INMATES RELEASED DIRECTLY FROM A MAXIMUM SECURITY INSTITUION DURING 1977 AND 1978

Prepared by:

Lawrence T. Williams
Research Specialist

Massachusetts Department of Correction

William T. Hogan
Commissioner

November, 1979

PUBLICATION #11656
Approved by Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the inmates released from a maximum security institution, MCI-Walpole, in 1977 and 1978. The sample for both years is divided to reflect and identify those individuals of the sample who spent all of their institutional life in Walpole as compared with those who had also been placed in medium security and those who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center. Also, individuals in each sub-group of the sample who participated in the furlough program will be identified. The reasons individuals did not move down to a lower security institution will be examined as well as the reasons for an individual being returned to maximum security. In addition, recidivism rates for each sub-group of the 1977 releasee population will be examined to determine differences, if any, in each sub-group.

This report resulted in several findings. Sixty-seven individuals or 56% of the population in 1977 and 70 individuals or 49% of the population in 1978 had spent all their institutional life at Walpole. Seventeen individuals or 15% of the population in 1977 and 33 individuals or 24% of the population in 1978 had been placed in a medium security institution during their incarceration. Thirty-five individuals or 29% of the population in 1977 and 39 individuals or 27% of the population in 1978 had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center during their incarceration. The recidivism rate in 1977 for individuals who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center was 19% which is lower than the similar rates for the other sub-groups of the sample. The recidivism rate for these individuals in the 1977 sample who participated in the furlough program was 9% compared to 31% for those who did not participate in the furlough program. The number of individuals who

participated in the furlough program decreased from 1977 to 1978.

Individuals who were returned to Walpole from a medium security institution or a forestry camp or pre-release center had a recidivism rate of 14% if they spent 6 months or less in Walpole before their release. If they spent more than 6 months in Walpole, the rate was 29%. Parole violators accounted for 61% in 1977 and 77% in 1978 of the individuals who spent their whole institutional life at Walpole. Non-parole violators accounted for 81% in 1977 and 87% in 1978 of the individuals who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center before their release from Walpole.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE		PAGE NUMBER
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Research Design	2
III.	General Findings	
	A. Number of Individuals in each sub-group	5
	B. 1977 Recidivism Rates by Sub-group	6
	C. Recidivism Rates by Length of Time Spent At Walpole Before Release	8
	D. Recidivism Rates and Furlough Participation	9
IV.	Sub-group Discussions	
	A. Number of Times in Medium Security	13
	B. Number of Times in a Forestry Camp or Pre-Release Center	15
	C. Recidivism Rate by Number of Times in A Forestry Camp or Pre-Release Center	16
	D. Recidivism Rate by Number of Times in a Medium Security Institution	16
	E. Recidivism Rates and Status as a Parole Violator Or Non-parole Violator	17
	F. Number of Parole Violators and Non-Parole Violators	18
V.	Discussion	20
VI.	Footnotes	22
VII.	Appendix I: Data on Individuals Released Directly From Walpole in 1977 and 1978	23
VIII.	Appendix II: List of Variables	36

INTRODUCTION

Recent reports published by the Research Unit have shown the increased use of pre-release centers as evidenced by the increase in the number of inmates released from pre-release centers.[1] However, there remains a significant number of individuals who are being released on parole or discharged directly from maximum security status at Walpole into the community. This report will have as its sample those individuals who were released from Walpole in 1977 and 1978.

There is some concern regarding the number of individuals who are released directly from Walpole each year. Graduated release programs or reintegration programs have been developed to assist individuals in making the transition from the institution to the community. However, the individuals released directly from Walpole seemingly are deprived of this experience. Also, the question arises as to whether it is appropriate to release an individual directly from Walpole. It would seem logical that if an individual is ready for parole, he should not be in Walpole still. This report will examine the sample of individuals released directly from Walpole in 1977 and 1978 to determine why they are being released directly from Walpole and will also look at recidivism data collected for the 1977 sample in an attempt to gain a better understanding of this sample.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Questions:

This study will address the following research questions:

1) How many individuals released from Walpole in 1977 and 1978 spent their total institutional life in Walpole?

2) How many individuals released from Walpole in 1977 and 1978 had some experience in a medium security institution?

3) How many individuals released from Walpole in 1977 and 1978 had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center?

4) How many individuals released from Walpole in 1977 and 1978 participated in the furlough program?

Samples:

The sample consisted of the releasees from MCI-Walpole in 1977 and 1978. That is, individuals released from Walpole who had spent at least 30 days in Walpole prior to their release. The 1977 releasee sample originally totalled 126, but 7 individuals were deleted from the sample because they had not spent 30 days or more in Walpole prior to their release. Therefore, the total sample for 1977 was 119. The 1978 population sample originally totalled 146, but 4 were deleted from the sample because they had not spent 30 days or more in Walpole prior to their release. Therefore, the total sample for 1978 was 142.

Recidivism:

A recidivist was defined as any subject returned to a federal or state correctional institution or to a county jail or house of correction for 30 days or more as a result of either a parole violation or a new court sentence.

Follow-Up Period for Recidivism:

For the recidivism data for 1977, the follow-up period was one year from the date of the subject's release into the community.

Variables Collected:

The analyses following in this report are based on four categories of variables: commitment variables, personal background variables, criminal history variables, and furlough variables. For the recidivism data, a fifth category of recidivism variables was added. A specific listing of all the variables is given in Appendix II.

Data was derived from the computerized data base developed by the Correction and Parole Management Information System (CAPMIS) and was produced on the Massachusetts State College Computer Network (MSCCN).

