


National Criminal Justice Reference Service



This microfiche was produced from documents received for inclusion in the NCJRS data base. Since NCJRS cannot exercise control over the physical condition of the documents submitted, the individual frame quality will vary. The resolution chart on this frame may be used to evaluate the document quality.



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

Microfilming procedures used to create this fiche comply with the standards set forth in 41CFR 101-11.504.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

National Institute of Justice
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D. C. 20531

6-17-82

72446

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

72446

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Massachusetts Department
of Corrections

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

A PROFILE OF CHARACTERISTICS DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN
PROGRAM COMPLETERS AND PROGRAM NON-COMPLETERS
CHARLOTTE HOUSE: 1977 AND 1978 RELEASES

NCJRS
OCT 13 1980
ACQUISITIONS

Prepared by:

Lawrence T. Williams
Research Specialist

Massachusetts Department of Correction

William T. Hogan, Jr.
Commissioner

August, 1980

PUBLICATION #12032

Approved By: Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent

ABSTRACT

This report examines the characteristics that distinguish between program completers and program non-completers for women released from Charlotte House during 1977 and 1978.

For the sample of combined 1977 and 1978 releases, there were twelve variables that produced statistically significant differences. In rank order of their significance, the variables were:

- 1) Time on Job of Longest Duration
- 2) Age at Charlotte House Placement and Age at Release
- 3) Age at First Arrest
- 4) Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations
- 5) Time at Most Skilled Position
- 6) Number of Charges for Property Offenses
- 7) Number of Court Appearances
- 8) Time Spent at Charlotte House
- 9) Age at Incarceration
- 10) Marital Status
- 11) Number of Charges for Escape Offenses
- 12) Number of Any Prior Incarcerations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE NUMBER
I. Introduction	1
II. Samples	2
III. Research Design	2
IV. Data Collection	3
V. Methodology	4
VI. Findings	4
VII. Summary	8
VIII. Appendix I: Variables Found to Distinguish Between Program Completers & Program Non-Completers: 1977 & 1978 Charlotte House Releases	9
IX. Appendix II: Variables Found Not to Distinguish Between Program Completers and Program Non-Completers: 1977 & 1978 Charlotte House Releases	13
X. References	20

INTRODUCTION

In June of 1972, the Massachusetts State Legislature passed the "Correctional Reform Act" (Chapter 777) authorizing the establishment of different correctional programs that were to be outside of the walled institutions. Charlotte House was one such program that was established to service women offenders and assist them in their readjustment into the community. In 1973, Charlotte House began accepting women on a pre-release basis from the Massachusetts Department of Correction.

This report is the second component of a three part evaluation of women released from Charlotte House during 1977 and 1978. The first component of the evaluation was a client profile of these women released during 1977 and 1978.¹ Included in this report is an analysis of the sample in terms of the basic statistical differences between individuals who were program completers and those who were program non-completers.

This analysis is an update of a previous report done by the Department of Correction.² It is useful in providing a guide to determine whether or not a particular individual has a high, medium or low success/failure probability for completing their Charlotte House program.

¹Williams, Lawrence T., Client Profile - Charlotte House: 1977 and 1978 Releases, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 201, August, 1980.

²Landolfi, Joseph, Charlotte House Pre-Release Center for Women: A Profile of Participants & a Recidivism Follow-up, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 125, October, 1976.

Samples

In determining the analysis, a population consisting of women admitted to and released from Charlotte House during 1977 and 1978 was chosen (N=45). The total sample was divided into two groups - program non-completers and program completers. A program completer was defined as any woman who successfully completed her stay at Charlotte House and was released to the streets either by permit of the Parole Board or by a certificate of discharge. Also, any women who received a lateral transfer to a similar security institution are included as program completers. A program non-completer was defined as any woman who escaped or did not complete her stay at Charlotte House but was instead returned to her sending institution or an institution of higher security.

