VALIDATION STUDY FINAL REPORT
PHASE III

Prepared by:

Linda K. Holt
Program Development
Specialist

Mary Beth Cronin
Student Intern

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Louis Berman
Interim Commissioner

October, 1980

ABSTRACT

This is the third and final report in the validation study
conducted by the Massachusetts Department of Correction. The
purpose of this study was to test the feasibility of adding new
variables to the present data base using currently available
official documents contained in inmate folders. In this report
60 new variables were gathered from other states. Twenty of these
variables were further studied to test the feasibility of adding
them to the present data base. For many of these variables data
is readily available in inmate folders and new variables of interest
to practitioners and researchers could be added to the data base
with relative ease.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the third phase in a data validation study done at the Massachusetts Department of Correction. In phase one information contained in the offender-based Correction and Parole Management Information System (CAPMIS) was compared with information contained in official documents in offender folders. In phase two information in CAPMIS was compared with inmate self reports. Both phase one and phase two of the project dealt with the existing data base used at the Department of Correction and improving its quality. In phase three attention is focused on the potential for expanding the data base. This was done by consulting the research reports done by other correctional agencies throughout the United States to see what variables they are using in their reports and then determining if that information is readily available in inmate folders.

The reason for expanding the data base is that it may be better to have more rather than fewer indicators of a measure. This allows the researcher and policy-maker to have a fuller understanding of the characteristics of offenders. A clearer view of the population is allowed since each variable adds another facet of understanding to the general concept. A general concept might be present offense. If present offense is only classified by the specific charge (manslaughter for example) the view is more sketchy than if other aspects of that offense are known (sentence, court, related charges).

The current data base can be divided into variables that fall into one of five general categories: present offense characteristics, offender's personal background characteristics, offender's prior criminal history, post release conditions, and present incarceration. The variables considered for addition to the data base in this study can also be placed in one of these five general categories and would add more information about them.

Having more information available also allows researchers more flexibility in the construction of possible hypotheses that can be tested. Multi-variate analysis and the disclosure of patterns among variables becomes easier with a larger data base.

Since there is a lot of information already collected as an offender goes through the criminal justice system, it would probably be relatively easy to add variables that are systematically collected to the data base. This report is intended to test the existence of new variables not currently in the data base that may be in official documents in inmate folders.

Method

In the first part of this study a list of possible variables was derived from other correctional agencies in the United States. Because of past contact with other correctional agencies, the Massachusetts Department of Correction has a large collection of research documents published by public and private agencies from almost every state in the country. Each of these documents was reviewed for variables used in their research that are not currently collected in Massachusetts. From this review, 60 new potential variables were isolated for consideration. Along with the variable name and source, possible coding schemes, suggested hypotheses and actual findings were also noted from these research documents.

From this list of variables a group of 20 were selected. The criteria for selection included:

1. Proven utility: research in other states showed this variable to be a useful one as a descriptive aid or as a predictor.

2. Uniqueness: this variable was substantially different from other variables already collected in Massachusetts and from variables suggested in other states.

3. Replicable: the information could be recreated in Massachusetts: that is, the variable was not contingent on programs, tests, or structural considerations not relevant to the situation in this state.

Variables were scored on each of these criteria. Variables with a point in each area were considered for further study.

Of these 20 variables 15 were concerned with present offense, background characteristics or prior criminal history and 5 were concerned with present incarceration and release conditions.

For the second part of the study a 10 percent random sample of commitments and releases to the department during 1979 was drawn yielding a sample of 107 commitments and 97 releasees. Using official documents in inmate folders, values for each of the 20 variables were searched for. The sample of commitments was used for the first 15 variables and the sample of releasees was used for the last 5 variables. The search was conducted until three documents, if available, were found that gave information about the variable. The source of information and the contents were noted.

After data was collected on all 20 variables for all the cases in the sample, tabulation was done in four ways:

1.   Information availability: the number of cases where data is available and the number of cases where data was not available.

2.   Data values: for the cases where data is available, the distribution of values that would result.

3.   Data source: for the cases where data is available, the distribution of the sources of the information. When there was more than one source of information, only the first source was counted.

4.   Data consistency: for those cases where data is available, the number where all data sources yielded consistent values and the number where there was discrepancies among the data sources.

