

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

3  
S  
U  
L  
U

Massachusetts Parole Board  
Research and Planning Unit

111133

111133

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Massachusetts Parole Board

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Risk and Recidivism Among  
Massachusetts Parolees:  
An Update

December, 1987

Prepared by  
Richard Lunden  
Research Analyst

NCJRS

EW 10 1988

ACQUISITIONS

John J. Curran Jr.  
Chairman

Ruth Ann Jones  
Executive Director

## **INTRODUCTION**

In 1986, a study entitled "Risk and Recidivism Among Massachusetts Parolees: An Exploratory Study" was conducted at the Massachusetts Parole Board. The study revealed that the combined recidivism rate for a sample of state and county parolees released during 1983-84 was 36% after a follow-up period that ranged from sixteen to twenty months. In that study state parolees were returned to prison at a slightly higher rate (39%) than the county parolees (33%). The study also identified many demographic, substance abuse and criminal history characteristics with significant statistical relationships with post-release outcome.

The purpose of this study is to provide a more recent account of parolee recidivism in Massachusetts by examining samples of state and county parolees released to parole supervision during a three month period in 1985. This study is also designed to identify background characteristics with significant statistical relationships with post-release outcome.

## **Methodology**

With a few exceptions, the methodology used in this study is the same as used in the previous study. The first difference involves the follow-up period used to determine parolee recidivism rates. In the previous study the findings were based on a follow-up period that ranged from sixteen to twenty months after the parolee's release. In this study the results are based on a one year follow-up.

Another difference in the studies is that in addition to reporting the recidivism rates for state and county parolees after a one year follow-up, this study also reports the recidivism rates for those state and county parolees who were on parole supervision at the time of their return to prison. This was not done in the previous study.

The final difference in the studies involves a substance abuse issue. In the previous study information collected on substance abuse was limited to alcohol and narcotics abuse only. Due to the prevalence of cocaine abuse in recent years, a new variable "history of cocaine abuse" was also collected and examined as part of this study.

## **Sampling Technique**

The Parole Board's Institutional Services Unit maintains release logs of all state and county inmates who are paroled. The release log separates the parolees by the date of their release, as well as, by the institution from which they were paroled. Since previous research has shown a link between the level of institutional security from which state inmates are released and post-release outcome, a stratified sampling tech-

nique was used to assure that the parolees selected for the study were not only representative of the overall parole population, but also representative of each releasing institution. The samples were selected from the populations of state (N=410) and county inmates (N=517) who were released to parole supervision during a three month period in 1985.

In order to make the results of this study comparable with the results of the previous study, which included 120 state and 138 county parolees, 105 state parolees and 136 county parolees were selected for the current samples.

The number of parolees selected from each of the releasing institutions was dependent upon how many parolees were actually released from the institution. For example, of the 410 state inmates released to parole supervision during the specified time period, 62 were released from Concord. Thus, one quarter of the 62 parolees or 16 of those paroled from Concord were included in the sample. To determine which 16 parolees would be included from Concord every fourth name, as it appeared in the release log, was selected. This same sampling procedure was carried out for each state and county institution from which parolees were released.

A section describing of the demographic, substance abuse and criminal history characteristics for both the state and county samples appears in the Appendix.

#### Post Release Outcome

For the purposes of this study post-release outcome was defined as follows:

##### **Success**

- No new arrest or technical violation of parole resulting in a return to prison for more than thirty days,
- No warrant issued within twelve months of release for whereabouts unknown (absconder status)

##### **Failure (Recidivist)**

- A new arrest or technical violation of parole resulting in a return to prison for more than thirty days,
- Absconder status.

Recidivism rates were based on a twelve month follow-up period from the time of the parolee's release to supervision.

## Analytical Technique

The recidivism rates were determined by computing the percentages of state and county parolees who were defined as failures. To determine which background characteristics were significantly related to parole outcome, the dependent variable (post-release outcome) was crosstabulated with the independent variables (prior commitments, prior paroles etc.) and the resulting chi square statistic and level of significance were examined. The chi square statistic is expressed in terms of probabilities and identifies those characteristics having significant statistical relationships with both being successful after release and being returned to prison.

The .05 level of significance was used to determine whether there was a statistically significant relationship between the background characteristics and post-release outcome. Using .05 as the cutoff means that the probability that the relationship can be attributed to chance is no more than 5 in 100. Significance at the .01 level means this probability is no more than one in 100. The chi square statistics and corresponding levels of significance are presented along with the tables in the Appendix.

