

CHARACTERISTICS OF MEN ACCEPTED AND REJECTED FOR DAY WORK AT M.C.I., CONCORD

Massachusetts Department of Correction

John J. Fitzpatrick  
Commissioner

May, 1970

Researcher:

Carroll T. Miller  
Research Analyst  
Division of Legal Medicine  
May, 1970

Social Science Research Specialist  
Francis J. Carney

Publication of this Document Approved by Arthur C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent

No. 5114

This study is part of a joint research effort of the Massachusetts Department of Correction and the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health, Division of Legal Medicine

## SUMMARY

This report will provide some background information on the Concord Day Work program and describe the process of getting into the program.

The length of time spent in the program averaged about fourteen weeks and ranged between two weeks and forty-one weeks. On the average, the men earned ninety dollars a week, one-quarter covering support payments and expenditures at work, one-third remitted to the men upon release, and the remainder taken up by taxes and room and board.

A certain number of men applying for the program are rejected as ineligible, either upon application or in a few cases upon seeing the Board. The reasons for ineligibility include a violent crime as the present offense, warrants or detainers outstanding, and more than six months or only several weeks remaining until the date of parole eligibility or discharge.

Table III on page four summarizes the factors individually most important in identifying types of men more likely to be accepted by the Board. Table IV on page ~~eight~~ combines these factors to spotlight types of men with low, moderate and high chances of acceptance. The three high acceptance categories of 44 men with an 86.4% overall chance of acceptance are comprised of men with at least one of the three outstanding positive characteristics:

- (1) Sent from another institution or forestry camp to Concord specifically for Day Work
- (2) Emergency addressee wife
- (3) Prior incarcerations total five years or more

The three low acceptance categories of 33 men with a 12.1% overall chance of acceptance are comprised of men not having any of the positive characteristics above and having at least one of the following outstanding negative characteristics:

- (1) Longest period on a job one month or less
- (2) Some good conduct days withheld prior to Board appearance
- (3) Screened as a sexually dangerous person (as opposed to no screening)

The remaining category of 21 men, with none of these six outstanding positive or negative characteristics, had an acceptance rate of 42.9%. The most striking finding is that all men sent from other institutions or camps to Concord specifically for Day Work were accepted into the program.

## INTRODUCTION

In line with the recent expansion of work release programs in the United States, a day work center at the Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Concord was authorized by the Legislature in December, 1967 and opened in August, 1968. This is the first of several studies on the Concord program undertaken to provide some guidance for the opening later in 1970 of another day work center in the area of M.C.I., Norfolk and M.C.I., Walpole. This report will focus on: (1) some background information concerning the program and (2) a description of the process whereby men get into the program. A second study to follow will evaluate the impact of Day Work on recidivism.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Number of men and length of time in program. Fifty-one men were admitted to the program between its inception and September 24, 1969. The average number of men in the program has been eleven, and after the first four months this number has ranged between nine and fifteen. Most recently the number of men has stabilized at fifteen.

The forty-eight men released from the program by February 28, 1970 averaged 13.9 weeks in the program. However, as Table I makes clear, there is no standard length of time spent in the program.

Table I

<u>Number of Weeks Spent in Day Work Program</u>			
<u>No. of weeks</u>	<u>No. of men</u>	<u>No. of weeks</u>	<u>No. of men</u>
1-4	3	17-20	7
5-8	8	21-24	6
9-12	14	25-28	3
13-16	6	29 or more	1

Employer. According to records sent from M.C.I., Concord, 28 men were employed by the Concord Wool Company, 12 by the Scott and Williams Foundry, 9 by Seiler's Service, and one each by the Middlesex Motor Company and the Concord Woodworking Company. The jobs tend to be low status and unskilled. In part because of the expense of living in the area of Concord and its distance from Boston, almost none of the men continued on the jobs after release.

Earnings. Table II contains information on the earnings of the 43 men in the program during the year from August 19, 1968 through August 16, 1969.

Table II

<u>Earnings of Men in Concord Day Work Program</u>			
<u>Average per week per man</u>		<u>%</u>	
\$12.60	Federal taxes and F.I.C.A.	14.1%	} 28.2%
\$ 1.07	State taxes	1.2%	
\$24.06	Room and Board	27.0%	} 57.7%
\$14.56	Support payments	16.3%	
\$ 5.41	Expenditures at work	6.1%	
\$31.45	To be given to men upon release	35.3%	
<u>\$89.15</u>	TOTAL	<u>100.0%</u>	

In short, they averaged about ninety dollars per week, almost sixty per cent of this going in some form to the men or their families.

