

CHARACTERISTICS OF MAJOR VIOLATORS
IN MASSACHUSETTS:
AN INTERIM REPORT

Prepared by:

Ellen Chayet
Program Evaluation
Analyst

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Frank A. Hall
Commissioner

October, 1976

PUBLICATION # 9260-44-200-10-76-CR

Approved by Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent

ABSTRACT

As national attention is increasingly focusing on career criminals (the recidivistic and more serious offenders), Massachusetts is one of the few states to have both prosecution and correction oriented programs to deal with this offender type. To enable correctional administrators to plan treatment programs for individuals convicted as such by the District Attorney, a typology of the career criminal, or Major Violator, needed to be developed. This study represents the first step in that task.

Two groups were selected for study. The treatment group (N = 112) consisted of all Major Violators convicted by Suffolk Superior Court since program inception. The control (N = 155) was culled from all commitments from that court to the institution receiving Major Violators during the same time period. Comparisons between the two groups were made to ascertain differentiating factors. Major differences were found to exist; a total of ten variables yielded significance using the Chi Square test. Among these: Major Violators were more likely to have received a longer sentence, to have been younger, both at the current incarceration and when arrested for the first time, have been arrested more times previously for committing person offenses and for property offenses, to have appeared in court more often, to be committed for an armed robbery. These findings were consistent with the theoretical conceptualization of the career criminal, and have pragmatic implications for correctional treatment planning.

Future studies will elaborate upon these findings by utilizing diverse control groups.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank the Research Unit staff of the Department of Correction for their invaluable assistance in many capacities in the preparation of this report.

CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
Introduction	
Methodology	3
The Sample	3
Table I - Description of Samples	3
Table II - Major Violators By Commitment Institution	4
Research Questions	4
Findings	6
Current Incarceration	6
Criminal History	8
Personal Characteristics	9
Summary of Findings	10
Table III - Summary of Findings Yielding Maximum Chi Squares	11
Discussion	13
Appendix I - Frequency Distributions of Data	15
Appendix II - Minimum and Maximum Lengths of Sentence	36
Appendix III - Time Until Parole Eligibility Date	39

INTRODUCTION

The concept of the career criminal is achieving increased recognition as a qualitatively distinct issue in the criminal justice field. It has been argued that an identifiable segment of the general offender population repeatedly engages in criminal activity despite traditional attempts at rehabilitation. Further, the crimes committed by this group are likely to be more serious in nature than those of other offenders. If these assumptions are valid, then alternative approaches must be devised in order to deal with the career criminal in ways that would minimize the likelihood of continued criminality.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is currently embarking on a two-pronged effort - both prosecutorial and correctional - to impact career criminals. The Major Violators Division of the Office of the District Attorney for Suffolk County was funded as a court and police-based program to identify the career criminal (hereinafter referred to as Major Violator); to develop strategies for effectively prosecuting individuals so identified; and to ensure speedy and efficient case management. From September 8, 1975 through July 19, 1976, aggregate project statistics indicate that 2,693 cases were referred to this unit, 238 were accepted (8.9 percent), and 177 classified as Major Violators (6.6 percent of all referred cases; 74.4 percent of all accepted cases).

Once an individual is convicted, the burden of responsibility rests with the Department of Correction, as a separately funded component, to effectuate treatment modalities specifically designed for this type (or types) of offender. Treatment planning cannot commence, however, until some assessment is made of the characteristics of the convicted Major Violators to determine if, in fact, Correction is receiving a decidedly different offender group. This interim study represents the first step toward describing such a typology.

The overall design utilizes a multifaceted approach. Ultimately, comparisons will be drawn between the cohort of convicted Major Violators in Suffolk County and various control groups. The specific institutional populations chosen as controls can be categorized into those incarcerated during the operational (contemporary) phase of the Major Violators program, or during the pre-program inception phase. Contemporary controls include (a) Suffolk Superior Court commitments to MCI-Walpole; and (b) all other court commitments to Walpole. The pre-program phase extends for two years prior to the establishment of the Major Violators Program (1974 and 1975), and involves dichotomizing court commitments to MCI-Walpole into (a) those occurring from Suffolk Superior Court; and (b) commitments made to that institution from elsewhere in the state. The selection of these varied groups is necessary if we are to ascertain that the Major Violator requires specific attention from the correctional system. The complexity of the design will ensure that any differences obtained are due to the existence of a definable population, and not to possible mitigating factors of location or commitment trends.

The immediate problem addressed by the present study is one of providing feedback to corrections planners in the early stages of operations to facilitate treatment program development based on sound analysis. Hence, this paper is concerned with one portion of the total design - a documentation of characteristics of the Major Violator cohort as they compare to Suffolk Superior Court commitments to MCI-Walpole during the program phase. Data is currently being collected for the remaining samples. Findings from future studies should be integrated with those presented below and incorporated as a refined depiction of the Major Violator in Massachusetts.

METHODOLOGY

The Sample

This study design includes two distinct groups between which comparisons will be drawn. The treatment sample, totalling 112, is comprised of all individuals convicted as Major Violators as a result of the District Attorney's program from September, 1975 through July, 1976. A control sample was constructed of all Suffolk Superior Court commitments to MCI-Walpole during the same time period who were not classified as Major Violators. This group, which includes 155 individuals, will be referred to as "non-Major Violators" throughout this study. The composition of the total sample is depicted in Table I.

TABLE I
DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLES

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Major Violators	112	(41.9)
Non-Major Violators	<u>155</u>	<u>(58.1)</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	267	(100.0)

Selection of the control group was limited to Walpole commitments since it was expected that the overwhelming majority of Major Violators would be sentenced to that institution. This stems from the policy of traditionally reserving Walpole for the older, recidivist offender, who may have also committed more serious crimes. Thus, the choice of Walpole commitments as a control assures comparability of the two groups, and allows us to assess whether or not the Major Violator can be considered a unique population.

