1

**PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT**

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

PIONEERS IN METHYLENE BLUE TESTING SINCE 1974

1500 COUNTY ROAD 3, BUFFALO, NY 14207 USA
TEL 812 435 7887 FAX 812 435 7887 TLE 5100000488

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

**EFFECTIVENESS OF The WISCONSIN CASE MANAGEMENT
STRATEGIES FOR USE WITH CANADIAN OFFENDERS.**

**By
Wagdy Loza**

**A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy.
Department of Psychology**

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
December, 1991**

Copyright C Wagdy Loza, 1991

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-75928-3

Canada

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
results of the Senate Studies are correct
and true to the original

and the findings of the Senate Study are correct
and true to the original

Witness my hand

at the City of New York, N.Y., this 12th day of

February, 1961, in testimony whereof I have hereunto

set my hand and the seal of the Senate.

Robert F. Wagner, Mayor

Mayor of the City of New York

Patricia Van Vorst

Patricia Van Vorst

Patricia Van Vorst

12/12/1961

ABSTRACT

The Wisconsin Case Management Strategies (CMS) is an offender classification tool which has been recently introduced into the Canadian Federal Correctional system but has not been subjected to extensive research to explore its effectiveness on Canadian offenders. The aim of this study was to fill this gap by conducting a comprehensive exploration of the effectiveness of the CMS subtypes as they apply to Canadian federal offenders. First the reliability and item validity of the CMS was explored. Five analyses were used: the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient, subscale/subscale correlation, correlation between parts of the same subscale, item analysis of CMS items actually contributing to parts of each subscale, and comparison between CMS subtypes' total scores on the CMS four subscales. The second series of explorations dealt with the concurrent validity of the CMS. Here the CMS subtypes were compared on demographics, crime histories, alcohol and drug abuse, emotional disturbance and antisocial potential scales of the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (Millon, 1982), Andrews' Level of Supervision Inventory (1982), Nuffields's General Statistical Information on Recidivism Scale (1982),

Hare's Psychopathy Checklist (1985a, 1985b), and the Case Management Strategies subscales. The third series of explorations focused on the predictive criterion variables of the CMS subtypes. Three sets of criterion variables were used: within-prison adjustment, post-release adjustment, and violent recidivism. The overall results indicated that the CMS is reliable and valid for identifying only one of its originally reported four subtypes. Two of the other subtypes were almost identical. The fourth subtype fluctuated between the other subtypes. The findings of this study are decidedly negative for the validity of the CMS and raise serious doubts about its ability to differentiate between four distinct subtypes. The results of this study suggest that the CMS may be a valid measure to distinguish two distinct forensic subtypes of Canadian offenders, the pro-social criminals and career criminals, rather than the four subtypes originally described by the CMS constructors.

Acknowledgements

Words are not enough to express my gratitude and appreciation to the Correctional Service of Canada for granting me educational leave to complete my Ph.D. I would particularly like to thank Mr. W. Gladu, Acting Warden at the time of my application, and Mr. A. Graham, Deputy Commissioner (Ontario) for their support in obtaining the educational leave.

I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr. D. Andrews for giving me the opportunity to work under his supervision. The encouragement, support, and guidance he gave over the past three years are greatly appreciated.

A word of appreciation must also go to Dr. F. Porporino, Director General, Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada for providing me with a research grant which made my task of completing this project much easier to accomplish. I would also like to thank Mr. K. Payen, Assistant Deputy Commissioner and Chairman of the Research Committee, Ontario for his role in facilitating my visits to Ontario Region correctional institutions. Dr. L. Motiuk of the Research and Statistics Branch also deserves a word of thanks for providing me with completed forms of Case Management Strategies, which were essential to some parts of

my study.

A special word of thanks must go to Mrs. M. Nashed, Mr. T. Gee, Mrs. P. Brown, and Mr. J. Thompson for their valuable assistance in carrying out this research project.

This research could not have been completed without the cooperation of wardens, chiefs of case management, and file management staff of the Correctional Service of Canada (Ontario institutions) and the National Parole Board (Ontario), as well as the inmates who participated in this study. Their help made my task of collecting my data a most pleasant one.

My greatest appreciation is to my wife Nabila and my daughters Amel and Evette for their support and understanding through my many years of studying.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of contents	vi
List of Tables	x
List of Appendices	xiii
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	1
CHAPTER 2: Brief review of the theoretical approaches to criminal typologies	10
a. The constitutional or physiological typologies	
b. The legalistic typologies	12
c. The sociological typologies	17
d. The psychological typologies	19
CHAPTER 3: Brief review of some of the current and commonly used classification systems in the United States and Canada	22
a. The Megargee's Classification System	
b. The Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification System (I-level).	31
c. The Sequential I-Level System	39

d. The Quay's Adult Internal Management System (AIMS)	41
e. Level of Supervision Inventory Classification System (LSI).	46
f. The Wisconsin Classification Systems	51
1. The Risk Scale	52
2. The Reassessment Risk Scale	53
3. The Need Scale	53
4. Case Management Classification Strategies for Case Supervision (CMS)	55
CHAPTER 4: Communalities Among Classification Systems	65
CHAPTER 5: Justification, Goals and Literature Review Regarding Criterion Variables	72
CHAPTER 6: Reliability of the CMS and Item Validity	82
Study I	
Method	82
Subjects	
Procedure and Statistical Analysis	
Results	85
Internal Consistency of the CMS	
The Subscale/Subscale Correlation	
Sams Subscale Part/Part correlation	

	Item Validity of Items Actually	86
	Contributing to Parts of CMS Subscales	
	Subtypes Total Scores on the CMS	87
	Subscales	
	Discussion	106
CHAPTER 7:	Concurrent Validity of the CMS Subtypes	113
Study II		
	Method	
	Subjects	
	Instruments	114
	Procedures	117
	Statistical analysis	120
	Results	121
	Demographics and CMS subtypes	
	Criminal history and CMS subtypes	
	Substance Abuse and CMS subtypes	122
	Millon's emotional disturbance and antisocial potential and CMS subtypes	
	Total scores on the Level of Supervision	123
	Inventory, the General Statistical Information on Recidivism, the Psychopathy Checklist and the two factors of the PCL-R and CMS subtypes	

	Subscales of the Level of Supervision Inventory and CMS subtypes	124
	Items of Level of Supervision Inventory and CMS subtypes	
	Items of Statistical Information on Recidivism and CMS subtypes.	125
	Items of the Psychopathy Checklist and CMS subtypes.	126
	CMS subscales and CMS subtypes	127
	Discussion	152
CHAPTER 8:	CMS and offender adjustment during incarceration	162
Study III	Method	
	Subjects	
	Instruments	
	Procedure	
	Statistical analysis	164
	Results	165
	Institutional adjustment and CMS subtypes	
	Discussion	168

CHAPTER 9:	CMS and offender's post-release	169
Study IV	adjustment and violent recidivism	
	Method	
	Subjects	
	Instruments	
	Procedure	170
	Statistical analysis	171
	Results	173
	Adjustment upon release criteria and CMS subtypes.	
	Recidivism, treatment and rehabilitation programs, and CMS subtypes.	
	Recidivism, time, and CMS subtypes.	175
	Violent recidivism and CMS subtypes	
	Discussion	185
Conclusion		189
References		193
Appedices		209

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1) CMS' subscale/subscale correlation matrix	88
2) Distribution of responses to CMS interview questions and results of χ^2 of case Management Strategies By CMS Subtypes	89
3) Number of items of parts of the CMS subscales which did not significantly differentiate between CMS subtypes	104
4) Means, standard deviations, results of ANOVAs and pairs of groups comparisons of offenders scores on the CMS	105
5) Means, standard deviations, results of ANOVA/ χ^2 and pairs of groups comparisons of demographic characteristics by CMS subtypes.	128
6) Means, standard deviations, results of ANOVA and pairs of groups comparisons of offender's criminal history by CMS subtypes	129
7) Means, standard deviations, results of ANOVA/ χ^2 and pairs of groups comparisons of Millon substance abuse scales, items of LSI's alcohol/drug problems and substance abuse interview information by CMS subtypes	131

- 8) Means, standard deviations, results of ANOVA and 133
pairs of groups comparisons of Millon emotional
disturbance and Millon antisocial potential by CMS
subtypes.
- 9) Means, standard deviations, results of ANOVA and 135
pairs of groups comparisons of total scores of the Level
of Supervision Inventory, total scores of the General
Statistical Information on Recidivism, and the total
scores and two factors of the Psychopathy Checklist by
CMS subtypes.
- 10) Means, standard deviations, results of ANOVA and 136
pairs of groups comparisons of the subscales of
the Level of Supervision Inventory by CMS subtype.
- 11) Subjects positive responses, results of $\bar{X}$ and pairs 138
of group comparisons of Level of Supervision
Inventory by CMS subtypes.
- 12) Subjects responses, results of $\bar{X}$ and pairs of group 144
comparisons of General Statistical Information on
Recidivism by CMS subtypes.

13) Subjects responses, results of $\bar{X}$ and results of pairs of group comparison of Psychopathy Checklist by CMS subtypes.	147
14) Means, standard deviations, results of ANOVA and pairs of groups comparisons of offenders's scores on the CMS subscales by CMS subtypes.	151
15) Percentage of subject's scores on criteria of institutional adjustment, results of $\bar{X}$ and pairs of group comparisons by CMS subtypes.	166
16) Percentage of offender's scores on adjustment upon release and violent acts criteria, results of $\bar{X}$ and pairs of group comparisons by CMS subtypes.	177
17) Percentage of offenders who completed treatment/ rehabilitation programs prior to release by subtypes.	178
18) Percentage of offender's recidivism over 6X4 month follow up period by CMS subtypes.	179
19) Percentage of offenders who committed new offences over 6X4 month follow up period by CMS subtypes.	180
20) Percentage of offenders who had new conviction over 6X4 month follow up period by CMS subtypes.	181
21) Percentage of offenders who had new sentence over 6X4 month follow up period by CMS subtypes.	182

22)Percentage of offenders who violated their parole conditions over 6X4 month follow up period by CMS subtypes.	183
23)Percentage of offenders who had negative parole reports over 6X4 month follow up period by CMS subtypes.	184

LIST OF APPENDICES

A- Principles of Classification	209
B- Comprehensive Classification Systems	211
C- Minimum Required Components Of A Classification Plan	214
D- Fundamental Policy Principles For Classification	215
E- Criteria For A "Good" Classification System	216
F- Wisconsin Case Management Strategies	217
G- Scoring Key For Wisconsin Case Management Strategies	218
H- Item/Total Correlations For Parts of the CMS Subscales.	222
I- The Distribution of Positive Responses to Items Which actually contributed to parts of CMS subscales, results of X and Pairs of Group Comparisons of CMS By CMS Subtypes	223
J-The Level Of Supervision Inventory	224
K- General Statistical Information On Recidivism	225
L- Hare Checklist Interview Format	226
M- Subjects Information and Consent Form	227
N- Offence Severity Scale	229
O- Inmate Offence Report And Notification Of Charge	230
P- Dissociation Log	231
Q- Performance Notice	232
R- Monthly Notice Of Earned Remission	233
S- Criteria for Violent Offences	234

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The practice of using objective procedures to classify offenders is a fairly new phenomenon to correctional systems in North America. In the United States, the change to an objective classification process was spurred by several court orders (Austin, 1983) and a mandate by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973). The courts were not satisfied with the inconsistency in the decision-making process and the traditional classification procedures used by the correctional system. The Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals mandated that all correctional institutions implement classification systems and provide programs suited to the individual needs of offenders. Another practical reason for the development and use of objective classification systems in the United States was the problem of prison overcrowding, which led administrators to demand a faster, more efficient method of classifying offenders (Austin, 1983).

The dissatisfaction with the traditional classification system in Canada was similar to that in the United States. The MacGuigan Parliamentary Committee (1977), which investigated the conditions of Federal correctional

institutions, recognized that "the classification procedure is disorganized and varied from region to region" and that "the process sometimes takes from three to four months for classification and movement (of offenders) to a designated institution". Furthermore, the committee found evidence that "correctional officers sometimes interfere (in the classification) process", exercising "deadly influences" and sometimes "veto power" over the process of classification of inmates. The committee recommended that "a major effort by the Penitentiary Service is required to review and improve the approach to classification and the practices and techniques now employed" (P.130- 132).

The search for a "good" model to use for the classification of offenders has driven courts, advisory commissions, accreditation commissions, correctional agencies, and concerned researchers such as Andrews, Bonta, and Hoge (1990), Brennan (1987), Clements (1988), Quay (1984), and Sechrest (1987) to recommend principles, characteristics, guidelines, standards, policy statements, and criteria for an effective classification system. A detailed description of some of these recommendations is provided in Appendices A through E. Recently Andrews, Bonta, and Hoge (1990) suggested four principles for effective

classification system. They emphasized the importance of the classification process as a step for implementing effective rehabilitation programs. The first principle is the risk principle, which entails classifying offenders according to their level of risk, then assigning them to appropriate levels of service. They have advocated that higher level of service be reserved for higher risk cases because higher risk cases respond better to intensive service, while lower risk cases do well with a minimal amount of service. Low risk cases may also be assigned to the least restricted custodial setting. The second principle is the need principle. According to this principle, services offered are best matched with the "criminogenic needs" of offenders. The responsivity principle is concerned with matching types of services to the abilities of offenders. The last principle is the professional override. This principle embodies the idea that after considering risk, needs, and responsivity, professionals may step beyond the routine application of these principles in making their decisions if circumstances so warrant.

Although recommendations for effective classification system vary somewhat in their contents, it seems that the most important feature of a good classification system is that the system should have a realistic purpose and clear

operational definitions on which to base classification. It should be comprehensive, reliable, valid, dynamic, and economical. It should also offer useful treatment strategies, enhance the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs offered to offenders, minimize risk to others involved with the offender, and maximize the objectiveness of the classification criteria.

Classification systems serve different purposes. They help prison management to reach decisions regarding offenders' movements and assignment to different levels of custody and security (Austin, 1986; Jesness, 1988). They also help assign offenders according to their needs and suitability to different rehabilitation and treatment programs, such as employment, education, and psychological treatment programs (Andrews, Bonta & Hoge, 1990); Jesness, 1988; Levinson, 1988). They facilitate reaching decisions in response to offenders' requests to attain privileges such as temporary absences from the institution or transfer to other institutions; They help in the prediction of offenders' behavior (Gottfredson, D, 1987); help in the prediction of recidivism (Andrews et al., 1990); Jesness, 1988; MacKenzie, Posey & Rapaport, 1988) and violent behavior (Jesness, 1988; Levinson, 1982); provide a means of assessing offender

characteristics, personality structures and dynamics (Jesness, 1988); and help in allocating appropriate resources vis a vis level of supervision needed (high-risk cases need higher levels of supervision (Andrews et al., 1990; Ashford & LeCroy, 1988; Wright, Clear & Dickson, 1984)).

Classification systems also provide assistance in prediction, which is useful for both research and practice (Levinson, 1982; Flanagan, 1983). Other more theoretical purposes of classification have been suggested by Brennan (1987). These include contributing to the description of complex phenomena, the epidemiological study and enumeration of crime patterns, and in the process of discovering new typologies of criminological phenomena; helping to create new analytical entities or "Ideal Types" which can be further described, studied, and compared; helping to test hypotheses and to confirm theoretical systems; and shaping the development of a nomenclature for criminal types, which in turn helps to facilitate better communication, storage, and retrieval of information (Brennan, 1987).

Several practical advantages of using objective classification systems have been reported. There is more objectivity, uniformity, and equity in the decision-making process (Nuffield, 1982; Webster & Adario, 1985), and

consistency of the decision making is enhanced (Baired, 1981; 1985). There is an increase in the accuracy of predictions. Efficiency is increased and it is easier to train new personnel. These systems make the classification decision process itself more explicit to offenders and staff (before using these systems, each case manager was conducting free style interviews and reaching his conclusions and decisions accordingly). In addition, they allow for more viable policies, which can be debated and improved. They reduce the chances of litigation because there is documentation to support their use, which tends to make evaluation of the system easier (Brennan, 1987; Gottfredson, 1987). They avoid unnecessary expenditure by helping administrators to determine how best to allocate their resources (Cary, Garske, & Ginsberg, 1986). Finally, they provide a bank containing a unified information base. Such a bank may be used for research purposes to advance our knowledge about offenders.

Classification systems differ in their use, theoretical background, rationale, objectives, and in the variables used to classify offenders, and are operationalized in quite different ways (Sechrest, 1987). Nevertheless, they follow three broad methods of typology : the heuristic method (theoretical method; sometimes called subjective; Clinical),

the empirical method, and the pragmatic method. The heuristic (theoretical) approach follows the principles of deductive logic and is based on theoretical principles. The theoretical typology begins with an initiator who has some assumptions and then develops a classification system based on those assumptions. The empirical approach is based on inductive logic and begins with observed patterns of covariation. The initiator of an empirical typology begins with a classification system and attempts to generate a theoretical explanation for these observations. Multivariate statistical techniques are used by the initiator to analyze data collected by measuring different variables on different samples of offenders. The empirical system focuses on the search for groups of offenders sharing similar characteristics. Types are then defined according to the results of the statistical analysis (Megargee and Bohn, 1979; Sechrest, 1987). Pragmatically-developed typologies, on the other hand, classify offenders according to immediate problems, such as their need for medical attention, or their escape potential, or according to obvious characteristics, such as substance-abuse problems (Sechrest, 1987).

Classification methods currently used in criminology and in the Criminal Justice System are the product of several stages of development. Brennan (1987) suggested that the

first stage of classification was intuitive and subjective, with no systematic collection of data. It produced little of scientific usefulness. In the second stage the disciplines of psychology, psychiatry and sociology produced several theoretical explanations and typologies which attempted to explain and classify criminals. However, evaluation of the merits of these theories was generally negative because of factors such as poor operational measurements, poor predictive validity, poor reliability, theoretical confusion, oversimplification, and reductionism. The third phase was marked with pessimism and a search for new approaches. This phase resulted from the dissatisfaction of practitioners with the available classification systems. They often ignored these systems and relied on their impressionistic classifications. The fourth stage was that of using multivariate quantitative classification. Although this approach allows for greater information content than was previously possible, and a higher level of precision, consistency, reliability, and objectivity, its usefulness remains to be demonstrated.

Currently, correctional institutions are increasingly using objective classification systems (Levinson, 1988) and the use of such systems is now more popular among

correctional officials (Wright, Clear & Dickson, 1984). Furthermore, new systems are appearing regularly, attempting to explore all possible criminological factors. However, criminal justice professionals are still guarded regarding these classification systems: the methodology used to create them varies considerably (Brennan, 1987) and there is also concern about the lack of theoretical sophistication for these systems (Gottfredson, cited in Sechrest, 1987).

As just reported in this presentation, Brennan (1987) suggested that the currently used classification methods in criminology are the result of earlier intuitive and theoretical attempts to classify criminals. The following chapter will present a brief review of these early theoretical efforts. This will be followed by a brief review of some of the currently commonly used classification systems in the United States and Canada.

CHAPTER 2

Brief Review of the Theoretical Approaches to
Criminal typologies.

