If you have issues viewing or accessing this file contact us at NCJRS.gov.

A PROFILE OF CHARACTERISTICS DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN PROGRAM COMPLETERS AND PROGRAM NON-COMPLETERS IN MASSACHUSETTS' PRE-RELEASE CENTERS

Prepared by:

Daniel P. LeClair
Social Science
Research Specialist

30598 Dup

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Frank A. Hall
Commissioner

November, 1975

PUBLICATION # 8535 - 45 - 250 - 11 - 75 - CR
Approved by Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent

INTRODUCTION

In 1972, the Massachusetts Department of Correction began its development of a network of community-based correctional programs. Programs such as Home Furloughs, Work-Release, Education-Release and residential Half-way Houses and Pre-Release Centers were some of the component parts of this network. Coordinated with the introduction of these various programs was an extensive effort to develop and carry out careful research evaluations for each of the individual programs in the community-based correctional network. The purpose of the research evaluations were twofold: first, research evaluations were designed to provide operational feedback for program administrators; secondly, research evaluations were designed to measure the rehabilitative effectiveness of the programs as correctional devices. Several of these research evaluations have already been completed and have been published by the Department of Correction's Research Unit.[1]

The present paper continues the research evaluation series. It deals with an important operational aspect of the Boston State and Shirley Pre-Release centers. Pre-Release Centers are small residential facilities located outside the confines of the walled institutions to which state prisoners who are within eighteen months of their parole eligibility date are able to be transferred. These centers take as their model the programs originally initiated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons in 1961, known as "Pre-Release Guidance Centers".

The purpose of the Pre-Release Guidance Center is to provide a mechanism whereby a more gradual process of societal reintroduction for prisoners completing their sentences would occur, and thereby reduce the rate of reincarceration. This process is accomplished in several ways. First the selected inmates live in a reintegration residence located outside of the walled institution, and often in the area of the community where they are to eventually return. Presumably, this action separates the inmates from what has been called the "anti-rehabilitative inmate social system" within the total institution of the walled prison. Secondly, most of the inmates work at jobs in the community during the day and return to the Pre-Release Center to spend their non-working hours.

NCJRS
JUL 29 1977
ACQUISITIONS

This allows for interaction with non-inmates at work in the community as well as provides the opportunity for the offender to participate in major economic roles. In addition to accumulating savings from their wages, residents in the program are participating in economic roles by paying state and federal taxes, by paying for social security benefits, and by paying for the cost of their room, board and personal expenditures even though they are still technically incarcerated inmates. Furthermore, a portion of their pay is often allocated to support dependents or to pay off debts or court costs accumulated before incarceration. When released from prison, the inmate receives his accumulated earnings less the deductions for room, board, taxes, personal expenditures and outside allotments. The remaining accumulated earnings provide an additional resource for the inmate's reintegration into the community when he is released.

Thirdly, inmates have the opportunity to enlist in educational programs in area schools and colleges by attending classes during the day or evening and returning to the Pre-Release Center during non-school hours. This allows the inmate to interact with individuals in the free community as well as to allow the inmate to re-establish ties with the educational system prior to his release on parole. In most instances, the centers are able to secure funds to support this activity.

Finally, the Pre-Release Centers are able to meet the need of gradual reintegration to the community by such programs as continued vocational and educational counseling, drug counseling, resource identification in the community, home furloughs, and job development and placement. In summary, the Pre-Release programs provide needed institutional supervision but at the same time allow the offender to continue to perform major societal and economic roles. Hopefully, the program eases the often difficult transition from prison to community by providing an intermediary step.

One facet of the current operational experience of running pre-release programs in Massachusetts that has caused administrators some concern is the high percentage of individuals who are selected for and enter into pre-release programs but who do not complete these programs. Instead of being released directly from the pre-release centers to the community on parole status, or on a good conduct discharge, the program non-completers are returned to their original sending walled institution usually to spend the remaining period of their incarceration. A few are allowed to re-

enter pre-release programs for a second time after a period of incarceration in the walled institution. However, the majority are paroled or discharged directly from the walled institution to the street. This occurence is problematic in the sense that it negates the attempted achievement of the basic goal of the pre-release program - the provision of an intermediary step between prison and parole or discharge in the community.

Individuals become program non-completers for a variety of reasons. Some are returned for failing to adjust to the pre-release environment; either because they exhibit serious disciplinary problems such as failing to adhere to house rules or because they fail to return from release programs at the specified time limit. Other individuals are returned because they attempt or actually complete an escape from the center. A few individuals are returned because they have become involved in illegal activities in the community while on release time; some are actually arrested for these crimes and receive an additional sentence. Finally, some individuals become involved in excessive alcohol and/or drug abuse. When any of these above situations occur and are detected, a committee consisting of selected program staff meets to determine whether or not removal from the program is warranted. If an agreement is reached that removal from the program is warranted, the individual in question is returned to his sending institution.

The behavior problems signal to the staff that the individual in concern is not ready to handle the responsibility involved in living in the relative freedom that constitutes the pre-release environment. The damage that results from such a situation, however, is far more extensive than the simple removal of an individual from a pre-release program. Not only is an individual returned to a walled institution, but he is probably to remain in that institution for a longer period of time than he would have, had he not entered the pre-release program. For example, if the individual had attempted or completed an escape from the pre-release program, he may receive an additional sentence from the courts of up to five years, thus considerably prolonging his period of incarceration. Similarly, if the individual concerned has been arrested for a new crime, he may receive an additional sentence of length to be determined in relation to the particular crime involved. Even if the individual

is returned for technical, disciplinary infractions that do not involve additional court action, such as failure to adjust, damage may occur. When the individual in concern eventually applies for parole while back at the walled institution, the record of his adjustment failure in the pre-release program may affect the decision of the Parole Board. Knowledge that a failure had already occurred in a minimum security setting lessens the chances of a parole being granted, or at least prolong the wait for a parole.