It should be noted here, however, that the treatment group in the present study includes Major Violators who were sentenced to facilities other than Walpole. These commitments, to MCI's Concord, Framingham, Bridgewater, and Houses of Correction, account for only 16% of the 112 individuals comprising the Major Violator cohort. Since this paper is primarily concerned with describing a statistical profile of program participants to date it was felt that inclusion of these commitments was justifiable. Further studies will focus solely on Walpole commitments.

TABLE II

MAJOR VIOLATORS BY COMMITMENT INSTITUTION*

INSTITUTION COMMITTED TO:	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
MCI-Walpole	91	(85.1)
MCI-Concord	10	(9.4)
MCI-Framingham	2	(1.8)
House of Correction	3	(2.8)
MCI-Bridgewater	1	(.9)
<u>TOTAL</u>	107	(100.0)

* Based on 107 cases for whom data was available

Research Questions

This study will address the following basic question: Are there any differences between those individuals who have been convicted as Major Violators, and those who have not?

The investigation will be specifically concerned with differences evidenced between the treatment and control group relating to indicators that (a) are presumed characteristics of Major Violators or career criminals (such as extent and nature of criminal history); and (b) bear on the current incarceration (length of sentence, nature of present offense). Focus on these clusters of items is particularly crucial, since findings have direct implications for correctional program planning. Further analyses will also center on such areas as tracking the movement of Major Violators and non-Major Violators between and among institutional security levels. This will allow us to determine if there are differences in the quality of incarceration experienced by the two groups, and whether the Major Violator is remaining at higher security levels for longer periods of time. Again, this would have direct bearing on the planning process.

Data was collected and processed for all individuals regarding current commitment, personal background characteristics, and criminal history (for a complete list of variables, please consult Appendix I). A total of 35 variables were available from the

existing Massachusetts data base.¹ Chi Square tests were used to determine if differences obtained between the groups could be considered statistically significant. A relationship will be assumed significant if the Chi Square yields a probability at the .05 level or beyond; that is, the demonstrated relationship could be expected to occur by chance less than 5 times out of 100.

Insofar as the purpose of this study is to depict a typology of the Major Violator cohort, a further refinement of the Chi Square technique was utilized. The relationships described in the following narrative will be those for which a Maximum Chi Square was obtained; i.e., that value at which the greatest differences were found to exist.

Findings will be presented by category of current incarceration, criminal history, and personal background characteristics. Table III on page 11 summarizes the data employed in calculating the Maximum Chi Squares, as well as the numerical value of the statistic and probability level.

¹Booking and probation data was provided by the data base maintained by the Correction/Parole Information System Unit.

FINDINGS

I. Current Incarceration

Minimum Sentence

Non-Major Violators were overwhelmingly more likely than Major Violators to receive a minimum sentence of Life, compared to all other minimum sentences. Whereas 21.4% of the control group were committed for Life, only 4.5% of the Major Violators received this sentence.¹ Even if those individuals with indeterminate sentences are excluded from the calculations, this relationship remains statistically significant. This constitutes an extremely important finding, since we would have expected the reverse to be true.

Pragmatically, however, we wished to further explore the relationship between minimum sentence and offender group, due to its bearing on parole eligibility. By systematically excluding Lifers from the analysis, we found a significant difference to exist between the groups at a minimum sentence of seven years. Major Violators were more likely to have a minimum sentence of greater than seven years (47.7%) than the control group (34.7%).

Maximum Sentence

The relationship posited for minimum sentence holds for maximum; non-Major Violators were significantly more likely to be sentenced for Life. Once again, if Life sentences are excluded, we obtain a maximum split occurring at 10 years, with Major Violators committed for a maximum of longer than 10 years (56.1%) proportionately more often than non-Major Violators (41.8%). A comparison of the minimum and maximum sentence received by Major Violators, non-Major Violators, and Suffolk Superior Court commitments to MCI-Walpole during the years 1974 and 1975 can be found in Appendix II (page 36).

¹Statistical significance of this and all subsequent findings is located in Table III on Pages 11-12.

Age at Incarceration

Major Violators were younger than non-Major Violators when incarcerated for the current offense. The greatest difference occurred at age 34 or younger, with Major Violators represented more heavily (95.5%) than non-Major Violators (87.1%).

Number of Jail Credits

Major Violators have significantly fewer jail credits accrued when incarcerated than do non-Major Violators. The cohort group was represented in greater proportion (93.8%) than the control group (71.6%) in having six months or fewer jail credits. The data also indicated that there was a significant difference in the proportions of both groups who had no jail credits whatsoever. In this case, 29.5% of the non-Major Violators had no jail credits, compared to 17.9% of the Major Violators.

Primary Offense

Commitments for property offenses accounted for a significant portion of the Major Violator sample (15.2% versus 2.6%). On the other hand, they were much less likely to be incarcerated on a charge of murder one or two than the control group (3.6% versus 20.6%). However, when we isolated the specific offense that differentiated the two groups, armed robbery emerged as the one for which Major Violators were more likely to be committed (50.9% compared to 28.4% of non-Major Violators).

II. Criminal History

Total Number of Court Appearances

Major Violators were liable to have had appeared in court on more than three previous occasions. Although 83.6% of the non-Major Violators were in this category, 94.2% of the cohort group fell into this range. This difference is statistically significant.

Offenses Against the Person

A greater proportion (50.9%) of the Major Violators had been arrested more than five times for offenses against the person, compared to only 35.5% of the control group.

Property Offenses

Individuals processed as Major Violators were especially likely to have been previously arrested more than once for committing a property offense (80.4% versus 65.2% of the non-Major Violators).

Age at Time of First Arrest

Major Violators were significantly younger than non-Major Violators when arrested for the first time. Whereas 91.2% of the former were 19 or younger, only 75.5% of the latter group were within this age bracket.

Age at First Drug Arrest

Consistent with the above relationship is the finding that if an individual had ever been arrested for drugs, a Major Violator was more likely than the non-Major Violator to have been 19 years old or younger at the time (61.7% compared to 35.2%).