The first scientific attempt to classify offenders may be traced back to Lombroso's criminal typology of the 19th century. Since that time many classification systems have been designed. Several authors such as Ferdinand (1966) and Roebuck (1967) have divided these typologies into four categories: the physical-constitutional-heredity approach which focus on the physique of the individual who committed the criminal act; the legalistic approach which centers on legal definitions, intent, regularity, and pattern of criminal acts; the sociological approach which concentrates on social class, interaction and subculture; and the psychological approach which is based on motivations, personality structure and psychological disabilities. The following is a brief review of the four categorization of typologies.

a. The constitutional or physiological typologies

An often-cited example of a typology which stems from the constitutional, or physiological approach is that of Lombroso's criminal types, dating back to the mid-1800s

(Gibbons, 1988; Gottfredson, 1987; Jayewardene, 1975; Megargel & Bohn, 1979; Roebuck, 1967; Roucek, 1958).

Lombroso considered the criminal to be a throwback to a more primitive period in the evolution of man. He theorized that the criminal behaved as he did because he was born with a certain biological constitution which caused him to commit criminal acts. Lombroso's typology divided criminals into five basic physical criminal types, the "born criminal", the "insane and feeble-minded criminal", the "criminal by passion", the "habitual criminal", and the "occasional criminal". Shortly after Lombroso, Ferri (Jayewardene, 1975; Roebuck, 1967) suggested other schemes of classifying criminals according to the constitutional and physiological typologies. Ferri's typology is similar to that suggested earlier by Lombroso. He classified criminals as: the born criminal, criminal suffering from neuropsychopathic conditions, the passion criminal of two subtypes of passion (i. e., chronic mental illness) and emotion (i. e., explosive mental state), the occasional criminal, the habitual criminal, and the involuntary criminal. More recently, the Gluecks (1952), as a result of a series of analyses of the physiques of one thousand delinquents and nondelinquents, divided their population into the three physical types, endomorph, mesomorph, and ectomorph.

Currently no classification system is using the biological-constitution approach. This may be due to the advancements made in scientific methods which effectively questioned the usefulness of the constitutional and physiological typologies.

b. The legalistic typologies

Typologies based on the legal definition of offences are the most frequently used form of classification (Clinard and Quinney, 1986). These typologies are based on the seriousness of the offense, legal category (i. e., crimes against person, crime against property), nature of the offence, crime patterns, degree of deviance, and criminal career patterns (Clinard & Quinney, 1986; Megargee & Bohn, 1979; Roebuck, 1967). Typologies stemming from the seriousness of the offence have been criticized (Clinard & Quinny, 1986) as not useful because the difficulty of making a distinction between serious and non-serious crimes. Typologies based on the nature of the offence for which offenders had been sentenced have been also found to be unreliable as a mean of classifying offenders for several reasons : there is an enormous number of offences listed in the Criminal Code under which offenders can be classified; offenders convicted of a certain type of offence form

heterogeneous groups and respond differently to similar treatment; few offenders commit a single crime; the original offence for which the offender has been charged or convicted has been often influenced by plea bargaining, the offender's status in the community and the skillfulness of the defence counsel; and the occurrence of a criminal offence could be precipitated by situational as well as personality factors (Clinard & Quinny, 1986; Megargee & Bohn, 1979).

The second category of typology included in the legalistic approach stems from crime patterns. Roebuck (1967) identified four categories of criminal careers: the single arrest, the multiple, the mixed pattern, and the no pattern category. Critics have described Roebuck's categorization as arbitrary, and have argued that they cannot be applied to first-time offenders as it would require previous convictions to complete the classification (Megargee & Bohn, 1979).

Typologies stemming from degree of deviance are the third category of typology included in the legalistic approach. In this category, offenders are classified on the basis of the frequency, continuity, social harmfulness of their offences and deliberateness of their criminal acts. Based on these considerations, Morris (1965) proposed five types of classification. The first type is made up of

legalistic or technical offenders, i. e., offenders who get involved in criminal behavior but with no intent to commit such acts. Examples of these offenders are those who commit crimes through ignorance or thoughtlessness. The second type is comprised of situational offenders, offenders whose criminal involvements are the result of situational pressures, stress or provocation. Next are pathological offenders, the chronically abnormal offenders who get involved in crime because of inadequacy, handicaps or growing up in deprived socio-economic conditions. The fourth type is comprised of avocational offenders, law abiding citizens who commit illegal offenses while carrying on their jobs. Fifth are career offenders, the "real criminals" who commit crime consciously and choose crime as an occupation. Similar to Morris classification, Cavan (Clinard & Quinny, 1986; Jayewardene, 1975; Megargee & Bohn, 1979) suggested a classification system consisting of four broad categories of offenders based on the public's reaction to crime and the criminal's reaction to the public. Offenders included in the first category are "professional career" criminals, "organized crime" figures, and "disorganized habitual" criminals. The second category includes "irresponsible" criminals who disregard the rights of others, such as intoxicated drivers and "occasional or opportunistic"

criminals. The third category includes "casual offenders" who violate only minor laws, "white collar criminals" and citizens who cooperate with organized criminals by placing bets or buying illegal liquor. The fourth category consists of offenders whose behavior is strongly disapproved of by the public but is supported by a specific cultural group.

The last category of typology included in the legalistic approach is that which stems from criminal career patterns. Using this approach, Clinard & Quinney (1973; 1986) suggested a classification system which consists of nine categories: "violent personal criminal", "occasional property criminal", "public order criminal", "conventional criminal", "political criminal", "occupational criminal", "corporate criminal", "organized criminal", and "professional criminal". Gibbons (1988) and Megargee and Bohn (1979) reported that critics faulted this system because it is "lacking in definitional and conceptual precision"; because it does not offer much help in classifying offenders; because many offenders do not fall neatly into a single pattern; and because the system neither provides causes for such classification nor suggests treatment strategies for the different patterns. Another typology based on career pattern was suggested by Glaser (Gibbons, 1988; Jayewardene, 1975; Megargee & Bohn, 1979).

He postulated the following typologies : "adolescence recapitulators", " subcultural assaulters", "addiction-supporting predators", "vocational predators", "organized illegal sellers", "avocational predators", "crisis-vacillation predators", "quasi- insane assaulters", "addicted performers", and " private illegal consumers". Glaser recommended a treatment strategy for each typology. Gibbons (1988) criticized Glaser's typology because his definitions and observations were relatively vague and "lacking in sharpness and specificity". Also using the criminal career pattern as a base for his typology, Gibbons (1965, 1975) formulated a "role-career" typology for juvenile and adult offenders. His formulation included nine delinquent and twenty-one adult role-career types. Examples of the delinquent types are: the "pedatory gang delinquent", "the conflicting gang delinquent", and "the overly aggressive delinquent". The adult types included the "professional thief", "professional heavy criminal", "semiprofessional property criminal", "property offender, one-time loser", "automobile thief" "joyrider", "naive cheque forger", "white-collar criminal", "professional fringe violator", "embezzler", "personal offender one-time loser", "psychopathic assaultist", "violent sex offender", "nonviolent sex offender, rape", "nonviolent sex offender,

statutory rape" and "narcotic addict heroin". Like Glaser, Gibbons provided treatment recommendations for each type. Recently, as a result of research findings, Gibbons (1988) abandoned his "role-career" scheme which he had postulated for approximately forty years. He realized that "many real-life offenders cannot be classified with much precision in (his) role-career" typology.

Currently, some aspects of the legalistic typologies such as seriousness of the offence, the nature of the offence and number of offences committed are included in recognized classification systems.

c. The sociological typologies

Sociologists have designed a few typologies based on sociological variables such as social interactions, subculture taxonomies, and social class differences. Most of these attempts at designing criminal typologies have been made in the area of juvenile delinquents. Very few such attempts have been made to develop adult offender typologies. Some of these typologies have been already mentioned under the legalistic typologies of Clinard and Quinney, Gibbons and Glaser. The most notable adult typologies are those of Lindesmith and Dunham (Roebuck, 1976; Megargee & Bohn, 1979) and Sykes, Sykes and Messinger,

and Scharg (Megargee and Bohn, 1979). Lindesmith and Dunham, using the social-individual continuum, suggested that there are two types of criminals, the "social criminal" and the "individualized criminal". The "individualized criminal" commits his illegal acts for personal reasons while the "social criminal" commits crimes that are supported by his culture. The individualized criminal's acts are not acceptable in his social milieu. Megargee and Bohn pointed out the difficulties involved in using such a classification system.

The second category of the sociological-based typology is based on subcultural taxonomies such as that Cohen and Short (1958). They suggested four delinquent subculture types: the parent-male, the conflict-oriented, the drug-addict, and the semiprofessional-thief subcultures. An example of adult typologies is that of Sykes, Sykes and Messinger, and Scharg (Megargee and Bohn, 1979). They compared different types of offenders based on their role within the prison subculture. They used conformity to the inmate code and language used by inmates and prison staff as a basis for their classification. Scharg postulated a four-type classification system : "the right guys", the "Square Johns", the "con politicians", and the "outlaws", which he termed as "prosocial", "antisocial", "pseudosocial" and

"asocial", respectively. Megargee and Bohn point out that not only is the typology limited to the inmate population, its reliability and validity has not yet been determined even for that group.

Currently no sociological typology is being used in classifying offenders. This may be due to the fact that from the beginning the sociologists were more concerned with concentrating their observations on the attributes of aggregates not on the person (Andrews, Bonta, and Wormith, 1987). This resulted in typologies which have proven to be of no use in real life situations (Gibbons, 1988). Furthermore, it resulted in theoretical typologies which did not offer help in designing practical and operational measurements for classifying offenders.

d. The psychological typologies

The earlier psychologically-based typologies were influenced by the psychoanalytic theories of Freud and his followers. These typologies emphasized the role of unconscious motivation in the commission of crime. Examples are those of Alexander and Staub and Abrahamsen (Ferdinand, 1966). Both systems differentiated "acute" criminals from "chronic" criminals. Acute offenders are not influenced by their internal psychic forces but they get involved in crime

in response to environmental circumstances, by chance or by mistake. Thus, they are called "situational offenders", "accidental offenders", and "momentary offenders". The chronic offenders in both systems are different in that the source of their deviancy stems from internal psychological forces. They have a problem in maintaining a healthy balance between the ego and the unconscious. Alexander and Staub's typology differentiated among five types of "chronic criminals": the organic or toxic, the compulsive or symptomatic, the neurotic acting-out, the normal, and the genuine criminal. Abrahamsen's typology identified four distinct types of chronic offenders: the neurotic, the character disordered offender, the psychotic and mentally defective, and the offender with faulty development of the superego.

Ferdinand (1966) reviewed several other psychoanalytical typologies (e.g., Friedlander and Sanford) and integrated them into three broad categories: the "impulsive delinquent" whose basic personality characteristic is antisocial; the "neurotic delinquent" who suffers from disorganized anxiety; and the "symptomatic delinquent" who violates the law because of pressures from his unconscious. Each of these broad categories includes several subtypes. The "impulsive delinquency" category includes the "unsocialized aggressive

child", the "self-centered indulgent delinquent", the "psychopath", and the "sexual pervert". The "neurotic delinquency" category includes the "inadequate" and the "crystallized" delinquent. The "symptomatic delinquency" category includes the "kleptomaniac", the "pyromaniac", and the "sexual delinquent".

Currently, no psychoanalytical classification system is being used. However some of the concepts used by psychoanalytically based typologies have been utilized in other classification systems such as classifying offenders as neurotic, impulsive, or unsocialized aggressive. The criticism directed at the psychoanalytic theory in general is its lack of experimental and empirical support. Furthermore, some critics have argued that the psychoanalytically based typologies cannot be used routinely in an applied setting because there is a lack of qualified analysts to evaluate offenders on the psychoanalytical criteria for classification (Megargee and Bohn, 1979).

CHAPTER 3

Brief Review of Some of the Current and Commonly Used Classification Systems in the United States and Canada.

Some of the current and commonly used classification systems in the criminal justice system are psychologically based. With the exception of the I-Level they have relied on multivariate statistical techniques in their development. They have been developed in the last three decades. The following section will present a brief description of some of the most commonly known systems in the United States and Canada.

a. The Megargee's Classification system.

Megargee's MMPI-based typology is an empirically-derived criminal classification system. Offenders are classified into one of ten types according to their scores and profile elevations on the clinical scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (the MMPI). The ten types are given arbitrarily nondescriptive names. They are presented in order from the most benign pattern to the most deviant profile. The following is a brief description of each group and treatment strategies suggested by Megargee and Bohn (1979).

1. Type Item. This is the least deviant group. Offenders classified in this group are described as generally stable, well-adjusted with minimal problems in institutions, outgoing, friendly, and nonaggressive. Their offenses are not caused by serious interpersonal problems or psychopathology. They are less assertive and dominant than offenders in other groups. They have positive attitudes toward their parents and low levels of anxiety. They have the "best" MMPI profile. This group has no immediate needs for treatment or a restrictive environment. However, if treatment is warranted, these offenders will do well in rational content therapies such as Reality therapy, Transactional Analysis, and Facilitative Counselling.

2. Type Easy are described as bright and stable. They exhibit good adjustment, get along well with others, and have personal resources, but are lacking in the motivation and discipline necessary to succeed. The suggested treatment plan for this group consists of a brief incarceration period to be followed with supervision in the community. They should be encouraged to make constructive use of their abilities. They may benefit from insight-oriented treatment.

3. Offenders classified in the Baker's group are described as depressed, withdrawn, defensive and rigid, and do not relate well to others. They are the neurotic delinquent

group. Members of this group are inadequate, anxious, and constricted and their criminal involvement increases with age. They have a tendency to abuse alcohol. Treatment should be offered in a supportive environment. They should be offered the opportunity to join substance abuse programs, to upgrade their educational and vocational skills, and to participate in psychotherapeutic programs.

4. Members of the Able group are described as clever, manipulative, opportunistic, daring and amoral. They are achievement-oriented and often adjust well in prisons. They need to be treated in a structured setting. They might profit from a directive, confronting and challenging approach. Staff working with this group should be self assured and comfortable with their roles. These offenders should be closely supervised upon release.

5. George group members are described as hardworking, submissive, fairly well-adjusted and nonviolent, but experiencing situational stress. They should be offered the opportunity for educational and vocational upgrading, and assertiveness training.

6. The Delta group is described as hedonistic, impulsive, manipulative, and bright, but its members have poor relations with others. These offenders should be assigned to

treatment staff who do not get easily intimidated. Reality and confrontational therapies may work well with this group.

7. Jupiter types are characterized as low in violence, but high in internal tension and conflict. They have a deprived background but tend to do better than expected in prison and upon release. This group will benefit from practical programs aimed at capitalizing on their early successes.

8. Foxtrots are described as more assertive, tough, interpersonally maladjusted, cynical, and antisocial. They have extensive criminal records and poor institutional adjustment records. The treatment strategy for this group should include moral and emotional appeals. Behavior modification is recommended. They may function well in self-help groups. In general this group need help in many areas such as socioeconomic, educational, vocational, and interpersonal relationships.

9. The Charlie group is described as hostile, acting-out, aggressive, having deep seated anger, alienated and antisocial. Treatment for this group should be highly structured. The targets for intervention should be their interpersonal relationships, management of stress and coping

10. The How is the most disturbed group. Group members have the highest interpersonal problems, and are described as unstable, and mentally disturbed. This group is more suited

for treatment in a mental health facility. They need a warm environment. They should be offered programs to improve their interpersonal, educational and vocational skills.

Megargee and Bohn (1979) have claimed that their system is useful in differentiating between violent and non-violent offenders within penitentiary settings. They developed a system of reassigning offenders classified by their 10 typology system into three groups. The first group is called "average" and includes offenders classified to Item, Easy and Able types. These offenders are expected to have the least adjustment problems in institutions. The second group "Prey" includes Baker, George, and Jupiter types of offenders. They are expected to have a moderate amount of difficulty. "Predatory" includes Charlie, Delta, and Foxtrot groups of offenders. They are expected to be the most difficult group of offenders to manage in institutions.

Several studies have assessed the reliability of the Megargee system. The first set of studies (Carey, Garske, & Ginsberg, 1986; Dahlstrom, Pantan, Bain, & Dahlstrom, 1986; Van Voorhis, 1988) examined the interrater reliability of classifications. The reported interrater reliabilities varied from 90% to 68% interrater agreement. The second set of studies (Johnson, Simmons, & Gordon, 1983; Simmons, Johnson, Gouvier, & Muzyczka, 1981) investigated the test-

retest stability for less than four months (short-term stability); from four to 10 months (mid-term), and for more than 10 months (long-term stability). The reported percentage changes in classifications varied from 77% to 93%, 81%, and 72% in the long-term, mid-term and short-term respectively. Zager (1983; 1988) argued that the results of these studies are not conclusive because they have major methodological shortcomings. She suggested further studies to address the question of test- retest reliability for Megargee's system (Zager, 1988). The final set of reliability studies (Mrad, Kabacoff, and Duckro, 1983; and Schaffer, Pettigrew, Blouin, & Edwards, 1983) examined the replicability of the system. Overall, these studies provided some support for the reliability of the system. Some subtypes, however, were not replicated. For example, Baker, Easy, and Jupiter subtypes were not replicated in Mrad's et al., study.

Several studies (Booth & Howell, 1980; Edinger, 1979; Edinger, Reuterfors, & Logue, 1982; Megargee & Bohn, 1979; Megargee, 1984; and Walters, 1986) investigated the concurrent validity of the Megargee system by using other psychological measurements, demographic characteristics, self reports and background information. Results were generally supportive. However, there were inconsistencies in

the findings of significant differences between the 10 types. For instance, while Megargee and Bohn (1979) reported a significant difference among the groups on variables such as racial composition, intelligence and offence type, Edinger (1979) and Edinger et al. (1982) reported no significant difference between types on racial composition. Also Booth and Howell (1980) found no significant difference on 13 out of 14 demographic variables and no significant differences on the general offence type. Furthermore Zager (1988) after comparing the results across several studies, she reported that there were some inconsistencies in the characteristics of three groups and characteristics initially reported by Megargee and Bohn (1979).

The predictive validity of the Megargee system has also been investigated. Some studies (Bohn, 1979; Booth & Howell, 1980; Carey et al., 1986; Edinger, 1979; Megargee & Carbonell, 1986; Van Voorhis, 1988; Walters, Scrapansky, & Marrlow, 1986) demonstrated its predictive usefulness. In the most recent study, Van Voorhis found that offenders classified as least disturbed (Item and Easy) were significantly less likely to be involved in disciplinary actions than were the four other groups classified as most disturbed (Charlie, How, Foxtrot, and Jupiter) character disorder (Abel and Delta), and neurotic (Baker and George).

However, other studies did not find Megargee's typology system to be predictively valid (Baum, Hosford, & Moss, 1982; Hanson, Moss, Hosford, & Johnson, 1983; Louscher, Hosford, & Moss, 1983; Motiuk, Bonta, & Andrews, 1986). The first three studies found the system to be ineffective in predicting institutional violence and adjustment. Baum et al. (1982) used Megargee's typology as a predictor of inmates' violence during incarceration. Her finding did not support Megargee's claim of the usefulness of his typology for this purpose. Louscher et al. (1983), after investigating the efficacy of Megargee's typology system, concluded that Megargee's typology groupings were not effective in predicting antisocial aggressive behavior in a penitentiary setting. Hanson et al. (1983), utilizing a sample of offenders, examined the ability of four systems of classification (e.g., demographic variables, Megargee's typology, security designations, and custody classification) in predicting institutional adjustment. They found that custody classification was the best predictor. Moss, Johnson, and Hosford (1984) conducted a similar study to examine the efficacy of Megargee's classification system in predicting the incidence of violence among inmates while incarcerated, future violent activity, adjustment in prisons, and future recidivism. They compared the inmates

classified as most assaultive and violence-prone with those classified as nonviolence-prone individuals, using the Megargee typology system. The results indicated no difference between the two groups in regard to prior violence, institutional violence, recidivism or future violence. Motiuk et al. (1986) also found that the system lacks accuracy in predicting program success and reincarceration among halfway house offenders. These offenders were initially classified by the Megargee system as low and high-risk offenders. Once again, Zager (1988) defended the Megargee system by suggesting that problems in the design and methodological flaws of these researchers limit their overall conclusion that the system is not predictively valid.