GENERAL FINDINGS

The sample for 1977 and 1978 was broken into six different groups: Each group and a description of the significant characteristics follows:

Group 1 Individuals released from Walpole who spent their whole institutional life in maximum security and never received furloughs;

Group 2 Individuals released from Walpole who spent their whole institutional life in maximum security and who received furloughs;

Group 3 Individuals released from Walpole who had some exposure to a medium security institution but were eventually returned to and released from Walpole and who never received furloughs;

Group 4 Individuals released from Walpole who had some exposure to a medium security institution but were eventually returned to and released from Walpole and who received furloughs;

Group 5 Individuals released from Walpole who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center but were eventually returned to and released from Walpole and who never received furloughs;

Group 6 Individuals released from Walpole who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center but were eventually returned to and released from Walpole and who participated in the furlough program.

TABLE I

RESULTS

NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS IN EACH SUB-GROUP

GROUP	1977		1978		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Group 1	57	48%	67	47%	124	48%
Group 2	10	8%	3	2%	13	5%
Group 3	15	13%	25	18%	40	15%
Group 4	2	2%	8	6%	10	4%
Group 5	12	10%	17	12%	29	11%
Group 6	23	19%	22	15%	45	17%
TOTAL	119	100%	142	100%	261	100%

From Table I, it is now possible to answer research questions 1-4. For question Number 1: Sixty-seven individuals or 56% of the 1977 Walpole releasee population spent their whole institutional life in Walpole without the benefit of a placement in lower security or participation in a forestry camp or pre-release center. Likewise, 70 individuals or 49% of the 1978 Walpole releasee population spent their whole institutional life in Walpole. For question Number 2: Seventeen individuals or 15% of the 1977 Walpole releasee population had spent some time in a medium security institution prior to their return to Walpole and subsequent release from there. Also, 33 individuals or 24% of the 1978 Walpole releasee population had spent some time in a medium security institution during their sentence before being released from Walpole. Question Number 3: Thirty-five individuals or 29% of the 1977 Walpole releasee population had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center prior to being returned to Walpole and being released from there. Thirty-nine individuals or 27% of the 1978 Walpole releasee population had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center prior to their

release from Walpole. Question 4: Thirty-five individuals or 29% of the 1977 Walpole releasee population participated in the furlough program prior to their release from Walpole. Thirty-three individuals or 23% of the 1978 Walpole releasee population participated in the furlough program prior to their release.

TABLE II

1977 RECIDIVISM RATES BY SUB-GROUP CLASSIFICATION

GROUP	NUMBER	NON-RECIDIVISTS	RECIDIVISTS	RECIDIVISM RATE
Group 1	57	40	17	30%
Group 2	10	10	0	0%
Group 3	15	11	4	27%
Group 4	2	1	1	50%
Group 5	8	4	4	50%
Group 6	23	21	2	9%

Table II provides a further insight into each sub-group utilizing 1977 recidivism data. Individuals who spent their whole institutional life in Walpole without the benefit of furloughs had a recidivism rate of 30%. Those who had a placement in a medium security institution had a rate of 27%. Individuals who had the benefit of a placement in a forestry camp or pre-release center had a rate of 50%. It is important to note that there were only eight people in this sub-group. Those individuals who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center and participated in the furlough program had a recidivism rate of 9%.

Table III delves into some detail regarding the amount of time served in Walpole before release for individuals who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center, or a medium security institution during their incarceration and the effects on recidivism. The table shows that for the individuals who spent some time in a medium security institution, when they were returned to Walpole and spent six months or less there before their release, their recidivism rate was 14% as compared to a rate of 40% for individuals who spent more than 6 months in Walpole before their release. Individuals who had some exposure in a forestry camp or pre-release center, been returned to Walpole, and spent 6 months or less in Walpole before their release, had a zero recidivism rate. Those individuals who had the forestry camp or pre-release center exposure and who spent longer than 6 months in Walpole before being released, had a recidivism rate of 29%. The individuals who had exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center and were released from them had a recidivism rate in 1977 of 9%. The table indicates that the positive benefits associated with exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center diminish if an individual is returned to Walpole before his release, but if the time spent in Walpole before release is 6 months or less, the rate is 0% versus 29% for those who spent more than 6 months in Walpole. For those who spent six months or more in Walpole, their rate is virtually identical to individuals who spent their whole institutional life in Walpole without benefit of alternate placement.

TABLE III

RECIDIVISM RATES BY LENGTH OF TIME SPENT AT WALPOLE BEFORE RELEASE

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="3">Total Sample

N = 116

RR = 24%</td>
<td rowspan="2">Individuals who spent six months or less at Walpole before release

N = 48
RR = 14%</td>
<td>Individuals who spent six months or less at Walpole before release & who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center before release
N = 11
RR = 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals who spent six months or less at Walpole before release and who had been placed in a medium security institution before release
N = 7
RR = 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">Individuals who spent more than six months at Walpole before release

N = 68
RR = 29%</td>
<td>Individuals who spent more than six months at Walpole before release & who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center before release. N = 21
RR = 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals who spent more than six months at Walpole before release & who had been placed in a medium security institution before release
N = 10
RR = 40%</td>
</tr>
</table>

TABLE IV

RECIDIVISM RATES AND FURLOUGH PARTICIPATION

GROUP	RECIDIVISM RATE
1. Individuals who participated in the furlough program	9%
2. Individuals who did not participate in the furlough program	31%

Table IV indicates that individuals who participated in the furlough program before their release from Walpole had a recidivism rate of 9%. Those individuals who did not participate in the furlough program before release had a recidivism rate of 31%. It is significant to note that in the 1977 sample, 35 individuals or 29% of the sample participated in the furlough program whereas in the 1978 sample, only 33 individuals or 23% of the sample population participated in the furlough program. Since participation in the furlough program is associated with a significant decrease in the recidivism rate for the 1977 sample population, the reduction in the number of participants in the program for 1978 may have the effect of increasing the recidivism rate for the 1978 sample. It is also significant to note that in 1977 sample of individuals who had spent their whole institutional life in Walpole, 10 individuals or 15% of this sub-group had participated in the furlough program. For 1978, however, only 3 individuals or 4% of the sub-group had participated in the furlough program. This would indicate that the number of individuals being released from Walpole without benefit of any alternate placement or participation in the furlough program is increasing.

