

1960

A study of the personal and social characteristics of public offenders from three Massachusetts correctional institutions in treatment with the division of legal medicine

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/19593>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

A STUDY OF THE PERSONAL AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS
OF PUBLIC OFFENDERS FROM THREE MASSACHUSETTS CORRECTIONAL
INSTITUTIONS IN TREATMENT WITH THE DIVISION OF LEGAL
MEDICINE

A thesis

Submitted by

Elizabeth Ann Abramek

(B.A., St. Joseph College, 1958)

Donald Martin Coburn

(B.A., Hesser College, 1958)

Charlyne Dean

(B.A., University of Connecticut, 1958)

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Science in Social Service

1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	
Purpose	1
Sample Selection	2
Methods of Data Collection	3
Previous Studies of Characteristics of Offenders	6
II. THE AGENCY SETTING	
The Division of Legal Medicine	11
The Correctional Institutions	13
Norfolk	
Concord	
Framingham	
XII. GENERAL SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF INMATES	20
IV. HISTORY OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR	25
V. FAMILY HISTORY	46
VI. MARITAL HISTORY	56
VII. CONTACTS WITH HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES	60
VIII. EDUCATION AND OCCUPATION	66
Education	66
Occupation	72
IX. MILITARY SERVICE	75
X. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	84
APPENDICES	
A. KEYSORT DATA CARD	92
B. SCHEDULE	93
C. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY CLASSIFICATION	94
BIBLIOGRAPHY	95

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Age of Inmates at Intake by DLM	20
2. Race of Inmates	21
3. Religious Affiliation of Inmates	22
4. Marital Status of Inmates	23
5. Last Residence of Inmate	24
6. Age at Time of First Offense	26
7. Age at First Institutionalization	27
8. Number of Previous Offenses	28
9. Nature of Previous Offenses	29
10. Number of Inmates Committing Each Type of Previous Offense	32
11. Disposition of Previous Offenses: Institutionaliza- tion	33
12. Disposition of Previous Offenses: Probation	34
13. Disposition of Previous Offenses: Other Dispositions	35
14. Number of Times on Parole	36
15. Number of Times Parole Broken	37
16. Number of Times Probation Broken	38
17. Nature of Present Offense	39
18. Time of Day Present Offense Committed	40
19. Involvement of Partner(s) in Present Offense	41
20. Involvement of Opposite-Sex Partner(s) in Present Offense	41
21. Parole Situation at Time of Present Offense	42
22. Probation Situation at Time of Present Offense	43

TABLE	PAGE
23. Number of Inmates Under Supervision at Time of Present Offense	44
24. Months Between Date of Incarceration and Date of Intake	45
25. Number of Broken Homes	46
26. Age at Time of Broken Home	47
27. Cause of Broken Home	48
28. Outcome After Initial Crisis	49
29. Crises in the Home	50
30. Family Residential Moves	51
31. Court Record of Father	52
32. Court Record of Mother	52
33. Court Record of Siblings	53
34. Birth Order of Inmates	54
35. Full Siblings of Inmates	54
36. Half Siblings of Inmates	55
37. Age at First Marriage of Inmates	57
38. Number of Children in Total Number of Marriages of Inmates	58
39. Number of Illegitimate Children of Inmates	58
40. Residential Moves of Inmates After Marriage	59
41. Inmates Hospitalized as Children	60
42. Inmates Who Received Prior Psychiatric Treatment	61
43. Inmates Who Received Physical Treatment for Psychiatric Conditions	62
44. Previous Contacts With Social Agencies	62

TABLE	PAGE
45. Parental Family Contacts With Social Agencies	63
46. Patient and Marital Family Contacts With Social Agencies	64
47. Age of Inmates at Termination of Education	66
48. Number of Grades Completed by the Inmates	67
49. Number of Inmates Who Repeated Grades	69
50. School Discipline Problems of Inmates	69
51. School Reading Problems of Inmates	70
52. I.Q. of Inmates	71
53. Occupation at the Time of Crime	72
54. Job Stability at the Time of Crime	73
55. Number of Jobs	74
56. Past Military Service of the Inmates	75
57. Branch of Military Service Entered	76
58. Method of Entering Military Service	77
59. Number of Inductions	78
60. Total Length of Time Served	79
61. Nature of Experience: Combat	80
62. Nature of Experience: Incarceration	80
63. Type of Last Discharge from Military Service	81
64. Types of All Discharges from Military Service	82
65. Personal Evaluation of Military Service Experience	83

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The Division of Legal Medicine is a state agency under the auspices of the Department of Mental Health, which offers psychiatric and social work services to public offenders and their families. The clientele which the Division of Legal Medicine¹ serves is thought of as being somewhat distinct from those served in other social agencies. Clients in all agencies present a variety of life experiences; however, the patient treated at DLW has acted out his problems in a delinquent fashion, has been apprehended, and has become known as a "public offender." A history of difficulties with authoritarian figures and difficulty in maintaining a constructive treatment relationship also distinguishes this clientele. There is considerable general knowledge concerning the characteristics of public offenders. However, DLW has been interested in acquiring more specific knowledge about the type of offender that is being referred to this clinic for therapy. It was felt that a study of the social characteristics and life experiences of its patients would give a clearer picture of this particular clientele. Therefore, the present study was undertaken to compile the available facts concerning the social characteristics and life experiences of the patients in the clinic's caseload. It was

¹

The Division of Legal Medicine will hereafter be referred to as DLW or simply "the clinic."

also felt that the study would provide a basis for further research on the relationship of such background characteristics to various aspects of treatment.

Sample Selection

At the time of this study DLM accepted patients from six² sources: inmates from the Massachusetts Correctional Institutions at Framingham, Concord, Norfolk and Walpole, referrals from the Youth Service Board, and referrals of persons on parole. Since it was not possible to include the total clinic population within the limits of a student thesis, the study group was limited to three of these sources, the institutions of Framingham, Concord and Norfolk. Patients from these three institutions constitute about one-half of the total clinic caseload.

The study group consisted of inmates from these three institutions who were in treatment with DLM as of January 1, 1959, or who came into treatment between that date, and December 1, 1959. This eleven-month period was selected for two reasons: (1) a new "key-sort" coding system was instituted for recording basic information on all clinic cases as of January 1, 1959; (2) due to time limits the data collection had to be undertaken as of December 1, 1959. The study group that resulted consisted of 100 inmates from Framingham, Concord and Norfolk.

2

The Correctional Institutions will hereafter be referred to as Framingham, Concord and Norfolk without the formal designation, MCI.

All of the thirty-eight inmates from Framingham who were in treatment during the time period were included. There were sixty-eight inmates in the Norfolk group that qualified for the study. Since this group was too large to be used within the limits of the study, a sample of thirty-four was selected. This was done by arranging the code numbers from the "keysort" data cards in numerical order and choosing every other one. All of the forty-six inmates from the Concord treatment group did not qualify. This group was reduced to twenty-eight because: (1) three of the "keysort" data cards referred to diagnostic studies rather than treatment cases; and (2) the basic information was unavailable for fifteen of the inmates.

Methods of Data Collection

Data were collected from three sources: (1) DLM's own keysort coding cards; (2) the inmates' institutional records; (3) the inmates' records at the Department of Corrections. DLM's coding system consists of keysort data cards covering basic personal, social and treatment information on its cases (see Appendix A). The various categories are arranged on the card with a corresponding coding system around its perimeter for manual sorting.

Data to be analyzed are recorded on the cards, and the cards are coded by notching away the portion of the card between the hole and the card edge. Data coded under any one category can be recovered by means of a sorting-needle, which separates notched cards from unnotched cards.³

³ William D. Wells, "The Use of McBee Keysort in Content Analysis," American Psychologist, vol. 11 (1956), p. 53.

These cards has been completed by the respective caseworker for each patient in treatment as of January 1, 1959, and for all patients coming into treatment after that date. The main areas of information consist of: identifying data, history of criminal behavior, contacts with health and welfare services, occupational history, educational history, military service history, family and marital history, and progress during and after treatment.

In order to gain a more comprehensive view of the life experiences of the inmates a schedule based on the above data cards was formulated (see Appendix B). All of the items on the code card were included except those concerning progress during and after treatment. Some areas of information on the code cards were expanded as follows:

(1) Identifying Data expanded to include: date of intake, community of residence, and date of birth.

(2) History of Criminal Behavior expanded to include: number and nature of previous offenses; nature of dispositions; the number of times on parole, breaking parole and breaking probation; and date of incarceration.

(3) Contacts with Health and Welfare Services expanded to include: a chronological listing of contacts with social agencies by parental and marital family.

(4) Family expanded to include: the history of crises in the home; the number and location of residential moves.

(5) Marital History, a new category added.

(6) Education expanded to include: nature of discipline and reading problems; nature of additional education; and I.Q.

4

Those items from the code card which were included in the schedule appear with their corresponding numbers on the schedule. Those items which are unnumbered were added for the purposes of this study.

(7) Military Service expanded to include: dates; reasons for discharge; and service prison record.

(8) Occupation expanded to include: type of job; location; duration; and periods of unemployment.

The additional information for this expanded schedule was collected from the case records of DLM, the inmates' records in the Department of Corrections, and the inmates' records in the respective institutions. This additional information for the Framingham inmates was collected solely from the Department of Corrections, since these records were found to be current and complete in all areas of information requested. The information for the Concord and Norfolk inmates was collected from both the Department of Correction records and the institutional records. Both of these record sources varied in content and completeness, and therefore it was necessary to use whichever record was most complete in each individual case. The case records at DLM were used to verify material, especially identifying data.

In a considerable number of cases discrepancies were found between the information on the keysort cards and that from the records. In these cases the records were considered valid and the data cards were corrected to correspond with this. Two items, "reading problems" and evaluation of military service," were not found in any records and the responses on the data cards were accepted as correct.

In the Norfolk group eight schedules could not be filled out completely because the records were not accessible. These records were not available at the institution due to their filing system and the records at DLM and the Department of Corrections were incomplete. This has meant that there are a considerable number of "unknown" items in the Norfolk group.

The data from each institution were collected and analyzed by one of the three writers: from Norfolk by Miss Dean; from Concord by Mr. Coburn; and from Framingham by Miss Abramek.

Previous Studies of Characteristics of Offenders

As a background for this study we have used the writings of Elliott,⁵ the Gluecks,⁶ and Sutherland and Cressey.⁷ The Gluecks' companion studies: Five Hundred Delinquent Women and Five Hundred Criminal Careers are based on two of the institutions used in the present study; Framingham and Concord, respectively. Although much literature has been published on the characteristics of the public offender, there is a gap between this knowledge and its application. Elliott explains this gap as due to an accumulation of knowledge about superficial characteristics rather than information as to why crimes are committed. She points out that the

⁵ Mabel A. Elliott, Crime in Modern Society.

⁶ Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Five Hundred Criminal Careers, and Five Hundred Delinquent Women.

⁷ Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, Principles of Criminology.

available literature does not help the profession to understand why these people differ from the rest of society.⁸

The studies consulted are concerned chiefly with the general social characteristics of criminals. There is general agreement about the largest age group of criminals, which is the young adult group. However, the age of the "young adult" is not defined and may vary a year or two in the different studies. In the Gluecks' studies the average age was found to be twenty.⁹ Sutherland points out that age is related to the frequency and type of crime committed and that the more violent crimes are committed by young adults.¹⁰

In relation to criminal history the writers point out that the majority of offenders are recidivists, that they have spent over a year and a half in a correctional institution, and that the majority of offenses are against property. The Gluecks found in their study on male offenders that over half of the inmates were recidivists.¹¹ Nine per cent had served from one to four sentences in the reformatory prior to their present commitment. Of those who had prior institutional experiences, the average commitment had been for nineteen months.¹²

⁸ Mabel A. Elliott, op. cit., p. 73.

⁹ Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Five Hundred Criminal Careers, p. 153, and Five Hundred Delinquent Women, p. 187.

¹⁰ Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald E. Cressey, op. cit., p. 107.

¹¹ Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Five Hundred Criminal Careers, p. 148.

¹² Ibid., p. 148.