Research Design

The present study was designed with the purpose of answering the following research question:

What variables distinguish between women who complete and women who do not complete their stay at the Charlotte House pre-release program?

DATA COLLECTION

Data collection consisted of criminal history variables, social background variables, and commitment variables. The material was collected from the Massachusetts Department of Correction Central Office files and 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).³

³The author would like to acknowledge his appreciation for the careful and thorough work and assistance given in coding data for this report by Denise Amand, Suffolk University student intern.

Findings

A. Methodology

Commitment, background, and criminal history variables were characterized according to a series of splits for the total completion sample. The split yielding the highest chi square value was chosen. Variables that yielded a statistically significant relationship at the .05 probability level ($\chi^2=3.84$, 1df) were selected as indicators of differences between the sample.

B. Results

A comparison of the differences in the variables between program completers and non-completers for the Charlotte House sample of 1977 and 1978 releases resulted in twelve variables that produced statistically significant differences. In rank order of their significance the variables were:

- 1) Time on Job of Longest Duration
- 2) Age at Charlotte House Placement and Age at Release
- 3) Age at First Arrest
- 4) Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations
- 5) Time at Most Skilled Position
- 6) Number of Charges for Property Offenses
- 7) Number of Court Appearances
- 8) Time Spent at Charlotte House
- 9) Age at Incarceration
- 10) Marital Status
- 11) Number of Charges for Escape Offenses
- 12) Number of Prior Incarcerations

A brief discussion of each variable follows.

1) Time on Job of Longest Duration

After excluding all unknowns, it is discovered that the majority of completers (65%) had spent one year or longer at the job that they held for the longest duration. This compares with a percentage of only 13% for the non-completers. The majority (87%) of the non-completion sample had spent less than one year as their longest time on any one job.

2) Age at Charlotte House Placement and Age at Release

An analysis of these two variables yields interesting results. A significant majority of the program completers (74%) were age 26 or older at the time of their placement at Charlotte House and at the age of their release. Only 28% of the non-completion sample were that age when placed and released. This contrasts with the fact that the vast majority of the women who were non-completers (72%) were age 25 or younger when placed in Charlotte House and when released.

3) Age at First Arrest

After excluding any unknowns we get the following result for this particular variable: almost all of the program completion sample (91%) were adults (age 18 or older) when first arrested. Only 47% of the non-completion sample fell in that age range.

4) Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations

The vast majority of women who were program completers (96%) had not had any prior state or federal incarcerations. Significantly fewer (59%) of the non-completion sample fell into that category.

5) Time at Most Skilled Position

The majority of the non-completers (87%) had spent one year or less at their most skilled position compared to only 39% for the completers in this same class. Conversely, 61% of the program completers had spent one year or longer at their most skilled position.

6) Number of Charges for Property Offenses

Seventy percent of the program completers had not had any charges for property offenses or had only one previous charge for a property offense. Seventy three percent of the non-completers had two or more charges for property offenses.

7) Number of Court Appearances

The majority of the program completers (63%) had three or fewer previous court appearances. Only (22%) of the non-completion sample had three or fewer court appearances. Seventy-eight percent of the non-completers had four or more court appearances.

8) Time Spent at Charlotte House

All of the non-completers (100%) had spent seven months or less at Charlotte House before release. Thirty-three percent of the program completion sample had spent eight months or more at Charlotte House before release.

9) Age at Incarceration

A significant majority of the program completers (93%) were 22 or older when committed to MCI-Framingham. Significantly more of the non-completion sample (39% vs. 7%) were 21 or younger at age at commitment.

10) Marital Status

The majority of the program failures (82%) were single. The majority of the program successes (56%) were either married, divorced,

widowed, or separated.

11) Number of Charges for Escape Offenses

Ninety-two percent of the program completion sample had not had any prior charges for escape offenses. Significantly more of the women who were non-completers (41% vs. 8%) had one or more charges for escape offenses.