SUB-GROUP DISCUSSIONS

The next section will examine each of the sub-groups of the populations in 1977 and 1978 to determine any significant characteristics of each sub-group.

Group 1 and 2 - Individuals who spent their whole institutional life in Walpole.

Attempts were made in this study to examine inmate records for each group to determine significant characteristics of each population sub-group. For the sub-group of individuals in Groups 1 & 2, an attempt was made to determine the reasons mentioned why an individual in these two groups never was placed in a medium security institution nor had the opportunity to participate in a forestry camp or pre-release center. For both the 1977 and 1978 releasee populations, there were a substantial number of cases where there were not any reasons given for the continued placement of individuals in Walpole. In the instances where reasons were mentioned, the most prevalent one was that the particular individual was a disciplinary problem in Walpole and therefore not suitable for any kind of transfer. Similarly, many individuals were determined to be security risks and consequently, alternative placement was impossible. These reasons accounted for 32% of the population sub-group sample. Other reasons cited: individual unmotivated, individual is assaultive or dangerous, individual requests his continued placement in Walpole, individual cannot handle an unstructured or open setting, individual has a bad attitude, drug or alcohol abuser, or individual is mentally unstable and not suitable for lower security.

For the individuals in Groups 3 & 4, they had an opportunity to participate in a medium security institution during their incarcerations but were eventually transferred to and released from Walpole. Records were examined to determine why these individuals were returned to Walpole and why they never had subsequent opportunities for transfer to lower security again, or for a transfer to a forestry camp or pre-release center. A large number of cases did not have any explanations listed in the folder regarding reasons for the return to Walpole or reasons why the particular individuals remained there. In the folders that listed reasons, the majority listed disciplinary problems as the reasons for the return back to Walpole from medium security. It was also felt that these disciplinary problems prevented these individuals from returning to medium security. Also, once returned to Walpole, often times other characteristics or problems (such as drug abuse or alcohol abuse) were used as reasons for not giving these individuals an opportunity to return to medium security.

TABLE V

NUMBER OF TIMES IN MEDIUM SECURITY

NUMBER OF TIMES	1977 NUMBER OF RESIDENTS	1977 PERCENTAGE	1978 NUMBER OF RESIDENTS	1978 PERCENTAGE
1	8	47%	20	61%
2	6	35%	6	18%
3	2	12%	4	12%
4 or more	1	6%	3	8%
TOTAL	17	100%	33	100%

As Table V clearly shows, the majority of individuals (53%) in Groups 3 & 4 in the 1977 sample had two or more chances in a medium security institution. In the 1978 sample, a larger percentage of the individuals (61%) had only one chance in a medium security institution.

Table VIII investigates recidivism rates by the number of times in a medium security institution. As the table shows, those individuals who had only one opportunity for placement in a medium security institution had a recidivism rate of 43% versus 0% for those who had three or more opportunities in a medium security institution. Since Table V shows that a larger percentage of the sample in this sub-group had only one chance in a medium security institution, this would indicate that the 1978 recidivism rate for this sub-group will be higher than the 1977 rate.

Individuals in Groups 5 & 6 had the opportunity to participate in a forestry camp or pre-release facility but were eventually returned to Walpole and released from there. Records of these individuals were examined to determine the reasons for the transfer back to Walpole, the reasons why these individuals never had the opportunity to go to a lower security institution or another forestry camp or pre-release center after their return to Walpole. The vast majority of these individuals were returned to Walpole after either escaping from a forestry camp or pre-release center or causing serious and/or repeated disciplinary problems at these facilities. Once returned to Walpole, these disciplinary problems, or the existence of an escape on their record, precluded their transfer out of Walpole. Table VI shows that for the 1977 sub-group, 46% of the individuals had two or more opportunities in a forestry camp or pre-release center. For the 1978 group, 62% had two or more opportunities, with 36% having three or more chances. The individuals were, more often than not, given more than one chance in a forestry camp or pre-release center and after not succeeding once or twice, were not given the opportunity to return again. For the individuals in these two groups who only had one placement in a forestry camp or pre-release center, their recidivism rate was 38%. For the individuals who had two or more placements in a forestry camp or pre-release center, their recidivism rate was zero.