There is also general agreement that a vast majority of offenders come from homes which are emotionally and financially deprived. In the Glueck study 81.5 per cent of the inmates had left home by the age of fourteen or under. The major reasons for this were either commitment to a correctional institution or break-up of the home.¹³ Although they found these families to be quite mobile, they did not find this to be appreciably different from the general public.¹⁴ Also, half of the families of the inmates contained members who had court records. Over half of the families had had contact with social service agencies, and the majority of these contacts were for financial reasons.¹⁵

There was agreement that the majority of male offenders were single. It was the Gluecks' opinion that this was true in their sample because of the low average age of the men at the time of incarceration.¹⁶ There was, however, some disagreement between the writers regarding the marital status of women. Elliott¹⁷ and Sutherland¹⁸ state that married women have a higher commitment rate than single women. However, the Gluecks point out in their study of women that almost half of their sample were single.¹⁹

¹³Ibid., p. 137.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 138.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 121.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 131.

¹⁷Mabel A. Elliott, op. cit., p. 11.

¹⁸Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, op. cit., p. 186.

¹⁹Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Five Hundred Delinquent Women, p. 103.

The Gluecks found that the educational achievement of their group was much lower than that of the general population. Almost half of those whose termination age was known had left school at fourteen.²⁰ They found that only one-third of their population was categorized as having a "normal" I.Q. However, they point out that with the establishment of a special unit for defective delinquents the percentage of the inmates in the lower mental categories would be reduced.²¹ It is not surprising, in relation to the educational and I.Q. statistics, that the great majority of the group were unskilled or semi-skilled workers. In the Glueck study the maximum time that a job was held was less than a year for over half the group.²² The other authors, also, recognized the instability of the occupational history.

The literature on women offenders is not as extensive as that for men. There is a disproportionate number of men offenders compared to women. Sutherland's explanation for this difference is in terms of social position and tradition. That is, when women's equality becomes comparable to men's they commit more crimes.²³ However, because of the very fact of sex many of

²⁰ Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Five Hundred Criminal Careers, p. 138.

²¹ Ibid., p. 156.

²² Ibid., p. 138.

²³ Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, op. cit., p. 112.

The items mentioned above have different implications for women. For example, the type of crimes committed by women are more self-destructive and very often involve a sex charge. Over half of the women in the Gluecks' study were serving sentences which involved a sex charge.²⁴ A history of family disorganization was felt to have a greater influence on the delinquency of female than male offenders.

²⁴ Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Five Hundred Delinquent Women, p. 186.

CHAPTER II

THE AGENCY SETTING

The Division of Legal Medicine

The DLM is a psychiatrically oriented agency under the administrative auspices of the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health. It operates a three-fold program of work with the public offender. The first aspect of this program is service to both juvenile and adult courts. This includes dispositional evaluations, consultative services to court personnel, and direct treatment to probationers. Secondly, multiple services are extended to the Massachusetts Division of Youth Service. These services include diagnostic evaluations as well as long-range rehabilitative recommendations. It also provides some direct treatment of institutionalized and paroled delinquents and their families, as well as consultative services to Juvenile Parole Officers and other community agencies actively engaged with problems of delinquency. The third phase of the program operates within the framework of the Massachusetts Department of Corrections, providing approximately the same services here as those to the Division of Youth Service, and in addition consultative services to employers of parolees.

The DLM is an outgrowth of a joint committee of the Boston Bar Association and Suffolk District Medical Society which was formed in February, 1948, for the purpose of studying the problem of "Criminal Responsibility in Mental Disease." This group, consisting of three lawyers and three psychiatrists, worked for several years at the task of studying and making known the cultural

gap between ritualized legal processes and the neglected potential contributions that psychiatry could make to these legal procedures. The findings of this committee were presented to the State Legislature in the Spring of 1951. In essence the report concluded:¹

The joint Committee . . . (is) aware that there is no completely accurate method of predicting human behavior. But it has assumed that psychiatry in some areas has developed . . . a higher degree of accurate prediction . . . (In spite of this) the courts to a large extent are by their present attitudes and methods failing to make use of such abilities . . . (Moreover) the psychiatrist tends to shy away from it because the criminal is an unsatisfactory problem for him to treat; he has not yet acquired the skills satisfactorily to deal with a goodly number of cases the law provides for him--the exhibitionist, the voyeurist, the homosexual, the alcoholic, the drug addict, the psychopathic personality. The lawyer avoids it because he is trained to abide by rules and tests . . . Nevertheless, if there is maintained an imaginative, a realistic, and above all a continuing attempt to find a common language and meeting ground for the psychiatrist and the lawyer, then there may yet emerge something really positive in this huge area of human relations. . . .

On this basis the Massachusetts Legislature sanctioned the commencement of two pilot projects in 1954. These were the Cambridge Court Clinic and the Concord Reformatory Program, both of which were for the purpose of working with legally-defined sex offenders. In the six years following this the DLM has expanded to the point where it now has operating programs in all of the institutions of the Department of Corrections, in clinics in twelve of the Commonwealth's seventy-two District Courts, and in

¹ Preliminary Report of Joint Committee of the Boston Bar Association and the Suffolk District Medical Society for the Study of Criminal Responsibility in Mental Disease, -- pp. 63-64.

three of the seven institutions of the Division of Youth Service. It also maintains a central Parole Clinic at 33 Broad Street, Boston, for out-patient treatment for all parolees, both juvenile and adult. In addition, it has an ongoing and expanding research program. Full-time professional personnel consists of approximately twelve psychiatrists, twenty-five social workers, and four psychologists, with an approximately equal number of consultants devoting varying amounts of time.

Since this study deals with the portion of the DLM's caseload that has been referred from the three Massachusetts Correctional Institutions of Norfolk, Concord, and Framingham, these three institutions will be described briefly.

The Correctional Institutions

Norfolk.

The buildings now utilized by Norfolk, located in the town of the same name, originally housed a hospital for alcoholics. In 1927 the land and buildings were transferred to the Department of Corrections and inmates from the Charlestown State Prison worked on renovations and additions to the already-existing structures. A wall enclosing thirty-five acres of land was completed and the institution was ready for permanent use in 1931, although internal construction was not finished until 1934.²

Norfolk is a medium-security institution for adult male offenders which was planned for the men who show the most

²Walter H. Commons, et. al. The Development of Penological Treatment at Norfolk Prison Colony in Massachusetts, p. 4.

rehabilitative promise. As such, it does not receive offenders directly from the courts. They are received only on transfer from other correctional institutions after approval by the Transfer Board, a committee in the Department of Corrections. Thus, there is a screening process to eliminate from possible transfer those inmates whose adjustment would be precarious in the "community life" atmosphere of Norfolk, with its dormitory units rather than cell blocks and its provision for freedom of movement rather than severely restricted activity.³

This institution has an industrial program, provision for extensive avocational work, and educational and library facilities. In addition, outdoor sports and the cultivation of small individualized garden plots are possible. Its hospital is of such high caliber that men from other institutions frequently are transferred there for medical and surgical treatment.⁴

Inmates in treatment with DLM at Norfolk are self-referred. They may become acquainted with the program through other inmates, talks with chaplains, suggestion and encouragement by house officers, and so forth, but the ultimate decision to seek help is their own. Application is made through the institution's Head Social Worker who, in turn, forwards a written request to DLM's Norfolk coordinator. The inmate is

³ Edwin Powers, The Basic Structure of the Administration of Original Justice in Massachusetts, pp. 26-27.

⁴ Ibid., p. 27.

then seen for one or more intake interviews in which the reasons for this request are explored. The material from these interviews, plus historical and criminal information from the correctional records, subsequently is presented to DDM's Norfolk intake committee. This committee is composed of the psychiatric social workers assigned to this institution and is chaired by a staff psychiatrist. A decision is made by this committee as to whether the request is appropriate to DDM's program and whether the inmate may be expected to benefit from its services.

Censord

Censord, designed as the Commonwealth's State Prison to replace the antiquated one at Charlestown which had served since 1807, was opened in 1876. Six years later its name was changed to the Massachusetts Reformatory, and the Charlestown State Prison was reopened as authorities felt the need to separate the youthful and first offenders from the recidivists and older men. From 1884 to 1955, the "Massachusetts Reformatory," now known as Censord, was reserved for these youthful offenders. Today, however, there is no such legal limitation on sentencing, although its younger population reflects a continuing view of its long-term purpose. A majority of these young adults have been confined previously in other institutions, primarily juvenile training schools, and a sizable proportion of the prison population is composed of transfers from other correctional settings and those whose paroles have been revoked.⁵

⁵ Id., p. 28.

Although Concord is a walled institution, approximately 15% of its population, which may range occasionally to over five hundred, lives and works on the institutional farm. The usual industrial shops, varied in nature from the other correctional settings, and recreational, avocational, and entertainment facilities constitute the major facets of the program. However, the age of this institution has led to consideration of its abandonment and the construction of a new, medium-security setting complete with modern rehabilitative resources.⁶

The process by which an inmate comes into treatment with DLM is somewhat similar to that in effect at Norfolk. However, there is no Head Social Worker through whom requests are channelled. Applications may come as a result of monthly interviews held with personnel in the institution's Record Section or through officer contacts, other inmates, and so forth as seen at Norfolk. But, here again, the final decision to ask for treatment is the inmate's own.

An inmate's request is followed by a short screening interview to determine if the presenting problem is in the general area of mental health. Two to three intake interviews follow, after which an intake conference is held, attended by the DLM treatment team for Concord and chaired by a staff psychiatrist. If accepted (under the same criteria outlined

⁶ Idem.

previously for Norfolk), the applicant's name is placed on a "treatment list" to be seen on a continuing basis as soon as possible.

Frankingham

Frankingham was opened as the Reformatory Prison for Women in 1877, the second such institution designed exclusively for women offenders. The word "Prison" was dropped from the name in 1971 making the title consistent with its construction. For the lack of surrounding walls classes it as a minimum security institution. It has a capacity for 344 women in what are essentially outmoded buildings.⁷ Until recently the number of inmates (or "students," to use a preferred term) had tended to decline, but now the facilities are being strained once again.⁸

Frankingham's program consists of industrial activities, such as sewing, knitting, and flag-making; academic education; and inmate participation in recreational activities, supported by the encouragement of volunteers. Since 1958 a new superintendent has added to this program additional vocational education, such as hair styling, and has renovated the industrial rooms and the institution as a whole through the acquisition of new machinery and the application of several coats of cherry, pastel-colored paint.

⁷ IAGM.

⁸ Personal Communication with Theodore Gurley, formerly DLM's Chief of Social Service.

Women are sentenced to Framingham by both municipal and district courts as well as the Superior Courts.⁹ Thus, these women who are incarcerated for a misdemeanor such as drunkenness, carrying a maximum term of six months, are housed along with other women offenders who may be under a life sentence. This is in contrast to the male institutions in this study whose inmates are almost exclusively adult male offenders.

The process of referral to DLM differs in comparison to the male institutions also. DLM's Framingham coordinator sits in on the institutional classification meetings in which each new inmate's case is presented and decisions relative to her rehabilitation are made. The coordinator, who is also DLM's Director of Clinical Services, selects those cases for exposure to the opportunity of treatment on the basis of certain criteria. The first criterion is that prospective treatment would be meaningful and profitable for the inmate who, consequently, may not be mentally retarded or acutely psychotic. Another criterion is that the prospective patient has post-release residential plans which provide for the possibility of continuing treatment on an out-patient basis at the Parole Clinic. Each qualified inmate is seen for an interview in which the opportunity for treatment is extended, but she makes the final decision regarding acceptance of the offer. Therefore, although each

⁹ Powers, op. cit., p. 28

institution's intake approach differs somewhat, in all the
acceptance of treatment rests with the individual.

CHAPTER III

GENERAL SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF INMATES

The general social characteristics of the 100 inmates of the three Massachusetts Correctional Institutions included in this study are presented in the following tables. These include: age, race, religion, marital status and community of residence.

Table 1 shows the age of the inmates at intake by DLM.

TABLE 1
AGE OF INMATES AT INTAKE BY DLM

Age	Number of Inmates						Total n %
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
15 - 19	2	5.9	3	10.7	16	42.1	21
20 - 24	8	23.5	12	42.9	15	39.5	35
25 - 29	11	32.4	7	25.0	2	5.3	20
30 - 34	4	11.7	4	14.3	3	7.9	11
35 - 39	5	14.7	2	7.1	2	5.3	9
40 & over	4	11.7	0	0	0	0	4
Totals	34	100	28	100	38	100	100

* Since the total number of cases is 100, the number and per cent are the same.