What follows is an analysis of the two pre-release samples in terms of the basic statistical differences between program participants who completed the program and were released from the pre-release centers to the free community and program participants who did not complete the program but who were instead returned to their sending institutions. Such an analysis is deemed important for two basic reasons. First, if program administrators have some sort of objective guide by which to predict in advance whether or not a particular individual has a high, low or moderate success/failure probability for completing their program, the selection process would be facilitated by the use of such indicators. That is, if program administrators choose to select only those individuals who are found to have a reasonably high statistical probability of completing the program, so as to maximize use of scarce residential bed space or to avoid doing eventual harm to the resident, indicators distinguishing between completion/non-completion may be utilized at the selection process stage for this purpose.

A second, perhaps more creative use of the indicators could be at the reception and diagnosis stage of the pre-release program. At the time of the client intake orientation period the indicators could be utilized to identify high, moderate or low completion risks. High risk groups could be identified and more individualized and more intensive supervision or programming and guidance could be established.

In summary, identified indicators distinguishing between potential program completers and program non-completers could be utilized either as a selection function in which high return risks would be screened out, or as a diagnostic function in which high return risks would be assigned more intensive

supervision and programming. In either case, an attempt is being made to identify characteristics of individuals who fail to complete the pre-release programs to which they have been assigned so that this material can be used by program administrators in an attempt to reduce such failures.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The present study was begun in January of 1973[2] and was designed with the purpose of answering the following research question:

> What variables distinguish between individuals who complete and individuals who do not complete their assignments to Pre-Release programs?

In determining the existence of characteristics distinguishing between program completers and program non-completers, a multivariate analysis was conducted on a sample of individuals assigned to either of two programs operated by the Massachusetts Department of Correction: the Boston State Pre-Release Center and the Shirley Pre-Release Center. A statistical comparison of commitments, personal history background characteristics, and criminal history background characteristics on each of the program completers and each of the program non-completers was carried out to determine whether or not any significant differences existed between the two samples. Statistically significant differences between the two sub-samples were recorded and a profile of the differences was conducted.[3]

The study includes those participants who entered the Pre-Release programs and who were also released from the programs during the first fourteen months of operation. Thus, all inmates who participated in the Shirley and Boston State Pre-Release programs from the time of the inception of the program in November of 1972 and who had been released from the program as of January 1, 1974 were included. Included in this sample are both program completers - individuals who had been released directly to the community - and program non-completers - individuals who were removed from the program and returned to their respective sending institutions.

A total of 228 individuals had participated in and were released from the two Pre-Release centers collectively during the specified time period of the study. Of the 228 individuals in the two samples who participated in the Pre-release programs under study, 137 (60%) successfully completed these programs and were released to the community directly from the programs.

The other 91 individuals (40%) were returned to their walled institutions as program non-completers. Many of the program non-completers were subsequently released directly from their walled institutions to the community at the time of their eventual paroles; others are still in prison. A few individuals were reaccepted into Pre-release programs after a period of incarceration.

Of the 111 individuals who participated in the Boston State Pre-Release Program, 75 (68%) were program completers, and 36 (32%) were program non-completers. Of the 117 individuals who participated in the Shirley Pre-Release Program, 62 (53%) were program completers and 55 (47%) were program non-completers. A summary of the number of individuals returned as program non-completers as well as a breakdown of the specific reason for their return is provided in Table I below.

TABLE I

Reason for Return to Sending Institution
Boston State and Shirley
Pre-Release Population: 1972-1973

Specific Reason	Boston State	Shirley	Total
Escape on Furlough	10 (28)	26 (47)	36 (40)
Violation of Furlough Rules	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (1)
Escape on Work-Release	6 (17)	2 (4)	8 (9)
Direct Escape from Pre-Release Facility	5 (14)	3 (5)	8 (9)
New Arrest	2 (6)	0 (0)	2 (2)
Medical Problems	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (1)
Violation of House Rules	7 (19)	10 (18)	17 (19)
Inability to Adjust	1 (3)	7 (13)	8 (9)
Other (i.e. own request)	4 (11)	2 (4)	6 (7)
Unknown	1 (3)	3 (5)	4 (4)
Total	36 (100)	55 (100)	91 (100)

Data Collection

Data collection for both the treatment and control samples consist of: (1) criminal history variables, (2) social background variables, (3) history of present offense variables, and (4) history of present incarceration. This material was collected from the Massachusetts Department of Correction central office files. A full listing of the variables collected and utilized in the analysis that follows can be found in Appendix I of this report.[4]

FINDINGS

I. Boston State Pre-Release Program

A comparison of Commitment, Background and Criminal History variables between Boston State program completers and program non-completers yielded nine variables that produced statistically significant differences. These variables were: Number of Previous Juvenile Paroles, Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations, Number of Prior Court Appearances for Crimes Against Property, Length of time to Parole Eligibility Date, Length of Employment at any one Job, Number of Prior Court Appearances for Narcotic Offenses, Age at Time of Release, and Total Number of Prior Court Appearances. The specific dividing point and the actual direction of each of these differences is discussed below.

(1) The Program non-completion sample had a disproportionately higher number of individuals who had previously been paroled as a juvenile. Whereas 47% of the program non-completion sample had experienced parole status as a juvenile, only 19% of the program completion sample had experienced parole status as a juvenile.