PROCESS OF ACCEPTANCE INTO THE DAY WORK PROGRAM

The Basic Process. Men are accepted into the Day Work program by a three-step process: (1) Inmates apply for the program, often at the recommendation of the Classification Board. (2) A certain number of these are immediately rejected as ineligible. By legislation, those serving life sentences or convicted of sex crimes or crimes against the person are ineligible. By departmental policy, an inmate is ineligible if he has a warrant or detainer filed against him, if he has more than six months remaining before his parole eligibility or discharge date, or if he is not "free from disease or other conditions which would menace himself or others." In practice, those with very little time remaining until parole or discharge are usually judged ineligible. (3) They are then personally seen by the Day Work Board. At this stage a small number (14 of 112 in the sample for this study) are rejected as ineligible for the reasons described above. The Board usually consists of from three to five men. Typically, these include the Director of Treatment, the administrator of the program, a correctional social worker, and an Assistant Deputy Superintendent. In this way varying perspectives can be brought to bear on the evaluation of a man. Each board member gives each applicant a rating in points; these scores are summed; if the total falls above a point the man is accepted and if below he is rejected. (At this stage 47 of 98 were rejected in the sample for this study.)

Method. To understand the reasoning behind the decisions of the Day Work Board, those accepted into the program were compared with those eligible but rejected by the Board. The sample consisted of the 98 men, seen by the Board from the beginning of the program until September 18, 1969, who were eligible for Day Work.

Information was collected on four categories of variables:

- (A) Background Factors
- (B) Criminal History
- (C) Present Offense
- (D) Institutional Behavior.

The relation of each of the 38 factors to acceptance or rejection by the Day Work Board was analyzed for statistical significance. Finally, the most important factors were combined to identify men with a very good or very poor chance of acceptance.

### Findings

The criteria significantly related to the decisions of the Day Work Board are summarized in Table III and discussed below.

Table III

Types of Men More Likely to be Accepted by the Day Work Board

<u>Importance of the Factor</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>Acceptance More Likely When:</u>
Very high	Institution prior to Board appearance	Other than Concord
High	Institution committed to	Walpole
Very high	Emergency addressee	Wife <sup>2</sup>
Very high	Age at commitment	Older
Very high	Longest period one job	Longer period
High	Marital status	Married or separated
Very high	On juvenile probation? <sup>3</sup>	No
High	No. of prior property arrests. <sup>3</sup>	Fewer
High	No. of prior arrests <sup>3</sup>	Fewer
High	Total no. months prior incarcerations <sup>3</sup>	Many or few
High	Screened for SDP? (vs. not screened) <sup>3</sup>	No
Moderate	No. of prior drunkenness arrests <sup>3</sup>	None
Very high	No. of good conduct days withheld	None
High	No. of disciplinary reports (DR)	None or one
High	No. DR-other contraband, stealing	None
High	No. DR - disobed. , insolence, prof.	None
Moderate	No. DR - damaging state property	None

1 This column refers to the level of statistical significance. "Very high" signifies  $p < .001$ ; "high" signifies  $p < .01$  or  $p < .02$ ; "moderate" signifies  $p < .05$ .

2 There is a high chance of acceptance when the wife is the emergency addressee and a low chance when one of the parents is the emergency addressee.

3 The relationships are those that hold after the effect of age has been mathematically taken out by a regression technique.

Present Offense. All 18 men transferred from Walpole, Norfolk, and the Forestry Camps to Concord for Day Work were accepted into the program (Appendix I, Section B-6). In other words, for all practical purposes these men were screened before transfer by the sending institution rather than after transfer by the Concord Day Work Board.

Eleven men were transferred from the forestry camps to Concord for the Day Work program; all were accepted into Day Work, all but one within four days of transfer, five did not see the Day Work Board. Four men were transferred from Norfolk to Concord; all were put on Day Work, after an average wait of two weeks; three did not see the Day Work Board. Three men were transferred from Walpole to Concord; after an average wait of five months, all three saw the Board, were accepted and were put on the program. One man was committed to Concord then transferred to Norfolk; four months after this transfer, while still at Norfolk, he was rejected by the Day Work Board.