Over half, or 56 per cent, of the total group were under twenty-five years of age; almost one-third, or 31 per cent, were between twenty-five and thirty-five; and only 13 per cent were thirty-five or over. The mean age for the

total group was 26.4 and the modal age group was twenty to twenty-four years.

Norfolk had the largest proportion of older inmates. The mean age for this institution was 31.8 and the median twenty-eight years. Its youngest inmate represented was nineteen; and it had the two oldest in the total group who were forty-eight and fifty-two years of age. Concord showed a mean age of 25.3 and a median age of 23.5. Its youngest inmate was eighteen and the oldest was thirty-nine years of age. The group from Framingham had the largest proportion of young inmates. Over 80 per cent were under twenty-five. Framingham's youngest inmate of fifteen years was also the youngest of the total sample. Its mean age was 21.7 and the median was twenty years.

As shown in Table 2, 85 per cent of the sample was white. Nine negro inmates, or over half of the fifteen per cent representing the negro population, were from Framingham.

TABLE 2
RACE OF INMATES

Race	Number of Inmates						
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
White	31	91.2	25	89.3	29	76.3	85
Negro	3	8.8	3	10.7	9	23.7	15
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100

Table 3 presents the religious affiliation of the inmates. Nearly two-thirds, sixty-two inmates, were Roman Catholic. According to the guide for the keyserl data cards, the Protestant affiliation includes--Episcopal, Congregational, Methodist, Baptist, Unitarian, Lutheran, and Presbyterian. All other branches of Protestantism were included in the third category in Table 3. Of the two cases represented here, one was a Christian Scientist, the other was unknown.

TABLE 3
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF INMATES

Religious Affiliation	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Roman Catholic	22	64.7	18	64.3	22	57.9	62	
Protestant (major sects)	10	29.4	9	32.1	15	39.5	34	
Protestant (minor sects)	1	2.9	0	0	1	2.6	2	
Jewish	1	2.9	1	3.6	0	0	2	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Table 4 shows the marital status of the inmates.

TABLE 4
 MARITAL STATUS OF INMATES

Marital Status	Number of Inmates						
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n %
Single	19	55.9	20	71.4	29	76.3	68
Married	3	8.8	1	3.6	3	7.9	7
Divorced	6	17.6	3	10.7	5	13.2	14
Separated	2	5.9	4	14.3	1	2.6	7
Divorced (remarried)	3	8.8	0	0	0	0	3
Widowed	<u>1</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100

The majority of the inmates, 68 per cent, were found to be single, while the remaining 32 per cent had had some marital experience. This high proportion of single inmates may be attributed to the large proportion of persons under twenty-five years of age shown in Table 1. Fifteen, or nearly one-half of those who had ever been married were from Norfolk, which also had the largest proportion of elder inmates.

Table 5 shows the community of residence of the inmates at the time of incarceration. Boston includes all areas within the municipal unit. Anything within a fifteen mile radius of Boston was considered "suburban Boston."

TABLE 5
LAST RESIDENCE OF INMATE

Community of Residence	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Frankingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Boston	11	32.4	13	46.4	14	36.8	38	
Suburban Boston	13	38.2	5	17.9	9	23.7	27	
Massachusetts	10	29.4	10	35.7	13	34.2	33	
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>2</u>	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Boston and Massachusetts represented the areas lived in most frequently with 38 per cent and 33 per cent respectively. Two of the inmates were living out of the state in New York City and Connecticut, respectively, at the time of apprehension. The offense had been committed in Massachusetts, and they were returned here for sentencing.

CHAPTER IV

HISTORY OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

With regard to criminal history, further explanation of data collection procedures is necessary. This topic presented problems in establishing a system of coding which would yield comparable data because of the fact that the methods of recording this information varied for each institution. The Framingham records listed the criminal history in concise fashion within a summary of the social and developmental backgrounds. The Concord records contained "onionskin" carbons of the detailed court record, listing offenses under alphabetical headings (a, b, c, etc.) for each court appearance, together with corresponding dispositions for each offense. These were used in every instance. (The coding of dispositions presented special problems, as will be explained below.) However, in the Norfolk records these carbons of the detailed court record were not always available. In these cases a Thermo-fax copy of the previous court record, as prepared by the Probation Department of the sentencing Superior Court, was used. Comparison showed this frequently to provide a grosser view. Therefore, elaborations were sought and sometimes found within the other historical material in the record, such as parole summaries and parole officer reports, in an attempt to reconcile discrepancies. Thus, the nature of the records and the necessity for interpretation in some areas of criminal history are bound to be reflected

to an unknown (but expectedly minimal) degree for all three institutional groups in this study.

It should be pointed out that only civil offenses appear in this section. The history of military offenses is presented in Chapter IX.

Table 6 indicates the age at the time of the first offense.

TABLE 6
AGE AT TIME OF FIRST OFFENSE

Age	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Under 10	1	2.9	0	0	1	2.6	2	
10 - 14	10	29.4	6	21.4	3	7.9	19	
15 - 19	14	41.2	14	50.0	29	76.3	57	
20 - 24	5	14.7	7	25.0	2	5.3	14	
25 - 29	2	5.9	0	0	1	2.6	3	
30 - 34	1	2.9	1	3.6	2	5.3	4	
Over 34	1	2.9	0	0	0	0	1	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

It can be seen that over half (fifty-seven) of the total number were in the adolescent years, while twenty-one were under age fifteen and twenty-two were over age nineteen. The mean and median ages for the separate institutions are: Norfolk 17.1 and 15.5, respectively; Concord 17.0 and 16.0; and Framingham 17.6 and 17.0. A significant feature here is the fact that twenty-nine of the thirty-eight Framingham inmates committed their first offense in the ages fifteen

through nineteen, accounting for about 75 per cent of the total Framingham group.

Table 7 shows the age at the time of the first commitment to a correctional institution. The same age intervals were used to facilitate comparison with Table 6.

TABLE 7
AGE AT FIRST INSTITUTIONALIZATION

Age	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Under 10	1	2.9	0	0	1	2.6	2	
10 - 14	4	11.7	3	10.7	1	2.6	8	
15 - 19	13	38.2	13	46.4	27	71.1	53	
20 - 24	8	23.5	10	35.7	4	10.5	22	
25 - 29	4	11.7	1	3.6	3	7.9	8	
30 - 34	1	2.9	1	3.6	1	2.6	3	
35 - 39	2	5.9	0	0	1	2.6	3	
Over 39	1	2.9	0	0	0	0	1	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Here again, the fifteen through nineteen age group stands out, with fifty-three of the inmates first committed during this span of years. However, a noticeable difference between this table and Table 6 is that only ten inmates were first institutionalized under the age of fifteen while thirty-seven were over nineteen when similar action was first taken. This indicates that, in many cases, more than one offense was committed before institutionalization was effected.

The mean and median ages, reflect this "postponement" of first institutionalization: Norfolk 20.7 and 18.5, respectively; Concord 18.9 and 18.5; and Framingham 18.6 and 17.0.

The two inmates who committed their first offenses under age ten were also institutionalized during that same period. The records indicated that both were sent to juvenile institutions on "stubborn child" complaints at the age of six because of their failure to adjust in a series of foster homes.

Table 8 presents the number of previous offenses per inmate.

TABLE 8
NUMBER OF PREVIOUS OFFENSES

Number of Offenses	Number of Inmates Committing Offenses							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
None	0	0	1	3.6	4	10.5	5	
1 - 5	12	35.3	7	25.0	22	57.9	41	
6 - 10	8	23.5	6	21.4	9	23.7	23	
11 - 15	3	8.8	12	42.9	2	5.3	17	
16 - 20	9	26.5	2	7.1	1	2.6	12	
21 - 25	1	2.9	0	0	0	0	1	
Over 25	1	2.9	0	0	0	0	1	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Forty-one per cent of the inmates fall within the one through five interval, with Framingham alone contributing over half of this figure. Five per cent committed no previous

offenses, again with the Framingham group outstanding. Fifty-four per cent of the total offended six or more times. The mean and median for each group are, respectively: Norfolk 10.3 and 9.0; Concord 9.2 and 10.5; and Framingham 4.4 and 3.0. One Norfolk inmate's record listed thirty-two offenses.

Table 9 presents the number of offenses committed under the major headings shown. Appendix C provides the complete "break-down" for each of these categories. Because of the close tie between larceny and burglary seen in so many charges of "Breaking, Entering and Larceny," these two classifications were combined for simplicity.

TABLE 9
NATURE OF PREVIOUS OFFENSES

Nature of Offense ^a	Number of Offenses Committed			
	Norfolk	Concord	Framingham	Total
Miscellaneous Minor	155	65	76	296
Larceny and Burglary	116	132	35	283
Robbery	32	28	3	59
Confidence	10	1	2	13
Checks	4	3	18	25
Gambling	0	1	0	1
Sex	14	18	13	45
Narcotics	0	5	8	13
Miscellaneous Major	19	5	14	42
Totals	350	258	169	777

^a The nomenclature used in this table was developed by Robert Roth, Identification Bureau, Massachusetts Department of Public Safety (see Appendix C). The choice of these categories for this study was consistent not only with the Division's Key-sort card system but also with the system employed by one of the Commonwealth's administrative units, the Department of Public Safety.

The number of miscellaneous-minor offenses just exceeds the combined total of the burglaries and larcenies. Under the "Miscellaneous-Minor" heading, it is interesting that this group of previous offenses was the highest for both Norfolk and Framingham. Contributing to this total at Norfolk were seventy-three drunkenness offenses and forty-eight motor vehicle violations, while at Framingham the respective numbers for the same offenses were fifteen and nine. In Framingham each of these figures was exceeded by charges of stubborn child (sixteen) and idle and disorderly (ten), seen relatively infrequently in the male groups. In the Concord group, motor vehicle violations accounted for twenty-one offenses, but drunkenness was seen only seven times, again a factor which may be age-related (see Table 1).

The institutions differed also in the "Larceny and Burglary" offenses. Larceny accounted for the greatest number of offenses in this category for both Norfolk and Framingham, represented forty-five and twenty-four times, respectively. Norfolk's next most frequently seen previous offense was "Breaking, Entering and Larceny," numbering twenty-one. The Concord group, on the other hand, was represented by fifty-three "Breaking, Entering and Larceny" offenses and thirty-one cases of larceny.

Also of interest in this table are the low incidence of robbery and the relatively high incidence of check offenses in the Framingham population.

The nature of sex offenses for men and women varied, as might be expected. The males committed more offenses involving indecent assault, indecent exposure, and open and gross lewdness, while the female group evidenced charges of fornication and lewd and lascivious cohabitation.

The Framingham group had more narcotics convictions and were second in miscellaneous-major offenses. However, the latter number can be partially explained on the basis of the "open-type" institution, for eight of the fourteen offenses were for escape. On the other hand, eight of the nineteen miscellaneous-major offenses of the Norfolk population were for non-support.

Table 10 complements Table 9 and presents the number of inmates who offended at least once under the major headings indicated. For example, twenty-eight Norfolk inmates committed one hundred and fifty-five offenses (from Table 9) of a miscellaneous-minor nature while twenty-two Concord inmates (six less than Norfolk) committed only sixty-five similar offenses, ninety less than the Norfolk group. Also, from Table 10, it is plain that eighty-one of the one hundred inmates in this study had at least one conviction for a miscellaneous-minor offense.

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF INMATES COMMITTING EACH TYPE OF PREVIOUS OFFENSE

Nature of Offense *	Number of Inmates Committing Offense			
	Newfolk	Concord	Framingham	Total
Miscellaneous Minor	28	22	31	81
Larceny and Burglary	25	22	17	64
Robbery	16	11	2	29
Confidence	4	1	1	6
Checks	2	1	3	6
Gambling	0	1	0	1
Sex	9	9	6	24
Narcotics	0	1	3	4
Miscellaneous Major	12	5	9	26

* For the source of this nomenclature, see Table 9.

