

A  
MONOGRAPH

PROFILING THE  
CAREER CRIMINAL

NCJRS

OCT 13 1978

ACQUISITIONS

NATIONAL LEGAL DATA CENTER  
100 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard  
Suite 172  
Thousand Oaks, California 91360

This Monograph was prepared by National Legal Data Center, Inc., supported by Grant Number 76-TA-99-0030, awarded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, United States Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this publication are those of the National Legal Data Center Inc., and do not necessarily represent the official position of the United States Department of Justice.

51737

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This document was produced by Larry David, Ron Sabo, and Al Walkling of the staff of the National Legal Data Center. They were ably assisted by Ken Myer, Linda Bodenhamer, and Aroua McGowan. Thanks are extended to Mr. Charles M. Hollis, Career Criminal Program Manager, LEAA, for his support and guidance, and to Dr. Talmadge Day, OPM, LEAA, for his review and suggestions.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction and Reporting Format . . . . .	1
II. Description of Data Base Composition . . . . .	4
Table 1 - Data Base Composition . . . . .	8
Table 2 - Comparison of Defendant Trips to Actual Defendants . . . . .	9
III. Defendant Criminal History and Status Information . . . . .	10
A. <u>Prior Criminal Record</u> . . . . .	11
Table 3 - Percent of Defendants with Local/ Non Local Prior Records Reported by Jurisdiction . . . . .	12
B. <u>Prior Arrests</u> . . . . .	13
Table 4 - Percentage of Various Numbers of Prior Arrests by Jurisdiction . . . . .	14
C. <u>Prior Felony Convictions</u> . . . . .	15
Table 5 - Percent of Defendants with Specified Prior Felony Con- victions by Jurisdiction . . . . .	16
D. <u>Prior Misdemeanor Convictions</u> . . . . .	17
Table 6 - Percent of Defendants with Specified Prior Misdemeanor Convictions by Jurisdiction . . . . .	18
E. <u>Pending Cases</u> . . . . .	19
Table 7 - Percent of Defendants with Specified Numbers of Pending Cases by Jurisdiction . . . . .	20
F. <u>Defendant Status</u> . . . . .	21
Table 8 - Percentage of Defendants by Jurisdiction Under Legal Restraint at Time of Arrest . . . . .	22
G. <u>Years Since Release</u> . . . . .	23
Table 9 - Percentage of Defendants by Jurisdiction with Various Amounts of Time Since Release from Incar- ceration . . . . .	24
Table 10- Minimum, Maximum, and Average Years Since Release from Incar- ceration by Jurisdiction . . . . .	25
IV. Defendant Demographic Information . . . . .	26
A. <u>Age</u> . . . . .	27
Table 11- Age Analysis of Defendants . . . . .	28

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
B. <u>Age Groups</u> . . . . .	29
Table 12- Percent of Defendants in Various Age Groups by Jurisdiction . . . . .	30
C. <u>Sex</u> . . . . .	31
Table 13- Percentage of Males and Females by Jurisdiction . . . . .	32
D. <u>Race</u> . . . . .	33
Table 14- Racial Breakdown by Jurisdiction . . . . .	34
E. <u>Marital Status</u> . . . . .	35
Table 15- Percentage of Defendants with Various Reported Marital Status by Jurisdiction . . . . .	36
F. <u>Employment Status</u> . . . . .	37
Table 16- Percentage of Defendant Employment Status by Jurisdiction . . . . .	38
G. <u>Drug Use</u> . . . . .	39
Table 17- Percentage of Respondents by Jurisdiction Known or Suspected to be Drug Users . . . . .	40
H. <u>Time in Jurisdiction</u> . . . . .	41
Table 18- Percentage of Defendants by Jurisdiction with Various Times in Jurisdiction . . . . .	42
Table 19- Minimum, Maximum and Average Lengths of Time in Jurisdiction . . . . .	43
V. <u>Crime Characteristic Information</u> . . . . .	44
A. <u>Major Crime Types</u> . . . . .	45
Table 20- Major Charges by Jurisdiction . . . . .	46
Table 20A-Charges Analysis . . . . .	47
B. <u>Number of Co-Defendants</u> . . . . .	48
Table 21- Percent of Defendants Having Specific Numbers of Co-Defendants by Jurisdiction . . . . .	49
C. <u>Weapons Possessed and Used During Crime</u> . . . . .	50
Table 22- Percentage of Offenses Where Weapon Possessed and Used by Jurisdiction . . . . .	52
D. <u>Arrest Weapon</u> . . . . .	53
Table 23- Percentage of Defendants by Jurisdiction with Various Weapons at Time of Arrest . . . . .	54
VI. <u>Conclusion</u> . . . . .	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Appendix A - Case Data Form

Appendix B - NLDC Performance Summary Report

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION AND REPORTING  
FORMAT

This monograph is divided into six major sections, this being the first section (Section I). Following a description of the data base composition (Section II), are two broad categories of defendant criminal history status (Section III), and demographic characteristics (Section IV), after which occurs a description of the criminal incident which brought the defendants into the CCP (Section V), followed by the concluding section (Section VI).

The data reported answers the following three questions:

- Why was the defendant classified as a career criminal?
- What did the typical career criminal look like demographically?
- What was the nature of the crimes targeted by the Career Criminal Program?

In answering the question "why the defendant was classified as a career criminal", the third section deals with the defendant's criminal history and status. Here is described the nature and extent of the defendant's prior records, the extent of other then-pending cases when the defendant was selected by the Unit, the extent to which the defendant was already under legal restraint for another crime, and, finally, the average time since the defendant was last released from prison.

Section IV, in answering the question "what does the typical career criminal look like?", describes various defendant demographic characteristics. That is, this section deals with factors such as age, sex, race, marital and employment status, drug use, and length of time in the particular jurisdiction.

In order to describe the nature of the crimes committed by career criminal defendants, Section V provides several characteristics about these crimes. Here presented are the major crimes charged against defendants, the number of persons (co-defendants) involved, and the propensity for violence in the various crimes as measured by the possession of weapons by defendants, both at the time of offense and at the time of their arrest. This section conveys information relative to whether programs have targeted serious, violent offenders, as judged by either the crime itself or the propensity of the defendant to exercise dangerous or deadly force.

Common to each of the above three sections is the following format. A general narrative description of the particular characteristic for the entire defendant data base is followed by a tabular presentation of the variations (if any) from that particular "nationwide description" on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis.

This monograph is not intended to be an in-depth cross-tabulation of all the potential variables pertinent to persons selected as "career criminal defendants". That is a job best left to criminal justice researchers who are hereby invited to ruminate through the entire data base.

One should, however, from this monograph, be able to obtain some "gross description" of the "typical career criminal" and any significant variations therefrom on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis.

The conclusion (Section VI) gives a brief synopsis of the "typical career criminal" as judged by the nationwide program data.

SECTION II

DESCRIPTION OF  
DATA BASE COMPOSITION

The data base used to create the Career Criminal Profiles was compiled over a three-year period and was composed of data from thirty (30) participating jurisdictions. These participating jurisdictions either had Career Criminal Programs funded by the federal government through LEAA, or had a program funded by state block funds (largely composed of LEAA monies), or had a program funded under local funds with perhaps, but not necessarily, some participation at a low level with federal or state funds. The bulk of the data in the data base came from jurisdictions funded with federal funds. These LEAA funded jurisdictions are identified in Table 1 with a double asterisk (\*\*).

Data were submitted by participating jurisdictions on a form called the Case Data Form (see Appendix A for a copy of the Case Data Form). The data collectors completed a Case Data Form for each defendant who met the jurisdiction's criteria for selection into the program, and who was processed by the Career Criminal Unit. Some defendants were reported more than once as they made multiple processing "trips" through the jurisdiction's criminal justice system.

The total number of defendant trips contained in the data base was 7,941. A defendant is counted each time he or she passes through the criminal justice system. In other words, if a defendant made three separate trips through the criminal justice system and was separately reported to NLDC with each trip through the system, the defendant would be counted in the data base three times. The relationship between actual defendants and defendant trips is displayed in Table 2.

Table 1 shows that Detroit, Michigan and New Orleans,

Louisiana were each major contributors to the data base, with each of them contributing about 12% of the total number of defendants included in the data base. Since these two jurisdictions contributed about 24% of the total data base, it is assumed that the bias or potential bias introduced by these two jurisdictions is substantially nullified by the volume of data from the other jurisdictions.

The nature of the self-reporting of the data with no formal audit of the submitted data, allowed several problems to develop in the data base. Several items were reported by the data collectors as impossible and/or difficult to collect from the records available, consequently resulting in a high missing data rate<sup>1</sup>, i.e., the following items had high missing data rates: years since release (39%), marital status (28%), employment status (27%), drug use (66%), time in jurisdiction (39%), number of prior misdemeanors (44%), number of pending cases (61%), and number of co-defendants (66%).

There was also a confounding of zero responses and no responses (or missing data) for: number of prior misdemeanor convictions, number of pending cases, and number of co-defendants. Similarly, the number of prior felony convictions and number of prior arrests suffered from the zero and missing responses being confounded. In other words, the zero responses, indicating no priors for these items are lost

---

<sup>1</sup> A subsequent audit of the data base accomplished by sampling three jurisdictions by the Institute for Law and Social Research found that, at the time of the audit, in the selected jurisdictions about 10% of the missing data was available in the files and presumably should have been reported.

in the missing data. Consequently, the data do not specifically indicate if any defendants were processed by the CCP who had no prior arrests, no prior misdemeanor convictions, no prior felony convictions, no pending cases and no co-defendants. On the positive side, the data do indicate the appropriate numbers greater than zero for these items.