Certain expected differences in terms of criminal history were not found. For example, there was no significant relationship between being processed as a Major Violator and total number of adult or juvenile incarcerations; or total number of parole violations.

-9-

III. Personal Characteristics

Last Grade Completed

Differences in educational level attained existed for the two groups; 56.7% of the Major Violators had completed more than the ninth grade, compared to 40.6% of the non-Major Violators.

Summary of Findings

The greatest differences between the two groups can be summarized as follows:

Major Violators were significantly more likely than non-Major Violators to:

- have received a minimum sentence of longer than seven years, and a maximum of longer than 10 years, if the category of Life is excluded from the analysis
- be 34 or younger when incarcerated for the present offense
- have fewer than six months jail credits accumulated
- have armed robbery as the primary offense on the current commitment
- be committed for the general category of a property offense
- have had more than three prior court appearances
- have been arrested more than five times for offenses against the person
- have been arrested more than once for property offenses
- have been 19 or younger when arrested for the first time
- have been 19 or younger if ever arrested for drugs
- have completed more than the ninth grade

Major Violators were significantly less likely than non-Major Violators to:

- have been committed for Life
- to be serving their present sentence for the general offense category or murder

Table III, on page 11, presents statistical data used for deriving these maximum relationships.

TABLE III: FINDINGS YIELDING SUMMARY OF MAXIMUM CHI SQUARES

VARIABLE	SPLIT		MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON MAJOR VIOLATORS		χ^2 (1df for all variables)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
I. CURRENT INCARCERATION							
1. Minimum Sentence							
Life	5	(4.5)	33	(21.4)	15.239		
All other minimum	107	(95.5)	121	(78.6)	P < .001		
Life	5	(5.6)	33	(21.4)	10.687		
All other minimum (excluding indeterminate)	94	(94.4)	121	(78.6)	P < .01		
Excluding Life:							
7 years or less	56	(52.3)	79	(65.3)	3.944		
longer than 7 years	51	(47.7)	42	(34.7)	P < .05		
2. Maximum Sentence							
Life	5	(4.5)	33	(21.3)	15.080		
All other maximum	107	(95.5)	122	(78.7)	P < .001		
Excluding Life:							
10 years or less	47	(43.9)	71	(58.2)	4.648		
longer than 10 years	60	(56.1)	51	(41.8)	P < .05		
3. Age at Incarceration							
34 or younger	107	(95.5)	135	(87.1)	5.456		
older than 34	5	(4.5)	20	(12.9)	P < .02		
4. Jail Credits							
6 months or fewer	105	(93.8)	111	(71.6)	20.619		
more than 6 months	7	(6.2)	44	(28.4)	P < .001		
5. Present Offense							
All property offenses	17	(15.2)	4	(2.6)	12.554*		
All other offenses	95	(84.8)	151	(97.4)	P < .001		

* Yates Correction applied when the expected value in one cell is less than 5.

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>SPLIT</u>	<u>MAJOR VIOLATORS</u>	<u>NON MAJOR VIOLATORS</u>	<u>X²</u>
5. Present Offense (Continued)	Murder 1, 2	4 (3.6)	32 (20.6)	14.817*
	All other offenses	108 (96.4)	123 (79.4)	P < .001
Armed Robbery	57 (50.9)	44 (28.4)	14.002	
All other offenses	55 (49.1)	111 (71.6)	P < .001	

II. CRIMINAL HISTORY

1. Total Prior Court appearances	3 or fewer	6 (5.7)	23 (16.4)	6.600
	more than 3	99 (94.3)	117 (83.6)	P < .02
2. Offenses against the person	5 or fewer	55 (49.1)	100 (64.5)	6.339
	more than 5	57 (50.9)	55 (35.5)	P < .02
3. Property offenses	1 or fewer	22 (19.6)	54 (34.8)	7.373
	more than 1	90 (80.4)	101 (65.2)	P < .01
4. Age at First Arrest	19 or younger	93 (91.2)	105 (75.5)	9.812
	older than 19	9 (8.8)	34 (24.5)	P < .01
5. Age at First Drug Arrest	19 or younger	29 (61.7)	25 (35.2)	7.995
	older than 19	18 (38.3)	46 (64.8)	P < .01

III. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Last grade completed	9th or less	45 (43.3)	85 (59.4)	6.315
	over 9th grade	59 (56.7)	58 (40.6)	P < .02

* Yates Correction applied when the expected value in one cell is less than 5.

DISCUSSION

It appears evident from the above findings that the Major Violators Division is in fact selecting a distinct group of offenders for prosecution. These individuals differ from other Suffolk Superior Court commitments to MCI-Walpole with respect to a variety of factors traditionally associated with the career criminal. The Major Violators embarked on these criminal careers at an earlier age, and appeared in court with greater frequency than the comparison group. Regarding their current incarceration, they are much more likely to have been committed for an armed robbery as opposed to murder, which is often a first time affair. The non-Major Violators, on the other hand, were especially likely to be serving their present sentence for murder.

Support was also gained for the assumption that Major Violators will be received by the correctional system more quickly than other commitments, due to speedier prosecution. Number of jail credits was used as an indicator of this, although the relationship may be spurious due to differential bail considerations granted to different types of offenders. Since non-Major Violators are more apt to be committed for murder, they may be less likely to post bail, and subsequently evidence a greater number of jail credits upon commitment. A more accurate indicator would therefore be the number of days from arrest to conviction. Although this data was readily available for the Major Violator cohort, the difficulty in accessing this for the comparison group in this study exceeded practicality. Future studies will incorporate this data to directly address this issue. Nevertheless, we can infer that the fewer number of jail credits possessed by Major Violators will result in less of a deduction from the sentence actually to be served, and in this regard, constitutes a valuable finding. The difference between the two groups in having no jail credits also poses an interesting question. If we attribute the absence of jail credits to judicial leniency in granting bail, the greater proportion of non-Major Violators in this category assumes increased importance. It may be that this group is perceived by the court as constituting a less serious offender type, and hence, will be more likely to allow for release on bail.