## FINDINGS

### Recidivism Rates

After a twelve month follow-up period a sample of state and county parolees released in 1985 had a combined recidivism rate of 36%. Thirty-nine (37%) of the 105 state parolees were returned to prison, while this was the case for 47 (35%) of the 136 county parolees. On the average, state recidivists managed to stay in the community a little longer before their return to prison than the county recidivists. The average time until recidivism for the state recidivists was 6.2 months compared to 5.8 months for the county recidivists.

The vast majority of state (79%) and county (87%) recidivists were returned to prison for a new arrest, while thirteen percent of both the state and county recidivists were returned for technically violating the conditions of their parole. Three state parolees or eight percent of the state recidivists were considered failures because their whereabouts was unknown. There were no absconders among the 47 county recidivists.

As mentioned earlier, one of ways this study differed from the previous study is that an individual's parole status or whether or not they were still on parole at the time of their return to prison was recorded. The results of this analysis reveal some very interesting findings for the county parolees.

State inmates are generally given much longer sentences than county inmates, therefore, it was assumed that the majority of the state recidivists would still be on parole at the time of their return to prison. This assumption proved to be true in that 95% of the state recidivists were still on parole when they were returned to prison. On the other hand, almost half (49%) of 47 county recidivists were discharged from parole supervision prior to recidivating.

If the recidivism rates were based on the percentage of parolees who recidivated while on parole and not a one year follow-up, the rates drop only slightly for the state cases from 37% to 35%, but for county parolees the recidivism rate drops substantially from 35% to 18%. Interestingly, twenty-five percent of the county recidivists (6 of 24), who were still on parole, were returned for technical violations. These findings indicate that in the case of county parolees the recidivism rates do not necessarily reflect the success of parole supervision, but in many instances reflect an unsuccessful reintegration process that extends beyond the period of parole supervision.

### Risk Characteristics

Overall, nine characteristics having significant statistical relationships with post-release outcome were identified for state parolees and six characteristics were identified for the county parolees. The risk characteristics identified for the state parolees include: number of prior adult commitments, number of prior paroles and prior parole revocations, number of prior escapes, age at first adult commitment and number of disciplinary reports received during the past incarceration. State parolees who were reparaoled or identified as having a history of narcotics or cocaine abuse were also found to recidivate at significantly higher rates than parolees without these characteristics.

Three of the risk characteristics identified for the state parolees; number of prior paroles, number of prior parole revocations and age at first adult commitment were also significantly related to post-release outcome for the county parolees. In addition, county parolees who had less than a high school education, had an alias noted in their record or who were under the age of twenty-one at the time of their release also had significantly higher recidivism rates than those not identified as such. All of these risk characteristics are discussed in the sections that follow and appear in tables in the Appendix.

### **Prior Commitments**

Past research conducted at the Massachusetts Parole Board indicates that parolees with at least one prior adult commitment are generally returned to prison at a significantly higher rate than those with no prior commitments (Lunden, 1985, 1986). The results of this study show that this was true for the state par-

olees, but not for the county cases. State parolees with no prior commitments had a recidivism rate of only 22%, those with one prior commitment 42% and those state parolees with two or more prior commitments had a much higher recidivism rate of 64%.

County parolees with prior commitments also recidivated at higher rates than those with no prior commitments, however, the differences in the recidivism rates were not significant at the accepted .05 level. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that county parolees with no prior commitments recidivated at a rate of 26%; those with one prior commitment at 39%; and those with two or more prior commitments were returned to prison 47% of the time. Information on prior commitments and recidivism for state and county parolees is depicted in Tables 2 and 3 of the Appendix.

#### Prior Paroles/Parole Revocations

Consistent with prior research involving Massachusetts' parolees, number of prior paroles and number of prior parole revocations were both found to be significantly related to outcome for the state and county parolees released in 1985. State and county parolees with at least one prior parole had recidivism rates of 60% and 54%, respectively, while the state and county parolees who were on parole for the first time recidivated at the much lower rates of 25% and 27%. This information is depicted in Tables 4 and 5 in the Appendix.

The recidivism rates for state and county parolees with a prior parole revocation were also significantly higher than for those parolees with no prior revocations. State and county parolees with at least one prior revocation had recidivism rates of 62% and 82% respectively, while state and county parolees with no prior revocation recidivated at the much lower rates of 25% and 30%. This information is depicted in Tables 6 and 7 of the Appendix.

#### Age at First Adult Commitment

Prior research shows age to be one of the best predictors of recidivism. The younger parolees are at the time of their first adult commitment, the more likely they will recidivate. The results of this study support this finding in that age at first adult commitment was significantly related to post-release outcome for both the state and county samples.