Summary findings comparing all 20 variables are also presented.

Findings

A.   Deriving the List of Variables

After reviewing publications from each state, Canada, and the District of Columbia a list of 60 variables was derived. These variables are not currently included in the CAPMIS data base. The following table shows the list of variables, the state from whose research it was taken and the variable's rating on the three criterion measures.

Variables which received a point in each area were included in the study. Some variables (religion, I.Q.) were found in more than one state. Some states provided no relevant research or new variables were found in their research. Two variables were later divided into four separate variables. Family size became number of siblings and birth order, living situation at time of admission became number of children and living situation.

B.   Data Collection Results

The findings from the data collection efforts of each of the twenty variables is presented here. A narrative and tabular description of each variable is included as well as comparisons among the twenty variables. The number of cases changes from 107 for the first 15 variables to 97 for the last 5 variables because a different sample was used.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS - VARIABLES FOR POSSIBLE STUDY

VARIABLE	SOURCE	UTILITY	UNIQUE	REPLICABLE	TOTAL	INCLUDED
Tested Grade Level	Arizona	1	1	1	3	Yes
I.Q.	Arizona	1	1	1	3	Yes
Religious Background	Arizona	1	1	1	3	Yes
Employment Status on Parole	Arizona	1	1	1	3	Yes
Family Status During Childhood	Arizona	1	1	1	3	Yes
Jail Booking Status	California	1	1	0	2	No
Base Expectancy Score	California	1	1	0	2	No
Criminal Type	California	1	1	0	2	No
Juvenile Behavior Pattern	Canada	0	1	0	1	No
Offender Attitude	Canada	1	1	0	2	No
Effect of Incarceration on Family	Canada	1	1	1	3	Yes
Association with other Criminals	Canada	0	1	0	1	No
Pre-Incarceration Employment	Canada	1	0	1	2	No
Beta I.Q. Score	Canada	1	1	1	3	Yes
SAT Score	Canada	0	1	0	1	No
Sexual Behavior Within Prison	D.C.	0	1	0	1	No
Youth Center Participation	D.C.	1	1	0	2	No
Church Affiliation	D.C.	1	1	1	3	Yes
Time to Parole Date	D.C.	1	0	1	2	No
In-Community Success	D.C.	1	0	0	1	No
Legal Status Code	Florida	0	1	0	1	No
Intelligence Tese Score	Florida	1	1	0	2	No
Sentence Investigation Status	Florida	0	1	0	1	No
Length of Residency in State	Florida	1	1	1	3	Yes
Self-Rating Depression Score	Florida	1	1	0	2	No
Average Functional Grade Level	Georgia	1	1	1	3	Yes
Religion	Georgia	1	1	1	3	Yes
Family Size	Illinois	1	1	1	3	Yes
Offender's Opinions of Dept.	Illinois	1	1	0	2	No
Marital Status of Parents	Illinois	1	1	1	3	Yes
Family Income	Illinois	1	1	1	3	Yes
I.Q.	Illinois	1	1	1	3	Yes
Place of Birth	Illinois	1	1	1	3	Yes
Status in Programs	Maryland	1	1	0	2	No
Urine Test Results	Maryland	0	1	1	2	No
Contract Status	Maryland	1	1	0	2	No
I.Q.	Minnesota	1	1	1	3	Yes
Family Members with Correctional Experience	Minnesota	1	1	1	3	Yes
Living Situation at Time of Offense	Minnesota	1	1	1	3	Yes
Mental Ability	New Jersey	1	1	0	2	No
Ego Strength Scale	N. Carolina	1	1	0	2	No
Hypomanic Scale	N. Carolina	1	1	0	2	No
Time Until First Job on Release	N. Carolina	1	1	0	2	No
Place of Birth	Pennsylvania	1	1	1	3	Yes
Cash on Hand at Release	Pennsylvania	1	1	1	3	No
Certainty of Release	Pennsylvania	1	1	1	3	Yes
Return to Previous Job	Pennsylvania	1	1	1	3	Yes
Psychological Test Battery	Pennsylvania	1	1	0	2	No
Employment Suitability	Pennsylvania	1	1	0	2	No
Number of D Reports	Pennsylvania	1	1	1	3	Yes
Security Classification	Rhode Island	1	1	1	3	Yes
Recidivist Before Incarceration	Rhode Island	1	0	1	2	No
Intelligence Test (I.Q.)	Tennessee	1	1	1	3	Yes
Tested Educational Level	Tennessee	1	1	1	3	Yes
Place of Birth	Tennessee	1	1	1	3	Yes
Plea Entered at Trial	Tennessee	1	1	1	3	Yes
I.Q. Tests	Texas	1	1	1	3	Yes
Parole Performance Expectancy	Washington	1	1	0	2	No
Religious Preference	Washington	1	1	1	3	Yes
Achievement Test	Wisconsin	1	1	0	2	No