Table 1

## Data Base Composition

Jurisdiction	Number of Defendant Trips	Percent
Albuquerque, NM**	272	3.4
Boston, MA**	513	6.5
Columbus, OH**	552	7.0
Detroit, MI**	930	11.7
Dallas, TX**	442	5.6
Houston, TX**	648	8.2
Indianapolis, IN**	464	5.8
Indianapolis, Juv.	25	0.3
Kalamazoo, MI**	170	2.1
Kenosha, WI	6	0.1
Louisville, KY**	105	1.3
Las Vegas, NV**	67	0.8
Miami, FL**	509	6.4
Memphis, TN**	372	4.7
Milwaukee, WI	133	1.7
New Orleans, LA**	979	12.3
Manhattan, NY**	405	5.1
Portland, OR**	175	2.2
Portsmouth, VA**	2	0.0
Rhode Island**	109	1.4
Santa Barbara, CA	74	0.9
San Diego, CA**	187	2.4
Seattle, Juv.	17	0.2
Salt Lake City, UT**	342	4.3
Seattle, WA	4	0.1
St. Louis City, MO**	179	2.3
St. Louis City*	90	1.1
St. Louis Cnty., MO**	65	0.8
St. Louis Cnty.*	74	0.9
Ventura, CA	.31	0.4
TOTALS	7941	100.0

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

\*\* LEAA Discretionary Funded CCP

Table 2

Comparison of Defendant  
Trips to Actual Defendants

Jurisdiction	Number of Actual Defendants	Number of Defendant Trips	Number of Trips/Defendant
Albuquerque, NM	212	272	1.2
Boston, MA	335	513	1.5
Columbus, OH	453	552	1.2
Detroit, MI	736	930	1.3
Dallas, TX	357	442	1.2
Houston, TX	604	648	1.1
Indianapolis, IN	349	464	1.3
Indianapolis, Juv.	19	25	1.3
Kalamazoo, MI	95	170	1.8
Kenosha, WI	6	6	1.0
Louisville, KY	86	105	1.2
Las Vegas, NV	48	67	1.4
Miami, FL	265	509	1.9
Memphis, TN	282	372	1.3
Milwaukee, WI	117	133	1.1
New Orleans, LA	857	979	1.1
Manhattan, NY	335	405	1.2
Portland, OR	152	175	1.2
Portsmouth, VA	2	2	1.0
Rhode Island	95	109	1.1
Santa Barbara, CA	61	74	1.2
San Diego, CA	186	187	1.0
Seattle, Juv.	17	17	1.0
Salt Lake City, UT	237	342	1.4
Seattle, WA	4	4	1.0
St. Louis City, MO	135	179	1.3
St. Louis City*	89	90	1.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	50	65	1.3
St. Louis Cnty.*	69	74	1.1
Ventura, CA	26	31	1.2
TOTALS	6279	7941	1.26

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

SECTION III

DEFENDANT CRIMINAL HISTORY  
AND STATUS INFORMATION

A. PRIOR CRIMINAL RECORD

In examining the prior criminal records of the defendants, approximately 2% had no record, 66% had a local record, 4% had a non local record, and 27% had both local and non local records. Thus, we see that 93% of the defendants with records reported had local records. (This is about 89% of all defendants.) This tends to substantiate the finding that most of the defendants were known to local law enforcement and had been in their home community for a long period of time.

Table 3 summarizes the percentage distribution of prior records by jurisdiction for those defendants having prior records reported. (There were 386 forms without prior record information (5%) and 7,555 with.)

Table 3

Percent of Defendants with  
Local/Non Local Prior Records Reported  
by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Prior Record Percentages				Total Local Include Both Column
	None	Local	Non Local	Both	
Albuquerque, NM	0.0	48.7	0.0	51.3	100.0
Boston, MA	2.2	77.7	4.3	15.8	93.5
Columbus, OH	0.4	44.8	6.8	48.0	92.8
Detroit, MI	3.2	80.6	7.0	9.2	89.8
Dallas, TX	1.0	67.5	3.1	28.4	95.9
Houston, TX	4.7	71.8	6.9	16.5	98.3
Indianapolis, IN	1.3	82.2	3.6	12.9	95.1
Indianapolis, Juv.	20.8	79.2	0.0	0.0	79.2
Kalamazoo, MI	0.0	54.8	3.0	42.3	97.1
Kenosha, WI	25.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	75.0
Louisville, KY	2.0	48.0	1.0	49.0	97.0
Las Vegas, NV	0.0	30.9	3.6	65.5	96.4
Miami, FL	1.7	79.5	6.1	12.6	92.1
Memphis, TN	2.4	77.2	1.9	18.4	95.6
Milwaukee, WI	4.1	67.5	8.1	20.3	87.8
New Orleans, LA	3.8	71.9	0.9	23.3	95.2
Manhattan, NY	0.0	40.0	2.2	57.7	97.8
Portland, OR	0.6	31.1	0.0	68.3	99.4
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Rhode Island	7.5	72.6	4.7	15.1	87.7
Santa Barbara, CA	2.8	42.3	21.1	33.8	76.1
San Diego, CA	7.0	50.3	17.3	25.4	75.7
Seattle, Juv.	0.0	41.7	8.3	50.0	91.7
Salt Lake City, UT	0.0	45.3	3.3	51.4	96.7
Seattle, WA	0.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	100.0
St. Louis City, MO	1.3	68.8	0.0	30.0	98.7
St. Louis City*	0.0	67.8	0.0	32.2	100.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	0.0	77.8	0.0	22.2	100.0
St. Louis Cnty.*	5.6	60.6	1.4	32.4	93.0
Ventura, CA	0.0	7.1	3.6	89.3	96.4
TOTAL	2.3%	65.5%	4.3%	27.9%	93%
	(174)	(4949)	(324)	(2108)	(7555)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

## B. PRIOR ARRESTS

The prior arrest data for the entire nation reflected an interesting range of prior arrests. On the low end, we found about 3% of defendants with one prior arrest reported. The maximum number of prior arrests was 99 (which, being the maximum number that could be expressed, could indicate 99 or more arrests) with two respondents at that end of the extreme.

Because of the extreme range of values, the average number of prior arrests, eleven, tends to be skewed on the high side. The most frequently occurring number of arrests (or mode) was six (6), whereas the middlemost (or median) was eight (8). In picking our statistical average defendant to represent the entire nationwide data base, it was determined that the median would be the most representative measure for prior arrests, therefore our representative defendant would have been arrested eight (8) times prior to the current arrest.

Table 4 displays the prior arrests by jurisdiction. Prior arrest information was omitted on 427 reporting forms (5.4% missing data).

Percentage of Various Numbers of Prior  
Arrests by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Number of Prior Arrests										
	1	2	3	4	5	6-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50+
Albuquerque, NM	0.4	4.1	8.1	6.3	7.4	27.7	31.0	7.7	6.6	0.7	0.0
Boston, MA	1.4	3.9	2.9	2.5	2.1	17.1	41.8	21.0	5.8	0.8	0.8
Columbus, OH	1.7	4.4	7.3	9.4	9.2	33.8	27.7	4.8	1.1	0.6	0.2
Detroit, MI	2.1	4.2	9.0	8.1	7.7	38.8	22.4	5.9	1.2	0.7	0.0
Dallas, TX	0.9	7.0	6.5	6.3	12.1	36.1	24.9	5.1	0.2	0.5	0.2
Houston, TX	5.6	7.3	7.3	9.9	8.7	28.5	22.6	6.8	2.1	0.7	0.6
Indianapolis, IN	12.9	14.9	12.6	14.0	7.8	23.9	12.4	0.7	0.2	0.5	0.0
Indianapolis, Juv.	5.6	5.6	5.6	22.2	11.1	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kalamazoo, MI	4.3	4.3	7.4	11.7	9.8	41.1	18.4	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kenosha, WI	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisville, KY	4.9	5.9	7.8	9.8	13.7	20.6	28.4	5.9	2.9	0.0	0.0
Las Vegas, NV	17.7	3.2	3.2	9.7	0.0	17.7	30.6	12.9	1.6	1.6	1.6
Miami, FL	2.3	4.5	3.5	2.3	6.6	31.2	27.3	12.5	6.6	1.6	1.6
Memphis, TN	1.1	0.5	0.5	2.2	3.0	15.7	40.0	22.4	5.7	4.1	4.9
Milwaukee, WI	19.2	15.1	12.3	8.2	2.7	21.9	13.7	4.1	1.4	1.4	0.0
New Orleans, LA	2.0	3.1	3.0	4.6	10.4	32.3	35.6	7.3	1.3	0.2	0.2
Manhattan, NY	2.5	2.5	3.2	5.0	5.0	19.3	41.8	13.9	4.7	1.7	0.4
Portland, OR	0.0	3.5	5.3	4.7	6.5	33.5	31.8	10.0	3.5	0.6	0.6
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	7.1	2.0	6.1	1.0	3.0	25.3	26.3	17.2	9.1	1.0	2.0
Santa Barbara, CA	5.6	5.6	8.3	4.2	4.2	33.3	20.8	12.5	4.2	1.4	0.0
San Diego, CA	6.5	7.1	14.9	7.1	7.1	28.0	23.2	4.2	0.6	1.2	0.0
Seattle, Juv.	0.0	0.0	11.8	0.0	11.8	52.9	23.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	0.3	1.5	0.6	2.7	4.2	13.6	44.3	23.2	6.6	2.7	0.3
Seattle, WA	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City, MO	0.0	5.2	5.2	6.9	7.5	19.5	31.0	17.2	4.6	1.1	1.7
St. Louis City*	0.0	1.1	7.9	5.6	4.5	20.2	27.0	33.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	0.0	3.1	1.5	1.5	3.1	4.6	35.4	24.6	10.8	3.1	12.3
St. Louis Cnty.*	1.4	1.4	4.2	2.8	4.2	25.0	30.6	30.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ventura, CA	3.2	0.0	3.2	6.5	3.2	9.7	38.7	22.6	12.9	0.0	0.0
	3.1%	4.8%	5.9%	6.4%	7.2%	27.9%	29.5%	10.5%	3.0%	1.0%	0.3%
	(235)	(361)	(443)	(478)	(544)	(2098)	(2213)	(786)	(225)	(75)	(25)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

### C. PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS

The number of prior felonies for the defendants in the data base varied from no prior felony convictions to a maximum of thirty-nine (39) prior felony convictions. Approximately 19% of the defendants had one prior felony conviction, while 17% had two prior felony convictions. 14% had three, 10% had four, and 7% had five, while the remaining percentages were all under 5%. The arithmetic mean and the median were both about three, therefore, the average defendant would have had about three prior felonies to his credit when entering the program.

Table 5 reflects the jurisdiction by jurisdiction analysis of prior felony conviction information for those defendants where the information was recorded. There were 1528 forms (19%) with no prior felony conviction information recorded. This may indicate either there were no prior felonies, or the data was not available and is simply missing data.