Tables 11 through 13 show the three major types of dispositions of previous offenses used in this study: institutionalization, probation, and "other," referring to those of a minor nature. As noted at the outset of this chapter, this was one of the topics that presented difficulties in reliability of coding. Each detailed offense carried a disposition. Many times the dispositions overlapped, as in the case of concurrent sentences to an institution, and in many cases an incarceration was carried out under the probationary conditions attached to an earlier offense. Obviously, the most useful information here was the number of times the person was institutionalized, placed on probation, or subjected to a lesser disposition; that is, the number of times the actual experience was encountered was the important factor. Therefore, this became the criterion upon which the numbers in the following three tables are based.

Table 11 shows the number of institutionalizations.

Although almost one-half (forty-nine) of the inmates had had one to three incarcerations, under sentence, in jails, workhouses, houses of correction, and prisons, twenty-seven of the total group were undergoing their first experience. The remaining twenty-five inmates had been confined four or more times previously. One inmate from Norfolk, an older man with a long criminal history, was committed nineteen times prior to the present sentence.

The Norfolk group had the largest number of previous institutionalizations, reflecting the same trends that appear in age range, age at first offense, age at first institutionalization, etc.

TABLE 11

DISPOSITION OF PREVIOUS OFFENSES: INSTITUTIONALIZATION

Number of Institutionalizations	Number of Inmates						
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n %
No previous offense	0	0.0	1	3.6	4	10.5	5
None	8	23.5	3	10.7	11	28.9	22
1 - 3	11	32.4	18	64.3	20	52.6	49
4 - 6	8	23.5	4	14.3	2	5.3	14
7 - 9	5	14.7	1	3.6	1	2.6	7
10 - 12	1	2.9	1	3.6	0	0.0	2
Over 12	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100

Table 12 shows the number of probationary periods experienced by these groups.

TABLE 12

DISPOSITION OF PREVIOUS OFFENSES: PROBATION

Number of Probations	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No previous offense	0	0.0	1	3.6	4	10.5	5	
None	11	32.4	8	28.6	12	31.6	31	
1 - 3	17	50.0	17	60.7	20	52.6	54	
4 - 6	4	11.7	2	7.1	2	5.3	8	
7 - 9	2	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Over half, or 54 per cent, had been on probation at least once and not more than three times, with this interval being the most frequently represented for each institutional group. Thirty-six per cent had never been given a probationary sentence, and only 10 per cent had experienced four or more such dispositions. Once again the Norfolk group, with its greater range in age and number of offenses, continues this trend in number of probations.

Table 13 shows the "other" dispositions of a less serious nature which were meted out for various offenses. These include such dispositions as filed or no action; fined, dismissed, released, nol-prossed, and acquitted.

TABLE 13
DISPOSITION OF PREVIOUS OFFENSES: OTHER DISPOSITION

Number of Other Dispositions	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No previous off.	0	0.0	1	3.6	4	10.5	5	
None	7	20.6	1	3.6	14	36.8	22	
1 - 3	13	38.2	14	50.0	14	36.8	41	
4 - 6	6	17.6	6	21.4	3	7.9	15	
7 - 9	4	11.7	5	17.9	1	2.6	10	
10 - 12	4	11.7	1	3.6	2	5.3	7	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Twenty-seven per cent of the total group never experienced such dispositions. The largest percentage (41) had at least one and not more than three of their offenses handled in this fashion. The remaining 32 per cent experienced four or more "other" dispositions.

The following three tables are concerned with the results of institutionalization and probation. Table 14 indicates the number of times the inmates were released on parole.

TABLE 14
NUMBER OF TIMES ON PAROLE

Number of Times	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No previous institutional.	8	23.5	4	14.3	15	39.5	27	
None	7	20.6	5	17.9	3	7.9	15	
1	9	26.5	13	46.4	15	39.5	37	
2	2	5.9	3	10.7	5	13.2	10	
3	2	5.9	1	3.6	0	0.0	3	
4	3	8.8	1	3.6	0	0.0	4	
5	3	8.8	1	3.6	0	0.0	4	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Forty-two per cent of the total group had never been on parole, but 27 per cent had never been previously incarcerated. Therefore, an additional 15 per cent of those institutionalized were not extended the privilege of parole.

Although the number of incarcerations ranged as high as the exceptional case of nineteen (see Table 11), the number of times on parole did not exceed five. This is a reflection of at least two factors: (1) some inmates were denied parole one or more times and served maximum sentences, and (2) in other cases the incarcerations were for shorter periods of time in local and county jails and the sentences were served in entirety.

Table 15 shows the number of times parole was broken.

TABLE 15
NUMBER OF TIMES PAROLE BROKEN

Number of Times Broken	Number of Inmates							
	Hartford		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No previous parole	13	44.1	9	32.1	18	47.4	42	
None	14	11.7	3	10.7	2	5.3	9	
1	9	26.5	12	42.9	16	42.1	37	
2	3	14.7	2	7.1	2	5.3	9	
3	1	2.9	1	3.6	0	0.0	2	
4	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Fifty-one per cent of the total group had never broken parole. However, 42 per cent had never been on parole, this leaving 9 per cent who successfully handled the privilege of parole as many times as granted. On the other hand almost half of the inmates, 49 per cent, had broken parole one or more times.

The number of times probation was broken appears in Table 16.

TABLE 16
NUMBER OF TIMES PROBATION BROKEN

Number of Times Broken	Number of inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No previous probation	11	32.4	9	32.1	16	42.1	36	
None	13	35.2	6	21.4	8	21.1	27	
1	4	11.7	7	25.0	13	34.2	24	
2	5	14.7	2	7.1	1	2.6	8	
3	1	2.9	2	7.1	0	0.0	3	
4	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Thirty-six of the total group had never been on probation. Of the sixty-four inmates who experienced a probationary sentence, twenty-seven had no violations; while thirty-seven had broken probation one or more times. Although ten inmates in the total group were on probation more than three times, only two (from Concord) broke probation as many as four times. Of the fifty-four inmates who were on probation from one through three times (see Table 12), thirty-five violated, leaving nineteen within this class who successfully met the conditions of this sentence.

The remainder of this chapter on criminal history is devoted to the characteristics of the offense which resulted in the most recent institutionalization. Table 17 shows the nature of this offense.

TABLE 17
NATURE OF PRESENT OFFENSE

Nature of Offense ^a	Number of Inmates Committed on Offense							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Misc. Minor	0	0.0	1	3.6	12	31.6	13	
Larc. & Burg.	5	14.7	11	39.3	6	15.8	22	
Robbery	18	52.9	6	21.4	7	18.4	31	
Confidence	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	
Cheeks	2	5.9	1	3.6	2	5.3	5	
Gambling	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	
Sex	9	26.5	9	32.1	8	21.1	26	
Narcotics	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.6	1	
Misc. Major	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.3	2	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.00	38	100.0	100	

^a For the source of this nomenclature, see Table 9.

A striking feature of this table is the fact that robbery is the leading offense, resulting in the incarceration of thirty-one of the total group. This is in contrast to its frequency among the previous offenses (Table 9), where this classification ran a poor third. This can be explained at least partially on the basis that under this major heading are classified some of the most serious offenses, including murder (see Appendix C), which tend to call for a major disposition. For example, four of the inmates in treatment at Norfolk committed murder and two were sentenced for manslaughter.

Sex offenses constitute the second most common cause of present institutional commitment.

Twelve of the thirteen inmates committed on miscellaneous-minor crimes were at Framingham. However, seven of these were adolescents on "stubborn child" charges, a juvenile offense which was arbitrarily placed under this major heading by the writers (Appendix C covers only adult offenses).

Table 18 shows the time of day the present offense was committed. Fifty-eight per cent of the inmates whose offenses could be pinpointed at a definite time used the cover of darkness. Twenty-nine per cent of the group offended during daylight, and thirteen per cent were institutionalized on charges which were either unknown or could not be categorized; i.e., seven "stubborn child" commitments at Framingham.

TABLE 18
TIME OF DAY PRESENT OFFENSE COMMITTED

Time of Day	Number of Inmates						
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n %
Daytime	10	29.4	13	46.4	6	15.8	29
Nighttime	22	64.7	15	53.6	21	55.3	58
Not Applicable	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	15.8	6
Unknown	2	5.9	0	0.0	5	13.2	7
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100

Table 19 indicates whether or not a partner or partners were involved in the present offense. There is a difference in only two between the "yes" and the "no" classifications, with

forty-nine inmates having offended in partnership and fifty-one of the total having offended alone.

TABLE 19

INVOLVEMENT OF PARTNER(S) IN PRESENT OFFENSE

Partner(s) Involved	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	15	44.1	11	39.3	23	60.5	49	
No	19	55.9	17	60.7	15	39.5	51	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

The female group from Framingham was the only one in which the incidence of the involvement of partners was greater than that of offending alone, with twenty-three of these inmates having "partners."

Table 20 complements Table 19 by presenting data relative to the sex of the partner or partners involved.

TABLE 20

INVOLVEMENT OF OPPOSITE-SEX PARTNER(S) IN PRESENT OFFENSE

Sex of Partners	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No partners	19	55.9	11	39.3	15	39.5	45	
Opposite-sex partners	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	26.3	10	
Same-sex part.	14	41.2	17	60.7	12	31.6	43	
Unknown	1	2.9	0	0.0	2	2.6	2	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Of the fifty-three offenses known to involve partners, in only ten cases were these opposit-sex partners, and all ten offenders were women.

Table 21 indicates the inmate's parole status at the time of the present offense.

TABLE 21
PAROLE SITUATION AT TIME OF PRESENT OFFENSE

Parole Situation	Number of Inmates						
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n %
On Parole	21	61.7	9	32.1	6	15.8	36
Not on Parole	13	38.2	19	67.9	32	84.2	64
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100

Fewer inmates were on parole (thirty-six) than not (sixty-four) at the time of the present offense. Norfolk is the only institutional group in which more inmates were parolees. This fact may be attributable to the greater number of offenses (see Tables 8 and 9) and also to the greater number of potential opportunities for parole through more institutionalizations, as seen in Table 11.

Table 22 indicates whether or not the person was on probation at the time of the present offense. Obviously, those on parole as shown in Table 21 would not also be on probation, and this table would be expected to reflect this fact, as it does.

TABLE 22

PROBATION SITUATION AT TIME OF PRESENT OFFENSE

Probation Situation	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
On Probation	3	8.8	4	14.3	13	34.2	20	
Not on Probation	31	91.2	24	85.7	25	65.8	80	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Only twenty of the inmates were on probation. The greatest number of those on probation were in the Framingham group (thirteen), almost twice as many as in the male groups combined. This is in contrast to the parole situation seen in Table 21. That more women were on probation when the present crime was committed may be due to several factors: that more men were on parole and thus were eliminated from a probationary situation; that fewer institutionalizations had been experienced by the Framingham group (see Table 11); that the offenses themselves were fewer in number and less serious in nature, allowing for the less severe dispositions (see Tables 8 and 9); and that the age level of the Framingham group was younger (Table 1).

Table 23 combines information from Tables 21 and 22 to show the number of inmates who were under supervision, either probation or parole, at the time the present offense was committed.

TABLE 23

NUMBER OF INMATES UNDER SUPERVISION AT TIME OF PRESENT OFFENSE

Supervision Situation	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Supervised (on parole or probation)	24	70.6	13	46.4	19	50.0	56	
Unsupervised (not on parole or probation)	10	29.4	15	53.6	19	50.0	44	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Over half (fifty-six) of the total group were supervised.

Although the Framingham group was evenly split, less than half (thirteen of twenty-eight) of the Concord inmates were under supervision, while over three-fourths (twenty-four of thirty-four) of the Norfolk men were free on similar conditions. Data on the men's institution's appear to reflect the comparative ages and the criminal history previously seen.

Table 24 shows the time elapsing between the exposure to the opportunity for treatment and the date of application for DLM's services.

TABLE 24

MONTHS BETWEEN DATE OF INCARCERATION AND DATE OF INTAKE

Months	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1 - 6	4	11.7	9	32.1	20	52.6	33	
7 - 12	12	35.3	6	21.4	10	26.3	28	
13 - 18	3	8.8	4	14.3	6	15.8	13	
19 - 24	1	2.9	2	7.1	1	2.6	4	
25 - 30	4	11.7	0	0.0	1	2.6	5	
Over 30	7	20.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	
Unknown	3	8.8	7	25.0	0	0.0	10	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Thirty-three per cent applied within six months and 58 per cent within the first year. Following this period of time there is a tapering off of applications. In the "over 30" category almost eighteen years elapsed before application of one Norfolk inmate. The fact that twenty inmates from Framingham came into treatment within their first six months of institutionalization mirrors the difference in referral procedures noted in Chapter II above. The "Unknown" classification was necessitated by the fact that exact dates of intake for these cases could not be established because of the inadequacy of records in the early stages of programming and some turnover in the Division's staff.