1.   Number of Siblings

Family size was defined as the number of children in the

offender's family. This included the offender and siblings in all

categories (step and half). Information was available in 90 cases

(76.9%). The values ranged from 1 to 23. The median number of

children in an offender family was 5. Information was most often

available in probation reports. In all cases the various data

sources were internally consistent.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	89
Information Not Available	18
	107

II. Variable Values

Number of Siblings	Number of Cases
1	3
2	7
3	15
4	17
5	12
6	10
7	7
8	4
9	5
10	4
11	1
12	0
13	1
14	2
23	1
	89

III. Data Sources

Probation reports	60
Quick Reference Index	15
Classification Reports	12
Treatment Report	1
Booking Sheet	1
TOTAL	89

IV. Data Consistency

Data Sources Consistent	89
Data Sources Inconsistent	0
	89

2.   Religious Preference

Religious preference is defined as the offender's stated religion. Information was available in 106 cases (99.1%). Ten different religious categories were found. The largest group was Catholic with 57 (53.8%). Information was most readily available in the Quick Reference Index (QRI). In 100 cases data was consistent among all sources. In 6 cases there was some inconsistency.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
CHURCH AFFILIATION

I.   Information Availability

Information Available:	106
Information Not Available:	1
	107

II.   Variable Values

Catholic	57
Protestant	21
None	10
Baptist	6
Methodist	3
Christian	3
Jewish	2
Jehovah's Witness	2
Muslim	1
Greek Orthodox	1
TOTAL	106

III. Data Sources

Quick Reference Index	72
Probation	29
Parole Summary	2
Walpole ID	1
Treatment Sheet	1
Classification	1
TOTAL	106

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Consistent	100
Data Inconsistent	6
TOTAL	106

3.   Place of Birth

Place of birth is defined as the state or country in which the offender was born. Information was available in all cases. Twenty-three different values were found, the largest group being Massachusetts in which 55 offenders were born. Information was most often found in the Q.R.I. In 106 cases, the information was consistent and in 1 case there was a discrepancy.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
PLACE OF BIRTH

I.   Data Availability

Data Available	107
Data Not Available	0
	107

II.   Data Values

Massachusetts	55
Puerto Rico	10
New York	4
N. Carolina	4
Tennessee	4
Connecticut	4
Georgia	3
Rhode Island	3
Florida	2
Mississippi	2
California	2
Washington	1
S. Carolina	1
Arkansas	1
Kentucky	1
New Hampshire	1
Pennsylvania	1
Vermont	1
Arizona	1
Maryland	1
Illinois	1
Ohio	1
Michigan	1
Portugal	1
Dominican Republic	1
TOTAL	107

III. Data Sources

Q.R.I.	63
Probation	38
Classification	3
Booking	1
Preliminary Intake Report	1
Police Report	1
	107

IV. Data Consistency

Data Consistent	106
Discrepancies	1
	107

4.   Length of Residency in State

Length of residency in state was defined as the number of years a person resided in Massachusetts prior to the offense that resulted in their present incarceration. Information was available for 75 cases (70%). Most offenders have lived in Massachusetts for many years, the modal category is 16 to 20 years. Classification reports were the greatest source of information on this variable. In all 75 cases where data was available, all data sources were consistent.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN STATE

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	75
Information Not Available	32
	107

II. Data Values

Less Than 1 Year	1
1 to 5 Years	6
6 to 10 Years	4
11 to 15 Years	5
16 to 20	21
21 to 25 Years	20
26 to 30 Years	6
Over 30 Years	12
	75

