168

168

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

A STUDY OF THE RECEPTION AND DIAGNOSTIC PROCESS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

A THESIS
Submitted by

Alan Siegel Bashevkin
B.S., University of Connecticut, 1973

Thomas Battin
B.A., Ohio Wesleyan University, 1974

Fredric Jon Bobroff
B.A., State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1975

Judith Burruss
B.S., Columbia University, 1966
Ed.M., Harvard University, 1974

James Cooney
B.A., University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1976

Robert Engel
B.A., Boston University, 1976

Chick Maroni
B.A., Merrimack College, 1974

Jill Richard
B.A., Brandeis University, 1974
M.A., Cambridge-Goddard College, 1976

Karen Stern
B.A., Boston University, 1976

Barry Tonkon
B.S., American University, 1971
Ed.M., Temple University, 1974

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science in Social Service

April, 1978

Approved by

Francis J. Carney

Francis J. Carney, Ph.D.
Adjunct Assistant Professor
of Social Work

ABSTRACT

This is a study of the reception and diagnostic process of the Massachusetts Department of Correction. It includes an analysis of the flow of individuals through the Reception and Diagnostic Center (RDC) and the Northeast Reception and Diagnostic Center (NRDC), including their placement six months after their initial classification; a comparison of those who were formally classified at the RDC or NRDC with those who were not formally classified at these facilities, including an assessment of the impact of the initial classification on the subsequent movement through the correctional system; an analysis of the security levels of the initial placements made by the RDC and NRDC, including the significant variables associated with placement in maximum, medium, or minimum security facilities; and, an examination of the success rates of placements in minimum security facilities, along with an analysis of the variables that distinguished between successful and non-successful placements. The sample consisted of the 1199 men sentenced to Walpole or Concord during 1976.

Flow of Individuals Through the Correctional System

The majority of the 1199 men sentenced directly to the Department of Correction during 1976 (83%) went through the formal classification process at the RDC or the NRDC. The RDC was effective in diverting men from maximum security inasmuch

as 55% of the RDC placements were to medium security facilities and 16% were directly to minimum security facilities. Diversion from maximum security was less apparent at the NRDC primarily because Concord was defined as maximum security in this study. However, it is noteworthy that 34% of the NRDC placements were directly to minimum security facilities.

There was a fairly substantial degree of movement through the correctional system. Six months after the initial placement, only 30% of the RDC cases and 31% of the NRDC cases were in maximum security, and 20% of the RDC cases and 61% of the RDC cases were either in minimum security or had been paroled. Classification at the RDC or NRDC tended to facilitate movement through the correctional system since fewer than a third of those initially classified at the RDC or NRDC were in maximum security after six months, while slightly over half of the non-classified individuals were still in maximum security after six months.

The median length of time between commitment to the DOC and initial placement by the RDC/NRDC was eleven weeks (9.5 weeks for the RDC and 13.4 weeks for the NRDC).

Comparison of Classified vs. Non-Classified Men

Walpole commitments who were not initially classified at the RDC or NRDC were likely to have more serious criminal histories--as consistently reflected by significant differences on six criminal history variables--than those who were initially

classified at the RDC. Concord commitments who were not initially classified at the NRDC or the RDC were likely to have shorter sentences and to be older than those who were initially classified at the NRDC.

Background Variables and Initial Placement

For the most part, the significant relationship between background variables and the security level of the initial placement were not unexpected. For example, men with longer sentences and more serious criminal histories were more likely to be placed in maximum security, while men with shorter sentences and less serious criminal histories were more likely to be placed in minimum security. However, the finding that blacks and Boston residents were over-represented in RDC maximum security placements was not expected and further study of this phenomenon was recommended.

Success Rates of Minimum Security Placements

In general, the RDC and NRDC seem to do an effective job of screening and placing men in minimum security facilities, since the overall success rate was 87%. This finding, in conjunction with the results of other research which indicates that those released from minimum security facilities have significantly lower recidivism rates, suggests that it would be both feasible and productive for the DOC to assign more men to minimum security facilities.

Significant differences on success rates were found on three interrelated variables--age (younger men had higher success rate), type of sentence (those with indeterminate sentences had higher success rates), and facility of initial classification (those initially classified at the NRDC had higher success rates). Further analysis to determine whether age or facility of initial classification was more important in relation to success rates was inconclusive. However, it is clear that the NRDC is particularly effective in placing younger men in minimum security facilities.

Finally, it was concluded that the RDC and the NRDC could probably increase the number of younger men placed in minimum security facilities without adverse effects. Younger men were significantly underrepresented among the minimum security placements of the RDC and the NRDC, yet they had significantly higher success rates than older men.

Also, the data suggested that the RDC could probably increase the number of blacks placed in minimum security facilities. Blacks were significantly underrepresented among RDC minimum security placements, yet race was not associated with success rates. However, further research into the relationship between race and such factors as offense, length of sentence, and seriousness of criminal history would be required before this could be presented as a firm conclusion.

Alan Siegel Bashevkin
Thomas Battin
Fredric Jon Bobroff
Judith Burruss
James Cooney
Robert Engel
Chick Maroni
Jill Richard
Karen Stern
Barry Tonkon
Francis J. Carney, Jr., Ph.D., Thesis Advisor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the assistance of several persons at the Department of Correction.

First, Richard Grelotti, Supervisor of Classification, and Dale Musgrave and Sharon Smith, Directors of Classification for Area II and Area III respectively, were very helpful in providing an overview of the DOC classification process and in helping to formulate research questions. Also, we would like to thank Barbara Young, Superintendent of the NRDC, and Terrance Holbrook, Superintendent of the RDC, and Alan Nathan, Director of Treatment for the RDC, for providing site visits to the NRDC and the RDC, for explaining the specifics of the reception and diagnostic process, and for suggesting issues to be addressed in this thesis. We appreciate, too, Ellen Chayet's useful information regarding her research and its implications for our study.

We would also like to express our gratitude for the assistance provided by DOC data processing personnel. We appreciated the keypunching efforts of Janice Cappozzi and Miranda Mucciante. Special thanks go to John Lee for his extensive work in preparing the data file for analysis and to Carroll Miller for his advice on data processing. A particular debt of gratitude is due to Charles Metzler for generating the yards of printouts which provided the basis for this research.

Also, we wish to thank Judy Carney for her care and expertise in typing the final copy. Finally, a very special thanks is due to our thesis advisor, Frank Carney. Words can hardly express our appreciation for his unending support and clarity of vision throughout our times of chaos.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

AND

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Stated most broadly, the values of correctional systems are the protection of society and the salvaging of human life. Through the legal system, individuals judged injurious to the community are most frequently removed from the general population for a period of time, after which they are returned to the community with the intent that they will then maintain acceptable levels of social functioning.

A variety of management and treatment principles are introduced during incarceration in order to accomplish this change in functioning. A management orientation without a treatment component can only focus on and seek to affect inmate behavior while the individual is in custody. Treatment modalities, ranging from strenous physical labor to insight-oriented psychotherapy, seek to achieve behavior alterations which will be sustained after release from the institution. Identical procedures such as physical labor are often employed to meet these frequently overlapping and sometimes opposing goals.

Given the presence of both protection and rehabilitation as values, most often both management and treatment techniques are employed to produce the desired outcome of the correctional process, a law-abiding citizenry. The clarity and specificity with which the outcome-producing procedures are defined, employed, and evaluated vary by program and over time. Classification is the initial tool employed by the system in the concrete task of processing its inmate population. As a working tool, the classi-

fication process is designed in accordance with its job specifications to fit the machinery already in place.

Classification has been defined as "a system or process by which a correctional agency . . . determines differential care and handling of offenders" (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (NACCJSG), p. 197). The reasons for this procedure and the methodologies employed to carry it out are by no means as easily summarized. They may in fact be partially obscured even from those involved in the process. This is partially due to the evolutionary changes of systems over time, and partially to the covert and overt differences in values and goals of policymakers and implementers, between and within their ranks.

History

The historical development of classification within correctional institutions has undergone considerable alteration in both function and form since it was initially instituted in mid-sixteenth century England. A separation of newly incarcerated from hardened inmates was sought by two reform groups. One was concerned with jailers' involvement in and abetment of inmate vice; the other sought less brutal staff operating procedures. Separations by age, sex, and types of offense were also practiced. Humanitarian concerns thus provided the impetus for the introduction of classification to the prison system.

Other distinctions were added in response to and as impetus for the evolution of increasingly specialized institutions. Criteria by this time included not only age, sex, and seriousness of crime, but also race, political status, and physical and mental health.

> Supporters of specialization were motivated mainly by two principles: prevention of contamination of one type of offender by another; and adaptation of work methods and facilities to the characteristics of special offender groups. (NACCJSG, p. 198)

This system provided for major divisions by type of crime with slightly more refined categorization within these blocks.

As psychological and sociological theories began to gain acceptance, prisons began to feel the effects of changes within the culture they served. The belief in internal and external determining factors both beyond the inmate's control, any many times even beyond conscious awareness, had considerable impact on societal perceptions of the criminal, his or her motivations, and the consequences of legal guilt. Classification was altered both in terms of the types of distinctions made and the relevant usages which followed from them.

Since primary concerns around security and custody have always been a part of the process, determinations--classifications--of societal risk must be made. The dominance of a management orientation traditionally does this by designating categories by type of offense. A more individualized treatment orientation would seek to determine inmate needs and requirements, assigning

individuals to appropriate programs available within the system resource pool.

The juxtaposition of management and treatment, with their distinctive, and many times conflicting, goals and procedures, form the primary dichotomy which both gives rise to and delimits the correctional continuum. While sharing wide areas of conceptual belief and practical functioning, these orientations, often denoted as management and treatment, most often call for fundamental differences in approach or at least in emphasis.

> As it (the treatment orientation) gained prominence, the stated purpose of classification moved from segregation of various categories of offenders from each other to that of implementing different rehabilitative strategies. (NACCJSG, p. 199)

Diagnosis, classification, and treatment became the relevant responses to conviction, proceedings following an individualized line. Current Massachusetts policy integrates these two perspectives with heavy emphasis on treatment as the dominant theme

Policy Formulation

The creation of social policy entails an integration of fundamental values, establishment of operating principles, and assessment of program outcomes in terms of their adherence to originating values. Attention is further directed toward maximizing changes which allow for the most complementary fit among these values, principles, and outcomes (Rein, 1971).

Clearly defined or not, these values and principles determine which actions are taken and whether, in fact, a coherent and functional process can be decided upon and carried out.

At its center, social policy is "concerned with choice among competing values, and questions of what is morally or culturally desirable can never be excluded from the discussion" (Rein, 1971, p. 298). The beliefs underpinning any comprehensive policy are "seldom mutually reinforcing," with varying degrees of conflict present at a variety of levels. Even the most superficial examination of the Massachusetts correctional system will reveal the dynamic interplay of management and treatment values, goals, and methodologies. The importance of retaining a clear picture of the relative strengths of and relationship between these two orientations at any given time is immediately apparent when it is understood that, "Values intrude in the analysis of policy outcome in at least two important ways--they imply different questions and competing interpretations of the same facts" (Rein, 1971, p. 303). As we consider the influence of management and treatment orientations on present Massachusetts correctional policy and procedure, we must also remember that,

> The clarification of choices and their consequences does not offer, by itself, rules for choosing. The substantive issue in policy analysis is the reconciliation of aims--each desirable, but most also conflicting. (Rein, 1971, p. 304)

Massachusetts Policy

If Massachusetts values both management and rehabilitation, what then are the implications for classification procedures; that is, how can these values be incorporated into the classification system? One important implication is that, ideally, the implementers themselves ought not to be exclusively from one interest group whether it be management or treatment. Some mechanism should be developed so that the concerns of both parties are incorporated in the process.

Another implication for developing a classification procedure which includes both treatment and management goals is that the classification process should not be isolated from the criminal justice network. This is important for two reasons. The first is that, in order to classify effectively, it is essential that a mechanism be provided for feedback in order to determine the accuracy of the classification. To be most effective, this information is needed on every offender who goes through the process. Furthermore, the recommendations which are a result of the classification procedure ought to be available to the persons who decide where the offender will be sent. Ideally, there should be ongoing dialogue between the classifiers and decisionmakers. Assuming that sentencing to a particular type of facility is one of several options, classification, at least initially, should take place in conjunction with the courts.

A second reason why the classification procedure should not be isolated from the system is that classification is designed to be an ongoing, and thus dynamic, process. It should not be limited to a one-time event. Reclassification may be necessary because of inmate change, such as a need for different services or a different security rating. A number of decisions will have to be made at various points for all offenders. Because of this, the location of the classification process needs to be flexible.

As mentioned previously, classification based primarily on management concerns tends to classify by type of offense, and studies show this to be an inaccurate method of determining an offender's dangerousness (Warren, 1971). Classification based on offender needs also has inadequacies. In order to combat these difficulties, it appears that, first, classification and recommendation for action should be explicit for both management and treatment goals. Also, the classification procedure ought to be based on variables that have been validated, are known to be reliable, and have been measured for that individual relative to some standard. In other words, the variables should not be arbitrary or subjective. Third, community needs should be represented, particularly if the classification process begins in the courtroom. Sometimes the community is primarily concerned with custody but at other times rehabilitation is more important. Since "the community" is regularly invoked by both management

and treatment proponents, it certainly is appropriate that this community have a voice in how it is being protected and how its members are being rehabilitated.

In order to determine how effective these procedures are, it is necessary to be able to measure the extent to which both management and treatment goals are accomplished. This assessment ability would allow for early detection and correction of an inappropriate classification. It would be important to determine whether such a classification was unsuccessful due to faulty procedure or because the program recommended for the person had not been carried out. Most important, however, is that the model, in terms of measuring effectiveness, be capable of clearly distinguishing groups both in terms of management and treatment goals. That is, both must be specific. However, the system should not be too elaborate. If there are too many variables (and thus the amount of feedback is overwhelming), the procedure may be more confusing than helpful. Usually the best model, in terms of measuring effectiveness, is that which is most parsimonious, employing a few pragmatic variables.