CHAPTER V

FAMILY HISTORY

The family history of the total group is presented in the following section. The areas included are: broken home; age at time of broken home; cause of broken home; court records of father, mother, and siblings; birth order of inmate; and total number of siblings, full and half.

Table 25 presents the number of inmates whose parental home was broken at any time prior to adulthood.

TABLE 25
NUMBER OF BROKEN HOMES

Broken Home	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	26	76.5	21	75.0	29	76.3	76	
No	8	23.5	7	25.0	9	23.7	24	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Over three-fourths, of the total group had experienced some type of broken home, and this same proportion occurred in each of the groups from the three institutions.

The age of the inmate at the time of broken home is presented in Table 26.

TABLE 26

AGE AT TIME OF BROKEN HOME

Age	Number of Inmates						
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n %
No broken home	8	23.5	7	25.0	9	23.7	24
0 - 4	8	23.5	7	25.0	17	44.7	32
5 - 6	4	11.7	6	21.4	0	0	10
7 - 12	6	17.6	5	17.9	10	26.3	21
13 - 18	8	23.5	1	3.5	2	5.3	11
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100

The largest proportion, 42 per cent, of the seventy-six inmates who had come from broken homes were "0-4" years old when the home was broken. Of these, 53 per cent were from MOI-Framingham. Twenty-one inmates, or 27 per cent, were between the ages of "7-12." The "5-6" and "13-18" categories represented 13 per cent and 14 per cent respectively. Only two inmates experienced broken homes at age "19-21."

The cause of the broken home of the inmate is given in Table 27.

TABLE 27
CAUSE OF BROKEN HOME

Cause	Number of inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No broken home	8	23.5	7	25.0	9	23.7	24	
Separation of Parents	9	27.3	4	14.3	10	26.3	22	
Divorce	3	9.4	9	32.1	9	23.7	21	
Death of mother	2	6.1	3	10.7	2	5.3	7	
Death of father	4	11.8	4	14.3	4	10.5	12	
Institutionaliza- tion of mother	1	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	
Institutionaliza- tion of father	2	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	
Other	4	11.8	0	0.0	4	10.5	8	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

The largest proportion, 57 per cent, of these seventy-six inmates' broken homes were caused by divorce and separation of parents. Death of father represented 15 per cent, and "other" was 11 per cent of the group. For the four inmates from Norfolk classified as "other" the reasons for the broken home were unknown; in three cases from Framingham the parents never married, and in one the parents moved North leaving the children behind.

Table 28 presents the outcome for the inmate after the home was broken.

TABLE 28
OUTCOME AFTER INITIAL CRISIS

Outcome	Number of inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Home not broken	8	23.5	7	25.0	9	23.7	24	
Lived with mother	10	29.4	11	39.3	11	28.9	32	
Lived with father	3	8.8	0	0.0	5	13.2	8	
Lived with gr- mother	1	2.9	3	10.7	3	7.9	7	
Lived with gr- parents	0	0.0	1	3.6	2	5.3	3	
Lived with aunt and uncle	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	2.6	2	
Foster homes	3	8.8	2	7.1	2	5.3	7	
Children's home and orphanage	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	10.5	4	
Sent away to school	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.6	1	
Training School	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	
Adoption	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	
Service	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	
Patient on own	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	
Unknown	5	14.7	3	10.7	0	0.0	8	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Over two-fifths, or 42 per cent, of the total group who had experienced broken homes continued to live with the mother; 16 per cent were taken care of by relatives; only eight inmates, 11 per cent, remained with the father. Twenty per cent were taken away from the home and put in various placements. It was impossible to obtain this information for eight inmates because of the inadequacy of the records for these families who exhibited a history of extreme disorganization.

Table 29 shows the number of crises in the home including that of the broken home. A crisis was considered to be any other physical and/or emotional disruption of the family which may have occurred in addition to the initial one of the broken home shown in Table 28.

TABLE 29

CRISES IN THE HOME

Crisis	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
None	4	11.7	3	8.8	2	5.3	9	
1 - 3	16	47.1	11	32.4	22	57.9	49	
4 - 6	2	5.9	14	41.2	13	34.2	29	
7 & over	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.6	1	
Unknown	12	35.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Almost half, 49 per cent, of the total group had a history one to three crises in the home; 30 per cent had four or more such crises; and nine inmates' families never experienced any. In twelve cases from Norfolk the history of crises was unobtainable because the records on these families were inadequate—mainly, giving no dates or not being specific about the crisis. In general, these families were very disorganized and had neglected the children to the point where the state had taken over their custody, so that the number of crises in these cases could be considered high.

The residential history of the families is shown in the following table. Table 30 gives the number of moves for the inmate and his family from the time of birth. These figures are not exact because it was impossible to get from the records a complete chronological listing for the institutions of Concord and Norfolk. Those given in the records were limited to what the inmate could remember, and some records had no listing at all. However, the records for Framingham contained a more complete listing of residential moves.

TABLE 30

FAMILY RESIDENTIAL MOVES

Moves	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
None	2	5.9	3	10.7	0	0.0	5	
1 - 4	14	41.2	7	23.0	10	26.3	31	
5 - 8	3	8.8	3	10.7	14	36.8	20	
9 - 12	4	11.7	1	3.6	8	21.1	13	
13 & over	3	8.8	0	0.0	6	15.8	9	
Unknown	8	23.5	14	50.0	0	0.0	22	
Total	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

One-half, or 51 per cent, of the total group showed from one to eight different moves; 22 per cent experienced nine or more moves; only five inmates never moved. In the Framingham group, where the information was most complete, the number of moves was highest. In twenty-two cases from Norfolk and Concord this information was unknown because of the inadequacy

of the records. In many cases, the men were on the "move" continually and could not remember themselves how often they had moved.

The following three tables present the court records of the father, mother, and siblings.

TABLE 31

COURT RECORD OF FATHER

Court Record	Number of Fathers						
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n %
Yes	14	41.2	15	53.6	11	28.9	40
No	20	58.8	12	42.9	24	63.2	56
Unknown	0	0.0	1	3.6	3	7.9	4
Total	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100

TABLE 32

COURT RECORD OF MOTHER

Court Record	Number of Mothers						
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n %
Yes	7	20.6	8	28.6	6	15.8	21
No	26	76.5	19	67.9	31	81.6	76
Unknown	1	2.9	1	3.6	1	2.6	3
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100

TABLE 33
COURT RECORD OF SIBLINGS

Court Record	Number of Siblings							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Not Applicable (only child)	6	17.6	4	14.3	5	13.1	15	
Yes	12	35.3	14	50.0	8	21.1	34	
No	14	41.2	8	28.6	24	63.2	46	
Unknown	2	5.9	2	7.1	1	2.6	5	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

In the foregoing tables there is a high proportion of court records in the family. It is evident that the fathers had the greatest number of previous court records; 40 per cent of the fathers had been previously apprehended. Only one-fifth of the mothers had court records, while in one-third of the cases siblings had such records. Also, each table indicates a lesser proportion of family court records in Framingham than in the other institutions.

Table 34 presents the birth order of the inmates. All except the youngest and the oldest were rated as "middle-child" regardless of the size of the family.

TABLE 34
BIRTH ORDER OF INMATE

Birth Order	Number of Inmates						Total	
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		n	%
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Only Child	6	17.6	4	14.3	5	13.2	15	
Youngest	9	25.5	6	21.4	11	28.9	26	
Middle Child	11	32.4	8	28.6	14	36.8	33	
Oldest	7	20.6	10	35.7	8	21.1	25	
Unknown	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

The largest proportion of inmates, 33 per cent, were "middle children." The "youngest" and the "oldest" were about equal, each with about one quarter of the group, while only fifteen inmates were "only children" in the family.

Table 35 shows the number of full siblings of the inmates.

TABLE 35
FULL SIBLINGS OF INMATE

Full Siblings	Number of Inmates						Total	
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		n	%
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
0 - 2	10	29.4	17	60.7	16	42.1	43	
3 - 5	16	47.1	7	25.0	14	36.8	37	
6 - 8	4	11.7	3	10.7	6	15.8	13	
Over 8	4	11.7	1	3.6	2	5.3	7	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Nearly one-half, or 43 per cent, of the total group had no more than two siblings; over one-third had three to five siblings; only 20 per cent had six or over.

Table 36 shows the number of half siblings of the inmates.

TABLE 36
HALF SIBLINGS OF INMATE

Half Siblings	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
None	30	88.2	18	64.3	32	84.2	80	
1 - 3	3	8.8	8	28.6	6	15.8	17	
4 - 6	1	2.9	2	7.1	0	0.0	3	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

The majority of the inmates did not have half siblings. Of these eighty inmates, fifteen were listed as "only child" in Table 34. Therefore, 76 per cent of those who did have other children in their families did not have any half siblings, while 24 per cent of this group did.

CHAPTER VI

MARITAL HISTORY

The items on marital history were not on the keyport card but were added to the schedule in order to have a more comprehensive view of the life experiences of the group. The items used give only an outline of the marital experience. They include: age at marriage; number of children; number of illegitimate children; outcome of the marriages; and residential history.

As shown in Table 4 there were thirty-two inmates, or approximately one-third of the group, who had some marital experience; fifteen in the Norfolk group, eight in the Concord group, and nine in the Framingham group. There were seven inmates in the total group who had more than one marriage. Five were in the Norfolk group and two in the Framingham group. The two in the Framingham group and three in the Norfolk group had been married twice. The ages for the second marriage ranged from twenty-two to thirty-seven. In the Norfolk group one inmate had three marriages and one had four marriages. Both of these men remarried women they had previously divorced. Of the seven in the total group who had more than one marriage four were married, two were separated, and one was a widower.

Table 37 shows the age at first marriage of these inmates.

TABLE 37

AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE OF INMATES

Age	Number of Inmates			
	Norfolk	Concord	Framingham	Total
17 or under	0	0	4	4
18	1	1	2	4
19	2	1	1	4
20	3	1	1	5
21	2	4	0	6
22	2	1	0	3
23 or over	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Totals	15	8	9	32

The youngest age at which marriage occurred was fifteen in the Framingham group. The oldest age was twenty-six and was represented in both the Norfolk and Framingham groups. The mean age of marriage for the total group was 20.5 years. The majority of inmates, or 89 per cent, in the Framingham group married below this mean age, while the majority in the Norfolk group, or 60 per cent, married above the mean age.

Table 38 shows the number of children in the total number of marriages.

TABLE 38

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN TOTAL NUMBER OF MARRIAGES OF INMATES

Children	Number of Inmates			
	Norfolk	Concord	Framingham	Total
0	4	3	1	8
1	5	2	2	9
2	1	1	3	5
3	2	2	1	5
4	0	0	1	1
5 and over	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Totals	15	8	9	32

Over half of the married inmates had either only one child or no children at all. The largest number of children represented in the Norfolk group was six and in the Framingham group was eight. It should be noted that for the total group of 150, including single and married inmates, only twenty-four had legitimate children.

Table 39 shows the number of illegitimate children of the group.

TABLE 39

NUMBER OF ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN OF INMATES

Children	Number of Inmates			
	Norfolk	Concord	Framingham	Total
1	1	2	8	11
2	0	1	4	5
3	0	2	0	2
4	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	1	5	13	19

Nineteen of the total group of 100 inmates were known to have illegitimate children.¹ Over half of these had only one illegitimate child. The one Norfolk inmate and one of the Framingham inmates were married. The other seventeen inmates in this group were single.

TABLE 40

RESIDENTIAL MOVES OF INMATES AFTER MARRIAGE

MOVES	Number of Inmates			
	Norfolk	Concord	Framingham	Total
0 - 2	2	5	5	12
3 - 5	3	2	1	6
6 - 8	2	0	2	4
9 - 11	1	0	1	2
UNKNOWN	1	1	0	2
Totals	15	8	9	32

Twelve, or over one-third, of the married inmates had made two or less moves during their marriages. However, the writers do not think that this table presents a true picture of residential moves. Only a minority of records included a chronological listing of moves. The majority of records gave a partial listing and then indicated that the family had made innumerable moves which could not be determined.