Finally, although it was expected that Major Violators would be receiving longer sentences than other commitments, the reverse was found to be the case. Careful examination of the data revealed that the control group was more likely to have been incarcerated for murder, and to be confined for Life in greater proportion. When the Life sentence was systematically excluded from the analysis of minimum and maximum sentences, it emerged that Major Violators do indeed receive significantly longer sentences.¹ In terms of parole eligibility, however, there was no remarkable difference between the two groups with respect to the portion of sentence to be served before becoming eligible for parole.²

In conclusion, salient differences between the cohort of Major Violators and a comparison group have been isolated. It remains for more extensive analysis to further build upon these findings, and to explore relationships beyond the scope of this research. In the interim, the preceding analysis should have some practical benefit for correctional treatment planning.

¹See Appendix II on page 36 for a comparison of Major Violators with other MCI-Walpole commitments over a time period of two years.

²Appendix III on page 39 summarizes this data.

APPENDIX I: Frequency Distributions of Data

The tables on pages 16 through 35 summarize the distribution of the samples with respect to each variable utilized in this study. The tables should be read as follows:

1. Variable refers to the name of the item being considered. All possible values of the variable are listed under each heading.
2. Major Violators depicts the number (listed under N) of Major Violators for each category of the variable, and the percentage (%) this represents of all Major Violators for whom data was available for the particular variable. Total refers to the total number and percentage of Major Violators, out of the combined samples, for whom data existed.
3. The column Non-Major Violators should be interpreted in the same manner, with the obvious difference being that the number and percent refer to non-Major Violators in that category.
4. Total Sample is the number and percentage of the two samples combined that are found in each category. Total here means the total number of cases analyzed, and will always be 100 percent.

Please note that for those variables in which the totals do not read 112 for the Major Violators, 155 for the non-Major Violators, and 267 for the total sample, the discrepancy is due to data missing from the data file. Percentages are calculated on the basis of available data.