Table 5

Percent of Defendants with Specified  
Prior Felony Convictions by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Number of Prior Felony Convictions										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Over 11
Albuquerque, NM	32.3	27.9	21.4	7.9	4.8	0.4	1.3	3.1	0.4	0.4	0.0
Boston, MA	15.3	15.0	20.3	8.8	12.0	8.0	5.5	2.3	3.5	2.0	7.3
Columbus, OH	12.5	35.2	24.1	12.5	6.3	3.9	1.7	1.5	0.6	0.2	1.7
Detroit, MI	9.0	11.1	18.3	19.0	13.8	10.9	6.0	4.3	2.7	0.8	4.1
Dallas, TX	17.9	20.1	19.1	15.1	9.6	5.5	2.2	4.1	1.7	1.7	3.1
Houston, TX	32.2	26.6	12.7	7.3	7.9	3.7	1.9	1.7	0.2	1.7	4.4
Indianapolis, IN	52.6	20.4	13.3	7.7	3.4	1.2	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.3
Indianapolis, Juv.	6.7	20.0	13.3	6.7	20.0	6.7	20.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kalamazoo, MI	38.3	32.5	16.7	5.0	2.5	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.8	0.8
Kenosha, WI	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
Louisville, KY	16.7	16.7	19.4	13.9	9.7	5.6	6.9	2.8	4.2	1.4	2.8
Las Vegas, NV	62.8	14.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	4.7	2.3	0.0	2.3	0.0
Miami, FL	14.9	15.4	19.0	11.0	10.3	4.1	4.1	2.8	6.2	3.3	9.0
Memphis, TN	3.1	5.3	11.7	15.6	18.1	12.5	6.4	7.8	3.6	4.2	11.7
Milwaukee, WI	47.1	20.7	9.2	9.2	2.3	4.6	2.3	1.1	1.1	0.0	2.3
New Orleans, LA	35.8	28.6	16.0	10.5	3.2	2.2	1.6	1.0	0.3	0.4	0.3
Manhattan, NY	48.8	30.1	14.2	5.3	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
Portland, OR	10.7	21.9	23.1	13.0	8.9	7.1	4.7	2.4	1.2	0.6	6.5
Portsmouth, VA	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	9.6	10.8	6.0	9.6	14.5	9.6	10.8	6.0	1.2	4.8	16.9
Santa Barbara, CA	48.7	28.2	7.7	12.8	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Diego, CA	35.1	22.1	21.4	6.9	7.6	1.5	3.1	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.8
Seattle, Juv.	0.0	35.3	17.6	29.4	5.9	5.9	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	35.3	23.4	16.7	10.4	3.0	3.0	3.7	1.5	2.6	0.0	0.4
Seattle, WA	50.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City, MO	18.6	23.4	19.8	16.8	7.8	2.4	4.8	0.6	3.0	1.2	1.8
St. Louis City*	16.9	30.3	19.1	16.9	5.6	6.7	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.1
St. Louis Cnty., MO	24.6	6.2	13.8	20.0	6.2	10.8	3.1	4.6	1.5	0.0	9.2
St. Louis Cnty.*	14.9	36.5	17.6	10.8	8.1	6.8	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.7
Ventura, CA	22.2	7.4	14.8	7.4	3.7	3.7	7.4	3.7	3.7	3.7	22.2
	23.6%	21.4%	17.3%	11.9%	8.1%	5.2%	3.3%	2.5%	1.7%	1.2%	3.7%
	(1513)	(1372)	(1111)	(762)	(522)	(333)	(211)	(161)	(112)	(78)	(238)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

D. PRIOR MISDEMEANOR CONVICTIONS

Approximately 55 1/2% of all defendants had prior misdemeanor conviction records. The mean number of prior misdemeanor convictions was 3.5, while the median was 2.3. Therefore, the average defendant would have had approximately three prior misdemeanors recorded against him. 17.8% of the defendants had one misdemeanor, 12% had two, 8% had three, 5% had four, 3% had five, and the remaining percentages were all under 2%. The maximum number of prior misdemeanors was 46, and the minimum was none.

Table 6 contains the jurisdictional breakdown of prior misdemeanor convictions. There were 3,532 forms without misdemeanor conviction information recorded (44%). There is no way to determine if these 3,532 forms are indicating missing data or the absence of a misdemeanor conviction record.

Percent of Defendants with Specified Prior  
Misdemeanor Convictions by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Number of Prior Misdemeanor Convictions										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Over 11
Albuquerque, NM	34.2	28.2	21.5	6.7	2.7	1.3	2.7	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3
Boston, MA	15.7	15.7	13.7	10.2	13.0	3.8	9.2	4.4	2.7	2.0	9.6
Columbus, OH	46.1	23.2	11.7	6.6	4.5	2.7	1.5	1.8	0.6	0.3	0.9
Detroit, MI	25.8	22.6	13.8	12.0	5.3	5.3	3.3	2.0	2.4	2.0	5.6
Dallas, TX	37.9	25.4	15.4	9.3	4.3	1.8	1.4	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.5
Houston, TX	53.8	29.8	8.0	3.1	1.1	1.1	0.4	1.1	0.4	0.4	0.8
Indianapolis, IN	56.9	22.8	12.0	1.2	2.4	1.8	0.0	0.6	0.6	1.2	0.6
Indianapolis, Juv.											
Kalamazoo, MI	28.1	25.2	13.7	12.2	10.1	5.0	2.2	1.4	0.0	0.7	1.4
Kenosha, WI	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisville, KY	17.6	22.1	22.1	10.3	7.4	4.4	4.4	2.9	0.0	1.5	7.4
Las Vegas, NV	21.1	23.7	7.9	2.6	2.6	5.3	7.9	2.6	13.2	7.9	5.3
Miami, FL	29.7	21.9	20.1	7.8	6.4	3.2	0.5	3.7	2.3	2.3	2.3
Memphis, TN	21.3	17.0	14.3	6.1	10.0	4.8	2.2	3.0	3.9	2.6	14.8
Milwaukee, WI	30.6	12.9	19.4	14.5	3.2	3.2	4.8	0.0	1.6	4.8	4.8
New Orleans, LA	46.7	27.0	12.1	7.0	4.2	1.4	0.9	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.2
Manhattan, NY	12.3	10.8	12.6	10.5	11.4	6.4	4.4	4.4	6.1	4.7	16.4
Portland, OR	34.1	30.2	16.7	7.9	4.0	3.2	1.6	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.6
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	18.5	16.9	24.6	3.1	3.1	9.2	4.6	1.5	1.5	3.1	13.8
Santa Barbara, CA	34.5	29.3	10.3	5.2	5.2	3.4	0.0	1.7	3.4	0.0	6.9
San Diego, CA	25.2	24.4	15.0	8.7	7.9	7.1	3.9	2.4	2.4	1.6	1.6
Seattle, Juv.	33.3	16.7	33.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	19.8	23.1	22.6	11.3	6.6	2.8	3.3	4.2	0.5	2.4	3.3
Seattle, WA	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City, MO	51.0	25.5	5.9	11.8	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City*	69.6	8.7	4.3	4.3	8.7	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	46.4	17.9	21.4	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty.*	60.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7
Ventura, CA	8.7	4.3	13.0	30.4	4.3	4.3	8.7	0.0	8.7	13.0	4.3
	32.1%	22.3%	14.3%	8.4%	6.1%	3.6%	2.7%	2.2%	1.8%	1.6%	4.9%
	(1416)	(982)	(632)	(372)	(271)	(158)	(119)	(97)	(78)	(70)	(214)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

E. PENDING CASES

Approximately 49% of all the defendants had pending cases outstanding against them at the time that they entered the Career Criminal Program. Of those who had pending cases outstanding against them, approximately 53% or 1,626 had one outstanding case. (This represented approximately 21% of all the defendants.) Approximately 8% of the defendants had two pending cases outstanding against them, while about 4% had three pending cases, and approximately 2% had four pending cases. The average number of pending cases based on the mean was two cases per defendant, while the median was one. (It should be noted that a case may contain more than one criminal charge.)

Table 7 contains a jurisdictional array of percentages of present pending cases for defendants with present pending cases. There were 4,872 forms (61%) without this information. Again, it is impossible to differentiate between missing data and those situations where the defendant had no pending cases outstanding.

Table 7

Percent of Defendants With Specified  
Numbers of Pending Cases by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Number of Pending Cases										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Over 11
Albuquerque, NM	52.0	27.9	10.8	3.7	1.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.4
Boston, MA	26.7	17.7	15.4	9.3	5.5	8.0	1.3	1.9	3.9	4.8	5.5
Columbus, OH	77.6	16.3	3.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Detroit, MI	63.6	13.6	13.6	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dallas, TX	56.1	29.5	13.6	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Houston, TX	59.7	22.1	10.3	3.4	1.4	2.4	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indianapolis, IN	65.0	21.9	10.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indianapolis, Juv.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kalamazoo, MI	72.3	16.0	7.4	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kenosha, WI	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisville, KY	78.9	10.5	7.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Las Vegas, NV	26.1	21.7	17.4	34.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miami, FL	28.8	20.9	17.2	7.1	6.7	2.4	3.0	3.4	3.4	2.2	4.7
Memphis, TN	64.3	17.8	8.2	4.0	0.8	2.3	1.1	0.0	0.8	0.3	0.3
Milwaukee, WI	56.4	30.8	5.1	5.1	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Orleans, LA	83.6	7.5	4.5	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Manhattan, NY	52.3	20.5	13.2	7.4	4.7	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
Portland, OR	62.5	29.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	39.2	31.4	15.7	3.9	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.9
Santa Barbara, CA	90.9	3.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Diego, CA	95.7	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Seattle, Juv.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	55.8	30.8	11.5	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Seattle, WA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City, MO	72.9	22.9	2.9	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City*	69.2	15.4	2.6	7.7	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	56.0	20.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty.*	72.7	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ventura, CA	75.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	53.0% (1626)	20.9% (640)	11.3% (348)	4.8% (148)	2.5% (78)	2.1% (65)	0.9% (27)	0.8% (25)	1.2% (38)	0.9% (29)	1.5% (45)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

F. DEFENDANT STATUS

Approximately half of all the defendants in the data base were under some form of restraint or commitment to the criminal justice system at the time that they were arrested for their present CCP crime. 24% were on parole, 14% were on probation, approximately 10% were on pre-trial release, 2.7% had escaped, .3% were on work release, .1% were on furlough, 1.5% were in jail, and 1% were released on suspended sentence at the time that they were arrested for their present crime. Thus, we can conclude that the average or typical career criminal will be on some form of conditional or pre-trial release approximately half of the time.

Table 8 displays the percentages of defendants under legal restraint when arrested for their present crime (listed by jurisdiction). This data was missing on 565 forms (7.1%).