(2) Similar to item I above, the program non-completion sample had a disproportionately higher number of individuals who had been previously incarcerated as a juvenile. Specifically, 50% of the program non-completion sample had experienced juvenile incarceration. For the program completion sample only 22% had experienced juvenile incarcerations.

(3) The program non-completion sample had a higher number of individuals who had a large number of prior court appearances for crimes against property. Seventy-four percent of the program non-completion sample had five or more prior court appearances for crimes against property as compared to only 43 percent for the program completion sample.

(4) In terms of Length of Time to parole eligibility date a disproportionately higher number of the program non-completion sample had more than six months to go before parole eligibility. Whereas 67 percent of the program non-completion samples had seven months or longer before eligibility, only 21 per cent of the program completion sample had seven months or longer before

parole eligibility. (For this variable individuals with unknown parole eligibility dates were excluded from the sample).

(5) When considering employment variables, it was discovered that the program non-completion sample had a disproportionately higher number of individuals with relatively short periods of employment at their prior most skilled position. Eighty-one percent of the program non-completion sample had been employed less than one year at their most skilled prior position. Fifty-two percent of the program completion sample had been employed less than one year at their most skilled position.

(6) It was also discovered that when considering the longest period of employment at any one job (excluding unknowns) that the program non-completion sample had a disproportionately higher number of individuals with less than one year at any job. Seventy-six percent of the non-completion sample compared to 48 percent of the program completion sample had worked less than one year at any prior job.

(7) The program non-completion sample had a disproportionately higher number of individuals with prior court appearances for narcotic offenses. Fifty-five percent of the non-completion sample had one or more prior court appearances for narcotic offenses as compared to 31 percent for the completion sample.

(8) A disporportionately higher number of individuals in the program non-completion sample were under 30 years of age at the time of their termination from the pre-release program completion sample. Eighty-four percent of the program non-completion sample was 30 years of age or under at time of release while 64 percent of the program completion sample was 30 years of age or under at time of release.

(9) Finally, the program non-completion sample has a disproportionately larger number of individuals with five or more previous court appearances. Ninety-five percent of the program non-completers compared to 80 percent of program completers had five or more prior court appearances.

In summary, analysis revealed that program non-completers at Boston State Pre-Release Center more often than not tended to be younger offenders with long court records largely for narcotic offenses and/or offenses against property whose incarceration and parole histories began on the juvenile level. The program non-completer had a more severely sporadic employment history than the program completer. Additionally, the program non-completer had a longer wait for a parole eligibility date and thus a potentially longer period of stay at the pre-release center.

A summary of these relationships as well as the remaining variables that did not produce statistically significant results is presented in Appendix II. The Chi Square statistic for the most significant splits for each of the variables utilized in the analysis are also given in Appendix II.

II. Shirley Pre-Release Program

A comparison between Shirley Program Completers and Program Non-completers that had resided at the center between November of 1972 and December of 1973 yielded five variables that produced statistically significant differences at the .05 probability level. These variables were: Number of Prior Court Appearances for Crimes Against the Person, Number of Previous Juvenile Paroles, Total Number of Prior Court Appearances, Number of Previous Adult Paroles, and Total Number of Prior Juvenile incarcerations. The specific dividing point and the actual direction of each of these differences is discussed below.

(1) Individuals in the Program Non-Completion Sample had a disproportionately higher frequency of Previous Court Appearances for Crimes Against the Person. Specifically, 66 percent of the Program Non-Completers had two or more court appearances for crimes against the person whereas only 43 percent of the Program Completers had two or more such court appearances.

(2) Analysis of the variable Number of Previous Juvenile Paroles revealed that significantly more members of the Program Non-Completion Sample had one or more previous juvenile paroles than did individuals in the Program Completion Sample. Thirty-two percent of the Non-Completers had one or more previous

juvenile paroles compared to 13 percent of the Completers.

(3) Analysis of the variable, Total Number of Prior Court Appearances, revealed that a disproportionate number of individuals who were Non-Completers had 11 or more prior court appearances. For this cut-off point, 48 percent of the non-completers and 30 percent of the completers had 11 or more court appearances.

(4) A disproportionate number of the Non-Completers had experienced a previous adult parole. Approximately 18 percent of the Non-Completion sample, compared to three percent of the completion sample had had one or more previous adult paroles.

(5) When considering the variable, Total Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations, it was found that Program Non-Completers more frequently than Program Completers had experienced one or more prior juvenile incarcerations, only 17 percent of the completers had experienced one or more such incarcerations.

As a profile of the typical Shirley program non-completer as compared to the completer, one would say that he was an individual with a longer court record especially involving offenses against the person whose prior incarceration history had begun at the juvenile level and subsequently led to both juvenile and adult paroles.

A summary of these findings containing the specific frequency for each sector of the dichotomy in each sub-sample as well as the statistical significance levels is produced in Appendix II. Also included in Appendix II are those variables not found to display a statistically significant difference.

DISCUSSION

The present study was designed with the purpose of determining characteristics which distinguish between individuals who complete and individuals who do not complete their assignment to the two community-based pre-release programs operated by the state of Massachusetts. The programs had emerged out of the current national treatment philosophy characterized as community-based corrections. This treatment philosophy argues that the series of stresses that accompany the transition from the rigid controls of traditional penal institutions to the relative freedom found upon community re-entry, infringe upon (or negate) any rehabilitative gains made through institutional treatment programs. Therefore, the community-based treatment philosophy advocated the establishment of supervised graduated release centers to be located outside the confines of the penal institutions and to be directly linked to the major social institutions of the outside community. It was considered crucial to re-establish (or, in fact, to establish for the first time) ties between the releasee and the legitimate social institutions in the community to which the inmate would eventually return. This process, it was hypothesized, would reduce the present high levels of recidivism of correctional institution releasees. The Boston State and Shirley Pre-Release Centers were established in Massachusetts to meet this goal.