Thus, judging from records sent from Concord, all 18 men transferred from other institutions or camps to Concord for Day Work were put on the program. This reflects both the choosing of "good risk" candidates at the sending institution and the administrative difficulties of returning a man sent to Concord for this program from another institution or camp. One result of this process is that men committed to Walpole are more likely to be accepted than are men committed to Concord (B-5). None of the other variables in this category are significantly related to acceptance by the Board. It makes only a minor difference what a man's offense is (given that it is not a person or sex crime) (P-1), how many codefendants he has (B-2), whether his version of the offense agrees or disagrees with the official version (B-3), and whether he was a parole violator for the present incarceration (B-4).

Background Factors. The Board clearly preferred men older and more stably settled in the community, as reflected in their marital status, community ties and work history. Men with these positive characteristics were two to three times more likely to be accepted.

Men 27 or older were significantly more likely to be accepted than men 26 or younger (A-1). Those married or separated were significantly more likely to be accepted than those single or divorced (A-4). Related to this is another significant finding: the chance of acceptance is high when the emergency addressee is the man's wife, low when a parent, and moderate when a sibling or other relative or non-relative (A-6).

The length of the longest period on one job is significantly related to acceptance (A-10). While occupational status and the stability of employment are not significantly related to acceptance, the small number of men with regular employment histories (A-9) or with prior major jobs that were skilled, sales, clerical, professional or managerial (A-8) had very good chances of acceptance.

Race (A-2), religion (A-3), military service (A-5), and education (A-7), were all not significantly related to a man's chances of acceptance by the Day Work Board.

Criminal History. Here the Board prefers men with shorter criminal histories but also men who are older (and therefore generally have longer criminal histories.) Thus we find two groups with a high chance of acceptance, men with particularly short criminal histories and men with particularly long criminal histories (who are older). To separate the influence of each of these factors, Section B of Appendix I presents the relation of each of the criminal history factors to acceptance separately for men 18-21, 22-26, and 27 or older at commitment.

Within each of the age categories, the Board consistently prefers men with fewer prior arrests - of all types. This relation is particularly strong for the total number of prior arrests (D-2) and for arrests for property offenses (D-3), but it also holds for arrests for person (D-4), sex (D-5), narcotics (D-6) and drunkenness (D-7) offenses. Further, men with any sexually dangerous person screening action have almost no chance of acceptance (D-13).

Men with prior incarcerations totalling either six or fewer months or 60 or more months have a significantly higher chance of acceptance (D-11). The preference for men with long total prior incarcerations reflects the preference for older men: 18 of the 20 men with total prior incarcerations of 60 months or more were 27 or older at the present commitment. Men who have never been on juvenile probation have a significantly higher chance of acceptance. However, the length of prior juvenile ( -8), House of Correction ( -9), and state or federal ( -10) incarcerations are all not significantly related to acceptance.

Institutional Behavior. Misconduct during the present incarceration and prior to the Board appearance was strongly related to rejection by the Board. Men with some good conduct days withheld (G-1) or with two or more disciplinary reports (G-2) have a significantly lower chance of acceptance; they are roughly one-third as likely to be accepted as are men with no good conduct days withheld or with zero or one disciplinary report. It is not apparent what types of disciplinary reports are more seriously viewed (G-3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9).

Criteria Combined. Finally, these factors work together to differentiate types of men with particularly good or poor chances of acceptance. Table III presents the factors most closely related to acceptance or rejection by the Day Work Board combined by the method of successive dichotomization.

Table IV  
Types of Men Most Likely to Be Accepted or Rejected  
by the Concord Day Work Board

<u>A. Factors Associated with Acceptance</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Rate</u>	
1. Sent from another institution or Forestry Camp to Concord for Day Work	18	100.0%	} N=44 86.4% Accepted
2. Emergency addressee wife	17	76.5%	
3. Prior incarcerations total five years or more	9	77.8%	
 <u>B. Factors Associated with Rejection*</u>			
1. Longest period one job zero or one month	19	10.5%	} N=33 12.1% Accepted
2. Some good conduct days withheld	9	11.1%	
3. Some (rather than none) sexually dangerous person screening	5	20.0%	
 <u>C. Residual Category</u> ( none of the above six factors present)			N=21 42.9% Accepted

\* None of the three "acceptance factors" present.

