55 (61.8%)	Drug/alcohol/referral/recovery/offense-linked indicators
System 1 dominant	56 of 90 (62.2%)	18 of 31 (58.1%)	0 of 4 (0.0%)	38 of 55 (69.1%)	Reactive/short-term/emotional decision pattern coded
System 2 oriented	83 of 90 (92.2%)	28 of 31 (90.3%)	0 of 4 (0.0%)	55 of 55 (100.0%)	Planning/future orientation/prosocial goal indicators coded

Most important cluster finding: responsibility-gap indicators are the highest-frequency coded cluster in the master database at 70 of 90 participants (77.8%). System 1 dominance appears in 56 of 90 (62.2%), and regulation cluster indicators appear in 55 of 90 (61.1%).

Behavioral Cluster Definitions from Master Database

Cluster	Coding Definition
Regulation Cluster	Yes when MH referral is present or the record has multiple anxiety, depression, worry, sleep, attention, low-confidence, panic, grief, trauma, or emotional shutdown indicators.
Responsibility Gap Cluster	Yes when prosocial identity claims (responsible, disciplined, leader, trustworthy, rule follower, etc.) conflict with arrests/incarcerations, financial instability, rule-breaking, or other adverse outcome markers.
Externalizing Cluster	Yes when the record contains multiple anger, confrontation, aggression, violence, rule-breaking, weapons, domestic violence, or retaliation indicators.
Substance Cluster	Yes when SA referral is present or the record includes multiple drug/alcohol use, treatment, recovery, relapse, or substance-related offense indicators.
System 1 Dominant	Yes when impulsive, reactive, emotional, short-term, peer-pressure, financial-pressure, or aggressive conflict indicators are prominent.
System 2 Oriented	Yes when planning, future focus, rule-following, reflection, calm conflict response, accountability, and structured routine indicators are prominent.

Expanded Cluster Additions for v3.0

New Cluster	Working Definition	Source Status
Inflated Self-Perception	Positive self-description or role identity appears stronger than the behavior history supports. Closely related to narrative inflation and responsibility-gap indicators.	Analytical expansion from Responsibility Gap 70/90 and Reentry Responsibility Gap 53/55
Externalization	Failures or consequences are framed primarily as external circumstances while personal decision patterns remain under-acknowledged.	Qualitative pattern from inconsistency/risk language; no separate prevalence rate calculated
Execution Deficit	Participant identifies goals, resources, or knowledge but does not reliably translate them into stable behavior under pressure.	Analytical observation supported by opportunity-outcome and repeat-offender tables
Structure-to-Freedom Vulnerability	Functioning appears stronger under institutional/program structure than under community autonomy.	Qualitative pattern from risk/insight language; no separate prevalence rate calculated
Manifestation-Mechanism Mismatch	Referral label or presenting problem differs from the underlying behavioral-regulation mechanism identified in the assessment.	Emerging hypothesis from referral and cluster patterns

New Cluster	Working Definition	Source Status
Behavior Under Pressure Failure	Decision quality deteriorates during financial stress, emotional overload, substance exposure, peer pressure, or transition stress.	Core project framework
Responsibility-Behavior Disconnect	Responsibility, reliability, or discipline language conflicts with arrests, incarceration, substance problems, rule violations, or supervision failures.	Overlaps with Responsibility Gap cluster
Opportunity-Outcome Mismatch	Education, employment, support, or program completion exist, but repeat justice involvement or instability continues.	Supported by repeat-offender tables and reentry audit

7. Referral and Screening Pattern Findings

Referral Type	All N=90	Community N=31	Community Tracking N=4	Reentry N=55
Mental health referral	26 of 90 (28.9%)	14 of 31 (45.2%)	0 of 4 (0.0%)	12 of 55 (21.8%)
Substance abuse referral	25 of 90 (27.8%)	7 of 31 (22.6%)	0 of 4 (0.0%)	18 of 55 (32.7%)
Dual MH + SA referral	11 of 90 (12.2%)	5 of 31 (16.1%)	0 of 4 (0.0%)	6 of 55 (10.9%)

Referral pattern: community records show a higher mental-health referral percentage (14 of 31, 45.2%) than substance-abuse referral percentage (7 of 31, 22.6%). Reentry records show the opposite pattern: substance-abuse referrals are 18 of 55 (32.7%), while mental-health referrals are 12 of 55 (21.8%). Both groups still show regulation-related cluster indicators, supporting the mechanism-versus-manifestation hypothesis.