Warren (1971) agrees that the fit between the person and management goals and the person and treatment goals is an essential part of an effective classification system. In addition, she believes that there are two other equally important parts to a meaningful categorization of offenders. These are the development of "explanatory theory with the resulting aid

to prediction which follows from understanding (and) greater precision for maximally effective research" (Warren, 1971, p. 240). Carney (1969) also supports the need for research in developing a workable classification system, noting that,

> As yet, little empirical evidence exists on the relative effectiveness of the various treatment programs or, more importantly, on the types of inmates who tend to benefit most (and least) from the different programs. (Carney, 1969, p. 114)

Obviously, the three are all interrelated: Better research leads to better explanatory theory, which results in better prediction, and thus leads to more accurate classification with respect to both management and treatment decisions. Basically, a good classification system should lead to differential programming.

Types of Classification Systems

Warren (1971) has organized the different classification systems that have developed over the years according to the systems' similarities. Thus, they are not grouped in conjunction with management or treatment purpose. The first of the groupings is the "prior probability approach" as represented by the California Department of Corrections study (Warren, 1971). One of the major factors considered in this study and others of this type was the offender's risk of parole violation. This approach is a type of classification system which is particularly useful for management purposes. A second group is the reference group typologies represented by Schrag (1961), among others. In

Schrag's study, a criminal typology was developed along the lines of pro-social, anti-social, pseudo-social, and asocial criminal types, and interrelationships were found in the groups among categories of crime, career variables, normative orientations, self-conceptions, and patterns of social participation. The third group of classification systems is that of behavior classifications as represented, for example, by the work of Roebuck and Cadwalladar (1961). In this study, a typology was developed according to specific crimes, types of crime, and criminals. The "Negro armed robber" was considered as an offender type, and similarities were found in terms of families and relationships in these families, neighborhoods that the criminals were raised in, juvenile delinquency, and prior arrest behavior. The authors found that their empirical data demonstrated that the armed robber differs in kind and degree from other criminal types in terms of social and psychological background factors. Reckless (1955) also argues that there is a need to identify specific etiological factors in criminology. He describes the historical attempts to do this, such as Sheldon's body types and Franz Alexander's psychoanalytic classification of offenders.

This leads to the fourth grouping, the psychiatrically oriented approaches, represented, for example, by Jenkins and Hewitt (1944). The authors of this article delineated three major types of personality structure encountered in child

psychiatry: Type I--very inhibited, Type II--uninhibited, unsocialized, and aggressive, and Type III--"more normal." The authors then related personality structure to culture. Erikson, in Childhood and Society (1950), makes similar connections between personality development and culture. The fifth category of classification schemes extends these considerations to social perception and interaction classifications as represented by Peterson et al. (1959), Gibbons (1965), and Gough and Peterson (1952). Peterson et al., conducted a factor analysis of two questionnaire scales of demonstrated effectiveness in differentiating delinquents from non-delinquents. Three personality dimensions (psychopathic, impulsive anti-social, and sense of incompetence and inadequacy) emerged as did two background factors, one related to family dissension and the other, although much less clearly, to a history of school difficulties. Similarly, Gibbons (1965) was concerned with background or situational factors, but he also looked at what he termed role behavior. This included a number of factors: offense behavior, interactional setting, self-image, and attitudes. Gough and Peterson (1952) sought to identify and measure pre-dispositional factors in crime and delinquency. A pre-tested questionnaire differentiated between control subjects (behavior problems, reformatory inmates) and delinquent youth. Delinquents' scores were significantly higher in four distinct areas, relating to

role-taking deficiencies, resentment vs. family and feelings of victimization and exploitation, feelings of despondency and alienation, and poor scholastic achievement.

The sixth grouping, empirical-statistical typologies, is somewhat different in that it combines several of the dimensions listed above; as a result it has been termed a more "eclectic" approach. The Gluecks (1965) appear to be moving in this direction, away from their earlier (1959) orientation of prior probability. Hurwitz (1965) has done a multi-variate analysis of delinquent types, integrating several conceptual levels--socio-environmental, intra-familial, interpersonal, and intrapsychic. The study suggests that each of the broad approaches to explanation (psychogenic and sociogenic) pertains to particular types of delinquents rather than to delinquency in general.

Warren's own scheme is representative of her seventh and last grouping of classification procedures--the cross-classification approach--in which sociological and psychological situational variables are linked theoretically. A conference on typologies held under the auspices of the National Institute of Mental Health in 1966 found six bands which cut across the various classification systems. These bands delineated the following major types of offenders: asocial, conformist, antisocial manipulator, neurotic, subcultural identifier, and situational (Warren, 1971).

Massachusetts Classification System

The Massachusetts Department of Correction has formulated its value base and operating principles with considerable clarity. It has done so in an attempt to insure both the integration and accomplishment of its goals:

> . . . a consistent frame of reference for the formulation of correctional policies, rules and regulations, and operating procedures; and, a basis for the development of a model correctional system from which will emerge a set of priorities for correctional planning and program development. (Department Order (DO) 1000.1, p. 1)

The protection of society (management), humane care and custody (management and treatment), and "a truly corrective experience" (treatment) comprise the stated value system (DO 1000.1, p. 2). And with this delineation of values comes the working assumption that criminal behavior is symptomatic of individual and cultural pathology. Given this basic premise, the stated goal is:

> . . . to return a man to society with the knowledge and skills necessary to earn an honest living, with a reasonable sense of social responsibility and self-value, and with an increased capacity for self-control, judgement, and realistic optimism. Thus the reintegration of the offender into community life is the primary concern of the Department of Correction. (DO 1000.1, p. 2)

If any question remained as to the relative weights of treatment and management methodologies within the State's policy formulations, further clarification is found in the Department's statement which follows:

> A fundamental tenet of this philosophy is that the needs of the offender take precedence over the needs of the correctional facility; that individual treatment of offenders, rather than mass handling, is the norm. This implies the existence of a comprehensive classification process for diagnosing the needs of each offender, recommending the most appropriate correctional program, and monitoring the extent to which the program is implemented. It also implies the existence of a reasonable range of correctional programs and facilities, and flexibility in correctional practices, so that the differential treatment and control needs of offenders can be met. (DO 1000.1, p. 2)

The classification system employed by the Massachusetts Department of Correction is oriented toward the situation and needs of the individual offender. Essentially, it is a treatment approach based on the medical model (diagnosis, assessment, and treatment) and thus is most like the psychiatrically oriented approach described previously. It is believed that such an individually oriented approach can best carry out the goal of the Department's classification system--to ultimately reintegrate the offender into community life--with its inherent value that individual treatment of offenders rather than mass handling should be the norm.

The idea of having a statewide classification process in Massachusetts developed out of the reform movement which followed the "Cherry Hill Riot" in 1955 at Charlestown's old state prison. The "Chpater 770" law was passed that same year (as a result of the reform movement), and it authorized the creation of a reception center for men sentenced to Walpole or Concord. It also

formalized the treatment approach to corrections and established a social work director and staff within each correctional institution. An initial appropriation of $1,100,000 was made for the reception center, but sufficient funds were not provided by the Legislature until 1972 when "Chapter 777, the Correctional Reform Act was passed. This law was also created in response to general prison unrest (most notably, the "Attica Riot" in New York in 1971). Chapter 777 provided the necessary operating funds, and, although the original plan called for one, statewide reception and diagnostic center to be located at Boston State Hospital, ultimately two centers were created: one located inside the walls at M.C.I. Norfolk (known as the "RDC") and the other at M.C.I. Concord (the Northeast RDC and also known as the "New Line"). The centers officially opened in 1974.

Terrance Holbrook, former superintendent of Norfolk's RDC, described the classification process generally as "bringing a man in and getting to know him; via collecting the man's records and putting together a "psycho-social-economic history." The Department of Corrections' Order 4400.1, "The Classification Process and Organization of Classification," states it more specifically in the following terms:

> The classification process shall identify the needs of the resident, assess the existing services within the department and the availability of these in terms of programs for the resident. An overall plan of classification brings together the following aspects of the individual program:
>
> --individual guidance, orientation, diagnosis and placement;

--areas of treatment include, but are not limited to, social service, recreation, vocational and academic education, religion, medical care, psychiatric and counseling services and pre-release planning;
--custodial supervision includes housing, custodial levels, and other aspects of institutional life;
--work detail or placement includes institutional maintenance, correctional industries, and vocational-educational release programs. Assignment to activities consistent with the diagnostic evaluation is emphasized; . . .

The current state of affairs in correctional policy retains a number of difficulties requiring attention. Some pertain to the Massachusetts correctional system more than others. In general, these may be stated as the needs for (1) an efficient, reliable classification system, (2) developed to provide for a typological system capable of effective integration and generation of knowledge, (3) with the use of a research component, thus allowing for (4) maximum impact of the limited manpower available.

In addressing the first point, the Massachusetts correctional system has clearly enumerated the goals which its classification system is designed to meet. To function satisfactorily it must assess risk, facilitate efficient management, diagnose causative factors, and provide appropriate treatment (D.O. 4400.1, p. 6). These are relatively comprehensive goals, speaking to both management and treatment concerns in keeping with its value base and philosophical statement of purpose. The achievement of such a comprehensive set of goals is obviously a significant challenge to those responsible for implementing the classification process.

Concerns for the provision of integrated knowledge and the generation of new data from this essential base are approached on two levels. First, the problem is conceptualized within a more inclusive, systems-treatment framework, criminal behavior being defined as "a symptom not only of the failure or pathology of the individual offender, but also of the failure or disorganization of the social institutions of the community" (DO 1000.1, p. 2). This statement reflects the Department's efforts to avoid a narrow fragmented approach. "Any classification system must consider influences and input from the entire justice system and not just a single component such as corrections" (NACCJSG, p. 201).

There is some disagreement as to the effectiveness and adequate implementation of current treatment practices. "This attempt to incorporate casework theory into penal institutions has been warped . . . by a failure to absorb two of the most basic tenets of social work, voluntarism and self determination" (NACCJSG, p. 19 Classification policy clearly addresses these concerns, attempting optimal inmate motivation while retaining safeguards necessary for effective management of the institutions themselves. "Written policy and procedure grant inmates the choice to refuse to participate in institutional programs, except work assignments." Furthermore, "inmates should not be penalized for refusing to participate in the institution's total rehabilitation program" (ACA Standards,77',p.73). At the same time, "the classification system provides for maximum involvement of the individual in

determining the nature and direction of his own goals, and mechanisms for appealing administrative decisions affecting him . . ." (D.O. 4400.1, p. 6). There is a simultaneous examination of extra-institutional factors pertinent to effective treatment. "The institution supports the development of pre-institutional assessment efforts that incorporate information on the inmate's progress outside of the institution" (ACA Standards, 1977, p. 73).

Research as a method of furthering the integration of goals and procedures is also recognized and clearly referred to: "The system should be sufficiently objective and quantifiable to facilitate research, demonstration, intra-system comparisons, and administrative decision-making" (D.O. 4400.1, p. 6). The employment of uniform standards is seen as essential to this process. It is also in this area that our efforts have most bearing.

The belief that these proceedings should make for increased system impact is certainly the basic motivation for this complex host of activities. The importance of stimulating and supporting responsible autonomy through the effective use of institutional climate and staff attitudes and expertise, as well as system research, evaluation, and planning, are clearly recognized.

Current data on the results of this costly endeavor show high recidivism rates which are touted as clear evidence of the failure of the treatment approach. A more informed look reveals the operation of a complex and well structured philosophical framework, setting out well articulated goals and procedures, clearly

recognizing both management and treatment goals. Difficulties seem to arise when these philosophical tenets, avowedly emphasizing treatment goals as preeminent concerns, seek to carry these treatment values to fruition through processes which are dominated by management concerns. Just as any other institution takes on a life of its own, daily management considerations require adaptations which may not always give precedence to the needs of the offender over those of the correctional institution.

> The dichotomy between means and ends is often artificial. Typically, we assume that an assessment of means is neutral and that the ideological debate centers only on social objectives. Reality is more complex. Institutional arrangements themselves imply ideological meaning. (Rein, 1971, p. 301)

Therefore, we have examined the functioning of the Massachusetts correctional system with particular attention to the classification process. We chose to consider certain salient characteristics of the population, the subsequent placements of these inmates, and the success or failure of placement outcomes as determined by a primarily management criterion of acceptable performance within the assigned security rating.

> The study of policy can be most insightful when it examines afresh the critical assumptions on which action proceeds. One such assumption is the context within which the analysis is framed, including definitions of and choices between constraints and options, which are typically governed by belief or opportunity or both. (Rein, 1971, p. 309)

A thorough analysis of Massachusetts correctional policy is beyond both the focus and scope of this paper. Some preliminary examination was required in order to provide some sense of its structure

and function. The focus of this undertaking is on the reception and diagnostic process for those men sentenced to Walpole and Concord in 1976. Attention was on who was classified, where they were assigned, and whether these placements were successful when re-examined after a six-month period. Successful placement was defined as continued presence at the facility assigned after classification, transfer to lower custody, or parole. These factors were selected to provide feedback on the success rate of staff assignments as well as further information on the ways in which these assignments took shape. It is hoped that the information generated will assist both in increasing the proportion of successful placements and refining the precision of indicators and processes employed in making these classification decisions.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGY

The methodology section is composed of three general sections. The first of these sections describes the initial phase of establishing the research design. As this is an exploratory study, the initial phase of identifying research issues and determining the availability of data on the classification process of the state correctional system was an involved process. The second section describes the approach used in designing the data collection, including the use of existing computer information, the manual collection of data, and operational definitions. The third section describes the approach used in the analysis of data.

Exploratory Phase

Prior to the formulation of a research design for this study, meetings were held with key personnel in the classification departments of the Massachusetts Correctional System. The group initially met with Richard Grelotti, Supervisor of Classification for the Massachusetts Department of Correction and Area Directors of Classification, Sharon Smith and Dale Musgrave. The focus of this meeting was to review the classification process utilized by Massachusetts and to identify possible research issues. As a follow-up to this meeting, two

separate site visits were made to the Reception and Diagnostic Center at M.C.I. Norfolk (R.D.C.) and the Northeastern Reception Diagnostic Center at M.C.I. Concord (N.R.D.C.). During these site visits, meetings were held with Terry Holbrook, Superintendent of the R.D.C., Allen Nathan, Director of Treatment at the R.D.C., and Barbara Young, Superintendent of the N.R.D.C.