A separate study has been published that dealt with the correctional effectiveness of these two pre-release programs by testing whether or not inmates who ended their terms of incarceration in these pre-release centers were less likely to be reincarcerated within one year of their release than similar types of inmates who did not participate in a pre-release program prior to release. Results revealed that these pre-release centers reduced recidivism 50%.[5] However, the reduction in recidivism only applied to individuals who <u>successfully completed</u> their assignment to pre-release programs. Individuals who did not complete the program, but were instead returned to walled institutions and eventually released from these walled institutions, did not demonstrate reduced recidivism rates.

Therefore, if the programs are not correctionally effective with the non-completers, and if program non-completion rates continue at their present high levels (40 to 50% of those assigned to the programs do not complete the programs); an index of characteristics associated with the incidence of completion/

non-completion becomes crucial for program administrators. Because of this situation, the present study was designed to address the question of what particular characteristics seem to distinguish between individuals who complete and individuals who do not complete their assignments to pre-release programs.

In order to determine the possible existence of characteristics distinguishing between program completers and program non-completers, a multivariate analysis using commitment, personal background, and criminal history variables on each participant was carried out. The background characteristics were used as independent variables, and the incident of completion versus non-completion was used as the dependent variable for this analysis.

The comparison of commitment, personal background and criminal history variables for the Boston State program completers versus non-completers yielded 9 variables that produced statistically significant differences on outcome. These variables were summarized in the following profile: At the Boston State Pre-Release Center individuals who failed to successfully complete the program tended to be the younger offenders; offenders with long court records, largely consisting of narcotic offenses and/or offenses against property, and offenders whose incarceration and parole histories began on the juvenile level. The program non-completer had a more severely sporadic employment history than did the program completer. Additionally, the program non-completer had a longer wait until legally eligible for parole and thus a potentially longer stay at the pre-release center.

The comparison between Shirley Program completers and Program Non-completers yielded five variables that produced statistical differences. These variables are summarized in the following profile: The typical program non-completer at Shirley when compared to the program completer was found to be an individual with a longer court record, especially involving offenses against the person, whose prior incarceration history began at the juvenile level, and who had previously experienced both juvenile and adult paroles.

It was suggested that these indicators of potential non-completion types could be used administratively in two ways. First, they could provide administrators with an objective guide, to be used in conjunction with subjective feelings, by which to predict in advance whether or not a particular indiv-

idual applying for entry into the program has a high, low or moderate success/failure probability for program completion. In this way, the selection process could be facilitated by the use of these indicators, so as to maximize optimum use of scarce residential bed space or to avoid eventual harm to a prospective resident with a high non-completion risk.

Secondly, the indicators could be used as a treatment device at the reception and diagnosis stage in the program. At the time of the intake orientation, the indicators could be used to identify the high, low, or moderate non-completion risk groupings. The identified high non-completion risks could be singled out and assigned to more individualized and more intensive supervision, programming, and guidance. Hopefully, the process would reduce the non-completion rate.

Footnotes

1. See the Following Massachusetts Department of Correction Publications

O'Malley, Joanne An Evaluation of the Massachusetts Furlough Experience - November 1972 - August 1973. Massachusetts Department of Correction January, 1974;

Landolfi, Joseph Interim Report on Community Rehabilitation Centers, Massachusetts Department of Correction, April, 1974;

Farrington, Faye The Massachusetts Furlough Experience. Massachusetts Department of Correction, April, 1974;

Wright, Michele and Faye Farrington Selected Characteristics of Residents Who Have Escaped on Furlough from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions. Massachusetts Department of Correction October 1974;

Farrington, Faye 1974 Statistical Report of the Furlough Program. Massachusetts Department of Correction, April, 1975;

Mackey, Chris 1974 Statistical Report of the Community Rehabilitation System. Massachusetts Department of Correction, April, 1975;

LeClair, Daniel P. An Analysis of Recidivism Among Residents Released from Boston State and Shirley Pre-Release Centers During 1972-1973. Massachusetts Department of Correction, August, 1975;

Landolfi, Joseph 1974 Client Profile, Massachusetts Halfway Houses, Inc., Massachusetts Department of Correction, September, 1975.

2. The author acknowledges his appreciation for the assistance that Joseph Landolfi and Russ Kerr, Research Assistants at the Massachusetts Department of Correction, gave in the course of this analysis. Some of the material had been previously published as Departmental Information Bulletins by Joseph Landolfi and Daniel LeClair.

3. In order to conduct the analysis of the distinguishing characteristics between program completers and program non-completers, both the total Boston State and the total Shirley Pre-Release treatment samples were subdivided into subsamples of completions and non-completions. A multivariate analysis in which the background variables were dichotomized according to a series of different splits for each sample and the chi square statistics was run on each of these splits. The dichotomized split that yielded the highest chi square was chosen. However, only variables that yielded a statistically significant relationship at the .05 probability level ($X^2 = 3.84$,1 df) were selected as indicators of differences between the two subsamples.