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF TIMES IN A FORESTRY CAMP OR PRE-RELEASE CENTER

	1977		1978	
NUMBER OF TIMES	NUMBER OF RESIDENTS	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER OF RESIDENTS	PERCENTAGE
1	19	54%	15	33%
2	7	20%	10	26%
3	6	17%	11	28%
4	1	3%	2	5%
5	2	6%	1	3%
TOTAL	35	100%	39	100%

TABLE VII

RECIDIVISM RATE BY NUMBER OF TIMES IN A FORESTRY CAMP OR PRE-RELEASE CENTER

NUMBER OF TIMES	NUMBER	RECIDIVISM RATE
1	19	38%
2	7	0%
3	6	0%
4	1	0%
5 or more	2	0%

TABLE VIII

RECIDIVISM RATE BY NUMBER OF TIMES IN A MEDIUM SECURITY INSTITUTION

NUMBER OF TIMES	NUMBER	RECIDIVISM RATE
1	8	43%
2	6	33%
3	2	0%
5 or more	1	0%

TABLE IX

RECIDIVISM RATES AND STATUS AS A PAROLE VIOLATOR OR NON-PAROLE VIOLATOR

Total Sample N = 116 RR = 24%	Individuals who have been returned as parole violators N = 54 RR = 24%	Individuals who have been returned as parole violators and who never left Walpole N = 41 RR = 20%
		Individuals who have been returned as parole violators & who had been placed in a minimum security institution N = 7 RR = 43%
		Individuals who have been returned as parole violators & who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center N = 6 RR = 33%
	Individuals who have not been returned as parole violators N = 61 RR = 23%	Individuals who have not been returned as parole violators & who never left Walpole N = 26 RR = 31%
		Individuals who have not been returned as parole violators & who had been placed in a minimum security institution N = 10 RR = 20%
		Individuals who have not been returned as parole violators and who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center N = 25 RR = 16%

Table IX investigates the recidivism rates in 1977 for individuals who are parole violators versus individuals who are not parole violators. As shown by the table, the lowest recidivism rates are for the individuals who are not parole violators. The lowest rate is for the individuals who are not parole violators and who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center who had a rate of 16%. This compares to a rate of 33% for individuals who are parole violators and who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center.

TABLE X

1977 RELEASEES

GROUP	PAROLE VIOLATORS		NON-PAROLE VIOLATORS		TOTALS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Group 1 & 2	41	61%	26	39%	67	58%
Group 3 & 4	7	41%	10	59%	17	15%
Group 5 & 6	6	19%	25	81%	31	27%
TOTAL	54	47%	61	53%	115	100%

TABLE XI

1978 RELEASEES

GROUP	PAROLE VIOLATORS		NON PAROLE VIOLATORS		TOTALS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Group 1 & 2	54	77%	16	23%	70	49%
Group 3 & 4	5	15%	28	85%	33	23%
Group 5 & 6	5	13%	34	87%	39	27%
TOTAL	64	45%	78	55%	142	100%

Tables X and XI identify those individuals who are parole violators versus those who are non-parole violators for the 1977 and 1978 samples. Table X shows that 61% of the individuals who spent all of their institutional life in Walpole were parole violators in 1977 and 77% of these were parole violators in 1978. Conversely, 81% of the individuals who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center were not parole violators in 1977 and 87% were not parole violators in 1978. Tables X and XI also demonstrate that in the 1977 and 1978 samples there were 26 and 16 individuals respectively who were not parole violators and who spent all of their time in Walpole before their release.

DISCUSSION

This report has dealt with the individuals released from Walpole in 1977 and 1978. It has shown that of the total number of people released in 1977 and 1978, 67 or 56% and 70 or 49% respectively had spent their whole institutional life in Walpole without the benefit of any alternate placements. Of these individuals, 26 in 1977 and 16 in 1978 were individuals who were not parole violators and who served their whole time in Walpole.

The individuals who participated in the furlough program had a recidivism rate of 9% compared to 31% for those who did not participate in the program. The individuals who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center had a recidivism rate of 19% compared to 25% for those who spent their whole institutional life at Walpole. For these individuals who had some medium security exposure during their incarceration, those who were transferred to a medium security facility once had a recidivism rate of 38% compared to a rate of 0% for those who had more than one opportunity in a medium security facility. For those individuals who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center, if they had only one placement there, their recidivism rate was 43% compared with a zero recidivism rate for those who had more than two placements in a forestry camp or pre-release center.

Individuals who had some exposure to a forestry camp or pre-release center, then returned to Walpole, and subsequently released from there after serving a period of 6 months or less there, had a recidivism rate of zero compared to a rate of 29% for those who spent more than 6 months in Walpole before being released. Likewise, those who had been placed in a medium security institution, been returned to Walpole, and spent

six months or less there before release, had a recidivism rate of 14% compared to a rate of 40% for those who spent more than 6 months at Walpole before release. Individuals serving their original commitment and who were not parole violators had the best opportunity for placement in a forestry camp or pre-release center. Parole violators tended to concentrate in Group 1, the individuals who spent all their institutional life in Walpole before being released.

FOOTNOTES

1. LeClair, Daniel P., An Analysis of Recidivism Among Residents Released from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions During 1973, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 126, October, 1976.

LeClair, Daniel P., An Analysis of Recidivism Among Residents Released from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions During 1974, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 136, September, 1977.

Mershon, Randi, An Analysis of Recidivism Among Residents Released from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions During 1975, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 156, September, 1978.

Mershon, Randi, An Analysis of Recidivism Rates Among Residents Released from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions in 1976, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 164, December, 1978.

Smart, Yvette, An Analysis of Recidivism Rates Among Residents Released from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions in 1977, Massachusetts Department of Correction, Publication No. 182, November, 1979.

APPENDIX I

Data on Individuals Released Directly From Walpole in 1977 and 1978.

The following tables contain all the pertinent statistical information for the population of individuals released from Walpole in 1977 and 1978. For the 1977 releasee data, there is also a column that lists the recidivism rates for each category of data.