12) Number of Any Prior Incarcerations

This variable yeilds the following result: most of the program successes had not had any prior incarcerations before their present commitment. Most of the program failures (53%) had one or more prior incarcerations.

A profile can be constructed of the typical Charlotte House program completer as compared to the non-completer for the total sample of 1977 and 1978 releases. The women who were program successes spent eight months or longer in the Charlotte House program, were 26 or older when placed at Charlotte House and released from there, had spent one year more at their job of longest duration and at their most skilled position, and had been married. The successes were also age 22 or older when committed, adults (18 or older) when first arrested, had three or fewer court appearances, and had not had either any charges for property offenses, or escape offenses, and had not had any state or federal incarcerations or any incarcerations of any kind. This profile is that of an inexperienced offender, without an extensive involvement in the criminal justice system.

A summary of these relationships is presented in Appendix I. The variables that did not produce statistical significant results for the sample, are documented in Appendix II.

SUMMARY

This report indicates that the inexperienced woman offender has a high probability of success at the Charlotte House Program. This would seem to follow from a rather common sense kind of logic. Those women who have not had extensive criminal histories or numerous incarcerations would seem to be logically more likely to succeed in programs than those women with extensive, long-term histories of involvement in the criminal justice system. However, it would seem that much more of an impact potentially exists for the criminal justice community if the community programs (halfway houses and pre-release centers) would develop strategies to positively impact the more serious offenders.

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX I

VARIABLES FOUND TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PROGRAM COMPLETERS
AND PROGRAM NON-COMPLETERS - 1977 AND 1978 RELEASES

	COMPLETION	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS	
	RATE	N	%	N	%
<u>1. Time on Job of Longest Duration</u> (Unknowns Excluded)					
Less Than 1 Year	38%	8	(35)	13	(87)
1 Year or Longer	88%	15	(65)	2	(13)
TOTAL		23	(100)	15	(100)
$(X^2=7.89, \text{ldf}, p < .01)$ (Yates correction applied)					
<u>2. Age at Charlotte House Placement</u> <u>And Age at Release</u>					
25 Years or Younger	35%	7	(26)	13	(72)
26 Years or Older	80%	20	(74)	5	(28)
TOTAL		27	(100)	18	(100)
$(X^2=7.59, \text{ldf}, p < .01)$ (Yates correction applied)					
<u>3. Age at First Arrest (Unknowns</u> <u>Excluded)</u>					
17 Years or Younger	18%	2	(9)	9	(53)
18 Years or Older	71%	20	(91)	8	(47)
TOTAL		22	(100)	17	(100)
$(X^2=7.07, \text{ldf}, p < .01)$ (Yates correction applied)					
<u>4. Number of Prior State or Federal</u> <u>Incarcerations (Unknowns Excluded)</u>					
None	71%	24	(96)	10	(59)
One or More	13%	1	(4)	7	(41)
TOTAL		25	(100)	17	(100)
$(X^2=6.82, \text{ldf}, p < .01)$ (Yates Correction applied)					

	COMPLETION	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS	
	RATE	N	%	N	%
<u>5. Time at Most Skilled Position</u> (Unknowns Excluded)					
Less Than 1 Year	41%	9	(39)	13	(87)
1 Year or More	88%	14	(61)	2	(13)
TOTAL		23	(100)	15	(100)
$(X^2=6.58, \text{ldf}, p < .02)$ (Yates Correction applied)					
<u>6. Number of Charges for Property Offenses</u>					
One or Fewer	79%	19	(70)	5	(27)
Two or More	38%	8	(30)	13	(73)
TOTAL		27	(100)	18	(100)
$(X^2=6.25, \text{ldf}, p < .02)$ (Yates correction applied)					
<u>7. Number of Court Appearances</u>					
Three or Fewer	81%	17	(63)	4	(22)
Four or More	42%	10	(37)	14	(78)
TOTAL		27	(100)	18	(100)
$(X^2=5.66, \text{ldf}, p < .02)$ (Yates correction applied)					
<u>8. Time Spent at Charlotte House</u>					
7 Months or Less	50%	18	(67)	18	(100)
8 Months or More	100%	9	(33)	0	(0)
TOTAL		27	(100)	18	(100)
$(X^2=5.56, \text{ldf}, p < .02)$ (Yates correction applied)					
<u>9. Age at Incarceration</u>					
21 or Younger	22%	2	(7)	7	(39)
22 or Older	69%	25	(93)	11	(61)
TOTAL		27	(100)	18	(100)
$(X^2=4.87, \text{ldf}, p < .05)$ (Yates correction applied)					

