

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS EVALUATION: VOLUME I
YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS COMMITTED TO THE
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION
1968 TO 1979: AN OVERVIEW

Prepared by:

Lawrence T. Williams
Research Specialist

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Michael V. Fair
Commissioner

September, 1981

PUBLICATION: #12564

APPROVED BY: John J. Manton, State Purchasing Agent

Abstract

This report is an overview of a five volume study of youthful offenders (youth who were seventeen years of age or younger at their commitment) committed to the Massachusetts Department of Correction from 1968 to 1979. This particular report provides a profile of the total sample of youthful offenders considered in the series of reports. Also, youthful offenders over the time frame of the study are examined to determine any significant differences in this population over time. Recidivism rates are also presented for this sample of offenders.

The analysis reveals that with the exception of more extensive criminal involvements, there have not been very many changes in this population over the time frame of the study. The youthful offenders are now receiving longer sentences but this is true of all offenders being committed to correctional institutions in the state. There is evidence presented in the report of a change in the manner in which the juvenile justice system and the adult correctional system handled these offenders. The recidivism rate of youthful offenders released from 1968 to 1978 was 30%. Their rates are consistently higher than the overall departmental yearly recidivism figures.

Acknowledgements

In order to complete a project of this scope, several individuals provided a great deal of assistance that enabled me to complete my data collection efforts. A special thanks to David Segal, Director of Research for the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services, and also to records room staff at the Department of Youth Services for their assistance in data collection efforts at the agency. Also, thanks are in order for several student interns who worked on the project and assisted in the collection and coding of data used for this series of reports. The students are Ruth Averill, John Harrington, Joan Hyler, Cynthia Lessa, Claire Lynch, Judi Ravanese, Paula Tamagno and Paul Tringale. Also special thanks to Ann Marie Rocheleau for her assistance in the coding of data and also in editing earlier drafts of this series of reports. A special thanks is also given to Dr. Daniel LeClair, Deputy Director of the Research Unit, who provided extensive comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this report as well as to Dr. Francis Carney, Director of Research and Charles Metzler, Manager of Data Processing, for their comments and review of earlier drafts of this report.

Table of Contents

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
I. Abstract	1
II. Introduction	5
A. Table I - Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category	7
B. Table II - Juveniles Arrested in the City of Boston, 1975 to 1980	8
C. Table III- Youthful Offenders Committed to County Houses of Correction or State Correctional Institutions in Massachusetts: 1968-1979	12
D. Table IV - Age at Incarceration-Youthful Offenders Committed to Correctional Institutions in Massachusetts: 1968-1979	14
III. Methodology	
A. Sample	18
B. Variables Collected	19
IV. Results	
A. Profile	20
1. Social History Variables	21
2. Juvenile Court/Department of Youth Service Variables	22
3. Present Offense/Commitment Variables	23
4. Institutional/Movement Variables	23
5. Recidivism Variables	24

Table of Contents

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
a. Table V - Recidivism Rates - One and Two Year Follow-up	25
b. Table VI- Recidivism Rates-Youthful Offenders & Departmental Recidivism Rates	27
6. Discussion	27
B. Youthful Offenders Over the Time Frame of the Study	28
1. Method	29
2. Findings	
a. Present Offense/Commitment Variables	31
b. Juvenile Court/Department of Youth Service Variables	33
c. Social History Variables	35
d. Institutional/Movement Variables	36
3. Discussion	37
V. Summary	40
VI. Footnotes	41
VII. Appendix I - Variables that Distinguish Youthful Offenders Over Time	45
VIII. Appendix II - Listing of all Variables Collected	53
IX. References	57

Introduction

There is a tendency when discussing the prison population to speak of all incarcerated individuals as one homogenous, similar group of people. However, this simply is not the case in most prisons across the country. There are racial, cultural, age, criminal history, and other factors that are evidence of great differences among many segments of the total population of incarcerated offenders. This first report, and the remainder of the reports in this series, will focus on one particular special population of incarcerated offenders. Specifically, this report will focus on those individuals, herein referred to as youthful offenders (youth who were age seventeen or younger at the time of their commitment to the Department)¹, who were committed to the state correctional system in Massachusetts from 1968 to 1979.

There are several reasons for examining this particular population. Most people feel that change or treatment is more likely to occur, or more desirable, when a person is younger rather than older and set in his or her ways. The juvenile court and juvenile justice system was established with this premise in mind. Even though the youths in this study are being dealt with in the adult criminal justice system, there is probably still a greater expectation or hope of change for these offenders than for other adult offenders. Also, youthful offenders whose behavior is not positively impacted pose a serious threat for the society for

several years while these offenders are at the peak of their criminal involvement. However, there has not been a careful examination of this population of youthful offenders in Massachusetts to determine how many are involved, what are their characteristics, what has happened to this population while they were under the jurisdiction of adult correctional authorities, and what has been the effect of incarceration on this population. This series of reports will examine the correctional systems' response to these youthful offenders to see how juvenile and adult correctional authorities in Massachusetts have dealt with these offenders and also to identify possible areas for improvement.

An additional reason for examining this particular group of offenders has to do with the public's perception that youthful offenders have become much more of a problem by becoming a major contributor to the crime rate. With the increase in reporting of crime, the emphasis of crime and law and order as a political issue, and the media's increased access to actual cases, crime by youthful offenders has been portrayed as an ever increasing problem necessitating the incarceration of more youths. Several recent reports have attempted to address this issue and in some cases have come to different conclusions. The Report of the Governor's Task Force on Juvenile Crime, submitted in April of 1981, was one such report. In this report, the FBI Uniform Crime Reports of juvenile arrests in the state were examined. Table 1

looks at juvenile arrests in the state by offense category. For the table, the data was classified into two major categories - violent and property crimes. Property crimes include burglary, larceny, and auto-theft, while violent crimes include murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated (and simple) assault, and arson.

Table 1
Juvenile Arrests By Offense Category²

Offense Category	1977	1978	1979
Violent Crimes	1828	2116	2320
Property Crimes	10027	9679	9390
TOTAL SERIOUS CRIMES	11855	11795	11710

As Table 1 shows, there has been an increase in reported violent crimes by juveniles in the state. From 1977 to 1979, there was an approximately 27% increase in reported violent juvenile arrests. However, property crimes have decreased by approximately 6% and total serious crime has decreased by about 1.2%.

The Governor's Task Force report then attempted to increase the accuracy of the figures in Table 1 by taking into account the declining juvenile population in Massachusetts. The Task Force concludes that due to a large decline in the population of juveniles in the state during this time period, that the total serious juvenile arrest rate has actually increased by 5%.

Another source to consider consists of arrests for juvenile offenders in the city of Boston. Since a large proportion of the offenders committed come from Boston, a substantial increase in juvenile crime would be expected to be reflected in the Boston arrest statistics. Table 2 presents this data.