¹ It is speculated that the Norfolk and Concord groups had more illegitimate children than was reflected in the records. This is an item that is generally not considered in the male inmate records.

CHAPTER VII

CONTACTS WITH HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES

The history of contacts with health and welfare services for the total group is presented in the following tables. These data were difficult to obtain because the information was not complete in the records. The first three tables include: the inmate's hospitalization as a child, any prior psychiatric treatment, and physical treatment received while under therapy for such emotional disturbance. The inmates' contacts with social service agencies were divided into: 1) types of agencies for the parental family; 2) types of agencies for the patient and for his marital family.

Table 41 shows the number of inmates who were hospitalized as children. This refers to any hospitalization for a length of time exceeding five days which the inmate may have experienced prior to the age of ten.

TABLE 41
INMATES HOSPITALIZED AS CHILDREN

Hospitalized	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	5	14.7	13	46.4	5	13.2	23	
No	25	73.5	15	53.6	33	86.8	73	
Unknown	4	11.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Almost three-fourths, or 73 per cent, of the total group had not experienced any type of hospitalization as children. Approximately one-fourth, or 23 per cent, were known to have had such an experience.

Table 42 presents the number of inmates who had been previously exposed to some kind of therapy for emotional disturbances. It does not include diagnostic evaluations without treatment.

TABLE 42

INMATES WHO RECEIVED PRIOR PSYCHIATRIC TREATMENT

Prior Psychiatric Treatment	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Oscord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	8	23.5	10	35.7	10	26.3	28	
No	26	76.5	18	64.3	28	73.7	72	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Nearly three-fourths of the inmates of the total group, 72 per cent, had not received any prior psychiatric treatment, while 28 per cent of the group were found to have had such treatment.

Table 43 shows the number of inmates who received physical treatment; such as, shock, lobotomy, etc., while under psychiatric treatment. Physical treatment information was primarily taken from the keysort coding card. In most cases there was no indication in the records of the inmate experiencing such

treatment. The validity of these data depends on the information received from the inmate by the worker who recorded it on the keysort card.

TABLE 43

INMATES WHO RECEIVED PHYSICAL TREATMENT FOR PSYCHIATRIC CONDITIONS

Physical Treatment	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	8	23.5	5	17.9	2	5.3	15	
No	26	76.5	23	82.1	36	94.7	85	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Eighty-five per cent of the inmates had not received physical treatment. The remaining 15 per cent, who had received such treatment, represented over one-half of the twenty-eight inmates shown in Table 42 who had experienced prior psychiatric treatment.

Table 44 shows the number of inmates who had had previous contacts with social agencies.

TABLE 44

PREVIOUS CONTACTS WITH SOCIAL AGENCIES

Contacts	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	28	82.4	24	85.7	22	57.9	74	
No	6	17.6	4	14.3	16	42.1	26	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Almost three-fourths, or 74 per cent, of the total group had had contacts with social agencies. Of the 26 per cent remaining who were not known to such agencies, the largest proportion was represented in the group from Framingham; 42 per cent of this group did not have record of previous contacts with social agencies.

Tables 45 and 46 show the number of contacts with social agencies for the parental family and for the patient's marital family. These were divided into three types: 1) psychiatric; 2) medical; 3) welfare. The latter category included any placements in foster homes or orphanages. The data were collected from the Social Service Index found in the records at the respective institutions for the Norfolk and Concord groups, and in the verbatim records for the Framingham group. However, this information was limited because many of the indices were several years old and had not been brought up to date, and because not all social agencies subscribe to the Social Service Index.

TABLE 45

PARENTAL FAMILY CONTACTS WITH SOCIAL AGENCIES

Agency	Number of Contacts							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Psychiatric	15	13.6	12	7.4	7	13.7	34	9.7
Medical	10	8.8	34	18.1	0	0.0	44	12.5
Welfare	88	77.8	142	75.5	44	86.2	274	72.8
Totals	113	100.0	188	100.0	51	100.0	352	100.0

Seventy-eight per cent of the total contacts were with welfare agencies, while the medical and psychiatric agencies were represented by 12 per cent and 10 per cent respectively. The group from Concord had the largest proportion, 53 per cent, of the total contacts; Norfolk was represented by 32 per cent; Framingham had 14 per cent.

Table 46 shows the number of contacts with social agencies experienced by the inmate himself or his marital family.

TABLE 46

PATIENT AND MARITAL FAMILY CONTACTS WITH SOCIAL AGENCIES

Agency	Number of Contacts							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Psychiatric	21	38.2	12	48.0	28	47.5	61	43.9
Medical	1	1.8	1	4.0	6	10.2	8	5.8
Welfare	<u>33</u>	<u>60.0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>48.0</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>41.4</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>50.3</u>
Totals	55	100.0	25	100.0	59	100.0	139	100.0

Welfare agencies again represented the largest proportion, 50 per cent, of the total number of contacts. However, 44 per cent were with psychiatric agencies and only 6 per cent with medical agencies.

In comparing Tables 45 and 46 it can be seen that the total number of contacts with social agencies for the patient and/or his marital family was considerably less than those for the parental family. The group from Concord, which had the largest proportion of contacts for the parental family, 53 per cent,

had the lowest proportion, 18 per cent, for the patient and/or his marital family. Also, the group from Framingham had the largest proportion of contacts, 42 per cent, for the patient and/or marital family; yet, it had the lowest proportion of contacts for the parental family, 14 per cent.

CHAPTER VIII

EDUCATION AND OCCUPATION

Education

The educational history of the inmates presented in the following tables includes age at termination of formal education, grades completed, and nature of additional education, as well as grades repeated, discipline problems, reading problems and I.Q.

Table 47 shows the age at which the inmates terminated their formal education.

TABLE 47

AGE OF INMATES AT TERMINATION OF EDUCATION

Age	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
13	1	2.9	2	7.1	0	0.0	3	
14	1	2.9	0	0.0	4	10.5	5	
15	9	26.5	4	14.3	4	10.5	17	
16	16	47.1	14	50.0	18	47.4	48	
17	4	11.7	5	17.9	6	15.8	15	
18	0	0.0	2	7.1	3	7.9	5	
19 and over	0	0.0	1	3.6	3	7.9	4	
Unknown	3	8.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

The greatest proportion in each group terminated at age sixteen, which is the legal age for termination. Almost one-half, or 48 per cent, of the total group terminated at sixteen; and 27 per cent at an age over sixteen. Framingham had

the largest percentage, 32 per cent, who terminated their education after sixteen. The oldest age at termination was twenty-one which occurred in the Framingham group.

Table 48 presents the number of grades completed by the inmates. Four grade categories were used corresponding to: grade school (1-6), junior high (7-9), high school (10-12), and college (13 and over). Those inmates who were in special classes are shown in the category corresponding to the last grade they completed.

TABLE 48
NUMBER OF GRADES COMPLETED BY THE INMATES

Grades	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1 - 6	4	11.7	8	28.6	1	2.6	13	
7 - 9	19	55.9	15	53.6	20	52.6	54	
10 - 12	11	32.4	5	17.9	14	36.8	30	
13 and over	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	7.9	3	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Over half, or 54 per cent, of the total group were classified in the "7-9" category; only 13 per cent were in the "0-6" category; and one-third, or 33 per cent, completed ten or more grades. Framingham had the largest percentage, 44 per cent, who completed ten or more grades and was the only group represented in the "13 and over" category. Of the eight inmates who had gone to special classes six were represented in

the "0-6" category and two in the "7-9" category. A large proportion of the group did not meet the educational requirements of the community. An individual is expected to have completed grade eleven by age sixteen. Two-thirds of the total group completed nine or less grades and also as seen in Table 47 terminated school at age sixteen or under.

Only fifteen of the total group had any additional education. For five inmates from Norfolk this education included training in voice, a beautician's school and a technical school; two of the inmates at Norfolk completed their high school education after terminating their public school education, one in the service and the other at the Prison Colony. For five inmates from Concord this training included: barber school, electrical school, Civil Service school, an extension course at Concord, and a rehabilitation center for the handicapped. At Framingham two inmates had gone to junior college, one for a year and one for four months; one had attended clerical school; and one had studied drama and modeling for two years. Also, in the Framingham group one inmate had 13 or more years of education but the nature of this was not known.

Table 49 shows the number of inmates that repeated one or more grades during their educational history.

TABLE 49
NUMBER OF INMATES WHO REPEATED GRADES

Repeated	Number of Inmates						
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n %
Yes	17	50.0	19	67.9	21	55.3	57
No	14	41.2	9	32.1	17	44.7	40
Unknown	3	8.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100

Over half, or 57 per cent, of the total group had a history of grade repeats, and 40 per cent had no repeats. Three Norfolk cases were unknown as school records were not available. This table explains the fact that the majority of inmates had not completed more than nine grades, although they did not leave school until sixteen.

Table 50 presents the number of inmates who had discipline problems during their formal schooling.

TABLE 50
SCHOOL DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS OF INMATES

Discipline Problems	Number of Inmates						
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n %
Yes	23	67.6	16	57.1	23	60.5	62
No	8	23.5	12	42.9	15	39.5	35
Unknown	3	8.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100

Almost two-thirds, or 62 per cent, of the total group had discipline problems; only 35 per cent did not.

Table 51 shows the number of inmates who had reading problems.

TABLE 51
SCHOOL READING PROBLEMS OF INMATES

Reading Problems	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	9	26.5	15	53.6	7	18.4	31	
No	15	44.1	13	46.4	29	76.3	57	
Unknown	10	29.4	0	0.0	2	5.3	12	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Over half, or 57 per cent, of the total group did not have reading problems and 31 per cent did. The Framingham group had the largest proportion, 76 per cent, which did not have reading difficulties.

It had been speculated that the majority of inmates would have had reading problems. There is a correlation between school failure and delinquency, and one of the areas in which school failure is reflected is reading problems. The problem increases as the individual continues in school because reading is basic to all other learning. The reading problem may then become the reason for school failure.¹ However, in the present

¹ Personal communication with Dr. Norman Neiberg, Clinical Research Director, Division of Legal Medicine.

study the data on reading problems were not reliable nor complete enough to be meaningful.

Table 52 presents the I.Q.'s of the inmates. Since it was not indicated in the records which intelligence tests were used a scale of twenty point units was used for coding rather than an established classification.

TABLE 52
I.Q. OF INMATES

I.Q.	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
130 and over	1	2.9	0	0.0	1	2.6	2	
110 - 129	4	11.7	4	14.3	6	15.8	14	
90 - 109	8	23.5	10	35.7	23	60.5	41	
70 - 89	6	17.6	8	28.6	8	21.1	22	
69 and under	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	
Unknown	15	44.1	5	17.9	0	0.0	20	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

The greatest proportion of the inmates in each group and in the total group, 41 per cent, were classified in the "average" category. Twenty-three per cent were classified in categories below the average and 16 per cent above. The highest I.Q. represented was 135 in the Norfolk group and the lowest was 63 in the Concord group. The latter record points out that the I.Q. of 63 was not considered valid as this inmate was able to function at a higher level than a "mental defective." Proportionately, the Framingham group had the highest level of

I.Q.'s with 76 per cent testing "average" or above.

Occupation

The following tables will present the occupational history of the group, including: occupation at the time of crime; job stability at the time of crime; and number of employments.

Table 53 shows the occupation at the time of the present offense.

TABLE 53
OCCUPATION AT THE TIME OF CRIME

Occupation	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Unemployed	14	41.2	11	39.3	28	73.7	53	
Unskilled	11	32.4	13	46.4	0	0.0	24	
Skilled	5	14.7	0	0.0	6	15.8	11	
Clerical	1	2.9	2	7.1	4	10.5	7	
Managerial-Prop.	2	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	
Sales	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	2	
Farm	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Over half, or 53 per cent, of the inmates were unemployed at the time of their offense. Of those employed one-half, or 24 per cent of the total, were engaged in unskilled labor. The Framingham group had the highest proportion of unemployed.

Table 54 shows the length of time, in months, spent in the last employment prior to incarceration.