	<u>COMPLETION</u>	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>	
	<u>RATE</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
10. <u>Marital Status (Unknown Excluded)</u>					
Single	44%	11	(44)	14	(82)
Other	82%	14	(56)	3	(18)
TOTAL		25	(100)	17	(100)

($X^2=4.69$, 1df, $p < .05$)
 (Yates correction applied)

11. Number of Charges for Escape Offenses (Unknowns Excluded)

None	69%	22	(92)	10	(59)
One or More	22%	2	(8)	7	(41)
TOTAL		24	(100)	17	(100)

($X^2=4.49$, 1df, $p < .05$)
 (Yates correction applied)

12. Number of Any Prior Incarcerations (Unknowns Excluded)

None	71%	20	(83)	8	(47)
One or More	31%	4	(17)	9	(53)
TOTAL		24	(100)	17	(100)

($X^2=4.49$, 1df, $p < .05$)
 (Yates correction applied)

APPENDIX II

APPENDIX II

VARIABLES FOUND NOT TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PROGRAM COMPLETERS AND PROGRAM NON-COMPLETERS - 1977 AND 1978 RELEASES

	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS	
	N	%	N	%
1. <u>Jail Credits</u>				
Less Than 10 Days	18	(67)	16	(89)
More Than 10 Days	9	(33)	2	(11)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =1.81, ldf, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
2. <u>Present Offense</u>				
Property Offense	6	(21)	7	(39)
Non-Property Offense	22	(79)	11	(61)
TOTAL	28	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.89, ldf, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
3. <u>Minimum Sentence</u>				
Less Than 1 Year	9	(33)	4	(22)
Indeterminate	18	(67)	14	(78)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.22, ldf, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
4. <u>Maximum Sentence</u>				
Less Than 5 Years	18	(67)	15	(83)
5 Years or More	9	(33)	3	(17)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.80, ldf, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				

	COMPLETIONS		NON-COMPLETIONS	
	N	%	N	%
5. <u>Race</u>				
Black	11	(41)	7	(39)
Other	16	(59)	11	(61)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.034, ldf, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
6. <u>Military Status (Unknowns Excluded)</u>				
No Service	20	(95)	15	(100)
Some	1	(5)	0	(0)
TOTAL	21	(100)	15	(100)
(X ² =.03, ldf, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
7. <u>Address (Unknowns Excluded)</u>				
Out of State	3	(12)	1	(6)
In State	23	(88)	17	(94)
TOTAL	26	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.02, ldf, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
8. <u>Prior Address-County (Unknowns Excluded)</u>				
Middlesex	4	(15)	1	(6)
Other	22	(85)	17	(94)
TOTAL	26	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.28, ldf, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
9. <u>Number of Furloughs at Charlotte House</u>				
None	26	(96)	16	(89)
One or More	1	(4)	2	(11)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.13, ldf, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				