8. Repeat Offender Analysis

Repeat-Offender Marker	Count	Percent of Captured	Education/Employment/Support Profile
6+ arrests	30	42.3% of arrest-captured records	HS/GED+ 22 of 30 (73.3%); employed 22 of 30 (73.3%); family support 28 of 30 (93.3%)
3+ incarcerations	31	51.7% of incarceration-captured records	HS/GED+ 26 of 31 (83.9%); employed 24 of 31 (77.4%); family support 28 of 31 (90.3%)

Repeat Offenders by Cluster

Cluster	Among 6+ Arrests N=30	Among 3+ Incarcerations N=31
Regulation cluster	19 of 30 (63.3%)	21 of 31 (67.7%)
Responsibility gap cluster	30 of 30 (100.0%)	29 of 31 (93.5%)
Externalizing cluster	23 of 30 (76.7%)	22 of 31 (71.0%)
Substance cluster	21 of 30 (70.0%)	17 of 31 (54.8%)
System 1 dominant	25 of 30 (83.3%)	24 of 31 (77.4%)
System 2 oriented	30 of 30 (100.0%)	31 of 31 (100.0%)

Repeat-offender finding: repeated justice involvement remains high even among participants with education, employment, support, and program exposure. In the master file, 22 of 30 participants with 6+ arrests (73.3%) had HS/GED or higher indicators, 22 of 30 (73.3%) were employed, 28 of 30 (93.3%) had family/community support, and 25 of 30 (83.3%) had known program completion data. This supports the argument that repeated failure often reflects unresolved behavioral clusters rather than lack of opportunity alone.

9. Community vs Reentry Comparison

Domain	Community N=31	Reentry N=55	Interpretation
Age 18-24	13 of 31 (41.9%)	0 of 55 (0.0%)	Community sample is younger; reentry sample has no 18-24 participants in master database
Age 45+	8 of 31 (25.8%)	23 of 55 (41.8%)	Reentry sample is older overall
Justice-involved yes	23 of 31 (74.2%)	55 of 55 (100.0%)	Reentry is all/near-all justice involved; community includes non-justice participants
Regulation cluster	20 of 31 (64.5%)	35 of 55 (63.6%)	Similar percentages: community 64.5%, reentry 63.6%
Responsibility gap	17 of 31 (54.8%)	53 of 55 (96.4%)	Much higher in reentry: 96.4%
Substance cluster	9 of 31 (29.0%)	34 of 55 (61.8%)	Higher in reentry: 61.8% vs 29.0%
System 1 dominant	18 of 31 (58.1%)	38 of 55 (69.1%)	Higher in reentry: 69.1% vs 58.1%
System 2 oriented	28 of 31 (90.3%)	55 of 55 (100.0%)	High in both; must be interpreted as orientation/goals, not proof of behavioral control

Community vs reentry caution: differences may reflect jurisdiction, age, legal exposure, and source-file differences. The community sample includes younger Erie County/New York participants and non-justice-involved participants, while the reentry sample is primarily Ohio incarcerated/reentry participants.

10. Post-Program Community Tracking

Tracking Measure	30 Days	60 Days	90 Days	Notes
Employed	18 of 30 (60.0%)	17 of 26 (65.4%)	19 of 22 (86.4%)	Captured rows vary by follow-up interval
Housed	30 of 30 (100.0%)	26 of 26 (100.0%)	21 of 21 (100.0%)	Captured rows vary by follow-up interval
No new justice involvement	30 of 30 (100.0%)	26 of 26 (100.0%)	21 of 21 (100.0%)	Captured rows vary by follow-up interval

Community tracking file contains 30 rows. At 30 days, 18 of 30 (60.0%) were employed, 30 of 30 (100.0%) were housed, and 30 of 30 (100.0%) had no recorded new justice involvement. At 90 days, captured data show 19 of 22 (86.4%) employed, 21 of 21 (100.0%) housed, and 21 of 21 (100.0%) with no recorded new justice involvement. Missing 90-day entries should not be treated as negative outcomes.

11. Key Findings Registry

Finding A: Opportunity does not automatically improve outcomes
Verified reentry data show high levels of education, employment, program completion, and family/community support while repeat arrests/incarcerations remain high.
Evidence: Reentry audit shows HS/GED+ 44 of 55 (80.0%), employed 41 of 55 (74.5%), completed any programs 47 of 55 (85.5%), family/community support 52 of 55 (94.5%), yet 6+ arrests and 3+ incarcerations both appear in 29 of 55 (52.7%).
Limitation: Self-reported records and capped categories limit causal interpretation.