Table 2

Juveniles Arrested in the City of Boston, 1975-1980³
Under Age 17

Year	Total
1975	2718
1976	2171
1977	2081
1978	2189
1979	2025
1980	1733

Table 2 shows that while there have been fluctuations over the years, there has been a 36.2% decrease in the number of arrests for juveniles in Boston from 1975 to 1980. The number of arrests for 1980 was the lowest for the five year period and represented a 14% decrease from the 1979 figure. These figures do not support the conclusion that juvenile crime in the state is increasing.

Another way to shed some light on this issue is by examining a recent report on the Patterns of Juvenile Delinquency Charges (1978 - 1980) issued by the Massachusetts Department of Probation. This report examined a random sample of juvenile cases heard over the three-year period of 1978, 1979, and 1980. All juvenile arraignments in Massachusetts were collected during three parallel sample weeks. The results indicate that "the volume of juvenile arraignments has dropped over the three yearly samples," from 1,575 arraignments in 1978 to 1,456 in 1979 and 1,139 arraignments in 1980. Moreover, the actual yearly total of arraignments had declined even more. "While 24,958 juvenile delinquency cases were heard statewide in 1978, 22,552 juvenile cases were heard in 1979 indicating a decrease of 9.6%." ⁴ The three week sample for 1980 indicates a similar decline from 1979 to 1980. Also, when examining the offenses according to category, "property crimes represented the greatest frequency of offenses by juveniles in the combined three-year sample (47.9%)." ⁵ Selected major motor vehicle crimes represented 9.4% of the sample and crimes against persons accounted

for 13.7% of all arraignments during this period. Drug offenses represented 6.1% of the sample, sex offenses 0.4% and public order violations represented 22.5% of the total arraignments.

These results, using three different data sources, do not lend credibility to the perception that juvenile crime is increasing. As a recent report on the Violent Juvenile Offender in Massachusetts: A Policy Analysis, done by the Massachusetts Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee indicates, "all available information at the disposal of the JJAC indicates that as a whole, serious juvenile crime has not increased significantly over the past five years. Property crimes - by far the most common offense committed by juveniles - have decreased. This has resulted in a small overall decrease in the total amount of juvenile crime. At the same time, there are several indications of minor increases in certain juvenile crimes against persons."⁶ "In conclusion, all available sources on the current trends of juvenile crime in Massachusetts indicate that while there has been some increase in certain categories of crime, certainly there is no major juvenile crime wave occurring today."⁷

It is also important to get some indication of the extent of involvement of youthful offenders in the adult correctional system. While this series of reports is concerned with youthful offenders committed to state correctional institutions, it is important to realize that this sample does not represent the total committed

youthful offender population in Massachusetts. Not all incarcerated youthful offenders are committed to Walpole, Concord, or Framingham; some youthful offenders are sentenced to county houses of correction. In Massachusetts, incarcerated offenders who receive maximum sentences of less than two and one-half years are sentenced to county houses of correction. Those individuals receiving maximum sentences of two and one-half years or longer are incarcerated in one of the state correctional institutions. As a result, to get an accurate indication of the numbers of committed youthful offenders in the state, it is necessary to also examine statistics for committed youthful offenders in both state correctional institutions and county houses of correction. Table 3 provides information on youthful offenders who were committed either to county houses of correction or to one of three correctional institutions (Walpole, Concord, or Framingham) in Massachusetts from 1968 to 1979. Included also are percentages of youthful offenders represented in the total committed population for each year from 1968 to 1979.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS COMMITTED TO COUNTY HOUSES
OF CORRECTION OR STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS 1968 TO 1979

Year Committed	Youthful Offenders Committed To State Correctional Institutions	Percent of Total Commitments To Correctional Institutions	Youthful Offenders Committed To County Houses of Correction	Percent of Total County Commitments	Total Committed Youthful Offenders	Percent Of Total Commitments
1968	48	(5)	283	(3)	325	(3)
1969	30	(3)	247	(3)	277	(3)
1970	38	(4)	287	(4)	325	(4)
1971	47	(4)	240	(4)	287	(4)
1972	48	(4)	263	(5)	311	(5)
1973	42	(4)	250	(6)	292	(6)
1974	37	(4)	216	(7)	253	(7)
1975	28	(3)	207	(6)	235	(5)
1976	53	(4)	255	(6)	308	(5)
1977	34	(3)	243	(6)	274	(5)
1978	17	(2)	230	(5)	247	(5)
1979	23	(2)	269	(6)	292	(5)
TOTAL	439	(4)	2990	(5)	3429	(4)

As Table 3 indicates, 2990 (87%) of the youthful offenders committed to adult correctional institutions from 1968 to 1979 were committed to county houses of correction. While there has been some fluctuation in the percentage of the total commitments to both state correctional institutions and county houses of correction, generally youthful offenders represent 4% of the total number of state commitments and 5% of the total number of county commitments. The numbers of youthful offenders committed to state correctional institutions have ranged from a low of 17 in 1978 to a high of 53 in 1976 while the youthful offenders committed to county houses of correction have ranged from a low of 207 in 1975 to a high of 287 in 1970.

For the purpose of this report, a youthful offender is defined as any youth who was seventeen years of age or younger at his or her commitment to Walpole, Concord or Framingham. It is possible for juveniles (youth age sixteen or younger) to have been incarcerated in one of these correctional facilities if she or he was dismissed from juvenile court and treated as an adult in the adult system. Table 4 examines the age range for the sample of youthful offenders committed to state correctional facilities in Massachusetts from 1968 to 1979. Included is the percentage of the totals for each age group during each year.

TABLE 4

AGE AT INCARCERATION - YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS
 COMMITTED TO STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS
 1968 TO 1979⁹

Committing Year	Fourteen N (%)	Fifteen N (%)	Sixteen N (%)	Seventeen N (%)	T o t a l N (%)
1968		3 (8)	4 (11)	29 (81)	36 (100)
1969			3 (11)	24 (89)	27 (100)
1970		1 (3)	5 (14)	30 (83)	36 (100)
1971		1 (2)	2 (5)	38 (93)	41 (100)
1972		1 (2)	8 (17)	39 (81)	48 (100)
1973			7 (17)	33 (83)	40 (100)
1974			3 (8)	33 (92)	36 (100)
1975		1 (4)	4 (15)	21 (81)	26 (100)
1976		3 (6)	5 (9)	45 (85)	53 (100)
1977			5 (16)	26 (84)	31 (100)
1978	1 (6)	1 (6)	3 (19)	11 (69)	16 (100)
1979			4 (20)	16 (80)	20 (100)
TOTAL	1 (0)	11 (3)	53 (13)	345 (84)	410 (100)

As Table 4 indicates, the majority (84%) of the youthful offenders in the sample were seventeen years old when committed to correctional institutions in Massachusetts. However, there was one fourteen year old committed, eleven fifteen year olds, and fifty three sixteen year old youthful offenders from 1968 to 1979.