Almost half of the state and county parolees who were under the age of 21 at the time of their first commitment recidivated, compared to only about one-third of the state parolees and one-quarter of county parolees who were between the ages of 21 and 29 at the time of their first commitment. Finally, those state and county parolees who were at least thirty years old at the time of their first incarceration had extremely low recidivism rates of 6% and 14% respectively. This information is depicted in Tables 8 and 9 of the Appendix.

### **Age at Release to Parole Supervision**

Similar to the findings for county parolees involving age at first commitment and post-release outcome, age at release was also found to be significantly related to post-release outcome for the county parolees. The older the parolees were at the time of their release, the less likely they were to recidivate.

County parolees who were under the age of twenty-one when released had a recidivism rate of 57%; those between the ages 21 and 24 had a 35% recidivism rate and those county parolees who were 25 or older when released recidivated at a rate of 24%. Interestingly, for the state parolees age at release was found not only to be unrelated to post-release outcome, but contrary to the findings for county parolees, state parolees who were under the age of twenty-one at the time of their release exhibited a much lower rate of recidivism (18%) than the combined recidivism rate (50%) for state parolees who were twenty-one or older when released to parole.

On the average, county parolees (26 years) were three years younger than the state parolees (29 years) when released to parole supervision. Information on age at release and recidivism for county parolees appears in Table 17 of the Appendix.

### **Substance Abuse History**

Estimates of the proportion of Massachusetts inmates with serious substance abuse problems vary, but a conservative estimate would be around fifty to seventy-five percent. Of the 105 state parolees selected for this study, 32% were identified as having a history of narcotics addiction or serious abuse, 22% had a history of cocaine abuse and almost half had alcohol abuse problems noted in their records.

Consistent with prior research that shows parolees with serious drug abuse problems to recidivate at relatively high rates, state parolees in this study who were identified as having a history of narcotics abuse or cocaine abuse recidivated at significantly higher rates than those parolees without such a problem noted in their records.

Sixty-five percent of the state parolees with a narcotics abuse history and 60% of those with a cocaine abuse history were returned to prison within one year of their release. This was the case for only 27% of the state parolees with no narcotics abuse history and 31% of those with no cocaine abuse noted in their record. This information is depicted in Tables 10 and 11 of the Appendix.

Although county parolees with narcotics or cocaine abuse histories also recidivated at higher rates (50% and 47%) than

those county parolees not identified as such (32% and 32%), the differences in recidivism were not significant. It should be noted that since much of the officially recorded data involving substance abuse is based on the inmate's self-report and for obvious reasons inmates would tend to under-report substance abuse problems, the findings should be interpreted with that understanding.

### **Escape History**

State parolees whose records indicated at least one prior escape also recidivated at significantly higher rates than those parolees with no prior escapes noted in their record. More than half (55%) of the parolees with a prior escape recidivated, compared to less than one third (30%) of those with no prior escapes. Interestingly, while escapes are usually considered as a relatively rare occurrence 19% of the state parolees selected for this study had at least one prior escape on record.

County parolees with a prior escape noted in their record also recidivated at a higher rate (43%) than those with no prior escape (34%), but again the differences in recidivism were not significant. Information on escape history and recidivism for state parolees is depicted in Table 12 of the Appendix.

### **Institutional Adjustment**

Prior research, involving Massachusetts parolees and other parole populations as well, has shown a significant statistical relationship between measures of prison behavior and post-release outcome (Gottfredson et al, 1982; Klein, 1986; Hill, 1985; Lundeen, 1986). The results of this study support these findings in that sixty-three percent of the state parolees who received three or more disciplinary reports during their incarceration were returned to prison during the follow-up period, while this was the case for only 14% of the parolees who received less than three disciplinary reports.

County parolees with three or more disciplinary reports also recidivated at higher rates (43%) than those with less than three (34%), but as was found in the previous analysis' the differences were not significant. Information on disciplinary reports and recidivism for state parolees is depicted in Table 13 of the Appendix.

### **Reparoles**

State inmates who were reparoled after having their parole revoked on the current sentence were also returned to prison at significantly higher rates than those on parole for the first time on their current sentence. Seventy-one percent of the state reparoles recidivated within one year of their release, compared to only 27% of those parolees who were released for the first time on their current sentence. Interestingly, while there were

only three county parolees selected for this study who were reparoled, two of them were returned to prison during the follow-up period. Information on state reparoles and recidivism is depicted in Table 14 in the Appendix.