Thus, it appears that the question of the predictive validity of the Megargee system in predicting institutional adjustment has not been satisfactorily settled.

The overall results regarding the reliability and validity of the Megargee system suggest that these important psychometric aspects of this classification tool are still to be confirmed.

b. The Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification System (I-level).

The I-level is a theoretically derived typology. It is based on developmental theories. It is a method of subdividing the offender population in terms of personality types. The system is designed to be used in classification of offenders and to offer help in management and effective treatment of offenders. It has the goal of matching the offender to the most appropriate treatment strategy as well as matching the treatment staff according to their skills and interaction styles with specific levels of subtypes (Harris, 1988; Jesness, 1974; Warren, 1971).

The I-Level was developed by Warren. Her original classification system was formulated in 1961. It was developed for use in juvenile correctional programs at the California Department of Youth Authority. The system is based on Sullivan, Grant, and Grant's theoretical model of personality development, which describes a sequence of personality progress in normal childhood development. This theory postulates that individuals progress through seven successive stages of personal maturity during the course of their maturation. The first stage (I1) represent the newborn infant, a completely immature person. Level seven (I7) represents a theoretical ideal level of maturity that is

rarely achieved. According to Warren, most juvenile delinquents have had problems in the developmental stages between I2 and I4 levels of maturity. The delinquent's problems stems from his/her inability to resolve crucial interpersonal problems he/she must pass in order to successfully progress to the next developmental stage. The four most crucial stages are briefly described as follows: I2 is a stage typical of very young children. They view others as a source of comfort and gratification. In the I3 level, children grow and learn that they have power. They also learn how power is structured. The I4 level represents a stage where youths learn to internalize values, aware of their own and others feelings and motives. They tend to apply the learned rules rigidly. In the I5 level, they are less rigid than youths of the previous level. They are tolerant of others and appreciate their views. They are able to feel empathy toward others.

Warren added to Sullivan's theoretical model a set of delinquent subtypes. The outcome is nine subtypes, two subtypes within the I2 level, three at the I3 level and four at the I4 level. The following is a summary of the description of these subtypes and Warren's recommended treatment strategies.

Maturity Level 2 (I2): Asocial aggressive (Aa) and Asocial passive (AP).

Offenders classified in these two subtypes have similar characteristics. They are described as hostile and egocentric, and are concerned with their own needs. Their behavior is impulsive, immature, and demanding of immediate gratification. They feel alienated and blame others for that. The differentiating characteristic between the Aa and the Ap is that Aa reacts to frustration in a hostile and aggressive manner while the Ap complains and withdraws. Warren's (1974) recommended treatment strategy for the I2 subtypes consists of placing them in a low pressure setting which is highly structured. Attempts should be made through teaching rather than psychotherapy to reduce the fear of being alienated.

Maturity Level 3 (I3): Immature Conformist (Cfm), Cultural Conformist (Cfc) and Manipulator (MP).

The immature conformist follows whoever has power. He is concerned with the power structure. He is dominated by his need for social approval. The cultural conformist attributes his problems to external forces. He alienates himself from society but seeks to gain social approval through his delinquently-oriented peers. The manipulator is power-oriented. He seeks to gain control over others which in turn

satisfies his own need for power and control. He is often in conflict with other sources of power. Warren's (1971) suggested treatment for the immature conformist and cultural conformist includes the use of group treatment to increase social perceptiveness and to increase group pressure toward nondelinquent behavior. Warren's treatment recommendations for the manipulator subtype include teaching him skills to use his manipulative skills in a socially-acceptable way. She also suggests that the therapist deal with the childhood traumas which led manipulators to be that way. The goal of the treatment is to encourage the manipulator to be more concerned about others.

Maturity Level 4 (I4): Neurotic Acting-out (Na), Neurotic Anxious (Nx), Cultural Identifier (Ci), and Situational-emotional Reaction (Se).

The neurotic acting-out has a negative self-image. He constantly has feelings of anxiety. His illegal acting out is usually a reflection of his anxiety and internalized conflicts rather than a desire for material gain or a response peer pressure. The neurotic anxious has the same characteristics as the neurotic acting-out. However, he has more feelings of inadequacy or inferiority. He is more willing to search his past for the causes of his current

problems. Warren (1971) suggested that treatment plans for the neurotic subtypes concentrate on the resolution of the neurotic conflict. The cultural identifier identifies with the value system of a deviant subculture. Warren recommends that treatment concentrate on changing the content of the offender's value system. Situational-emotional reaction offenders are involved in illegal behavior as a result of situational crises or accidental circumstances. Warren (1971) feels that treatment may not be necessary for this group. However, it may be offered in the form of helping the offender to solve problems which have led him to commit his illegal acts.

The I-Level is a semistructured clinical interview of 90 minutes in length. The interviewer has to be specially trained for this task. There is no particular set of questions which the interviewer has to follow. However, he/she has to ask open-ended questions and to cover specified content areas such as asking about perceptions of the prison environment, present and prior offences, relationships with family, current situation, peers, school, self-descriptions, history of alcohol and/or drug abuse, employment history, and future plans.

The interviewer aims at determining the way his client perceives himself, others, and his environment. All

interviews are taped and rated by a second rater. The interviewer is expected to make a diagnosis regarding the stage of maturity of his client, and to classify him as a specific delinquent subtype (Harris, 1988, Jesness, 1974, Warren, 1971).

The system has been criticized for being subjective, requiring highly-trained staff, being relatively expensive to implement, and being time-consuming (Harris, 1988; Megargee and Bohn, 1979).

The interrater reliability for all subtypes of the I-Level assessed by the independent judgments of two different raters has been reported by Warren (1971) to be in the mid-80's. Jesness (1974) reported a 67% agreement for level and 37% agreement for subtype. Palmer and Werner (cited in Harris, 1988) suggested a better interrater agreement of 81% for level and 67% for subtype. Harris (1988) reported interrater agreement of 86% for level and 74% for subtype. A more recent study (Van Voorhis, 1988) suggested an interrater reliability of 82% for level and 65% for subtype.

The classification-reclassification reliability for a period of between three to six months for one group and between eight to twelve months for another group have been reported by Warren (1971) to be in the mid-80's and low 90's. Palmer and Warner (Harris, 1988), indicated an

agreement percentage of 91% for level and 75% for subtype for male subjects. For females, the percentage varies from 84%-93% for level and 76%-80% for subtype.

Few studies assessed the validity of the I-Level. Harris (1988) applied the system to males drawn from a general student population and found that only 35% of his subjects fit any of the I-Level subtypes. This was interpreted as lending support to the validity of the system and its subtypes. Jesness and Wedges (Harris, 1988) also reported an agreement between the Jesness Inventory Classification system (JI) and the original I-Level classification system of 67% for level and 47% for subtype. Furthermore, they reported significant differences among subtypes based on the following measures: academic aptitude, background characteristics, an opinion poll questionnaire, the Behavior Checklist, and self-reported delinquency.

More recently, Van Voorhis (1988) examined the predictive and construct validity of the I-Level as a part of her study to assess the validity of five psychological classification systems. The cross-tabular analysis of the relationship between I-Level and other measures indicated a significant relationship between I-Level and both the Conceptual Level and Moral Judgment classification systems. In addition, the neurotic types identified by the I-Level

were significantly related to the Quay Neurotic Anxious type and to clinical diagnoses of neuroses or anxiety previously reported in some inmates' files. However, the I-Level neurotic types were not correlated with neurotic types identified by the MMPI. Also, there was no agreement among I-Level, Quay, and MMPI on classifying offenders as situational types. Furthermore, there was no agreement among the classification systems on the immature dependent, character-disordered, subcultural, power-oriented, and manipulative types. There was a significant relationship between the MMPI's Charlie and Foxtrot types and I-Level's Cultural Identifiers and Subcultural Conformists. There was also a significant relationship between I-Level's Cultural Identifiers and Subcultural Conformists and Quay's Aggressive Psychopath and Manipulators. There were significant agreements between the I-Level subcultural types and diagnoses of psychopath/antisocial personality disorder previously reported in offenders' files.

Considering that Warren's system requires highly trained professionals for the system to be implemented properly plus the reality of current correctional systems which have to deal with a huge volume of offenders and budgetary constraints, it seems that the system is not practical for use for large-scale applications.

c. The Sequential I-Level System

The Sequential I-Level is an extension of the I-Level system. The system is empirically derived but based on the same theoretical principles of the I-Level. Jesness completed the development of his new system in 1974. He aimed at avoiding criticisms directed at Warren's system. His system consists of two paper and pencil psychometric instruments: the Jesness Inventory, and the Jesness Behavior Checklist (Jesness, 1974). Jesness argued that his system is more objective, less expensive, easy to use, easy to learn, does not require clinicians or staff with special skills and training and more practical, particularly when used for large-scale screening. He reported that his inventory has gone through several refinements (Jesness, 1988). The inventory consists of 155 true and false items. It uses two instruments: the Jesness Inventory and the Jesness Behavior Checklist (self-appraisal form). The sequential classification procedure is completed by determining the I-level first then subtypes. The inventory takes 20 to 40 minutes to complete. Staff administering the inventory do not need special training. It can be administered to groups.

The inventory classifies the offender into one of nine subtypes: unsocialized, active; unsocialized, passive; conformist; group-oriented; pragmatist; autonomy-oriented;

introspective; inhibited; and adaptive. For the labels used in I-Level, he substituted alternative terminologies. For example, instead of using neurotic, acting out, immature conformist, cultural conformist and manipulator, he used autonomy-oriented, conformist, group-oriented and pragmatist, respectively.

The Jesness Inventory also provides scores on the following eleven personality/attitude scales: social maladjustment, value orientation, immaturity, autism, alienation, manifest aggression, withdrawal, social anxiety, repression, denial, and asocial index (Jesness, 1974; 1988).

The Sequential I-Level system does not prescribe a specific treatment strategy for each subtype. However, it does provide staff with enough information about the characteristics of offenders to help them to design individualized treatment plans.

Jesness (1988) reported a 3-12 month test-retest stability of 58% in one study and a stability of 65% in another study. He also reported two construct validity studies to indicate that his system is valid. In these two studies, the subtype means differed significantly on all of the variables employed. Some of these variables were socioeconomic background, verbal and numerical aptitude, attitudes towards family, attitudes toward school, and self

concept. Carbonell (1983) cross-tabulated the Sequential I-Level with Megargee's MMPI-based classification system. Results indicated that the least mature I-Level offenders (the undersocialized active and the undersocialized passive) corresponded well to the most disturbed group of the MMPI (the "Predatory" group). Otherwise, there was no notable relationship between the sequential I-Level types and the MMPI groups.

d. The Quay's Adult Internal Management System (AIMS)

The AIMS is an empirically-based typology system. It is designed to be useful for internal management of offenders as well as for classifying offenders to suitable rehabilitation programs (Quay, 1984). The AIMS is an extension of a classification system originally designed for use with juvenile delinquents (Quay, 1964). The system consists of two components: the Correctional Adjustment Checklist (CACL) and the Checklist for the Analysis of Life History Records of Adult Offenders (CALH).

The CACL consists of 41 items which describe specific behavior such as worried, anxious; tries, but cannot seem to follow directions; easily upset; sluggish and drowsy; tense, unable to relax. This list has to be completed by a correctional officer or a caseworker who has been monitoring the offender's behavior for two to four weeks. The officer

is required to circle either 1 if the behavior stated in an item describes the offender or 0 if it does not. Offenders are initially classified into one of the following categories according to their scores on the CACL:

"Aggressive-Psychopathic" (AP), "Manipulative" (M), "Inadequate-Dependent" (ID), and "Neurotic-Anxious" (NA).

The CALH is a 27-item checklist that has to be completed by a case management officer/caseworker who is familiar with the offender's files and reports. It consists of behavioral statements such as has few, if any, friends; thrill-seeking; socially withdrawn; tough, defiant; and expresses lack of concern for others. The case management officer/caseworker after interviewing the offender and examining the available reports, places a checkmark before each behavioral trait that describes the inmate's life history. The CALH helps to initially classify offenders independent of the CACL to either "Aggressive-Psychopathic" (AP), "Inadequate-Dependent" (ID), or "Situational" (S).

The results of both the CACL and CALH determine the final classification of offenders into one of five groups. Offenders in each group are reported to differ in their personality characteristics. The "AP" group is comprised of offenders who are aggressive, confrontational, get easily bored, are hostile to authority, have high rates of

disciplinary infractions, have little concern for others, and are victimizers. Group "M" is made up of offenders who are sly, not directly confrontational, untrustworthy, hostile to authority, have a moderate to high rate of disciplinary infractions, are manipulative, and can be characterized as "con artists" and victimizers. The third group, "ID", includes those who are not excessively aggressive or dependent, who are reliable and cooperative, industrious, do not see themselves as criminals, have a low rate of disciplinary infractions, are concerned for others, and avoid fighting. The "NA" group consists of offenders who are dependent, unreliable, passive, "clinging", have a low-to moderate rate of disciplinary infractions, and are self-absorbed and easily victimized. The "S" group includes those who are constantly afraid, anxious, easily upset, seek protection, have a moderate rate of disciplinary infractions, are explosive under stress, and are easily victimized. Quay recommended using this typology for assignment of offenders to rehabilitation programs and different living quarters within institutions. For internal management, he suggested further reassignment of offenders to three different groups. The "Heavy" (this include the "Ap" and "M" groups); the " Moderate" (the "S" group); and the "Light" (the "ID" and "NA" groups).

Quay prescribed differential programming for the three groups. For example, for the heavy group he recommended individualized education programs, non-repetitive work assignments with short-term goals, individualized behavioral counselling, and advised that staff take a "by the book and no-nonsense" approach in dealing with these offenders. In contrast, for the light group he suggested that they be involved in classroom educational programs, repetitive and team oriented work assignments, group and individual counselling, and that staff communications with them be highly verbal and supportive.

The AIMS offenders are classified into groups designated by numerals rather than names to avoid labelling and negative connotations.

Quay(1984), using the internal consistency measure, Cronbach's alpha, reported a reliability of between .91 and .77 for the CACL and between .72 and .57 for the CALH. To demonstrate the validity of his system, Quay reported that the Heavies group had the highest number of disciplinary reports, committed the most serious institutional infractions, and committed the highest number of aggressive acts within the institution. He also reported a study completed on 100 consecutive admissions to a federal institution in Texas. Results indicated significant

correlations between subscales of his classification system and the criterion variables used (i. e., age, race, IQ, income per month, area of residence, previous arrests, previous incarcerations, and age at first arrest). In addition he presented data collected over a three-year period on samples of offenders from two federal prisons to show the concurrent validity of his system. Results indicated significant differences between offenders scores on the subscale of his system and criterion measures. These measures were In-Program Behavior (in-institution work performance, minor and major disciplinary infractions, and Post-Release Behavior (rearrest, rearrest and confinement, and rearrest for violent crimes.

Recently, Levinson (1988) presented data which supported Quay's argument about the validity of his scale. He reported that as a result of using AIMS in a South Carolina Department of Corrections Institution, the serious incident such as inmate assaults on others, fights, and destruction of property were reduced by 18%. During a year and half of the AIMS use in the same institution, the serious incidents rate per 1,000 was cut in half. Also, the percentage of disciplinary reports received by inmates in the Heavies group ranged from 60% to 90%, while the Moderates ranged from 4% to 9%. Levinson suggested that these results attest

to the construct validity of the AIMS. To further support his claim that the AIMS is valid, Levinson reported data from a federal prison system which indicates that assaults on staff and inmates were sharply reduced because of using the AIMS. Other results indicated a considerable difference between the "Heavies" group and the "Moderates" on accrued misconduct reports, serious infractions, and post-release adjustment measured by rearrest percentage.

e. Level of Supervision Inventory Classification System (LSI).

The LSI is a Canadian classification system which was developed by Andrews and has been in use by the Ontario correctional system since 1980 (Andrews, 1983). The LSI has an empirical and a theoretical base. The theoretical base stems from the social learning perspective. The inventory consists of 58 items. It helps to classify released offenders according to their need for different levels of supervision. The system is comprised of eleven psychosocial and legal categories: Criminal History, Education/Employment, Financial, Family/ Marital, Accommodation, Leisure/Recreation, Companions, Alcohol/Drugs, Emotional/Personal, Probation Conditions, and Attitudes/Orientation. The Inventory is completed through an

intake interview between the case management officer and the offender. Each item is assigned a weight of either 0 or 1. The final score on the LSI is calculated by simple summation of scores obtained. Officers completing the inventory are free to report their views regarding negative or positive circumstances not given sufficient attention in the LSI. This gives the officer the opportunity to override any classification. Offenders are assigned to level of supervision according to their scores on the Inventory. Offenders may be classified into one of the following levels "Low" (0-7), "Moderate" (8-11), "High" (12-23), and "Very High" (24+) (Andrews, 1982). The higher the level of classification, the higher the risk of recidivism and the need for services (Andrews, 1983).

Several studies (Andrews, 1983; Andrews, Kiessling, Mickus, & Robinson, 1985, 1986; Andrews & Robinson, 1984; Bonta & Motiuk, 1983, 1985; Motiuk, Bonta, & Andrews, 1986) assessed the reliability and validity of the LSI. In regard to the reliability, Andrews (1983) and Andrews and Robinson (1984) suggested that the LSI has good reliability in terms of interrater and internal consistency estimates. His investigation of the stability of LSI scores indicates an impressive correlation between .99 and .95 between the ratings of the same rater over a period of less than one

month ($n = 16$ to 25). He also reported a correlation of $.94$ between different raters seeing offenders ($n = 5$) in the same situation and at approximately the same time, and a correlation between $.88$ and $.80$ between the ratings of different raters seeing offenders in different situations at different times ($n = 14$ to 19). In addition, Andrews and Robinson (1984) reported a test-retest stability for a period of more than 10 months of 44% change in classification ($n = 57$) and an internal consistency alpha of $.72$ ($n = 598$). Bonta and Motiuk (1985) reported an overall reliability coefficient (alpha) of $.71$.

With regard to the validity of the LSI Andrews (1983) and Andrews and Robinson (1984) presented two sets of results which attest to the predictive validity of the LSI in terms of inprogram recidivism. In both studies inprogram recidivism rates increased significantly with LSI risk identifications collected at the intake assessment. Andrews' first report is based on a sample of 561 Ottawa probationers. Offenders identified as very high ($n = 35$), high ($n = 210$), moderate ($n = 105$), and low risk ($n = 211$) by the LSI had a 60% , 33% , 15% , and 06% in-program recidivism, respectively. In the second report, Andrews and Robinson had a validation sample of 97 offenders. Using the LSI, offenders identified as very high risk ($n = 5$), high

risk (n= 33), moderate risk (n = 22), and low risk (n = 37) had 80%, 48%, 18% and 05 % in-program recidivism respectively. The predictive validity of the LSI has also been demonstrated by Andrews's and Robinson's (1984) follow up study on the 561 Ottawa probationers. Results indicated that offenders identified as very high risk (n = 35), high risk (n = 210), moderate (n = 105) and low risk (n =211) at the intake assessment had a postprogram recidivism rate of 74%, 49%, 24%, and 23%, respectively.

