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ABSTRACT

The primary goal of this study is to evaluate the rehabilitative quality of Massachusetts medium and minimum security institutions using recidivism as the gauge for measuring the impact of the program. Specifically this study was designed to analyze the occurrence of differential rates of recidivism for MCI-Walpole commitments by their specific institution of release. The sample populations consisted of 1971 releasees.

The evaluation resulted in two significant findings. First, it was determined that evidence did not exist in support of the contention that low recidivist risks were in fact chosen for transfer to the programs. Secondly, even when controlling for a possible selection bias analyses revealed that there was indeed a rehabilitative quality in the movement from maximum to medium and minimum security levels in the Massachusetts Department of Correction.
INTRODUCTION

In the Massachusetts criminal justice system the courts make direct commitments to three institutions. Men are committed to either MCI-Walpole or MCI-Concord, while women are committed exclusively to MCI-Framingham. When sentencing a man to Concord a judge does not fix a minimum and maximum term as he does when sentencing a man to Walpole. Sentences to this maximum security institution, traditionally the place of confinement for the younger offender, are always indefinite. A District Court or the Superior Court may sentence a male of any age, not previously sentenced for a felony more than three times, to an indefinite term at MCI-Concord, after conviction of a crime punishable in any state or county penal or correctional institution. If a maximum term is not specified it is considered an indefinite sentence, having a maximum of 2 1/2 years. This maximum term, however, cannot exceed the maximum provided by law for the crime of which the individual was convicted. An indefinite sentence with no minimum term is a "reformatory type" sentence, giving the Parole Board considerable leeway as to the releases on Parole of an offender.

When sentencing a man to the Commonwealth's other maximum security institution, MCI-Walpole, a judge must fix both a minimum and maximum term, and the minimum sentence may not be less than two and one half years. In recent years the crime for which more men were committed to Walpole was robbery, armed and unarmed.

A "Segregation Unit" with accommodations for 60 men was opened at Walpole in 1959. Male inmates in the general population of any of the correctional institutions whose presence there is "detrimental to the program of the institution" may be transferred to this unit for an indefinite period of time by the commissioner. An "Isolation Unit" where inmates may be confined for not longer than 15 days is also available for the "enforcement of discipline".

MCI-Norfolk, a medium security walled institution opened in 1931 was planned for the more hopeful and adaptable men. Residents at Norfolk live in dormitory units rather than cell blocks. This approach, at least to "community life" was considered the first "community prison" in the United States for males. Selected inmates sentenced to Walpole or Concord, are eligible for transfer to Norfolk, after a careful screening process.

Since 1952, the Department of Correction has opened the first of three Forestry Camps in state forest reservations throughout the Commonwealth. Because these camps are minimum security institutions without walls or security barriers, escape is not difficult. For this reason men are carefully selected for transfer and are informed that an escape may result in an additional sentence and forfeiture of all deductions for good conduct from the sentence he was then serving. The law specifies that certain types of offenders cannot be transferred to the camps, specifically those serving life sentences for first degree murder or sentences for rape or assault to commit rape.
The courts do not commit men directly to either MCI-Norfolk, or Forestry Camps.

The Division of Research of the Massachusetts Department of Correction previously published a recidivism follow-up analysis of the releases from the Massachusetts State Correctional Institutions in the year 1971. One important result cited in this report pointed to an interesting pattern regarding the recidivism rate of MCI-Walpole commitments when differentiated by institution of release. It was determined that the recidivism rate of individuals committed to MCI-Walpole and directly released from Walpole was 27%. In contrast to this, the recidivism rate of residents committed to MCI-Walpole but directly released from MCI-Norfolk was 17%; and the recidivism rates of MCI-Walpole commitments released from MCI-Norfolk or Forestry Camps, then, had a significantly lower recidivism rate than those residents who were committed to and released from MCI-Walpole. These results are summarized in Table I, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Releasing Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCI-Walpole</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI-Norfolk</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI-Concord</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI-Forestry</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>484</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author of the above mentioned report suggested that these differences might be accounted for by at least two possible hypotheses: (1) low recidivist risks men were selected for transfers, specifically to MCI’s-Norfolk and Forestry Camps, disproportionately, and thus these facilities had lower recidivism rates; or, (2) there was a rehabilitative or reintegrative quality to the movement from a maximum to medium or minimum security institution, as compared to direct release from a maximum security institution. It is the purpose of this study to test if either of the above hypotheses are in fact supportable.