Percentage of Defendants by Jurisdiction Under  
Legal Restraint at Time of Arrest

Jurisdiction	Type of Legal Restraint								
	Pre Trial Rel	Parole	Prob	Suspended Sent	Escape	Work Rel	Fur	None	In Jail
Albuquerque, NM	22.5	34.7	21.0	0.0	4.1	1.1	0.0	16.2	0.4
Boston, MA	21.7	20.7	12.2	6.4	8.9	0.2	1.0	28.8	0.0
Columbus, OH	1.0	37.1	13.3	0.6	1.7	0.0	0.0	46.2	0.2
Detroit, MI	2.7	15.2	14.3	0.5	4.3	0.0	0.1	62.6	0.2
Dallas, TX	13.7	51.9	3.1	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.0	29.3	1.0
Houston, TX	2.1	28.4	8.6	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	57.1	2.8
Indianapolis, IN	6.5	15.6	9.1	0.7	2.4	0.0	0.0	63.9	1.9
Indianapolis, Juv.	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.0	4.0
Kalamazoo, MI	34.1	26.8	12.2	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	24.4	0.0
Kenosha, WI	16.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Louisville, KY	25.2	32.0	25.2	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	15.5	0.0
Las Vegas, NV	3.0	10.6	12.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	24.2
Miami, FL	2.0	5.9	39.4	0.8	3.1	0.3	0.0	46.4	2.2
Memphis, TN	0.3	36.9	12.7	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	48.2	0.5
Milwaukee, WI	6.5	23.4	25.8	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.5	37.9	4.8
New Orleans, LA	2.5	13.9	8.4	0.1	1.6	0.8	0.1	72.4	0.2
Manhattan, NY	46.8	11.8	10.2	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	29.7	0.5
Portland, OR	2.3	31.4	30.8	0.0	5.2	0.6	0.0	25.6	4.1
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	8.9	17.8	11.9	24.8	2.0	0.0	0.0	31.7	3.0
Santa Barbara, CA	2.9	24.6	37.7	0.0	1.4	1.4	0.0	29.0	2.9
San Diego, CA	3.8	36.8	30.2	0.5	2.7	0.0	0.0	25.8	0.0
Seattle, Juv.	0.0	68.8	12.5	0.0	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	7.2	33.6	13.4	0.0	3.1	0.3	0.0	38.3	4.0
Seattle, WA	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
St. Louis City, MO	11.6	6.9	11.0	0.6	1.2	0.0	0.0	63.0	5.8
St. Louis City*	18.6	5.8	4.7	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.0	66.3	0.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	30.0	20.0	6.7	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty.*	1.4	34.3	5.7	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	55.7	1.4
Ventura, CA	7.1	25.0	35.7	0.0	7.1	0.0	3.6	10.7	10.7
	9.5%	23.6%	14.1%	1.0%	2.7%	0.3%	0.1%	47.2%	1.5%
	(701)	(1741)	(1042)	(77)	(198)	(19)	(10)	(3481)	(107)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

#### G. YEARS SINCE RELEASE

In looking at the amount of time which passed since the defendants had been released from prior incarceration until the career criminal defendants were reintroduced into the system through an arrest, it was interesting to note that the highest percentage (mode) of the individuals, over 50%, re-entered the system within a year of their release. About 3.3% of all defendants had only been out of prison one-tenth of a year, or a little over one month when they were re-arrested. The periods of time that the defendants had been free ranged from a minimum of .1 years to a maximum of 35 years. Half of the defendants could be expected to have been out of prison 1.3 or less years before re-entering the criminal justice system (1.3 being the median. The average was 2.3 years.

Table 9 displays for each jurisdiction, the percentage of defendants with various amounts of time (rounded to whole years) since release from incarceration. This information was missing for 3,097 (39%) of the forms.

Table 10 displays the maximum, minimum and average number of years since release for each jurisdiction.

Percentage of Defendants by Jurisdiction with Various  
Amounts of Time Since Release from Incarceration

Jurisdiction	Number of Years (Rounded to Whole Years)											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Albuquerque, NM	0.0	67.1	16.5	11.8	3.4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Boston, MA	0.0	49.6	19.9	12.7	7.6	5.1	0.4	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8
Columbus, OH	0.8	42.3	18.8	12.2	7.3	3.9	4.2	4.2	1.3	1.6	0.8	3.7
Detroit, MI	6.3	38.4	24.6	12.7	8.1	3.9	2.8	1.6	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.8
Dallas, TX	29.6	37.8	9.9	6.9	6.4	3.4	1.7	0.9	0.9	1.3	0.4	0.9
Houston, TX	25.1	32.3	13.6	13.6	6.5	3.9	2.2	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.4	1.4
Indianapolis, IN	5.4	51.3	18.3	3.6	4.5	6.7	3.6	0.4	0.9	0.0	0.9	4.5
Indianapolis, Juv.												
Kalamazoo, MI	12.2	45.1	7.3	15.9	8.5	4.9	2.4	0.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.0
Kenosha, WI												
Louisville, KY	0.0	56.1	19.3	7.0	10.5	3.5	1.8	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Las Vegas, NV	0.0	28.6	17.9	14.3	14.3	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	7.1
Miami, FL	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Memphis, TN	0.0	75.1	10.6	4.5	3.6	2.0	0.8	1.4	0.3	1.1	0.0	0.6
Milwaukee, WI												
New Orleans, LA	15.1	26.9	15.7	13.1	8.4	7.3	5.2	1.2	1.7	1.6	1.6	2.2
Manhattan, NY	0.0	57.5	15.0	7.7	6.7	5.1	2.9	3.2	0.3	0.0	0.6	1.0
Portland, OR	0.0	60.7	12.0	6.7	5.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.3	0.7	0.7	0.7
Portsmouth, VA												
Rhode Island	0.0	50.9	20.0	14.5	3.6	0.0	5.5	0.0	1.8	1.8	1.8	0.0
Santa Barbara, CA	0.0	51.5	9.1	15.2	15.2	0.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
San Diego, CA	0.0	65.8	10.3	7.7	5.1	6.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.7
Seattle, Juv.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	0.0	74.9	13.0	4.8	1.9	3.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
Seattle, WA												
St. Louis City, MO	0.0	42.0	15.2	11.6	10.9	8.7	3.6	2.2	2.9	0.0	0.7	2.2
St. Louis City*	0.0	34.7	19.4	5.6	4.2	9.7	5.6	5.6	5.6	1.4	0.0	8.3
Sto. Louis Cnty., MO	0.0	59.6	11.5	9.6	3.8	3.8	1.9	3.8	0.0	1.9	0.0	3.8
St. Louis Cnty.*	0.0	55.8	15.4	7.7	5.8	1.9	3.8	1.9	0.0	1.9	1.9	3.8
Ventura, CA	<u>0.0</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
%	1.5	47.6	6.4	10.1	6.6	4.5	2.8	1.5	0.9	0.7	0.7	1.7
Total	(317)	(2304)	(792)	(490)	(319)	(220)	(136)	(74)	(44)	(35)	(32)	(81)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

Table 10

Minimum, Maximum, and Average Years Since  
Release from Incarceration by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Minimum Years	Maximum Years	Average Years
Albuquerque, NM	0.1	6.1	1.2
Boston, MA	0.1	15.0	2.1
Columbus, OH	0.0	34.0	2.8
Detroit, MI	0.0	16.0	2.1
Dallas, TX	0.0	12.3	1.5
Houston, TX	0.0	18.8	1.7
Indianapolis, IN	0.0	35.0	2.4
Indianapolis, Juv.			
Kalamazoo, MI	0.0	10.0	2.0
Kenosha, WI			
Louisville, KY	0.1	7.7	1.9
Las Vegas, NV	0.3	15.0	3.7
Miami, FL	0.3	6.0	2.4
Memphis, TN	0.1	12.8	1.2
Milwaukee, WI			
New Orleans, LA	0.0	20.0	2.7
Manhattan, NY	0.1	19.0	1.9
Portland, OR	0.1	12.0	2.0
Portsmouth, VA			
Rhode Island	0.2	10.0	2.1
Santa Barbara, CA	0.1	12.7	2.2
San Diego, CA	0.1	13.3	1.8
Seattle, Juv.	0.1	0.8	0.2
Salt Lake City, UT	0.1	11.0	1.1
Seattle, WA			
St. Louis City, MO	0.1	25.0	2.8
St. Louis City*	0.2	26.0	3.9
St. Louis Cnty., MO	0.1	10.8	2.3
St. Louis Cnty.*	0.2	13.8	2.4
Ventura, CA	<u>0.1</u>	<u>5.2</u>	<u>0.7</u>
Total	0.0	35.0	2.3

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

SECTION IV

DEFENDANT DEMOGRAPHIC  
INFORMATION

A. AGE

The ages of career criminal defendants (at the date of arrest) ranged from 14 to 78 years. (Curiously enough, three defendants were 78 and there were a total of 16 defendants over 65.) The mean age was 28.7, while half of the defendants were 26.7 or less. Therefore, the typical defendant could be construed to be between 27 and 29 years of age. Approximately 7% of all the defendants (537 defendants) were 24 years old (which was the mode or most frequently occurring age). Examining the ages for those with a frequency of occurrence of 5% or more, we see the ages from 21 thru 28 all qualified with about 5% or more. The 19 and 20 year olds were about 4% of the data base, as were the 29 and 30 year olds. About 3% of the data base was comprised of 31, 32, and 33 year olds, with about 2% of the ages being 34, 35, 36 and 37. The remaining ages were represented 1% or less of the time in the data base.

Table 11 displays the age distribution for the entire data base. Only 0.6% of the defendant forms had no age information.

Table 11

## Age Analysis of Defendants

Age	Number	Percent	Age	Number	Percent
14	4	0	43	78	1
15	12	0	44	60	1
16	19	0	45	53	1
17	102	1	46	57	1
18	197	2	47	43	1
19	325	4	48	42	1
20	320	4	49	48	1
21	383	5	50	50	1
22	505	6	51	28	0
23	473	6	52	24	0
24	537	7	53	24	0
25	486	6	54	18	0
26	471	6	55	14	0
27	451	6	56	7	0
28	394	5	57	13	0
29	340	4	58	8	0
30	323	4	59	9	0
31	269	3	60	4	0
32	265	3	61	2	0
33	229	3	62	8	0
34	194	2	63	1	0
35	187	2	64	4	0
36	164	2	66	1	0
37	150	2	67	4	0
38	122	2	68	3	0
39	102	1	70	1	0
40	96	1	73	4	0
41	90	1	78	3	0
42	71	1			
			Total	7892	

## B. AGE GROUPS

When the ages are collapsed and categorized into the age groupings of under18, 18-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40, and over 40, it was found that the 21-25 group contained 30% of all ages. The 26-30 group had about 25% of the ages. Thus, as would be expected, over half of the ages fell into the 10 year range from 21 to 30 years of age. This is consistent with the fact that it takes a few years for the career criminal to build an adult felony record and to serve a couple of years in prison in order to qualify as a career criminal.

Table 12 contains a jurisdiction by jurisdiction display of the percentages of defendants in the various age categories.