III. Data Sources

Classification Report	31
Probation	30
Classification Board Recommendation	13
Parole Summary	1
	75

IV. Data Consistency

Data Consistent	75
Data Inconsistent	0
	75

5.   Number of Children

Number of children was defined as the total number of children the offender has, including step-children and foster children, regardless of whether there is any contact with them or not. Information was available in 60 out of 107 cases (56%). There were 13 values found for this variable with a result of the 1 child category obtaining the majority. Most of the information, 36 out of 60, was found in the Q.R.I. Fifty-eight of the values proved to be consistent and 2 had discrepancies.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
NUMBER OF CHILDREN

I.   Data Availability

Information Available	60
No Information Available	47
	107

II. Data Values

None	15
1	18
2	16
3	6
4	1
5	0
6	1
7	2
Spouse or Girlfriend Pregnant	1
TOTAL	60

III. Data Sources

Quick Reference Index	36
Classification	7
Probation	16
Parole Officer Log	1
	60

IV. Data Consistency

Data Consistent	58
Data Discrepancy	2
	60

6.   Marital Status of Parents

Marital status of an offender's parents was considered at the time of commitment. Information was available for 106 cases. The modal category was parents married (N=40). The Quick Reference Index and Probation reports were the most common sources of information. In only one case was there discrepant information regarding this variable.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
MARITAL STATUS OF PARENTS

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	106
Information Not Available	1
	107

II.   Data Values

Married	40
Deceased	23
Separated	19
Divorced	8
Unknown to Offender	8
Divorced & Remarried	7
Orphanage	1
	106

III. Data Sources

Q.R.I.	50
Probation	44
Classification	8
Booking	1
Identification	1
Treatment	1
Parole Summary	1
	106

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Sources Consistent	105
Data Sources Inconsistent	1
	106

7.   Family Members Currently Incarcerated

Family members with corrections experience was defined as the
number of relatives also incarcerated in state or county facilities at
the time of the offender's present commitment. Information was available
in 94 cases. In 79 cases no other family member was currently incar-
cerated. In 11 cases a brother was currently incarcerated. The most
common source of information was the Q.R.I. In all cases data was
consistent among varying data sources.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
FAMILY MEMBERS WITH CORRECTIONS EXPERIENCE

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	94
Information Not Available	13
	107

II.   Data Values

No Family Members Incarcerated	79
Brother Incarcerated	11
Cousin Incarcerated	2
Sister Incarcerated	1
Uncle Incarcerated	1
	94

III.   Data Sources

Q.R.I.	57
Probation Reports	26
Classification Reports	11
	94

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Sources Consistent	94
Data Sources Inconsistent	0
	94

-14-

8.   Source of Family Income

Source of Family Income was defined as the primary source of an offender's financial support at the time of commitment. Generally, there was little information concerning the amount of income earned. Information about source of income was available in 51 cases. The most common source of income was the offender's salary. Secondarily, parental income provided support. The most common source of information is Probation Reports. Information was consistent in all cases.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
FAMILY INCOME

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	51
Information Not Available	56
	107

II.   Data Values

Offender's Salary	12
Father's Salary	10
Unemployed, No Source	5
Mother's Salary	4
Father's & Mother's & Offenders Salary	4
A.F.D.C.	4
Welfare, General Relief	4
C.E.T.A.	2
Social Security	1
Armed Services	1
	51

III. Data Sources

Probation Reports	28
Q.R.I.	16
Classification Report	6
Treatment Sheet	1
	51

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Consistent	51
Data Inconsistent	0
	51

9. Living Situation at Time of Admission

Living situation at the time of admission was defined as those family members or friends with whom the offender was residing at the time of commitment. Information was available in 101 cases. The most common living arrangements were living alone (N=36) and living with parents (N=23). The most common source of information was classification reports. In 100 of the 101 cases data sources were consistent.