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
I. <u>CURRENT INCARCERATION</u>						
<u>Present Offense</u> (most serious charge)						
Murder 1	3	(2.7)	14	(9.0)	17	(6.4)
Murder 2	1	(.9)	18	(11.6)	19	(7.1)
Manslaughter	0	(0.0)	9	(5.8)	9	(3.4)
Armed Robbery	57	(50.9)	44	(28.4)	101	(37.8)
Other Person	23	(20.5)	20	(12.9)	43	(16.1)
Rape	6	(5.4)	13	(8.4)	19	(7.1)
Other Sex	1	(.9)	2	(1.3)	3	(1.1)
Burglary	12	(10.7)	2	(1.3)	14	(5.2)
Other Property	5	(4.5)	2	(1.3)	7	(2.6)
Escape	1	(.9)	6	(3.9)	7	(2.6)
Narcotics	0	(0.0)	19	(12.3)	19	(7.1)
Other	3	(2.7)	6	(3.9)	9	(3.4)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Minimum Sentence in Years</u>						
Indeterminate	18	(16.1)	0	(0.0)	18	(6.8)
2 Years	2	(1.8)	6	(3.9)	8	(3.0)
3 Years	5	(4.5)	18	(11.7)	23	(8.6)
4 Years	8	(7.1)	14	(9.1)	22	(8.3)
5 Years	9	(8.0)	23	(14.9)	32	(12.0)
6 Years	8	(7.1)	7	(4.5)	15	(5.6)
7 Years	6	(5.4)	12	(7.8)	18	(6.8)
8 Years	8	(7.1)	3	(2.0)	11	(4.1)
9 Years	3	(2.7)	6	(3.9)	9	(3.4)
10 Years	6	(5.4)	6	(3.9)	12	(4.5)
12 Years	12	(10.7)	8	(5.2)	20	(7.5)
14 Years	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
15 Years	10	(8.9)	12	(7.8)	22	(8.3)
16 Years	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
17 Years	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
18 Years	0	(0.0)	3	(2.0)	3	(1.1)
20 Years	3	(2.7)	2	(1.3)	5	(1.9)
25 Years	5	(4.5)	1	(.6)	6	(2.2)
45 Years	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
Life	5	(4.5)	33	(21.4)	38	(14.3)
TOTAL	112	(42.1)	154	(57.9)	266	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Maximum Sentence in Years</u>						
2 Years	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
3 Years	2	(1.8)	3	(1.9)	5	(1.9)
4 Years	0	(0.0)	1	(.6)	1	(.4)
5 Years	7	(6.3)	21	(13.5)	28	(10.5)
6 Years	4	(3.6)	6	(3.9)	10	(3.7)
7 Years	9	(8.0)	14	(9.0)	23	(8.6)
8 Years	5	(4.5)	2	(1.3)	7	(2.6)
9 Years	1	(.9)	1	(.6)	2	(.7)
10 Years	18	(16.1)	23	(14.8)	41	(15.4)
11 Years	2	(1.8)	0	(0.0)	2	(.7)
12 Years	13	(11.6)	12	(7.7)	25	(9.4)
13 Years	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
15 Years	13	(11.6)	13	(8.4)	26	(9.7)
18 Years	2	(1.8)	1	(.6)	3	(1.1)
20 Years	18	(16.1)	18	(11.6)	36	(13.5)
25 Years	2	(1.8)	3	(1.9)	5	(1.9)
30 Years	3	(2.7)	3	(1.9)	6	(2.2)
35 Years	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
40 Years	4	(3.6)	1	(.6)	5	(1.9)
60 Years	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
Life	5	(4.5)	33	(21.3)	38	(14.2)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Time Until First Parole Eligibility Date</u>						
0 to 3 Months	1	(.9)	2	(1.3)	3	(1.1)
4 to 6 Months	2	(1.8)	4	(2.6)	6	(2.3)
7 to 9 Months	2	(1.8)	3	(2.0)	5	(1.9)
10 to 12 Months	7	(6.4)	9	(5.9)	16	(6.1)
13 to 18 Months	9	(8.3)	9	(5.9)	18	(6.9)
19 to 24 Months	11	(10.1)	14	(9.2)	25	(9.5)
2 to 3 Years	9	(8.3)	19	(12.4)	28	(10.7)
3 to 4 Years	11	(10.1)	14	(9.2)	25	(9.5)
4 to 5 Years	5	(4.6)	10	(6.5)	15	(5.7)
5 to 6 Years	7	(6.4)	4	(2.6)	11	(4.2)
6 to 7 Years	7	(6.4)	9	(5.9)	16	(6.1)
7 to 8 Years	5	(4.6)	4	(2.6)	9	(3.4)
8 to 10 Years	12	(11.0)	10	(6.5)	22	(8.4)
10 to 12 Years	8	(7.3)	5	(3.3)	13	(5.0)
12 to 15 Years	5	(4.6)	18	(11.8)	23	(8.8)
More than 20 Years	6	(5.5)	7	(4.6)	13	(5.0)
Life	2	(1.8)	12	(7.8)	14	(5.3)
TOTAL	109	(41.6)	153	(58.4)	262	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of Jail Credits</u>						
None	20	(17.9)	46	(29.7)	66	(24.7)
Less Than 3 Months	64	(57.1)	34	(21.9)	98	(36.7)
3 to 6 Months	21	(18.8)	31	(20.0)	52	(19.5)
6 to 9 Months	4	(3.6)	17	(11.0)	21	(7.9)
9 Months to 1 Year	1	(.9)	15	(9.7)	16	(6.0)
Longer Than 1 Year	2	(1.8)	12	(7.7)	14	(5.2)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)
<u>Age at Incarceration</u>						
Sixteen	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
Seventeen	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
Eighteen	3	(2.7)	6	(3.9)	9	(3.4)
Nineteen	8	(7.1)	6	(3.9)	14	(5.2)
Twenty	9	(8.0)	7	(4.5)	16	(6.0)
Twenty-One	6	(5.4)	14	(9.0)	20	(7.5)
22 to 24	29	(25.9)	31	(20.0)	60	(22.5)
25 to 29	32	(28.6)	47	(30.3)	79	(29.6)
30 to 34	18	(16.1)	24	(15.5)	42	(15.7)
35 to 39	4	(3.6)	12	(7.7)	16	(6.0)
40 to 44	1	(.9)	5	(3.2)	6	(2.2)
45 to 49	0	(0.0)	1	(.6)	1	(.4)
50 and over	0	(0.0)	2	(1.3)	2	(.7)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>II. CRIMINAL HISTORY</u>						
<u>Total Number of Prior Court Appearances</u>						
First Offense	1	(1.0)	11	(7.9)	12	(4.9)
Two	3	(2.9)	7	(5.0)	10	(4.1)
Three	2	(1.9)	5	(3.6)	7	(2.9)
Four	4	(3.8)	4	(2.9)	8	(3.3)
Five	3	(2.9)	5	(3.6)	8	(3.3)
6 to 8	13	(12.4)	17	(12.1)	30	(12.2)
9 to 11	12	(11.4)	22	(15.7)	34	(13.9)
12 to 15	26	(24.8)	17	(12.1)	43	(17.6)
16 to 20	14	(13.3)	20	(14.3)	34	(13.9)
More Than 20	27	(25.7)	32	(22.9)	59	(24.1)
TOTAL	105	(42.9)	140	(57.1)	245	(100.0)
<u>Number of Prior Court Appearances for Person Offenses</u>						
None	6	(5.4)	13	(8.4)	19	(7.1)