#### **Educational Level**

Educational level was found to be significantly related to post-release outcome for the county parolees only. Almost half (49%) of the county parolees with less than a high school education were returned to prison within one year of their release, while this was the case for only 26% of the parolees with a high school diploma, a G.E.D. or at least some college. The educational level attained by state parolees was found to be unrelated to post-release outcome with just over one-third of both the parolees with less than a high school education and those with at least a high school education being returned to prison during the follow-up period. Information on educational level and recidivism for county parolees appears in Table 15 of the Appendix.

#### **Use of Alias Identities**

County parolees whose record indicated the use of an alias in the past were also returned to prison at significantly higher rates than those parolees whose record indicated no past use of an alias. Although there were only nine county parolees whose record indicated the past use of an alias, seven (78%) of the nine recidivated. This was true for only 33% of the county parolees with no recorded alias.

Similar to the findings involving educational level and recidivism, state parolees with an alias noted in their record recidivated at about the same rate as those whose record showed no indication of an alias identity. Information on the use of alias identities and recidivism for county parolees is depicted in Table 16 of the Appendix.

#### **Combinations of Risk Characteristics**

As in the earlier study, this study was also designed to identify combinations of risk characteristics which were significantly related to post-release outcome. By combining pairs of individual risk characteristics and crosstabulating them with post-release outcome, cohorts of parolees displaying even higher or lower rates of recidivism than could be accounted for by knowing their background included just one of the characteristics were identified.

For example, the results of this study show that state parolees with no prior commitments had an overall recidivism rate of 22%. However, closer examination of the state parolees with no prior commitments shows that if they also had three or more D Reports during their current incarceration their recidivism rate was much higher at 50%. On the other hand, state parolees who

had no prior commitments and received less than three disciplinary reports during their current incarceration had an extremely low recidivism rate of only 6%.

As this example shows, combining risk characteristics and showing how these combinations relate to post-release outcome provides decision-makers with much more useful information than is available by knowing a parolee's background includes only one of the characteristics. A complete listing of the different combinations of background characteristics found to be significantly related to post-release outcome for both the state and county samples is included in the Appendix.

### Conclusions

The results of this study are very similar to those of the previous study of Massachusetts parolees released during 1983-84. After a one year follow-up, the combined recidivism rate for state and county parolees involved in that study was 31% or slightly lower than the combined recidivism rate of 36% for the parolees followed in this study. As was found in the previous study, state parolees selected for this study also had slightly higher recidivism rates (37%) than the county parolees (35%).

Although it was not calculated in the previous study, the results of this study show that if recidivism rates were based on the percentage of parolees who were still on parole supervision at the time of their return to prison, the recidivism rate for state cases would have dropped only slightly (37% to 35%), but would have decreased by more than half, from 35% to 18%, for the county cases. This finding suggests that the recidivism rates for the county parolees do not necessarily reflect the success of parole supervision, but in many instances reflect an unsuccessful reintegration process that extends beyond the period of parole supervision.

In addition to providing recidivism rates for the state and county samples, this study also provides important information on the likelihood of being returned to prison for parolees who possess certain background characteristics. In this study, number of prior paroles, number of prior revocations and age at first adult commitment were found to be significantly related to recidivism for both the state and county samples. State parolees who were reparaoled, had a prior commitment, a prior escape, three or more disciplinary reports, or who were identified as having a history of narcotics or cocaine abuse were also returned to prison at significantly higher rates than those parolees without these characteristics.

In addition to number of prior paroles, number of prior parole revocations and age at first adult commitment, county parolees who were under the age of twenty-one at release, whose records indicated the past use of an alias or who were identified as having less than a high school education also recidivated at

significantly higher rates than county parolees not identified as such. Many of these same characteristics were also found to be significantly related to post-release outcome for the state and county parolees involved in the previous study.

To the extent that the findings from this study of parolees are representative of the overall Massachusetts parole population, certain individual characteristics and pairs of characteristics do provide a general indication of how parolees might be expected to do after they are released to parole supervision. However, since the results of this study are based on findings for aggregate numbers of parolees and do not take into account the effect of many intervening factors (employment, community and family support, self-esteem, maturity etc.) which can play a major part in shaping a parolee's post-release experience, the findings should not be interpreted as a way of predicting how every parolee will fare after release.

Regardless of these apparent limitations, the results of this study do provide parole board members with an objective assessment of background characteristics which can be used as a basis to begin the judgment of mitigating and aggravating factors which contribute to making a release decision.

In addition, since many characteristics associated with both high and low rates of recidivism are identified, the results of this study can also be used by field parole officers as an aid in developing effective supervisory plans with a relatively limited supply of agency resources. Parolees possessing characteristics associated with relatively low rates of recidivism should not need the same type of supervision or require the same amount of agency resources as the parolees possessing the high risk characteristics.