This report is the first volume of a five volume study of youthful offenders committed to the Massachusetts Department of Correction from 1968 to 1979. This first volume is an overview of the total sample of youthful offenders committed to the Department. Included in this report is a profile of the sample of youthful offenders as well as an evaluation of the sample over the time frame of the study to indicate any important changes in this group of offenders from 1968 to 1979. Included below is a listing of the upcoming volumes of this series as well as a short description of the contents of each forthcoming volume.

Volume 2: Bind Over Juveniles Committed to the Department of Correction

This report will look at a subset of the total youthful offender population by looking at those youths who were juveniles at the time of their offense, had their charges dismissed from juvenile court jurisdiction, and were bound over and tried as adults in the adult criminal process for their offense.¹⁰ This

report will develop a profile of the bind-over youthful offender, examine any changes over time, and compare them with the other youthful offenders to determine any differences between the two samples. Recidivism data will be presented on bind-overs and all factors associated with reduced rates will be analyzed.

Volume 3: Quantitative Analysis

Included in this report will be detailed analyses of the juvenile court/Department of Youth Service variables, social history variables, institutional/movements variables, and recidivism variables to give a better indication of the characteristics of this population. This report will examine the seriousness of the youthful offenders' past offense histories in order to determine if the youths being committed are more serious offenders than before.¹¹ Finally the factors related to lower recidivism rates for this sample will be discussed.

Volume 4: Statistical Tables

Included in this volume will be all the statistical tables for the total sample of youthful offenders and a separate section that will only have a breakdown of all variables for the bind over youthful offenders in the sample.

Volume 5: Qualitative Analysis, Summary and Implications

This volume will be concluding volume in the series. Included will be a presentation of case studies of some of the youthful offenders in the sample. Also, interviews have been carried out with youthful offenders committed in 1980 and 1981 and the results of some of these interviews will be presented in this report. Finally, a summary of the series will be presented and a discussion of the implications will be presented as well. Since this particular series of reports has policy implications for institutional programming, placement decisions and classification, the results found from this series of analyses will be discussed in light of their implications for correctional administrators and policy makers.

Methodology

Sample

As previously stated, this report deals with youthful offenders committed to the Massachusetts Department of Correction from 1968 to 1979. The Department of Correction maintains a computerized data base for all individuals who have been committed from 1972 to 1979. The sample of individuals committed from 1972 to 1979 was drawn from the computerized data base of the department. For the sample of individuals committed from 1968 to 1971, all commitments were drawn from the admission and release forms maintained by the three committing institutions (Walpole, Concord, and Framingham). After identifying each person committed for each year, dates of birth were collected and all those offenders who were seventeen years of age or younger at commitment were included in the total sample.

It is important to realize that an offender may have been fifteen or sixteen when he or she committed the offense, and due to delays in awaiting trial and other procedural delays, may have been eighteen at their commitment. This individual would not be included in the sample. During the latter years of the 1970's some offenders awaited booking at county houses of correction for several weeks (or even months) before being committed to the Department of Correction and these offenders may have turned eighteen before they were committed to the Department. If this happened,

these offenders would also not be included in the sample. As a result, it is possible for some bind overs or other youthful offenders to have been excluded from the sample because they had turned eighteen prior to their commitment. The best way to avoid these types of problems would have been to define the sample based on the youth's age at offense. However, this information is not systematically collected and could not be used to define the sample. The sample also does not include youthful offenders who were sentenced out of state or in federal prisons and transferred to Massachusetts prisons. The cut off date for the data collection effort was January 1, 1980.

For the purpose of the analysis, youthful offenders who served less than thirty days in prison before being released were excluded from the analysis. This restriction resulted in twenty-one youthful offenders being excluded from the total sample. Also, eight youthful offenders were excluded from the sample because they were immediately transferred from adult prison to juvenile facilities and there is a lack of substantive information in the Department of Correction records on these youths.¹²

Variables Collected

The analyses that follow in this series of reports are based on five categories of variables: commitment variables, institutional history/movement variables, juvenile court history variables,

Department of Youth Service (DYS) history variables, and social history variables. For those youthful offenders released from 1968 to 1978¹³, a sixth category of recidivism variables was added. A specific listing of all variables that were collected is contained in Appendix II. The majority of the data was collected from Central Office files at the Department of Correction. The DYS history variables were collected at the Central Office of the Department of Youth Services. The data was analyzed and the tables produced on the Massachusetts State College Computer Network (MSCCN).

RESULTS

I. Profile

Prior to embarking on the detailed analyses that follow in later volumes of this series of reports, it is important to develop a profile of the youthful offenders who made up the sample for this study. This profile attempts to highlight the characteristics and qualities of youthful offenders committed to the Department during the time frame of the study (1968 to 1979) by first looking at their social history variables and their

juvenile court/Department of Youth Service variables. Also, the profile will look at the present offense and commitment variables to get an understanding of the crimes that were committed by the sample of offenders. Finally, the examination will look at the institutional/movement variables to determine how these youthful offenders progressed in the Department of Correction.

A. Social History Variables

A disproportionate number of the sample was black or hispanic (44%). Census figures for Massachusetts from 1960 to 1980 indicate that of the total population of 15-19 year olds in the state, only 3% were black or hispanic.¹⁴ Most of the youthful offenders in the sample were single at the time of their commitment to the Department of Correction (96%), most were born in Massachusetts (72%) and did not have any children of their own at the time of their original commitment (89%). They had not gone beyond the ninth grade in school (67%) and a reading of school information indicates that many of these youths were not performing at grade level when they terminated their school involvement. At the time of their commitment to the Department, most of the youthful offenders had both of their parents living. The median age of the mother at the youth's birth was twenty-three and the median age of the father at the youth's birth was twenty-seven.¹⁵ The majority of the youths had less than three brothers (63%) or

three sisters (65%).

Immediately prior to their commitment, most youth in the sample were living with either both parents (32%) or their mother only (36%); there were also less than three other siblings living at home with the youth (55%). Most of the youthful offenders in the sample had less than four addresses in the past ten years before their commitment (54%), and had lived for less than six years at their current address (51%). Finally, in the cases where information was available, ¹⁶ at their commitment most of the youths had evidence of past drug use (90%).