Research evaluations of this nature must always deal with the problem of a possible selection bias. Keller and Alper (1970) in their criticism of the Illinois Youth Commission’s claim of a lower failure rate at the state’s forestry camps suggested that:

"The Commission's forestry camps claim a lower failure rate than the commission's other facilities, but any comparative evaluation of the success rates of camps versus closed institutions is without validity because the selection process which takes place at time of intake sends only the less serious offenders to open institutions." The authors continued their criticism of methods used to assess the results and effectiveness of correctional programs asserting that:

"most state correctional agencies do not undertake controlled surveys, reporting rather in the most general terms on their rates of success without consideration for random assignment, matched groups, or comparison with the effectiveness of other agencies”

In a study concerning recidivism among inmates released from Massachusetts Forestry Camps, Carney and Bottome (1967), determined that men were selected for the camps on the basis of a judgment as to how they will adjust to the camp routine. This, they determined, did not always mean that the best risks in terms of recidivism were transferred to the camps. The actual recidivism rate of the Carney and Bottome forestry sample was calculated to be 52.3%, while the expected rate was 57.7%. Despite the fact that the difference between the two rates was not statistically significant, it was in a favorable direction and it did approach significance (X^2=3.15, df=1, P<.10). Using expected rates of recidivism as a comparative measure the researchers did control to some degree then for the type of inmate transferred to the camps.

From their analysis it was further determined that sex offenders had the lowest recidivism rate of all types of offenders studied. The law which excludes sex offenders from the camps, then, actually tends to have a lowering effect on the return rate at the other institutions. It should be pointed out that only those men who volunteer are considered for transfer to the camps. Coupled with the added pressure of keeping the camps full, this fact becomes significant. Maintaining the camps at full capacity with the dependence on volunteers, lowers the degree of selectivity then for transfer to the forestry facilities.

The data presented in the Carney and Bottome study strongly suggest that this probability for recidivism was not a major consideration for transfer to a forestry camp. The findings of this study seem to be at odds, then, with the theory that low recidivist risk men might have been selected for transfers to MCI-Forestry Camps.

The courts do not commit men directly to either MCI-Norfolk, or Forestry Camps. The Division of Research of the Massachusetts Department of Correction previously published a recidivism follow-up analysis of the releases from the Massachusetts State Correctional Institutions in the year 1971. One important result cited in this report pointed to an interesting pattern regarding the recidivism rate of MCI-Walpole commitments when differentiated by institution of release. It was determined that the recidivism rate of individuals committed to MCI-Walpole and directly released from Walpole was 27%. In contrast to this, the recidivism rate of residents committed to MCI-Walpole but directly released from MCI-Norfolk was 17%; and the recidivism rates of MCI-Walpole commitments released from MCI-Norfolk or Forestry Camps, then, had a significantly lower recidivism rate than those residents who were committed to and released from MCI-Walpole. These results are summarized in Table I, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Releasing Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCI-Walpole</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI-Norfolk</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI-Concord</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI-Forestry</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>484</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author of the above mentioned report suggested that these differences might be accounted for by at least two possible hypotheses: (1) low recidivist risks men were selected for transfers, specifically to MCI’s-Norfolk and Forestry Camps, disproportionately, and thus these facilities had lower recidivism rates; or, (2) there was a rehabilitative or reintegrative quality to the movement from a maximum to medium or minimum security institution, as compared to direct release from a maximum security institution. It is the purpose of this study to test if either of the above hypotheses are in fact supportable.