	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
10. <u>Occupation</u>				
Manual	7	(28)	4	(25)
Other	18	(72)	12	(75)
TOTAL	25	(100)	16	(100)
(X ² =.02, 1df, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
11. <u>Last Grade Completed (Unknowns Excluded)</u>				
Less Than 10th Grade	8	(29)	6	(35)
10th Grade or Higher	19	(71)	11	(65)
TOTAL	27	(100)	17	(100)
(X ² =.004, 1df, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
12. <u>Known Drug Use</u>				
None	12	(44)	5	(28)
Some	15	(56)	13	(71)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.67, 1df, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
13. <u>Number of Charges for Person Offenses</u>				
Less Than One	20	(74)	8	(44)
Two or More	7	(26)	10	(56)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =2.87, 1df, p > .05) (Yates Correction applied)				
14. <u>Number of Charges for Sex Offenses (Unknowns Excluded)</u>				
None	22	(96)	15	(88)
One or More	1	(4)	2	(12)
TOTAL	23	(100)	17	(100)
(X ² =.07, 1df, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				

	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
15. <u>Number of Charges for Narcotics Offenses</u>				
None	17	(63)	9	(50)
One or More	10	(37)	9	(50)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.31, 1df, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
16. <u>Number of Charges for Drunkenness Offenses</u>				
None	25	(93)	14	(78)
One or More	2	(7)	4	(22)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.97, 1df, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
17. <u>Number of Juvenile Incarcerations (Unknowns Excluded)</u>				
None	25	(96)	14	(78)
One or More	1	(4)	4	(22)
TOTAL	26	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =1.97, 1df, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
18. <u>Number of County Incarcerations</u>				
None	25	(93)	16	(89)
One or More	2	(7)	2	(11)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)
(X ² =.01, 1df, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				
19. <u>Number of Prior Adult Incarcerations (Unknowns Excluded)</u>				
None	22	(88)	10	(59)
One or More	3	(12)	7	(41)
TOTAL	25	(100)	17	(100)
(X ² =3.28, 1df, p > .05) (Yates correction applied)				

	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
20. <u>Number of Juvenile Paroles (Unknowns Excluded)</u>				
None	24	(92)	16	(89)
One	2	(8)	2	(11)
TOTAL	26	(100)	18	(100)

($\chi^2=.02$, 1df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

21. Number of Juvenile Parole Violations

Never Paroled	24	(89)	16	(89)
None	3	(11)	2	(11)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)

($\chi^2=.23$, 1df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

22. Number of Adult Paroles (Unknowns Excluded)

None	25	(96)	14	(78)
Two or More	1	(4)	4	(22)
TOTAL	26	(100)	18	(100)

($\chi^2=1.97$, 1df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

23. Number of Adult Parole Violations

Never Paroled	25	(93)	14	(78)
Some	2	(7)	4	(22)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)

($\chi^2=.97$, 1df, $p > .05$)

24. Number of Paroles (Unknowns Excluded)

None	22	(88)	13	(72)
One or More	3	(12)	5	(28)
TOTAL	25	(100)	18	(100)

($\chi^2=.84$, 1df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

	<u>COMPLETIONS</u>		<u>NON-COMPLETIONS</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
25. <u>Number of Parole Violations (Unknowns Excluded)</u>				
Never Paroled	22	(85)	13	(72)
One or More	4	(15)	5	(28)
TOTAL	26	(100)	18	(100)

($\chi^2=.39$, 1df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

26. Age at First Drug Arrest (Unknowns Excluded)

Not Applicable	13	(57)	8	(47)
At Least 1 Arrest	10	(43)	9	(53)
TOTAL	23	(100)	17	(100)

($\chi^2=.07$, 1df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

27. Age at First Drunk Arrest (Unknowns Excluded)

Not Applicable	21	(91)	13	(76)
At Least 1 Arrest	2	(9)	4	(24)
TOTAL	23	(100)	17	(100)

($\chi^2=.72$, 1df, $p > .05$)
(Yates correction applied)

REFERENCES

1. Landolfi, Joseph, Charlotte House Pre-Release Center for Women: A Profile of Participants and a Recidivism Follow-up, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 125, October, 1976.

2. Williams, Lawrence T., Client Profile - Charlotte House: 1977 and 1978 Releases, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 201, August, 1980.

END