B. Juvenile Court/Department of Youth Service Variables

These variables indicate that the youthful offenders have had fairly extensive criminal histories prior to their adult commitment to the Department of Correction. Slightly more than half (53%) of the youthful offenders had received a prior commitment to the Department of Youth Services while under juvenile court jurisdiction. Also, most of the youthful offenders had not been incarcerated or detained in juvenile institutions while under the juvenile court's jurisdiction (62%).¹⁷ Slightly less than half (48%) of these youthful offenders had more than eight prior juvenile court appearances and the majority had fewer than two prior juvenile court suspended DYS commitments (seventy three percent) or probations

(65%).¹⁸ Finally, 44% of these offenders had received more than ten prior complaints as a juvenile under the juvenile court's jurisdiction.

C. Present Offense/Commitment Variables

The vast majority of the youthful offenders committed to state correctional institutions in Massachusetts from 1968 to 1979 were Concord commitments (78%) who were serving indeterminate sentences of less than six years (75%). When committed to the correctional institutions, most of the youthful offenders had one year or less to serve until their parole eligibility date (71%).¹⁹ Most of the youthful offenders were committed to the Department for offenses against the person (66%) with the majority of these offenders committing the crime of armed robbery. Twenty-one percent had committed property offenses and eight percent had committed a sex offense as their committing offense.

D. Institutional/Movement Variables

Most of the youthful offenders committed to state correctional institutions from 1968 to 1979 did not receive any maximum security placements while incarcerated in adult facilities (82%), had fewer than two placements in a medium security institution (76%), and never received minimum security placements (94%) or pre-release placements (80%).²⁰ Also, most of these offenders were

never placed at Bridgewater State Hospital for the Criminally Insane (88%) and never received a transfer to a county house of correction (92%). Most of the youthful offenders in the sample spent less than nine months incarcerated in a medium security institution (53%), and had served less than four months in prison before receiving any disciplinary reports (55%), if they had received any disciplinary reports at all. Finally, for those youthful offenders in the sample who were released prior to the cut-off date, most were seventeen or eighteen years old at their release date (62%) and had served less than one year or exactly one year in prison prior to being released (59%). The majority of the youthful offenders who were released had not participated in the furlough program prior to being released (76%) and were released directly from MCI-Concord (63%).

E. Recidivism Variables

These variables look at the recidivism rates for youthful offenders released from the Department of Correction from 1968 to 1978. For the purpose of this analysis, a recidivist is defined as any individual returned to a federal or state correctional institution, the Department of Youth Service, or to a county jail or house of correction for 30 days or more as a result of either a parole violation or a new court sentence.

Table 5 gives recidivism rates with both a one-year and two-year follow-up period for youthful offenders released from 1968-1978.²¹

Table 5
Recidivism Rates - One Year And Two-Year Follow-Up

Releasing Year	Total Number Of Releases	Recidivism Rate	
		One-Year Follow-Up	Two Year Follow-Up
1968	36	31%	67%
1969	26	23%	46%
1970	34	21%	29%
1971	41	34%	49%
1972	46	41%	57%
1973	39	26%	38%
1974	33	24%	30%
1975	21	38%	57%
1976	40	25%	35%
1977	22	36%	45%
1978	10	30%	N/A
TOTAL	348	30%	46%*

* This figure excludes 1978 data.

As Table 5 indicates, recidivism rates with a one-year follow-up range from a low of 21% in 1970 to a high of 41% in 1972. Overall, for all youthful offenders released from 1968 to 1979, their recidivism rate (with a one-year follow-up) is 30%. When looking at the recidivism rates with a two-year follow-up period, the low was 29% in 1970 and the high was 67% in 1968. Overall (excluding 1978) the recidivism rate for the youthful offenders (utilizing a two year follow-up period) was 46%.

Table 6 compares the recidivism rates for the youthful offenders (using a one-year follow-up period) with the overall recidivism rates for the Department of Correction as a whole.

Table 6

Recidivism Rates - Youthful Offenders And Departmental Rates

Year	Recidivism Rates	
	Youthful Offenders	Departmental Rate ²²
1971	34%	25%
1972	41%	22%
1973	26%	19%
1974	24%	19%
1975	38%	20%
1976	25%	16%
1977	36%	15%
1978	30%	16%

As table 6 shows, the recidivism rates for the youthful offenders are consistently higher than the yearly departmental rates.

F. Discussion

Based on these five categories of variables certain observations can be made concerning the youthful offenders who were committed to the Department of Correction from 1968 to 1979. Most of these offenders were committed for serious person offenses and typically were sentenced to MCI-Concord. While most of these offenders received maximum sentences of five years or less, those

youthful offenders who were released had served twelve months or less in prison prior to their release. While incarcerated, these offenders spent the majority of their time in medium security institutions and tended not to receive any alternate placements to a higher or lower security institution. Most had completed their formal school experience prior to being incarcerated, had both of their parents alive when they were committed to the Department, but were often not living with both natural parents prior to their commitment. These youthful offenders had a much higher recidivism rate than the yearly departmental recidivism rate and when using a two-year follow-up period, almost half of the youthful offenders released had been returned to custody.

II. Youthful Offenders Over The Time Frame of the Study

This section of the report looks at the youthful offenders over the twelve year period of this study to examine any changes in this population. This type of examination helps to illuminate the issue of whether the youthful offenders being committed now are more serious than those who were committed in earlier years. Some sense of changes in this population since the deinstitutionalization of the juvenile justice system in Massachusetts is also possible from looking at the results of this analysis. First, a discussion of the method used will be undertaken and then a discussion of the findings will follow.

A. Method

This phase of the analysis is concerned with looking at the youthful offenders over the twelve year study of the report. This was done by grouping the youthful offenders committed over the twelve years into three groups: Group 1 consists of youthful offenders committed from 1968 to 1971, Group 2: those youthful offenders committed from 1972 to 1975, and Group 3: those youthful offenders committed from 1976 to 1979. Then, Groups 1 and 3 were compared and a chi square analysis was carried out to determine all variables that proved to be significant. Once variables and splits were found that were significant, a comparison was then made with Group 2 to determine if the relationship held during the middle phase of the study years. In this way, any spurious relationships were discarded and not included in the discussion.

There are two main reasons for splitting the sample years into the three groups already mentioned. Since the report examines a twelve year period of time, grouping the sample years into groups of three makes the analysis easier to handle. Also, since there was a possibility of spurious relationships, having three groups makes it much easier to test for these spurious relationships. Another reason for this grouping concerns the historical changes that occurred in juvenile justice in Massa-

chusetts with the closing of the juvenile institutions. By grouping the commitment years into the three groups already mentioned, it is possible to relate these groups to the changes in the juvenile system in the state. That is, Group 1 (youths committed from 1968 to 1971) represents those youthful offenders who were committed to the Department of Correction prior to the closing of the juvenile institutions or at the onset of the closing of the institutions. Group 2 (youths committed from 1972 to 1975) represents those youthful offenders who were committed to the Department of Correction during the transition period in the juvenile justice system when the community based system was being established. Finally, Group 3 (youth committed from 1976 to 1979) represents those youthful offenders who were committed to the Department of Correction after the establishment and improvement of the community based juvenile justice system in Massachusetts. In this way, some conclusions can be made concerning any differences in the youthful offenders committed to the Department prior to the closing of the juvenile institutions and those youthful offenders committed after the development and operation of the community based juvenile system.