4. The author would like to acknowledge his indebtedness and appreciation for the careful work that the following individuals provided in the collection and coding of data used for the analysis: Ira Baline, Linda Collins, Donna Gurski, Denise Huffman, Carolyn Jackson, Russ Kerr, Joe Landolfi, Chris Mackey, Therese Pink, and Ellen Weiner. He would also like to acknowledge his indebtedness and appreciation for the computer processing aid of Andy Griffiths, Robert Patrician, Tom Cannon, and Ed Callahan.

5. LeClair, Daniel P. An Analysis of Recidivism Among Residents Released from Boston State and Shirley Pre-Release Centers During 1972-1973. Massachusetts Department of Correction, August, 1975.

APPENDIX I

PART A

VARIABLES USED IN ANALYSES

A. Commitment Variables

1. Institution of Original Commitment*
2. Number of Jail Credits
3. Age at Commitment
4. Present Offense (most serious charge)*
5. Number of Charges Involved in Present Offense *
6. Type of Sentence*

B. Personnel Background Characteristics Variables

1. Race*
2. Marital Status*
3. Military Service*
4. Last Civilian Address*
5. Emergency Addressee*
6. Occupational Field*
7. Length of Employment at Most Skilled Position
8. Longest Time Employed at Any One Job
9. Last Grade Completed*
10. History of Drug Use*

C. Criminal History Variables

1. Age at First Arrest
2. Age at First Drunk Arrest
3. Age at First Drug Arrest

---

*An asterik indicates variables that will be formally defined in Part B of this Appendix.

4. Total Number of Court Appearances
5. Number of Court Appearances for Person Offenses
6. Number of Court Appearances for Property Offenses
7. Number of Court Appearances for Sex Offenses
8. Number of Court Appearances for Narcotic Offenses
9. Number of Court Appearances for Drunkenness Offenses
10. Number of Court Appearances for Escape Offenses
11. Number of Juvenile Commitments
12. Number of House of Correction Commitments
13. Number of Prior State of Federal Commitments
14. Number of Any Incarcerations
15. Number of Juvenile Paroles
16. Number of Adult Paroles
17. Number of Any Paroles
18. Number of Juvenile Parole Violations
19. Number of Adult Parole Violations
20. Number of Any Parole Violations

D. Releasing Variables

1. Age at Release
2. Length of time served on present incarceration
3. Type of Release.*

E. Recidivism Variable

PART B

FORMAL DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES

A-1. Institution of Original Commitment

a. Walpole

b. Concord

c. Framingham

d. Other institutions

A-4. Present Offense

a. Offenses Against the Person (Chapter 265)*

Murder, 1st degree (section 1)
Murder, 2nd degree (section 2)
Manslaughter (section 13)
Assaults with intent to commit murder.
includes assault with intent to murder, maim, etc.; assault to commit murder; assault with a deadly weapon with intent to murder; assault with intent to kill (section 15)

Attempted murder
includes all attempts to commit murder, other than assaults: attempted murder, attempts to commit murder by poisoning, drowning, or strangling (section 16)
Armed Robbery (section 17)
Unarmed Robbery
includes robbery, robbery-not being armed, robbery by force and violence. (section 19)

Assaults with intent to rob, etc., Being Armed
includes assault with a deadly weapon with intent to rob. (section 18)

Assaults with intent to rob, etc. Not Being Armed
includes assault to rob, assault with intent to rob, assault with intent to rob by force and violence (section 20)

Confining or putting in fear a person for the purpose of stealing
includes breaking, burning or blowing up a safe. (Section 21)

---

*Chapters and sections refer to the General Laws of Massachusetts.

Armed Assaults in dwelling houses
the act may be an actual assault or an attempt. (section 18A)

Assault and Assault and Battery
includes assault, assault and battery, assault on an officer (sections 13A and 13D)

Assault and Battery with Dangerous Weapon (section 15A)

Assault by means of a Dangerous Weapon
includes armed assault. (section 15B)

Mayhem (section 14)

Assaults not before mentioned
includes assault with intent to commit manslaughter (section 29)

Kidnapping
includes abduction, holding hostages. (section 26)

Extortion
includes attempts to extort money, threats. (section 25)

Conspiracy
where possible do not code case here, but under the specific crime that the subject conspired to commit. That is, conspiracy to commit larceny should be coded as (522) Larceny.

b. Sex Offenses - Against the Person (Chapter 265)

Rape (section 22)

Assault with Intent to Commit Rape
includes attempts to rape, indecent assault on an adult, indecent assault and battery on an adult, indecent assault on an adult with intent to rape (section 24)

Rape of Female under Sixteen (section 22A)

Rape of Child
includes carnal abuse of a child, carnal abuse of a child under "x" years, statutory rape (section 23)

Assault on Female under Sixteen with intent to commit Rape
includes attempts to carnally abuse, assault on child under the age of consent, indecent assault on a minor (section 24B)

Indecent Assault and Battery on Child under 14
includes indecent assault and battery on a minor (section 13B).