Another support for the predictive validity of the LSI came from Bonta and Motiuk (1983). Thirty percent of offenders (n = 119) classified by LSI as high risk were responsible for 60% of incidences of institutional misconduct and 84% of total days spent in segregation.

Bonta and Motiuk (1985) administered the LSI along with other psychometric tests to incarcerated offenders who were placed in halfway houses, and inprogram and postprogram success was followed up. The results indicated that the LSI score was predictive of success at halfway houses. They found that as offenders scores on the LSI increased, their success rates at the halfway houses decreased. They also found that LSI score was predictive of reincarceration. As the offenders score on the LSI increased, the percent of reincarcerated offenders increased. Finally, they found a

significant correlation between the subcomponents of the LSI and similar components of other psychometric measures. These results lend support to the construct validity of the LSI subcomponents.

Another support for the validity of the LSI came from research conducted by Motiuk, Bonta, and Andrews (1986). They investigated the relative and incremental predictive criterion validities of the LSI and the Megargee MMPI-based classification system. Generally, the LSI was found to have better incremental validity than the Megargee system in terms of halfway house outcome, and reincarceration.

Andrews, Kiessling, Mickus, and Robinson (1985) also provided evidence of the predictive validity of the LSI utilizing the level of supervision and recidivism and correctional outcomes criteria. With regard to the levels of supervision criterion, they reported significant correlations between offenders scores on the LSI and each of the following measures: casebook entries, mean frequency contacts with probation officers, early termination of supervision (negative correlation), level of institutional custody and length of sentence. With regard to the criterion of recidivism and correctional outcomes their results clearly indicate a positive relationship between offenders scores on the intake LSI scores and the rates of recidivism.

As offenders scores on the LSI risk level increased the recidivism rates also increased.

Andrews, Kiessling, Mickus, and Robinson (1986) investigated the construct validity of the LSI in relation to other measures of similar construct. The results provided evidence for the construct validity of the LSI.

The LSI is unique in that it is not narrow in its approach to classifying offenders (i. e., it is not only a psychological, sociological or legal classification system, but takes into account all of these approaches). In addition, it is the only system which allows staff administering the inventory to override the classification reached by the LSI if they feel it is warranted. The LSI has been well established for use throughout community corrections in Ontario.

f. The Wisconsin Classification System

The Wisconsin system has four basic components: a risk scale; a reassessment risk scale; an assessment of client needs scale; and a client management classification scale. Although these four systems are integrated into a comprehensive package, a single feature of the overall package could be implemented alone (Baird, 1982; Baird, Heinz, & Bemus, 1981).

1. The Risk Scale

This scale was developed to assess the offender's propensity for future criminal behavior. The scale is comprised of the following 11 items: number of address changes in last 12 months, percentage of time employed in last 12 months, alcohol usage problems, other drug usage problems, attitude, age at first conviction, number of prior probation/parole revocations, number of prior felony convictions, convictions or juvenile adjudications for burglary, theft, auto theft, or robbery, worthless checks or forgery, conviction or juvenile adjudication for assaultive offences within the last five years. With the exception of the last item, each item has a weight which varies from 0-2, 0-3, or 0-4. The total score on the last item is 15 points. The officer administering the scale selects the appropriate answer to each item and enters the associated weight in the score column. For example, the offender is assigned 15 points on the last item if he has been convicted for an assaultive offence within the last five years. If he has not been involved in such a conviction, he is assigned a 0 weight on this item. The total score on this scale determines the offender's level of supervision while on parole or probation. Cut-off scores are: seven and below (minimum), eight-14 (medium), and 15 and above (maximum).

2. The Reassessment Risk Scale

This scale was developed and used to assess offenders' overall adjustment to supervision in the community. The scale is administered every six months, thus providing offenders with the opportunity to change their level of supervision while on parole. The scale consists of 12 items. Eight items of this scale are almost identical to items on the risk assessment scale. The new items are problems in inter-personal relationships, social identification, response to court or bureau-imposed conditions, and use of community resources. Since this scale shifts the emphasis from criminal history to items that reflect offenders' adjustment while on parole/probation most of the items dealing with criminal history are deleted.

3. The Needs Scale

This scale is designed to identify problems with which offenders may need help so as with to increase their chances for success on parole/probation. The scale consists of 12 items which cover areas of need such as academic/vocational skills, employment, financial management, marital/family relationships, companions, emotional stability, alcohol usage, drug usage, mental ability, health, sexual behavior, and agent's impression of client's needs. Again, officers select the appropriate answer and enter the associated

weight in the score column. Higher scores on each item indicate a need to be addressed. Cut-off scores on this scale are: 14 and below (minimum), 15-29 (medium), and 30 and above (maximum). Based on the offender scores on this scale and on the risk scale, the offender is assigned to one of four supervision levels and a treatment plan is devised (Baird, 1981).

The needs scale is the only one of the three for which reliability data have been reported. Baird et al. (1981) reported an interrater reliability of 87 % when 45 to 57 raters listened to nine tapes representing different interviews with offenders.

With regard to the validity of the scales, Baird et al. (1981) reported a decrease in the percentage of distribution of offenders to supervision levels using the Wisconsin risk-assessment scale. They found that 38.2 %, 32.3%, 22.1%, and 7.40% of the offenders were classified into low, moderate, moderately high, and high levels of supervision respectively. Wright, Clear, and Dickson (1984), however, reported a pattern of almost even distributions on the same classification schema. Wright and his colleagues also investigated the validity of the Wisconsin Risk Scale on a sample of probationers from New York. The criterion variable was success versus failure while on probation. They found

that many of the variables included in the scale did not predict success or failure on release.

4. Case Management Classification Strategies for Case Supervision (CMS).

The development of this system began in Wisconsin in 1975 (Lerner, Arling and Baird, 1986). The Correctional Service of Canada has been using this system since the middle of 1986. This system is known in Canada as Case Management Strategies System (CMS). The goal of the developers of this tool (i.e., Lerner and his colleagues) was to develop a system which would assist probation and parole officers in developing case plans and utilizing effective supervision strategies. Since the implementation of the system in Canada, it has been used on offenders within institutions as well as offenders in the community.

The construction of the CMS system started by generating a pool of items which have the potential for differentiating among basic offender types. These items were selected by the CMS development team which consisted of two clinical psychologists, a line officer, and research staff. A forced-choice scale to measure these items, utilizing information obtained from interviews with offenders was developed. In order to assist in obtaining reliable ratings, a semi-structured interview with scripted questions was developed.

In addition, a "Scoring Guide" was developed to improve inter-rater reliability. The final version of the CMS consists of 71 items divided into four sections (see Appendix F).

Attitude section: This consists of 45 questions which the offender has to answer during the semi-structured interview session. These questions deal with the offender's attitude about his offences, offence history, family, interpersonal relationships, current problems and future plans.

Objective History: This consists of 11 objective background and offence history items. Information obtained for this section deals with the offender's legal, medical, school, and family history and current marital status.

Behavioral Observation: This consists of eight behavior ratings of the offender as observed by the interviewer. They deal with the offender's grooming and dress, self-confidence, attention span, comprehension, thought process, affect, self disclosure, and cooperation.

Officer's impression of the offender's range of problem areas. This section includes seven items which deal with the observer's rating of the offender: social inadequacy, criminal orientation, emotional factors, family history problems, isolated situational circumstances, and interpersonal manipulation (misuse of others).

After the completion of the interview, items are scored using the "Scoring Guide". The items are scored in a positive or negative direction for each group. A positive score for a particular group predicts that the offender is more likely to fall into that group. A negative score indicates the opposite. Each score that is either positive or negative is weighted one, two, or three. These weights were based on the ability of an item to discriminate between groups and the degree of inter-rater reliability. The criterion to establish an item weight of three was to attain an item reliability of .90 or better and item validity of $P < .001$ or better. An item weight of two was given to items which attained a reliability of .80 or better and item validity of $P < .01$ or better. Items that achieved a reliability of .75 or better and a validity of $P < .05$ or better were given a weight of one.

After the completion of the scoring, the offenders are classified according to one of four classification subtypes. This classification is the basis of five treatment strategy groups.

The first subtype is the Selective Intervention group (SI). The most prominent characteristic of clients in this group is that they generally tend to have relatively stable and pro-social life styles, are usually steadily employed,

and have minimal involvement with the law. Their offences are generally motivated by some isolated and stressful event or a relatively specific neurotic problem. The SI group includes two subgroups of offenders, although the scoring system does not differentiate between them: the Selective Intervention-Situational (SI-S) and the Selective Intervention-Treatment (SI-T). The SI-S subgroup includes offenders whose legal problems stem from a temporary lapse or an unusually stressful circumstance occurring in their lives. The SI-T sub group includes offenders whose offence is caused by a more continuing neurotic need or compulsion and offenders who have one or more of the following problems: a sexual offence history, serious drug or alcohol abuse, serious emotional disturbances, or an assaultive offence history.

The second subtype is the Casework/Control (C.C) group. The predominant characteristic of offenders in this group is the general instability in their life situations (i.e., inability to hold employment, financial irresponsibility, unwillingness to accept self-responsibility, and emotional problems). They are habitually involved with alcohol or drugs. Their offence pattern includes a considerable number of arrests for summary offences and more serious crimes. Offences stem from serious long-term emotional problems,

chemical dependency or negative self-perception. Although they have enough job skills, their emotional problems prevent them from maintaining steady employment. They have frequently suffered from a chaotic childhood, a pattern which tends to be repeated in their own families.

The third subtype group is the Limit Setting (LS). Offenders in this group display a fair degree of comfort with a criminal life style. They view "being a successful criminal" as a major goal in their lives in preference to achieving success in a more conventional manner. The expression of guilt over criminal activities is generally superficial. They are not motivated to use their abilities in a pro-social manner, although they are capable of functioning adequately in society. They tend to minimize or deny personal problems and assign the blame for their criminal activities to others or to circumstances. They function well in institutions because they adapt to dealing with the system.

The fourth subtype is the Environmental Structure (ES). Offenders in this group lack social and vocational skills. They are intellectually deficient. Their illegal behavior is the result of their inability to function and use sound judgment about the motives of others. They are easily led by more sophisticated associates. They demonstrate little

foresight about consequences of criminal activity and tend to be very impulsive in their behavior. They have difficulty in learning from past experiences.

Although the CMS is promoted as a valid "model system" it has not been subjected to extensive research. Lerner et al. (1986) reported the results of three studies aimed at evaluating the use of the CMS process. The first study was conducted by the American National Institute of Corrections and was carried out on line staff who were trained to be CMS trainers to examine their opinions regarding its use. Of the 474 staff who responded, 94% rated the CMS description of behavior and attitudes as "accurate". The interview was rated as good by 47% and excellent by 33%. The majority (92%) of the respondents recommended the CMS training to other officers. A similar percentage rated the system as helpful, and only 8% rated it as "not helpful".

In the second study, high risk probationers (identified by the Wisconsin Risk Assessment Scale) were randomly assigned to one of three groups: Regular supervision, Intensive supervision and CMS/Intensive Supervision. The third group was different from the second in that it increased staffing, referrals and contacts and was combined with the use of the CMS assessment and case planning procedures. Three measures of adjustment (revocation, full-

time employment, and income at termination) were analyzed to provide data on the efficiency of intensive supervision and the use of the CMS. The results indicated that the CMS/Intensive supervision group performed significantly ($P < .05$) better than the regular supervision group on the three measures of adjustment. However, no significant differences were obtained when the CMS/Intensive and Intensive groups, and intensive and regular supervision groups were compared.

The third study was conducted on two groups of parolees released from Texas prisons. The first group of 1176 offenders were supervised by officers trained in the use of CMS, and 1375 parolees were supervised by officers who had not been trained in this system. A comparison between these two groups of parolees at low, moderate and high-risk levels, using a measure of pre-revocation warrants issued, indicated that the group supervised by staff trained in CMS performed significantly better than the other group overall and at the high and moderate risk levels.

A recent study by Andrews, Hoge, Robinson, and Andrews (1988) of Canadian correctional staff involved in the implementation of the CMS indicated an overall

dissatisfaction with the CMS. More than half of the respondents felt that it was not worth the effort to use this system. Seventy-one percent felt that by using the CMS, the amount of time required to manage individual cases had increased. Fifty-one percent were clearly negative with regard to the contributions and effectiveness of the CMS, given current program resources. Similarly, 43% were clearly negative regarding the contributions of CMS to program development. Eighty-two percent expressed some lack of confidence regarding whether different officers would classify a particular offender in the same way with CMS. Compared with past practices, 37% saw it as very negative. With regard to the contributions of CMS to identify risk level, 50% felt that it is not at all useful, and 54% thought it is not at all useful in identifying violent offenders.

A Recent study by Loza and Andrews (1989) examined the concurrent validity of the CMS subtypes in relation to a number of clinically-relevant dimensions of personality. One hundred and thirty-six offenders incarcerated in a protective custody multi-level security federal Canadian penitentiary in Ontario were classified into four groups using the CMS (i. e., SI, ES, CC, and LS). They were later tested using the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory and

their psychological and administrative files were reviewed. The results indicated that the CC and LS groups were statistically indistinguishable in regard to number of prior convictions and on the Millon measures of antisocial propensity and substance abuse. Both the CC and LS groups had a greater number of prior convictions than both the SI and ES groups. The SI group scored lowest of the four groups on number of prior convictions, measures of antisocial propensity and substance abuse. Consistent with the CMS, on average ES was the youngest of the groups, had achieved the lowest level of education, and had the least stable record of employment. There were no significant differences between the four subtypes at the .01 level on any of the emotional disturbance subscales. The LS group scored generally lowest on these subscales, which is consistent with the clinical picture of the "cool" antisocial type. These results provided evidence for the antisocial and substance abuse dimensions of the CMS subtypes. The findings regarding emotional disturbance, however, were decidedly negative for the validity of the CMS. There was no strong evidence that CMS types differ in fundamental personality patterns or emotional disturbance. This finding raises serious doubts about the ability of the CMS interview and rating scales to

differentiate psychologically except on the antisocial, social incompetence, and substance abuse dimensions.

CHAPTER 4

Communalities Among Classification Systems

A theoretical examination of the descriptions of subtypes in each system looking for communalities among the offender classification systems presented here was attempted. The outcome of this attempt suggests the existence of some similarities which cut across most of the classification systems. The following is a review of these findings.

Three classification systems (Megargee's MMPI-based, Quay's AIMS, Lerner et al.'s CMS) are empirically derived; two have theoretical and empirical bases (Jesness' Sequential I-level; Andrews' LSI); and only one is theoretically based (Warren's I-level).

With the exception of the Megargee (objective) and the Warren (subjective) systems, the measures are both objective and subjective. Two systems (Andrews and Lerner et al.,) provide the opportunity for staff to report their views. The LSI provides a section for staff input regarding negative or positive circumstances not given sufficient attention in the LSI. The CMS devotes two sections for staff to report their behavioral observations and impressions of their clients.

Warren's, Jesness's, and Quay's systems were originally developed for use with juvenile delinquents. The rest (Andrews', Lerner et al.'s, and Megargee's) were developed for use with adult offenders.

Jesness' and Megargee's systems could be completed by having offenders respond directly to a set of written questions. The rest of the systems must be completed by an interviewer.

The number of items included in each system varies considerably. Megargee's consists of the lengthy 566 true/false MMPI questions; Jesness' has 155 true/false questions also; LSI, AIMS, and CMS have 58, 68, and 71 items, respectively. Warren's has no particular number of questions.

Time required to administer the assessment can range from approximately three quarters of an hour to two hours, depending on the system used. Megargee's takes approximately two hours, Warren's takes approximately an hour and a half, and the rest take approximately 45 minutes or less.

Systems also differ in the time required after the administration to complete the assessment such as time required to score and interpret the MMPI; time required to listen to the taped interview; in Warren's system, time to be rated by a second rater, and for the other systems time

required to review offenders' files. Warren's and Megargee's systems each require substantially more time after the administration time than the other assessments. They are followed by Jesness', Quay's, Lerner et al.'s and Andrews's systems.

Both the Megargee's and Warren's systems require extensive training and staff with special skills (i. e., clinicians) to credibly and reliably implement them. The other systems do not need such requirements.

Considering the time needed for offenders and staff to complete the assessment, the need for staff with particular skills, the extensivness of training required from staff, and cost of testing materials or computer time purchased, it is notable that the LSI, CMS, AIMS, and Sequential I-level are more economical to complete than the Megargee and Warren systems.

The systems differ on the number of possible classifications. The Megargee's system classifies offenders into 10 types, Warren's and Jesness's each has nine subtypes, Quay's has 5, and each of the LSI and the CMS classifies offenders into four groups.

Both Megargee's MMPI-based and Quay's AIMS systems have secondary systems for further reassignment of offenders. The ten subtypes classified by Megargee's system could be

reclassified to only three groups. Quay's five subtypes could be reassigned to three groups. These reclassification were both designed to help in the internal management within penitentiary settings by separating the violent offenders (the heavies) from the non-violent offenders (the lights). The other systems studied do not reclassify in this way.

Differential treatment strategies for each subtype or group of offenders have been recommended by all the systems. Megargee, Warren, Quay, and Lerner et al., suggested a specific treatment strategy for each subtype. Andrews and Jesness did not prescribe a specific treatment plan for each diagnostic category. However, information obtained from their inventories help staff to design individual treatment plans which meet the needs of individual offenders.

The AIMS, MMPI-based, I-Level, and Sequential I-Level systems rely heavily on the personality characteristics of offenders in their classification. The LSI and CMS consider other factors as well, such as criminal history, education/employment, companions, financial problems, alcohol/drug abuse, and leisure activities.

Andrews et al. (1990) have identified four principles for an effective classification system, risk, need, responsivity, and professional override. All systems acknowledge the importance of matching offenders' level of

risk with level of service and level of supervision needed. Also all systems to different degrees, attempt to match the offender's criminogenic needs with the target of service. Warren's, Megargee's, Jesness', and Quay's systems consider the responsivity principle of matching offenders' abilities with types of services from the point of view of personality characteristics. Andrews and Lerner et al.'s systems consider additional factors such as employment, education, and vocational abilities. Only the LSI system gives staff the opportunity to override the classification made by the system based on professional judgement.

Communalities among classification systems according to description of personality characteristics of subtypes of offenders were investigated following Warren's (1971) model. Findings suggested the existence of similar broad categories among most of the systems.

The first category is the Asocial Aggressive type. This category corresponds to Warren's asocial, aggressive and asocial, passive category; to Jesness's unsocialized, active, unsocialized, passive; to Quay's aggressive-psychopathic; to Megargee's Foxtort, Charlie, and How groups; and to Lerner et al.'s LS group. Andrews' very high risk group may correspond to this category.

The Conformists nondelinquently-oriented and delinquently-oriented form the second category. Warren has two subtypes for this category: the conformist, immature and conformist, cultural. Jesness classifies them under conformist and group-oriented. Quay's system classifies these type of offenders under neurotic anxious or inadequate-dependent subtypes. Megargee's system classifies the nondelinquently-oriented offenders under Item and Easy groups. Lerner and his associates classify these offenders under the inadequate group (i. e, environmental structure group).