<div align="center">

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
LIVING SITUATION AT TIME OF ADMISSION
</div>

I. Information Availability

Information Available	101
Information Not Available	6
	107

II. Data Values

Alone	36
With Both Parents	23
Spouse	17
Mother	12
Girlfriend or Boyfriend	6
Sister or Brother	4
Father	2
Grandparents	1
	101

III. Data Sources

Classification Report	48
Probation	38
Classification Sheet	11
Parole Summary	1
Preliminary Intake Report	1
Psychiatrist's Report	1
Defendant's Financial Statement	1
	101

IV. Data Consistency

Data Consistent	100
Data Inconsistent	1
	101

10.   Educational Testing Level

Educational testing level was defined as the result of any test designed to assess the grade level at which a person is performing independent of the number of grades completed. Information was available in only 3 cases, usually found in classification reports. There was no problem with data consistency.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
EDUCATIONAL TESTING LEVEL

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	3
Information Not Available	104
	107

II.   Information Values

Third Grade	1
Fifth Grade	1
Eighth Grade	1
	3

III.   Information Sources

Classification Report	2
Q.R.I.	1
	3

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Consistent	3
Data Inconsistent	0
	3

11. I.Q. Score

Scores for the I.Q. test were generally not available in inmate folders. In only 3 cases was an I.Q. score found. The I.Q. scores found were 74, 107 and "intelligent" range. I.Q. scores were most commonly found in Probation Reports. There was no discrepancy among data sources.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
I.Q. SCORE

I. Information Availability

Information Available	3
Information Not Available	104
	107

II. Data Values

74	1
107	1
Intelligent	1
	3

III. Data Sources

Probation Report	2
Parole Summary	1
	3

IV. Data Consistency

Data Consistent	3
Data Inconsistent	0
	3

12.   Plea Entered at Time of Trial

Information was available for 30 cases concerning the plea

entered at the time of trial.   In two-thirds of those cases a guilty

plea was entered.   The most common source of information was classi-

fication reports.   In no cases were there discrepancies among data

sources.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
PLEA ENTERED AT TRIAL

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	30
Information Not Available	77
	107

II.   Data Values

Guilty	20
Not Guilty	10
	30

III. Data Sources

Classification	13
Probation	10
Q.R.I.	3
Disposition Sheet	3
Police Report	1
	30

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Consistent	30
Data Inconsistent	0
	30

13.   Security Classification

Security classification was defined as an inmate's initial level of security as recommended by the classification board. Information was available in 93 cases from an inmate's folder. The most common placement was medium with over half of the initial placements (N=53). Classification reports were the most common source of information. There was discrepancy regarding initial security classification in only one case.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
INITIAL SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	93
Information Not Available	14
	107

II.   Data Values

Medium	53
Maximum	23
Minimum	13
House of Correction	2
Pre-Release	1
State Hospital	1
	93

III. Data Sources

Classification Reports	71
Classification Sheet	11
Q.R.I.	7
Progress Report	1
Parole Summary	1
Inmate Transfer Sheet	1
WCB Report	1
	93

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Sources Consistent	92
Data Sources Inconsistent	1
	93

14. Birth Order

Birth order was defined as the inmate's rank in relation to other siblings, including step and half siblings. Information was available in 71 cases. The most common single value was oldest child in 18 cases. The most common source of information was the probation report. In 70 of the 71 cases all data sources were consistent.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
BIRTH ORDER

I.   Information Availability

Information Available   71
Information Not Available   36
                                    ___
                                    107

II.   Data Values

Oldest   18
Second   13
Third   14
Fourth   7
Fifth   0
Sixth   3
Seventh   1
Eighth   0
Ninth   1
Tenth   0
Youngest   7
Middle   2
Only Child   3
Foster   2
                                     ___
                                     71

III. Data Sources

Probation Report   51
Q.R.I.   10
Classification   8
Parole Summary   2
                                     ___
                                     71

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Sources Consistent   70
Data Sources Inconsistent   1
                                     ___
                                     71

15.   Family Status During Childhood

Family status was defined as those relatives with whom the offender lived as a juvenile. In cases where the offender had multiple living situations, the living situation of longest duration was counted. Data was available in 97 cases. The most common family status was living with both natural parents (59 cases). In cases where the offender lived with only one natural parent, that parent was likely to be the mother. The most common source of information regarding family status was the Classification Report (76 cases). Data was consistent in all cases.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
FAMILY STATUS

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	97
Information Not Available	10
	107

II. Data Values

Both Natural Parents		59
One Parent		13
Mother	11	
Father	2	
One Parent & Step-Parent		14
Mother & Step Father	12	
Father & Step Mother	2	
Other Relatives		6
(grandparents, aunts, uncles)		
Foster/Adoptive Parents		5
		97

III. Data Sources

Classification Report	76
Probation Report	16
Parole Summary	2
Social History	1
Progress Report	1
Bridgewater Treatment Ctr. Report	1
	97

IV. Data Consistency

Data Consistent	97
Data Inconsistent	0
	97

The following variables were evaluating using a sample of releasees.