Finding B: Employment does not automatically prevent reoffending
Among 6+ arrest participants, 22 of 30 (73.3%) were employed. Verified reentry audit: 41 of 55 (74.5%) were employed before incarceration.
Evidence: repeat-offender marker table and verified reentry audit.
Limitation: Employment type, wage stability, and duration are not fully validated.

Finding C: Education does not automatically prevent reoffending
Among 3+ incarceration participants, 26 of 31 (83.9%) had HS/GED or higher indicators.
Evidence: repeat-offender marker table.
Limitation: Education level is self-reported and does not measure functional literacy, executive functioning, or skill transfer.

Finding D: Behavioral clusters are more consistent than offense labels
Responsibility gap: 70 of 90 (77.8%); regulation cluster: 55 of 90 (61.1%); System 1 dominance: 56 of 90 (62.2%).
Evidence: behavioral cluster index.
Limitation: Cluster coding is project-coded and requires continued validation.

Finding E: Regulation problems appear across referral groups
Mental-health and substance-abuse referrals differ by sample, but regulation-related indicators remain common in both community and reentry samples.
Evidence: referral table and regulation cluster comparison.
Limitation: Referral status is not a clinical diagnosis.

Finding F: Structure often produces better functioning than freedom
The risk/insight PDF language repeatedly identifies institutional compliance or structured setting stability that may not translate fully to community functioning without external supports.
Evidence: qualitative alignment across risk/insight language and structure-dependence definitions.
Limitation: No single numeric prevalence rate is calculated for structure-to-freedom vulnerability in this version.

Finding G: Repeat offending strengthens the case for targeted programming
Repeated arrests/incarcerations after prior contact suggest previous interventions did not address the mechanism driving behavior. Mandatory targeted programming is most defensible for persistent behavioral-cluster indicators, repeated supervision failure, and repeat offending.
Evidence: repeat-offender tables show high rates of clusters among 6+ arrests and 3+ incarcerations.
Limitation: Policy recommendations require jurisdictional review and validation against outcomes.

Finding H: The referral gap may reflect manifestation versus mechanism
MH and SA referrals may identify presenting problems, while cluster coding suggests underlying regulation, executive-function, stress-response, and responsibility-gap mechanisms.
Evidence: community MH 14 of 31 (45.2%) versus SA 7 of 31 (22.6%); reentry SA 18 of 55 (32.7%) versus MH 12 of 55 (21.8%).
Limitation: This remains an emerging interpretation, not proof of shared etiology.

Finding I: Program completion alone is not enough
Verified reentry data show 47 of 55 (85.5%) completed at least one program, yet repeat justice involvement remains high. This suggests programming must match underlying behavioral clusters and include accountability/transfer to community conditions.
Evidence: verified reentry audit and repeat-offender table.
Limitation: Program type, quality, dosage, and post-program fidelity are not fully available.

Finding J: System 2 orientation is common but may be aspirational
System 2 orientation appears in 83 of 90 (92.2%), but responsibility-gap indicators appear in 70 of 90 (77.8%), meaning future-oriented goals often coexist with inconsistent behavior.
Evidence: behavioral cluster index.
Limitation: System 2 orientation reflects goals/planning language, not proven behavioral control.

Finding K: Inflated Self-Perception vs Behavioral Reality
A recurring disconnect appears between positive self-perception and documented behavioral outcomes. Responsibility-gap indicators appeared in 70 of 90 participants (77.8%) and 53 of 55 reentry participants (96.4%).
Evidence: responsibility-gap cluster and reentry responsibility-gap rates.
Limitation: This is coded from self-report inconsistency patterns and should be validated against longitudinal outcomes.

Finding L: Responsibility Gap Is the Most Common Behavioral Cluster
Responsibility Gap was the highest-frequency coded behavioral cluster at 70 of 90 (77.8%), exceeding Regulation Cluster (61.1%), System 1 Dominance (62.2%), and Substance Cluster (47.8%).
Evidence: behavioral cluster index.
Limitation: Overlap with narrative inflation and self-perception indicators means this cluster should be interpreted as a broad insight/reliability pattern.

Finding M: System 2 Goals Frequently Coexist With System 1 Behavior
System 2 Orientation = 83 of 90 (92.2%), Responsibility Gap = 70 of 90 (77.8%), and System 1 Dominance = 56 of 90 (62.2%). This suggests many participants know or endorse what they should do, but execution under pressure is inconsistent.
Evidence: behavioral cluster index.
Limitation: Requires outcome validation to determine predictive value.