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
1. PRESENT OFFENSE							
A. Person	63	(53)	25%	83	(59)	146	(56)
B. Sex	9	(8)	11%	9	(6)	18	(7)
C. Property	27	(23)	26%	27	(19)	54	(21)
D. Drug	12	(10)	8%	14	(10)	26	(10)
E. Other	7	(6)	57%	9	(6)	16	(6)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
2. SEX OFFENSES							
A. Not Applicable	109	(92)	26%	133	(93)	242	(93)
B. Rape	7	(6)	14%	7	(5)	14	(5)
C. Assault-Rape	1	(1)	0%	1	(1)	2	(2)
D. Rape-Minor	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(0)
E. Assault-Rape-Minor	1	(1)	0%	0	(0)	1	(0)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
3. DRUG OFFENSES							
A. Non-Drug Offense	107	(90)	26%	128	(90)	235	(90)
B. Poss. of Narc.	1	(1)	0%	0	(0)	1	(1)
C. Poss. of Heroin	2	(2)	0%	1	(1)	3	(1)
D. Sale of Heroin	4	(3)	0%	2	(1)	6	(2)
E. Sale of Narc.	2	(2)	0%	1	(1)	3	(1)
F. Intent to Sell	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(1)
G. Cont.Subst.No.Cl.	1	(1)	0%	5	(3)	6	(2)
H. Class A	1	(1)	100%	3	(2)	4	(1)
I. Class B	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
4. PROPERTY OFFENSES							
A. Not Applicable	91	(77)	24%	115	(81)	206	(79)
B. Arson	2	(2)	0%	0	(0)	2	(1)
C. Burglary-Armed	1	(0)	0%	0	(0)	1	(0)
D. Burglary	14	(12)	36%	18	(13)	32	(12)
E. Tools	2	(27)	0%	3	(2)	5	(2)
F. Larceny	2	(2)	0%	2	(1)	4	(2)
G. Vehicle Theft	2	(2)	50%	1	(1)	3	(1)
H. Forgery-Uttering	2	(2)	50%	2	(1)	4	(2)
I. Stolen Goods	2	(2)	0%	1	(1)	3	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
5. PERSON OFFENSES							
A. Not Applicable	55	(47)	24%	59	(41)	114	(44)
B. Murder-1	2	(2)	0%	0	(0)	2	(1)
C. Manslaughter	7	(6)	43%	4	(3)	11	(4)
D. Assault-Intent	2	(2)	0%	1	(1)	3	(1)
E. Armed Robbery	35	(30)	31%	54	(38)	89	(34)
F. Unarmed Robbery	7	(6)	0%	10	(7)	17	(6)
G. Armed Assault	6	(5)	33%	12	(8)	18	(7)
H. Unarmed Assault	4	(3)	0%	1	(1)	5	(2)
I. Kidnapping	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
6. OTHER OFFENSES							
A. Not Applicable	100	(93)	23%	133	(94)	243	(94)
B. Escapes	6	(5)	67%	6	(4)	12	(5)
C. Weapons Offenses	1	(1)	0%	3	(2)	4	(1)
D. Other	1	(1)	0%	0	(0)	1	(0)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
7. MINIMUM SENTENCE IN YEARS							
A. 2 Years	8	(7)	13%	12	(8)	20	(8)
B. 3 Years	34	(29)	27%	25	(18)	59	(23)
C. 4 Years	10	(9)	50%	12	(8)	22	(8)
D. 5 Years	18	(15)	33%	22	(15)	40	(15)
E. 6 Years	4	(3)	0%	10	(7)	14	(5)
F. 7 Years	13	(11)	0%	7	(5)	20	(8)
G. 8 Years	3	(2)	33%	10	(7)	13	(5)
H. 9 Years	3	(2)	33%	3	(2)	6	(2)
I. 10 Years	1	(1)	0%	9	(6)	10	(4)
J. 11 to 12 Years	1	(1)	0%	4	(3)	5	(2)
K. 13 to 15 Years	3	(2)	100%	2	(1)	5	(2)
L. 16 to 19 Years	1	(1)	0%	0	(0)	1	(0)
M. 20 or More Years	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(0)
N. Indeterminate	19	(16)	16%	25	(18)	44	(17)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
8. MAXIMUM SENTENCE IN YEARS							
A. 2 Years	5	(4)	20%	4	(3)	9	(3)
B. 3 Years	2	(2)	50%	6	(4)	8	(3)
C. 5 Years	29	(25)	24%	21	(15)	50	(19)
D. 6 Years	10	(8)	30%	7	(5)	17	(6)
E. 7 Years	14	(12)	21%	17	(12)	31	(12)
F. 8 Years	1	(1)	100%	5	(3)	6	(2)
G. 9 Years	3	(2)	33%	1	(1)	4	(1)
H. 10 Years	32	(27)	19%	32	(22)	64	(25)
I. 11 to 12 Years	10	(8)	10%	12	(8)	22	(8)
J. 13 to 15 Years	3	(2)	33%	21	(15)	24	(9)
K. 16 to 19 Years	0	(0)	0%	4	(3)	4	(1)
L. 20 or More Years	9	(8)	44%	12	(8)	21	(8)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
9. RACE							
A. White	77	(65)	33%	94	(66)	171	(66)
B. Black	39	(33)	8%	43	(30)	82	(32)
C. Other	2	(2)	50%	5	(4)	7	(2)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
10. MARITAL STATUS							
A. Married	27	(23)	19%	23	(16)	50	(19)
B. Single	66	(56)	26%	90	(63)	156	(60)
C. Divorced	17	(14)	35%	18	(13)	35	(13)
D. Widowed	1	(1)	100%	1	(1)	2	(1)
E. Separated	5	(4)	0%	10	(7)	15	(6)
F. Unknown	2	(2)	0%	0	(0)	2	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
11. TIME SERVED WITH JAIL CREDITS							
A. Less than 6 Months	3	(3)	67%	1	(1)	4	(1)
B. 6 to 11 Mos.	4	(3)	25%	3	(2)	7	(2)
C. 1 to 2 Years	8	(7)	0%	8	(6)	16	(6)
D. 2 to 3 Years	14	(12)	21%	19	(13)	33	(13)
E. 3 to 5 Years	13	(11)	15%	17	(12)	30	(12)
F. 5 to 10 Years	14	(12)	14%	11	(8)	25	(10)
G. 10 to 15 Years	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(0)
H. Complex Sentence	62	(52)	31%	82	(58)	144	(56)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
12. PRIOR ADDRESS SELECTED TOWNS							
A. Boston	52	(44)	21%	62	(44)	114	(44)
B. Brockton	1	(1)	0%	1	(1)	2	(1)
C. Fall River	3	(3)	33%	3	(2)	6	(2)