1.   Resumed Past Employment

This variable was intended to measure the number of releasees who were able to resume employment in a position they held prior to incarceration. The employment that was reported for post-release was compared with prior employment to see if this was a new or old job. Other indications of whether this was a new or old job were also looked for.

Data was available in 80 cases. In 62 cases the person found a new job. In 9 cases the person returned to a job held before incarceration. In 9 cases this variable was not applicable because the person did not find employment or was a student on release. The most common source of information was the parole summary. In all cases data sources were consistent regarding employment plans.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
RESUMED PAST EMPLOYMENT

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	80
Information Not Available	17
	97

II.   Data Values

Yes	9
No	62
Not Applicable	9
	80

III. Data Sources

Parole Summary	24
Classification Sheets	15
Probation Report	12
Q.R.I.	10
Notice of Home & Work	8
Progress Report	4
Parole Hearing Report	2
Letter to Parole Officer	2
Memorandum	2
Parole Plan	1
	80

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Consistent	80
Data Inconsistent	0
	80

2.   Number of Disciplinary Reports

This variable represents the total number of disciplinary

reports (D-reports) received during the current period of incarceration.

This was done either by looking for a disciplinary chronology or by

counting D-reports present in the folder. Information was available

for 84 cases. The median number of D-reports is 2. The most common

source of information is the disciplinary chronology. Data sources

were inconsistent in only 1 case.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
NUMBER OF REPORTS

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	84
Information Not Available	13
	97

II.   Data Values

None	20
One	17
Two	11
Three	5
Four	5
Five	8
Six	4
Seven	3
Eight	1
Nine	1
Eleven	2
Twelve	3
Fourteen	1
Eighteen	1
Twenty-six	1
Forty-six	1
	84

III. Data Sources

Disciplinary Chronology	42
Classification Sheet	22
Folder Count	8
Parole Summary	5
Furlough Progress	2
Memorandum	1
Special Summary	1
Criminal Record Report	1
Social History	1
Probation Report	1
	84

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Consistent	83
Data Inconsistent	1
	84

3. Employment Status on Release

The purpose of this variable was to measure the employment plans of the releasee population. Interest was in the number of offenders who were receiving employment as opposed to those who were unemployed. No attempt was made to verify that these employment plans were actually carried out or to follow up these plans to see how long the person actually was employed.

Data was available in 81 cases. The largest group (N=60) was employed full-time in the community. Only 6 were unemployed according to their employment plan. The most common source of information was the Notice of Home and Work form which provided information on 54 cases. In two cases there were discrepancies among the various data sources.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
EMPLOYMENT STATUS ON RELEASE

I. Information Availability

Information Available	81
Information Not Available	16
	97

II. Data Values

Full-Time Employment	60
Public Employment(CETA, MASS. REHAB.)	11
Unemployed	6
Student	4
	81

III. Data Sources

Notice of Home and Work	54
Parole Summary	12
Classification Sheet	4
Progress Report	3
Letter from Employer	2
Request for Parole Vote	2
Parole Log	1
Pre-Release Form	1
Q.R.I.	1
WCB - New Men	1
	81

IV. Data Consistency

Data Sources Consistent	79
Data Sources Inconsistent	2
	81

4.   Effect of Incarceration on Marriage and Family

This variable was intended to measure if any disruption in family and marital relations had occurred as a result of the present period of incarceration. Data was available for 82 cases. By far the most common impact was no change in marital and family relations. Family generally seemed supportive of the offenders in this group, maintaining contact through visits, the sponsorship of PRA and furlough time. There was generally no disruption of the level of relations that had existed before the incarceration. In the other 20 cases, 14 resulted in worsening of marital or family relations and 6 resulted in some positive impact on these relations. Information was provided by Classification materials and other release information. Data was inconsistent in 10 cases.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
EFFECT OF INCARCERATION ON MARRIAGE AND FAMILY