Overall, the results of this study not only provide parole board members with important feedback on release decisions which were made in the recent past, but also offer information that should be useful when making release decisions in the future. As mentioned earlier, this same information should also be useful to field parole officers when faced with the task of making supervision plans.

## **APPENDIX**

**TABLE 1**  
**Time Until Revocation/  
 New Commitment**

<b>Months to Recidivism</b>	<b>Number of Recidivists State/County</b>		<b>Percent of Total State/County</b>		<b>Cumulative Percent State/County</b>	
1	3	1	8%	2%	8%	2%
2	5	6	13%	14%	21%	16%
3	3	11	8%	23%	29%	38%
4	4	4	10%	9%	39%	47%
5	4	6	10%	13%	49%	60%
6	2	1	5%	2%	54%	62%
7	3	4	8%	9%	62%	70%
8	5	2	13%	4%	75%	75%
9	1	3	2%	6%	77%	81%
10	4	1	10%	2%	87%	83%
11	0	3	0%	6%	87%	89%
12	5	5	13%	11%	100%	100%

The average time until return to prison was similar for both groups of recidivists. The county recidivists were returned to prison at an average of 5.8 months, while the average for state recidivists was a little longer at 6.2 months.

**TABLE 2**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Number of Prior Commitments**  
**State Parolees**

<u>Prior Commitments</u>				
Post-Release Outcome	None N (%)	One N (%)	Two or More N (%)	Total (%)
SUCCESS	42 (78%)	15 (58%)	9 (36%)	66 (63%)
FAILURE	12 (22%)	11 (42%)	16 (64%)	39 (37%)
Total	54 (51%)	26 (25%)	25 (24%)	105 (100%)

Chi Square= 13.17 Significance Level .001  
 Missing Cases= 0

**TABLE 3**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Number of Prior Commitments**  
**County Parolees**

<u>Prior Commitments</u>				
Post-Release Outcome	None N (%)	One N (%)	Two or More N (%)	Total (%)
SUCCESS	49 (74%)	22 (61%)	18 (53%)	89 (65%)
FAILURE	17 (26%)	14 (39%)	16 (47%)	47 (35%)
Total	66 (48%)	36 (27%)	34 (25%)	136 (100%)

Chi Square= 4.91 Significance Level .086  
 Missing Cases= 0

**TABLE 4**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Number of Prior Paroles**  
**State Parolees**

<u>Prior Paroles</u>				
<b>Post-Release Outcome</b>	<b>None</b> <b>N (%)</b>	<b>One or More</b> <b>N (%)</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	
SUCCESS	51 (75%)	15 (40%)	66 (63%)	
FAILURE	17 (25%)	22 (60%)	39 (37%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>68 (65%)</b>	<b>37 (35%)</b>	<b>105 (100%)</b>	

Chi Square= 10.76 Significance Level .001  
 Missing Cases= 0

**TABLE 5**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Number of Prior Paroles**  
**County Parolees**

<u>Prior Paroles</u>				
<b>Post-Release Outcome</b>	<b>None</b> <b>N (%)</b>	<b>One or More</b> <b>N (%)</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	
SUCCESS	72 (73%)	17 (46%)	89 (65%)	
FAILURE	27 (27%)	20 (54%)	47 (35%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>99 (73%)</b>	<b>37 (27%)</b>	<b>136 (100%)</b>	

Chi Square= 7.40 Significance Level .007  
 Missing Cases= 0

**TABLE 6**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Number of Prior Parole Revocations**  
**State Parolees**

<u>Prior Revocations</u>				
Post-Release Outcome	None N (%)	One or More N (%)	Total (%)	
SUCCESS	53 (75%)	13 (38%)	66 (63%)	
FAILURE	18 (25%)	21 (62%)	39 (37%)	
Total	71 (68%)	34 (32%)	105 (100%)	

Chi Square= 11.54 Significance Level .000  
 Missing Cases= 0

**TABLE 7**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Number of Prior Parole Revocations**  
**County Parolees**

<u>Prior Revocations</u>				
Post-Release Outcome	None N (%)	One or More N (%)	Total (%)	
SUCCESS	87 (70%)	2 (18%)	89 (65%)	
FAILURE	38 (30%)	9 (82%)	47 (35%)	
Total	125 (91%)	11 (9%)	136 (100%)	

Chi Square= 9.65 Significance Level .002  
 Missing Cases= 0

**TABLE 8**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Age at First Adult Commitment**  
**State Parolees**

Post-Release Outcome	<u>Age at First Adult Commitment</u>				Total (%)
	Under 21 Years	21 thru 29	30 Years or Older	N (%)	
SUCCESS	26 (53%)	25 (63%)	15 (94%)	66 (63%)	
FAILURE	23 (47%)	15 (37%)	1 ( 6%)	39 (37%)	
Total	49 (47%)	40 (38%)	16 (15%)	105 (100%)	