Table 12

Percent of Defendants in Various  
Age Groups By Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Age Groups						Over 40
	Under 18	18-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	
Albuquerque, NM	0.0	10.3	34.2	27.6	14.7	10.7	2.6
Boston, MA	7.0	21.7	40.2	14.3	9.0	3.1	4.7
Columbus, OH	0.0	3.1	22.1	29.4	16.3	10.7	18.3
Detroit, MI	3.4	13.9	30.9	25.6	13.9	5.7	6.6
Dallas, TX	0.0	6.2	26.8	24.3	19.7	11.7	11.4
Houston, TX	0.3	7.0	27.1	23.9	16.1	11.3	14.3
Indianapolis, IN	0.7	13.1	34.7	24.9	12.9	6.8	7.0
Indianapolis, Juv.	56.0	44.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kalamazoo, MI	0.0	13.5	29.4	32.4	15.9	1.8	7.1
Kenosha, WI	16.7	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0
Louisville, KY	0.0	16.2	32.4	23.8	13.3	5.7	8.6
Las Vegas, NV	3.0	16.4	41.8	19.4	3.0	9.0	7.5
Miami, FL	3.0	10.0	34.8	24.4	14.4	6.5	6.9
Memphis, TN	0.0	2.7	32.5	29.0	15.1	8.6	12.1
Milwaukee, WI	1.5	18.9	40.9	20.5	9.8	6.8	1.5
New Orleans, LA	0.6	12.7	26.6	25.0	15.0	8.8	11.3
Manhattan, NY	1.5	9.4	28.7	23.8	16.1	11.1	9.4
Portland, OR	1.7	4.6	30.9	27.4	18.3	5.1	12.0
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	0.0	11.1	31.5	30.6	15.7	5.6	5.6
Santa Barbara, CA	0.0	20.3	40.5	21.6	12.2	2.7	2.7
San Diego, CA	1.1	17.1	34.8	28.9	10.7	5.9	1.6
Seattle, Juv.	94.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	0.0	5.8	22.2	27.5	15.8	9.9	18.7
Seattle, WA	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City, MO	0.0	5.6	34.3	27.5	12.9	7.9	11.8
St. Louis City*	0.0	4.4	32.2	26.7	15.6	7.8	13.3
St. Louis Cnty., MO	0.0	6.2	24.6	20.0	18.5	13.8	16.9
St. Louis Cnty.*	0.0	8.1	20.3	36.5	17.6	6.8	10.8
Ventura, CA	0.0	6.5	29.0	32.3	9.7	16.1	6.5
	1.8%	10.7%	30.2%	25.1%	14.5%	8.0%	9.8%
	(139)	(842)	(2384)	(1979)	(1144)	(634)	(772)

C. SEX

The female population in the career criminal data base was 3.7% of the total population, while the males represented 96.1% of the total population. Based on this data it could be argued that women tend not to become career criminals, since they account for fully 10.7% of all city violent felony arrests on the national average. Crime in the United States, 1976, Federal Bureau of Investigation, pg 192 (1977).

Table 13 displays the sex breakdown by jurisdiction.

Table 13

## Percentage of Males and Females by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Sex		Missing Data
	Male	Female	
Albuquerque, NM	92.6	7.0	0.4
Boston, MA	98.1	1.9	0.0
Columbus, OH	94.6	5.3	0.2
Detroit, MI	96.2	3.7	0.1
Dallas, TX	98.6	1.4	0.0
Houston, TX	97.5	1.1	1.4
Indianapolis, IN	97.6	2.2	0.2
Indianapolis, Juv.	100.0	0.0	0.0
Kalamazoo, MI	94.1	5.3	0.6
Kenosha, WI	83.3	16.7	0.0
Louisville, KY	96.2	3.8	0.0
Las Vegas, NV	100.0	0.0	0.0
Miami, FL	96.1	3.9	0.0
Memphis, TN	91.9	8.1	0.0
Milwaukee, WI	95.5	3.8	0.8
New Orleans, LA	92.7	7.0	0.2
Manhattan, NY	98.0	2.0	0.0
Portland, OR	97.7	2.3	0.0
Portsmouth, VA	100.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	97.2	1.8	0.9
Santa Barbara, CA	93.2	6.8	0.0
San Diego, CA	98.4	1.6	0.0
Seattle, Juv.	100.0	0.0	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	96.5	3.5	0.0
Seattle, WA	100.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City, MO	100.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City*	97.8	1.1	1.1
St. Louis Cnty., MO	100.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty.*	98.6	1.4	0.0
Ventura, CA	96.8	3.2	0.0
	96.1% (7632)	3.7% (290)	0.2% (19)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

D. RACE

The racial breakdown of the career criminals in the data base tended to be approximately the racial breakdown in normal crime statistics. Approximately 30% were white or anglo, approximately 60% were black, about 7% were Spanish surname, about .2% were American Indian and very small percentages fell into other categories. Comparing these figures with the FBI produced Uniform Crime Report data, the racial composition of city violent felony arrestees was 52.9% black and 45% white (includes Spanish surname). Crime in the United States, 1976, Federal Bureau of Investigation, pg. 194 (1977).

Table 14 provides a racial breakdown by jurisdiction. Racial information was available in all but 58 defendant forms(.7%).

page 4  
Racial Breakdown by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Race (percentages)					
	Anglo	Black	Spanish	Oriental	Indian	Other
Albuquerque, NM	22.2	11.5	64.8	0.0	1.5	0.0
Boston, MA	37.5	59.2	2.5	0.0	0.2	0.6
Columbus, OH	32.7	66.8	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.0
Detroit, MI	17.5	81.7	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dallas, TX	32.4	64.3	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Houston, TX	34.1	54.9	10.7	0.2	0.0	0.2
Indianapolis, IN	32.5	67.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indianapolis, Juv.	12.0	88.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kalamazoo, MI	37.3	60.4	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.6
Kenosha, WI	50.0	33.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisville, KY	42.3	57.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Las Vegas, NV	57.1	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miami, FL	25.7	67.0	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Memphis, TN	22.1	77.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Milwaukee, WI	21.8	75.9	1.5	0.0	0.8	0.0
New Orleans, LA	14.8	85.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Manhattan, NY	12.1	60.6	27.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Portland, OR	63.2	33.3	0.6	0.0	2.9	0.0
Portsmouth, VA	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	72.5	25.5	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Santa Barbara, CA	50.7	18.3	31.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Diego, CA	46.5	38.0	14.4	0.5	0.0	0.5
Seattle, Juv.	47.1	47.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9
Salt Lake City, UT	73.9	14.7	10.6	0.0	0.9	0.0
Seattle, WA	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City, MO	19.6	79.9	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0
St. Louis City*	20.5	79.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	41.5	58.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty.*	33.8	66.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ventura, CA	51.6	25.8	22.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
	30.1%	62.8%	6.7%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%
	(2375)	(4953)	(529)	(2)	(16)	(8)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

#### E. MARITAL STATUS

This item was reported by the data collectors as being very difficult to collect, being frequently inconsistent, and often contradictory in the records which were available. About 29% of the defendants had no marital status reported. Some 47% were reported as being single, 18% married, 3% divorced, 3% cohabitating and .2% widowed. Thus, it can be concluded that the typical career criminal is likely to be single (divorced or widowed) about 50% of the time, and only about 18% of the time currently be married.

Table 15 provides a percentage breakdown by jurisdiction for the marital status recorded for the various defendants. This information was missing on 2293 forms (28.9%).

Table 15

Percentage of Defendants With Various Reported  
Marital Status By Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Marital Status					Missing Data
	Widowed	Single	Married	Divorced	Cohabiting	
Albuquerque, NM	0.0	55.5	32.0	3.7	7.7	1.1
Boston, MA	0.0	80.1	15.2	0.6	1.6	2.5
Columbus, OH	0.2	33.5	26.8	4.9	4.7	29.9
Detroit, MI	0.0	0.9	0.2	0.0	0.0	98.9
Dallas, TX	0.5	45.7	15.8	7.5	1.4	29.2
Houston, TX	0.0	43.2	18.8	0.9	7.4	29.6
Indianapolis, IN	0.6	39.4	15.1	4.5	7.3	33.0
Indianapolis, Juv.	0.0	44.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	56.0
Kalamazoo, MI	0.0	58.2	25.9	2.9	0.0	12.9
Kenosha, WI	0.0	50.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	33.3
Louisville, KY	0.0	69.5	17.1	1.0	5.7	6.7
Las Vegas, NV	3.0	50.7	29.9	13.4	3.0	0.0
Miami, FL	0.0	8.4	2.0	0.2	0.0	89.4
Memphis, TN	0.0	82.8	14.0	1.1	0.0	2.2
Milwaukee, WI	0.0	57.1	16.5	7.5	0.0	18.8
New Orleans, LA	0.3	68.3	28.2	2.1	0.1	0.9
Manhattan, NY	0.5	69.4	14.6	1.0	5.9	8.6
Portland, OR	1.1	54.3	25.7	5.7	6.3	6.9
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	0.0	32.1	14.7	2.8	2.8	47.7
Santa Barbara, CA	0.0	59.5	25.7	10.8	2.7	1.4
San Diego, CA	0.0	55.6	28.3	4.8	5.3	5.9
Seattle, Juv.	0.0	94.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9
Salt Lake City, UT	0.6	48.8	28.1	10.2	2.9	9.4
Seattle, WA	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City, MO	0.0	69.3	28.5	0.0	0.0	2.2
St. Louis City*	0.0	68.9	26.7	1.1	0.0	3.3
St. Louis Cnty., MO	0.0	38.5	32.3	4.6	0.0	24.6
St. Louis Cnty.*	1.4	47.3	35.1	5.4	0.0	10.8
Ventura, CA	0.0	48.4	22.6	19.4	6.5	3.2
Totals	0.2%	47.1%	18.1%	3.0%	2.7%	28.9%
	(18)	(3744)	(1437)	(235)	(214)	(2293)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

F. EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Approximately 40% of the career criminals were reported as being unemployed. Only 16% of the defendants were indicated as being employed full-time, while 8% were employed part-time, and another 5% were non-workers. Only 3% were students, and about 1% were intermittent workers. These data tend to support the hypothesis that the amount of time available for committing crime seems to be a factor in achieving career criminal status. The average career criminal could be expected to be unemployed (or non-worker or part-time worker) about half of the time.

Table 16 contains the percentage breakdown by jurisdiction of the various employment status reported for the defendants. There was no status available on 2158 defendant forms (27%).