During this phase, the group also reviewed the Department of Corrections' Classification Directives. In addition, the group reviewed the literature on classification. As a result of these meetings, the review of the classification directives, and the review of the literature, there were several concerns that were identified in relation to the treatment and management aspects of the Massachusetts classification process. First, there has been very little follow-up and feedback with respect to the outcome of the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. recommendations. Second, there is no systematic way of knowing whether or not the program recommendations of the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. staffs are being implemented at the receiving facilities. Third, there is a need to develop a profile of successes and failures of inmates assigned security ratings of maximum, medium, and minimum. Fourth, there is no data on the outcome of the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. decisions to place inmates directly in minimum security facilities and community based pre-release centers.

Subsequent to the identification of these issues, the

following research questions were developed:

1.) What are the background characteristics, demographic variables and offense histories of those men who go through the formal R.D.C./N.R.D.C. process versus those men who do not go through this process?

2.) What is the breakdown of R.D.C./N.R.D.C. placements in terms of maximum, medium, and minimum security facilities?

3.) What is the relationship between background characteristics, demographic variables and offense histories and security rated placements?

4.) What are the needs of incoming inmates as diagnosed by the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. staffs?

5.) What are the actions or programs recommended by the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. staffs and what is the relationship between the diagnosed needs and the recommended action or program?

6.) To what extent are the recommended actions and programs implemented once an inmate is placed in a correctional facility?

7.) How successful are the placements made by the R.D.C./N.R.D.C.?

8.) What are the characteristics that distinguish between successful and non-successful placements in minimum security facilities?

Pre-Test

The preliminary step of the data collection process involved

implementing a pre-test to determine the consistency and accuracy of classification information stored within central office inmate folders. Twenty folders were randomly selected out of the total population for the study. A code sheet (see Appendix F) was developed to collect information on those inmates selected. Four areas to be investigated were identified: the needs identified by the classification staffs for individuals going through the classification process; the program recommendations that were made in relation to these identified needs; the actual program involvement resulting from the recommended action; and, the relationships between identified needs, program recommendations, and actual progam involvement with success or non-success in initial placements. After a thorough review of the selected folders, it was determined that although there was fairly consistent data concerning the presence of need(s) and recommended action by the classification staffs, there was an absence of consistent data concerning program involvement. Thus, it was concluded that the data collection process required to examine the interrelationship of diagnosed need(s), recommended action, and actual program involvement would be difficult and well beyond the time contingencies allowed for in this study.

Final Research Questions

As a result of the findings identified by the pre-test, the following research questions were formulated for study.

1.) What are the characteristics of those men who go through the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. process versus those who do not go through the process?

2.) How does not going through the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. process impact upon the subsequent placement of an inmate after six months?

3.) What is the breakdown of the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. placements in terms of maximum, medium, and minimum security facilities?

4.) What is the relationship between background characteristics, demographic variables, and offense histories, with security rated placements?

5.) How successful are the placements made by the R.D.C/N.R.D. staffs?

6.) What are the characteristics that distinguish between successful and non-successful placements in minimum security placements?

Operational Definitions

The following operational definitions are only applicable to one specific aspect of the study, i.e., the component concerned with the outcome of the placements made by the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. staffs. As this focus on the outcome of placements specifically relates to minimum security placements, these operational definitions are consistent with this focus. (A maximum security placement from R.D.C./N.R.D.C. can not be a non-successful placement in the context of these definitions.) In addition,

the men who were included in the comparison of successful versus non-successful placements were limited to those who were formally classified at either the R.D.C. or the N.R.D.C.

Successful Placement - A successful placement from the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. is defined as any individual that either remained placed in a facility with the same security rating as the initial placement, moved to a facility with a lower security rating than that of the initial placement, or was paroled six months after the initial placement from the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. was made.

Non-successful Placement - A non-successful placement from the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. is defined as any individual in the sample who was returned to a higher security rated facility than the initial placement facility six months after the initial placement from the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. was made.

Sample

The total sample of the study consists of the 1199 men committed directly to MCI-Walpole and MCI-Concord between January 1, 1976 and January 1, 1977. Thus, the sample for the comparison of successful versus non-successful minimum security placements by the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. staffs was the 38 men committed to MCI-Walpole and the 193 men committed to MCI-Concord during this one year time period. This sample of men consists of those who are new commitments to the Massachusetts correctional

system and does not include those who had been previously committed to the system and were returned to it as a result of violation of parole. It also excludes those individuals who received a 'From and After' sentence and a 'Forthwith' sentence because these individuals were already in the prison system and were therefore not referred to the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. There are also a number of men in the sample who were classified in 1977 but who were committed to the prison system in 1976.

A complication was discovered in the data collection process with respect to the sample. A review of the RDC and NRDC records indicated that not all of the men who were committed to MCI-Walpole and MCI-Concord went through the classification process at either R.D.C. or N.R.D.C. It is likely that many individuals in this group were classified informally at the facilities. This group is treated as a separate sub-sample in the study. Since there is no definitive information pertaining to the initial placement of these men, the impact of not going through the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. process will be examined by identification of placement six months after commitment to either MCI-Walpole or MCI-Concord.

why?

Data Collection

Data Base - The goal of the data collection phase of this research study is the creation of a computerized data base which contained information indicating those men formally classified

at either the R.D.C. or the N.R.D.C. and those men not classified at either of these facilities. In addition, the data base contains the initial placements after classification for those men classified, the dates of these placements, and the subsequent placements of these men six months after classification. For those men not classified at the R.D.C./N.R.D.C., the data base indicates the commitment dates of these men and their subsequent placements six months after commitment. This information can then be cross-tabulated with an already existing data file containing background characteristics, demographic variables, and offense histories (see Appendix) for the men in the sample in order to answer the research questions outlined earlier.

Since much of the information needed for the creation of the above data base was already stored on an existing computer file, the data collection process attempts to maximize the utilization of existing computer information. Nevertheless, the procedure used for data collection consists of both an automated and manual collection process.

Automated Data Collection for Walpole Commitments - The Department of Correction already had created a computer file for men committed to MCI-Walpole or MCI-Concord, indicating the location and dates of transfer of these men to and from the various facilities operated by the Department. For those men committed to MCI-Walpole, the existing file indicated the dates of their commitment to MCI-Walpole, the dates of their transfer

to the R.D.C. for classification, and the dates and locations of all subsequent transfers after they left the R.D.C. Information indicating those men classified at the R.D.C. and those men not classified at the R.D.C., the initial placements of those men classified at the R.D.C. and the dates of these placements, and subsequent placements six months after classification, were transferred by the computer to the new data file. For those men not classified at the R.D.C., their commitment dates and placement dates six months later were also transferred on to the new computer file.

The existing computer file contained much of this same information for men committed to MCI-Concord except that the file did not identify those men classified at the N.R.D.C., nor did it distinguish between men residing in MCI-Concord and those placed in the MCI-Concord Farm Dorm or the Gralton Hall Pre-Release Center. This latter fact is considered significant since MCI-Concord is rated as a maximum security facility while the Farm Dorm and Gralton Hall both have minimum security ratings. As a result of these discrepancies, the data needed to complete the computer file used in this study was generated by having the computer transfer the required information from the existing computer file on MCI-Concord commitments to the new file, in addition to adding the information missing for MCI-Concord commitments to this new file by a manual data collection process.

Manual and Automated Data Collection for Concord Commitments - The first step in the manual data collection process consisted of locating the men committed to MCI-Concord who were classified at the N.R.D.C. This procedure involved recording the initial placement recommendations of the N.R.D.C. staff which had been approved by the Commissioner of Corrections. For those men without approved placement recommendations from the N.R.D.C. staff, the assumption was that they were not classified at the N.R.D.C. In these cases a check was made to determine whether or not they had been transferred to the R.D.C. for initial classification.

Once the men classified at the N.R.D.C. were identified, those men initially placed or subsequently residing at the Farm Dorm or Gralton Hall needed to be determined. This information was obtained by reviewing the daily 'Change of Status Sheets' published at MCI-Concord between January 1, 1976 and June 30, 1977. These sheets noted all transfers of men to MCI-Concord and the Farm Dorm or Gralton Hall, and any subsequent returns to MCI-Concord. The location and dates of transfer to either the Farm Dorm or Gralton Hall and any returns to MCI-Concord were noted for each man in the sample whose name appeared on the 'Change of Status Sheets'.

In addition to collecting this manual data for MCI-Concord commitments, data needed to be updated for those men classified at the R.D.C. who were initially placed at MCI-Concord. Information was also updated for those men committed to MCI-Walpole

who were transferred to the N.R.D.C. for classification. The men classified at the R.D.C. and initially placed at MCI-Concord were identified and then cross-checked with available information on transfers to the Farm Dorm and Gralton Hall in order to determine whether their initial placement or placement after six months was actually at one of these two minimum security facilities.

After updating the information for MCI-Concord commitments, the information was coded, punched on to computer cards, and read into the computer. For those men classified at the N.R.D.C., the computer cards indicated the initial placement, the date of their placement, their subsequent placement after six months, and the fact that they were classified at the N.R.D.C. For those men classified at the R.D.C., and initially placed at MCI-Concord, computer cards were punched only for those men who, in reality, were placed initially in the Farm Dorm or Gralton Hall, or were residing at either of these two facilities six months after being placed at MCI-Concord. These cards contained the same information as the other computer cards, except that they indicated that the men were classified at the R.D.C. rather than the N.R.D.C.

The names of men not classified at the N.R.D.C. were transferred directly to the data base used in this study from the existing computer file already noted during the discussion of MCI-Walpole commitments. The information transferred consisted of the commitment dates of these men and their subsequent place-

ment after six months.

Summary of the Data Base Information - The end results of this data collection process were a computerized data file indicating those men who were and were not classified at either the R.D.C. or the N.R.D.C., the initial placements of those men classified, the dates of these placements, and their placements six months after classification. In addition, the data file also noted the commitment dates of men sentenced to MCI-Walpole and MCI-Concord who were not classified at the R.D.C./N.R.D.C., and the subsequent placements of these men six months after commitment. Information on this new computer file was then cross-tabulated with the existing data on background characteristics, demographic variables, and offense histories, already stored on another computer file.

Data Analysis - The initial step in the data analysis for this study involves tabulating and comparing the men in successful and non-successful placements. A primary concern of this study, as noted earlier, is the percentage of men successfully placed in minimum security facilities by the R.D.C./N.R.D.C. staffs. Once the percentages of men in successful and non-successful placements are determined, a series of cross-tabulations will be made with existing data on background characteristics, demographic variables, and offense histories. For the purpose of these comparisons, the dependent variable will be successful

or non-successful placement and the independent variable will be the background characteristics, demographic variables, and offense histories of the men in these two groups. Comparing the men in these two groups according to these variables will possibly offer some reasons why the men in non-successful placement were returned to facilities with higher security ratings.

Another phase of the data analysis consists of determining the percentages of men in the sample not classified at either the R.D.C. and N.R.D.C., and their placements six months after commitments to MCI-Walpole or MCI-Concord. This group will then be compared to those men in the sample who were classified at the R.D.C. or N.R.D.C. Again, these groups will be compared according to their background characteristics, demographic variables, and offense histories by a series of cross-tabulations. In this instance, the background characteristics, demographic variables, and offense histories will serve as the independent variable, while classification and non-classification will represent the dependent variable. It is the intent of these comparisons to gain some perspective as to the reason(s) why some men are classified at either the R.D.C. or the N.R.D.C. and others are not classified at either of these facilities.

The final phase of the data analysis will consist of a series of cross-tabulations comparing the background characteristics, demographic variables, and offense histories of all

men in the sample initially assigned to maximum, medium, and minimum security facilities. As with the other comparisons, the independent variable will be background characteristics, demographic variables, and offense histories, while the dependent variable will be security rating. This analysis should provide some insights into the types of factors that are considered important in making the initial assignment to maximum, medium, or minimum security facilities.

CHAPTER THREE

FINDINGS

FINDINGS

The chapter of findings is divided into four sections. In the first section the flow of individuals into the correctional system and through the reception and diagnostic process was examined. This analysis indicated that for some individuals there was no record that they went through the formal reception and diagnostic process at one of the RDC's. Therefore, the second section was concerned with a comparison of those classified vs. those not classified through the formal process.

In the third section the relationship between background characteristics, criminal histories, and the security level of the initial placement from the RDC's was studied. Finally, in the fourth section, the success rates for those placed in minimum security facilities were examined, and an attempt was made to spotlight the characteristics of those who were likely to be successful placements in minimum security facilities, as well as the characteristics of those who were not likely to be successful placements.

Flow of Individuals Through the Correctional System

Table 1 in Appendix A presents the relationship between commiting institution and facility of initial classification. The vast majority of Walpole commitments (75%) were classified at the RDC at Norfolk. The overwhelming percentage of Concord commitments were classified at the RDC at Concord (72%).

Inmates who were neither classified at the RDC nor NRDC (17%) were more likely to have been sentenced to Walpole rather than to Concord.

Table 2 in Appendix A presents the relationship between facility of initial classification and security level of initial placement. Those classified at the RDC were more likely to be given medium security placements (i.e., Norfolk). Inmates classified at the NRDC facility were more apt to receive a maximum or minimum security facility. One reason for this outcome regarding maximum security placements for NRDC cases was that Concord was defined as maximum security in this study.

Fifty-five percent of the RDC classification had medium security initial placements, compared to 6% of the NRDC classifications. Sixteen percent of the RDC initial placements and 34% of the NRDC initial placements were to minimum security facilities.

All persons who were not classified at the RDC or the NRDC were considered to have maximum security initial placements.

Table 3 concerns itself with the relationship between facility of initial classification and security level of the placement after six months. There is much greater movement through the correctional system after being classified at the NRDC than the RDC. Sixty-one percent of the inmates classified at the NRDC had a minimum security placement or had been paroled

six months after classification. It should be noted that 34% of the NRDC classification had an initial minimum security placement. Seventy-nine percent of the RDC classifications had a maximum or medium security placement after six months. This compares with 73% of those people initially being placed in maximum or medium security placements.