Unnatural and Lascivious Acts (Chapter 272)
includes unnatural acts, lascivious acts, assaults to commit unnatural sex acts (section 35)

Unnatural Acts with Child under 16 (section 31)
Sodomy and Buggery (section 34)
Incest (section 17)
Other Sex Offenses
includes adultery, fornication, indecent exposure, lewd lascivious cohabitation, lewdness, open and gross lewdness. (sections 14, 16, 18, 53)

c. Crimes Against Property (Chapter 266)

Arson
includes burning of houses, woods, fence, etc.; and any attempts. (sections: 1,2,5,5A,7,8,9,10, 108,109,111A)

Burglary, Being Armed or Making an Assault

includes armed burglary, breaking and entering with intent to assault with dangerous weapon (section 14)

Burglary
includes breaking and entering (both night and day), attempt to break and enter, breaking and entering and larceny, burglary, breaking and entering with intent larceny, breaking and entering with intent larceny and larceny. (sections: 15,16,16A, 17,18,19)

Possession of Burglary Implements (section 49)
Stealing
includes stealing in building, ship, at a fire, etc. (sections 20,24)

Larceny from the Person (section 25)
Larceny
includes attempted larceny. (section 30)

Theft of a Motor Vehicle
includes larceny of a motor vehicle, operation without authority or owner after suspension, operation without authority of owner, use without authority (section 28)

Forgery and Uttering
include forgery, uttering, counterfeiting (section 37 and 37A and Chapter 267, sections 1-31)

Common and Notorious Thief (section 40)
Fraud
includes embezzlement (sections: 50-59)

Receiving Stolen Goods
includes both the receiving and the buying of stolen goods (section 60)

Common Receiver of Stolen Goods (section 62)

Malicious or Wanton Injuries to Property
includes the destruction, defacement, wilful injury, explosion of both public or private property; malicious mischief (sections: 94-114, 124-130)

d. Other Offenses (Chapter 268-273)

Escapes
includes attempts, assisting in, accessory to (Chapter 268-Sections 15, 16, 16A, 17)

Weapons Offenses
includes carrying or possession (Chapter 269-Section 10)

Nonsupport
includes desertion (Chapter 273-Section 1 thru 10)

Polygamy
includes bigamy (Chapter 272-Section 15)

Stubborn Child
includes runaway, common night walker (Chapter 272-Section 53)

Deriving Support from Prostitute (Chapter 272-Section 9)

Disturbing the Peace
includes idle and disorderly (Chapter 272-Section 53)

Prostitution (Chapter 272-Section 53)

Illegitimacy (Chapter 273-Section 11-19)

Abortion (Chapter 272-Section 19)

Gaming
includes the manufacture, possession, or sale of gaming implements; keeping common gaming house (Chapter 271-Sections 1-48)

Motor Vehicle Offenses
includes all motor vehicle offenses other than larceny of a motor vehicle, operation without authority of owner after suspension, operation without authority of owners, use without authority.

Contempt of Court
includes perjury (Chapter 268, section 1)

Bribery
includes both accepting and offering (Chapter 268A-Sections 1-24)

Drunkenness (Chapter 272-Section 48)

Possession of Narcotic Drugs
includes the possession of all narcotic drugs other than heroin only where the sale of the drug is not inferred or explicitly stated. For example: possession of narcotic drugs, narcotic drugs found in possession (Chapter 94-Section 205)

Possession of Heroin
only where the sale of the drug is not inferred or explicitly stated. (Chapter 94-Section 212)

Stealing Narcotic Drug
only where the sale of the drug is not inferred or explicitly stated (Chapter 94-Section 217C)

Being Present Where Narcotic Drug Illegally Kept
includes narcotic drug law violation, conspiracy to violate narcotics drug law, and all charges involving "Being Present" where narcotic drugs are illegally kept. (Chapter 94-Section 213A)

Possession of Hypodermic Syringe
includes possession of hypodermic needle, or any instrument adapted for the administration of narcotic drugs. (Chapter 94-Section 211)

Inducing Another to Violate Narcotic Drug Law
includes inducing a minor to violate narcotic drug law (Chapter 94-Section 217A)

Sale of Heroin
includes possession of heroin with intent to sell, unlawful possession of heroin with intent to Sell, sale of heroin (Chapter 94-212A)

Sale of Narcotic Drugs
includes the sale of all narcotic drugs other than heroin. For example: unlawful sale of narcotic drugs, sale of narcotic drugs (Chapter 94-Section 217)

Possession of Narcotic Drugs with Intent to Sell
includes the possession of all narcotic drugs other than heroin with the intent to sell (Chapter 94-Section 217B)

Operating a Motor Vehicle Under Influence of Narcotics

Controlled Substance
includes the manufacturing, distribution, dispensing or possession with intent to manufacture, distribute or dispense a controlled substance.

A-5 Number of Charges Involved in Present Offense

The total number of charges involved in the present commitment. For example, if an individual is committed for Burglary, Arson and Assault, three charges are recorded. Charges should not be confused with courts. An individual may be committed on 16 counts for the single charge of Burglary.

A-6. Type of Sentence:

Simple - one sentence is being served.

Concurrent - more than one sentence is being served (all served coterminous)

Aggregate - more than one sentence is being served but the sentences are added together and not served coterminous.

Forthwith - a sentence which supercedes an existing sentence.

From and After - a sentence which began after an individual had been released from an existing sentence.

B-1 Race/Ethnic Origin

White
Black
American Indian
Asiatic
Spanish

B-2 Marital Status

Married
Single
Divorced
Widowed
Common Law
Separated

B-3 Military Service

None
Honorable Discharge
Dishonorable Discharge
Bad Conduct Discharge, Other than Honorable, General, Undesirable
Medical
In Armed Services, but the type of discharge is not listed on the Booking Sheet.

B-4. Last Civilian Address

Boston
Northern Boston Suburbs
Remaining Metropolitan Boston
Lowell-Lawrence Area
New Bedford - Fall River Area
Springfield Area
Worcester Area
Other Massachusetts Areas
Outside Massachusetts

B-5. Emergency Addressee. Name listed by the inmate as the person to contact should an emergency occur. Categories included were:

Father	Other Relative
Mother	Non-Relative
Spouse	No emergency addressee listed.

B-6. Occupational Field

Professional - (e.g., lawyers, doctors, engineers, clergy).

Business/Managerial - ownership of management of a business valued at $10,000 or more.