Finding N: Knowledge Deficit Is Less Common Than Execution Deficit
High education rates, employment rates, support levels, and program participation coexist with high arrest and incarceration rates. The issue often appears less about knowing what to do and more about doing it under pressure.
Evidence: education/employment/support tables, reentry audit, and repeat-offender tables.
Limitation: Knowledge, skill, and execution were not directly measured with standardized cognitive testing.

Finding O: Behavior Under Pressure Appears More Predictive Than Stated Intentions
Core framework: Pressure -> Regulation Breakdown -> Poor Decisions -> Negative Outcomes. This framework connects financial stress, emotional overload, substance exposure, peer pressure, and reentry transition stress to later instability.
Evidence: repeated alignment of financial pressure, regulation cluster indicators, System 1 dominance, and repeat offending.
Limitation: This is a major explanatory framework and emerging hypothesis, not causal proof.

Finding P: Structure-to-Freedom Transition Appears To Be a Major Failure Point
Structure dependence should be expanded to include the transition from institutional or program structure to community freedom as a recurring vulnerability.
Evidence: risk/insight language and community-versus-reentry interpretation.
Limitation: No direct transition outcome variable exists in this version.

Finding Q: Repeat Offenders Often Possessed Traditional Protective Factors
Among 6+ arrest participants, HS/GED+ = 73.3%, employed = 73.3%, and family support = 93.3%. Among 3+ incarceration participants, HS/GED+ = 83.9%, employed = 77.4%, and family support = 90.3%.
Evidence: repeat-offender marker table.
Limitation: Protective factors are self-reported and do not prove quality or durability of the factor.

Finding R: Executive Function May Be the Missing Variable
Planning, follow-through, delayed gratification, attention, and self-regulation indicators recur across multiple participant groups and may explain why opportunity does not reliably translate into outcomes.
Evidence: focus/learning indicator 23 of 55 (41.8%) in verified reentry audit and recurring executive-function language in cluster definitions and recommendations.
Limitation: Executive function was not measured with a standardized clinical instrument in the master database.

Finding S: Manifestation Versus Mechanism
Criminal behavior, addiction, supervision failure, and mental health symptoms may be manifestations of deeper emotional regulation, executive-function, stress-reactive decision-making, and behavioral-regulation problems.
Evidence: referral patterns and cluster overlap across groups.
Limitation: This should be treated as an emerging project finding requiring prospective validation.

Finding T: Behavioral Clusters May Precede Criminal History
Behavioral-cluster indicators may identify risk before criminal-history indicators become extensive. This is important for youth, first-time offenders, diversion, and early intervention.
Evidence: system model and cross-sample cluster logic; no prospective pre-criminal-history validation yet.
Limitation: This is a research recommendation and hypothesis-supporting observation, not a validated prediction model.

Finding U: Opportunity Alone Does Not Appear Sufficient for Positive Outcomes
Among repeat-arrest and repeat-incarceration participants, high educational attainment, employment history, family support, and program participation did not eliminate repeat justice involvement.
Evidence: repeat-offender profile table and reentry opportunity markers.
Limitation: This does not deny the importance of opportunity; it shows opportunity may be insufficient when behavioral-regulation deficits remain active.

Finding V: Executive Function Recommendations Emerged Across Referral Categories
Assessment recommendations and cluster patterns repeatedly point toward executive functioning, self-regulation, and behavioral regulation as cross-cutting mechanisms.
Evidence: Focus/learning indicator 23 of 55 (41.8%) plus repeated executive-function language in insight/risk themes.
Limitation: Recommendation frequency should be validated using the full insight-report dataset.