As Table IV indicates, there are a few crucial variables that tend to be very closely associated with acceptance or rejection for the Day Work Program. The probability of acceptance was very high (1) for those transferred to Concord specifically for the program (presumably because they had already been screened at the sending institution or camp); (2) for those who named their wife as their emergency addressee; and (3) for those who

had spent a total of at least five years in correctional institutions prior to their present incarceration (reflecting the fact that they were older than most of the candidates considered). The acceptance rate for the 44 men in these three categories was 86.4%.

On the other hand, the probability of acceptance was very low for those with none of the above three positive characteristics and (1) with poor work histories (never more than one month on any job); or (2) who had been institutional disciplinary problems (some good conduct time withheld); or (3) who had been screened under the Sexually Dangerous Persons Law (even though they were found to be not sexually dangerous at the initial screening). The acceptance rate for the 33 men in these three categories was only 12.1%.

Finally, there were 21 men who had neither the three positive characteristics nor the three negative characteristics related to acceptance in the program. The acceptance rate for the 21 men in this residual category was 42.9%. Therefore, in most cases the decision to accept or reject a candidate for work release was found to be closely related to a few key characteristics of the subjects.

Appendix I

STATISTICAL DATA ON THOSE ACCEPTED AND REJECTED BY CONCORD DAY WORK BOARD

	<u>N</u>	<u>Acceptance Rates</u>	<u>Significance of Differences between Acceptance Rates<sup>1</sup></u>
<b>A. <u>BACKGROUND FACTORS</u></b>			
<b>1. <u>Age at commitment*</u></b>			
26 or younger	67	38.8%	x <sup>2</sup> =14.86 df=1 p<.001
27 or older	31	80.6%	
<b>2. <u>Race</u></b>			
Black	23	47.8%	x <sup>2</sup> =.13 df=1 p<.70
White	74	52.7%	
American Indian	1	100.0%	
<b>3. <u>Religion</u></b>			
Protestant	35	54.3%	x <sup>2</sup> =.11 df=1 p<.70
Catholic	62	51.6%	
Jewish	1	0.0%	
<b>4. <u>Marital Status*</u></b>			
Single	52	40.4%	x <sup>2</sup> =7.67 df=1 p<.01
Divorced	7	42.9%	
Married	26	73.1%	
Separated	13	61.5%	
<b>5. <u>Military Service</u></b>			
None	75	48.0%	x <sup>2</sup> =2.89 df=1 p<.10
Honorable Discharge	11	54.5%	
Other than honorable discharge	12	75.0%	
<b>6. <u>Emergency Addressee*</u></b>			
Wife	25	84.0%	x <sup>2</sup> =15.46 df=2 p<.001
Brother, sister, other relative or non-relative	16	65.2%	
Father or mother	57	35.1%	
<b>7. <u>Education</u></b>			
0-8 years	52	48.1%	x <sup>2</sup> =.67 df=1 p<.50
9-16 years	46	56.5%	

<sup>1</sup> Chi-squares were calculated on the grouped acceptance rates.

\* Indicates a statistically significant difference in acceptance rates.

Appendix I

STATISTICAL DATA ON THOSE ACCEPTED AND REJECTED BY CONCORD DAY WORK BOARD

	<u>N</u>	<u>Acceptance Rates</u>	<u>Significance of Differences between Acceptance Rates</u>
<b>A. <u>BACKGROUND FACTORS</u> (continued)</b>			
<b>8. <u>Occupational Status</u></b>			
Unskilled	57	47.4%	} 49.5%
Semi-skilled	34	52.9%	
Skilled, sales, clerical, prof., managerial	7	85.7%	} 85.7%
<b>9. <u>Stability of Employment</u></b>			
Regular	8	75.0%	} 75.0%
Irregular	29	55.2%	
Casual	61	47.5%	} 50.0%
<b>10. <u>Longest Period on One Job*</u></b>			
0-1 months	24	25.0%	} 56.4%
2-13 months	57	54.4%	
14 or more months	17	82.4%	} 85.7%
<b>B. <u>PRESENT OFFENSE</u></b>			
<b>1. <u>Type of Offense</u></b>			
Sex	0	----	} 56.4%
Against the person	0	----	
Against property	86	52.3%	} 47.6%
Other	12	50.0%	
<b>2. <u>Number of codefendants</u></b>			
None	39	61.5%	} 56.4%
Some	59	45.8%	
<b>3. <u>Inmate Version of Present Offense, as Compared to Official Version</u></b>			
Agree	55	56.4%	} 56.4%
Agree, with qualifications	8	50.0%	
Disagree	34	47.1%	} 47.6%
Not Available	1	0.0%	
<b>4. <u>Present Incarceration as Parole Violator (in part or whole)</u></b>			
Yes	36	50.0%	} 53.2%
No	62	53.2%	