D. Framingham	2	(2)	50%	1	(1)	3	(1)
E. Holyoke	0	(0)	0%	2	(1)	2	(1)
F. Lawrence	1	(1)	0%	3	(2)	4	(2)
G. Lowell	0	(0)	0%	5	(3)	5	(2)
H. Lynn	3	(3)	0%	2	(1)	5	(2)
I. New Bedford	2	(2)	0%	1	(1)	3	(1)
J. Quincy	0	(0)	0%	4	(3)	4	(2)
K. Somerville	4	(3)	0%	5	(4)	9	(3)
L. Springfield	6	(5)	33%	3	(2)	9	(3)
M. Worcester	7	(6)	29%	12	(9)	19	(7)
N. Other Mass.	29	(25)	31%	33	(23)	62	(24)
O. Out of State	4	(3)	25%	5	(4)	9	(3)
P. Unknown	4	(3)	25%	0	(0)	4	(2)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
13. MILITARY DISCHARGE							
A. No Service	92	(78)	23%	112	(78)	204	(78)
B. Honorable	3	(3)	33%	8	(6)	11	(4)
C. Dishonorable	1	(1)	0%	0	(0)	1	(0)
D. Bad Conduct	0	(0)	0%	3	(2)	3	(1)
E. Medical	1	(1)	100%	0	(0)	1	(0)
F. Discharge unknown	12	(10)	25%	14	(10)	26	(10)
G. Unknown	9	(8)	33%	5	(4)	14	(5)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
14. DRUG USE							
A. None	46	(39)	28%	59	(42)	105	(40)
B. Non-specific	12	(10)	25%	15	(11)	27	(10)
C. Heroin	41	(35)	24%	50	(35)	91	(35)
D. Marijuana	2	(2)	0%	6	(4)	8	(3)
E. Other	11	(9)	18%	7	(5)	18	(7)
F. Unknown	6	(5)	17%	5	(4)	11	(4)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
15. TOTAL NUMBER OF COURT APPEARANCES							
A. First Offense	2	(2)	0%	5	(4)	7	(3)
B. Two	2	(2)	0%	2	(1)	4	(2)
C. Three	2	(2)	0%	2	(1)	4	(2)
D. Four	0	(0)	0%	2	(1)	2	(1)
E. Five	2	(2)	0%	5	(4)	7	(3)
F. 6 to 8	11	(9)	9%	8	(6)	19	(7)
G. 9 to 11	15	(13)	27%	17	(12)	32	(12)
H. 12-15	22	(19)	23%	30	(21)	52	(20)
I. 16 to 20	23	(20)	26%	27	(19)	50	(19)
J. More than 20	39	(33)	33%	42	(30)	81	(31)
K. Unknown	0	(0)	0%	2	(1)	2	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
16. NUMBER OF CHARGES FOR PROPERTY OFFENSES							
A. None	5	(4)	40%	9	(6)	14	(5)
B. One	3	(3)	0%	8	(6)	11	(4)
C. Two	6	(5)	0%	1	(1)	7	(3)
D. Three	7	(6)	29%	8	(6)	15	(6)
E. Four	8	(7)	13%	8	(6)	16	(6)
F. Five	9	(8)	33%	5	(4)	14	(5)
G. 6 to 8	24	(20)	17%	19	(13)	43	(17)
H. Over 8	54	(46)	32%	80	(56)	134	(52)
I. Unknown	2	(2)	0%	4	(3)	6	(2)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
17. NUMBER OF CHARGES FOR PERSON OFFENSES							
A. None	12	(10)	17%	11	(8)	23	(9)
B. One	9	(8)	11%	11	(8)	20	(8)
C. Two	20	(17)	15%	14	(10)	34	(13)
D. Three	19	(16)	42%	26	(18)	45	(17)
E. Four	12	(10)	17%	19	(13)	31	(12)
F. Five	11	(9)	36%	12	(9)	23	(9)
G. 6 to 8	23	(20)	22%	16	(11)	39	(15)
H. Over 8	10	(9)	40%	30	(21)	40	(15)
I. Unknown	2	(0)	0%	3	(2)	5	(2)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
18. NUMBER OF CHARGES FOR NARCOTICS OFFENSES							
A. None	55	(47)	24%	67	(47)	122	(47)
B. One	12	(10)	25%	20	(14)	32	(12)
C. Two	14	(12)	14%	11	(8)	25	(10)
D. Three	9	(8)	33%	12	(9)	21	(8)
E. Four	1	(1)	0%	8	(6)	9	(3)
F. Five	5	(4)	60%	4	(3)	9	(3)
G. 6 to 8	4	(3)	0%	9	(6)	13	(5)
H. Over 8	16	(14)	31%	8	(6)	24	(9)
I. Unknown	2	(2)	0%	3	(2)	5	(2)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
19. NUMBER OF CHARGES FOR ESCAPE OFFENSES							
A. None	84	(71)	21%	108	(76)	192	(74)
B. One	19	(16)	26%	21	(15)	40	(15)
C. Two	5	(4)	40%	4	(3)	9	(3)
D. Three	3	(3)	0%	4	(3)	7	(3)
E. Four	2	(2)	50%	1	(1)	3	(1)
F. Five	2	(2)	100%	2	(1)	4	(2)
G. 6 to 8	1	(1)	100%	1	(1)	2	(1)
H. Unknown	2	(2)	0%	1	(1)	3	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
20. NUMBER OF CHARGES FOR DRUNKENNESS OFFENSES							
A. None	51	(43)	22%	70	(49)	121	(47)
B. One	23	(20)	26%	21	(15)	44	(17)
C. Two	5	(4)	40%	15	(11)	20	(8)
D. Three	12	(10)	33%	8	(6)	20	(8)
E. Four	5	(4)	20%	9	(6)	14	(5)
F. Five	3	(3)	0%	1	(1)	4	(1)
G. 6 to 8	6	(5)	50%	7	(5)	13	(5)
H. Over 8	11	(9)	18%	8	(5)	19	(7)
I. Unknown	2	(2)	0%	3	(2)	5	(2)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
21. NUMBER OF CHARGES FOR SEX OFFENSES							
A. None	91	(77)	28%	116	(82)	207	(80)
B. One	19	(16)	21%	21	(15)	40	(15)
C. Two	4	(3)	0%	1	(1)	5	(2)
D. Three	0	(0)	0%	0	(0)	0	(0)
E. Four	2	(2)	0%	2	(1)	4	(2)
F. Five	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(0)
G. Unknown	2	(2)	0%	1	(1)	3	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
22. NUMBER OF ADULT PAROLES							
A. None	53	(45)	30%	74	(52)	127	(49)
B. One	40	(34)	18%	36	(25)	76	(29)
C. Two	15	(13)	27%	18	(13)	33	(13)
D. Three	7	(6)	29%	2	(1)	9	(3)
E. Four or More	2	(2)	0%	9	(6)	11	(4)
F. Unknown	1	(1)	0%	3	(2)	4	(2)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
23. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADULT PAROLE VIOLATIONS							
A. Never Paroled	53	(45)	30%	74	(52)	127	(49)
B. None	19	(16)	5%	13	(9)	32	(12)
C. One	28	(24)	29%	31	(22)	59	(23)