Clerical/Sales - (e.g., sales managers, life insurance sales, bookkeeper, clerks).

Skilled Manual - (e.g., master tradesman, machinist, factory foreman).

Semi-Skilled Manual - (e.g., apprentice craftsman, automobile mechanic, assembly line).

Unskilled Manual - labor tasks requiring little training or skill.

Service - (e.g., bartender, waiter, taxi driver, janitor).

B-9. Education (Last Grade Completed)

the last grade of education which the subject completed. Both a high school graduate and a G.E.D. should be coded as 12. An individual who has completed one year of college should be coded 13. Two years of college is coded as 14. Etcetera.

B-10 History of Drug Use

Data collected from inmate files determining whether:

No mention of Drug use.

Drug User (no specific drug mentioned)

Drug User (mention of heroin use)

Drug User (mention of the use of any drug other than heroin or marijuana - the exclusive use of Marijuana)

Drug User (Marijuana only drug mentioned)

D-3. Type of Release

Parole

Discharge

APPENDIX II

TABLE A

Variables Found to Distinguish Between Program Non-Completions and Program Completions at Boston State Pre-Release Center

I. Total Number of Previous Juvenile Paroles

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	60	(81)	20	(53)
One or More	14	(19)	18	(47)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 9.96$, 1 df, $p < .01$)

II. Total Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	58	(78)	19	(50)
One or More	16	(22)	19	(50)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 9.41$, 1 df, $p < .01$)

III. Number of Court Appearances for Crimes Against Property

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Four or Less	42	(57)	10	(26)
Five or More	32	(43)	28	(74)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 9.35$, 1 df, $p < .01$)

TABLE A (continued)

IV. Length of Time to Parole Eligibility Date
(unknowns excluded)

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Six Months or Less	38	(79)	5	(33)
Seven Months or More	10	(21)	10	(67)
Total	48	(100)	15	(100)

($x^2 = 9.07$, 1 df, $p < .01$)
(Yates correction applied)

V. Length of Time at Most Skilled Position
(unknowns excluded)

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Less than One Year	33	(52)	26	(81)
One Year or More	31	(48)	6	(19)
Total	64	(100)	32	(100)

($x^2 = 7.93$, 1 df, $p < .01$)

VI. Longest Period of Employment at Any One Job
(unknowns excluded)

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Less than One Year	31	(48)	26	(76)
One Year or More	34	(52)	8	(24)
Total	65	(100)	34	(100)

($x^2 = 7.57$, 1 df, $p < .01$)

VII. Number of Prior Court Appearances for Narcotic Offenses

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	51	(69)	17	(45)
One or More	23	(31)	21	(55)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 6.16$, 1 df, $p < .02$)

TABLE A (continued)

VIII. Age at Release from Pre-Release

Category	Completion		Non-Completion	
	N	%	N	%
Thirty Years or Under	47	(64)	32	(84)
Thirty-One Years or More	27	(36)	6	(16)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 5.17$, 1 df, $p < .05$)

IX. Total Number of Prior Court Appearances

Category	Completion		Non-Completion	
	N	%	N	%
Four or Less	15	(20)	2	(5)
Five or More	59	(80)	36	(95)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 4.39$, 1 df, $p < .05$)

TABLE B

Variables Which Did Not Distinguish Between Program Non-Completers and Program Completers at Boston Pre-Release Center

(differences not statistically significant)

1. Institution of Commitment

Category	Completion		Non-Completion	
	N	%	N	%
Walpole	29	(39)	14	(37)
Concord	45	(61)	24	(63)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = .05$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

2. Race

Category	Completion		Non-Completion	
	N	%	N	%
White	45	(61)	20	(53)
Non-White	29	(39)	18	(47)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = .69$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

3. Marital Status

Category	Completion		Non-Completion	
	N	%	N	%
Single	36	(49)	20	(53)
Other	38	(51)	18	(47)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = .57$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

4. Military History

Category	Completion		Non-Completion	
	N	%	N	%
None	50	(68)	27	(71)
Some	24	(32)	11	(29)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = .14$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

TABLE B (continued)

5. Number of Prior Court Appearances for Sex Offenses

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	65	(88)	33	(86)
One	9	(12)	5	(13)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = .02$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

6. Number of Prior Court Appearances for Drunkenness

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	44	(59	17	(45)
Some	30	(41)	21	(55)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 2.19$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

7. Number of Court Appearances for Crimes Against the Person

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Four or Less	63	(85)	28	(74)
Five or More	11	(15)	10	(26)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 2.16$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

8. Number of Prior Court Appearances for Escape Charges

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	72	(97)	34	(89)
One	2	(3)	4	(11)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 3.03$, 1 df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

TABLE B (continued)

9. Education: Last Grade Completed

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Eighth Grade or Less	24	(32)	19	(50)
Ninth Grade or More	50	(68)	19	(50)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 3.27$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

10. Emergency Addresses

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Father or Mother	36	(49)	23	(61)
Other	38	(51)	15	(39)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 1.42$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

11. History of Prior Drug Use

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
No Mention of Drug Use	46	(62)	20	(53)
History of Use	28	(38)	18	(47)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = .94$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

12. Total Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	50	(68)	19	(50)
One or More	24	(32)	19	(50)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

($x^2 = 3.27$, 1 df, $p > .05$)

TABLE B (continued)

13. Total Number of Prior House of Corrections Incarcerations

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Three or Less	64	(86)	35	(92)
Four or More	10	(14)	3	(8)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

(x^2 = .77, 1 df, p > .05)
(Yates correction applied)

14. Number of Previous Adult Paroles

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	53	(72)	22	(58)
One or More	21	(28)	16	(42)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

(x^2 = 2.13, 1 df, p > .05)

15. Number of Previous Adult Parole Violations

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	58	(78)	25	(66)
One or More	16	(22)	13	(34)
Total	74	(100)	38	(100)

(x^2 = 2.07, 1 df, p > .05)

16. Age at Commitment (Unknowns Excluded)

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Twenty-Five or Less	30	(50)	24	(69)
Twenty-Six or Older	30	(50)	11	(31)
Total	60	(100)	35	(100)

(x^2 = 3.11, 1 df, p > .05).