12. Behavioral Cluster Library for Future Questions

Cluster	Working Definition
Emotional Regulation Deficit	Anxiety, anger, panic, depression, mood swings, grief, sleep problems, shutdown, internalized stress, or poor conflict control.
Executive Function Weakness	Trouble planning, organizing, delaying gratification, paying attention, sitting still, remembering, sequencing, or following through.
Substance-Linked Decision Making	Drug/alcohol referral, offense, relapse risk, recovery identity, hard drug use, pills, alcohol misuse, or substance-exposed environment.
Financial Instability	Debt, overspending, borrowing, court fees, child support pressure, bills, budgeting needs, job instability, or illegal-income pressure.
Responsibility Gap	Positive identity claims, family goals, leadership, discipline, or responsibility claims that conflict with behavior record.
Social Influence Vulnerability	Peer influence, respect dynamics, gang exposure, approval seeking, loyalty conflicts, or environment-driven decisions.
Structure Dependence	Better behavior in prison/program/work structure than in the community; routine maintained externally rather than internally.
System 1 Dominance	Fast, reactive, emotional, impulsive, short-term, survival-oriented decision pattern.
System 2 Orientation	Future goals, planning, responsibility language, reflection, and values-based identity. Must be checked against behavior.
Opportunity-Outcome Gap	Education, jobs, support, or programming exist, but behavior under pressure still produces negative outcomes.
Narrative Inflation	Self-presentation appears more positive or stable than behavior history supports.
Mandatory Programming Rationale	Not mandatory because of crime alone; justified when repeated objective indicators show unresolved behavioral clusters.
Inflated Self-Perception	Positive self-description appears stronger than demonstrated behavioral outcomes; often overlaps with narrative inflation and responsibility-gap indicators.
Externalization	Failures are attributed primarily to other people, systems, bad luck, or circumstances while personal decision patterns remain minimized.
Execution Deficit	Participant identifies goals, resources, or knowledge but does not reliably convert them into stable behavior when pressure increases.
Structure-to-Freedom Vulnerability	Stability is stronger under institutional, program, or work structure than under community autonomy.
Manifestation-Mechanism Mismatch	Referral category or presenting problem differs from the underlying regulation/executive-function mechanism identified in assessment patterns.
Behavior Under Pressure Failure	Decision quality deteriorates during financial stress, emotional overload, peer pressure, substance exposure, or transition stress.
Responsibility-Behavior Disconnect	Responsibility, reliability, or discipline language conflicts with arrests, incarceration, substance problems, rule violations, or supervision failures.
Opportunity-Outcome Mismatch	Education, employment, support, or program completion are present, yet repeat justice involvement or instability continues.

13. Emerging Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Pressure - Regulation Breakdown - Poor Decisions - Negative Outcomes
Financial stress, emotional overload, substance exposure, and peer pressure may trigger regulation breakdowns that produce criminal, supervision, employment, or relationship failure.

Hypothesis 2: Manifestation vs mechanism
Mental-health referrals, substance-abuse referrals, criminal behavior, and supervision failure may be different manifestations of overlapping regulation/executive-function mechanisms.

Hypothesis 3: Repeat offending reflects unresolved clusters
Repeated arrests/incarcerations may often indicate that prior interventions did not identify or address the underlying behavioral cluster.

Hypothesis 4: Opportunity alone is insufficient
Education, employment, family support, and program completion are protective only when the person can regulate behavior under pressure.

Hypothesis 5: Mandatory targeted programming may be beneficial for repeat offenders
For chronic repeat offenders, enforced behavioral programming may be a public-safety intervention when it targets identified behavioral clusters and includes accountability, repetition, and transfer to community settings.

Hypothesis 6: Behavioral poverty vs material poverty within this sample
Current data suggest that within this justice-involved sample, opportunity and material resources were often present, while behavioral execution under pressure remained unstable. This should not be generalized to all poverty without further research.

Hypothesis 7: System 2 goals with System 1 execution
Preliminary evidence indicates that future-oriented goals and prosocial identity may coexist with reactive or short-term behavior under stress.

Hypothesis 8: Executive function as a common mechanism
Executive-function weakness may underlie multiple presenting problems, including addiction, supervision failure, unstable employment, and poor decision-making.

Hypothesis 9: Behavioral clusters may precede criminal history
Behavioral indicators may allow earlier risk identification before extensive arrests or convictions accumulate.

Hypothesis 10: Grand hypothesis
Criminal behavior, addiction, supervision failure, chronic unemployment, financial instability, and some mental-health presentations may represent different outcomes of overlapping behavioral-regulation deficits.

14. Future Update Protocol

Use this file title for future reference: MASTER_BEHAVIORAL_RESEARCH_INDEX_MBRI_v3.0_FULLY_POPULATED.

When new assessments are added, update the master database first, then regenerate this index. Future versions should add participant-level validation outcomes, 6-month and 12-month follow-up data, new arrest/reincarceration outcomes, program completion outcomes, supervision completion outcomes, and workbook pre/post changes.

Recommended next version: MBRI v4.0 should include participant-level validation outcomes, offense category cross-tabs by age/gender/race, and validation analysis linking clusters to actual post-release outcomes.