D. Two	14	(12)	29%	13	(9)	27	(10)
E. Three	2	(2)	0%	6	(4)	8	(3)
F. Four or More	1	(1)	0%	2	(1)	3	(1)
G. Unknown	1	(1)	0%	3	(2)	4	(2)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
24. NUMBER OF PRIOR COUNTY INCARCERATIONS							
A. None	42	(36)	19%	47	(33)	89	(34)
B. One	26	(22)	15%	30	(21)	56	(22)
C. Two	17	(14)	29%	23	(16)	40	(15)
D. Three	10	(9)	60%	20	(14)	30	(12)
E. Four	8	(7)	38%	11	(8)	19	(7)
F. Five or More	15	(13)	20%	9	(6)	24	(9)
G. Unknown	0	(0)	0%	2	(1)	2	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
25. AGE AT INCARCERATION							
A. Sixteen	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(1)
B. Seventeen	1	(1)	0%	0	(0)	1	(1)
C. Eighteen	2	(2)	50%	7	(5)	9	(3)
D. Nineteen	5	(4)	40%	6	(4)	11	(4)
E. Twenty	4	(3)	0%	10	(7)	14	(5)
F. Twenty-One	9	(8)	44%	7	(5)	16	(6)
G. Twenty-Two	6	(5)	17%	12	(9)	18	(7)
H. Twenty-Three	6	(5)	17%	13	(9)	19	(7)
I. Twenty-Four	4	(3)	0%	7	(5)	11	(4)
J. Twenty-Five	9	(8)	44%	7	(5)	16	(6)
K. 26-29	27	(23)	30%	38	(27)	65	(25)
L. 30 to 39	38	(32)	16%	26	(18)	64	(25)
M. 40 and Over	7	(6)	29%	8	(6)	15	(6)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
26. AGE AT RELEASE							
A. Eighteen	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(1)
B. Nineteen	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(1)
C. Twenty	1	(1)	0%	1	(1)	2	(1)
D. Twenty-One	3	(3)	0%	4	(3)	7	(2)
E. Twenty-Two	6	(5)	17%	7	(5)	13	(5)
F. Twenty-Three	5	(4)	60%	10	(7)	15	(6)
G. Twenty-Four	5	(4)	40%	11	(8)	16	(6)
H. Twenty-Five	8	(7)	25%	7	(5)	15	(6)
I. 26 to 29	31	(26)	32%	33	(23)	64	(25)
J. 30 to 39	51	(43)	18%	46	(32)	97	(37)
K. 40 and Older	8	(7)	25%	21	(15)	29	(11)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
27. AGE AT FIRST ARREST							
A. Ten or Younger	6	(5)	17%	12	(9)	18	(7)
B. Eleven	7	(6)	14%	10	(7)	17	(6)
C. Twelve	11	(9)	18%	14	(10)	25	(10)
D. Thirteen	13	(11)	39%	15	(11)	28	(11)
E. Fourteen	14	(12)	36%	8	(6)	22	(8)
F. Fifteen	16	(14)	19%	16	(11)	32	(12)
G. Sixteen	6	(5)	33%	14	(10)	20	(8)
H. Seventeen	17	(14)	24%	21	(15)	38	(15)
I. Eighteen	5	(4)	60%	5	(4)	10	(4)
J. Nineteen	5	(4)	0%	3	(2)	8	(3)
K. Twenty	3	(3)	33%	5	(4)	8	(3)
L. Twenty-One	0	(0)	0%	3	(2)	3	(1)
M. Twenty-Two	0	(0)	0%	2	(1)	2	(1)
N. Twenty-Three	3	(3)	33%	3	(2)	6	(2)
O. Twenty-Four	2	(2)	0%	0	(0)	2	(1)
P. Twenty-Five	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(0)
Q. 26-29	1	(1)	0%	4	(3)	5	(2)
R. 30-39	1	(1)	1%	1	(1)	2	(1)
S. 40 And Over	1	(1)	100%	1	(1)	2	(1)
T. Unknown	7	(6)	0%	4	(3)	11	(4)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
28. TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS							
A. None	81	(69)	32%	108	(76)	189	(73)
B. One	10	(9)	0%	7	(5)	17	(6)
C. 2 to 5	15	(13)	13%	13	(9)	28	(11)
D. 6 to 10	9	(8)	0%	9	(6)	18	(7)
E. 11 to 15	2	(2)	50%	3	(2)	5	(2)
F. 21 to 30	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(0)
G. 31 to 50	1	(1)	0%	1	(1)	2	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
29. NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL FURLOUGH OUTCOMES							
A. Never Furloughed	81	(69)	32%	108	(76)	189	(73)
B. None	1	(1)	0%	2	(1)	3	(1)
C. One	9	(8)	0%	6	(4)	15	(6)
D. 2 to 5	19	(16)	11%	12	(9)	31	(12)
E. 6 to 10	5	(4)	0%	8	(6)	13	(5)
F. 11 to 15	2	(2)	50%	3	(2)	5	(2)
G. 21 to 30	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	1	(0)
H. 31 to 50	1	(1)	0%	1	(1)	2	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
30. NUMBER OF LATE UNDER FURLOUGH OUTCOMES							
A. Never Furloughed	81	(69)	32%	108	(76)	189	(73)
B. None	26	(22)	8%	26	(18)	52	(20)
C. One	10	(9)	10%	8	(6)	18	(7)
D. 2 to 5	1	(0)	0%	0	(0)	1	(0)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
31. NUMBER OF LATE OVER FURLOUGH OUTCOMES							
A. Never Furloughed	81	(69)	32%	108	(76)	189	(73)
B. None	37	(31)	8%	34	(24)	71	(27)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
32. NUMBER OF ARREST FURLOUGH OUTCOMES							
A. Never Furloughed	81	(69)	32%	108	(76)	189	(73)
B. None	37	(31)	8%	34	(24)	71	(27)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
33. NUMBER OF ESCAPE FURLOUGH OUTCOMES							
A. Never Furloughed	81	(69)	32%	108	(76)	189	(73)
B. None	30	(25)	10%	31	(22)	61	(23)
C. One	7	(6)	0%	3	(2)	10	(4)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
34. NUMBER OF OTHER FURLOUGH OUTCOMES							
A. Never Furloughed	81	(69)	32%	108	(76)	189	(73)
B. None	36	(30%	8%	34	(24)	70	(27)
C. One	1	(1)	0%	0	(0)	1	(0)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