Table

Percentage of Defendant Employment  
Status by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Employment Status					
	Full Time	Part Time	Unemployed	Nonworker	Student	Intermittant
Albuquerque, NM	23.9	4.5	66.8	1.1	3.4	0.4
Boston, MA	8.6	9.4	66.3	7.7	7.7	0.2
Columbus, OH	30.7	5.0	61.7	1.1	0.2	1.3
Detroit, MI	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dallas, TX	7.8	32.8	52.6	3.9	2.6	0.3
Houston, TX	18.3	17.7	48.8	10.1	4.4	0.8
Indianapolis, IN	14.4	4.0	68.8	11.6	0.9	0.3
Indianapolis, Juv.	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kalamazoo, MI	25.2	6.8	54.4	1.9	11.7	0.0
Kenosha, WI	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisville, KY	48.1	5.8	35.6	0.0	6.7	3.8
Las Vegas, NV	4.5	1.5	61.2	16.4	0.0	16.4
Miami, FL	32.2	21.0	30.4	9.8	5.6	1.0
Memphis, TN	20.3	7.0	70.0	1.9	0.8	0.0
Milwaukee, WI	17.8	3.0	60.4	0.0	2.0	16.8
New Orleans, LA	36.3	17.9	31.9	10.3	3.7	0.0
Manhattan, NY	14.2	5.0	72.4	5.0	3.1	0.3
Portland, OR	14.5	6.9	59.5	16.8	1.7	0.6
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	15.0	1.7	36.7	41.7	0.0	5.0
Santa Barbara, CA	8.7	14.5	55.1	5.8	10.1	5.8
San Diego, CA	10.3	13.1	72.6	1.1	2.9	0.0
Seattle, Juv.	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.3	64.7	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	37.3	4.6	55.2	1.0	1.6	0.3
Seattle, WA	25.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
St. Louis City, MO	21.1	3.5	52.0	18.7	2.9	1.8
St. Louis City*	4.7	11.8	80.0	0.0	3.5	0.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	16.7	2.4	81.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty.*	0.0	47.0	40.9	6.1	6.1	0.0
Ventura, CA	12.9	0.0	54.8	0.0	3.2	29.0
Total	22.0% (1274)	11.4% (660)	54.8% (3171)	7.0% (403)	3.5% (204)	1.2% (71)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

G. DRUG USE

The data collectors were instructed to code drug use if the defendant were known to be a drug user or reliably suspected to be a drug user (hard drugs only). About 34% of the defendants were identified as being drug users. In absolute numbers, this was 2,724 of the 7,941 defendants. (The drug user item was a difficult item to collect, and we strongly suspect that this percentage was actually higher than indicated.)

Table 17 contains a jurisdictional breakdown of drug use. There were 5217 defendant forms (66%) which did not indicate drug use. These represent a combination of those defendants who did not use drugs, as well as those who did use drugs but did not get reported as users (missing data) because the information was not available to the data collector.

Table 17

Percentage of Respondents by Jurisdiction  
Known or Suspected to be Drug Users

Jurisdiction	Drug Use
	Drug Use Known or Suspected
Albuquerque, NM	64.7
Boston, MA	46.4
Columbus, OH	12.7
Detroit, MI	68.2
Dallas, TX	27.4
Houston, TX	22.1
Indianapolis, IN	22.0
Indianapolis, Juv.	0.0
Kalamazoo, MI	40.0
Kenosha, WI	16.7
Louisville, KY	24.8
Las Vegas, NV	71.6
Miami, FL	29.5
Memphis, TN	25.5
Milwaukee, WI	10.5
New Orleans, LA	21.0
Manhattan, NY	32.3
Portland, OR	63.4
Portsmouth, VA	0.0
Rhode Island	16.5
Santa Barbara, CA	50.0
San Diego, CA	38.5
Seattle, Juv.	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	26.0
Seattle, WA	50.0
St. Louis City, MO	47.5
St. Louis City*	34.4
St. Louis Cnty., MO	21.5
St. Louis Cnty.*	25.7
Ventura, CA	74.2
	34.3%
Total	(2724)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

#### H. TIME IN JURISDICTION

The length of time that the defendants were in the jurisdiction before arrest and prosecution by a Career Criminal Project ranged from a minimum of .1 years to a maximum of 73 years. Some 40% of the defendants' records did not have this information included in them, consequently, these figures are based on only 60% of the potential defendants. The average defendant had been in the jurisdiction from 16 to 18 years (median = 18 years, mean = 16 years). An underlying hypothesis when the data collection instrument was created, was that a large part of the population of career criminals would be transient. This hypothesis was disproved by the data. Most career criminals are long-time residents and known in the community. About 10% of the defendants were in the community for about a year. This 10% who had a reported time in the jurisdiction of a year represented 6% of the total defendant population. Half of the career criminals would have been in the jurisdiction about 18 years or less.

Table 18 contains the percentage breakdown by jurisdiction for the various reported times that defendants were in the jurisdiction prior to the current arrest. There were 3,105 forms with missing data (39%).

Table 19 contains the minimum time, maximum time and average time in jurisdiction for each jurisdiction.

Table 18

Percentage of Defendants by Jurisdiction  
With Various Times in Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Time in Jurisdiction (rounded to nearest whole year)											
	0.0	13.8	5.6	3.0	4.1	1.5	2.2	1.5	0.0	1.5	3.3	63.6
Albuquerque, NM	0.0	13.8	5.6	3.0	4.1	1.5	2.2	1.5	0.0	1.5	3.3	63.6
Boston, MA	0.0	0.7	0.5	0.9	0.5	2.5	0.7	0.2	0.7	0.2	3.2	89.9
Columbus, OH	3.7	10.2	3.7	4.0	4.7	3.7	4.7	4.4	2.6	2.1	5.6	50.7
Detroit, MI	25.0	7.6	12.9	8.3	1.5	6.1	3.8	0.0	0.8	0.8	28.8	4.5
Dallas, TX	2.1	2.8	0.7	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	91.7
Houston, TX	0.3	9.1	3.5	1.8	4.3	1.5	2.5	2.3	2.5	1.3	2.3	68.7
Indianapolis, IN	0.0	6.3	4.3	1.0	0.0	1.9	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.4	0.5	81.3
Indianapolis, Juv.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	85.7
Kalamazoo, MI	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	54.2
Kenosha, WI												
Louisville, KY	0.0	42.3	15.5	7.0	8.5	2.8	1.4	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	21.1
Las Vegas, NV	0.0	21.5	20.0	4.6	6.2	7.7	3.1	1.5	3.1	3.1	4.6	24.6
Miami, FL	0.0	0.0	3.6	17.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	71.4
Memphis, TN	0.0	2.2	1.1	2.7	1.6	2.2	0.5	2.2	1.1	1.6	1.4	83.2
Milwaukee, WI	0.0											
New Orleans, LA	1.9	2.1	4.3	5.6	2.6	7.8	7.7	5.3	5.5	3.8	4.0	49.5
Manhattan, NY	1.9	16.1	8.4	4.6	5.0	2.8	2.8	6.5	4.0	2.5	2.2	43.3
Portland, OR	0.0	54.8	12.3	11.6	5.2	3.2	4.5	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	5.8
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Rhode Island	0.0	13.2	5.3	0.0	5.3	2.6	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.6	0.0	68.4
Santa Barbara, CA	0.0	19.3	17.0	1.8	1.8	8.8	5.3	1.8	1.8	1.8	3.5	47.4
San Diego, CA	10.4	8.7	5.8	2.3	3.5	3.5	1.2	2.3	0.6	1.2	0.6	60.1
Seattle, Juv.	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	93.3
Salt Lake City, UT	1.7	14.9	5.5	3.8	2.1	1.7	5.2	2.1	2.4	2.1	3.5	55.0
Seattle, WA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
St. Louis City, MO	0.0	1.4	6.9	1.4	0.7	2.1	0.0	0.7	2.8	2.1	1.4	80.7
St. Louis City*	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.0	8.2	2.4	3.5	4.7	2.4	2.4	74.1
St. Louis Cnty., MO	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.9
St. Louis Cnty.*	0.0	3.7	3.7	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	3.7	0.0	85.2
Ventura, CA	0.0	34.5	0.0	0.0	3.4	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.7
%	2.2	9.2	4.8	3.7	2.8	3.7	3.2	2.7	2.4	1.8	3.5	60.1
Total	(108)	(445)	(232)	(177)	(133)	(178)	(156)	(130)	(116)	(89)	(164)	(2908)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

Table 19

Minimum, Maximum and Average  
Lengths of Time in Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Minimum Years	Maximum Years	Average Years
Albuquerque, NM	0.1	45.6	17.6
Boston, MA	0.4	55.0	21.9
Columbus, OH	0.0	50.4	14.1
Detroit, MI	0.0	28.0	5.1
Dallas, TX	0.0	42.8	24.7
Houston, TX	0.0	54.0	19.2
Indianapolis, IN	0.2	56.0	20.6
Indianapolis, Juv.	4.0	18.0	14.7
Kalamazoo, MI	0.0	30.0	14.5
Kenosha, WI			
Louisville, KY	0.1	28.0	5.9
Las Vegas, NV	0.1	26.0	7.2
Miami, FL	2.0	34.0	17.4
Memphis, TN	0.1	73.0	23.4
Milwaukee, WI			
New Orleans, LA	0.0	51.4	13.3
Manhattan, NY	0.0	49.5	12.0
Portland, OR	0.1	28.5	3.0
Portsmouth, VA	18.0	18.0	18.0
Rhode Island	0.2	39.3	19.6
Santa Barbara, CA	0.1	33.0	11.9
San Diego, CA	0.0	39.0	14.7
Seattle, Juv.	0.1	17.5	15.1
Salt Lake City, UT	0.0	50.0	16.2
Seattle, WA	18.6	27.6	23.2
St. Louis City, MO	1.0	50.0	22.0
St. Louis City*	2.0	47.0	20.5
St. Louis Cnty., MO	0.1	43.0	26.3
St. Louis Cnty.*	0.4	46.0	23.2
Ventura, CA	0.1	31.0	13.9
Total	0.0	73.0	16.3

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

SECTION V

CRIME CHARACTERISTIC  
INFORMATION

A. MAJOR CRIME TYPES

The 6,279 defendants in the data base had a total of 14,612 charges against them in their 7,941 processings through the court system, for an average of 2.3 charges per defendant (1.8 charges per trip). Of these 14,612 total charges, some 11,166 charges were considered to be major charges and are reflected in Table 20. The average number of major charges per defendant is 1.8 (1.4 major charges per trip).

From Table 20 we can see that the most popular crime among career criminals was robbery (36%), second was burglary (24%), third was larceny (10%), with assault also occurring about 10% of the time. Thus, we can see that our average career criminal would probably be a robber or burglar and would probably have more than one charge against him. Table 20 also provides a jurisdiction by jurisdiction summary of major charges, while Table 20A compares major crimes against total crimes.