It is noteworthy that fewer than one-third of those initially classified at the RDC or NRDC were still in maximum security after six months, while slightly over half of the non-classified individuals were still in maximum security after six months. However, it should be noted that 49% of those not classified at either the RDC or the NRDC had moved out of maximum security within six months.

Table 4 concerns itself with the relationship between initial placement and placement after six months: total sample. The greatest movement from the initial placement occurred from maximum security facilities. Forty-two percent of those initially placed in maximum security placements were transferred to a lesser security facility. There was little movement from medium security initial placements. Eighty-three percent of those inmates initially classified medium security placements were still there six months later. There was also little movement out of the minimum security initial placements. Sixty-eight percent of those initially placed in a minimum security

placement were there six months later. Fourteen percent of those initially placed in a minimum security facility moved to a more secure placement, and 18% were paroled.

Table 5 shows the relationship between initial placement and placement after six months for those classified at RDC. Those initially placed in maximum or medium security facilities from the RDC were still likely to be in their initial placements six months later. Eighty-five percent of maximum security and 83% of medium initial placements were still there six months later. Those initially placed in minimum facilities from the RDC had the greatest movement. Fifty-seven percent of the inmates originally placed in minimum security placements from the RDC were still there. Twenty-two percent of those minimum security initial placements were paroled and 20% were returned to a more secure facility.

Table 6 shows the relationship between initial placement and placement after six months for those classified as NRDC. Overall from the NRDC, those initially placed in maximum security facilities had the greatest movement. Only 47% of those initially placed in maximum security facilities were still there six months later. The vast majority (95%) of the movement from those maximum security placements were to minimum security facilities. Medium security initial placements from the NRDC show the least movement through the system. 89% of the medium

security placements initially classified at the NRDC were still there after six months. There was little movement out of minimum security initial placements from the NRDC. 75% initially classified to minimum security facilities were still there after six months. 16% of those initial minimum security placements received their paroles while 9% went to a more secure correctional facility.

Table 7 shows the relationship between initial placement and placement after six months for those not formally classified at the RDC or NRDC. Of those given Walpole commitments, there was less movement from maximum security facilities. Sixty-two percent of the inmates initially sentenced to Walpole were still there six months later. Inmates initially sentenced to maximum security at Concord showed greater movement. Seventy-nine percent of the Concord maximum security commitments had moved to a less secure facility after six months.

Table 8 provides data on the length of time between commitment to the Department of Correction and the initial placement subsequent to classification in the RDC or NRDC. This table shows that a majority of RDC cases (65%) were classified and placed in a correctional facility within twelve weeks of their commitment to the Department of Correction. The median time between commitment and this initial placement was 9.5 weeks for RDC cases.

Table 8 also indicates that one-third of the NRDC cases were classified and placed in a correctional facility within twelve weeks of their commitment to the Department of Correction. The median time between commitment and this initial placement was 13.4 weeks for NRDC cases.

Overall, about half the total RDC and NRDC cases were classified and placed within twelve weeks of their commitment. The median length of time between commitment and initial placement was 10.9 weeks for the total RDC and NRDC cases.

Comparison of Classified vs. Non-Classified Individuals

RDC Cases vs. Non-Classified Walpole Commitments. As a sizeable number (17%) of the men in the sample apparently weren't classified at either the RDC or the NRDC, the background characteristics of these men were compared with the background characteristics of those who were classified at the RDC or NRDC. The comparisons were made separately for RDC cases vs. Walpole commitments not classified and NRDC cases vs. Concord commitments not classified. Only those background characteristics on which statistically significant differences were found between the groups are discussed here. The tables in Appendix B show the significant differences found between those classified at RDC and Walpole commitments classified at neither facility, along with the significant differences found between those cases

classified at NRDC and Concord Commitments classified at neither facility. The tables in Appendix C provide comparisons of classified vs. non-classified individuals on all variables included in the study.

Table I-1 in Appendix B shows the comparison of the number of prior arrests for RDC cases vs. non-classified Walpole commitments. Those individuals with 12 or more prior arrests were much more likely to be non-classified than to be classified at the RDC (66% vs. 46%). Those cases with 11 or fewer prior arrests were more likely to be classified at the RDC than to be non-classified (53% vs. 34%). Table I-2 compares the number of prior charges for property offenses for those who were classified at the RDC vs. those who were non-classified. Individuals who had been charged with property offenses six or more times were more likely to be non-classified than to be classified at the RDC (60% vs. 44%). Those cases with five or fewer prior charges for property offenses were more likely to be classified at the RDC than to be non-classified.

Table I-3 shows the comparison between the number of prior charges for narcotic offenses for those who were classified at the RDC vs. those not classified. Individuals with no prior charges for narcotic offenses were more likely to be classified at the RDC than to be non-classified (59% vs. 47%). Those cases with one or more prior charges for a narcotic offense were more likely to be non-classified than to be classified (53% vs. 41%).

Table I-4 shows the number of prior charges for escape for those classified at the RDC vs. those not classified. Walpole commitments with one or more prior charges for escape were more likely to have been non-classified than to have been classified at the RDC (24% vs. 9%), while those with no prior charges for escape were more likely to have been classified at the RDC (91% vs. 76%).

Table I-5 shows the number of prior juvenile incarcerations for those men classified at the RDC vs. those not classified. Those with one or more prior juvenile incarcerations were less likely to have been classified at RDC than to be non-classified (24% vs. 38%), while those cases with no prior juvenile incarcerations were more likely to have been classified (75% vs. 61%).

Table I-6 shows the age at first arrest for those men classified at the RDC vs. those non-classified. Individuals who were 17 or older at first arrest were more likely to be classified than non-classified (54% vs. 36%), while those individuals who were 16 or younger when first arrested were more likely to be non-classified than classified (62% vs. 45%).

<u>NRDC Cases vs. Non-Classified Concord Commitments</u>. Table II-1 compares the length of maximum sentence of those classified at the NRDC vs. Concord commitments not classified. Those with a maximum sentence of ten or more years were more likely to be classified at NRDC than to be non-classified (45% vs. 12%), while

those with a maximum sentence of 9 years or less were more likely to be non-classified (88% vs. 55%).

Table II-2 shows the comparison of the prior charges for person offenses for those classified at the NRDC vs. non-classified Concord commitments. Those men who had had no prior charges for person offenses were more likely to be classified at NRDC than to be non-classified (11% vs. 2%), while those with one or more prior charge for a person offense were more likely to be non-classified (98% vs. 89%).

Table II-3 shows the comparison of the number of prior incarcerations for NRDC classified cases vs. non-classified cases. Those with no prior incarcerations were less likely to be classified than to be non-classified (57% vs. 69%), while those with one or more prior incarcerations were more likely to have been classified than non-classified (43% vs. 31%).

Table II-4 shows the age of incarceration for NRDC classified cases compared with non-classified cases. Those who were 24 years old or younger were more likely to have been classified than to be non-classified (95% vs. 62%). Those who were 25 years or older when incarcerated were more likely to be non-classified (38% vs. 4%).

Relationship Between Background Variables and Security Level of Initial Placement

The data on the relationship between background variables and security level of initial placement for RDC and NRDC cases

is presented in Appendix C. Of the 567 persons classified at the RDC, 160 (28%) were placed in maximum security, 310 (55%) were placed in medium security, 90 (16%) were placed in minimum security, and 7 (1%) were placed in Houses of Correction.

Of the 421 persons classified at the NRDC, 248 (59%) were placed in maximum security (i.e., primarily inside the wall at Concord), 26 (6%) were placed in medium security, 141 (34%) were placed in minimum security, and 6 (1%) were placed in Houses of Correction.

Table 1 in Appendix C shows the relationship between present offenses and initial placement of RDC cases. It was more likely to find inmates with offenses against the person in maximum security placements compared with other RDC cases placed in maximum security placements (33% vs. 11% of property and drug offenders). It seemed more likely that those with drug offenses (63%) and sex offenses (62%) were initially placed in a medium security placement. Those with drug (26%) and property offenses (28%) had a greater likelihood to be placed in a minimum security facility than person (14%) and sex (11%) offenders.

Table 2 shows the relationship between present offense and initial placement of NRDC cases. Persons who committed sex offenses had the greatest likelihood to be initially placed in a maximum security placement (85%) and were least likely to be placed in minimum security facilities (4%). Persons who

committed drug offenses were more likely to go to minimum security (50%), and least likely to go to maximum security (41%).

Table 3 shows the relationship between those who committed person offenses and initial placement for RDC cases. Persons who committed murder had the greatest likelihood to be sent to a maximum security placement (72%) and the least likelihood to be sent to a medium security placement (28%). This compares with a 25% maximum security placement for all other person offenders and a 57% medium security placement for all other person offenders.

Table 4 shows the relationship between minimum sentence and initial placement of RDC cases. Those with life sentences are most likely to be placed in a maximum security (73%), while those with indefinite sentences were least likely to be placed in maximum security (6%). Those who were given an indefinite sentence had the greatest likelihood to be placed in minimum security (50%), while none of those with a sentence of 10 years or more, including lifers, was placed in minimum security.

Table 5 shows the relationship between maximum length of sentence and initial placement for those who have gone through RDC. Those with life sentences were more likely to be placed in a maximum security facility (73%). Those with maximum sentences of 10 years or less had the greatest chance of going to a minimum security facility (28%).

Table 6 shows the relationship between maximum sentence and initial placement of those classified at the NRDC. The length of sentence was not a significant variable in the initial placement of inmates. The percentages of inmates given 9 years or less vs. 10 years or more in maximum, medium, and minimum security placements do not vary to a significant degree from the initial placements of the total NRDC sample.

Table 7 shows the relationship between race and initial placement of RDC cases. Blacks are more likely than whites to get a maximum security placement (34% vs. 25%), and less likely than whites to get a minimum security placement (8% vs. 20%).

Table 8 shows the relationship between race and the initial placements of those classified at NRDC. Race was less likely to be a significant variable in the initial placement. There was only a difference of between one and three percentage points for whites vs. blacks placed in maximum, medium, or minimum security.

Table 9 shows the relationship between marital status and initial placement of RDC cases. The overall trend indicated that married or divorced, separated, or widowed men were more likely to get a less secure initial placement. Married men (15%) and divorced, separated, or widowed (20%) were less likely to get a maximum security placement in comparison to single men (40%). Married men (25%) and those divorced, separated, or widowed (19%) were more likely to get a minimum security place-

ment than single men.

Table 10 shows the relationship between marital status and initial placement for NRDC cases. Married men (11%) and divorced, separated, or widowed men (20%) were more likely to get a medium security placement. Divorced, separated, or widowed men were, however, less likely to get a minimum security placement in comparison to single or married men.

Table 11 shows the relationship between time on job of longest duration and initial placement for RDC cases. The longer the time on the job the lower the security level of the placement. Those that were on a job less than 12 months were about twice as likely, proportionately, to get a maximum security placement, compared to those on a job for more than 12 months (36% vs. 17%). Those on the job for less than 12 months were less likely to be given a minimum security placement than those on a job for 12 months or more (11% vs. 23%).

Table 12 shows the relationship between time on job of longest duration and initial placement for NRDC cases. The longer the time on job of longest duration the lower the security level of the placement. Those with less than 12 months on a job were more likely to get a maximum security placement compared with those with 12 months or more on a job (64% vs. 47%). Those who had 12 or more months on a job were more likely to receive a minimum security placement than those with less than 12 months on a job (41% vs. 30%).

Table 13 shows the relationship between last grade completed and initial placement for RDC cases. The lower the amount of education the higher the security placement. Those with 9 years or less were more likely to be given a maximum security placement in comparison with those with some college (34% vs. 15%) who were somewhat more likely to be placed in a minimum security placement.

Table 14 concerns itself with the relationship between last grade completed and initial placement for NRDC cases. Those with some college were less likely to be placed in maximum security placements in comparison with those with a ninth grade education or less (47% vs. 63%). Those with some college were also more likely to receive medium security placements and minimum security placements.

Table 15 shows the relationship between prior address and initial placement for RDC cases. Boston residents were on the whole more likely to receive more secure placements. Those who were Boston residents had the greatest likelihood to be sent to a maximum security placement when compared with those whose residence was other than Boston (34% vs. 19%). Those outside of the Boston area were more likely to receive a minimum security placement than those from Boston (22% vs. 12%).

Table 16 shows the relationship between prior address and the security levels of initial placement for those who went through the NRDC. Whether an inmate is from the Boston area or outside of it has little effect on the initial placement

the inmate receives, although there was a slight tendency for Boston residents to be overrepresented among maximum security placements and underrepresented among minimum security placements.

Table 17 shows the relationship between the number of prior arrests and the security levels of initial placement for those who went through the RDC. The number of prior arrests has little effect on the security level of initial placement for those men classified at the RDC.

Table 18 shows the relationship between the number of prior arrests and the security levels of initial placement for those who went through the NRDC. Those inmates with twelve or more prior arrests were more likely to be initially placed in a maximum security facility (66% vs. 55%) and less likely to be housed in a minimum security facility (24% vs. 39%) than those inmates with less than twelve prior arrests.

Table 19 shows the relationship between the number of prior charges for person offenses and security level of initial placement for those inmates who went through the RDC. Those inmates with no prior charges for person offenses were less likely to be placed in a maximum security facility (9%) than those inmates who had more than eight prior charges for person offenses (49%). Those inmates with no prior charges for person offenses were more likely to be placed in a minimum security

(24%) than those with more than eight prior charges for person offenses (6%).

Table 20 shows the relationship between the number of prior charges for person offenses and security level of initial placement for those inmates who went through the NRDC. Those inmates with more than eight prior charges for person offenses were more likely to be placed in a maximum security facility (68% vs. 58%) and less likely to be placed in a minimum security facility (23% vs. 35%) in comparison with those with eight or fewer prior charges for person offenses.

Table 21 shows the relationship between the number of prior charges for sex offenses and the security level of initial placement for those inmates who went through the RDC. Those men with one or more prior charges for sex offenses were less likely to be placed in a minimum security facility (9%) than those men who had no prior charges for sex offenses (18%).