Chi Square= 8.56 Significance Level .014  
 Missing Cases= 0

**TABLE 9**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Age at First Adult Commitment**  
**County Parolees**

Post-Release Outcome	<u>Age at First Adult Commitment</u>				Total (%)
	Under 21 Years	21 thru 29	30 Years or Older	N (%)	
SUCCESS	32 (50%)	38 (76%)	19 (86%)	89 (65%)	
FAILURE	32 (50%)	12 (24%)	3 (14%)	47 (35%)	
Total	64 (47%)	50 (37%)	22 (16%)	136 (100%)	

Chi Square= 13.47 Significance Level .001  
 Missing Cases= 0

**TABLE 10**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Narcotics Abuse History**  
**State Parolees**

<b>Post-Release Outcome</b>	<b>Narcotics Abuse History</b>			<b>Total (%)</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
<b>SUCCESS</b>	11 (35%)	48 (73%)		59 (61%)
<b>FAILURE</b>	20 (65%)	18 (27%)		38 (39%)
<b>Total</b>	31 (32%)	66 (68%)		97 (100%)

**Chi Square= 10.77 Significance Level .001**  
**Missing Cases= 8**

**TABLE 11**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Cocaine Abuse History**  
**State Parolees**

<b>Post-Release Outcome</b>	<b>Cocaine Abuse History</b>			<b>Total (%)</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
<b>SUCCESS</b>	8 (40%)	49 (69%)		57 (63%)
<b>FAILURE</b>	12 (60%)	22 (31%)		34 (37%)
<b>Total</b>	20 (22%)	71 (78%)		91 (100%)

**Chi Square= 4.44 Significance Level .035**  
**Missing Cases= 14**

**TABLE 12**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Prior Escape History**  
**State Parolees**

<b>Post-Release Outcome</b>	<b><u>Escape History</u></b>			<b>Total (%)</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
<b>SUCCESS</b>	9 (45%)	57 (70%)		66 (65%)
<b>FAILURE</b>	11 (55%)	25 (30%)		36 (35%)
<b>Total</b>	20 (19%)	82 (81%)		102 (100%)

**Chi Square= 9.36 Significance Level .009**  
**Missing Cases=3**

**TABLE 13**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Number of Disciplinary Reports**  
**State Parolees**

<b>Post-Release Outcome</b>	<b><u>Number of Disciplinary Reports</u></b>			<b>Total (%)</b>
	<b>Two or Less</b>	<b>Three or More</b>		
<b>SUCCESS</b>	48 (86%)	18 (37%)		66 (63%)
<b>FAILURE</b>	8 (14%)	31 (63%)		39 (37%)
<b>Total</b>	56 (53%)	49 (47%)		105 (100%)

**Chi Square= 24.80 Significance Level .000**  
**Missing Cases= 0**

**TABLE 14**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Reparole**  
**State Parolees**

<b>Post-Release Outcome</b>	<b><u>Reparoled</u></b>			<b>Total (%)</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
<b>N</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>(%)</b>	
<b>SUCCESS</b>	7 (29%)	59 (73%)		66 (63%)
<b>FAILURE</b>	17 (71%)	22 (27%)		39 (37%)
<b>Total</b>	24 (23%)	81 (77%)		105 (100%)

**Chi Square= 13.31 Significance Level .000**  
**Missing Cases= 0**

**TABLE 15**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Educational Level**  
**County Parolees**

<b>Post- Release Outcome</b>	<b>Educational Level</b>					<b>Total</b>
	<b>Less than High School</b>	<b>GED</b>	<b>High School Graduate</b>	<b>Some College</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>	
<b>SUCCESS</b>	27 (51%)	30 (70%)	18 (75%)	12 (86%)	87 (65%)	
<b>FAILURE</b>	26 (49%)	13 (30%)	6 (25%)	2 (14%)	47 (35%)	
<b>Total</b>	53 (40%)	43 (32%)	24 (18%)	14 (10%)	134 (100%)	

**Chi Square= 8.72 Significance Level .033**  
**Missing Cases= 2**

**TABLE 16**  
**Post-Release Outcome by**  
**Past Use of Alias Names**  
**County Parolees**

<u>Past Use of Alias Names</u>					
<u>Post-Release Outcome</u>	<u>Yes</u> <u>N</u> <u>(%)</u>	<u>No</u> <u>N</u> <u>(%)</u>	<u>Total (%)</u>		
SUCCESS	2 (22%)	81 (67%)	83 (64%)		
FAILURE	7 (78%)	40 (33%)	47 (36%)		
Total	9 ( 8%)	121 (92%)	130 (100%)		