B. Findings

In discussing the differences found over the time frame of the study, variables were grouped into the following categories: Present offense/Commitment variables, Juvenile Court/DYS variables, Social History variables, and institutional/movement variables. The differences found will be discussed by looking at these four categories of variables.

1. Present Offense / Commitment Variables

There were two present offense/commitment variables that yielded significant results. Basically, both variables indicate that youthful offenders in the latter years of the sample are serving longer sentences than those youth who were committed in the earlier years. Specifically, only 17% of the youths in Group 1 (1968 to 1971) had received maximum sentences of six years or longer. When looking at Group 2 (1972 to 1975) the results indicate that almost half (49%) of the youthful offenders committed during those years had received maximum sentences of six years or longer. An examination of the sentences for those youthful offenders in Group 3 (committed from 1976 to 1979) indicates that 68% of the youthful offenders had received maximum sentences of six years or longer, showing that during the twelve

years of the study period, maximum sentences have increased for youthful offenders committed to the Department of Correction. This trend is also shown by focusing on the amount of time to be served until original parole eligibility dates for the total sample. For youthful offenders in Group 1 (1968 to 1971) the overwhelming majority of them (81%) had one year or less to serve until they were eligible for parole. Seventy-six percent of the youthful offenders in Group 2 (1972 to 1975) had one year or less to serve until their original parole eligibility date. During the latter group (Group 3: 1976 to 1979), slightly more than half (53%) of the youthful offenders had one year or less until they were eligible for parole. This indicates that the youth have a longer amount of time to serve until they are eligible for parole, a further reflection of longer sentences.

These two results are not surprising given the trends for the total population of committed offenders. Research has shown that the overall trend in sentencing in Massachusetts is towards longer sentences.²³ The results discussed above must be seen as a further demonstration of the general increasing sentence length trend currently going on in the Commonwealth.

2. Juvenile Court/DYS History Variables

Three of the juvenile court/DYS History variables proved to be significant in distinguishing between the earlier and later youthful offenders committed to the Department. For youthful offenders committed from 1968 to 1971 (Group 1) only 11% of the youthful offenders had more than one prior Department of Youth Service commitment before being committed to the Department.²⁴ For youthful offenders in Group 2 (committed from 1972 to 1975), 33% had more than one prior Department of Youth Service commitment before their adult commitment. The results indicate that for youthful offenders in Group 3 (committed from 1976 to 1979), almost half (43%) had more than one prior DYS commitment prior to their adult commitment to the Department of Correction.

When looking at the variable "number of juvenile court appearances", several interesting results become evident. For youthful offenders in Group 1 (committed from 1968 to 1971), 41% had more than four prior court appearances in juvenile court before their commitment to the Department. In Group 2 (youth committed from 1972-1975), sixty-nine percent of the youthful offenders had more than four prior court appearances in juvenile court. This difference was found to be significant. However, when looking at the youthful offenders in Group 3 (committed from 1976-1979),

only slightly more than half (54%) of the youths had more than four prior juvenile court appearances. When comparing youthful offenders in Group 2 to those in Group 3 for this variable the results indicate that the difference is significant. That is, the current trend indicates that fewer youthful offenders are being committed to the Department with more than four prior juvenile court appearances. While the percentage of youthful offenders with more than four juvenile court appearances in Group 3 is more than the comparable percentage in Group 1, the percentage is decreasing.

The last of these variables that was significant was the variable "total number of charges as a juvenile in juvenile court". For youthful offenders in Group 1 (committed from 1968 to 1971), slightly less than half (47%) had more than five charges as a juvenile in juvenile court. For youthful offenders in Group 2 (committed from 1972 to 1975), 72% had more than five charges as a juvenile in juvenile court. Finally, for youthful offenders in Group 3 (committed from 1976 to 1979), 66% had more than five charges as a juvenile in juvenile court.²⁵

3. Social History Variables

Most of the social history variables reflected a change in the youthful offenders committed to correctional institutions that was indicative of many of the changes in the total population of people in the United States during the time frame of the study. For the youthful offenders in Group 1, 38% of their parents were married when their son or daughter was committed to the Department. For youthful offenders in Group 2 27% of their parents were married when their son or daughter was committed. Finally, for youthful offenders in Group 3 only 22% had married parents when they were committed. Only four percent of the youthful offenders committed from 1968 to 1971 (Group 1) had children when committed to prison. Nine percent of the youthful offenders in Group 2 (committed from 1972 to 1975) had children when they were committed to prison. Finally, fourteen percent of the youthful offenders in Group 3 (committed from 1976 to 1979) had children when committed to prison.

The variable, "number of addresses in the past ten years,"²⁶ yielded significant results. Slightly more than half (fifty-one percent of the youthful offenders in Group 1 had more than two addresses the previous ten years before their prison commitment. However, seventy percent of the youthful offenders in Group 2 (committed from 1972 to 1975) had more than two addresses the previous ten years, evidence of increased mobility for this particular sample of offenders. But, when looking at youthful

offenders in Group 3 (committed from 1976 to 1979) only 37% had more than two addresses the previous ten years before their adult prison commitment. This indicates that there is less mobility in this particular group than at anytime in the years measured by the study. The last variable, "length of time at current address" indicated results similar to the one just discussed. Slightly less than half (46%) of the youthful offenders in Group 1 had lived for more than four years at their last address before their prison commitment. Fifty-three percent of the youthful offenders in Group 2 had more than four years at their last address while 61% of the youthful offenders in Group 3 had lived for more than four years at their last address.

4. Institutional Variables

There were three institutional variables that differentiated the sample over time. For youthful offenders in the earliest grouping (Group 1), only 29% had more than two disciplinary reports while in prison. For those in Group 2 and Group 3, 47% and 51% respectively had more than two disciplinary reports while incarcerated in prison in Massachusetts. Of course, since the results indicate that youth in Groups 2 and 3 are receiving longer sentences it could be presumed that this would mean that since the youths are serving longer sentences, they have more of an opportunity to receive a disciplinary report. For youthful offenders

in Group 1, only 14% had received one or more maximum security placements during their incarceration. Seventeen percent of the youthful offenders in Group 2 had one or more maximum security placements during their incarceration and one-fourth (25%) of the youthful offenders in Group 3 had one or more maximum security placements. Finally, for youthful offenders committed from 1968 to 1971, 14% had received more than one medium security placement while incarcerated in prison. For youths in Group 2, one-fourth (25%) had received more than one medium security placement while incarcerated. In Group 3, 32% had received more than one medium security placement while incarcerated.