Table 22 shows the relationship between the number of prior charges for sex offenses and the security level of initial placements for those inmates who went through the NRDC. Those men who had one or more prior charges for sex offenses were more likely to be placed in a maximum security facility (80% vs. 55%) and less likely to be placed in a minimum security facility (12% vs. 38%) than the men who had no prior charges for sex offenses.

Table 23 shows the relationship between the number of prior charges for property offense and the security level of initial placements for those inmates who went through the RDC. Those men who had no prior charges for property offense were less likely to be placed in a maximum security facility (22% vs. 31%) and more likely to be placed in a minimum security facility (25% vs. 12%) than the men who had six or more prior charges for property offense.

Table 24 shows the relationship between the number of prior charges for property offense and security level of initial placement for those inmates who went through the NRDC. Those men with six or more prior charges for property offenses were more likely to be placed in a maximum security facility (71% vs. 46%) and less likely to be placed in a minimum security facility (22% vs. 48%) when compared to those with no prior charges for property offenses.

Table 25 shows the relationship between the number of prior charges for narcotics offenses and the security level of initial placement for those inmates who went through the RDC. The number of prior charges for narcotics offenses does not have a significant effect on the security level of initial placement, although those with prior charges for narcotic offenses are somewhat more likely to be placed in medium security facilities.

Table 26 shows the relationship between the number of prior charges for narcotics offense and the security level of initial placement for those inmates who went through the NRDC. The number of prior charges for narcotics offense is not related to the security level of initial placement for NRDC cases.

Table 27 concerns itself with the relationship between the number of prior charges for escape offenses and how a man is classified at the RDC. A man with one or more arrests was about twice as likely to be placed in a maximum security facility (50% vs. 26%). Also, a man with no previous escape charges had a slightly greater chance to go to a minimum security facility (17%) compared to those with one or more escape charges (8% sent to minimum security).

Table 28 concerns itself with the relationship between the number of prior charges for escape offenses and how a man is classified at the NRDC. A man with one or more arrests stood a greater likelihood of being sent to a maximum security facility (71%) than a man with no previous escape charges (58%). Also, a man with no previous escape charges had a better chance of being sent to minimum security (36%) than those with one or more escape charges (15% sent to minimum security).

Table 29 concerns itself with the relationship between the number of prior juvenile incarcerations and how a man is classified at the RDC. A man with one or more juvenile incarcerations was more likely to be sent to maximum security (39%) than

a man with no record of juvenile incarcerations (25%). Also, men with no previous juvenile incarcerations had a greater chance of being sent to minimum security (19%) than those with one or more juvenile incarcerations (7%).

Table 30 concerns itself with the relationship between the number of prior juvenile incarcerations and how a man is classified at the NRDC. A man with one or more juvenile incarcerations is more likely to be placed in maximum security (70%) than those men with no prior juvenile incarcerations (55%). Also, a man with no prior juvenile incarcerations had a better chance of being placed in minimum security (37%) than those men who had one or more juvenile incarcerations (26%).

Table 31 concerns itself with the relationship between the total number of prior incarcerations and how a man is classified at the RDC. There appears to be little relationship between prior incarcerations and being sent to a maximum security facility. Twenty nine per cent with one or more incarcerations were sent to maximum security compared with 27% of those with no prior incarcerations. Fifty nine per cent with one or more prior incarcerations were sent to medium security compared to 48% of those with none. Those with no prior incarcerations had a better chance of being sent to minimum security compared to those with one or more prior incarcerations (23% vs. 11%).

Table 32 concerns itself with the relationship between the total number of prior incarcerations and how a man is

classified at the NRDC. Those with one or more prior incarcerations had a slightly better chance of being sent to maximum security (65%) than those who had no prior incarcerations (54%). Those with no prior incarceration had a slightly better chance to go to minimum security (39%) than those with at least one prior incarceration (28%).

Table 33 concerns itself with the man's age at incarceration and how he is classified at the RDC. Those men 24 or under were much more likely to be placed in maximum security than men older. Fifty per cent of the 24 and under population were placed in maximum security compared to only 17% of the 25 or older group. Men 25 and older had a much better chance of being sent to minimum security than younger men. Twenty two per cent of the men 25 and older were sent by the RDC to a minimum security placement compared to only 5% of the men 24 or younger.

Table 34 concerns itself with the man's age at incarceration and how he is classified at the NRDC. Since there were only 17 men at the NRDC 25 or older, it is difficult to compare this group to the 402 men 24 or younger. Still what stands out is that over half the 25 or older population were sent to medium security while 95% of the 24 and younger population were either sent to a maximum or minimum security facility.

Table 35 concerns itself with the age of the men at the time of their first arrest and how they were classified by the

RDC. Men who had their first arrest at 16 years or younger had a greater chance of being sent to maximum security (38%) than the older first arrested inmates (20%). Those inmates first arrested at 17 or older had a greater chance of being sent to minimum security (21%) than those men who were arrested at a younger age (10%).

Table 36 concerns itself with the age of the men at the time of their first arrest and how they were classified by the NRDC. Men who had their first arrest when they were 16 or younger had a greater chance of being sent to maximum security (67%) than those men who were arrested when they were older (49%). Those men first arrested at 17 or older had a greater chance of being sent to minimum security (41%) than those men who were arrested at a younger age (28%).

Summary of Significant Factors Associated with Initial Placement in Maximum Security and in Minimum Security Facilities. A summary of the statistically significant factors associated with placement by the RDC and the NRDC in maximum security and in minimum security facilities is presented in Appendix D.

Starting with the RDC placements we found those inmates initially placed in maximum security facilities to be significantly overrepresented in the following demographic categories. In terms of offense committed, murder was significantly overrepresented in maximum security placements. The maximum and minimum sentences were more likely to be 10 years or more. Men

placed in maximum security were more likely to be black, single, and 24 years of age or younger. Other factors which were over-represented were residents in the Boston area, a first arrest at age of 16 or younger, an education of 9th grade or less, and a short job duration of one year or less. Finally, in terms of criminal history, maximum security placements were overrepresented on the following factors: 9 or more prior person offenses; one or more prior escapes; and, one or more prior juvenile incarcerations.

Those inmates initially placed in minimum security facilities through the RDC were significantly overrepresented in the following demographic categories. In terms of offense committed, property/drug offenses were significantly overrepresented. Minimum sentences were more likely to be indefinite or nine years or less. Men initially placed in minimum security facilities tended to be 25 years or older, white, married at least once, and from a non-Boston address. They tended to have held a job for one year or more, age at first arrest was more likely to be 17 years or older. Finally, in terms of criminal history, they were more likely to have no prior person offenses, no prior sex offenses, no prior property offenses, and no prior incarcerations, including no juvenile incarcerations.

Thus, in comparing men placed in minimum and maximum security placements from the RDC, there are some key differences. Men given initial minimum security placements tended to be

older, white, married at least once, and had a steady job history. They tended not to be from Boston and were older at the time of their first arrest. They were also apt not to have prior juvenile incarcerations or prior sex offenses or property offenses.

In examining the NRDC placements, the significant factors that affect a man's initial placement being maximum security tended to be overrepresented in the following ways. In terms of offense committed, sex crimes were most likely sent to maximum security. Men sent to a maximum security initial placement tended to be 22 or younger and had a poor job history (less than one year on the job). Concerning criminal history, age at first arrest tended to be 16 years or younger. Other factors in their criminal histories included 12 or more arrests, one or more sex offenses, 6 or more property offenses, and one or more prior juvenile incarcerations.

In examining the NRDC minimum security initial placements, these men tended to be overrepresented in the following ways. They tended to be 23 or older and they tended to have a job history that included one or more years on the job. Significant factors associated with criminal history were that the men tended to be older at first arrest (17 or older). Also, they had 11 or fewer prior arrests. They had no prior sex offenses, prior escapes, juvenile incarcerations or prior incarcerations. They had 5 or fewer property offenses.

Thus, in comparing maximum and minimum security NRDC initial placements, we find significant differences in the following areas. Men sent to minimum security tended to be older and tended to have a steadier job history. They were older at the time of their first arrest and had fewer prior arrests than men sent to maximum security. Men sent to minimum security were likely not to have any prior sex offenses, prior escapes, prior juvenile incarcerations, or total prior incarcerations.

Comparison of Successful vs. Non-Successful Placements in Minimum Security Facilities

An important issue to be addressed in this research was the extent to which the initial classification placements--especially the minimum security placements--were successful. The data comparing the characteristics of successful vs. non-successful minimum security placements is presented in Appendix E.

A successful placement was operationally defined as any individual who remained in a minimum security facility or was paroled six months after the initial placement in minimum security. Conversely, a non-successful placement was operationally defined as any individual who had been returned to a higher security facility six months after the initial placement in minimum security. Using the above operational definitions, the overall success rate for the 231 persons initially placed in minimum

security facilities was 87%.

In the relationship between background variables and success rates for individuals initially placed in minimum security facilities, there were significant differences in success rates on three interrelated factors. The first of these variables were the types of sentence inmates received. The data showed 70% of those men given a Walpole (determinate) sentence were successful, while 90% of those given a Concord (indeterminate) sentence were successful at their initial minimum security placements. The second of these variables concerns the age of the men incarcerated. Those inmates 24 or younger initially placed in a minimum security facility had a 91% success rate. Inmates 25 or older placed in a minimum security facility had only 79% success rate. The third variable concerned the facility of initial classification. Men placed in minimum security facilities initially classified at the NRDC had a 91% success rate. Men initially classified at the RDC and had a minimum security placement had only an 80% success rate.

The success rates of RDC and NRDC placements were then examined with age held constant, in an attempt to determine whether age or facility of initial classification was more important in relation to success rates. This cross-tabulation is presented at the end of Appendix E. The results were inconclusive since the vast majority of the younger individuals were classified at the NRDC, while virtually all of the older individuals were classified at the RDC. However, the data does indicate

that the NRDC is particularly effective in placing younger persons in minimum security placements--especially those between the ages of 20 and 24 (success rate= 96%).

Finally, it is noteworthy that there were no statistically significant differences in success rates on such variables as type of offense, race, marital status, education, and prior criminal record.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

DISCUSSION

In this chapter the major findings of the study will be discussed and an attempt will be made to interpret them. This chapter is divided into four sections which correspond to the four sections presented in the chapter on findings:

(1) flow of individuals through the system;
(2) comparison of classified vs. non-classified individuals;
(3) background variables and initial placement; and,
(4) success rates of minimum security placements.

Flow of Individuals Through the Correctional System

The data in this section indicated that, for 17% of the 1199 individuals sentenced to the DOC in 1976, there was no record that they had been formally classified at the RDC or the NRDC. The majority (72%) were men who had been sentenced to Walpole. It is likely that these men received their initial classification at Walpole rather than at the RDC due to overcrowding and the lack of bed space at the RDC.

For those who were classified at the RDC, diversion from maximum security was apparent. The majority of placements (55%) were to medium security, and a number of placements (16%) were directly to minimum security.

Diversion from maximum security was less apparent at the NRDC, primarily because Concord was defined as a maximum security institution in this study. However, it is noteworthy that a

substantial number of initial placements by the NRDC (34%) were directly to minimum security facilities.

A review of the status of individuals six months after their initial placement indicated that there was substantial movement through the system, especially for NRDC cases. After six months, only 30% of the RDC cases and 31% of the NRDC cases were in maximum security. Further, 20% of the RDC cases and an impressive 61% of the NRDC cases were either in minimum security facilities or had been paroled after six months.

It is also important to note that classification at the RDC or NRDC tends to facilitate movement through the correctional system. Fewer than one-third of those initially classified at the RDC or NRDC were in maximum security after six months, while slightly over half of the non-classified individuals were still in maximum security after six months.

How does classif → movement?

With respect to the time for initial classification, it was found that the time period between commitment to the DOC and initial placement by the RDC/NRDC was somewhat longer than expected. Overall, the median length of time between commitment and initial placement was eleven weeks, with about half the cases classified and placed within twelve months of their commitment.

Movement was faster at the RDC where the median time between commitment and initial placement was 9.5 weeks, compared to 13.4 weeks for the NRDC cases. About two-thirds of the RDC

cases and one-third of the NRDC cases were classified and placed within twelve weeks of their commitment.

Comparison of Classified vs. Non-Classified Individuals

Comparisons of background characteristics for those who were classified and those who were not classified were made separately for RDC cases vs. non-classified Walpole commitments and NRDC cases vs. non-classified Concord commitments. Of the six significantly different background characteristics of the RDC classified and non-classified individuals, the prior offense record was found to be the key difference. Those with more prior arrests on charges for property, narcotic, or escape offenses, as well as those who were first arrested at a younger age, were less likely to be classified at the RDC and were more likely to be non-classified. The data clearly indicated a trend in which individuals were less likely to be classified at the RDC if they had had a history of prior charges for these offenses.

The comparison of the background characteristics of individuals classified at the NRDC vs. those not classified did not yield trends as clearly interpretable. The two highly significant variables ($p < .001$) were the length of maximum sentence and the age at incarceration. Individuals with a shorter maximum sentence were more likely to be non-classified than to have been classified at the NRDC. Since the median length of time between commitment and initial placement from the NRDC is 13.4 weeks, it is possible that individuals with a shorter

maximum sentence would not benefit from the classification process because of earlier parole eligibility. Table 3 (Appendix A) indicates that, proportionately, twice as many non-classified men were paroled after six months in comparison to classified men.

The other highly significant variable was age at incarceration. Younger individuals were much more likely to be classified at the NRDC than older men. Since the NRDC serves primarily a younger population some differences would be expected. It is possible that older men committed to Concord were transferred to Norfolk without being classified at the NRDC.

Background Variables and Initial Placement

A number of factors was found to be significantly associated with initial placement in maximum security and in minimum security by the RDC and the NRDC. For example, individuals with the following characteristics were significantly overrepresented among the RDC maximum security placements--committed for murder, longer sentence, younger, black, single, lower educational level, less stable work history, from Boston, younger at first arrest, with more prior person offenses and escapes, and with prior juvenile incarceration.

On the other hand, individuals with the following characteristics were significantly overrepresented among the RDC minimum security placements--committed for property or drug offenses, shorter sentence, older, white, married, more stable

work history, not from Boston, and with less serious criminal records.