Chi Square= 5.45 Significance Level .020  
 Missing Cases= 6

**TABLE 17**  
**Post-Release Outcome**  
**by Age at Release**  
**County Parolees**

<u>Age at Release</u>					
<u>Post-Release Outcome</u>	<u>Under 21 Years</u> <u>N (%)</u>	<u>21 thru 24</u> <u>N (%)</u>	<u>25 Years or Older</u> <u>N (%)</u>	<u>Total (%)</u>	
SUCCESS	12 (43%)	32 (65%)	45 (76%)	89 (65%)	
FAILURE	16 (57%)	17 (35%)	14 (24%)	47 (35%)	
Total	28 (21%)	49 (36%)	59 (43%)	136 (100%)	

Chi Square= 9.93 Significance Level .019  
 Missing Cases= 0

### Risk Characteristics Combinations and Recidivism

This section lists separately for the state and county parolees all of the combinations of risk characteristics found in this study to have a significant statistical relationship with both high and low probabilities of recidivism. Presented with the risk characteristics are the related recidivism rates and the number of parolees whose background included the characteristics.

<u>Risk Characteristics</u>	<u>STATE PAROLEES</u>	<u>Number of State Parolees with Characteristic(s)</u>
	<u>Recidivism Rates %</u>	
<u>Two or More Prior Commitments and;</u>	<u>64%</u>	<u>25</u>
Reparoled	100%	8
Three or more D Reports	86%	14
Not Reparoled	47%	17
Less than 3 D Reports	36%	11
<u>No Prior Commitments and;</u>	<u>22%</u>	<u>54</u>
Three or more D Reports	50%	20
Less than 3 D Reports	6%	34
<u>Reparoled and;</u>	<u>71%</u>	<u>24</u>
Two or more prior commitments	100%	8
One prior commitment	75%	8
No prior commitments	38%	8
<u>Not Reparoled and;</u>	<u>27%</u>	<u>81</u>
Narcotics abuse history	55%	22
Three or more D Reports	54%	28
No narcotics abuse history	19%	52
Less than 3 D Reports	13%	53
<u>Under the age of 21 at first commitment and;</u>	<u>47%</u>	<u>49</u>
Narcotics abuse history	82%	11
Two or more prior commitments	80%	15
Three or more D Reports	61%	31
One prior commitment	47%	15
No narcotics abuse history	38%	34
Less than 3 D Reports	22%	18
No prior commitments	21%	19

**STATE PAROLEES**

Risk Characteristics	Recidivism Rates %	Number of State Parolees with Characteristic(s)
<u>Between ages 21 and 29 at first commitment and;</u>	37%	40
Reparoled	90%	10
Prior escape	75%	8
Prior parole revocation	71%	14
Three or more D Reports	69%	16
Prior parole	67%	15
Narcotics abuse history	61%	18
No escape	26%	31
No prior parole	20%	25
Not reparoled	20%	30
No prior parole revocation	19%	26
No narcotics abuse history	19%	21
Less than 3 D Reports	17%	24
<u>Three or more D Reports and;</u>	63%	49
Reparoled	75%	12
Narcotics abuse history	67%	18
Not reparoled	36%	36
No narcotics abuse history	32%	28
No prior commitment	6%	34
<u>Prior Escape and;</u>	55%	20
Three or more D Reports	73%	15
Less than 3 D Reports	0%	5
<u>No Prior Paroles and;</u>	25%	68
Narcotics abuse history	60%	15
Prior escape	56%	9
Three or more D Reports	54%	24
No narcotics abuse history	17%	46
No prior escape	18%	57
Less than 3 D Reports	9%	44

**COUNTY PAROLEES**

Risk Characteristics	Recidivism Rates %	Number of County Parolees with Characteristic(s)
<u>Between ages 21 and 29 at first commitment and;</u>	24%	50
Prior use of alias	80%	5
No prior use of alias	19%	42
<u>Two or more prior commitments and;</u>	47%	34
Prior parole revocation	88%	8
Less than high school education	77%	13
No prior revocation	35%	23
High school education or more	29%	21
<u>No prior commitments and;</u>	26%	66
Prior use of alias	100%	3
Under 21 at release	53%	19
Under 21 at first commitment	50%	22
No prior use of alias	23%	61
Between 21-29 at first commitment	22%	28
Over 20 at release	15%	47
Thirty or older at first commitment	6%	16
<u>Less than three D Reports and;</u>	34%	122
Prior parole revocation	88%	8
Prior use of alias	75%	8
Under 21 at release	61%	23
Prior parole	55%	29
Under 21 at first commitment	51%	53
No prior use of alias	32%	111
Between 21-29 at release	30%	70
No prior revocation	30%	114
No prior parole	27%	93
Between 21-29 at first commitment	23%	48
Thirty or older at release	21%	29
Thirty or older at first commitment	14%	21
<u>High school, GED or Some College and;</u>	26%	81
Prior parole revocation	80%	5
No prior parole revocation	22%	76