Table 20

## Major Charges by Jurisdiction

Major Charges								
Jurisdiction	Assault	Burglary	Homicide	Kidnap	Larceny	Narcotics	Rape	robbery
Albuquerque, NM	11.8	25.9	2.4	9.3	17.9	15.4	3.5	13.2
Boston, MA	28.0	7.9	1.1	3.7	2.9	1.7	7.3	46.9
Columbus, OH	5.8	26.9	4.7	5.6	22.1	8.9	6.0	19.5
Detroit, MI	9.2	10.5	8.8	1.8	1.6	3.8	19.0	45.0
Dallas, TX	2.1	45.6	4.3	.2	8.2	8.0	3.4	27.9
Houston, TX	.7	26.9	3.6	.9	9.8	5.5	5.4	46.7
Indianapolis, IN	11.3	20.4	7.0	4.0	3.5	1.2	10.0	42.3
Indianapolis, Juv.	10.0	27.5	-	-	-	-	10.0	52.5
Kalamazoo, MI	13.1	18.5	-	1.0	7.6	27.8	5.4	26.2
Kenosha, WI	-	50.0	12.5	-	-	-	12.5	25.0
Louisville, KY	7.5	27.7	2.0	4.5	2.5	19.1	8.0	28.2
Las Vegas, NV	-	13.8	10.5	9.7	-	-	.8	65.0
Miami, FL	8.7	34.7	3.4	.9	24.7	2.8	3.0	21.4
Memphis, TN	7.9	36.7	2.1	.2	24.8	4.8	5.5	17.6
Milwaukee, WI	6.0	11.1	2.5	.5	1.0	3.0	-	75.7
New Orleans, LA	8.4	27.6	3.1	.1	16.5	26.0	2.0	16.0
Manhattan, NY	1.1	42.7	3.2	4.3	-	-	.6	47.8
Portland, OR	4.5	35.2	5.1	1.7	13.6	5.1	5.6	28.9
Portsmouth, VA	-	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	50.0
Rhode Island	35.8	2.8	.4	13.5	2.0	2.0	3.2	39.9
Santa Barbara, CA	-	78.8	-	-	12.5	2.8	-	5.7
San Diego, CA	9.1	7.3	1.7	2.3	1.1	.5	1.0	76.4
Seattle, Juv.	-	83.7	2.7	-	2.7	-	-	10.8
Salt Lake City, UT	6.5	33.5	2.3	2.0	27.4	6.2	4.7	17.0
Seattle, WA	-	50.0	-	-	-	-	25.0	25.0
St. Louis City, MO	12.9	35.0	2.5	.8	3.7	2.5	9.5	32.9
St. Louis City*	16.3	42.8	3.0	-	5.1	-	8.1	24.4
St. Louis Cnty., MO	12.3	56.1	1.1	-	7.8	-	4.4	17.9
St. Louis Cnty.*	10.0	38.1	-	.9	24.5	-	3.6	22.7
Ventura, CA	14.5	20.0	-	7.2	12.7	5.4	20.0	20.0
	9.9%	24.3%	3.9%	2.5%	10.0%	6.0%	6.8%	32.2%
Total	(1112)	(2714)	(438)	(285)	(1136)	(672)	(762)	(4047)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

Table 20A

## Charges Analysis

Jurisdiction	Major Charges		Major Charges
	Number of Major Charges	Number of All Charges	% of Total Charges
Albuquerque, NM	362	546	66.3
Boston, MA	1041	1267	82.1
Columbus, OH	757	1111	68.1
Detroit, MI	1584	1771	89.4
Dallas, TX	462	558	82.7
Houston, TX	812	934	86.9
Indianapolis, IN	699	778	89.8
Indianapolis, Juv.	40	46	86.9
Kalamazoo, MI	183	211	86.7
Kenosha, WI	8	9	88.8
Louisville, KY	198	272	72.7
Las Vegas, NV	123	199	61.8
Miami, FL	941	1292	72.8
Memphis, TN	414	556	74.4
Milwaukee, WI	198	252	78.5
New Orleans, LA	699	1040	67.2
Manhattan, NY	437	457	95.6
Portland, OR	176	249	70.6
Portsmouth, VA	2	3	66.6
Rhode Island	243	368	66.0
Santa Barbara, CA	104	150	69.3
San Diego, CA	668	1308	51.0
Seattle, Juv.	37	42	88.0
Salt Lake City, UT	382	480	79.5
Seattle, WA	4	5	80.0
St. Louis City, MO	240	280	85.7
St. Louis City*	98	100	98.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	89	117	76.0
St. Louis Cnty.*	110	111	99.0
Ventura, CA	55	96	57.2
Total	11166	14608	76.4%

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

B. NUMBER OF CO-DEFENDANTS

About 66% of the defendants did not have a co-defendant. Of those (34%) who did have a co-defendant, 71% of them had one co-defendant, and 21% had two co-defendants. Another way of examining the co-defendant situation would be to state that 24% of all the defendants had one co-defendant and 7% of all the defendants had two co-defendants. Thus, we could conclude that the typical career criminal would have about a 25% chance of having one co-defendant or a 31% chance of having 1 or more co-defendants.

Table 21 contains an analysis of co-defendants by jurisdiction. This information was either missing or there were no co-defendants on 5238 forms (66%).

Table 21

Percent of Defendants Having Specific  
Numbers of Co-Defendants by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Number of Co-Defendants				
	1	2	3	4	5(or more)
Albuquerque, NM	62.3	20.8	2.6	5.2	9.1
Boston, MA	57.1	27.6	11.1	2.8	1.4
Columbus, OH	67.4	27.4	4.4	0.7	0.0
Detroit, MI	70.2	26.9	1.4	1.4	0.0
Dallas, TX	78.6	20.9	0.0	0.5	0.0
Houston, TX	68.3	26.3	4.5	0.9	0.0
Indianapolis, IN	80.2	17.2	2.6	0.0	0.0
Indianapolis, Juv.	76.9	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kalamazoo, MI	49.0	24.5	20.4	2.0	4.0
Kenosha, WI	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisville, KY	86.2	6.9	6.9	0.0	0.0
Las Vegas, NV	96.4	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miami, FL	73.6	21.7	4.7	0.0	0.0
Memphis, TN	70.3	14.5	11.0	1.4	2.8
Milwaukee, WI	65.4	26.9	7.7	0.0	0.0
New Orleans, LA	76.2	14.3	7.6	0.0	1.9
Manhattan, NY	71.4	23.4	1.3	3.9	0.0
Portland, OR	82.0	13.1	0.0	0.0	4.9
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	54.9	27.5	2.0	0.0	15.7
Santa Barbara, CA	68.3	26.8	4.9	0.0	0.0
San Diego, CA	70.9	20.9	1.8	0.9	5.5
Seattle, Juv.	58.3	33.3	8.3	0.0	0.0
Salt Lake City, UT	89.1	10.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Seattle, WA	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis City, MO	73.8	12.3	10.8	3.1	0.0
St. Louis City*	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	82.6	17.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty.*	74.1	25.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ventura, CA	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	71.6%	21.1%	4.7%	1.1%	1.1%
	1935	570	128	31	30

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

### C. WEAPONS POSSESSED AND USED DURING CRIME

About 44% of the offenses involved a weapon possession at the time of the offense (3880 of the 8918 offenses). The most popular weapon was, of course, a gun. Guns were possessed in 2949 of the offenses (33%). The next most possessed weapon was a knife, which was possessed 8.6% of the time.

Contrasting the weapons possessed with the weapons used, we see that the weapons were used in 41% of the offenses (3665 offenses involved weapons use out of the 8918 offenses total). A gun was used in 2044 offenses, or in 22.9% of the offenses). There were 905 offenses committed where a gun was possessed but not used. Obviously, in most offenses where a gun was possessed it has a high likelihood of being used. Similarly, a sharp instrument or knife was used in 6.1% of the offenses, while in 8.6% of those offenses a knife was actually possessed but not used. In raw numbers, there were some 217 offenses where a knife or sharp instrument was possessed but not used during the commission of the crime.

Table 22 provides a jurisdictional breakdown of weapons possessed and used at the time of offense. Also note that in the jurisdictional table (Table 22) in some cases the percentage of weapons used is higher than weapons possessed.

This results from jurisdictions with a substantial percentage of multiple defendant cases where the data collector checked "weapons use" if the defendant was legally charged with the same. That is, if four defendants rob a victim

and one defendant possessed and used a firearm, all four defendants were legally charged with robbery through use of a firearm (4 occurrences of use), while only one possessed a firearm (1 occurrence of possession).

Percentage of Offenses where Weapon Possessed  
and Used by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Weapon		Gun	
	Weapon Possessed	Weapon Used	Gun Possessed	Gun Used
Albuquerque, NM	24	22	15	7
Boston, MA	72	74	46	42
Columbus, OH	34	31	21	10
Detroit, MI	68	67	58	52
Dallas, TX	36	29	28	12
Houston, TX	48	33	42	27
Indianapolis, IN	55	59	41	17
Indianapolis, Juv.	52	65	42	35
Kalamazoo, MI	35	33	23	12
Kenosha, WI	33	33	17	0
Louisville, KY	44	45	35	33
Las Vegas, NV	67	48	57	14
Miami, FL	31	36	25	15
Memphis, TN	21	25	14	12
Milwaukee, WI	51	63	37	16
New Orleans, LA	26	14	20	9
Manhattan, NY	39	47	21	14
Portland, OR	40	33	23	7
Portsmouth, VA	50	50	50	0
Rhode Island	67	75	48	34
Santa Barbara, CA	12	14	6	5
San Diego, CA	83	75	77	65
Seattle, Juv.	9	11	0	0
Salt Lake City, UT	25	25	17	13
Seattle, WA	25	50	0	0
St. Louis City, MO	34	34	26	23
St. Louis City*	0	0	0	0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	23	25	19	17
St. Louis Cnty.*	0	0	0	0
Ventura, CA	33	25	15	8
	44%	41%	33%	23%
Total	(3880)	(3665)	(2945)	(2040)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

#### D. ARREST WEAPON

About 20% of the defendants had a weapon at the time of arrest. This 20% of the defendants would be considered to be violence prone criminals, in that they had a weapon after they had a chance to reach a zone of safety (by instruction, the arrest weapon box was to be used only where the arrest was not contemporaneous with the offense). About 58% of the defendants had no weapon when arrested. Also, for about 20% of the defendants, the records were incomplete or inconclusive and the data collector could not make a determination about weapons at arrest.

The types of weapons were collapsed into blunt instruments, sharp instruments, guns, physical force and chemicals (the only other type of weapon which did not fall into the general categories). The most popular weapon among those defendants who had weapons was a firearm which occurred 14.6% of the time.

Table 23 displays the various percentages of defendants with weapons, at arrest, by jurisdiction. There were 6424 defendant forms with no arrest weapon information (80.9%). This missing information could indicate that no weapon existed at arrest or that data was not available in the files to make a determination.