I.   Information Availability

Information Available	82
Information Not Available	15
	97

II.   Data Values

No Change in Marital Status or Family Relations	62
Separation/Divorce from Spouse	6
Marriage	4
Dislocation of Children	3
Loses Parental Support or Contact	2
Serious Marital Problems	2
Improvement in Family Relations	2
Loss of Girlfriend/boyfriend	1
	82

III.   Data Sources

Classification Reports	33
Notice of Home and Work	11
Parole Summary	9
Furlough Report	7
Letters from Family	7
Probation Reports	6
Pre-Release Reports	4
Institutional History	3
Q.R.I.	2
	82

IV.   Data Consistency

Data Sources Consistent	72
Data Sources Inconsistent	10
	82

5. Certainty of Release Date

This variable was intended to measure how close the release date of the offender was to the original parole eligibility date. Certainty of release date (release near the originally scheduled date) was postulated to facilitate careful release planning and hence preparation for reintegration into the community. Release before or after this planned date should interfere with this planning. Data were available for 96 cases. The largest group was released (by parole or discharge) within one month of their parole eligibility date. For those released either one month earlier than this date or one month later than this date, 39 were released later and 16 were released earlier. In all cases the parole eligibility date established in the QRI was compared with the release date of the individual. There were no cases of data discrepancy.

VALIDATION STUDY RESULTS
CERTAINTY OF RELEASE DATE

I. Information Availability

Information Available	96
Information Not Available	1
	97

II. Data Values

More Than 6 Months Early	5
3 to 6 Months Early	4
1 to 3 Months Early	7
On Time (Within One Month)	41
1 to 3 Months Late	10
3 to 6 Months Late	10
More Than 6 Months Late	19
	96

III. Information Sources

Comparing Parole Eligibility Date (Q.R.I. With Date of Release	96

IV. Data Discrepancies

Data Sources Consistent	96
Data Sources Inconsistent	0
	96

Summary

There is a large number of variables used by other corrections'
agencies that are useful and easily replicable that are not currently
included in the data base used in Massachusetts. Even the cursory
review of research conducted here yielded 60 variables of potential
interest. Of the 20 variables that were studied more fully, 16 were
found in more than half of the folders. This indicates that more
variables could be added with little additional data collection
effort. A summary of the findings on all of the variables appears in
the following table. The addition of these or other new variables to
the data base should be pursued vigorously.

SUMMARY TABLE

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT OF CASES WITH INFORMATION AVAILABLE	PRIMARY DATA SOURCE	PERCENT OF CASES WITH DISCREPANCIES	MOST COMMON VALUE FOUND
Place of Birth	100.0	QRI	0.9	Massachusetts
Religious Preference	99.1	QRI	5.7	Catholic
Marital Status of Parents	99.1	QRI	0.9	Married
Certainty of Release Date	99.0	QRI	0.0	Released on Time
Living Situation at Time of Admission	94.4	Classification	1.0	Alone
Family Status During Childhood	90.6	Classification	0.0	Both Natural Parents
Family Members in Corrections	87.8	QRI	0.0	None
Initial Security Classification	86.9	Classification	1.1	Medium
Number of D-Reports	86.6	Disciplinary Chronology	1.2	One
Effect of Incarceration on Family	84.5	Classification	12.2	No Effect
Employment Status on Release	83.5	Notice of Home & Work	2.5	Full-time
Number of Siblings	83.2	Probation	0.0	4 Children
Resumed Past Employment	82.5	Parole Summary	0.0	No
Length of Residency in State	70.1	Classification	0.0	16-20 Years
Birth Order	66.4	Probation	1.4	Oldest
Number of Children	56.1	QRI	3.3	1 Child
Source of Family Income	47.7	Probation	0.0	Offender's Salary
Plea Entered at Trial	28.0	Classification	0.0	Guilty
I.Q. Score	2.8	Probation	0.0	107
Educational Testing Level	2.8	Classification	0.0	5th Grade