**COUNTY PAROLEES**

Risk Characteristics	Recidivism Rates %	Number of County Parolees with Characteristic(s)
<u>Less than high school education and;</u>	<b>49%</b>	<b>53</b>
Prior assaultive conviction	68%	22
Prior parole	75%	16
Under 21 at first commitment	65%	31
No prior parole	38%	37
No prior assaultive conviction	35%	31
Between 21-29 at first commitment	31%	16
Thirty or older at first commitment	17%	6

**Demographic, Criminal History  
and Substance Abuse Characteristics  
of the State and County Samples**

Characteristic	STATE (N=105)	COUNTY (N=136)
<b><u>Demographic</u></b>		
Sex		
Male	87%	100%
Female	13%	0%
Race		
White	62%	73%
Black	29%	18%
Hispanic	9%	9%
Marital Status		
Single	64%	73%
Married	16%	9%
Divorced	12%	13%
Separated	6%	4%
Widowed	2%	1%
# of Children		
None	50%	58%
One	21%	18%
Two	11%	14%
Three or more	12%	10%
Unknown	6%	--
Educational Level		
Less than H.S.	51%	39%
G.E.D	24%	31%
High School Graduate	10%	18%
Some College	11%	10%
Unknown	4%	2%
Age at Release		
22 years or younger	19%	37%
23-25 years	17%	26%
26-30 years	31%	16%
31 years or older	33%	21%
<b><u>Substance Abuse</u></b>		
History of Alcohol Abuse		
Yes	43%	45%
No	55%	54%
Unknown	2%	1%
History of Narcotics Abuse		
Yes	30%	12%
No	63%	84%
Unknown	7%	4%

Characteristic	STATE	COUNTY
----------------	-------	--------

**History of Cocaine Abuse**

Yes	19%	22%
No	68%	74%
Unknown	13%	4%

**Criminal History**
**Alias Names (AKA)**

Yes	15%	7%
No	82%	89%
Unknown	3%	4%

**Governing Offense**

Person	57%	24%
Property	16%	48%
Sex Related	10	1%
Drug related	11%	6%
Drunk driving (OUI)	4%	9%
Other	3%	11%
Unknown	0%	1%

**Reparoled**

Yes	23%	2%
No	77%	98%

**Time served**

3 months or less	17%	30%
Between 4-6 months	14%	27%
Between 7-12 months	8%	23%
Between 13-24 months	24%	18%
More than 2 years	37%	2%

**Prior Commitments**

None	51%	49%
One	25%	27%
Two	11%	13%
Three or more	13%	11%

**Age at First Commitment**

less than 21 years	47%	47%
21-29 years	38%	37%
30 years or older	15%	16%

**Prior Paroles**

None	65%	73%
One	22%	18%
Two or more	13%	9%

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>STATE</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>
Prior Parole Revocations		
None	68%	92%
One	20%	7%
Two or more	12%	1%
Disciplinary Reports		
None	34%	71%
One	12%	13%
Two or more	50%	13%
Unknown	4%	3%
History of Escape(s)		
Yes	19%	5%
No	78%	95%
Unknown	3%	--
Prior Felony Convictions		
None	20%	13%
One	13%	10%
2-9	46%	59%
10 or more	20%	15%
Unknown	1%	3%
Prior Assaultive Convictions		
None	58%	60%
One	17%	22%
2-4	18%	12%
5 or more	6%	0%
Unknown	1%	6%

### REFERENCES

- Gottfredson, Michael R. and Kenneth Adams  
1982 Prison behavior and release performance. Law and Policy Quarterly. 4/3 (July):373-391.
- Hill, Gillian  
1985 Predicting recidivism using institutional measures. Chapter 5 in Farrington and Tarling's (Eds.) Prediction in Criminology. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Lunden, Richard W.  
1985 Risk/Needs Assessment and Parole Outcome in Massachusetts: An Evaluation Study. Boston: Massachusetts Parole Board.
- 1986 Risk and Recidivism Among Massachusetts Parolees: An Exploratory Study. Boston: Massachusetts Parole Board.