The third category is the antisocial-manipulator. This category corresponds to Warren's manipulator; Jesness' pragmatist; Quay's manipulative; Megargee's Able and Delta; Lerner et al.'s LS; and possibly CC subtypes.

Neurotic offenders form the fourth category. Included in this category are offenders who have been classified by Warren as neurotic acting-out and neurotic anxious; by Jesness as autonomy-oriented and introspective; by Quay as neurotic-anxious; by Megargee under groups George, Baker, and Jupiter; and by Lerner and his associates as Casework/Control.

The fifth category is comprised of Situational offenders. This category comes under situational, emotional

reaction in Warren's system, situational/inhibited in Jesness' system; situational in Quay's system; Item, Easy and George groups in Megargee's system; selective intervention- situational group in the Lerner et al.'s system; and low risk offenders of Andrews' system.

CHAPTER 5

Justification, Goals and Literature Review
Regarding Criterion Variables

The CMS system which has been recently introduced into the Canadian Federal Correctional system has not been subjected to extensive research that explores its effectiveness on Canadian offenders. The few available independent research results shed some doubt on its effectiveness. For example, Andrews et al. (1988) reported dissatisfaction among Canadian staff implementing the CMS system. Serious doubts exist regarding the usefulness of this system and that some measure of its effectiveness is vital. Another example could be drawn from Loza's and Andrews's (1989) findings which again raise serious doubts about the ability of the CMS to differentiate between four subtypes of offenders. The authors of that study recommended that the clinical utility and the predictive criterion validity of the CMS should be further explored by comparing the CMS with standard risk and need scales and with psychometric instruments. Also, there are some indications that models developed for one offender population can not necessarily be applied to other offender populations (Wright, Clear & Dickson, 1984).

The purpose of this study is to conduct a comprehensive exploration of the effectiveness of the CMS subtypes as they apply to Canadian federal offenders.

First, the reliability and item validity of the CMS will be explored using five analyses: the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient; subscale/subscale correlation; correlation between parts of the same subscale; item analysis (i. e., the distribution of responses to the CMS items a, b, or c, items which are actually contributing to parts of each subscale, will be linked with CMS subtypes); and comparison between CMS subtypes total scores on the CMS four subscales.

The second series of explorations will deal with the concurrent validity of the CMS. Here the CMS subtypes are compared on demographics, crime histories, alcohol and drug abuse, emotional disturbance and antisocial potential scales of the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI; Millon, 1982), Andrews' Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI; 1982), Nuffield's General Statistical Information on Recidivism scale (SIR, 1982), Hare's Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R; 1985a, 1985b), and the CMS subscales.

The third series of explorations focusses on the predictive criterion variables of the CMS subtypes. Three

sets of criterion variables will be used: within-prison adjustment, post-release adjustment, and violent recidivism.

Thus, the present research will be aimed at:

- a. Examining the reliability and item validity of the CMS.
- b. Assessing the concurrent validity of the CMS subtypes, i.e., are groups classified by the CMS distinct in their personal characteristics?. The concurrent validity is criterion-related validity. It is established by measuring a test against another well established test, known for its validity (Cronbach, 1984).
- c. Assessing the predictive validity of the CMS pertaining to offenders' adjustment during incarceration. The research question here is: Is it possible to predict offenders' institutional adjustment during incarceration using their scores on the CMS subtypes?

Researchers investigating offenders' institutional adjustment have used several criterion variables to measure it. Wright (1988) looked at rule infraction reports with specific emphasis on number of assaults on staff or inmates, number of charges of inmate altercations and refusal to obey orders, and number of sick calls during a specific period. Van Voorhis (1988) utilized disciplinary dispositions and the occurrence of victimizations. Carey et al., (1986) used several measures: nights spent in cell, number of cell

changes, number of times attending institutional court, referrals to psychologists or psychiatrists, and emergency placement into a segregation area or psychiatric facility when the offender is considered at high risk for harming himself or others. Walters et al., (1986) used three measures: measures of institutional adjustment (total number of days spent in a hospital ward for psychiatric reasons), vocational/social adjustment measures (ratings of staff at work locations and housing units), and disciplinary adjustment measures (rules violation or infraction). Megargee and Carbonell (1985) and Carbonell, Megargee, and Moorhead (1984) utilized record of disciplinary infractions reported, number of days spent in disciplinary segregation, number of days on which each offender reported sick, ratings of adjustment and behavior made by custodial staff, and similar reports completed by work supervisors or teachers for inmates involved in educational programs. Moss et al. (1984) used participation in a racial riot, number of disciplinary reports, and days spent in segregation. Adams (1983) looked at history of escape or attempted escape, assaultive infractions (injury or threat of injury), and punishment awarded for any rule violation. Hanson et al., (1983) used number of disciplinary reports, days spent in segregation, days of forfeited good-time, and work

performance rating. Louscher et al., (1983) looked at number of incident reports, types of incident reports, number of admissions to segregation, and number and type of any complaints submitted by offenders. Ekland, Barrick, and Cohen (1983) looked at total incidents and assault reports and time spent in solitary confinement. Booth and Howell (1980) looked at critical chronological notes, minor write-ups, major write-ups, transfer to a higher security institution because of disciplinary problems, transfer to a protective custody institution, and hospitalization for a period of time in a psychiatric ward. Holland and Holt (1980) used rating by classification staff of offenders, escape incidents, and transfer to higher or lower security institutions. Flanagan (1980) looked at creating a disturbance, refusing to obey an order, being out of place or absent from assigned area, refusal to work, participating in a strike or unauthorized assembly, interference with an employee doing duty, creating trouble with staff including verbal abuse, fights or assaults, escape or attempt escape, and possession of contraband. Megargee and Bohn (1979) used officer ratings of offenders' interpersonal adjustment, offender participation in institutional programs, number of disciplinary reports, number of sick calls, and time spent in own cell. Edinger (1979) looked at rule infractions

resulting from: verbal aggression, group defiance, evasive action (such as being in an unauthorized area, pilfering, and possessing contraband), and total number of infractions of any type. Akman (1977) looked at number of homicides and assaults committed. Adams (1977) measured rule violations using assaults on inmates, assaults on staff, holding hostages, robbery, threatening personnel, arson, murder, and willfully damaging state property. Andrews and Young (1974) used number of misconduct reports serious enough to warrant appearance before the superintendent's disciplinary board such as fighting, possession of contraband, or insolence. They also used correctional officers' ratings of the offender's behavior regarding his relationships with peers and staff.

d. Examining the predictive validity of the CMS as it applies to the offender's post-release adjustment. The important question here is: Is it possible to predict recidivism using an offender's scores on the CMS subtypes?.

Researchers investigating the offender's post release adjustment have used different criteria to measure it. Clayton and Carr (1987) used returning to prison for any reason. Motiuk et al., (1986) also used returning to prison but distinguished between breaching halfway house regulations and committing a new offence. Hill (1985)

reviewed several research projects pertaining to juvenile, young adult, and adult recidivism. Criteria measurements used were offender returned to prison, committing or admitted to committing a new offence, parole violation, revocation of parole, offender defined as a failure by supervisor during parole, and re-arrest. Moss et al., (1984) looked at number and types of arrests and convictions that have occurred since the offender's release. Adams (1983) utilized absconding, returning to prison, new conviction, and FBI reports of parole or mandatory release violation. Anderson (1982) looked at number of arrests on parole, violation of parole, and number of months working on parole. Davis (1980) used removal from parole. Gendreau, Madden and Leipziger (1980) and Gendreau and Leipziger (1978) developed and used a Canadian recidivism index which included re-imprisonment for a new conviction, technical parole violation accompanied by further charges, absconding, and a new conviction for crime. Wormith and Goldstone (1984) modified and used Gendreau's and Leipziger's (1978) index. Megargee and Bohn (1979) looked at rates of re-arrest, re-conviction and re-incarceration. Babst, Moseley, Schmeidler, Neithercutt, and Koval (1976) looked at minor and major parole violations. Beck and Hoffman (1976) used new conviction, return to prison, absconding, and death as a

result of a criminal act. Blumstien and Clarson (1971) looked at rearrests, new convictions and new sentences. Mack (1969) used failure on parole as a result of negative recommendations of parole supervisors.

e. Examining the ability of the CMS to predict violent behavior upon release. The question here is: Is there a correlation between CMS subtypes and violent recidivism?

Two major problems exist in using violent behavior as a criterion variable. The first is that violent behavior is hard to define. There is a lack of agreement among clinicians as to what constitutes violent behavior and the definition of violent acts (Krakowski, Volavka, and Brizer, 1986; McGuire, 1976; Megargee, 1970). Clinicians have complained about the lack of objective legal definitions regarding the precise nature, extent or object of the violent act (Honig, 1982; Dershowitz, 1974; Dix, 1977). Honig (1982) and Monahan (1981) reviewed the psychological and legal literature and cited several examples in support of this claim. For example, in some legal cases "violent act" was defined to include only injury to others; in other cases, it was defined as causing injury to others or the destruction of property; it was also defined as causing both physical and psychological injury. Violent fantasies, thoughts or threats have also been considered as examples of

2

**PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT**

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

PIONEERS IN METHYLENE BLUE TESTING SINCE 1974

15020 COUNTY ROAD 5, BURBANK, CA 91507, USA
TEL: 818 435 7887 FAX: 818 435 7887 TLX: 510000000

violent behavior. Even writing a bad cheque has been considered dangerous behavior because of its negative effect on the economy. Monahan (1981) suggested that the lack of a precise definition as to what constitutes violent behavior invites personal and subjective considerations to take place. This results in confusion and conflict among clinicians (Megargee, 1970). It also results in arbitrariness and unfairness in the use of violent behavior for making predictions (Levine, 1984; Quinsey and Maguire, 1986).

The second problem involved in the use of violent behavior as a criterion is the lack of adequate psychometrics specifically designed to measure violent behavior (Hinton, 1983; Quinsey, 1979).

Researchers who have used violent acts as a criterion variable measure it by different means. For example, Louscher et al., (1983) defined as violent any crime against a person. Others used psychological measurements such as the MMPI-based scales and Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory. Others used previously constructed lists of violent acts. Such lists are usually extracted from criminal codes. For example, Loza (1981) used Offence Severity Scale (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980) and Wormith (1990) used a list of violent offences.

The present study will consist of four sub-studies. The first will be devoted to the reliability and item validity of the CMS. The second will focus on the concurrent validity of the CMS. The third will assess the predictive validity of the CMS pertaining to offenders' adjustment during incarceration. The fourth will examine the predictive validity of the CMS as it applies to the offender's post-release adjustment and violent recidivism.

CHAPTER 6

STUDY I

Reliability of the CMS and Item Validity

Method

Subjects

One thousand and twenty-five male offenders who were incarcerated in the federal correctional system, Ontario region and had the CMS completed during the period from January 1, 1987 to December 31, 1989 were identified and formed the pool of subjects. Six hundred and three of these subjects' CMS answer sheets were selected randomly.

Procedure and Statistical Analysis

Five analyses were performed. In the first, the internal consistency method was utilized. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was used on each of the eight CMS subscales separately (i. e., SI+, SI-, ES+, ES-, CC+, CC-, LS+, and LS-). This process involved dividing the questions into items (i.e., responses... a, b, etc.). As a result a list of two, three, four and five-level questions was created. Items were then traced to their original subscales. Loadings of either 1, 2 or 3 with their negative or positive signs were assigned to each item as originally suggested by the constructors of the CMS (Appendix G). The Cronbach alpha

was then applied using items contributing to the construction of each subscale.

In the second level of analysis cases with missing data regarding group membership were deleted and a correlation matrix between the total scores of the subscales of the CMS was generated. The third level of analysis involved a correlation between parts of the same subscale (i.e., between SI+ and SI-, ES+ and ES-, CC+ and CC-, and LS+ and LS-). In the fourth level of analysis the distribution of responses to the CMS questions was linked with CMS subtypes. Then the usefulness of items (i.e., item a, b, or c) actually contributing to parts of each subscale (e.g., SI+ or SI-) in differentiating between the CMS subtypes was investigated. The distribution of responses of the CMS items contributing to parts of each subscale was linked with CMS subtypes. This procedure required the generation of eight tables. Each table included items which actually contributed to one part of a subscale. Chi-square and Scheffe methods were used for these analyses. The application of the Scheffe's test was preceded by applying the general linear model procedure. The Scheffe's test was used to detect where significant differences between the subtypes existed. The Scheffe's test was preferred to breaking big tables into 2X2 tables as a mean for detecting subtypes differences. Using

the latter method would not have controlled for Type I error. Consequently, some results would have been significant only by chance. The decision to favour the use of Scheffe's over other a posteriori tests was made because it is most general method of multiple comparisons. It also enables one to make all possible comparisons between individual means as well as between combinations of means. Another advantage of Scheffe's is that it is a conservative test (i.e., it is less likely than other tests to show differences as significant). Scheffe's can also be used for equal as well as unequal number of subjects in each group (Kepple, 1982; Kirk, 1982; Pedhazur, 1982), which is the case in this study. Chi-square 2X2 analysis was also used for pairs of groups comparisons on each item included in tables which actually contributed to one part of a subscale. This was an extra analysis performed, in spite of the problem of breaking big Chi-square table into 2X2 tables, to check on the validity of results obtained from the Scheffe's. In the fifth level of analysis, a comparison between CMS subtypes' total scores on the CMS four subscales was completed. One-way Anova and Scheffe were utilized for this analysis.

Results

Internal consistency of the CMS

The reliability coefficient alphas were .85, .73, .51, .18, .49, .59, .54, .31 for SI+, SI-, ES+, ES-, CC+, CC-, LS+, LS- subscales, respectively. The mean inter-item correlations were .14, .05, .04, .006, .05, .07, .03, .02 for SI+, SI-, ES+, ES-, CC+, CC-, LS+, LS- subscales, respectively. The SI+ and SI- parts of the SI subscale achieved the highest internal consistency. With the exception of the CC- part of the CC subscale all other parts had very low internal consistencies. Appendix H includes eight tables which report the Item/ Total correlations for the parts of the CMS subscales.

Subscale/subscale correlation

The subscale/subscale correlation matrix is reported in Table 1. The most notable observation here is that the SI subscale has negative correlations with the other subscales.

Same subscale part/part correlation

The correlation between parts of the same subscale were ($r = -0.90$, $P < 0.0001$), ($r = -0.50$, $P < 0.0001$), ($r = -0.56$, $P < 0.0001$), ($r = -0.67$, $P < 0.0001$) for the SI+ and SI-, ES+ and ES-, CC+ and CC-, and LS+ and LS-, respectively.

Item validity of items actually contributing to parts of CMS subscales

Table 2 reports the distribution of responses of CMS subtypes to the CMS questions and Appendix I include eight tables, each includes the distribution of positive responses to items which actually contributed to one part of the CMS subscale. The results of item validity of items actually contributing to parts of CMS subtypes indicated that the CMS subtypes were significantly different on 93.55%, 87.5%, 86.21%, 86.21%, 87.5%, 94.74%, 91.67%, 89.66% of the items of the SI+, SI-, ES+, ES-, CC+, CC-, LS+, and LS-, respectively. However, the Scheffe's a posteriori results indicated a very high percentage of items across the parts of the CMS subscales which did not significantly differentiate between the subtypes. A few important observations should be noticed. First, 35.48 and 68.75% of items of the SI+ and SI-, respectively, failed to distinguish between the SI subtype and other subtypes of the CMS. Also, 48.77% and 88.24% of the items of the ES+ and ES-, respectively, failed to discriminate between the ES subtype and other CMS subtypes. Similarly 88.96% and 100.00% of the items of the CC+ and CC- respectively did not differentiate between the CC subtype and the other subtypes. Consistent with these results 83.33% and 93.1% of the items

of the LS+ and LS-, respectively, did not distinguish between the LS subtype and the other subtypes of the CMS (Table 3). The results obtained from the pairs of groups comparisons using Chi-square 2X2 tables produced similar results to those obtained by the Scheffe's a posteriori. Subtypes total scores on the CMS subscales

Table 4 reports the results for this analysis. The most important observation is that the SI, ES, CC and LS subtypes were significantly different from the other subtypes on their respective subscales.

Table 1: CMS's Subscale/Subscale Correlation Matrix

	SI (n=151)	ES (n=40)	CC (n=165)	LS (n=177)
SI	--			
ES	*** - .16	--		
CC	*** - .64	*** .18	--	
LS	*** - .52	* - .12	** .15	--
X	43.44	40.16	50.23	50.03
SD	25.92	9.92	8.27	9.19

***= P is significant at 0.0001 level

** = " " " " " 0.001 "

* = " " " " " 0.01 "

Table 2: Distribution of Responses to CMS Interview Items and Results of χ^2 of Case Management Strategies By CMS Subtypes

	CMS SUBTYPE				χ^2 Value (df)	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡		
1. Motivation for crime:						
1-Emotional	50.69	35.14	45.40	27.01		
2-Material	37.50	43.24	27.61	56.90	41.50	0.000
3-Both	11.81	21.62	26.99	16.09		
2. Acceptance of responsibility						
1-Admits	55.33	43.59	46.95	46.29		
2-Use excuses	34.00	51.28	46.95	38.29	14.63	0.023
3-Denies	10.67	5.13	6.10	15.43	(6)	
3. Expression of guilt						
1-express guilt	48.98	25.64	20.61	21.84		
2- " " no "	34.01	64.10	70.91	71.84	60.60	0.000
3-victimless crime	17.01	10.26	8.48	6.32	(6)	
4. Prior offences						
1-none	41.33	5.00	1.86	2.87		
2-summary	23.33	40.00	24.22	4.02	204.28	0.000
3-no pattern	13.33	12.50	11.80	12.64	(9)	
4-indictable	22.00	42.50	62.11	80.46		
5. Violence used						
1-yes	40.18	42.50	56.44	67.63	23.75	0.000
2- no	59.82	57.50	43.56	32.37	(3)	

Table 2 cont'd/2

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2 Value (df)	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %		
6. Offences						
1-planned	27.36	30.00	17.79	30.00		
2-no pattern	20.75	17.50	20.25	16.18	35.05	0.000
3-impulsive	51.89	52.50	61.96	36.99	(6)	
7. Offences while on Alco/drugs						
1-never	45.79	25.64	14.11	40.23		
2-50% or <	14.02	41.03	24.54	26.44	53.64	0.000
3-> 50%	40.19	33.33	61.35	33.33	(6)	
8. Offences committed						
1-alone	59.22	38.46	60.12	37.93		
2-no pattern	15.53	17.95	18.40	24.71	24.73	0.000
3-with others	25.24	43.59	21.47	37.36	(6)	
9. Favorite subject in school						
1-vocational	13.33	12.82	19.51	13.71		
2-academic	79.33	43.59	54.88	56.57	47.85	0.000
3-gym	2.67	17.95	9.14	7.32	(9)	
4-no favorite	4.67	23.08	18.29	20.00		
10. Attitude toward teachers						
1-no favorite	43.92	63.89	53.99	53.89		
2-liked some	43.24	27.78	34.36	32.34	7.50	n/s
3-close relation	12.84	8.33	11.66	13.77	(6)	

Table 2 cont'd/3

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2	
	SI	ES	CC	LS	Value	<P
	(n=151)	(n=40)	(n=165)	(n=177)	(df)	
	%	%	%	%		