5. Discussion

To summarize these findings, there were twelve variables that indicated significant changes in the population of youthful offenders committed to correctional institutions in Massachusetts over time. Since there were sixty variables considered, only 20% of the variables indicated significant changes over time. This would indicate that youthful offenders committed to prison in the state in latter years have remained very similar to their earlier counterparts, except that those youth committed in latter years have more extensive criminal histories than the youthful offenders committed in earlier years. Consequently, they are being dealt with differently by official agencies and exhibit some different social characteristics.

On the surface, the results would seem to indicate that the youthful offenders in latter years are more serious offenders than those committed in the earlier years. They have received more DYS commitments, had more juvenile court appearances, and had more total charges than their counterparts in earlier years. Of course, other changes have occurred at the same time that would make this conclusion a questionable one at best. There has been an increase in the reporting of crimes by the public and an increase in the development and sophistication of police departments that would tend to result in youths receiving more charges and subsequently more court appearances in juvenile court. This increase does not necessarily mean an increase in seriousness but may simply reflect an increase in the detection of crime by juveniles and other youthful offenders. Also, by reporting an increase in commitments, juvenile court appearances and total charges in juvenile court, this does not give a clear indication of the nature of the offenses or the disposition of the offenses. It might be that the number of delinquency petitions has increased proportionately to the increase in total charges and court appearances. As a result of these considerations, it is premature at this time to report or conclude that the results over time indicate that the youthful offenders are more serious in latter years than they were in earlier years. Volume II

in this series will delve into this question at some length to determine whether in fact this statement can be made and demonstrated to be factually correct.

A listing of all significant variables and their corresponding chi square values are presented in Appendix I.

Summary

This report has provided an overview of the youthful offenders committed to correctional institutions in Massachusetts from 1968 to 1979. The remaining five volumes in this series will examine in further detail other specific aspects of this population in order to provide a more detailed and thorough understanding of the population of youthful offenders who were committed to the Department from 1968 to 1979.

The analysis in this report has described the profile of the youthful offender. An attempt was also made to look at the youthful offender over the entire time frame of the study to determine if there are any changes in the type of youth presently being committed to the Department of Correction in Massachusetts. The report has shown that there have been some changes in the response of the juvenile justice and criminal justice systems to the youthful offender in Massachusetts. The youth being committed to correctional institutions presently receive longer sentences than before and generally have penetrated much deeper into the juvenile justice system prior to their commitment to the Department. Adult correctional authorities are being less hesitant about placing these youthful offenders in maximum security institutions during their incarceration period in state correctional institutions. Finally, these youths have a much higher recidivism rate than the rate for the total population of individuals released by the Department of Correction.

Footnotes

1. Youth in Massachusetts who are younger than seventeen years of age when they commit an offense come under the original jurisdiction of the juvenile court and juvenile justice system which could lead to a commitment to the Department of Youth Service. Youth who are seventeen years of age or older at the time of offense are under the original jurisdiction of the criminal court which could lead to a commitment to a county house of correction or to the Department of Correction.
2. Report of the Governor's Task Force on Juvenile Crime April, 1981, p.2.
3. Lowell, Harvey D. and Bullington, Bruce, Rediscovering Juvenile Justice: The Cost of Getting Tough (June, 1981)p. 10.
4. Marjorie Brown Roy, Juvenile Defendants in Massachusetts: Patterns of Delinquency Charges (1978-1980), Massachusetts Department of Probation (November 18, 1980), p.3.
5. Ibid, p.4
6. A Report of the Massachusetts Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee, The Violent Juvenile Offender in Massachusetts: A Policy Analysis, Massachusetts Committee on Criminal Justice (June, 1981), p. 15.
7. Ibid, p.24.
8. The data on youthful offenders committed to state correctional institutions was taken from the Statistical Report of the Commissioner of Correction for 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and for 1972-1979 from the Massachusetts Department of Correction Yearly Commitment Reports, Publication Numbers, 68, 86, 108, 116, 139, 161, 172, and 196 respectively.

The data on youthful offenders committed to county houses of correction was taken from the Statistical Report of the Commissioner of Correction for 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972 and for 1973-1979 from the Massachusetts Department of Correction Yearly House of Correction Reports, Publication numbers 149, 144, 167, 173, and 185.

9. The total figures for youthful offenders in Table 3 differs from the figures in Table 2. The data presented in Table 3 is derived from the sample for the report and excludes youthful offenders who were not included in the sample due to lack of information.
10. There is no way of knowing how many of the bind overs have not completed the whole bind over process. Some of the bind overs may have been at different stages of the process and may be subsequently put on probation.
11. To determine serious offenders, the report will examine all juvenile offenses for individuals in the sample. Those offenders who have committed multiple offenses against the person will be considered more serious than an offender who committed only a few status offenses.
12. There was an agreement between the Department of Youth Service (DYS) and the Department of Correction (DOC) that any youth committed to the Department of Correction who was younger than seventeen at commitment and who was felt to be inappropriately placed in the DOC could be transferred directly to DYS upon agreement by the Commissioners of Correction and Youth Service. As a result, even though a youth may have been bound over from juvenile authorities to the adult criminal process, he or she may have ended up back in juvenile facilities as a result of this agreement.
13. The recidivism analysis covered the years 1968 to 1978. An analysis for youthful offenders released during 1978 could not be carried out since the cut off date for the data collection effort was January 1, 1980.
14. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970.
15. The information on median age of mother and father at youth's birth was calculated based on those cases where this information was available. For statistics on mother's age at youth's birth this was derived from 306 cases and for the statistics on father's age at youth's birth, this was derived from 270 cases.
16. Information was available for 240 of the 410 youthful offender sample (59%).
17. This figure does not include any instances of pre-trial detainments.
18. Juvenile Court judges can make several possible dispositions. They may:

- A. Adjudicate the juvenile not delinquent.
- B. Adjudicate the juvenile delinquent and:
 - 1. Impose a fine
 - 2. Place youth on probation
 - 3. Commit the juvenile to the Department of Youth Service
 - 4. Suspend the commitment
- C. Dismiss charges due to lack of evidence
- D. File the case with no further action unless the juvenile engages in further trouble.
- E. Continue without a finding - no determination made on guilt or innocence.
- F. Bind over youth to Superior Court to be tried as an adult.

(Juvenile Bind Overs in Massachusetts: 1979 .
Marjorie Brown Roy and Rachel Sagan).

- 19. Concord commitments receive an indeterminate sentence; that is, they do not receive a minimum sentence and are given a maximum sentence. For some Concord commitments (first offenders), they are eligible for parole within six months. Other Concord commitments are eligible within one year, one year and a half, etc.
- 20. From 1968 to 1972, pre-release centers were not utilized on a regular basis by the Department of Correction. As a result, the percentage given may not give an accurate indication of the utilization of these facilities by the Department during the 1970's. However, when looking at the number of pre-release placements from 1973 to 1979, 68% of the sample had never received any placements in a pre-release facility.