	1977 RELEASEES			1978 RELEASEES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	RR	N	%	N	%
35. TYPE OF SENTENCE							
A. One Sentence only	54	(46)	26%	69	(49)	123	(47)
B. Concurrent Sentence	47	(40)	21%	47	(33)	94	(36)
C. Aggregate Sentence	3	(3)	0%	7	(5)	10	(4)
D. Forthwith Sentence	12	(10)	33%	14	(10)	26	(10)
E. Forthwith H/C	1	(1)	100%	3	(2)	4	(2)
F. From & After sentence	1	(1)	0%	2	(1)	3	(1)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)
36. INSTITUTION COMMITTED TO							
A. Walpole	99	(84)	26%	117	(82)	216	(83)
B. Concord	19	(16)	16%	25	(18)	44	(17)
TOTAL	118	(100)	25%	142	(100)	260	(100)

APPENDIX II

VARIABLES

A. COMMITMENT VARIABLES

1. Institution of Original Commitment
2. Age at Commitment
3. Present Offense
4. Number of Charges Involved in Present Offense
5. Type of Sentence
6. Minimum Sentence
7. Maximum Sentence

B. PERSONAL BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS VARIABLES

1. Race
2. Marital Status
3. Military Service
4. Last Civilian Address
5. History of Drug Use
6. Occupation

C. CRIMINAL HISTORY VARIABLES

1. Age at First Arrest
2. Total Number of Court Appearances
3. Total Number of Court Appearances for Person Offenses
4. Total Number of Court Appearances for Property Offenses
5. Total Number of Court Appearances for Sex Offenses
6. Total Number of Court Appearances for Narcotics Offenses
7. Total Number of Court Appearances for Drunkenness Offenses
8. Total Number of Court Appearances for Escape Offenses
9. Total Number of Prior County Incarcerations
10. Total Number of Adult Paroles
11. Total Number of Adult Parole Violations
12. Age at Release

D. FURLOUGH VARIABLES

1. Total Number of Furloughs
2. Total Number of Successful Furlough Outcomes
3. Total Number of Late-under Furlough Outcomes
4. Total Number of Late-over Furlough Outcomes
5. Total Number of Escape Furlough Outcomes
6. Total Number of Arrest Furlough Outcomes

E. RECIDIVISM VARIABLES

1. Category of Return
2. New Arrests
3. Types of Parole Violations
4. Disposition of new Arrests
5. Date of Return to Custody
6. Date Parole Warrant Issued

END