Many of the above differences were not unexpected. However, two variables--race and residence--warrant further study. Blacks and Boston residents were more likely to be placed in maximum security, while whites and non-Boston residents were more likely to be placed in minimum security. The relationship between race and residence and initial placement should be further examined, holding constant such variables as offense and criminal history factors, in order to gain a better understanding of this phenomenon.

Significant factors associated with initial placements were not particularly surprising. Younger men, committed for sex offenses, with less stable work records, and more serious criminal histories were more likely to be placed in maximum security. Older men with more stable work records and less serious criminal histories were more likely to be placed in minimum security.

Success Rates of Minimum Security Placements

Overall, the findings in terms of successful and non-successful placements indicate that both the RDC and NRDC do an effective job in placing men in minimum security facilities. The finding of a combined success rate in minimum security placements of 87% seems to indicate that the staffs at both the RDC and the NRDC carefully screen men prior to recommending

their assignment to a minimum security facility. In addition, it is important to note that such background characteristics as race, type of present offense, marital status, military background, education, number of prior incarcerations, types of prior incarcerations, geographic locale, and age at first arrest do not significantly affect the successful outcome of men placed in minimum security facilities.

Significant differences on success rates were found on three interrelated variables: age, type of sentence (determinate vs. indeterminate), and facility of initial classification. Younger individuals, those with indeterminate sentences, and those initially classified at the NRDC had significantly higher success rates.

An attempt was made to specify through further cross-tabulations whether age or facility of initial classification was more important in relation to success rates. That is, was the NRDC more effective in screening persons for minimum security and, because they dealt with more younger men, age also emerged as a significant factor; or, were younger people more likely to be successful in minimum security in general, and, because more younger men went through the NRDC, facility of initial classification also emerged as a significant factor.

The results were inconclusive since the vast majority of the younger men were classified at the NRDC, while virtually all of the older individuals were classified at the RDC. Thus,

the lack of comparative data precludes the possibility of determining whether age or facility of initial classification is of primary importance in relation to success rates. However, it is clear that the NRDC is particularly effective in placing younger persons in minimum security facilities--especially those between the ages of 20 and 24 (success rate= 96%).

In terms of examining the RDC's significantly lower success rate in placing men in minimum security facilities, not much definitive information is available to formulate conclusions. One possible explanation for the lower success rate of the RDC is that they work primarily with men over 25 and with men who receive determinate sentences--factors which are negatively associated with a man's success in minimum security. As was the case above, the lack of comparative data makes it difficult to determine which factors are of primary importance in relation to success rates.

As a means of examining this issue further, future researchers might want to look more closely than was possible in this study at the influence which age and type of sentence have on the outcome of men placed in minimum security facilities by the RDC and the NRDC. This research would, hopefully, elucidate which factors--age, type of sentence, or classification at the RDC or NRDC--affect the rate of success of men assigned to minimum security facilities by the RDC staff.

In addition to the factors just outlined, there are other issues of importance in terms of success--nonsuccess rates in minimum security facilities which need mentioning. As noted above, the findings of this study demonstrate that men under the age of 24 years have higher rates of success in minimum security facilities than men over 25 years of age. This finding runs counter to the general impression that young offenders are less likely than older offenders to be successful in minimum security placement. Yet, as observed when examining the background characteristics of men initially placed in minimum security facilities, men under the age of 24 are least likely to be assigned to minimum security facilities after completing the classification process. Indeed, men under 24 years are significantly overrepresented in maximum security facilities, as previously noted. One could argue that the higher success rates of younger men in minimum security is a function of the men under 24 years being better screened during classification than men over 25 years of age. Others might observe that minimum security facilities within the Department are better able to work with younger people, justifying the placement of more men under the age of 24 in minimum security facilities. Obviously, further study of this issue is needed; however, the data generated in this study supports the argument that more men under the age of 24 can be transferred to minimum security facilities.

As noted above, type of offense is not significantly

associated with rate of success. However, it is clear that the RDC and the NRDC take type of offense into consideration in making minimum security placements. For those screened and placed in minimum security facilities, type of offense was not significantly associated with success rate. This suggests that the screening process for minimum security placements has been effective with respect to type of offense.

It is also worthy of mention that blacks classified at the RDC are also underrepresented among men initially placed in minimum security facilities. As previously observed, the data in this study indicates that race is not a significant factor in determining success in a minimum security facility. This finding suggests that the RDC staff is justified in placing more blacks than they currently do in minimum security facilities, unless there are other factors influencing the overrepresentation of blacks in maximum security placements, such as type of offense, length of sentence, and seriousness of criminal record.

By way of summarizing this section, there are certain areas for future study which are identified by the findings of this report. Of primary importance, is an examination of the treatment programs offered by the minimum security facilities in the Department in order to determine more specifically than was possible in this study their effectiveness in working with men under the age of 24. Such an examination of minimum security facilities might also offer some insights into the reasons that

men assigned to minimum security facilities by the RDC are less likely to succeed at these placements than men assigned by the staff at the NRDC.

As a means of determining why the NRDC has a significantly higher success rate than the RDC in placing men in minimum security facilities, the data in this study demonstrates the need for further study of the classification processes at both the RDC and NRDC. Particular emphasis of future studies, in addition to the age variables already mentioned, should be on how type of sentence, determinate or indeterminate, affects the outcome of men in minimum security facilities. The comparison of the background characteristics of men with each type of sentence, for example, could be elucidating. A closer examination of the classification process at both the RDC and the NRDC would also offer some perspective as to the reasons the NRDC is apparently so effective in placing men under the age of 24 in minimum security facilities. As mentioned earlier, the findings in this particular part of the study are inconclusive, making it impossible to determine the specific reasons the NRDC is so effective in assigning younger men to minimum security facilities.

A final implication for research indicated by this study pertains to the utilization of minimum security facilities within the Department of Correction. The overall findings of this study suggest that the staffs at both the RDC and the NRDC carefully screen and effectively assign men to minimum security facilities, as seen in the high rates of success of both classi-

fication centers. This finding, in conjunction with previous research (LeClair, 1975; Landolfi, 1976 & 1977) which indicates that men placed in minimum security facilities have lower recidivism rates than men incarcerated in higher security facilities, suggests that it would be feasible and productive for the Department of Correction to increase the number of persons it assigns to minimum security facilities.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The focus of this study was on the reception and diagnostic process of the Department of Correction and on the status of individuals six months after this initial classification process. The sample consisted of the 1199 men sentenced directly to Walpole or to Concord during 1976. The major research questions were:

(1) What are the statistics on the flow of inmates through the reception and diagnostic process, the initial placements by the RDC and NRDC, and the placements after six months?

(2) What are the characteristics of those men who go through the RDC/NRDC process vs. those who do not go through the process?

(3) Does initial classification by the RDC/NRDC make a difference with respect to an individual's movement through the correctional system--i.e., with respect to placement after six months?

(4) What is the breakdown of the RDC/NRDC placements in terms of maximum, medium, and minimum security facilities?

(5) What is the relationship between background characteristics, present offense data, and criminal history and the security level of the initial placement by the RDC/NRDC?

(6) How successful are the minimum security placements of the RDC/NRDC?

(7) What are the characteristics that distinguish between successful and non-successful placements in minimum security facilities?

Flow of Individuals Through the Correctional System

The majority of the 1199 men sentenced directly to the Department of Correction during 1976 (83%) went through the

formal classification process at the RDC or the NRDC. The RDC was effective in diverting men from maximum security inasmuch as 55% of the RDC placements were to medium security facilities and 16% were directly to minimum security facilities. Diversion from maximum security was less apparent at the NRDC primarily because Concord was defined as maximum security in this study. However, it is noteworthy that 34% of the NRDC placements were directly to minimum security facilities.

There was a fairly substantial degree of movement through the correctional system. Six months after the initial placement, only 30% of the RDC cases and 31% of the NRDC cases were in maximum security, and 20% of the RDC cases and 61% of the RDC cases were either in minimum security or had been paroled. Classification at the RDC or NRDC tended to facilitate movement through the correctional system since fewer than a third of those initially classified at the RDC or NRDC were in maximum security after six months, while slightly over half of the non-classified individuals were still in maximum security after six months.

The median length of time between commitment to the DOC and initial placement by the RDC/NRDC was eleven weeks (9.5 weeks for the RDC and 13.4 weeks for the NRDC).

Comparison of Classified vs. Non-Classified Individuals

As 17% of the men in the sample were apparently not classified at either the RDC or the NRDC, the background charac-

teristics of these men were compared with those who were classified. Comparisons were made separately for RDC and NRDC cases. Six background characteristics were found to be significantly different for RDC cases non-classified Walpole commitments. These characteristics are: the number of prior arrests, prior charges for property offenses, prior charges for narcotic offenses, prior charges for escape, number of prior juvenile incarcerations, and age at first arrest. It is clear that the offender's prior arrest record is the dominant factor. Those with a more serious criminal history were less likely to be classified at the RDC. The comparison between NRDC cases and non-classified Concord commitments yielded four significant differences: length of maximum sentence, prior charges for person offenses, number of prior incarcerations, and age at incarceration. The two most significant variables were length of maximum sentence and age at incarceration. Individuals with a shorter maximum sentence were less likely to be classified at the NRDC. In addition, younger men were much more likely to be classified at the NRDC than not.

Background Variables and Initial Placement

For the most part, the significant relationships between background variables and the security level of the initial placement were not unexpected. For example, men with longer sentences and more serious criminal histories were more likely to be placed

in maximum security, while men with shorter sentences and less serious criminal histories were more likely to be placed in minimum security. However, the finding that blacks and Boston residents were overrepresented in RDC maximum security placements was not expected and further study of this phenomenon was recommended.

Success Rates of Minimum Security Placements

A general finding of this study indicates that the the RDC and NRDC do an effective job of screening and placing men in minimum security facilities, as indicated by their 87% success rate. In this instance, success is operationally defined as an offender's remaining in minimum security or being released on parole six months after initial placement in a minimum security facility by the RDC or the NRDC. The overall high rate of success found in this study, in conjunction with the data of other research which indicates that men released from minimum security have lower rates of recidivism than men released from higher security facilities, suggests that it is feasible and productive for the DOC to assign more men to minimum security facilities.

When cross-tabulating the success--nonsuccess rates of men placed in minimum security facilities with their background characteristics, three significant variables were discovered. Men under the age of 24 years had significantly higher rates of success than men over the age of 25; men with indeterminate

sentences were significantly more successful than men with determinate sentences; and, men classified at the NRDC were more likely than men classified at the RDC to have successful outcomes when assigned to minimum security placements. These three factors--age, type of sentence, and facility of initial classification--appear interrelated. An attempt to determine whether age or facility of initial classification was more important in relation to success rates was inconclusive. However, it is clear that the NRDC is particularly effective in placing younger persons in minimum security facilities. The data also indicated that younger men are significantly underrepresented among minimum security placements, yet men under the age of 24 were found to have higher rates of success in minimum security than older men. As a result, the RDC and NRDC are justified in placing more men under the age of 24 in minimum security facilities. In addition, the data suggests that the RDC could increase the number of blacks placed in minimum security facilities, since race is not associated with a man's success in minimum security and blacks are significantly underrepresented among RDC placements in minimum security facilities.

APPENDIX A

TABLES ON THE FLOW OF INDIVIDUALS THROUGH THE CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM

Table 1

Relationship Between Committing Institution and Facility of Initial Classification

Classification Facility	Committing Institution: Walpole N	Walpole (%)	Concord N	Concord (%)	Total N	Total (%)
RDC	465	(75)	104	(18)	569	(48)
NRDC	2	(1)	419	(72)	421	(35)
Neither	151	(24)	58	(10)	209	(17)
Total	618	(100)	581	(100)	1199	(100)

Table 2

Relationship Between Facility of Initial Classification and Security Level of Initial Placement

Initial Placement	Classification Facility: RDC N	RDC (%)	NRDC N	NRDC (%)	Neither N	Neither (%)	Total N	Total (%)
Max.	160	(28)	248	(59)	209	(100)	617	(51)
Med.	310	(55)	26	(6)			336	(28)
Min.	92	(16)	141	(34)			233	(19)
House of Corr.	7	(1)	6	(1)			13	(1)
Total	569	(100)	421	(100)	209	(100)	1199	(100)

Table 3

Relationship Between Facility of Initial Classification and Security Level of Placement after Six Months

Placement after 6 Mos.	RDC Cases N	RDC Cases (%)	NRDC Cases N	NRDC Cases (%)	Neither N	Neither (%)	Total N	Total (%)
Max.	169	(30)	130	(31)	106	(51)	405	(34)
Med.	280	(49)	29	(7)	42	(20)	351	(29)
Min.	77	(14)	232	(55)	20	(10)	329	(27)
Parole	34	(6)	24	(6)	26	(12)	84	(7)
House of Corr.	7	(1)	6	(1)	15	(7)	28	(2)
Total	567	(100)	421	(100)	209	(100)	1197	(100)

Table 4

Relationship Between Initial Placement and Placement after Six Months: Total Sample

Placement after 6 Mos.	Initial Placement: Max. N	Max. (%)	Med. N	Med. (%)	Min. N	Min. (%)	H.C. N	H.C. (%)	Total N	Total (%
Max.	359	(58)	19	(6)	20	(9)	7	(54)	405	(34
Med.	61	(10)	279	(83)	11	(5)	-	-	351	(29
Min.	147	(24)	24	(7)	158	(68)	-	-	329	(27
Parole	32	(5)	10	(3)	42	(18)	-	-	84	(7
H.C.	17	(3)	4	(1)	1	(*)	6	(46)	28	(2
Total	616	(51)	336	(28)	232	(19)	13	(1)	1197	(100

Table 5

Relationship Between Initial Placement and Placement after Six Months: RDC Cases

Placement after 6 Mos.	Initial Placement: Max. N	Max. (%)	Med. N	Med. (%)	Min. N	Min. (%)	H.C. N	H.C. (%)	Total N	Total (
Max.	134	(85)	18	(6)	9	(10)	6	(86)	169	(3
Med.	15	(9)	256	(83)	9	(10)	-	-	280	(4
Min.	4	(3)	22	(7)	51	(57)	-	-	77	(1
Parole	4	(3)	10	(3)	20	(22)	-	-	34	(
H.C.	1	(1)	4	(1)	1	(1)	1	(14)	7	(
Total	160	(28)	310	(55)	90	(16)	7	(1)	567	(10