11. School performance						
1-no problem	64.34	18.92	20.00	14.02		
2-learning probs	7.69	43.24	6.88	10.98	153.1	0.000
3-lack interest	27.97	37.84	73.13	75.00	(6)	
12. Primary vocation						
1-unskilled	19.21	65.00	52.73	47.43		
2-semi-skilled	35.76	25.00	29.09	36.00		
3-skilled	41.72	0.0	13.94	10.86	99.43	0.000
4-no employment	0.66	10.00	3.64	5.14	(12)	
5-student	2.65	0.0	.61	.57		
13. Working						
1-> 90%	73.47	2.70	15.43	14.29		
2-50%-90%	21.09	32.43	35.80	30.86	194.08	0.000
3-50% or <	5.44	64.86	48.77	54.86	(6)	
14. Vocational problems						
1-none	74.29	16.67	16.25	15.38		
2-lack skills	5.00	50.00	9.38	6.51	226.87	0.000
3-attitude	20.71	33.33	74.38	78.11	(6)	
15. Living stability						
1-stable	82.00	28.21	28.22	44.89		
2-some instablity	11.33	23.08	30.67	25.00	105.50	0.000
3-unstable	6.67	48.72	41.10	30.11	(6)	

Table 2 cont'd/4

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				$\bar{X}$	
	SI	ES	CC	LS	Value	<P
	(n=151)	(n=40)	(n=165)	(n=177)	(df)	
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$		

16. Self supporting						
1-always	88.00	20.00	25.45	33.33		
2-not always	10.00	37.50	47.88	38.98	163.10	0.000
3-not	2.00	42.50	26.67	27.68	(6)	
17. Feelings - father						
1-close	75.17	60.00	30.19	45.40		
2-natural	24.14	35.00	52.20	47.24	75.69	0.000
3-hostile	.69	5.00	17.61	7.36	(6)	
18. Discipline used by father						
1-verbal	70.21	51.52	34.27	45.65		
2-permissive	12.77	18.18	20.98	21.01	40.10	0.000
3-physical	17.02	30.30	44.76	33.33	(6)	
19. Feelings - mother						
1-close	90.48	69.23	51.25	61.85		
2-neutral	8.84	20.51	40.63	32.95	60.11	0.000
3-hostile	.68	10.26	8.13	5.20	(6)	
20. Discipline used by mother						
1-verbal	77.08	61.54	48.98	48.48		
2-permissive	12.50	17.95	32.65	41.82	46.07	0.000
3-physical	10.42	20.51	18.37	9.70	(6)	
21. Abuse by parents						
1-yes	8.67	25.64	38.27	24.57	37.13	0.000
					(3)	

Table 2 cont'd/5

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	X ² Value (df)	<P

22. Parental view						
1-good child	92.67	57.50	49.69	51.74	82.10 (6)	0.000
2-problem "	5.33	37.50	41.61	43.60		
3-parents differed	2.00	5.00	8.70	4.65		
23. Describe self						
1-good child	95.36	62.50	65.03	59.20	60.18 (3)	0.000
2-problem "	4.64	37.50	34.97	40.80		
24. Feelings - siblings						
1-close	74.83	66.67	36.42	47.16	61.04 (9)	0.000
2-neutral	21.77	23.08	56.79	47.73		
3-hostile	.68	7.69	1.85	2.84		
4-no sibling	2.72	2.56	4.94	2.27		
25. Attitudes toward childhood						
1-happy	94.59	62.50	57.50	76.44	59.49 (3)	0.000
2-not happy	5.41	37.50	42.50	23.56		
26. Satisfaction with childhood						
1-satisfied	69.13	32.50	31.25	32.77	71.70 (6)	0.000
2-dissatisfied with material	5.37	2.50	1.25	2.26		
3-dissatisfied with self&others	25.50	65.00	67.50	64.79		

Table 2 cont'd/6

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				³ X Value	³ Value	
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	(df)		<P

27. Own description of personality							
1-multi-faceted	77.78	41.03	43.75	51.74	43.99		0.000
2-superficial	22.22	58.97	55.63	48.26	(3)		
23. S's associates							
1-non-criminal	71.52	15.38	20.13	19.43			
2-mixed	23.84	35.90	50.31	49.14	141.58		0.000
3-criminals	4.64	48.72	29.56	31.43	(6)		
29. Interactions with friends							
1-used by others	4.67	25.00	15.34	13.71			
2-withdrawn	2.67	12.50	9.82	7.43	29.58		0.001
3-problems	6.67	7.50	10.43	7.43	(9)		
4-normal	86.00	55.00	64.42	71.43			
30. Relations with friends							
1-share feelings	58.00	32.50	46.95	40.68			
2-do things together	19.33	47.50	20.12	27.68	23.99		0.001
3-has none	22.67	20.00	32.93	31.64	(6)		
31. Interpersonal relationships							
1-satisfied	86.00	75.00	76.69	87.50	9.79		0.02
2-unsatisfied	14.00	25.00	23.31	12.50	(3)		

Table 2 cont'd/7

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2 Value (df)	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %		
32. Outlook toward others						
1-trusting	67.79	48.72	40.24	44.57		
2-mixed	24.16	23.08	21.34	22.86	43.45	0.000
3-mistrusting	8.05	28.21	38.41	32.57	(6)	
33. Relationships with opposite sex						
1-long term	74.67	42.50	45.40	51.70		
2-mixed	16.67	12.50	26.99	26.14	45.41	0.000
3-short term	8.67	45.00	27.61	22.16	(6)	
34. Interaction W opposite sex						
1-dominants	25.50	7.50	27.61	32.95		
2-adequate	65.10	65.00	53.99	58.38	23.54	0.001
3-dominated	9.40	27.50	18.40	8.67	(6)	
35. Client view self as anxious						
yes	28.00	33.33	27.12	48.78	23.68	0.001
					(6)	
36. When depressed						
1-seek help	22.76	7.89	12.27	15.34		
2-seek activity	46.90	39.47	36.20	46.02	25.09	0.003
3-use alco/drugs	10.34	13.16	23.31	12.50	(9)	
4-isolate self	20.00	39.47	28.22	26.14		
37. Self-destructive behavior						
1-never contem- plated suicide	80.54	79.49	64.20	79.31		
2-had thoughts	8.05	7.69	13.58	9.77	15.51	0.02
3-attempted it	11.41	12.82	22.22	10.92	(6)	

Table 2 cont'd/8

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				^L X Value	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	(df)	

38. In handling anger						
1-aggressive	8.67	15.00	27.44	36.57		
2-has trouble	28.00	60.00	46.34	26.29	77.47	0.000
3-no problem	63.33	25.00	26.22	37.14	(6)	
39. Description of self						
1-emphasizes strength	65.56	20.00	37.20	61.58		
2-emphasizes inadequacy	23.18	35.00	35.37	16.38	56.34	0.000
3-can't describe	11.26	45.00	27.44	22.03	(6)	
40. Openness in discussing feelings						
1-open	96.39	77.50	89.09	74.01	37.58	0.000
2-evasive	3.31	22.50	10.91	25.99	(3)	
41. S'view of immediate problems						
1-personal	30.46	35.90	47.24	36.72		
2-relationships	16.56	17.95	19.63	15.82		
3-voc/ed/employ	10.60	30.77	6.75	10.17	34.76	0.001
4-financial	7.95	2.56	6.13	6.78	(12)	
5-no problems	34.44	12.82	20.25	30.51		
42. Attitudes to solving problems						
1-optimistic	80.56	60.00	60.25	73.26		
2-unclear	15.28	35.00	33.54	20.93	19.09	0.004
3-pessimistic	4.17	5.00	6.21	5.81	(6)	

Table 2 cont'd/9

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2	
	SI	ES	CC	LS	Value	<P
	(n=151)	(n=40)	(n=165)	(n=177)	(df)	
	%	%	%	%		

43. Future plans						
1-short term	29.80	55.00	46.63	37.71		
2-unrealistic	3.97	12.50	16.56	21.14	4.84	0.000
3-long term	66.23	32.50	36.81	41.14	(6)	
44. Completes things he begins						
1-yes	90.67	37.50	36.59	43.50	113.52	0.000
					(3)	
45. Expectation re supervision						
1-no effect	27.89	5.00	24.39	27.68		
2-\$+program help	23.13	22.50	21.34	23.16		
3-keep him	22.45	30.00	22.56	18.64		
out of trouble					20.08	ns
4-negative	4.76	17.50	10.98	14.12	(12)	
5-mixed	21.77	25.00	20.73	16.38		
46. Age of earliest court appearance						
1-14 or <	7.33	42.50	32.32	50.00		
2-15-17	17.33	32.50	51.22	36.36	225.55	0.000
3-18-22	27.33	25.00	12.80	9.66	(9)	
4-23 or >	48.00	0.0	3.66	3.98		
47. # of prior offences						
1-none	36.24	2.50	2.44	1.14		
2-1-3	34.90	25.00	11.59	5.68	229.80	0.000
3-4-7	17.45	17.50	20.12	16.48	(9)	
4- 8 or >	11.41	55.00	65.24	76.70		

Table 2 cont'd/10

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2	
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	Value (df)	<P

48. # of commitments						
1-none	68.46	30.00	12.00	15.24	169.01 (6)	0.000
2-1	20.13	32.50	26.22	20.00		
3-2 or >	11.41	37.50	58.54	68.00		
49. Time spent on parole						
1-none	54.73	12.50	7.93	2.27	175.22 (9)	0.000
2-1 year or <	18.92	27.50	29.27	29.55		
3-1-3 years	18.24	32.50	31.71	44.89		
4-> 3 years	8.11	27.50	31.10	23.30		
50. Medical history						
1-headaches/ back/stomach problems	33.77	30.00	47.27	33.90	9.53 (3)	0.02
2-head injury	10.60	5.00	19.39	18.64	9.35 (3)	0.03
3-psychiatric	6.62	12.50	21.21	16.95	14.02 (3)	0.003
4-psychotherapy	5.30	5.00	21.82	12.99	21.60 (3)	0.000
5-none of above	57.62	62.50	31.52	49.15	26.89 (3)	0.000
51. Highest grade completed						
1-9 or <	26.17	80.00	48.78	48.02	84.34 (9)	0.000
2-10-12	40.27	17.50	45.12	42.94		
3-higst school graduate	11.41	0	1.22	4.52.		
4-post secondary	22.15	2.50	4.88	4.52		

Table 2 cont'd/11

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2	
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡	Value (df)	<P
<hr/>						
52. Special education						
1-yes	10.14	41.03	24.07	23.73	21.43 (3)	0.000
53. S raised by						
1-biological family	86.58	55.00	49.69	54.29	53.86 (3)	0.000
2-others	13.42	45.00	50.31	45.71		
54. Parents history						
1-being on welfare	4.00	17.50	15.85	16.38	14.60 (3)	0.002
2-criminals	.67	15.00	17.68	11.86	25.13 (3)	0.000
3-psychiatric hospitalization	4.00	7.50	12.80	9.60	7.76 (3)	0.05
4-suicide attempts	1.33	5.00	12.20	3.95	18.79 (3)	0.000
5-drinking problems	18.00	30.00	47.56	37.85	31.62 (3)	0.000
6-none of the above	74.00	60.00	34.76	48.02	52.72 (3)	0.000

Table 2 cont'd/12

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2	
	SI	ES	CC	LS	Value	<P
	(n=151)	(n=40)	(n=165)	(n=177)	(df)	
	%	%	%	%		

55. Have brothers/sister arrested						
1-none	78.91	45.00	46.30	48.30	54.85 (9)	0.000
2-some	17.01	50.00	39.51	41.48		
3-most	0	2.50	10.49	6.82		
4-n/a	4.08	2.50	3.70	3.41		
56. Marital status						
1-never married	33.78	67.50	56.71	48.02	32.95 (6)	0.000
2-divorced/sep	26.35	10.00	18.29	11.30		
3-married	39.26	22.50	25.00	40.68		
57. Grooming						
1-below average	3.36	10.00	6.79	5.65	9.04 (6)	n/s
2-average	85.23	87.50	88.27	87.01		
3-above average	11.41	2.50	4.94	7.34		
58. Self-confidence						
1-lacks	7.38	35.00	11.73	7.34	33.11 (6)	0.000
2-average	84.56	55.00	84.57	84.18		
3-overly conf.	8.67	9.76	3.66	11.11		
59. Attention span						
1-easily distracted	2.68	17.50	6.83	4.52	28.08 (6)	0.000
2-average	73.83	72.50	80.75	86.44		
3-attentive	23.49	10.00	12.42	9.04		

Table 2 cont'd/13

<hr/>						
CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	χ^2 Value (df)	<P
<hr/>						
60. Comprehension						
1-below average	2.68	17.50	5.63	7.34		
2-average	75.17	80.00	85.00	83.62	30.04	0.000
3-above average	22.15	2.50	9.38	9.04	(6)	
61. Thought process						
1-sluggish	4.03	17.50	5.00	5.08		
2-average	89.93	82.50	91.88	90.96	14.54	0.02
3-accelerated	6.04	0	3.95	3.13	(6)	
62. Affect						
1-depressed	6.04	5.00	5.56	2.84		
2-average	93.29	92.50	92.59	93.75	5.10	n/s
3-elated	.67	2.50	1.85	3.41	(6)	
63. Self disclosure						
1-evasive	4.03	20.00	9.88	18.75		
2-average	70.47	75.00	69.14	71.59	35.89	0.000
3-very open	24.43	5.00	20.99	9.66	(6)	
64. Cooperation						
1-negativistic	.68	2.63	1.91	4.07		
2-average	78.08	86.84	87.26	87.21	17.25	0.05
3- eager to please	20.55	10.53	10.83	8.72	(6)	

Table 2 cont'd/14

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2	
	SI	ES	CC	LS	Value	<P
	(n=151)	(n=40)	(n=165)	(n=177)	(df)	
	%	%	%	%		

65. Social inadequacy						
1-v.significant	4.70	45.00	8.02	6.82		
2-significant	4.70	25.00	19.75	12.64		
3-somewhat "	8.72	10.00	25.93	11.36	149.61	0.000
4-of little "	17.45	12.50	25.31	28.41	(12)	
5-not signif.	64.43	7.50	20.99	39.77		
66. Vocational inadequacy						
1-v.significant	2.68	35.00	11.11	10.17		
2-significant	4.03	45.00	15.43	8.47		
3-somewhat "	6.04	15.00	13.58	11.30	154.03	0.000
4-of little "	15.44	5.00	27.16	33.33	(12)	
5-not signif	71.81	0	32.72	36.72		
67. Criminal orientation						
1-v.significant	6.71	33.33	18.63	63.84		
2-significant	5.37	33.33	27.33	15.25		
3-somewhat "	16.11	15.38	34.78	15.25	298.81	0.000
4-of little "	20.81	10.26	13.04	4.52	(12)	
5-not signif	51.01	7.69	6.21	1.13		
68. Emotional factors						
1-v.significant	48.99	50.00	90.00	46.02		
2-significant	6.71	35.00	6.25	18.75	147.26	0.000
3-somewhat "	12.08	7.50	1.88	11.93	(12)	
4-of little "	4.70	0	.63	13.07		
5-not signif	27.52	7.50	1.25	10.23		

Table 2 cont'd/15

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>					χ^2	
	SI	ES	CC	LS	Value	<P
	(n=151)	(n=40)	(n=165)	(n=177)	(df)	
	%	%	%	%		

69. Family history problems						
1-v.significant	.67	17.99	27.16	10.17		
2-significant	9.40	20.51	27.78	22.03	117.86	0.000
3-somewhat "	11.41	12.82	16.05	15.25	(12)	
4-of little "	18.12	7.69	9.26	26.55		
5-not signif	60.40	41.03	19.75	25.99		
70. Temporary circumstances						
1-v.significant	59.46	0	4.32	2.84		
2-significant	12.84	10.26	7.41	3.41	284.24	0.000
3-somewhat "	8.11	15.38	12.35	5.11	(12)	
4-of little "	8.11	17.95	16.67	5.68		
5-not signif	11.49	56.41	59.26	82.95		
71. Interpersonal manipulation						
1-v.significant	6.71	0	3.13	22.16		
2-significant	6.71	12.82	15.63	35.23	144.42	0.000
3-somewhat "	25.50	17.95	27.50	21.59	(12)	
4-of little "	19.46	15.38	33.75	10.23		
5-not signif	41.61	53.85	20.00	10.80		

a, b and c= Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Table 3. Items of Parts of the CMS Subscales Which Did Not Significantly Differentiate Between CMS Subtypes.

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>			
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡
<u>Items of CMS Subscales</u>				
SI+	35.48			
SI-	68.75			
ES+		48.27		
ES-		88.23		
CC+			86.96	
CC-			100.00	
LS+				83.33
LS-				93.10

Table 4: Means, Standard Deviations, Results of ANOVAS and Pairs of Groups Comparisons of Offenders Scores on the CMS Subscales By CMS subtypes

CMS SUBTYPE								
SI (n=151)		ES (n=40)		CC (n=165)		LS (n=177)		F (df=3)
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	
SI								
a		b		b		b		***
77.18	17.01	33.93	15.55	29.01	13.69	30.25	13.75	363.2
ES								
b		a		b		b		***
37.29	15.55	60.25	8.24	40.20	8.58	38.04	7.91	93.9
CC								
c		b		a		b		***
42.88	6.82	51.35	5.89	57.74	5.52	49.24	5.54	166.3
LS								
c		b		b		a		***
42.56	6.62	46.65	6.16	47.67	5.82	59.37	5.86	226.5

***= P is significant at 0.0001 level.

a, b and c = Scheffe's Pairs of groups comparisons.
Different letters indicate that means of these groups are significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Discussion

The goal of this study was to examine the reliability and item validity of the CMS. Looking at the results of the coefficient alphas suggested that the CMS has very low internal consistency. With the exception of the SI+, SI- and CC- (i. e., the two parts of the SI subscale and one part of the CC subscale) all other parts did not achieve the commonly acceptable internal consistency of $\geq .60$ and above. One of the parts (i.e., ES-) achieved an internal consistency of only .13. These results shed serious doubts on the reliability of three of the four CMS subscales. This, according to Ghiselli, Campbell, and Zedeck (1981), means that the internal structure of the CMS is not up to acceptable standards. Also, as explained by Anastasi, 1982; Brown, 1976; Cronbach, 1984; and Nunnally, 1978, this means that the items of the same components of most of the CMS subscales are not sufficiently correlated. These results cast doubt on the reliability of the CMS for classifying offenders into four subtypes.

Inspection of the subscale/subscale correlation matrix suggests a high negative correlation between the SI group and the CC and LS subtypes and a low negative correlation between the SI group and the ES subtype. These results provide support for the distinguishability of the SI from

the CC, LS, and ES subscales. The correlations between the LS and CC and ES and CC were positive but they were too low to be considered meaningful. The correlation between LS and ES was negative and also too low. These results also provide some support for the distinguishability of the CC subscale from both the LS and the ES subscales, and the distinguishability of the ES subscale from both the LS and CC subscales. The interpretation of the matrix as a whole suggests the existence of four distinctive subscales. The biggest distinction is between the SI versus CC, LS and ES subscales. This lends some support to the reliability of the CMS as a tool for measuring four distinct subtypes of offenders.

Examination of the correlation between parts of the same subscale (e. g., SI+, SI-) indicates a high negative correlation between the two parts of each of the CMS subscales. This finding lends support to the CMS constructors' claim that items included in the negative parts of the subscales are measuring characteristics opposite to those being measured by the positive parts of the same subscale. This result also lends support to the reliability of the CMS.