Future validation priorities: validate behavioral clusters against rearrest, reincarceration, supervision completion, workbook pre/post change, and 6-month/12-month outcomes; compare behavioral-cluster predictive value against criminal-history measures and traditional risk tools; test whether executive-function indicators predict outcomes independent of criminal history; test whether responsibility-gap indicators predict future outcomes; evaluate whether behavioral-cluster indicators improve identification of first-time offenders before extensive criminal-history accumulation.

15. Validation Outcomes

Validation Domain	Current Status	Result
Participant-level post-release validation	Data Not Available	Insufficient longitudinal outcome data in current source package
6-month follow-up outcomes	Data Not Available	Unable to calculate from available sources
12-month follow-up outcomes	Data Not Available	Unable to calculate from available sources
New arrest outcomes after assessment	Data Not Available	Unable to calculate from available sources
Reincarceration outcomes after assessment	Data Not Available	Unable to calculate from available sources

16. Arrest and Reincarceration Outcomes

Arrest and incarceration history are available as self-reported baseline variables. Post-assessment arrest and reincarceration outcome fields are not sufficiently available for longitudinal validation in this version. Therefore, predictive claims are not presented as verified outcome findings.

17. Supervision Completion Outcomes

Supervision completion outcomes are Data Not Available in the current source package. Supervision failure risk is discussed only as a risk/needs planning theme where supported by criminal history and risk assessment language, not as verified post-assessment outcome data.

18. Workbook Pre/Post Outcome Analysis

Workbook pre/post change data are Data Not Available in the current source package. Future versions should link workbook pre/post measures to participant-level behavioral clusters and later outcomes before claiming program effect.

19. Cluster-to-Outcome Analysis

Cluster	Available Baseline Association	Outcome Validation Status
Responsibility Gap	70 of 90 (77.8%); 30 of 30 (100.0%) among 6+ arrests; 29 of 31 (93.5%) among 3+ incarcerations	Post-release outcome validation not yet available

Cluster	Available Baseline Association	Outcome Validation Status
System 1 Dominance	56 of 90 (62.2%); 25 of 30 (83.3%) among 6+ arrests; 24 of 31 (77.4%) among 3+ incarcerations	Post-release outcome validation not yet available
Regulation Cluster	55 of 90 (61.1%); 19 of 30 (63.3%) among 6+ arrests; 21 of 31 (67.7%) among 3+ incarcerations	Post-release outcome validation not yet available
Substance Cluster	43 of 90 (47.8%); 21 of 30 (70.0%) among 6+ arrests; 17 of 31 (54.8%) among 3+ incarcerations	Post-release outcome validation not yet available

20. Participant-Level Validation Appendix

Participant-level validation appendix is Data Not Available for v3.0 because longitudinal validation outcomes are not included in the current source package. Future versions should add one row per participant with ID, demographics, criminal history, clusters, referrals, program completion, supervision status, new arrest status, reincarceration status, workbook pre/post change, and follow-up timing.

21. Offense Cross-Tab Analysis by Age, Gender, and Race

Offense category cross-tabs by age, gender, and race are not calculated in this expansion because participant-level offense coding was not fully validated across all source fields for official cross-tab reporting. Current offense data remain self-reported criminal-history text indicators and are reported in Section 5. Future versions should compute cross-tabs only after final participant-level offense coding is locked.

22. Behavioral Cluster Predictive Analysis

Behavioral cluster predictive analysis is not yet available as a validated predictive model. Current evidence supports baseline associations between clusters and repeat-offender markers, but prediction requires longitudinal outcomes. This section should be updated when new arrest, reincarceration, supervision completion, and program outcome data are available.

23. Executive Summary of Major Findings

The current data continue to support the core project interpretation that repeated negative outcomes often appear less tied to simple lack of opportunity and more tied to behavioral execution under pressure. The strongest verified quantitative finding remains the opportunity-outcome gap in the reentry sample: high rates of education, employment, program completion, and family/community support coexist with high rates of 6+ arrests and 3+ incarcerations. The strongest coded behavioral finding is the responsibility-gap cluster at 70 of 90 participants (77.8%) and 53 of 55 reentry participants (96.4%).

The expanded v3.0 findings registry preserves Findings A-J and adds Findings K-V, including inflated self-perception, responsibility gap as highest-frequency cluster, System 2 goals with System 1 behavior, execution deficit, behavior under pressure, structure-to-freedom vulnerability, repeat-offender protective factors, executive function as a missing variable, manifestation-versus-mechanism, and early behavioral cluster identification.

The central model for future testing remains: Pressure -> Regulation Breakdown -> Poor Decisions -> Negative Outcomes. This model is currently supported as an emerging explanatory framework, not final causal proof.