Appendix I

STATISTICAL DATA ON THOSE ACCEPTED AND REJECTED BY CONCORD DAY WORK BOARD

	<u>N</u>	<u>Acceptance Rate</u>	<u>Significance of Differences between Acceptance Rates</u>
B. <u>PRESENT OFFENSE</u> (continued)			
5. <u>Institution Committed to</u> *			
House of Correction	1	0.0%	} 78.3% x <sup>2</sup> =8.28 df=1 p<.01
Walpole	22	81.8%	
Concord	75	44.0%	
6. <u>Institution Prior to Board Appearance</u> *			
Walpole	3	100.0%	} 94.7% x <sup>2</sup> =16.44 df=1 p<.001
Norfolk	5#	80.0%	
Forestry Camps	11	100.0%	
Concord	79	43.0%	
# Includes one case at Norfolk prior to Board appearance, but not specifically sent to Concord for Day Work			
C. <u>INSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR</u>			
1. <u>Number of Good Conduct Days Withheld</u> *			
None	76	61.8%	x <sup>2</sup> =13.03 df=1 p<.001
Some	22	18.2%	
2. <u>Number of Disciplinary Reports</u> *			
0-1	82	58.5%	x <sup>2</sup> =8.49 df=1 p<.01
2 or more	16	18.8%	
3. <u>Number of Disciplinary Reports for Threats or Assaults</u>			
None	88	54.5%	x <sup>2</sup> =2.17 df=1 p<.20
Some	10	30.0%	
4. <u>Number of Disciplinary Reports for Disturbance or Malicious Mischief</u>			
None	94	52.1%	x <sup>2</sup> =.00 df=1 p<1.00
Some	4	50.0%	
5. <u>Number of Disciplinary Reports for Damaging State Property</u> *			
None	92	55.4%	x <sup>2</sup> =4.88 df=1 p<.05
Some	6	0.0%	

Appendix I

	<u>N</u>	<u>Acceptance Rate</u>	<u>Significance of Differences between Acceptance Rates</u>
C. <u>INSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR</u> (continued)			
6. <u>Number of Disciplinary Reports for Disobedience, Insolence or Profanity*</u>			
None	77	58.4%	$x^2=5.90$
Some	21	28.6%	df=1
			$p<.02$
7. <u>Number of Disciplinary Reports for Carrying a Dangerous Weapon</u>			
None	98	52.0%	
Some	0	----	
8. <u>Number of Disciplinary Reports for Under the Influence, Drug Contraband</u>			
None	97	51.5%	$x^2=.00$
Some	1	0.0%	df=1
			$p<1.00$
9. <u>Number of Disciplinary Reports for Other Contraband, Stealing*</u>			
None	88	56.8%	$x^2=7.89$
Some	10	10.0%	df=1
			$p<.01$