The results of the item analysis of the CMS items which are actually contributing to parts of each subscale were disappointing. The important question here was: do offenders classified to CMS subtypes differ on the items which actually measure characteristics unique to these subtypes?. The very high percentage of items across the parts of the CMS subscales which did not significantly differentiate between the subtypes did not answer "yes" for this question. This is particularly true when one consider the high percentage of items contributing to parts of the four subscales which failed to significantly discriminate between their own respective subscale and the rest of subscales. The results of this study were decidedly against a conclusion of item validity of the CMS for a high percentage of the items of the CMS.

Looking at tables used for the item analysis of the CMS items which are actually contributing to parts of each subscale provided some support for the validity of the description of the SI subtype as the most benign of the CMS subtypes. Items of the SI+ which clearly discriminated between the SI subtype and the other subtypes gave a profile of offenders who express guilt for their crimes, have no history of prior offences, have no problems at school, have an excellent work history, have no vocational problems, have

a stable living background, have a stable and happy childhood, do not have criminal associates, have long term future plans, were 23 or older at their earliest court appearance, have no prior offenses, no prior commitments and no prior time spent on parole, were raised by their biological family, have no brothers or sisters arrested, have no significant vocational inadequacy, and have no significant criminal orientation. Temporary circumstances were very significant in the commission of their crimes. In the opposite direction Items of the SI- which discriminated between the SI subtype and the other subtypes were items which characterize a group of offenders who express no guilt feelings, have a poor work record and an unstable life style, have been viewed by their parents as problematic children, describe their own childhood as problematic and unhappy, have criminal associates, were less than 14 years of age at their earliest court appearance. have eight or more prior offenses, have two or more prior commitments, have grade 10-12 education, were not raised by their biological parents, and have brothers and sisters who were arrested. In addition, temporary circumstances were not significant in the commission of their crimes. These items, which were found to significantly discriminate between the SI subtype and other subtypes either from the SI+ or the

SI-, parts provide a description of offender characteristics which are consistent with Lerner et al's (1986) description of the SI subtype of offenders.

Examining the items contributing to the ES+ and which were found to discriminate between the ES subtypes and the other subtypes gave a profile of offenders who have vocational problems. In their relations with friends they do things together but have less emphasis on sharing feelings. Have short term relationships with opposite sex. Cannot describe themselves. They view their immediate problems as vocational and educational. Their highest grade completed is grade 9 or less. They lack self confidence. They get easily distracted. They have sluggish thought processes. Their vocational inadequacy plays a significant role in their legal difficulties. Also, emotional factors have a significant role in their legal problems. Items of the ES- which discriminated between the ES subtype and the other subtypes provided a profile of offenders who believed that being in prison had no effect on their lives and who had two or more prior commitments. Vocational inadequacy was not a significant factor in their criminal involvement.

Inspecting the items which contributed to the CC+ and which were found to discriminate between the CC subtypes and the other subtypes gave a profile of offenders who committed

more than 50% of their offences while on alcohol/drugs. Emotional factors played a significant role in their involvement with the law. No Items of the CC- were found to discriminate between the CC subtype and the other subtypes.

Examining the items which contributed to the LS+ and which were found to discriminate between the LS subtypes and the other subtypes gave a profile of offenders whose criminal orientation played a significant part in their involvement with the law. Temporary circumstances were not significant in their criminal activities, but interpersonal manipulation played a significant part in their criminal involvement. Items which contributed to the LS- and which were found to discriminate between the LS subtypes and the other subtypes gave a profile of offenders whose prior offences were mainly summary offences. Emotional factors played a significant role in their involvement with the law.

The characteristics which were found to discriminate between the ES, CC and LS and the other subtypes are generally consistent with Lerner et al.'s (1986) description of these subtypes. However, these items were not many. On the contrary, most of the items involved in these subscales did not discriminate between the subtypes.

Inspection of the scores of the four subtypes of offenders on the CMS subscales (Table 4) indicated that the

SI, ES, CC and LS subtypes were significantly different from the other subtypes on their respective subscales. On the SI and ES subscales there was no significant differences between the other subtypes. On the CC subscale the ES and the LS subtypes were not significantly different from each other. Likewise, on the LS subscale the ES and CC did not significantly differ. These results lend some support to the validity of the CMS.

The overall results of the reliability and item validity studies cast serious doubts on the reliability and item validity of the CMS as the criteria for classifying offenders into four subtypes.

CHAPTER 7

Study II

Concurrent Validity of the CMS Subtypes

Method

Subjects

One hundred sixty offenders incarcerated in federal correctional institutions in the Ontario region and classified by the CMS as either SI, CC or LS were selected randomly. In addition, thirty one offenders classified as ESs were included in this study. Twenty offenders declined to participate and eight were dropped from the study because they were illiterate or their responses on the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory, a personality inventory used for this study, were not valid. Thus the total number of subjects was 163 from a population of approximately 2970 offenders incarcerated in Ontario institutions during the period from the middle of January to the end of March 1991. The process of subject selection was completed by asking case management officers and supervisors from each institution to provide a list of inmates on their case loads whom they recalled having had the CMS completed. They were also asked to identify inmates whom they recalled as being classified as of the ES subtype. All inmates identified as

belonging to the ES subtype were asked to participate in this study. This was due to the scarcity of this type of offender. The selection of offenders from other subtypes was completed in a randomized manner. Percentages of offenders involved in this study compared to the total number of offenders incarcerated in each institution were 8.89%, 8.33%, 6.55%, 5.88%, 7.23%, 8.57%, 8.77%, and 9.09% for Kingston Penitentiary, Millhaven, Collins Bay, Joyceville, Warkworth, Bath, Frontenac, and Pittsburgh institutions respectively. The first institution is a multi-level and the second is a maximum security institution. The next three are medium. The last three are minimums. Demographic characteristics and offender's criminal history are provided in Tables 5 and 6.

Instruments

In addition to the CMS, file information, Andrews' Level of Supervision Inventory (1982, Appendix J), Nuffield's General Statistical Information on Recidivism scale (1982, Appendix K), Hare's Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R; 1985a, 1985b; Appendix L) and the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI; Millon, 1982) were used.

Information about the Andrews' Level of Supervision Inventory has been reported in detail earlier in this paper.

The Nuffield's Scale consists of 15 items which when

scored provide five levels of risk for recidivism: very good, good, fair, fair to poor, and poor. This scale has been in use by the National Parole Board of Canada to help its members reach a decision regarding the granting of early release to offenders. Recent independent research by Hann and Harman (1989) has confirmed the validity of Nuffield's system in predicting recidivism.

The Hare Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R) consists of 20 items which assess characteristics of psychopaths (Appendix L). To complete the PCL-R, a psychologist conducts an interview with the offender and reviews his file. Three scores are obtained as a result of the assessment: a. Total scores, which are obtained by summing up all individual PCL-R item scores. b. Factor 1, which describes individuals who are selfish, callous, and remorseless regarding their use of others. c. Factor 2, which describes individuals who are chronically unstable, antisocial, and lead a socially deviant lifestyle. The inter-rater reliability of the PCL has been reported to be in the high .80s to .93 (Schroeder, Schroeder, & Hare, 1983) and greater than .90 (Serin, 1990). Both Schroeder et al., and Serin have reported a high correlation with the DSM-III Antisocial Personality Disorder diagnosis. This supports the validity of the PCL-R.

The Millon Inventory reflects basic personality patterns and clinical syndromes as described in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual [(DSM-III), American Psychiatric Association, 1980]. The scale is designed to be used by clinicians in their assessment of individuals with emotional and interpersonal difficulties. It consists of 175 items and has 20 clinical subscales. The first eight subscales numbered from one to eight measure the Basic Personality Patterns. Scale 1: Schizoid (asocial); Scale 2: Avoidant; Scale 3: Dependent (submissive); Scale 4: Histrionic (gregarious); Scale 5: Narcissistic; Scale 6: Antisocial (aggressive); Scale 7: Compulsive (conforming) and Scale 8: Passive-Aggressive (negativistic). The next three scales measure Pathological Personality Disorders. Scale S: Schizotypal (Schizoid); Scale C: Borderline (Cycloid); and Scale P: Paranoid. The last nine scales evaluate clinical symptom syndromes. Of these nine syndrome scales the first six measure neurosis and the last three measure psychosis. Scale A: Anxiety; Scale H: Somatoform; Scale N: Hypomanic; Scale D: Dysthmic; Scale B: Alcohol abuse; Scale T: Drug abuse; Scale SS: Psychotic Thinking; scale CC: Psychotic Depression and scale PP: Psychotic Delusions. The MCMI was reported to have a test-retest reliability in the .80s for the basic personality scales, in the .70s for the scales

measuring pathological personality disorder and in the .60s for the scales assessing clinical symptoms. The internal consistency studies have a median value of .88 (Gynther & Gynther, 1983).

Procedures

Prior to the beginning of this study the researcher completed a training program in the use of the Psychopathy Checklist. He obtained interrater reliability of .99, .96, .98 on the PCI-R total scores, Factor 1, and Factor 2, respectively.

All male federal correctional institutions in Ontario (10 institutions), with the exception of a minimum security institution in northern Ontario and regional psychiatric center, were visited by the researcher to complete this study. Offenders' cooperation to participate was solicited by the researcher. They were individually interviewed and provided with a copy of "Subjects Information and Consent Form" (Appendix M). Also a brief oral explanation of the goal of this study was provided. They were assured anonymity and confidentiality, and told that the results of their responses would not be placed on institutional files. They were also assured that their responses would be used strictly for research purposes. After this introduction,

each offender was advised that his participation was voluntary and was given the opportunity to participate or decline. Offenders willing to proceed were asked to read the instructions for completing the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI). Then they were asked to explain the content of the instruction section. This measure was taken to ensure that offenders participating in this study were literate and able to comprehend the questions. Offenders who were not able to read the instructions were thanked and let go. Offenders who successfully passed this "quiz" were asked to complete the MCMI. At a later date, each of these offenders was interviewed to complete the other psychometrics. In addition, offenders were asked questions related to CMS such as education, history of employment, current sentence, current and past crimes committed for which they were convicted, history of alcohol or drug abuse, total number of sex convictions and history of mental illness. Interview information was supplemented by a review of each offender's administrative files. The following documents were also reviewed:

a) The Finger Print Service (FPS) record (a detailed history of an offender's criminal record). This record provides information regarding the current sentence, current and past convictions, and nature of crimes committed.

- b) Pre-sentencing and progress summary reports. These documents provide detailed information about the offender's background, and his progress while incarcerated.
- c) The offender's score on Nuffield's Statistical Information On Recidivism Scale. This scale has been routinely completed on Federal offenders since 1987.

In general, the file review provided the opportunity to verify information given by inmates either during the completion of the CMS or in the brief interview. If there was a conflict between inmate-provided information and information obtained from files, the information obtained from files was used.

The answer sheet of the completed CMS provided the inmates' scores on each question as well as the results of the CMS classification (i.e., inmates' scores on the different subscales of the CMS: SI, CC, LS, ES).

To facilitate between-group comparisons, variables were classified and coded. To classify the seriousness and nature of current and past convictions, the Offence Scale developed by the Correctional Service of Canada, 1990; Appendix N) was used. This provided a four-point severity rating: major, serious, moderate, and minor. According to this scale, offenders included in the major offence group have committed crimes such as murder, attempted murder, assault causing

bodily harm, kidnapping, abduction, forcible confinement, and any activity which could cause death. Offenders included in the serious offence group have committed such crimes as robbery with violence and rape. The moderate offence group included offenders who have committed crimes such as possession of dangerous weapons, fraud, and other criminal acts committed without violence. The minor offence group included inmates who committed crimes such as possession of stolen property, theft under \$1000.00 and mischief. Thus, the crimes committed by each offender were coded according to severity.

In order to make comparisons between the four CMS subtypes on key dimensions relevant to this study, two psychologists were asked to read the description of the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory subscales and reclassify them under one of the following dimensions: emotionality and antisocial potential.

Statistical Analysis

Comparing offenders' scores on the CMS subtypes against criterion variables was completed using ANOVA and the Scheffe a posteriori test. The Chi-square and the Scheffe were utilized to determine if the CMS subtypes were different on each item of the Level of Supervision Inventory, the General Statistical Information on

Recidivism, and on the Psychopathy checklist. In addition, 2X2 Chi-square tables were used for pair of group comparisons on each item of the Level of Supervision Inventory. The Kruskal-Wallis test and multiple comparisons procedure that follows the Kruskal-Wallis's test were also used on each item of the General Statistical Information on Recidivism, and the Psychopathy checklist.

Results

Demographics and CIS subtypes

Inspection of Table 5 reveals that there were significant differences between the subtypes on the age, education and employment variables. The a posteriori test suggested that the SI group was significantly different from the other groups. The SI group showed the highest mean scores on the age, education and employment variables. The ES group had the lowest mean of education and employment. The CC and LS groups were very close on their scores on these variables.

Criminal History and CMS Subtypes

Results pertaining to the criminal history of the subtypes are reported in Table 6. It indicates significant differences between them only on the moderate and minor and overall number of prior convictions. Again the a posteriori results suggest that the SI subtype is distinct from the

other groups. They have the lowest scores on these variables. This table also indicates that there is no significant difference between the subtypes on number of sexual convictions.

Substance Abuse and CMS Subtypes

The of differences between the subtypes on the substance abuse variables are reported in Table 7. The results suggested that there was no difference among the subtypes on the three alcohol abuse criteria. However, there were significant differences between the subtypes on the drug abuse criteria. The a posteriori test did not clearly support the existence of differences between the CMS subtypes on drug abuse variables measured by the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory and interview information. However, there were significant differences between the SI subtype and other subtypes on the Level of Supervision Inventory items (i.e., items 38 and 40; drug problem ever and drug problem currently).

Millon's Emotional Disturbance and Antisocial

Potential and CMS Subtypes

The results of subtype performances on the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory's emotional disturbance and antisocial potential subscales are reported in Table 8. With

the exception of the dysthymic subscale, there were significant differences on the emotional disturbance subscales. The CC and LS subtypes scored lower than the SI and ES subtypes on the anxiety subscale and the ES subtype scored the highest among the groups. The Antisocial Potential table suggested that the SI group had the highest mean score on the compulsive (conforming) subscale and the lowest mean scores on the antisocial, passive-aggressive and hypomanic subscales.

Total Scores on the Level of Supervision Inventory,

the General Statistical Information on Recidivism, the Psychopathy Checklist and the two factors of the PCL-R and CMS Subtypes.

Inspection of Table 9 indicated highly significant differences between the subtypes on the total scores for the Level of Supervision Inventory, the General Statistical Information on Recidivism, the Psychopathy Checklist and the two factors of the Psychopathy Checklist. The SI subgroup had the lowest mean total scores on the Level of Supervision, the Psychopathy Checklist, and on the two factors of the Psychopathy Checklist, and the highest mean score on the Statistical Information on Recidivism. The higher the score on the Statistical Information on Recidivism, the lower the chance of recidivism. The results

of the a posteriori test indicate that the SI subtype differed significantly from the other subtypes on total scores of the Level of Supervision Inventory, Statistical Information on Recidivism and Psychopathy Checklist. The CC and LS subtypes did not differ on total scores of the Level of Supervision Inventory, Statistical Information on Recidivism, Psychopathy Check List. Also, they did not differ on the two factors of the Psychopathy Check List-R.

Subscales of the Level of Supervision Inventory and CMS subtypes.

The analysis of differences between the subtypes on the subscales of the Level of Supervision Inventory showed significant differences on all of these subscales (Table 10). The a posteriori results indicated no significant differences between the CC and LS subtypes on all subscales with the exception of one. The SI subtype was significantly different from the other subtypes on 70% of their responses on these subscales. The ES subtype did not differ from the other subtypes in their responses on virtually all subscales.

Items of Level of Supervision Inventory and CMS
Subtypes

Inspection of Table 11 reveals that there were significant differences between the subtypes on 72.22% of

the LSI questions. The Scheffe's a posteriori results indicated that the CMS subtypes did not differ on 31.48% of the questions. Also, the CC and LS subtypes were identical as they did not differ on their responses to any question. The SI subtype was significantly different from the other subtypes on 37.04% of the questions. The ES subtype was not significantly different from the other subtypes on almost all of the responses. The ES, CC, and LS groups were indistinguishable on 57.41% of the questions which were found to be significant by the ANOVA. Pairs of group comparisons using Chi-square 2X2 tables produced almost identical results to those obtained by the Scheffe's.

Items of Statistical Information on Recidivism and
CMS Subtypes.

Results for testing for differences on the Statistical Information on Recidivism scale (Table 12) show that there were significant differences between the subtypes on 73.33% of the questions. The Scheffe's a posteriori results indicated that the CC and LS subtypes were identical as they did not differ on their responses to any question. The SI subtype was significantly different from the other subtypes on 40% of the questions. The ES subtype was not significantly different from the other subtypes on virtually all of the responses. The Kruskal-Wallis test and multiple

comparisons procedure that follows the Kruskal-Wallis's test produced identical results to those obtained by Chi-square and Scheffe.

Items of the Psychopathy Checklist and CMS

Subtypes.

Differences between the subtypes on the Psychopathy Checklist-R are reported in Table 13. This indicate that there were significant differences between the subtypes on 90% of the questions. The Scheffe's a posteriori results indicated that the CC and LS subtypes were identical as they did not differ on their responses to any question. The SI subtype was significantly different from the other subtypes on 55.55% of the questions which were found to be significantly different by ANOVA. The ES subtype was not significantly different from the other subtypes on virtually all of the responses. The Kruskal-Wallis test and multipule comparisons procedure that follows the Kruskal-Wallis's test produced identical results to those obtained by Chi-square and Scheffe. In addition, the percentages of offenders who met the criterion to be classified as psychopathic, achieving a score of 30 and more on the PCL-R, were found to be 0, 7.41%, 20% and 34.04% for offenders of the SI, ES, CC, and LS subtypes respectively.

CMS Subscales and CMS Subtypes

The test of differences between the subtypes on the CMS subscales (Table 14) revealed that the subtypes significantly differed on each of the SI, ES, CC, and LS subscales. The results of the a posteriori tests suggested that there were no significant differences between the ES, CC, and LS subtypes on the SI subscale. There were no significant differences between the SI, CC, and LS subtypes on the ES subscale. There were significant differences between the SI, ES, CC and LS subtypes on the CC subscale. There was no significant difference between the ES and CC on the LS subscale.

Table 5: Means, Standard Deviations, Results of ANOVA/ X and Pairs of Groups Comparisons of Demographic Characteristics by CMS Subtypes.

CMS SUBTYPE									
SI (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)			
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F	
Age									
a		b		b		b		*	
32.63	10.66	25.52	9.17	28.87	7.67	30.06	10.86	3.12	
Education									
a		c		a&b		b		***	
11.04	2.05	8.19	2.53	9.73	2.47	9.15	2.28	9.70	
Employment +									
a		b		b		b		***	
1.52	.70	.15	.46	.38	.53	.45	.69	N/A	
Current Sentence Length									
16.24	45.11	8.29	7.91	8.08	14.44	10.41	7.06	ns	
								.95	

* = P is significant at 0.05 level.

***= " " " " 0.0001 "

a and b = Scheffe's Pairs of groups comparisons. Same letters indicat that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

+ = Categorical Variable, X was used instead of ANOVA.