Table 6

Relationship Between Initial Placement and Placement after Six Months: NRDC Cases

Placement after 6 Mos.	Initial Placement: Max. N	Max. (%)	Med. N	Med. (%)	Min. N	Min. (%)	H.C. N	H.C. (%)	Total N	Total (%
Max.	117	(47)	1	(4)	11	(8)	1	(17)	130	(3
Med.	4	(2)	23	(89)	2	(1)	-	-	29	(
Min.	124	(50)	2	(8)	106	(75)	-	-	232	(5
Parole	2	(1)	-	-	22	(16)	-	-	24	(
H.C.	1	(*)	-	-	-	-	5	(83)	6	(
Total	248	(59)	26	(6)	141	(34)	6	(1)	421	(10

Table 7

Relationship Between Initial Placement and Placement after Six Months by Committing Institution: Neither RDC Nor NRDC

Placement after 6 Mos.	Initial Placement: Maximum Walpole N	Walpole (%)	Concord N	Concord (%)	Total N	Total (%)
Max.	94	(62)	12	(21)	106	(51)
Med.	35	(23)	7	(12)	42	(20)
Min.	11	(7)	9	(16)	20	(10)
Parole	10	(7)	16	(28)	26	(12)
H.C.	1	(1)	14	(24)	15	(7)
Total	151	(72)	58	(28)	209	(100)

Table 8

Length of Time Between Commitment to the Department of Correction and the Initial Placement Subsequent to Classification in the RDC or NRDC

	RDC Cases		NRDC Cases		Total Cases	
Weeks	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
4 or Less	33	(5.9)	2	(0.5)	35	(3.6)
5-8	165	(29.3)	46	(11.0)	211	(21.6)
9-12	166	(29.5)	90	(21.6)	256	(26.1)
13-16	102	(18.1)	151	(36.2)	253	(25.8)
17-20	50	(8.9)	66	(15.8)	116	(11.8)
21-24	15	(2.7)	44	(10.6)	59	(6.0)
25 or More	32	(5.7)	18	(4.3)	50	(5.1)
Total	563	(100.0)	417	(100.0)	980	(100.0)
Median	9.5 weeks		13.4 weeks		10.9 weeks	

APPENDIX B

TABLES ON THE COMPARISON OF CLASSIFIED VS. NON-CLASSIFIED INDIVIDUALS

Comparison of Classified vs. Non-Classified Individuals: Significant Differences

I. RDC Cases

Variable	Classified	Non-Classified
1. No. of Prior Arrests* **		
11 or fewer	53%	34%
12 or more	46%	66%
2. Prior Charges for Property Offenses* **		
5 or fewer	56%	39%
6 or more	44%	60%
3. Prior Charges for Narcotic Offenses **		
None	59%	47%
1 or more	41%	53%
4. Prior Charges for Escape* **		
None	91%	76%
1 or more	9%	24%
5. No. of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations* **		
None	75%	61%
1 or more	24%	38%
6. Age at First Arrest* **		
16 or younger	45%	62%
17 or older	54%	36%

II. NRDC Cases

Variable	Classified	Non-Classified
1. Maximum Sentence* **		
9 years or less	55%	88%
10 years or more	45%	12%
**2. Prior Charges for Person Offenses* **		
None	11%	2%
One or more	89%	98%
**3. No. of Prior Incarcerations* **		
None	57%	69%
One or more	43%	31%
4. Age at Incarceration* **		
24 or younger	95%	62%
25 or older	4%	38%

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

APPENDIX C

TABLES ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BACKGROUND VARIABLES AND SECURITY LEVEL OF INITIAL PLACEMENT FOR RDC AND NRDC CASES

Relationship Between Background Variables and Security Level of Initial Placement for RDC and NRDC Cases

1. Present Offense: RDC Cases

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Person N=363	Sex N=66	Property N=64	Drug N=54	Other N=21
Max.	160	(28)	33%	24%	11%	11%	57%
Med.	310	(55)	52%	62%	56%	63%	43%
Min.	90	(16)	14%	11%	28%	26%	-
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	2%	5%	-	-
Total Classified	567		64%	12%	11%	10%	4%
Total Non-Classified (Walpole Commitments)	151		66%	11%	13%	6%	3%

2. Present Offense: NRDC Cases

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Person N=279	Sex N=47	Property N=69	Drug N=22	Other N=4
Max.	248	(59)	55%	85%	62%	41%	75%
Med.	26	(6)	5%	11%	9%	9%	-
Min.	141	(34)	39%	4%	26%	50%	25%
H.C.	6	(1)	1%	-	3%	-	-
Total Classified	421		66%	11%	16%	5%	1%
Total Non-Classified (Concord Commitments)	58		71%	5%	14%	9%	2%

3. Person Offenses: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Murder N=58	Other Person N=305	All Other Offenses N=205	Unknown N=1
Maximum	160	(28)	72%	25%	20%	-
Medium	310	(55)	28%	57%	59%	-
Minimum	90	(16)	-	17%	19%	1%
H.C.	7	(1)	-	1%	2%	-
Total Classified	567		10%	54%	36%	0%
Total Non-Classified	151		7%	59%	33%	1%

4. Minimum Sentence: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Less than 10 years N=300	10 years or more N=105	Life N=59	Indefinite Sentence N=104
Maximum	160	(28)	23%	39%	73%	6%
Medium	310	(55)	64%	59%	27%	39%
Minimum	90	(16)	12%	0%	-	50%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	-	-	4%
Total Classified	567		53%	18%	10%	18%
Total Non-Classified	151		68%	25%	7%	0%

5. Maximum Sentence: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Less than 10 years N=225	10 years or more N=283	Life N=59
Maximum	160	(28)	16%	28%	73%
Medium	310	(55)	53%	61%	27%
Minimum	90	(16)	28%	9%	-
H.C.	7	(1)	3%	3%	-
Total Classified	569	(100)	40%	50%	10%
Total Non-Classified	151	(100)	34%	58%	7%

6. Maximum Sentence: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	9 years or less N=230	10 years or more N=190
Maximum	248	(59)	59%	58%
Medium	26	(6)	6%	7%
Minimum	141	(34)	33%	34%
H.C.	6	(11)	3%	-
Total Classified	421	(100)	55%	45%
Total Non-Classified	58	(100)	88%	12%

7. Race: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	White N=349	Black N=212	Other N=7
Maximum	160	(28)	25%	34%	-
Medium	310	(55)	53%	58%	43%
Minimum	90	(16)	20%	8%	57%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	1%	-
Total Classified	567		61%	37%	1%
Total Non-Classified	151		60%	36%	1%

8. Race: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	White N=300	Black N=101	Other N=20
Maximum	248	(59)	59%	60%	50%
Medium	26	(6)	5%	9%	15%
Minimum	141	(34)	34%	31%	35%
H.C.	6	(1)	2%	-	-
Total Classified	421		71%	24%	5%
Total Non-Classified	58		76%	21%	3%

9. Marital Status: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Single N=284	Married N=177	Div., Sep., Wid. N=104
Maximum	160	(28)	40%	15%	20%
Medium	310	(55)	50%	59%	60%
Minimum	90	(16)	9%	25%	19%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	2%	1%
Total Classified	567		50%	31%	18%
Total Non-Classified	151		51%	25%	21%

10. Marital Status: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Single N=336	Married N=65	Div., Sep., Wid. N=20
Maximum	248	(59)	60%	54%	55%
Medium	26	(6)	5%	11%	20%
Minimum	141	(34)	34%	35%	25%
H.C.	6	(1)	2%	-	-
Total Classified	421		80%	15%	5%
Total Non-Classified	58		72%	19%	10%

11. Time on Job of Longest Duration: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Less than 12 Mos. N=225	12 Mos. or More N=279	Unknown N=65
Maximum	160	(28)	36%	17%	48%
Medium	310	(55)	52%	58%	48%
Minimum	90	(16)	11%	23%	3%
H.C.	7	(1)	0%	2%	2%
Total Classified	567		40%	49%	11%
Total Non-Classified	151		42%	42%	17%

12. Time on Job of Longest Duration: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Less than 12 Mos. N=230	12 Mos. or More N=126	Unknown N=65
Maximum	248	(59)	64%	47%	63%
Medium	26	(6)	5%	11%	3%
Minimum	141	(34)	30%	41%	31%
H.C.	6	(1)	1%	1%	3%
Total Classified	421		55%	30%	15%
Total Non-Classified	58		55%	31%	14%

13. Last Grade Completed: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	9th Grade or Less N=262	10-12 Grades N=255	Some College or College Grad. N=39	Unknow N=13
Maximum	160	(28)	34%	25%	15%	23%
Medium	310	(55)	49%	59%	56%	62%
Minimum	90	(16)	16%	15%	21%	15%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	0%	0%	0%
Total Classified	567		46%	45%	7%	2%
Total Non-Classified	151		48%	43%	5%	3%

14. Last Grade Completed: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	9th Grade or Less N=193	10-12 Grades N=200	Some College or College Grad. N=15	Unknow N=13
Maximum	248	(59)	63%	55%	47%	77%
Medium	26	(6)	4%	8%	13%	15%
Minimum	141	(34)	32%	37%	40%	8%
H.C.	6	(1)	2%	2%	0%	0%
Total Classified	421		46%	48%	4%	3%
Total Non-Classified	58		34%	59%	0%	7%

15. Prior Address by SMSA: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Boston N=344	Other than Boston N=193	Out of State N=30
Maximum	160	(28)	34%	19%	27%
Medium	310	(55)	53%	58%	50%
Minimum	90	(16)	12%	22%	23%
H.C.	7	(1)	2%	1%	-
Total Classified	567		61%	34%	5%
Total Non-Classified	151		63%	28%	4%

16. Prior Address by SMSA: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Boston N=214	Other than Boston N=192	Out of State N=15
Maximum	248	(59)	63%	55%	58%
Medium	26	(6)	6%	6%	13%
Minimum	141	(34)	30%	38%	27%
H.C.	6	(1)	1%	2%	7%
Total Classified	421		51%	46%	4%
Total Non-Classified	58		45%	48%	5%

17. Number of Prior Arrests: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Fewer than 12 N=299	12 or More N=263
Maximum	160	(28)	28%	28%
Medium	310	(55)	54%	56%
Minimum	90	(16)	17%	14%
H.C.	7	(1)	2%	0%
Total Classified	567		53%	46%
Total Non-Classified	151		34%	66%

18. Number of Prior Arrests: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	Fewer than 12 N=284	12 or More N=129
Maximum	248	(59)	55%	66%
Medium	26	(6)	4%	10%
Minimum	141	(34)	39%	24%
H.C.	6	(1)	2%	0%
Total Classified	421		67%	31%
Total Non-Classified	58		59%	36%

19. No. of Prior Charges for Person Offenses: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=80	1-8 N=417	Over 8 N=71
Maximum	160	(28)	9%	28%	49%
Medium	310	(55)	64%	54%	44%
Minimum	90	(16)	24%	16%	6%
H.C.	7	(1)	4%	0%	1%
Total Classified	567		14%	73%	13%
Total Non-Classified	151		5%	74%	21%

20. No. of Prior Charges for Person Offenses: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=44	1-8 N=348	Over 8 N=22
Maximum	248	(59)	57%	58%	68%
Medium	26	(6)	7%	6%	5%
Minimum	141	(34)	34%	35%	23%
H.C.	6	(1)	2%	1%	5%
Total Classified	421		11%	84%	5%
Total Non-Classified	58		2%	94%	4%

21. No. of Prior Charges for Sex Offenses: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=449	One or More N=119
Maximum	160	(28)	28%	29%
Medium	310	(55)	53%	61%
Minimum	90	(16)	18%	9%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	0%
Total Classified	567		79%	21%
Total Non-Classified	151		78%	21%

22. No. of Prior Charges for Sex Offenses: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=355	One or More N=59	Unknown N=7
Maximum	248	(59)	55%	80%	71%
Medium	26	(6)	5%	8%	29%
Minimum	141	(34)	38%	12%	0%
H.C.	6	(1)	2%	0%	0%
Total Classified	421		84%	14%	2%
Total Non-Classified	58		85%	9%	7%

23. No. of Prior Charges for Property Offense: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=118	1-5 N=199	6 or More N=251
Maximum	160	(28)	22%	29%	31%
Medium	310	(55)	52%	54%	56%
Minimum	90	(16)	25%	15%	12%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	2%	1%
Total Classified	567		21%	35%	44%
Total Non-Classified	151		13%	26%	60%

24. No. of Prior Charges for Property Offenses: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=79	1-5 N=171	6 or More N=164	Unknown N=7
Maximum	248	(59)	46%	53%	71%	71%
Medium	26	(6)	5%	5%	7%	29%
Minimum	141	(34)	48%	39%	22%	0%
H.C.	6	(1)	1%	2%	0%	0%
Total Classified	421		19%	41%	39%	2%
Total Non-Classified	58		23%	33%	38%	7%

25. No. of Prior Charges for Narcotics Offense: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=334	One or More N=233
Maximum	160	(28)	31%	24%
Medium	310	(55)	50%	61%
Minimum	90	(16)	17%	15%
H.C.	7	(1)	2%	
Total Classified	567		59%	41%
Total Non-Classified	151		47%	53%

26. No. of Prior Charges for Narcotics Offense: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=241	One or More N=173	Unknown N=7
Maximum	248	(59)	58%	60%	71%
Medium	26	(6)	5%	8%	29%
Minimum	141	(34)	35%	33%	0%
H.C.	6	(1)	3%	0%	0%
Total Classified	421		57%	41%	2%
Total Non-Classified	58		52%	41%	7%

27. No. of Prior Charges for Escape Offense: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=515	One or More N=52
Maximum	160	(28)	26%	50%
Medium	310	(55)	56%	40%
Minimum	90	(16)	17%	8%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	-
Total Classified	567		91%	9%
Total Non-Classified	151		76%	24%