Appendix I

STATISTICAL DATA ON THOSE ACCEPTED AND REJECTED BY CONCORD JUVENILE WORK BOARD

	<u>18-21</u>		<u>22-26</u>		<u>27 or older</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>Acc.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Acc.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Acc.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Acc.</u>	<u>N</u>
	<u>Rate</u>		<u>Rate</u>		<u>Rate</u>		<u>Rate</u>	
<u>D. CRIMINAL HISTORY AND AGE AT COMMITMENT</u>								
<u>1. Age at First Arrest</u>								
8-10	0.0%	( 4)	50.0%	( 2)	60.0%	( 5)	36.4%	(11)
11-14	46.7%	(15)	44.4%	( 9)	91.7%	(12)	61.1%	(36)
15 or more	23.5%	(17)	52.6%	(19)	73.3%	(15)	49.0%	(51)
<u>2. Number of Prior Arrests</u>								
0-5	44.4%	( 9)	100.0%	(4)	100.0%	( 4)	70.6%	(17)
6-14	25.9%	(27)	43.5%	(23)	84.6%	(13)	44.4%	(63)
15 or more	----	( 0)	33.3%	( 3)	66.7%	(15)	61.1%	(18)
<u>3. Number of Prior Arrests for Property Offenses</u>								
0-5	45.0%	(20)	68.8%	(16)	80.0%	(15)	62.7%	(51)
6-13	12.5%	(16)	28.6%	(14)	23.1%	(13)	37.2%	(43)
14 or more	----	( 0)	----	( 0)	75.0%	( 4)	75.0%	( 4)
<u>4. Number of Prior Arrests for Person Offenses</u>								
0-1	32.3%	(31)	58.3%	(24)	86.4%	(22)	55.8%	(77)
2 or more	20.0%	( 5)	16.7%	( 6)	60.0%	(10)	38.1%	(21)
<u>5. Number of Prior Arrests for Sex Offenses</u>								
0-1	31.4%	(35)	51.7%	(29)	83.3%	(30)	54.3%	(94)
2 or more	0.0%	( 1)	0.0%	( 1)	0.0%	( 2)	0.0%	( 4)
<u>6. Number of Prior Arrests for Narcotics Offenses</u>								
None	33.3%	(33)	50.0%	(30)	80.0%	(30)	53.8%	(93)
One	0.0%	( 3)	----	( 0)	50.0%	( 2)	20.0%	( 5)
<u>7. Number of Prior Arrests for Drunkenness</u>								
None	29.6%	(27)	53.3%	(15)	90.9%	(11)	49.1%	(53)
Some	33.3%	( 9)	46.7%	(15)	71.4%	(21)	55.6%	(45)
<u>8. Length of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations (in months)</u>								
0-11	29.2%	(24)	45.8%	(24)	75.0%	(16)	46.9%	(64)
12 or more	33.3%	(12)	66.7%	( 6)	81.3%	(16)	61.8%	(34)
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>30.6%</u>	<u>(36)</u>	<u>50.0%</u>	<u>(30)</u>	<u>78.1%</u>	<u>(32)</u>	<u>52.0%</u>	<u>(98)</u>

Appendix J

STATISTICAL DATA ON THOSE ACCEPTED AND REJECTED BY CONCORD DAY WORK BOARD

	<u>18-21</u>		<u>22-26</u>		<u>27 or older</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>Acc.</u>		<u>Acc.</u>		<u>Acc.</u>		<u>Acc.</u>	
	<u>Rate</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>N</u>
<b>D. <u>CRIMINAL HISTORY AND AGE AT COMMITMENT</u> (continued)</b>								
<b>9. <u>Length of Prior House of Correction Incarcerations (in months)</u></b>								
0	38.5%	(13)	62.5%	(8)	100.0%	(7)	60.7%	(28)
1-23	26.1%	(23)	47.6%	(21)	68.8%	(16)	45.0%	(60)
24 or more	-----	(0)	0.0%	(1)	77.8%	(9)	70.0%	(10)
<b>10. <u>Length of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations (in months)</u></b>								
0	24.2%	(30)	57.1%	(21)	69.2%	(13)	45.3%	(64)
1-44	50.0%	(6)	33.3%	(9)	100.0%	(5)	55.0%	(20)
45 or more	-----	(0)	-----	(0)	78.6%	(14)	78.6%	(14)
<b>11. <u>Total Length of All Prior Incarcerations (in months)</u></b>								
0-6	35.7%	(14)	31.8%	(11)	100.0%	(6)	65.9%	(31)
7-59	27.3%	(22)	23.5%	(17)	50.0%	(8)	29.8%	(47)
60 or more	-----	(0)	100.0%	(2)	83.3%	(18)	85.0%	(20)
<b>12. <u>Ever on Probation ?</u></b>								
Never	42.9%	(7)	0.0%	(1)	83.3%	(6)	60.0%	(14)
Adult only	37.5%	(8)	68.8%	(16)	80.0%	(15)	66.7%	(39)
Juvenile only	14.3%	(7)	0.0%	(2)	66.7%	(3)	25.0%	(12)
Both juv. & adult	28.6%	(14)	36.4%	(11)	75.0%	(8)	42.4%	(33)
<b>13. <u>Any Sexually Dangerous Person Screening ?</u></b>								
No action	31.3%	(32)	57.0%	(26)	77.8%	(18)	47.7%	(88)
Screened, not processed	25.0%	(4)	0.0%	(4)	0.0%	(2)	10.0%	(10)
Action beyond screening	-----	(0)	-----	(0)	-----	(0)	-----	(0)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30.6%</b>	<b>(36)</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>(30)</b>	<b>78.1%</b>	<b>(32)</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>(98)</b>