TABLE 54

JOB STABILITY AT THE TIME OF CRIME

Months	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0 - 3	16	47.1	21	75.0	28	73.7	65	
4 - 18	14	41.2	6	21.4	9	23.7	29	
19 and over	3	8.8	1	3.6	1	2.6	5	
Unknown	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Nearly two-thirds, or 65 per cent, had been employed three months or less. Only 5 per cent were employed at one job for 19 or more months. The Norfolk group shows the greatest occupational stability with half of the inmates employed for four months or longer on their last job.

Due to the limits of the data the history of job stability of the group can not be shown. However, it is the opinion of the writers that Table 55 is a general reflection of the previous job stability of the inmates. The exception to this would be a minority of inmates who may have had stable employment records, but who had broken this continuity just prior to the offense.

Table 55 shows the number of jobs held prior to incarceration insofar as this could be determined from the records.

It is the opinion of the writers that the records did not give a valid picture of the employment history. The employment section of the record is dependent upon the inmate's memory, and in many cases employment had been so sporadic and short-lived that it did not appear in the record. Therefore, this table reflects only the minimum employment record of the group. However, it should be noted that some records, especially in the Framingham group, did give a comprehensive history of employment.

TABLE 55
NUMBER OF JOBS

Number of Jobs	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0 - 2	2	5.9	3	10.7	7	18.4	12	
3 - 5	11	32.4	10	35.7	17	44.7	38	
6 - 8	8	23.5	6	21.4	11	28.9	25	
9 - 11	2	5.9	3	10.7	2	5.3	7	
12 - 14	5	14.7	0	0.0	1	2.6	6	
15 - 17	5	14.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	
Unknown	1	2.9	6	21.4	0	0.0	7	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Exactly half of the group had records of five or less jobs, and almost half had records of six to seventeen jobs. Both Concord and Framingham had one inmate each who, because of age when institutionalized, had never been employed, and, in general, this picture of job changes should be viewed in the light of the relative youth of the inmates as a group.

CHAPTER IX
MILITARY SERVICE

Military service was interpreted to include only actual service in one of the branches of military service on a full-time basis, thus excluding one inmate from Norfolk and three men from Concord who had enlistments in the National Guard which demanded no more than weekly drills and summer encampments.

Table 56 shows the past military service of the three groups. None of the women in the study group had military experience, and consequently their representation will be dropped from the subsequent tables.

TABLE 56
PAST MILITARY SERVICE OF THE INMATES

Veteran of Military Service	Number of Inmates							
	Norfolk		Concord		Framingham		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	18	52.9	9	32.1	0	0.0	27	
No	16	47.1	19	67.9	38	100.0	73	
Totals	34	100.0	28	100.0	38	100.0	100	

Of the sixty-two males in the total group, less than half (twenty-seven) saw military service. Several reasons can be advanced for this. The age of these inmates is a factor, with several young men in the group. With the demands of the

military draft inconsequential of late, it has been of little effect in getting men to join forcibly or voluntarily. It may be noted that the older group at Norfolk (see Table 1) had a greater possibility of feeling the effects of World War II and the Korean Crisis with the concomitant pressures toward armed service. This may account for their greater participation as shown in this table, with eighteen being veterans and only sixteen having no such experience. Some of the men had early criminal histories which precluded their entrance into the armed forces.

Table 57 indicates the branch of service into which each man was first inducted.¹

TABLE 57

BRANCH OF MILITARY SERVICE ENTERED

Branch	Number of Inmates		
	Norfolk	Concord	Total
Army	9*	3	12
Navy	6	3	9
Air Force	3	1	4
Marines	0	2	2
Totals	18	9	27

* One man who first served in the Army (and is included in that figure) later served also in the Air Force.

¹ Since the Air Force has been established as a separate arm comparatively recently, it is open to question whether the records reflect the old designations of Army Air Force, Naval Air Force, or what is now simply the Air Force.

The comparative popularity of the different branches seen in the table, with the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines in that order, is in line with the past personnel strengths of these branches of the armed forces.

Table 58 shows the method by which each inmate was first inducted into military service. In all cases, subsequent inductions were re-enlistments.

TABLE 58
METHOD OF ENTERING MILITARY SERVICE

Method ^a	Number of Inmates		
	Norfolk	Concord	Total
Enlisted	13	8	21
Drafted	3	1	4
Unknown	2	0	2
Totals	18	9	27

^a This refers to the first induction only.

It is interesting that twenty-one of the twenty-seven men with military experience voluntarily sought it. Only four were drafted, and nothing was known about how two men were inducted.

Table 59 presents the number of times these individuals enlisted or were drafted.

TABLE 59
NUMBER OF INDUCTIONS

Number of Times	Number of Inmates		
	Norfolk	Concord	Total
1	14	8	22
2	2	1	3
3	1	0	1
Over 3	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	18	9	27

An overwhelming majority, twenty-two out of the twenty-seven men, were inducted once. Three inmates served two "hitches," one man was inducted three times, and one inmate from Norfolk had a history of five enlistments. One of these enlistments, however, was for a duration of one day because of a technicality, but four could be considered "legitimate" tours of duty. Here again, Norfolk's group shows the greatest range, reflecting the wide age range noted previously.

Table 60 shows the total length of time served in the armed forces.

TABLE 60
TOTAL LENGTH OF TIME SERVED

Total Length of Time (in months)	Number of Inmates		
	Norfolk	Concord	Total
1 - 12	5	1	6
13 - 24	4	4	8
25 - 36	3	2	5
37 - 48	1	0	1
49 - 60	1	1	2
61 - 72	0	1	1
73 - 84	2	0	2
Over 84	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Totals	18	9	27

Over half, or fourteen, of the men who saw military service spent less than two years in it. Five of the remaining thirteen served between two and three years, and the other men with more than one tour of duty spent several years in service. Two inmates from Norfolk were in the service close to eight and one-half years.

This table is of special interest when viewed in relation to Table 58 which shows that twenty-one of the twenty-seven men enlisted. With the usual enlistment encompassing a minimum of three years, the large number of short duty tours suggests some significance for the nature of the discharges received, a matter which is discussed below.

Tables 61 and 62 reflect two aspects of the military experience itself.

TABLE 61

NATURE OF EXPERIENCE: COMBAT

Combat	Number of Inmates		
	Norfolk	Concord	Total
Yes	3	1	4
No	10	8	18
Unknown	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	18	9	27

Eighteen of the twenty-seven men experienced no action. Four men did, and at least one of these, the inmate from Concord, was wounded and also received the Silver Star for combat heroism. The records on five men from Norfolk made no specific mention of combat, and it can be assumed that none was seen.

TABLE 62

NATURE OF EXPERIENCE: INCARCERATION

Incarcerated	Number of Inmates					
	Norfolk		Concord		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	5	27.8	5	55.6	10	37.1
No	<u>13</u>	<u>72.2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>62.9</u>
Totals	18	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0

Ten of these twenty-seven ex-servicemen served time in confinement ranging from three-month sentences to the guard-house to sentences of several years to service prisons. When accompanied by dishonorable discharges, as some were, such sentences help to explain the length of time served in the armed forces, as shown in Table 60. These were in addition to the imprisonments for civil offenses shown in Table 11. Two of the Norfolk inmates and all five of the Concord men had from one to three military confinements, one Norfolk inmate served four sentences, and the number of incarcerations experienced by the fifth Norfolk inmate was unknown.

Table 63 shows the type of the last discharge received from the armed forces.

TABLE 63

TYPE OF LAST DISCHARGE FROM MILITARY SERVICE

Type of Discharge	Number of Inmates					
	Norfolk		Concord		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Honorable	7	38.9	3	33.3	10	37.0
Dishonorable	10	55.5	4	44.4	14	51.8
Medical	1	5.6	2	22.3	3	11.2
Totals	18	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0

With ten honorable and three medical discharges the number of "acceptable" separations almost equals those of a dishonorable nature. It may be assumed that incarcerations, as shown in Table 62, frequently led to, or accompanied, dishonorable discharges. A question of interpretation was involved

in classifying some of the discharges which were listed under such terms as "General" and "Undesirable," but those not specifically carrying dishonorable connotations were included in the honorable category.

Table 64 adds information about the nature of military discharges by indicating the types of all discharges received. This number agrees with the thirty-six inductions for the total group (see Table 59).

TABLE 64

TYPES OF ALL DISCHARGES FROM MILITARY SERVICE

Type of Discharge	Number of Times Received					
	Norfolk		Concord		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Honorable	15	57.7	4	40.0	19	52.8
Dishonorable	10	38.5	4	40.0	14	38.9
Medical	1	3.8	2	20.0	3	8.3
Totals	26	100.0	10	100.0	36	100.0

When compared to Table 63, it is clear that the additional nine enlistments previous to the last one all resulted in honorable discharges.

The reasons for the discharges covered a wide range. Under the honorable heading, such reasons as demobilization, completed enlistments, unsuitability, emotional inadequacy, and lack of ability were advanced. Dishonorable discharges resulted from absences without leave (AWOL), insubordination, desertion, larceny of government property, and convictions for criminal

behavior of an assaultive nature. Discharges for medical reasons were made on the basis of physical defects and peer emotional adjustment.

Table 65 presents the inmate's personal evaluation of the military experience.

TABLE 65

PERSONAL EVALUATION OF MILITARY SERVICE EXPERIENCE

Evaluation	Number of Inmates		
	Norfolk	Concord	Total
Liked	9	6	15
Disliked	4	3	7
Unknown	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	18	9	27

Fifteen inmates claimed to have liked military life, seven specified dislike, while there was no indication of the views of five others.

CHAPTER X

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study a sample of one hundred inmates from the correctional institutions of Norfolk, Concord and Framingham, who were in treatment with the DLM as of January 1, 1959, or who came into treatment between that date, and December 1, 1959, were studied in order to present a more detailed description of the social characteristics and life experiences of this clientele. It was hoped that the study would provide a basis for further research on the relationship of such background characteristics to various aspects of treatment.

The data were collected from the DLM's own key-sort coding cards, the inmates' institutional records, and the inmates' records at the Department of Corrections. However, it was difficult to obtain adequate information from these records for certain areas; e.g., marital history, contacts with health and welfare agencies, residential moves, occupational history.

Various writers agree that the young adult is the largest age group of criminals. Over half, or 56 per cent, of the total group studied were under twenty-five years of age, and the mean age was 26.4 years. This compares with an average age of twenty found in the Gluecks' studies. The majority of the younger inmates were from Framingham. Norfolk had the largest proportion of older inmates with a mean age of 31.8. The factor of age has further implications for other aspects of the study;

e.g., marital status, number of institutionalizations, number of previous offenses, etc.

Eighty-five per cent of the total group were found to be white and nearly two-thirds were Roman Catholic. Sixty-five inmates were living in Boston and its suburbs at the time of incarceration. Sixty-eight inmates were single which can be related to the high proportion of persons under twenty-five. Half of those who had ever been married were from Norfolk which also had the largest proportion of older inmates. Twenty-nine of the thirty-eight women studied in this group were single, which is in contrast to the findings of other authors that married women have a higher commitment rate than single women. However, this is in agreement with the Bluecks' study on women in which almost half of their sample were single.

The history of criminal behavior was difficult to obtain because of the inadequacy of the records from which the data were collected. Over one-half of the inmates committed their first offense and were institutionalized for the first time in late adolescence, or between the ages of fifteen to nineteen. The number of previous offenses ranged from zero to thirty-two. Almost half of the group had committed from one to five previous offenses, and four of the five who were never apprehended before were from Framingham. Miscellaneous-mixer, larceny and burglary were the major types of previous offenses committed. Almost one-half of the inmates had been

institutionalized, put on probation or given other dispositions from one to three times. Forty-two inmates had never been on parole but twenty-seven of these had never been institutionalized. Only nine handled parole successfully. Thirty-six inmates had never been on probation, and of these who had been only twenty-seven handled it successfully.

Robbery was the leading present offense, which is in contrast to the nature of previous offenses where this classification was rated third. It, however, includes some of the most serious offenses--four inmates who committed murder and two who were sentenced for manslaughter. Sex offenses constituted the second most common cause of institutional commitment and was proportionately equal among the three institutions. Twelve of the thirteen miscellaneous-minor offenses were committed by women at Framingham. Seven of these women were sentenced on "stubborn child" charges.