Research evaluations of this nature must always deal with the problem of a possible selection bias. Keller and Alper (1970) in their criticism of the Illinois Youth Commission’s claim of a lower failure rate at the state's forestry camps suggested that:

"The Commission's forestry camps claim a lower failure rate than the commission's other facilities, but any comparative evaluation of the success rates of camps versus closed institutions is without validity because the selection process which takes place at time of intake sends only the less serious offenders to open institutions." The authors continued their criticism of methods used to assess the results and effectiveness of correctional programs asserting that:

"most state correctional agencies do not undertake controlled surveys, reporting rather in the most general terms on their rates of success without consideration for random assignment, matched groups, or comparison with the effectiveness of other agencies”

In a study concerning recidivism among inmates released from Massachusetts Forestry Camps, Carney and Bottome (1967), determined that men were selected for the camps on the basis of a judgment as to how they will adjust to the camp routine. This, they determined, did not always mean that the best risks in terms of recidivism were transferred to the camps. The actual recidivism rate of the Carney and Bottome forestry sample was calculated to be 52.3%, while the expected rate was 57.7%. Despite the fact that the difference between the two rates was not statistically significant, it was in a favorable direction and it did approach significance (X^2=3.15, df=1, P<.10). Using expected rates of recidivism as a comparative measure the researchers did control to some degree then for the type of inmate transferred to the camps.

From their analysis it was further determined that sex offenders had the lowest recidivism rate of all types of offenders studied. The law which excludes sex offenders from the camps, then, actually tends to have a lowering effect on the return rate at the other institutions. It should be pointed out that only those men who volunteer are considered for transfer to the camps. Coupled with the added pressure of keeping the camps full, this fact becomes significant. Maintaining the camps at full capacity with the dependence on volunteers, lowers the degree of selectivity then for transfer to the forestry facilities.

The data presented in the Carney and Bottome study strongly suggest that this probability for recidivism was not a major consideration for transfer to a forestry camp. The findings of this study seem to be at odds, then, with the theory that low recidivist risk men might have been selected for transfers to MCI-Forestry Camps.
This study, like the Carney and Bottome report, will address itself to Keller and Alper's criticisms by applying a base expectancy table to the Walpole commitments (treatment sample) in the sample who were transferred to and released from MCI's Norfolk and Forestry Camps. The expected rates of recidivism derived from the base expectancy tables will be used to test the possibility of selection factors accounting for the lower rates of recidivism for Walpole commitments released from Norfolk and Forestry Camps. In this way, the possibility that a low or high risk population may have been chosen in the process of selection for the programs will have been controlled for.

Research Design

Research Questions:

This study will address the following two research questions:

(1) Were low recidivist risks men selected for transfers specifically to MCI's Norfolk and Forestry Camps, disproportionately, thus accounting for these facilities lower recidivism rates?

(2) Was there a reintegrative or rehabilitative quality to the movement from a maximum to medium or minimum security institution, as compared to direct release from a maximum security institution?

Samples:

The treatment samples consisted of the MCI-Norfolk and MCI-Forestry Camp releases in the year 1971 who were originally committed to MCI-Walpole. The Norfolk sample contained 216 individuals while the Forestry Camp release population totaled 95.

The control sample was made up of the 155 individuals who were released from MCI-Walpole during the year 1971.

Data Collection:

From the computerized data base of the Correction/Parole Information System, 39 items of information were generated (see Appendix I for a list of these items and the official definition of these terms), all related to the releases, criminal history and background, pertaining to his present incarceration. A 40th item, the variable recidivism, was collected and added to the other variables.

Development of Base Expectancy Tables

Base expectancy categories have long been used by the Massachusetts Department of Correction both for program evaluation and as an aid in the decision making process.

The method used in this study to construct a base expectancy table is called predictive attribute analysis or successive dichotomization. Using this method, the sample was divided into two sub-groups for each variable, used in the analyses. A recidivism rate was then derived for the two sub-groups. The variable with the most significant differences in recidivism was selected. This procedure was continued until the sub-group became too small to produce significant differences in the recidivism rates. A predictive attribute analysis, then, was run on a population consisting of all releases from MCI-Walpole in 1971. The total sample consisted of 155 males. The successive sub-grouping of the predictive attribute analysis was accessed by a computer program designated "Max-Chi Square." The completed analysis resulted in the base expectancy table presented below:

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 24 or Older</th>
<th>Total Number of Charges 14 or Less</th>
<th>Total Number of Charges 15 or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Time of Release</td>
<td>RR = 36%</td>
<td>RR = 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR = 8%</td>
<td>Age 23 or Younger</td>
<td>Military Service Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR = 11%</td>
<td>At Time of Release</td>
<td>RR = 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR = 36%</td>
<td>RR = 41%</td>
<td>Military Service None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR = 54%</td>
<td></td>
<td>RR = 54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development of Base Expectancy Risk Categories

The completed base expectancy table yielded four basic risk categories. These were used to determine the expected rates of recidivism for the Norfolk and Forestry samples. A rank ordering of these four categories in terms of their risk level (i.e., recidivism rate), is summarized in Table III below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Military Service, 15 or more total number of charges</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Age 23 or younger at time of release, 14 or less total number of charges</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Some military service, 15 or more total number of charges</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Age 24 or older at time of release, 14 or less total number of charges</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expected rates for each of the separate and combined samples of treatment groups are presented below in Table IV. The specific computations made for each of these derived expected rates are found in Appendix II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Expected Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCI-Norfolk</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI-Forestry Camps</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLES</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table V it can be seen that the control group i.e., Walpole releases, had the highest actual or observed recidivism rate while the Forestry sample had the lowest rate. The Norfolk releases had a higher rate than the Total Treatment sample but a lower rate than the control group.

Because of the possible existence of a non-random selection process in the transfer of inmates to medium and minimum security institutions, a comparison between the treatment end control samples will be made. To test the first hypothesis the possibility of selection factors accounting for the lower rates of recidivism for MCI-Walpole commitments released from medium and minimum security institutions as opposed to those directly released from MCI-Walpole, this study will compare the actual rate of recidivism for Walpole releases (27%) with the expected rate for each of the MCI-Norfolk and Forestry Camp releases populations.
When comparing the actual recidivism rate of the Walpole releases with the expected rates of the Norfolk and Forestry samples, it was determined that both groups, when taken individually or as a whole, had expected rates of recidivism that were lower than Walpole's actual rate. While comparisons between these samples show a basic difference, when the Chi Square goodness of fit test was applied the differences were found not to be statistically significant. Therefore, in testing the possibility that difference approaches statistical significance for the combined Norfolk and Forestry samples, it was determined that both groups, when taken individually or as a whole, had expected rates of recidivism that were lower than the actual rate. It was also determined that the total treatment sample had an actual rate that was substantially lower than its expected rate. These findings are summarized in Table VII below:

### TABLE VI

**COMPARISONS BETWEEN RATES OF RECIDIVISM FOR WALPOLE COMMITMENTS RELEASED FROM MCI-NORFOLK AND FORESTRY CAMPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walpole Commitments Released from MCI-Norfolk</th>
<th>Expected Rate of Recidivism</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>$X^2=1.50$, $P&gt;0.05$, 1 df</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL WALPOLE COMMITMENTS RELEASED FROM LOWER SECURITY INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$X^2=3.48$, $P&gt;0.05$, 1 df</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table VI indicates that the expected recidivism rates of Walpole commitments who were released from Norfolk or Forestry Camps were lower than the actual recidivism rate of their counterparts who were released from Walpole. Because this difference approaches statistical significance for the combined Norfolk/Forestry release sample, a complete dismissal of the existence of a selection process cannot be made. Therefore, in testing the possibility that there is a reintegrative or rehabilitative quality to the movement from a maximum to medium or minimum security institution base expectancy tables will be used.

### Expected Rates of Recidivism Compared to Observed Rates

In order to test the second hypothesis this study will compare the expected recidivism rates for the MCI's Norfolk and Forestry Camps release populations with their actual rates of recidivism. Because a total rejection of the existence of a selection process could not be made selective factors will be held constant when testing the second hypothesis. Selective factors, to the extent that they exist will be controlled for, then, by using the expected rates of recidivism.

Using the risk categories generated from the completed base expectancy table, expected rates of recidivism for the treatment samples were derived. From these categories it was determined that the expected recidivism rate for the Norfolk release sample was 23.3%; and the expected rate for the Forestry sample was 19.9%. The expected rate for the combined sample was calculated to be 22.3%.