One	11	(9.8)	20	(12.9)	31	(11.6)
Two	10	(8.9)	16	(10.3)	26	(9.7)
Three	7	(6.3)	17	(11.0)	24	(9.0)
Four	11	(9.8)	19	(12.3)	30	(11.2)
Five	10	(8.9)	15	(9.7)	25	(9.4)
6 to 10	39	(34.8)	36	(23.2)	75	(28.1)
11 or More	18	(16.1)	19	(12.3)	37	(13.9)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of Prior Court Appearances for Property Offenses</u>						
None	13	(11.6)	37	(23.9)	50	(18.7)
One	9	(8.0)	17	(11.0)	26	(9.7)
Two	6	(5.4)	9	(5.8)	15	(5.6)
Three	6	(5.4)	5	(3.2)	11	(4.1)
Four	9	(8.0)	6	(3.9)	15	(5.6)
Five	6	(5.4)	8	(5.2)	14	(5.2)
6 to 10	22	(19.6)	32	(20.6)	54	(20.2)
11 to 15	23	(20.5)	23	(14.8)	46	(17.2)
16 to 20	5	(4.5)	8	(5.2)	13	(4.9)
21 to 30	9	(8.0)	9	(5.8)	18	(6.7)
Over 30	4	(3.6)	1	(.6)	5	(1.9)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)
<u>Number of Prior Court Appearances for Sex Offenses</u>						
None	93	(83.0)	118	(76.1)	211	(79.0)
One	6	(5.4)	18	(11.6)	24	(9.0)
Two	2	(1.8)	9	(5.8)	11	(4.1)
Three	7	(6.3)	6	(3.9)	13	(4.9)
Four	2	(1.8)	0	(0.0)	2	(.7)
6 to 10	2	(1.8)	4	(2.6)	6	(2.20)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of Prior Court Appearances for Drunkenness Offenses</u>						
None	79	(70.5)	108	(69.7)	187	(70.0)
One	16	(14.3)	19	(12.3)	35	(13.1)
Two	6	(5.4)	9	(5.8)	15	(5.6)
Three	6	(5.4)	7	(4.5)	13	(4.9)
Four	1	(.9)	6	(3.9)	7	(2.6)
Five	0	(0.0)	1	(.6)	1	(.4)
6 to 10	4	(3.6)	3	(1.9)	7	(2.6)
11 or More	0	(0.0)	2	(1.3)	2	(.7)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)
<u>Number of Prior Court Appearances for Narcotic Offenses</u>						
None	63	(56.3)	80	(51.6)	143	(53.6)
One	18	(16.1)	26	(16.8)	44	(16.5)
Two	12	(10.7)	17	(11.0)	29	(10.9)
Three	3	(2.7)	9	(5.8)	12	(4.5)
Four	5	(4.5)	5	(3.2)	10	(3.7)
Five	2	(1.8)	6	(3.9)	8	(3.0)
6 to 10	8	(7.1)	6	(3.9)	14	(5.2)
11 to 15	1	(.9)	4	(2.6)	5	(1.9)
16 to 20	0	(0.0)	2	(1.3)	2	(.7)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of Prior Court Appearances for Escape Offenses</u>						
None	91	(81.3)	132	(85.2)	223	(83.5)
One	13	(11.6)	13	(8.4)	26	(9.7)
Two	2	(1.8)	6	(3.9)	8	(3.0)
Three	2	(1.8)	3	(1.9)	5	(1.9)
Four	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
Five	2	(1.8)	0	(0.0)	2	(.7)
6 to 10	1	(.9)	1	(.6)	2	(.7)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)
<u>Age at First Arrest</u>						
7 to 9	3	(2.9)	4	(2.9)	7	(2.9)
10 to 13	34	(33.3)	24	(17.3)	58	(24.1)
14 to 15	26	(25.5)	31	(22.3)	57	(23.7)
16 to 17	18	(17.6)	31	(22.3)	49	(20.3)
18 to 19	12	(11.8)	15	(10.8)	27	(11.2)
20 to 21	4	(3.9)	10	(7.2)	14	(5.8)
22 to 24	3	(2.9)	9	(6.5)	12	(5.0)
25 to 29	1	(1.0)	8	(5.8)	9	(3.7)
30 to 34	0	(0.0)	4	(2.9)	4	(1.7)
35 to 39	1	(1.0)	3	(2.2)	4	(1.7)
TOTAL	102	(42.3)	139	(57.7)	241	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Age at First Drunkenness Arrest</u>						
Not Applicable	69	(67.6)	94	(67.6)	163	(67.6)
15 to 17	9	(8.8)	14	(10.1)	23	(9.5)
18 to 19	12	(11.8)	9	(6.5)	21	(8.7)
20 to 21	3	(2.9)	6	(4.3)	9	(3.7)
22 to 24	4	(3.9)	13	(9.4)	17	(7.1)
25 to 29	2	(2.0)	1	(.7)	3	(1.2)
30 to 34	2	(2.0)	2	(1.4)	4	(1.7)
35 to 39	1	(1.0)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
TOTAL	102	(42.3)	139	(57.7)	241	(100.0)
<u>Age at First Drug Arrest</u>						
Not Applicable	55	(53.9)	68	(48.9)	123	(51.0)
9 to 14	2	(2.0)	2	(1.4)	4	(1.7)
15 to 17	10	(9.8)	13	(9.4)	23	(9.5)
18 to 19	17	(16.7)	10	(7.2)	27	(11.2)
20 to 21	6	(5.9)	15	(10.8)	21	(8.7)
22 to 24	7	(6.9)	10	(7.2)	17	(7.1)
25 to 29	5	(4.9)	15	(10.8)	20	(8.3)
30 to 34	0	(0.0)	4	(2.9)	4	(.17)
40 and over	0	(0.0)	2	(1.4)	2	(.8)
TOTAL	102	(42.3)	139	(57.7)	241	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of Juvenile Incarcerations</u>						
None	69	(61.6)	107	(69.0)	176	(65.9)
One	18	(16.1)	16	(10.3)	34	(12.7)
Two	8	(7.1)	14	(9.0)	22	(8.2)
Three	6	(5.4)	7	(4.5)	13	(4.9)
Four	6	(5.4)	6	(3.9)	12	(4.5)
Five	2	(1.8)	2	(1.3)	4	(1.5)
6 or More	3	(2.7)	3	(1.9)	6	(2.2)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)
<u>Number of State or Federal Incarcerations</u>						
None	63	(56.3)	101	(65.2)	164	(61.4)
One	22	(19.6)	25	(16.1)	47	(17.6)
Two	13	(11.6)	15	(9.7)	28	(10.5)
Three	5	(4.5)	7	(4.5)	12	(4.5)
Four	2	(1.8)	4	(2.6)	6	(2.2)
Five	5	(4.5)	1	(.6)	6	(2.2)
6 or More	2	(1.8)	2	(1.3)	4	(1.5)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of County Incarcerations</u>						
None	63	(56.3)	94	(60.0)	157	(58.8)
One	19	(17.0)	25	(16.1)	44	(16.5)
Two	13	(11.6)	17	(11.0)	30	(11.2)
Three	7	(6.3)	8	(5.2)	15	(5.6)
Four	7	(6.3)	6	(3.9)	13	(4.9)
Five	1	(.9)	2	(1.3)	3	(1.1)
6 or More	2	(1.8)	3	(1.9)	5	(1.9)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)
<u>Total Number of Adult Incarcerations</u>						
None	43	(38.4)	71	(45.8)	114	(42.7)
One	19	(17.0)	33	(21.3)	52	(19.5)
Two	13	(11.6)	14	(9.0)	27	(10.1)
Three	14	(12.5)	10	(6.5)	24	(9.0)
Four	7	(6.3)	8	(5.2)	15	(5.6)
Five	6	(5.4)	4	(2.6)	10	(3.7)