21. For the youthful offenders released from the Department during 1978, it was not possible to carry out a two-year follow-up period since the data collection effort was terminated on January 1, 1980.
22. The data for the departmental recidivism rates for 1971 to 1977 was taken from: Smart, Yvette, An Analysis of Recidivism Rates Among Residents Released From Massachusetts Correctional Institutions in 1977, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication Number 183, and for 1978: Williams, Lawrence T., Statistical Tables Describing the Background Characteristics and Recidivism Rates of Releases From Massachusetts Correctional Institutions During 1978, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication Number 210.
23. Linda Holt, An Analysis of Recent Trends in Court Commitments to the Massachusetts Department of Correction, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication Number 207, (September, 1980).
24. Technically when a youth is committed to the Department of Youth Service (DYS) this commitment gives DYS jurisdiction over the youth until his or her eighteenth birthday. This would make multiple commitments seem to be an unnecessary occurrence (as long as a youth's prior DYS commitment was never terminated). However, some judges have utilized recommitments; i.e., youth who have previously been committed to DYS (and still have an active prior commitment) are subsequently committed again to DYS giving multiple commitments.
25. This increase in the number of charges as a juvenile in juvenile court may or may not be indicative of an increase in the seriousness of the youth involved. Police departments may have increased their ability to apprehend law violators and citizens may be more likely to report violations committed by juveniles which could lead to an increase in the total number of charges without this necessarily indicating more serious offenders.
26. This variable does not include placements or incarcerations as a result of being committed to the Department of Youth Service.

Appendix I
Variables That Distinguished Youthful Offenders
Over Time

	1968 - 1971		1972 - 1975	
	Commitments		Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
1. <u>Maximum Sentence</u>				
5 Years or Less	116	(83)	76	(51)
6 Years or More	24	(17)	74	(49)
TOTAL	140	(100)	150	(100)

($\chi^2=33.5386$, 1df, $p < .001$)

	1972 - 1975		1976 - 1979	
	Commitments		Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
5 Years or Less	76	(51)	39	(32)
6 Years or More	74	(49)	81	(68)
TOTAL	150	(100)	120	(100)

($\chi^2=8.9982$, 1df, $p < .01$)

	1968 - 1971		1976 - 1979	
	Commitments		Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
5 Years or Less	116	(83)	39	(32)
6 Years or More	24	(17)	81	(68)
TOTAL	140	(100)	120	(100)

($\chi^2=68.0587$, 1df, $p < .001$)

	1968 - 1971		1976 - 1979	
	Commitments		Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
2. <u>Time Until Original Parole Eligibility Date (Excluding Unknowns)</u>				
12 Months or Less	124	(89)	69	(58)
More Than One Year	16	(11)	51	(42)
TOTAL	140	(100)	120	(100)

($\chi^2=32.6117$, 1df, $p < .001$)

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1972 - 1975 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
3. <u>Total Number of Disciplinary Reports</u>				
Two or Fewer	99	(71)	79	(53)
Three or More	41	(29)	71	(47)
TOTAL	140	(100)	150	(100)
$(\chi^2=9.9499, 1df, p < .01)$				

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
Two or Fewer	99	(71)	59	(49)
Three or More	41	(29)	61	(51)
TOTAL	140	(100)	120	(100)
$(\chi^2=12.5842, 1df, p < .001)$				

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
4. <u>Number of Maximum Security Placements</u>				
None	120	(86)	90	(75)
One or More	20	(14)	30	(25)
TOTAL	140	(100)	120	(100)
$(\chi^2=4.7755, 1df, p < .05)$				

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1972 - 1975 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
5. <u>Number of Medium Security Placements</u>				
One or None	120	(86)	112	(75)
Two or More	20	(14)	38	(25)
TOTAL	140	(100)	150	(100)
$(X^2=5.5238, 1df, p < .02)$				

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
One or None	120	(86)	82	(68)
Two or More	20	(14)	38	(32)
TOTAL	140	(100)	120	(100)
$(X^2=11.2629, 1df, p < .001)$				

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1972 - 1975 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
6. <u>Number of Department of Youth Service Commitments</u>				
One or None	124	(89)	101	(67)
Two or More	16	(11)	49	(33)
TOTAL	140	(100)	150	(100)
$(X^2=18.7825, 1df, p < .001)$				

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
One or None	124	(89)	69	(58)
Two or More	16	(11)	51	(42)
TOTAL	140	(100)	120	(100)
$(X^2=32.6117, 1df, p < .001)$				

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1972 - 1975 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
7. <u>Number of Juvenile Court Appearances</u>				
Four or Fewer	82	(59)	47	(31)
Five or More	58	(41)	103	(69)
TOTAL	140	(100)	150	(100)

($\chi^2=21.7548$, 1df, $p < .001$)

	1972 - 1975 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
Four or Less	47	(31)	55	(46)
Five or More	103	(69)	65	(54)
TOTAL	150	(100)	120	(100)

($\chi^2=5.9629$, 1df, $p < .02$)

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
Four or Less	82	(59)	55	(46)
Five or More	58	(41)	65	(54)
TOTAL	140	(100)	120	(100)

($\chi^2=4.2059$, 1df, $p < .05$)

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1972 - 1975 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
8. <u>Number of Charges in Juvenile Court</u>				
Five or Fewer	74	(53)	42	(28)
Six or More	66	(47)	108	(72)
TOTAL	140	(100)	150	(100)

($\chi^2=18.6429$, 1df, $p < .001$)

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
Five or Fewer	74	(53)	41	(34)
Six or More	66	(47)	79	(66)
TOTAL	140	(100)	120	(100)

($\chi^2=9.1508$, 1df, $p < .01$)

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1972 - 1975 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
9. <u>Marital Status of Parents (Excluding Unknowns)</u>				
Married	53	(38)	40	(27)
Other	86	(62)	110	(73)
TOTAL	139	(100)	150	(100)

($\chi^2=4.3436$, 1df, $p < .05$)

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
Married	53	(38)	26	(22)
Other	86	(62)	94	(78)
TOTAL	139	(100)	120	(100)

($\chi^2=8.2339$, 1df, $p < .01$)

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1972 - 1975 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
10. <u>Number of Children at Incarceration</u>				
None	134	(96)	128	(91)
One or More	5	(4)	16	(9)
TOTAL	139	(100)	144	(100)

($\chi^2=5.8128$, 1df, $p < .02$)

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
None	134	(96)	103	(87)
One or More	5	(4)	17	(13)
TOTAL	139	(100)	120	(100)