Percentage of Defendants by Jurisdiction  
with Various Weapons at Time of Arrest

Jurisdiction	Weapon			
	Sharp Instruments	Blunt Instruments	Guns	Total Weapons
Albuquerque, NM	4.0	0.0	4.4	8.5
Boston, MA	8.5	1.7	22.4	33.2
Columbus, OH	2.5	2.1	9.2	14.0
Detroit, MI	2.9	1.0	28.4	32.6
Dallas, TX	5.2	.9	15.1	21.3
Houston, TX	2.1	.1	26.2	28.6
Indianapolis, IN	2.5	0.0	9.4	12.1
Indianapolis, Juv.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kalamazoo, MI	1.1	.5	7.6	9.5
Kenosha, WI	16.6	0.0	0.0	16.7
Louisville, KY	3.8	0.0	14.2	18.1
Las Vegas, NV	2.9	0.0	19.4	22.4
Miami, FL	3.7	.1	8.2	12.4
Memphis, TN	1.3	.5	4.5	6.8
Milwaukee, WI	3.7	0.0	14.2	18.1
New Orleans, LA	2.4	.2	11.0	13.7
Manhattan, NY	11.1	.5	10.8	22.5
Portland, OR	7.4	0.0	14.8	22.3
Portsmouth, VA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	9.1	2.7	31.1	44.1
Santa Barbara, CA	1.3	1.3	1.3	4.1
San Diego, CA	1.6	.5	28.8	31.1
Seattle, Juv.	5.8	0.0	0.0	5.9
Salt Lake City, UT	2.9	.5	7.3	10.9
Seattle, WA	25.0	0.0	25.0	50.0
St. Louis City, MO	.5	0.0	7.2	7.9
St. Louis City*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis Cnty., MO	3.0	0.0	15.3	18.5
St. Louis Cnty.*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ventura, CA	<u>12.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>9.6</u>	<u>22.6</u>
	3.8%	0.6%	14.6%	19.0%
Total	(298)	(51)	(1167)	(1517)

\* Indicates pre-CCP control group

SECTION VI

CONCLUSION

From the data available in the National Legal Data Center data base, it may be concluded that the typical career criminal defendant was likely to:

- \* be currently making 1.2 trips through the criminal justice system
- \* have been arrested 8 times prior to the current arrest
- \* have been convicted of 3 prior felonies
- \* have been convicted of 3 prior misdemeanors
- \* be male (96% of the time)
- \* have a local criminal record (90% of the time)
- \* have been charged with enhancement allegations or other charges in addition to the major charges (76% of total charges are major charges, the remainder are other charges)
- \* have no co-defendants (66% of the time)
- \* be black (60% of the time, white 30% of the time)
- \* have 1 or 2 pending cases (50% of the time)
- \* be currently under legal restraint, i.e., parole, probation, pre-trial release, etc. (50% of the time)
- \* have been re-arrested in the criminal justice system within 1 year of release for previous incarceration (50% of the time)
- \* be about 29 years of age (50% chance of being 21-30)
- \* be single (50% of the time)
- \* been in the jurisdiction 16-18 years (50% of the time)
- \* possess a weapon during the commission of the crime (44% of the time) and that weapon be a gun (33% of the time)
- \* have used a weapon during the commission of the crime (41% of the time) and the weapon be a gun (23% of the time)

- \* be unemployed (40% of the time)
- \* have committed a robbery (36% of the time) or burglary (24% of the time)
- \* be a drug user (34% of the time)
- \* have a non-local criminal record (30% of the time)
- \* be unarmed at the time of the arrest (20% armed at arrest)

After encountering the Career Criminal Program, the defendant was likely to:<sup>2</sup>

- \* be convicted 89.4% of the time on the top charge
- \* be sentenced to 15.4 years in prison
- \* be processed through the criminal justice system in 106 days (from arrest to disposition)

---

<sup>2</sup>Reference April 27, 1978 NLDC Performance Summary Report included in Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

NATIONAL LEGAL DATA CENTER, INC.

100 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd., Suite 172

Thousand Oaks, CA 91360 • 805-497-3786

CAREER CRIMINAL CASE DATA FORM

JURISDICTION CODE:

REPORT PERIOD

TO

I. DEFENDANT

1. CASE NUMBER(S) (max. of 13 spaces)	2. PRIORS A. Number of Previous Arrests B. Number of Pending Cases C. Number of Felony Convictions D. Number of Misdemeanor Convictions E. Check if prior Habitual Conviction F. Check if prior Second Offender Conviction	3. SELECTION CRITERIA SCORE(S)			5. DEFENDANT STATUS CODE		
		A CRIME	B CRIMINAL	C TOTAL	6. DRUG ADDICTION Known/Suspected		
		4. PREVIOUS CRIMINAL RECORD None Local Non-Local			7. TIME SINCE RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION Years Months Days		

8. CCP IDENTIFICATION CODE	9. DATE OF BIRTH	10. PLACE OF BIRTH	11. SEX M F	12. RACE	13. MARITAL STATUS M S D W C
----------------------------	------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------	------------------------------------

14. LENGTH OF TIME IN JURISDICTION Years Months Days	15. EMPLOYMENT STATUS Full-Time Non-Worker Part-Time Student Unemployed Intermittant	16. CO-DEFENDANT(S) A. Total Number of Co-Defendants B. Number of CCP Co-Defendants (max. of 13)	C. CCP Co-Defendant ID Codes:
---	---	--	-------------------------------

DEFENDANT STATUS CODES: 1. Pre-Trial Release, 2. Prison Parole, 3. Probation, 4. Suspended Sentence, 5. Escape, 6. Work Release, 7. Furlough, 8. None, 9. In Jail, 0. Other (Part VII) RACE CODES: 1. Anglo, 2. Black, 3. Spanish Surname, 4. Oriental, 5. Am. Indian, 6. Other (Part VII).

II. CRIMINAL EVENT

17. ARRESTING AGENCY Number of Offenses (max. of 30)		18. ARRESTING UNIT		19. Victim's Relationship to Defendant No Victim None, Other:		20. CHARGING METHOD A Complaint B Information C Indictment D Other	
21. DATE OF OFFENSE	22. TIME AM PM C	23. PLACE OF OFFENSE	24. DATE OF ARREST	25. TIME AM PM C	26. PLACE OF ARREST		30. INITIAL CUSTODY METHOD A Warrant B No Warrant C Surrender D Extradition
27. DID ACCUSED POSSESS WEAPON AT Yes Type No Unk. Time of Offense? _____ Time of Arrest? _____		28. WEAPON OR PHYSICAL FORCE USED AGAINST PERSON? Yes Type Used No Unk.		29. STOLEN PROPERTY/ EVIDENCE RECOVERED? Yes No Unk.			

III. CHARGES (max. of 30)

31. CHARGE (one charge per line)	32. STATUTE	33. NLDC USE ONLY	34. FILED BY AND DATE (Complete all that apply)	35. DISPOSITION		36. REASON CODE or DISPOSITION CHARGE	37. DISPOSITION DATE
				TYPE	CODE		
1.		<input type="checkbox"/>	POLICE				
		<input type="checkbox"/>	PROS.				
		<input type="checkbox"/>	G.J.				
2.		<input type="checkbox"/>	POLICE				
		<input type="checkbox"/>	PROS.				
		<input type="checkbox"/>	G.J.				
3.		<input type="checkbox"/>	POLICE				
		<input type="checkbox"/>	PROS.				
		<input type="checkbox"/>	G.J.				
4.		<input type="checkbox"/>	POLICE				
		<input type="checkbox"/>	PROS.				
		<input type="checkbox"/>	G.J.				

DISPOSITION TYPES: 2. R(Rejected), 3. NI(Not Indicted), 4. NP(Nolle Prosequi), 5. PD(Prosecutor Dismissal), 6. CD(Court Dismissal), 7. PG(Plead Guilty), 8. PGD(Plead Guilty During Trial), 9. NC(Nolo Contendere), 10. JC(Jury Conviction), 11. JA(Jury Acquittal), 12. NJC(Non-Jury Conviction), 13. NJA(Non-Jury Acquittal), 15. T(Transfer of Case), 17. CA(Case Abated), 19. NCD(Nolo Contendere During Trial), 20. AA(Administrative Abeyance).

DISPOSITION CODES: TF(Top Felony), LF(Felony less than top count), LM(Lower Misdemeanor)

REASON CODES: 16. Jumped Bail, 18. Covered, 40. Prosecutive Merit, 41. Constitutional Defect, 42. Evidence, 45. Witness Availability, 46. Witness Attitude, 47. Witness Credibility, 49. Defendant, 53. No Probable Cause, 54. Diversion, 56. Plea Agreement, 65. Other (Part VII), 66. No Substantial Benefit, 67. Escaped, 68. Waived Jurisdiction, 69. Insanity Acquittal, 70. Legal Defense.

IV. TRIAL OFFICIALS (Max. of 9 Last Names)

38. PROSECUTOR(S)	39. A. DEFENSE COUNSEL(S)	B. CODES	40. JUDGE(S)
-------------------	---------------------------	----------	--------------

DEFENSE COUNSEL CODES: (Item 39B) P (Private), PD (Public Defender/Legal Aid), CA (Court Appointed)



APPENDIX B

NATIONAL LEGAL DATA CENTER, INC.

100 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard

Suite 172

Thousand Oaks, California 91360

April 27, 1978

(805) 497-3786

Larry G. David  
Information Systems Coordinator

Philip Cohen  
Executive Director  
Ronald W. Sabo  
Projects Coordinator

ALL REPORTING JURISDICTIONS

CAREER CRIMINAL UNITS

PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

From May 1975 to January 1978, the Career Criminal Units of the DF Jurisdictions have forwarded documentation on the conviction of 6,641 defendants (who were accepted for priority prosecution) on a total of 10,409 separate criminal convictions (and sentence enhancement allegations).

I. THE FOLLOWING RESULTS WERE ACHIEVED:

3,179 of the crime convictions were by trial.

7,230 of the crime convictions were by pleas of guilty.

94.7% was the defendant conviction rate (defendant convictions ÷ defendant acquittals & convictions.)

89.4% of the defendants were convicted on a top felony as originally charged.

9,570 prison/jail sentences were pronounced.

15.4 years was the average non-enhanced sentence.

902 sentences were enhanced under a repeat (second) or habitual) offender statute (not all jurisdictions have such a statute).

106 days was the median time from arrest to disposition (includes times beyond prosecutor's control such as court ordered or defendants jumping bail.)

96 days was the median time from filing to disposition. (Includes times beyond prosecutor's control such as court ordered or defendants jumping bail.)

II. DEFENDANTS WERE CONVICTED FOR THE FOLLOWING MAJOR CRIMES (includes attempts):

<u>3,074</u>	Robberies
<u>2,149</u>	Burglaries
<u>356</u>	Homicides
<u>574</u>	Rapes
<u>754</u>	Felonious Assaults
<u>790</u>	Grand Larcenies
<u>171</u>	Kidnappings

III. TO ACHIEVE THESE RESULTS OVER 38,659 COURT EVENTS WERE REQUIRED.

IV. THE DEFENDANTS DISPOSED OF BY THE UNITS:

Had a total of 84,367 prior (non-juvenile) arrests.

Had a total of 38,710 prior (non-juvenile) convictions.

Actually used weapon/physical force in 47% of the criminal events handled by the Unit.       

(Note: One criminal event may result in more than one crime conviction.)

Were already on conditional release (parole, probation, etc.) on another crime 53% of the time when they committed the crime prosecuted by the Unit.



**END**