Most of the crimes were committed at night. Out of the forty-nine which involved partners, only ten were women whose partners were of the opposite sex. Thirty-six were on parole at the time of the present offense; and of the twenty who were on probation, thirteen were from Framingham.

The months between date of incarceration and the date of intake by DLM proved to be interesting. Over half of the study group came into treatment within the first year of confinement. Of the thirty-three who applied for

treatment within the first six months, twenty were from Framingham. This is possibly due to the difference in the intake procedure at this institution whereby the inmates are referred to DLM treatment by its staff worker who attends each classification meeting and initiates referrals accordingly.

The family history of the inmates was studied. Three-fourths had experienced broken homes, and most of these occurred before the inmate was five years of age. More than half of these broken homes were caused by divorce and separation. Almost half remained with the mother after this crisis. Other crises in the home in addition to this initial one were difficult to obtain from the records which gave no dates or were not specific about such crises. However, almost half of the group had a history of one to three crises in the home. Nine inmates' families had never experienced any. It is speculated that the actual number of crises was probably higher than indicated in the records.

Although the records were not adequate in giving a complete listing of residential moves of the inmate and his family from the time of his birth, these families seem to be quite mobile with almost one-half of them moving five times or more. Fifteen inmates were "only children" in the family; the largest proportion were "middle children." Almost half had at least two full siblings, but only one-fifth had half siblings.

There was found to be a high proportion of court records in the family; two-fifths of the fathers and one-fifth of the mothers were known to have court records. However, there was a lesser proportion of family court records in Framingham than in the other institutions. Almost three-fourths of the total group had had contacts with social agencies. The majority of these contacts for both the parental family and for the patient and/or his marital family were with welfare agencies.

The items on the marital history were not on the key-sort data card but were added to the schedule in order to have a more comprehensive view of life experiences. One-third of the group had had marital experience. Norfolk had the largest number of married; Concord had the least. The mean age of marriage was 20.5 years. Over half of this group either had only one child or no children at all. Framingham had the largest number of children. Of the total group, single and married, only twenty-four had legitimate children. Nineteen of the total group had illegitimate children. Due to the limitation of the records, it is speculated that Norfolk and Concord would have more illegitimate children than shown.

A large proportion of the total group did not meet the educational requirements of the community. An individual is expected to have completed grade eleven by age sixteen. Over half had completed nine or less grades and terminated school at age sixteen or under. Only fifteen had had any

additional education after public high school. The Framingham group showed the highest academic accomplishment. Over half of the total group had a history of grade repeats. Almost two-thirds had discipline problems. The data on reading problems were not reliable or complete enough to be meaningful. Framingham had the highest level of I.Q.'s with 76 per cent testing "average" or above. Norfolk had the highest I.Q. (135) and the lowest was 63 in the Concord group. The greatest proportion in each group were classified in the "average" category.

The records do not present a valid picture of the inmates' employment experiences, with the exception of Framingham which did give a comprehensive view of employment. Over half of the inmates were unemployed at the time of their offense. Most had been, or were, engaged in unskilled labor. For most inmates the longest periods of continuous employment had been no longer than three months.

None of the women in this study group had military experience. Only twenty-seven of the total of sixty-two males studied saw military service. Most of them were from Norfolk, the older-aged group, who may have served during World War II. About three-fourths of those who saw military service had enlisted and served only once. Over half were in service less than the usual term of two years, and this may reflect difficulty which they may have encountered with authorities. Only

four of the men were in combat. Ten men were incarcerated while in the service for periods of three months to several years. Fourteen were dishonorably discharged and thirteen were honorably discharged. Even though this large number of men were dishonorably discharged and ten had been in prison while in the service, fifteen inmates claimed to have liked military life.

This pilot study has attempted to provide a description of the type of person coming for treatment at the DLM. While it was possible to obtain a picture of the gross characteristics of this clientele, there were many other aspects of the life experiences of these clients which we would have liked to explore further. Some interesting differences between the clients from the three institutions studied have been pointed out in the foregoing summary. One outstanding finding for the whole group was the extreme family deprivation they had experienced. A large majority of the group were single and in their present circumstances presumably had a minimum of close family ties. The accumulation of previous offenses by this young age group and their employment history were also noteworthy. The predominance of such factors in the life experience of these clients implies reality difficulties in the type of present situations that they face and that must be taken into account in planning treatment methods and goals for them.

One area in which we would have liked to have more information was the history of contacts with social agencies. This would give a better picture of their familiarity with and ability to use helping services and better understanding of the childhood emotional disturbances that led to their delinquent behavior.

It is hoped that the present study will provide a basis for further investigation in at least two directions. It would be interesting to know how the inmates who come for treatment compare with the total population in these institutions with regard to the characteristics studied. It would also be of interest to relate the personal and social characteristics studied to the variables on the keysort coding card which record progress and outcome of treatment to see what associations, if any, occur between these two sets of variables.

Accepted 5-31-60
Katherine Spencer

SCHEDULE

IDENTIFYING DATA

A1. Code Number _____
A2. Referred by _____
A3. Sex _____
A4. Age at Intake _____
A5. Race _____
A6. Religion _____
A7. Marital Status _____

Date of Intake _____
Community of Residence _____
Date of Birth _____

HISTORY OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

A8. Age of First Offense _____
A9. Age of First Institutionalization _____
Number of Previous Offenses (don't include present) _____
Nature of Previous Offenses: _____

Nature of Dispositions:

- a. Acquitted _____
- b. Filed or no Action _____
- c. Probation _____
- d. Institutionalized _____
- e. Fine _____

Number of Times of Parole _____
Number of Times of Breaking Parole _____
Number of Times of Breaking Probation _____

D1. Last Crime: Parole _____ Not on Parole _____
D2. Last Crime: On Probation _____ Not on Probation _____
D3. Time of Crime _____
D4. Present Offense _____
D5. Partners _____
D6. Opposite Sex Partners _____
Date of Incarceration _____

II. CONTACTS WITH HEALTH & WELFARE SERVICES

B1. Hospitalized as Child _____
B2. Prior Psychiatric Treatment _____
B3. Physical Treatment _____

H1. Contacts with Social Agencies: (list agencies & approximate date) yes ___ no ___
a. Parental Family _____
b. Prisoner/Marital Family _____

FAMILY

- G1. Broken Home _____
- G2. Cause _____
- G3. Age at Time of Broken Home _____
- History of Crisis in Home (list all):
 - a. Cause _____
 - b. Age of Patient _____
 - c. Outcome for patient _____

Residential History: (within Gr. Boston, within Boston, other)

- a. Number of Moves _____
- b. Location _____

- F1. Court Record of Father _____
- F2. " " " Mother _____
- F3. " " " Siblings _____
- H2. Birth Order _____
- Total Number of Siblings: Full _____ Half _____

MARITAL HISTORY

- a. Age at Marriage _____
- b. Number of Children _____
- c. Outcome _____

Number of Illegitimate Children _____

Residential History: (within Gr. Boston, within Boston; other)

- a. Number of Moves _____
- b. Location _____

EDUCATION

- 11. Age at Termination _____
- 12. Grades Completed _____
- Nature of Additional Education (specify) _____
- 13. Repeats _____ Reason _____
- 14. Discipline Problem _____ Nature _____
- 15. Reading Problem _____ Nature _____
- IQ _____

I. MILITARY SERVICES

C1. Service _____ Dates _____
C2. Branch _____
C3. Drafted _____ Enlisted _____
C4. Combat _____
C5. Discharge _____
Reason for Discharge _____
Service Prison Record _____
C6. Evaluation _____

II. OCCUPATION

E1. Occupation at Time of Crime _____
E2. Job Stability _____
Occupations:
a. Type of Job b. Location c. Duration

Periods of Unemployment:

a. Short Term (under 2 mo.) Number of Times _____
b. Long Term: Number of Times _____ Duration _____

APPENDIX C: DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY CLASSIFICATION

1st column in every case, indicating offense (rather than modus operandi code)
 digit is major heading

character is number, or letter subdivision (letter includes the punch shown in parens)

MISCELLANEOUS CRIMES	04D(4) Charity Collection	MISC. MAJOR CRIMES
Obstructing Justice	04N(4) Subscript. Collect.	091 Communism
) Bribery	04U(4) Advertising Collect.	09A(1) Commun. Literature
) Perjury	045 Swindle Trick	09J(1) Loyalty Investig.
Damage	046 Impersonation	092 Arson
) Malicious Damage	04F(6) Impers. Pol. Officer	09B(2) Burning Mental
) Accidental Damage	04W(6) Impers. Military	09K(2) Burning to Defraud
Transient	051 CHECKS	09S(2) Burning incidental
) Trespass	052 Embezzlement	093 Defective
) Begging	053 Counterfeit	09C(3) Insane
Uneth Practice	05C(3) Making Counterfeit	09L(3) Homosexual
) " Practice Med	05L(3) Passing Counterfeit	094 Wanted/Parole Viol.
) " practice Law	05T(3) Possessing Counter.	09D(4) Escape
Unlicensed	054 Stocks and Bonds	09M(4) Missing
MV Violations	055 Commere. Paper/Record	095 Military Service
) Drunk Driving	061 GAMBLING	09E(5) Draft Dodger
) Hit & Run	062 Setting up Lottery	09N(5) AWOL
Drunkenness	063 Gambling Machine	09V(5) Mil. Escapes
<u>LARCENY</u>	064 Race Track	096 Liquor
Larc of Auto	065 Present at Gaming	09F(6) Illegal Still
2) Using w/o auth	071 SEX	09W(6)
Larc from Person	072 Lewd	097 Non-Support
3) Handbag Snatch	07B(2) Indecent Exposure	09G(7) Desertion/Civil
3) Drunk Roller	07K(2) Peeping Tom	09F(7) Desertion/Military
3) Pickpocket	073 Indecent Assault	
Larc from Shop	074 Unnatural Act	
Larc from Comm. Carr.	07D(4) Sodomy & Buggary	
Receiving Stol. Goods	07M(4) Incest	
Comm. & Notor. Thief	075 Lewd & Lasc Cohab.	
<u>BURGLARY</u>	07E(5) Fornication/Adult.	
Brk & Ent	07N(5) Illegitimacy	
2) Ent w/o Breaking	07V(5) Bigamy	
2) B & E Daytime	076 Abortion	
B & E Safe	07F(6) Abortion Accessory	
3) B & E Safe Rip	07W(6) Abortion Principal	
3) B & E Safe Blow	077 Immoral Entertain.	
3) B & E Safe Punch	07G(7) Prostitution	
Burglar Tools	07K(7) Female Impersonat.	
4) Celluloid	078 Rape	
<u>ROBBERY</u>	07H(8) Carnal Abuse	
Assault	07Q(8) Abuse Female Child	
2) Asslt with Dang. Weap.	07V(8) Rape of Idiot	
2) Asslt & Battery	07P(7) Strip tease	
Kidnapping	081 NARCOTICS	
Murder	082 Narcotics Seller	
4) Manslaughter	03B(2) Addict	
4) Suicide	083 Harmful Drugs	
Carry. Concealed Weap.		
<u>CONFIDENCE</u>		
Extortion		
2) Threats		
Conversion		
2) Business Conversion		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barnes, Harry Elmer and Negley K. Teeters. New Horizons in Criminology. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946.
- Commons, Walter H., Thomas Yakub and Edwin Powers. The Development of Penological Treatment at Norfolk Prison Colony in Massachusetts. New York: Bureau of Social Hygiene Inc., 1940.
- Elliott, Mabel A. Crime in Modern Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Five Hundred Criminal Careers. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1930.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Five Hundred Delinquent Women. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1934.
- Powers, Edwin. The Basic Structure of the Administration of Criminal Justice in Massachusetts. Boston: United Prison Association of Massachusetts, 1952.
- Preliminary Report of Joint Committee of the Boston Bar Association and the Suffolk District Medical Society for the Study of Criminal Responsibility in Mental Disease, pp. 63-64.
- Sutherland, Edwin and Donald Cressey. Principles of Criminology. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1955.
- Wechsler, David. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1955.
- Wells, William D. "The Use of the McBee Keysort in Content Analysis," American Psychologist, vol. 11 (1956), p. 53.