6 or More	10	(8.9)	15	(9.7)	25	(9.4)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Total Number of Any Incarcerations</u>						
None	33	(29.5)	60	(38.7)	93	(34.8)
One	21	(18.8)	30	(19.4)	51	(19.1)
Two	6	(5.4)	11	(7.1)	17	(6.4)
Three	10	(8.9)	13	(8.4)	23	(8.6)
Four	11	(9.8)	8	(5.2)	19	(7.1)
Five	9	(8.0)	9	(5.8)	18	(6.7)
6 or More	22	(19.6)	24	(15.5)	46	(17.2)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)
<u>Number of Juvenile Paroles</u>						
None	83	(74.1)	120	(77.4)	203	(76.0)
One	11	(9.8)	14	(9.0)	25	(9.4)
Two	9	(8.0)	8	(5.2)	17	(6.4)
Three	4	(3.6)	9	(5.8)	13	(4.9)
More Than 3	5	(4.5)	4	(2.6)	9	(3.4)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of Juvenile Parole Violations</u>						
Never Paroled	83	(74.1)	120	(77.4)	203	(76.0)
None	12	(10.7)	12	(7.7)	24	(9.0)
One	7	(6.3)	10	(6.5)	17	(6.4)
Two	5	(4.5)	11	(7.1)	16	(6.0)
Three	3	(2.7)	0	(0.0)	3	(1.1)
More Than 3	2	(1.8)	2	(1.3)	4	(1.5)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)
<u>Number of Adult Paroles</u>						
None	68	(60.7)	104	(67.1)	172	(64.4)
One	25	(22.3)	30	(19.4)	55	(20.6)
Two	8	(7.1)	13	(8.4)	21	(7.9)
Three	6	(5.4)	4	(2.6)	10	(3.7)
More Than 3	5	(4.5)	4	(2.6)	9	(3.4)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of Adult Parole Violations</u>						
Never Paroled	68	(60.7)	104	(67.1)	172	(64.4)
None	14	(12.5)	11	(7.1)	25	(9.4)
One	17	(15.2)	26	(16.8)	43	(16.1)
Two	6	(5.4)	10	(6.5)	16	(6.0)
Three	5	(4.5)	1	(.6)	6	(2.2)
More Than 3	2	(1.8)	3	(1.9)	5	(1.9)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)
<u>Total Number of Any Paroles</u>						
None	58	(51.8)	93	(60.0)	151	(56.6)
One	20	(17.9)	24	(15.5)	44	(16.5)
Two	11	(9.8)	16	(10.3)	27	(10.1)
Three	9	(8.9)	4	(2.6)	13	(4.9)
More Than 3	14	(12.5)	18	(11.6)	32	(12.0)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Total Number of Any Parole Violations</u>						
Never Paroled	58	(51.8)	93	(60.0)	151	(56.6)
None	15	(13.4)	15	(9.7)	30	(11.2)
One	17	(15.2)	22	(14.2)	39	(14.6)
Two	10	(8.9)	9	(5.8)	19	(7.1)
Three	5	(4.5)	7	(4.5)	12	(4.5)
More Than 3	7	(6.3)	9	(5.8)	16	(6.0)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>III. PERSONAL BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS</u>						
<u>Occupational Field</u>						
Semi-Professional	3	(2.9)	4	(2.9)	7	(2.9)
Business	1	(1.0)	3	(2.2)	4	(1.7)
Sales, Clerical	18	(17.3)	15	(10.9)	33	(13.7)
Skilled Manual	17	(16.3)	19	(13.9)	36	(14.9)
Semi-Skilled	20	(19.2)	39	(28.5)	59	(24.5)
Unskilled	8	(7.7)	17	(12.4)	25	(10.4)
Services	27	(26.0)	35	(25.5)	62	(25.7)
Student	2	(1.9)	3	(2.2)	5	(2.1)
Unemployed	8	(7.7)	2	(1.5)	10	(4.1)
TOTAL	104	(43.2)	137	(56.8)	241	(100.0)
<u>Time on Job of Longest Duration</u>						
Less Than 1 Month	3	(3.2)	5	(4.0)	8	(3.7)
1 to 2 Months	14	(15.1)	11	(8.8)	25	(11.5)
3 to 4 Months	19	(20.4)	30	(24.0)	49	(22.5)
5 to 6 Months	10	(10.8)	9	(7.2)	19	(8.7)
7 to 9 Months	6	(6.5)	4	(3.2)	10	(4.6)
10 to 12 Months	10	(10.8)	8	(6.4)	18	(8.3)
1 to 2 Years	14	(15.1)	21	(16.8)	35	(16.1)
2 to 5 Years	11	(11.8)	25	(20.0)	36	(16.1)
More Than 5	6	(6.5)	12	(9.6)	18	(8.3)
TOTAL	93	(42.7)	125	(57.3)	218	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Time at Most Skilled Position</u>						
Less Than 1 Month	5	(5.4)	5	(4.1)	10	(4.7)
1 to 2 Months	16	(17.4)	14	(11.5)	30	(14.0)
3 to 4 Months	19	(20.7)	33	(27.0)	52	(24.3)
5 to 6 Months	12	(13.0)	9	(7.4)	21	(9.8)
7 to 9 Months	6	(6.5)	6	(4.9)	12	(5.6)
10 to 12 Months	10	(10.9)	9	(7.4)	19	(8.9)
1 to 2 Years	11	(12.0)	17	(13.9)	28	(13.1)
2 to 5 Years	7	(7.6)	19	(15.6)	26	(12.1)
More Than 5 Years	6	(6.5)	10	(8.2)	16	(7.5)
<u>Last Grade Completed</u>						
Third or Lower	1	(1.0)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
Fourth	0	(0.0)	1	(.7)	1	(.4)
Fifth	0	(0.0)	2	(1.4)	2	(.8)
Sixth	2	(1.9)	4	(2.8)	6	(2.4)
Seventh	9	(8.7)	10	(7.0)	19	(7.7)
Eighth	12	(11.5)	30	(21.0)	42	(17.0)
Ninth	21	(20.2)	38	(26.6)	59	(23.9)
Tenth	19	(18.3)	17	(11.9)	36	(14.6)
Eleventh	11	(10.6)	12	(8.4)	23	(9.3)
High School	24	(23.1)	25	(17.5)	49	(19.8)
Some College	5	(4.8)	3	(2.1)	8	(3.2)
College Graduate	0	(0.0)	1	(.7)	1	(.4)
TOTAL	104	(42.1)	143	(57.9)	247	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Marital Status</u>						
Married	32	(28.6)	46	(29.7)	78	(29.2)
Single	66	(58.9)	89	(57.4)	155	(58.1)
Divorced	9	(8.0)	12	(7.7)	21	(7.9)
Widowed	2	(1.8)	0	(0.0)	2	(.7)
Separated	3	(2.7)	8	(5.2)	11	(4.1)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)
<u>Military Discharge</u>						
No Service	96	(85.7)	125	(83.3)	221	(84.4)
Honorable	4	(3.6)	1	(.7)	5	(1.9)
Bad Conduct	1	(.9)	0	(0.0)	1	(.4)
Discharge Unknown	11	(9.8)	24	(16.0)	35	(13.4)
TOTAL	112	(42.7)	150	(57.3)	262	(100.0)
<u>Drug Use</u>						
None	56	(53.8)	61	(41.8)	117	(46.8)
Non-Specific	3	(2.9)	14	(9.6)	17	(6.8)
Heroin	37	(35.6)	57	(39.0)	94	(37.6)
Other Use	8	(7.7)	14	(9.6)	22	(8.8)
TOTAL	104	(41.6)	146	(58.4)	250	(100.0)