($\chi^2=7.8236$, 1df, $p < .01$)

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1972 - 1975 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
11. <u>Number of Addresses the Past Ten Years (Excluding Unknowns)</u>				

Two or Fewer	52	(49)	35	(30)
Three or More	55	(51)	82	(70)
TOTAL	107	(100)	117	(100)

($\chi^2=8.2129$, 1df, $p < .01$)

	1972 - 1975 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
Two or Fewer	35	(30)	58	(63)
Three or More	82	(70)	34	(37)
TOTAL	117	(100)	92	(100)

($\chi^2=22.8873$, 1df, $p < .001$)

	1968 - 1971 Commitments		1976 - 1979 Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
Two or Fewer	52	(49)	58	(63)
Three or More	55	(51)	34	(37)
TOTAL	107	(100)	92	(100)

($\chi^2=4.1754$, 1df, $p < .05$)

	1968 - 1971		1976 - 1979	
	Commitments		Commitments	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
12. <u>Length of Time at Current Address (Excluding Unknowns)</u>				
4 Years or Less	68	(54)	42	(39)
More Than 4 Years	58	(46)	66	(61)
TOTAL	126	(100)	108	(100)

($\chi^2=5.3084$, 1df, $p < .05$)

Appendix II

A List of Variables Collected

I. Present Offense/Commitment Variables

- A. Date of Offense
- B. Age at Offense
- C. Committing Institution
- D. Minimum Sentence
- E. Maximum Sentence
- F. Time Until Original Parole Eligibility Date
- G. Reception Diagnostic Center - Initial Security Rating
- H. Age at Incarceration
- I. Present Offense - General Categories
- J. Present Offense - Person Offense
- K. Present Offense - Property Offense
- L. Present Offense - Drug Offense
- M. Present Offense - Sex Offense
- N. Present Offense - Other Offense
- O. Date of Commitment

II. Institutional/Movement Variables

- A. Total Number of Disciplinary Reports
- B. Date of First Disciplinary Report
- C. Number of Maximum Security Placements
- D. Number of Medium Security Placements
- E. Number of House of Correction Placements

- F. Number of Pre-Release Placements
- G. Number of Forestry Camp Placements
- H. Number of Bridgewater State Hospital Placements
- I. Time Spent in Maximum Security Institutions
- J. Time Spent in Medium Security Institutions
- K. Time Spent in a House of Correction
- L. Time Spent in Pre-Release Facilities
- M. Time Spent in Forestry Camps
- N. Total Number of Escapes
- O. Number of New Charges This Incarceration
- P. Type of Release
- Q. Age at Release
- R. Time Served Before Release

III. Juvenile Court/Department of Youth Service Variables

- A. Number of Department of Youth Service Commitments
- B. Number of Juvenile Court Appearances
- C. Number of Probations From Juvenile Court
- D. Number of suspended Sentences From Juvenile Court
- E. Number of filed Charges From Juvenile Court
- F. Date of First Juvenile Court Hearing
- G. Number of Charges in Juvenile Court
- H. Juvenile Court Offenses (1-24)
- I. Date of all Juvenile Court Appearances
- J. Disposition of all Juvenile Court Appearances

IV. Social History Variables

- A. Race
- B. Marital Status
- C. Parents Marital Status
- D. Number of Brothers
- E. Number of Step-Brothers
- F. Number of Brothers Incarcerated
- G. Number of Sisters
- H. Number of Step-sisters
- I. Number of Sisters incarcerated
- J. Number of Children
- K. Last Grade Completed
- L. Place of Birth
- M. Mother Living at Youth's Commitment Indicator
- N. Father Living at Youth's Commitment Indicator
- O. Mother's Age at Youth's Birth
- P. Father's Age at Youth's Birth
- Q. Age of Youth at Separation of Parents
- R. Father's Occupation
- S. Mother's Occupation
- T. Location Where Child Formerly Resided
- U. Number of Siblings Living With Youth at Last Address
- V. Source of Family Income
- W. Number of Addresses in the Past Ten Years
- X. Length of Time at Current Address
- Y. Drug Use Indicator

References

1. A report of the Massachusetts Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee, The Violent Juvenile Offender in Massachusetts: A Policy Analysis, Massachusetts Committee on Criminal Justice, June, 1981.
2. Academy for Contemporary Problems, Major Issues in Juvenile Justice Information and Training: Readings in Public Policy, Columbus, Ohio 1981.
3. Clarke, Stevens H. "Getting 'em Out of Circulation: Does Incarceration of Juvenile Offenders Reduce Crime"? Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 5, No. 4 (1974).
4. Fox, Sanford J., Cases and Materials on Modern Juvenile Justice, West Publishing Company, 1972.
5. Gold, Martin and David J. Reiner, "Changing Patterns of Delinquent Behavior Among Americans 13 Through 16 Years Old: 1967-1972," Crime and Delinquency Literature 7, No. 4 December, 1975).
6. Goshen, Charles E., Society and the Youthful Offender, Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1974.
7. Hamparian, Donna Martin; Schuster, Richard; Dinitz, Simon; and Conrad, John P., The Violent Few: A Study of Dangerous Juvenile Offenders, Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1978.
8. Holt, Linda K., An Analysis of Recent Trends in Court Commitments to the Massachusetts Department of Correction, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 207, September, 1980.
9. Lefkowitz, Monroe M.; Eron, Leonard D., Walder, Leopole O.; and Huesmann, L. Rowell, Growing Up To Be Violent, New York: Permagon Press, 1977.
10. Lowell, Harvey D. and Bullington, Bruce, Rediscovering Juvenile Justice: The Cost of Getting Tough (June, 1981).

11. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
12. Report of the Governor's Task Force on Juvenile Crime (April, 1981).
13. Rosenheim, Margaret K. ed., Pursuing Justice for the Child, The University of Chicago Press, 1976.
14. Roy, Marjorie Brown, Patterns of Crime and Delinquency in Massachusetts: 1979 - 1978, Massachusetts Department of Probation, February 3, 1980.
15. Roy, Marjorie Brown, Juvenile Bindovers in Massachusetts: 1979, Massachusetts Department of Probation (December 15, 1980).
16. Sellin, Thorsten and Marvin E. Wolfgang, The Measurement of Delinquency, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
17. Smith, Charles P.; Alexander, Paul S.; Halatyn, Thomas V.; Roberts, Chester F. Reports of the National Juvenile Justice Assessment Centers: A National Assessment of Serious Juvenile Crime and the Juvenile Justice System Volume II: Definitions, Characteristics of Incidents and Individuals, and Relationship to Substance Abuse, U.S. Department of Justice, April, 1980.
18. Strasburg, Paul A. Violent Delinquents, New York: Monarch, 1978.
19. Wheeler Stanton ed.; Controlling Delinquents, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.