When these expected rates were compared with the actual recidivism rates it was found that both the Norfolk and Forestry Camp samples had actual rates of recidivism that were lower than their expected rates. It was also determined that the total treatment sample had an actual rate that was substantially lower than its expected rate. These findings are summarized in Table VII below:

### TABLE VII

**WALPOLE COMMITMENTS WHO WERE TRANSFERRED TO AND RELEASED FROM LOWER SECURITY INSTITUTIONS, FOR RELEASES IN THE YEAR 1971**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walpole Commitments Released from MCI-Norfolk</th>
<th>Expected Recidivism Rate</th>
<th>Actual Recidivism Rate</th>
<th>Chi Square &amp; Probability Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>$X^2=3.94$, $P&lt;0.05$, 1 df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL WALPOLE COMMITMENTS RELEASED FROM LOWER SECURITY INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>$X^2=6.98$, $P&lt;0.05$, 1 df</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walpole Commitments Released from MCI-Forestry Camps</th>
<th>Expected Recidivism Rate</th>
<th>Actual Recidivism Rate</th>
<th>Chi Square &amp; Probability Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2=3.16$, $P&gt;0.05$, 1 df</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table VII it can be seen that while the MCI-Walpole commitments released from MCI-Norfolk had an expected recidivism rate of 23.3% their actual recidivism rate was 17.6%. MCI-Walpole commitments released from MCI-Forestry Camps exhibited an expected recidivism rate of 19.9% while their actual rate was 12.6%. Using the Chi Square goodness of fit test it was determined, in terms of statistical significance that the difference between the expected and actual rates of recidivism was significant for the Norfolk releasee sample. The difference for the combined Norfolk and Forestry Camp sample was also significant. It should be noted that the difference for the Forestry Camp sample, though approaching significance, was not statistically significant.

Controlling for a possible selection bias the results of this comparison between expected and actual recidivism rates supports the contention, then, that there is, to some degree, a reintegrative or rehabilitative quality in the movement from maximum to medium and minimum security levels in the Massachusetts Department of Correction.

In terms of statistical significance, individuals originally committed to MCI-Walpole but subsequently transferred to and released from MCI-Norfolk had significantly lower recidivism rates than those who remained at MCI-Walpole ($X^2 = 5.50, P < .02, 1$ df); individuals originally committed to MCI-Walpole but subsequently transferred to and released from MCI-Concord were not significantly different than those who remained at MCI-Walpole ($X^2 = 1.23$ (Yates correction applied), $P > .05, 1$ df); and individuals committed to MCI-Walpole but subsequently transferred to and released from Forestry Camps had significantly lower recidivism rates than those who remained at MCI-Walpole ($X^2 = 7.42, P < .01, 1$ df).

1. G.L., c.279, s.31.
3. Ibid., P.210.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
9. For the purpose of this study a person was defined as a recidivist if he became incarcerated in a Federal, State, County or Town correctional facility for 30 days or more during the first year following his release.
10. The max-chi square computer program was developed by Tom Cannon, Research Analyst, Massachusetts Department of Correction. The author of this study actually ran the Base Expectancy analysis.
11. To determine statistical significance, the $X^2$, goodness of fit test was utilized:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(\text{observed}-\text{expected})^2}{\text{expected}}$$
APPENDIX I

PART A
VARIABLES USED IN ANALYSIS

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. Personal Background Characteristics Variables
1. Race*
2. Marital Status*
3. Military Service*
4. Last Civilian Address*
5. Emergency Address*
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 asterisk indicates variables that will be formally defined in Part B of this Appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Total Number of Court Appearances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Number of Court Appearances for Person Offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Number of Court Appearances for Property Offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Number of Court Appearances for Sex Offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Number of Court Appearances for Narcotic Offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Number of Court Appearances for Drunkenness Offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Number of Court Appearances for Escape Offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Number of Juvenile Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Number of House of Correction Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Number of Prior State of Federal Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Number of Any Incarcerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Number of Juvenile Paroles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Number of Adult Paroles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Number of Any Paroles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Number of Juvenile Parole Violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Number of Adult Parole Violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Number of Any Parole Violations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Releasing Variables

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

E. Recidivism Variable

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 26)*
   - 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 assault; 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)
   - Assaualts with intent to rob, etc., Being Armed
     - Includes assault with a deadly weapon with intent
     to rob. (section 18)
   - Assaualts 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 Assaulting in dwelling houses
the act may be an actual assault or an
attempt. (section 19A).