TABLE C

Variables Found to Distinguish Between Program Non-Completions and Program Completions at Shirley Pre-Release Center

1. Number of Prior Court Appearances For Crimes Against the Person

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
One or Less	35	(57)	19	(34)
Two or More	26	(43)	37	(66)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

($x^2 = 6.46$, 1 df, $p < .02$)

2. Number of Previous Juvenile Paroles

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	53	(87)	38	(68)
One or More	8	(13)	18	(32)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

($x^2 = 6.12$, 1 df, $p < .02$)

3. Total Number of Prior Court Appearances

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
10 or Less	43	(70)	27	(48)
11 or More	18	(30)	29	(48)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

($x^2 = 6.03$, 1 df, $p \sim .02$)

4. Number of Previous Adult Paroles

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	59	(97)	46	(82)
One or More	2	(3)	10	(18)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

($x^2 = 5.25$, 1 df, $p < .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

TABLE C (continued)

5. Total Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	50	(82)	37	(66)
One or More	11	(17)	19	(34)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

($x^2 = 3.87$, 1 df, $p < .05$)

TABLE D

Variables Which Did not Distinguish Between Program Non-Completers and Program Completers at Shirley Pre-Release Center
(Differences Not Statistically Significant)

1. Institution of Commitment

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Walpole	2	(3)	0	(0)
Concord	59	(97)	55	(100)
Total	61	(100)	55	(100)

(x^2 = .41, 1 df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

2. Race

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
White	43	(70)	36	(64)
Non-White	18	(30)	20	(36)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = .51, 1 df, $p > .05$)

3. Marital Status

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Married	11	(18)	13	(23)
Other	50	(82)	43	(77)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = .48, 1 df, $p > .05$)

TABLE D (continued)

4. Military History

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	48	(79)	45	(80)
Some	13	(21)	11	(20)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = 0.05, 1 df, $p > .05$)

5. Number of Prior Court Appearances for Sex Offenses

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	55	(90)	55	(98)
One or More	6	(10)	1	(2)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = 2.08, 1 df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

6. Number of Prior Court Appearances for Drunkenness

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
One or Less	49	(81)	43	(76)
Two or More	12	(20)	13	(23)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = .22, 1 df, $p > .05$)

7. Number of Prior Court Appearances for Crimes Against Property

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
One or Less	18	(30)	10	(18)
Two or More	43	(70)	46	(82)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = 2.18, 1 df, $p > .05$)

TABLE D (continued)

8. Number of Court Appearances for Escape Charges

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	58	(95)	53	(95)
One	3	(5)	3	(5)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = .09, 1 df, $p > .05$

(Yates correction applied)

9. Education: Last Grade Completed

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Finished High School or More	18	(30)	11	(20)
Less than High School	43	(70)	45	(80)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = 1.52, 1 df, $p > .05$).

10. Emergency Address

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Parents	48	(79)	41	(73)
Other	13	(21)	15	(27)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = .48, 1 df, $p > .05$)

11. History of Prior Drug Use

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Drug User (mention of Heroin use)	34	(56)	39	(69)
Other	27	(45)	17	(31)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = 2.40, 1 df, $p > .05$)

TABLE D (continued)

12. Total Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	56	(92)	45	(80)
One or More	5	(9)	11	(20)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 =.2.34, 1 df, p > .05)
(Yates correction applied)

13. Total Number of Prior House of Correction Incarcerations

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
None	51	(84)	39	(69)
One or More	10	(17)	17	(31)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = 3.21, 1 df, p > .05)

14. Age at Commitment

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
30 Years or Less	55	(90)	45	(80)
31 years or More	6	(10)	11	(20)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = 2.26, 1 df, p > .05)

15. Longest Period of Employment at Anyone Job (Unknown Excluded)

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
12 Months or More	37	(73)	38	(79)
12 Months or Less	14	(27)	10	(21)
Total	51	(100)	48	(100)

(x^2 = .59, 1 df, p > .05)

TABLE D (continued)

16. Length of Time at Most Skilled Position (Unknowns Excluded)

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
Up to 5 Years	50	(98)	47	(98)
5 Years or More	1	(2)	1	(2)
Total	51	(100)	48	(100)

(x^2 = .45, 1 df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

17. Number of Prior Court Appearances for Narcotic Offenses

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
One or Less	32	(52)	33	(59)
Two or More	29	(48)	23	(41)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = .49, 1 df, $p > .05$)

18. Length of Time to Parole Eligibility (Unknown excluded)

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
0 to 6 Months	49	(88)	22	(92)
Seven Months or More	7	(13)	2	(8)
Total	56	(100)	24	(100)

(x^2 = 1.05, 1 df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

19. Age at Release from Pre-Release

Category	Completions		Non-Completions	
	N	%	N	%
25 Years or Less	55	(90)	53	(94)
26 Years or More	6	(10)	3	(6)
Total	61	(100)	56	(100)

(x^2 = .31, 1 df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

END

7 dbls/mm