VARIABLE	MAJOR VIOLATORS		NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Race</u>						
White	43	(38.4)	63	(40.6)	106	(39.7)
Black	69	(61.6)	91	(58.7)	160	(59.9)
Other	0	(0.0)	1	(.6)	1	(.4)
TOTAL	112	(41.9)	155	(58.1)	267	(100.0)

APPENDIX II: Minimum and Maximum Length of Sentence

Tables IV and V on pages 37 and 38 compare the mean and median of the minimum and maximum sentences received by Major Violators, the control group of non-Major Violators, and Suffolk Superior Court commitments to MCI- Walpole during the years 1974 and 1975. Note that there is some overlap occurring since the portion of the Major Violator sample that was convicted in 1975, and the corresponding portion of the control group are also represented in the 1975 population.

Although no analysis has been conducted on these figures, it can be seen from the tables that both the mean and median of the minimum and maximum sentences are notably higher for the Major Violator sample than those of the three comparison groups.

TABLE IV: MINIMUM LENGTH OF SENTENCE FOR MAJOR VIOLATORS, NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS, AND SUFFOLK SUPERIOR COURT COMMITMENTS TO MCI-WALPOLE DURING 1974 AND 1975

	<u>1974</u> <u>(N=139)</u>	<u>1975</u> <u>(N=178)</u>	<u>NON MAJOR</u> <u>VIOLATORS</u> <u>N=121)</u>	<u>MAJOR</u> <u>VIOLATORS</u> <u>(N=89)</u>
Mean (in number of years)	6.7	7.71	7.41	10.20
Median	5.91	6.45	5.48	8.31

TABLE V: MAXIMUM LENGTH OF SENTENCE FOR MAJOR VIOLATORS, NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS, AND SUFFOLK SUPERIOR COURT COMMITMENTS TO MCI-WALPOLE DURING 1974 AND 1975

	<u>1974</u> <u>(N=139)</u>	<u>1975</u> <u>(N=178)</u>	<u>NON MAJOR</u> <u>VIOLATORS</u> <u>(N=122)</u>	<u>MAJOR</u> <u>VIOLATORS</u> <u>(N=89)</u>
Mean (number of years)	11.48	11.92	11.78	15.12
Median	10.09	10.09	10.09	12.04

APPENDIX III: Time Until Parole Eligibility Date

Table VI on the following page presents a comparison between Major Violators and non-Major Violators regarding institutional time to be served before becoming eligible for parole. If the cumulative percentage of each sample's time until parole eligibility date is considered, there appears to be no substantial differences between the two groups.

TABLE VI: TIME UNTIL PAROLE ELIGIBILITY DATE

<u>TIME UNTIL FIRST P.E. DATE</u>	<u>MAJOR VIOLATORS (N=109)</u>			<u>NON-MAJOR VIOLATORS (N=153)</u>		
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>CUM. %</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>CUM. %</u>
0-3 months	1	(.9)	(.9)	2	(1.3)	(1.3)
4-6 months	2	(1.8)	(2.7)	4	(2.6)	(3.9)
7-9 months	2	(1.8)	(4.5)	3	(2.0)	(5.9)
10-12 months	7	(6.4)	(10.9)	9	(5.9)	(11.8)
13-18 months	9	(8.3)	(19.2)	9	(5.9)	(17.7)
19-24 months	11	(10.1)	(29.3)	14	(9.2)	(26.9)
2-3 years	9	(8.3)	(37.6)	19	(12.4)	(39.3)
3-4 years	11	(10.1)	(47.7)	14	(9.2)	(48.5)
4-5 years	5	(4.6)	(52.3)	10	(6.5)	(55.0)
5-6 years	7	(6.4)	(58.7)	4	(2.6)	(57.6)
6-7 years	7	(6.4)	(65.1)	9	(5.9)	(63.5)
7-8 years	5	(4.6)	(69.7)	4	(2.6)	(66.1)
8-10 years	12	(11.0)	(80.7)	10	(6.5)	(72.6)
10-12 years	8	(7.3)	(88.0)	5	(3.3)	(75.9)
12-15 years	5	(4.6)	(92.6)	18	(11.8)	(87.7)
20 years or more	6	(5.5)	(98.1)	7	(4.6)	(92.3)
LIFE	2	(1.8)	(100.0)	12	(7.8)	(100.0)