28. No. of Prior Charges for Escape Offense: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=380	One or More N=34	Unknown N=7
Maximum	248	(59)	58%	71%	71%
Medium	26	(6)	5%	15%	29%
Minimum	141	(34)	36%	15%	0%
H.C.	6	(1)	2%	0%	0%
Total Classified	421		90%	8%	2%
Total Non-Classified	58		87%	7%	7%

29. No. of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=429	One or More N=137
Maximum	160	(28)	25%	39%
Medium	310	(55)	55%	53%
Minimum	90	(16)	19%	7%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	1%
Total Classified	567		75%	24%
Total Non-Classified	151		61%	38%

30. No. of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=317	One or More N=98	Unknown N=6
Maximum	248	(59)	55%	70%	83%
Medium	26	(6)	7%	4%	17%
Minimum	141	(34)	.37%	26%	0%
H.C.	6	(1)	2%	0%	0%
Total Classified	421		75%	23%	1%
Total Non-Classified	58		69%	24%	7%

31. Total No. of Prior Incarcerations: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=238	One or More N=327
Maximum	160	(28)	27%	29%
Medium	310	(55)	48%	59%
Minimum	90	(16)	23%	11%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	1%
Total Classified	567		42%	57%
Total Non-Classified	151		44%	57%

32. Total No. of Prior Incarcerations: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	None N=239	One or More N=176	Unknown N=6
Maximum	248	(59)	54%	65%	83%
Medium	26	(6)	5%	7%	17%
Minimum	141	(34)	39%	28%	0%
H.C.	6	(1)	3%	0%	0%
Total Classified	421		57%	42%	1%
Total Non-Classified	58		69%	24%	7%

33. Age at Incarceration: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	24 or Younger N=199	25 or Older N=366
Maximum	160	(28)	50%	17%
Medium	310	(55)	45%	60%
Minimum	90	(16)	5%	22%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	2%
Total Classified	569	(100)	35%	64%
Total Non-Classified	151	(100)	32%	64%

34. Age at Incarceration: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	24 or Younger N=402	25 or Older N=17
Maximum	248	(59)	61%	12%
Medium	26	(6)	4%	53%
Minimum	141	(34)	34%	35%
H.C.	6	(1)	1%	0%
Total Classified	421	(100)	95%	4%
Total Non-Classified	58	(100)	62%	38%

35. Age at 1st Arrest: RDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	16 or Younger N=258	17 or Older N=307
Maximum	160	(28)	38%	20%
Medium	310	(55)	51%	58%
Minimum	90	(16)	10%	21%
H.C.	7	(1)	1%	-
Total Classified	567		45%	54%
Total Non-Classified	151		62%	36%

36. Age at 1st Arrest: NRDC

Initial Placement	Total N	Total (%)	16 or Younger N=220	17 or Older N=193
Maximum	248	(59)	67%	49%
Medium	26	(6)	4%	8%
Minimum	141	(34)	28%	41%
H.C.	6	(1)	1%	3%
Total Classified	421		53%	47%
Total Non-Classified	58		60%	40%

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH RDC AND NRDC PLACEMENTS IN MAXIMUM SECURITY AND IN MINIMUM SECURITY FACILITIES

SIGNIFICANT FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH RDC PLACEMENTS IN MAXIMUM SECURITY AND IN MINIMUM SECURITY

Variable	Maximum	Minimum
1. Offense	Murder	Property/Drug
2. Min. Sentence	10 yrs. or more	Indef. 9 yrs. or less
3. Max. Sentence	10 yrs. or more	-
4. Age	24 or Younger	25 or Older
5. Race	Black	White
6. Marital Status	Single	Ever Married
7. Longest Job	Less than 1 Yr.	1 Yr. or More
8. Education	9th or Less	-
9. Address	Boston	Non-Boston
10. Age at 1st Arrest	16 or Younger	17 or Older
11. No. of Prior Arrests	-	-
12. Prior Person Offenses	9 or More	None
13. Prior Sex Offenses	-	None
14. Prior Property Offenses	-	None
15. Prior Narcotic Offenses	-	-
16. Prior Escapes	One or More	-
17. Prior Juv. Incarc.	One or More	None
18. Total Prior Incarc.	-	None

SIGNIFICANT FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH NRDC PLACEMENTS IN MAXIMUM SECURITY AND IN MINIMUM SECURITY

Variable	Maximum	Minimum
1. Offense	Sex	-
2. Max. Sentence	-	-
3. Age	22 or Younger	23 or Older
4. Race	-	-
5. Marital Status	-	-
6. Longest Job	Less than 1 Yr.	1 Yr. or More
7. Education	-	-
8. Address	-	-
9. Age at 1st Arrest	16 or Younger	17 or Older
10. No. of Prior Arrests	12 or More	11 or Fewer
11. Prior Person Offenses	-	-
12. Prior Sex Offenses	One or More	None
13. Prior Property Offenses	6 or More	5 or Fewer
14. Prior Narcotic Offenses	-	-
15. Prior Escapes	-	None
16. Prior Juv. Incarc.	One or More	None
17. Total Prior Incarc.	One or More	None

APPENDIX E

TABLES ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BACKGROUND VARIABLES AND SUCCESS RATES FOR INDIVIDUALS INITIALLY PLACED IN MINIMUM SECURITY FACILITIES

Relationship Between Background Variables and Success Rates for Individuals Initially Placed in Minimum Security Facilities

	N	(%)	Success Rate
	231	(100)	87%
1. Present Offense			
Person	159	(69)	86%
Sex	9	(4)	89%
Property	36	(16)	86%
Drug	25	(11)	92%
Other	1	(*)	100%
2. Sentence			
Determinate	37	(16)	70%
Indeterminate	193	(84)	90%
3. Race			
White	172	(75)	87%
Black	47	(20)	85%
Other	11	(5)	91%
4. Marital Status			
Single	138	(60)	89%
Married	68	(29)	84%
Div., Sep., Wid.	24	(10)	79%
5. Military Service			
No Service	178	(77)	87%
Honorable Discharge	29	(13)	93%
Other Discharge	23	(10)	78%
6. Address			
Boston	52	(23)	90%
Worcester	24	(10)	83%
New Bedford	13	(6)	77%
Other	141	(61)	87%

	N	(%)	Success Rate
	231	(100)	87%
7. Education			
8th Grade or Less	49	(21)	86%
9-11 Grade	111	(49)	86%
12th Grade or Higher	68	(30)	88%
8. Prior Arrests			
5 or Fewer	92	(40)	91%
6-11	68	(30)	87%
12 or More	69	(30)	80%
9. Prior Charges for Person Offenses			
4 or Fewer	182	(79)	88%
5 or More	49	(21)	80%
10. Prior Charges for Property Offenses			
None or One	94	(41)	90%
2-5	70	(30)	87%
6 or More	67	29	81%
11. Prior Charges for Drug Offenses			
None	140	(61)	84%
One or More	91	(39)	90%
12. Prior Juvenile Incarcerations			
None	195	(84)	87%
One or More	36	(16)	83%
13. Prior County Incarcerations			
None	172	(75)	87%
One or More	59	(25)	85%
14. Prior State or Federal Incarcerations			
None	199	(86)	87%
One or More	32	(14)	81%

	N	(%)	Success Rate
	231	(100)	87%
15. Prior Incarceration of Any Kind			
None	146	(63)	89%
One or More	85	(37)	82%
16. Age at Incarceration			
20 or Younger	64	(28)	84%
21-25	92	(40)	95%
26 or Older	73	(32)	78%
24 or Younger	144	(63)	91%
25 or Older	85	(37)	79%
17. Age at First Arrest			
15 or Younger	75	(33)	81%
16 or Older	155	(67)	89%
18. Facility of Initial Classification			
RDC	89	(39)	80%
NRDC	141	(61)	91%

Relationship Between Age and Success Rate for RDC and NRDC Cases

	RDC Cases			NRDC Cases			Total Cases		
Age	N	(%)	Succ. Rate	N	(%)	Succ. Rate	N	(%)	Succ. Rate
24 or Younger	9	(10)	78%	135	(96)	92%	144	(63)	91%
25 or Older	79	(90)	80%	6	(4)	67%	85	(37)	79%
19 or Younger	1	(1)	0%	43	(30)	84%	44	(19)	82%
20-24	8	(9)	88%	92	(65)	96%	100	(44)	95%
25 or Older	79	(90)	80%	6	(4)	67%	85	(37)	79%
Total	88	(100)	80%	141	(100)	91%	229	(100)	86%

APPENDIX F

PRE-TEST INSTRUMENT

B.U. CLASSIFICATION STUDY

1. RDC: _____(1) Norfolk; _____(1) Concord

2. Name _____ 3. Commitment No. _____(2-6

4. Placement _____(7-8) 5. Security Rating _____(9)

6. Actual Placement _____ 7. Placement after 6 mos. _____

Need Area	Presence of Need	Action	Program Involvement
Education	_____ (10)	_____(24-25)	_____(52-
Vocation	_____ (11)	_____(26-27)	_____(54-
Family	_____ (12)	_____(28-29)	_____(56-
Social	_____ (13)	_____(30-31)	_____(58-
Alcohol Control	_____ (14)	_____(32-33)	_____(60-
Drug Control	_____ (15)	_____(34-35)	_____(62-
Counseling	_____ (16)	_____(36-37)	_____(64-
Health	_____ (17)	_____(38-39)	_____(66-
Legal	_____ (18)	_____(40-41)	_____(68-
Living Arrangements	_____ (19)	_____(42-43)	_____(70-
Financial	_____ (20)	_____(44-45)	_____(72-
Other _____	_____ (21)	_____(46-47)	_____(74-
Other _____	_____ (22)	_____(48-49)	_____(76-
Other _____	_____ (23)	_____(50-51)	_____(78-

Reason for Return to Higher Custody _____

APPENDIX G

CLASSIFICATION OF SECURITY LEVELS OF DOC FACILITIES FOR THIS STUDY

Classification of Security Levels of DOC Facilities for this Study

Maximum Security

- MCI-Walpole
- MCI-Concord

Medium Security

- MCI-Norfolk
- Southeastern Correctional Center

Minimum Security

- MCI-Plymouth
- MCI-Warwick
- MCI-Monroe
- Northeastern Correctional Center
- Medfield Prison Project
- Shirley Pre-Release
- Boston Pre-Release
- South Middlesex Pre-Release
- Park Drive Pre-Release
- Lancaster Pre-Release
- Norfolk Pre-Release
- Mass. Halfway House Facilities
- All other Contract Houses

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carney, Francis J., "Correctional Research and Correctional Decision-Making: Some Problems and Prospects," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, (July, 1969), pp. 110-122.

Erikson, E., Childhood and Society, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1950.

Freeman, H., Hildebrand, C. and Ayre, D., "A Classification System that Prescribes Treatment," Social Casework, 46 (1965), pp. 423-429.

Gibbons, D. C., Changing the Lawbreaker: The Treatment of Delinquents and Criminals, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Glueck, S. and Glueck, E., "Varieties of Delinquent Types," British Journal of Criminology, 5 (1965), pp. 236-248, and pp. 388-405.

_____, Predicting Delinquency and Crime, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Gough, H. G. and Peterson, D., "The Identification and Measurement of Predispositional Factors in Crime and Delinquency," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 16 (1952), pp. 207-212.

Hunt, D. E. and Hardt, R. H., "Developmental State, Delinquency and Differential Treatment," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 2 (1965), pp. 20-31.

Hurwitz, J., "Three Delinquent Types: A Multivariate Analysis," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 56 (1965), pp. 328-334.

Landolfi, Joseph, "A Comparison Between Pre-Release Program Completers and Non-Completers at Massachusetts Halfway Houses, Inc.," Massachusetts Department of Correction, Oct., 1975.

_____, "An Analysis of Recidivism Among Residents Released from the Pre-Release Centers Administered by Mass. Halfway Houses, Inc.," Massachusetts Department of Correction, June, 1976.

_____, "Roxbury Community Rehabilitation Center: A Profile of Participants and a Recidivism Follow-up," Massachusetts Department of Correction, March, 1977.

LeClair, Daniel, "An Analysis of Recidivism Rates Among Residents Released from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions During the Year 1974," Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1977 (mimeo).

_____, "A Profile of Characteristics Distinguishing Between Program Completers and Program Non-Completers in Massachusetts' Pre-Release Centers," Massachusetts Department of Correction, Nov., 1975.

_____, "An Analysis of Recidivism Among Residents Released from Boston State and Shirley Pre-Release Centers During 1972-73," Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1975 (mimeo).

Massachusetts Department of Correction, "D.O.-4400.1, Classification Process and Organization of Classification," March 7, 1975 (mimeo)

Massachusetts Department of Correction, "D.O.-4400.4, Classificatio Report," March 7, 1975 (mimeo)

Massachusetts Department of Correction, "D.O.-1000.1, Department of Correction Philosophy," Sept. 12, 1973 (mimeo).

McCord, W., McCord, J. and Zola, I. K., Origins of Crime, New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Corrections, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1973.

Ohlin, L. E., Selection for Parole, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1951.

Peterson, D. R., Quay, H. C. and Cameron, G. R., "Personality and Background Factors in Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 23 (1959), pp. 395-399.

Powers, E., The Basic Structure of the Administration of Criminal Justice in Massachusetts, 6th edition, Boston: Massachusetts Correctional Association, July 1, 1973.

Reckless, W. C., The Crime Problem, 3rd edition, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Rein, M., "Social Policy Analysis as the Interpretation of Beliefs," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. XXXVII, No. 5, (Sept., 1971), pp. 297-310.

Roebuck, J. B. and Cadwalladar, J., "The Negro Armed Robber As A Criminal Type: The Construction and Application of A Typology," Pacific Sociological Review, 4 (1961), pp. 21-26.

Schrag, C., "A Preliminary Criminal Typology," Pacific Sociological Review, 4 (1961), pp. 11-16.

Studt, E., Messinger, S. L. and Wilson, T. P., C-Unit: Search for Community in Prison, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.

Warren, M. O., "Classification of Offenders as an Aid to Efficient Management and Effective Treatment," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 62 (1971), pp. 239-258.