Assault and Battery
includes assault, assault and battery, assault
on an officer. (sections 13A and 17B)

Assault and Battery with Dangerous Weapon (section 18A)

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 man
slaughter (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.

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

Rape (section 12)
includes attempt 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)

Rapes of Female under Sixteen (section 22A)
Rape of Child
includes sexual 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 24A)

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

Unnatural and Lascivious Acts (Chapter: 271)
includes unnatural acts, lascivious acts, assaults to commit unnatural sex acts (section 15).

Unnatural acts with Child under 16 (section 31)

Buggery and Bestiality (section 18)

Forcible Rape
includes assault of a person, operation without authority of consent after suspension, operation without authority of consent after suspension (section 28)

Forcible Rape
includes assault of a person, operation without authority of consent after suspension, operation without authority of consent after suspension (section 28)

Common and Notorious Thief (section 40)

Embezzlement (sections: 50-59)
Drunkennes (Chapter 272-Section 46)

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 Hash
- 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 217)

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

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

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

Sale of Narcotic Drugs
- includes possession of heroin with intent to sell, unlawful possession of heroin with intent to sell (Chapter 94-Section 212)

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 272-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)

Obstructing a Motor Vehicle Under Influence of Narcotic Controlled Substance
- includes the manufacturing, distributing, 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 offense. For example, if an individual is committed for burglary, larcenies, and assault, three charges are not listed. Charges should not be confused with counts. An individual may be convicted on 16 counts for the single charge of Burglary.

B-6. Type of Sentence:

Simple - one sentence is being served,

Concurrent - all served concurrently,

Aggravate - more than one sentence is being served but the sentences are added together and not served concurrently,

Forthwith - a sentence which supersedes an existing sentence.

From and After - a sentence which begins after an individual has been released from an existing sentence.

B-1 Race/Ethnic Origin

White

Black

American Indian

Spanish

B-2 Marital Status

Married

Single

Widowed

Common Law

Separated

B-3 Military Service

None

Dishonorable Discharge

Bad Conduct Discharge, Other than Honorable

General

Desirables

Medical

In Armed Services, but the type of discharge is not listed on the Booking Sheet.

B-4. Civilian Address

Boston

Northern Boston Suburbs

Romancing Metropolitian Boston

Lowell-Lawrence Area

New Bedford - Fall River Area

Springfield Area

Worcester Area

Other Massachusetts Areas

Outside Massachusetts

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

Father

Mother

Non-Relative

Spouse

No emergency address 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, clerk).

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

Semi-Skilled Manual - (e.g., apprentice craftsman, automobile mechanic, assembler, etc.).

Unskilled Manual - labor tasks requiring little training or skill.

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

B-9. Education (List Grade Completed)

The last grade of education which the subject completed. Both a high school graduate and a GED could 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. Bachelor.
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)

B-3. Type of Release

Parole

Discharge
The formula for constructing an expected recidivism rate for a particular sample is:

\[
\text{Expected Rate of Category} \times \text{Number of Individuals in Category} \div \text{Total Number of Individuals in Sample}
\]

For example, if we take the Norfolk sample, the expected rate of recidivism would be calculated in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Expected Rate</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Computation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{Expected Rate} = \frac{50.36}{216} = 0.233\%
\]

In the above procedure the risk category is the specific Base Expectancy Risk Category computed from the construction of the Base Expectancy Table for the control group i.e., the Walpole 1971 Releasee sample (see Table III Page 6 for specific listing and description of the four (4) risk categories). The expected rate is the appropriate expected recidivism rate for the individual Risk category (see also Table III Page 6 for specific rate) while the Number refers to the number of individuals in the sample for which an expected rate is being calculated that fall into the particular risk category. Total Number is the total number of individuals in the sample for which an expected Rate is being determined.

The specific mathematical computations made for each of the derived expected rates are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Expected Rate</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Computation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Releases</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\frac{18.94}{95} = \text{Expected Rate} = 19.9\%
\]