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, Results of ANOVA and Pairs of Groups Comparisons of Offender's Criminal History by CMS Subtypes.

CMS SUBTYPE									
SI (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)			
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F	
# of Current Convictions									
Major									ns
.25	.48	.30	.54	.04	.20	.21	.46	2.58	
Serious									ns
.91	1.77	.56	.75	.80	1.21	.60	1.76	.49	
Moderate									ns
2.43	4.28	1.85	1.94	2.55	3.47	2.74	5.34	.28	
Minor									ns
.55	1.11	.96	1.76	.84	1.26	1.46	3.04	1.17	
Overall current convictions									ns
4.14	5.33	3.66	2.76	4.24	3.66	5.02	6.66	.47	
# of Prior Convictions									
Major									ns
0	0	.07	.26	0	0	.09	.08	2.57	
Serious									ns
.14	.44	.41	.89	.58	1.27	.60	.92	2.37	
Moderate									
b		a&b		a		a			***
1.09	2.31	6.11	6.73	10.69	11.84	8.36	7.42	11.74	
Minor									
b		a		a		a			***
1.52	2.21	4.52	5.42	7.20	5.20	7.00	5.31	14.39	

Table 6 continued/2

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>									
SI (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)			
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F	

Overall Prior Convictions									
c		b		a		a		***	
2.75	3.76	11.11	10.24	18.47	14.49	16.04	10.19	19.50	
# of sex convictions									
1.23	3.02	.48	1.09	.64	1.90	.51	1.13	ns	

* = P is significant at 0.05 level.

** = P is significant at 0.01 level.

***= " " " " 0.0001.

ns = not significantly different.

a, b and c = Scheffe's Pairs of groups comparisons.
Different letters indicate that means of these groups are significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Table 7. Means, Standard Deviations, Results of ANOVA/ χ^2 and Pairs of Groups Comparisons of Millon Substance Abuse scales, Items of LSI's Alcohol/Drug problems and substance abuse Interview Information By CMS Subtypes.

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>									
SI (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)			
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F	

Millon Substance Abuse									
Alcohol									n/s
51.25	19.56	58.56	20.86	58.98	18.18	55.53	21.65		1.31
Drugs									
a		a		a		a			*
59.64	18.51	62.78	23.62	69.51	20.34	69.40	17.52		2.71
LSI's Alcohol/Drug problems									
Alc.prob, ever +									ns
.38	.49	.52	.51	.51	.51	.47	.50		
Dg. Prob, ever +									
a		b		b		b			***
.28	.45	.63	.49	.76	.43	.79	.41		
Alc.Prob, currently +									
.29	.46	.48	.51	.49	.51	.38	.49		ns
Dg.prob currently +									
a		a&b		b		b			***
.28	.45	.56	.51	.69	.47	.66	.48		

Table 7/ cont'd 2

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>								
SI (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)		
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F
Interview Information								
Alcohol abuse +								ns
.39	.49	.48	.51	.56	.50	.45	.50	
Drug abuse +								
a		a		a		a		***
.33	.48	.59	.50	.76	.43	.77	.43	

* = P is significant at 0.05 level.

***= " " " 0.0001 "

+ = Categorical Variable, X was used instead of ANOVA.

a and b = Scheffe's Pairs of groups comparisons. Same letters indicat that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Table 8. Means, Standard Deviations, Results of ANOVA and Pairs of Groups Comparisons of Millon Emotional Disturbance and Millon Antisocial Potential By CMS Subtypes

CMS SUBTYPE								
SI (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)		
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F
Millon Emotional Disturbance								
Anxiety								
a&b		a		b		b		*
57.66	23.55	67.70	24.35	51.89	24.96	51.89	23.54	3.09
Dysthymic								
								ns
52.80	26.01	63.81	22.25	51.18	23.99	49.74	24.00	2.14
Psychotic Depression								
b		a		a		a&b		**
36.52	20.34	51.67	17.31	49.80	15.73	40.62	21.68	5.56
Psychotic Thinking								
a&b		a		a&b		b		**
50.50	17.35	61.00	14.20	56.78	12.26	47.72	20.75	4.69
Avoidant								
b		a		a&b		b		***
39.91	27.87	63.15	31.04	53.18	30.02	36.57	27.38	6.41
Schizoid (Asocial)								
b		a		a&b		a&b		**
44.66	26.52	64.70	27.74	52.22	27.56	43.74	26.70	4.16
Histrionic (Gregarious)								
a		a		a		a		*
54.64	22.39	53.30	18.55	57.49	20.49	65.08	18.02	2.87
Millon Antisocial Potential								
Antisocial (Aggressive)								
								ns
58.20	19.77	64.33	23.94	65.11	22.49	68.07	16.32	1.83
Compulsive (Conforming)								
a		b		b		b		***
68.57	10.53	50.67	16.93	52.58	16.24	56.53	15.64	11.74

Table 8 cont'd/2

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>								
SI (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)		
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F

Passive Aggressive								
b		a		a		a&b		***
32.23	23.60	58.52	28.33	53.22	25.30	46.00	25.67	7.59
Hypomaniac								
a		a		a		a		*
28.27	28.09	38.30	31.22	46.22	26.68	28.27	28.10	2.92

* = P is significant at 0.05 level.								
** = P is significant at 0.001 level.								
***= " " " " 0.0001.								

a, b and c = Scheffe's Pairs of groups comparisons.
 Different letters indicat that means of these groups are
 significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Table 9. Means, Standard Deviations, Results of ANOVA and Pairs of Groups Comparisons of Total Scores of the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI), Total Scores of the General Statistical Information on Recidivism (SIR), and the Total Scores and the Two Factors of the Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R) By CMS Subtypes

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>									
SY (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)			
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F	

LSI									
b		a		a		a		***	
14.37	7.49	28.63	5.77	30.45	6.65	31.55	6.94	59.25	
SIR									
a		b		b		b		***	
10.41	7.36	-3.62	6.62	-5.53	7.01	-4.43	7.25	45.91	
PCL-R									
c		b		a		a		***	
10.79	6.89	18.83	6.10	23.59	6.24	25.60	6.34	46.14	
Factor 1 score (PCL-R)									
b		b		a		a		***	
4.78	3.68	6.36	2.43	8.59	3.11	9.00	3.00	15.27	
Factor 2 score (PCL-R)									
c		b		a&b		a		***	
3.57	3.18	9.79	3.77	11.49	3.22	12.67	3.53	52.20	

***= P is significant at 0.0001 level									
** = " " " " 0.01 "									
* = P is significant at 0.05 level									

a and b = Scheffe's Pairs of groups comparisons. Same letters indicat that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Table 10. Means, Standard Deviations, Results of ANOVA and Pairs of Groups Comparisons of the Subscales of the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) By CMS Subtypes

CMS SUBTYPE									
ST (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)			
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F	
LSI's Subscales									
Criminal History									
c		b		a&b		a		***	
4.02	2.20	6.78	1.78	7.73	1.45	7.90	1.34	47.22	
Education/ Employment									
b		a		a		a		***	
2.37	1.81	6.50	1.62	5.63	2.31	5.55	2.40	27.22	
Financial									
b		a		a&b		a&b		*	
.54	.60	1.00	.80	.95	.63	.79	.71	3.52	
Family/Marital									
c		b		a		a&b		***	
.63	.79	1.50	.97	2.39	1.37	2.07	1.27	16.73	
Accommodation									
b		a		a		a		***	
.29	.60	1.04	.88	1.11	1.03	1.21	1.03	8.87	
Leisure/Recreation									
b		a		a&b		a		***	
.86	.93	1.67	.62	1.35	.90	1.65	.67	8.83	
Companions									
b		a		a		a		***	
1.41	1.12	2.63	1.64	3.21	1.32	3.22	1.24	17.29	
Alcohol/Drug Problems									
b		a&b		a		a		**	
2.57	2.67	3.88	2.13	4.27	2.39	4.35	2.56	4.21	

Table 10 cont'd/2

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>									
SI (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)			
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F	

LSI's Subscales									
Emotional/Personal									
b		a		a		a		***	
1.33	1.49	3.04	1.73	2.60	1.58	2.41	1.61	7.54	
Attitudes/Orientation									
c		b&c		b		a		***	
.49	.77	1.08	.93	1.51	1.16	2.28	1.26	21.95	

***= P is significant at 0.0001 level.

a, b and c = Scheffe's Pairs of groups comparisons.
Different letters indicat that means of these groups are
significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Table 11: Subjects's Positive Resposnses, Results of χ^2 and Pairs of Group Comparisons of Level of Supervision Inventory By CMS Subtypes

	CMS SUBTYPE				χ^2 Value (df=3)	< P
	SI (n=44) %	ES (n=27) %	CC (n=45) %	LS (n=47) %		
Prior convictions	b 58.14	a 85.19	a 100.0	a 97.83	39.72	0.000
2 or>Prior convictions	b 46.51	a 85.19	a 97.78	a 97.83	52.24	0.000
3 or>Prior convictions	c 32.56	b 66.67	a 95.56	a 97.83	64.42	0.000
3 or>present offenses	41.86	55.56	66.67	53.19		ns
Arrested < age 16	b 16.28	a 51.85	a 66.67	a 73.91	34.72	0.000
Incarcarated upon conviction	a 90.70	a 100.0	a 100.0	a 100.0	11.35	0.01
Escape history	a 9.30	a 25.93	a 34.09	a 34.78	9.51	0.02
Punished for inst. misconduct	b 25.58	a 70.37	a 77.27	a 76.60	33.65	0.000
Parole problems(past)	b 13.95	a 55.56	a 63.64	a 72.34	35.22	0.000

Table 11 Cont'd/2

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>						
	SI (n=44) %	ES (n=27) %	CC (n=45) %	LS (n=47) %	X ² Value (df=3)	< P
Assault record	62.97	70.37	73.33	82.98		ns
Was unemployed	b 32.56	a 80.77	a 70.45	a 72.34	23.28	0.000
Frequently unemployed	b 30.23	a 92.31	a 93.18	a 72.34	49.93	0.000
Never employed (full year)	c 16.67	a 76.92	b&c 40.48	a&b 51.06	25.49	0.000
Ever fired	30.95	46.15	55.00	50.00		ns
< grade 10	b 23.26	a 74.07	a&b 45.45	a&b 51.06	18.01	0.000
< grade 12	b 18.49	a 92.59	a&b 77.27	a 80.85	17.86	0.000
Suspended (school)	b 10.47	a 60.00	a 66.67	a 75.56	29.44	0.000
Participation (school/work)	b 14.29	a 55.56	a 45.24	a 61.70	22.55	0.000
Peer interaction	13.95	29.63	23.81	25.53		ns
Authority interaction	b 6.98	a 37.04	a 54.76	a 38.30	22.57	0.000

Table 11 Cont'd/3

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=44) %	ES (n=27) %	CC (n=45) %	LS (n=47) %	χ^2 Value (df=3)	< P
Financial problems	45.24	61.54	69.77	63.04		ns
Reliance upon social assistance	b 9.52	a 38.46	a&b 28.57	a&b 18.60	9.19	0.03
Marital dissatisfaction	a&b 28.21	b 16.67	a 54.55	a&b 46.51	10.05	0.02
Nonrewarding parents	b 9.30	a 56.52	a 65.12	a 63.04	35.70	0.000
Nonrewarding others	c 9.52	b&c 29.17	a 61.36	a&b 54.35	29.64	0.000
Criminal family	b 21.43	a 56.00	a 55.81	a 53.33	13.86	0.003
Accommodation unsatisfactory	4.76	17.39	21.05	25.00		ns
3 or> address changes (last year)	a 11.90	a 39.13	a 35.00	a 35.71	8.68	0.03
High crime neighbourhood	b 11.90	a 45.83	a 58.54	a 58.54	24.69	0.000
No leisure participation	b 35.71	a 74.07	a&b 62.79	a 78.26	19.17	0.000

Table 11 cont'd/4

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>						
	SI (n=44) ‡	ES (n=27) ‡	CC (n=45) ‡	LS (n=47) ‡	X [*] Value (df=3)	< P
could make better use of time	b 50.00	a 92.59	a&b 72.09	a 86.96	21.55	0.000
A social isolate	14.29	29.63	28.89	24.44		ns
Some criminal acquaintances	b 66.67	a&b 77.78	a 91.11	a 95.74	16.56	0.001
Some criminal friends	b 38.10	a 74.07	a 88.64	a 91.49	40.26	0.000
Few anti-criminal acquaintances	b 7.14	a 48.00	a 62.79	a 57.45	32.94	0.000
Few anti-criminal friends	b 7.69	a 45.83	a 54.76	a 53.19	24.33	0.000
Alcohol problem, ever	38.10	51.85	51.11	46.81		ns
Drug problem, ever	b 27.91	a 62.96	a 75.56	a 78.72	30.23	0.000
Alcohol problem, currently	28.57	48.15	48.89	38.30		ns
Drug problem, currently	b 27.91	a&b 55.56	a 68.89	a 65.96	18.54	0.000

Table 11 cont'd/5

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>						
	SI (n=44) ‡	ES (n=27) ‡	CC (n=45) ‡	LS (n=47) ‡	χ^2 Value (df=3)	< P
Alcohol/ Drug causing law violation	b 51.16	a&b 77.78	a&b 77.78	a 87.23	16.22	0.001
Alcohol/ Drug causing family problems	30.23	30.77	43.90	40.00		ns
Alcohol/ Drug causing school/work problems	13.95	11.54	28.21	28.89		ns
Alcohol/ Drug causing medical problems	7.14	7.69	15.00	20.45		ns
Alcohol/ Drug causing other problems	35.00	46.15	57.78	50.00		ns
Moderate emotional interference	b 37.21	a 77.78	a 75.56	a 74.47	20.70	0.000
Severe emotional interference	b 30.23	a 70.37	a 66.67	a&b 59.57	16.12	0.001
Psychiatric treatment (past)	b 11.63	a 62.96	a&b 35.56	b 33.33	19.94	0.000
Psychiatric treatment (current)	7.14	19.23	9.52	14.63		ns
Psycholo- gical assessment indicated	a 53.49	a 77.78	a 72.09	a 78.72	8.15	0.04
Attitudes supportive of crime	c 4.65	b 38.46	a&b 54.55	a 74.47	46.95	0.000

Table 11 cont'd/6

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=44) %	ES (n=27) %	CC (n=45) %	LS (n=47) %	X ² Value (df=3)	< P
Attitudes unfavourable toward convention	c 4.65	b&c 23.08	a&b 45.45	a 65.96	39.78	0.000
Attitudes poor, toward sentence	37.21	33.33	38.64	53.19		ns
Attitudes poor, toward supervision	b 2.33	b 14.81	a&b 18.18	a 34.04	15.53	0.001

a, b, and c= Scheffe's pairs of groups comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Table 12: Subjects's Responses, Results of χ^2 and Pairs of Group Comparisons of General Statistical Information on Recidivism By CMS Subtypes

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=44) ‡	ES (n=27) ‡	CC (n=45) ‡	LS (n=47) ‡	² X Value (df)	< P

1-Current Offence						
	a	a&b	b	b		
Incest etc	13.64	0.00	2.27	4.35		
Homicide/ Narcotics	54.55	29.63	22.37	36.96		
Unarmed	9.09	14.81	9.09	6.52		
robbery, Arson, dangerous driving..etc					34.94	0.01
Theft/Poss. of stolen goods	0.0	0	9.09	10.87	(18)	
B &E etc	6.82	18.52	29.55	19.57		
Escape	2.27	0.00	2.27	4.35		
N/A	13.64	37.04	25.00	17.39		
2-Age at admission						
	a	b	a&b	a&b		
> 39	29.55	7.41	11.36	10.87	20.70	0.002
< 21	9.09	33.33	11.36	6.25	(6)	
N/A	61.36	59.26	77.27	82.61		
3-Previous incarceration						
	a	b	b	b		
1st	68.18	14.81	2.27	6.52		
3-4	9.09	37.04	50.00	34.78	84.90	0.000
5or more	0	14.81	27.27	41.30	(9)	
Not above	22.73	33.33	20.45	17.39		
4-Previous revocation of a D/P, FP /MS						
	a	b	b	b		
	0	33.33	40.31	52.17	31.10	0.000
					(3)	

Table 12 cont'd/2

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=44) ‡	ES (n=27) ‡	CC (n=45) ‡	LS (n=47) ‡	X ² Value (df)	< P

5-Previous Escape	a	a	a	a		
	2.27	22.22	25.0	21.74	9.83 (3)	0.02
6-Security classification at time of parole hearing						
Maximum	6.82	11.11	9.09	6.52		ns
7-Age at 1st adult conviction						
	a	b	b	b		
> 49	2.27	0.0	0.0	2.17		
41 - 49	15.91	0.0	0.0	0.0		
31 - 40	20.45	1.24	0.0	4.35	61.63	0.000
23 - 30	31.82	11.11	9.09	10.87	(15)	
< 19	15.91	55.56	61.36	69.57		
Not above	13.64	25.93	29.55	13.04		
8-Previous convictions(Assault)						
	a	a&b	b	b		
One	18.18	18.52	22.73	26.09	13.94	0.03
Two or >	2.27	3.70	18.18	21.74	(6)	
Not above	79.55	77.78	59.09	52.17		
9- Current Marital Status						
	a	b	b	b		
Married	52.27	18.52	29.55	23.91	12.01 (3)	0.007
10-Interval at risk						
	a	a	a	a		
2 years or>	29.55	18.52	20.45	19.57	25.73	0.0001
<6month	0	40.74	36.36	43.48	(6)	
Not above	70.45	40.74	43.18	36.96		
11-Number of dependents						
>3	15.91	3.70	0.00	8.70	11.31 (6)	ns

Table 12 cont'd/3

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=44) ‡	ES (n=27) ‡	CC (n=45) ‡	LS (n=47) ‡	X² Value (df)	< P
12-Aggregate Sentence						
5-6 years	13.64	18.52	11.36	8.70		ns
6 years & >	34.09	18.52	22.73	47.83		
Not above	52.27	62.96	65.91	43.48		
13-Previous conviction for violent sex offence						
Only one	2.27	11.11	6.82	15.22		ns
14-# of Previous conviction for B & E						
	a	b	b	b		
0	52.27	11.11	13.64	28.26		
1-2	4.55	25.93	27.27	26.09	45.46	0.000
3-4	2.27	7.41	13.64	8.70	(12)	
5 & >	2.27	25.93	29.55	26.09		
Not above	38.64	29.63	15.91	10.87		
15-Employment status at arrest						
	a	b	b	b		
Employed	68.18	18.52	34.09	32.61	21.37	0.000
					(3)	

a, b, and c= Scheffe's pairs of groups comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Table 13: Subjects's Responses, Results of χ^2 and Results of Pairs of Group Comparisons of Psychopathy Checklist By CMS Subtypes

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=44) ‡	ES (n=27) ‡	CC (n=45) ‡	LS (n=47) ‡	X ² Value (df=6)	< P

1-Glibness						
0	80.37	100.0	91.11	87.23		
1	11.63	0.0	4.44	6.38		ns
2	0.0	0.0	4.44	6.38		
2-Grandiose of self-worth						
	b&a	b	a&b	a		
0	79.07	92.59	80.00	53.19		
1	11.63	7.41	11.11	27.66	17.36	0.01
2	9.30	0.0	8.89	19.15		
3-Proness to boredom						
	c	c&b	a&b	a		
0	76.74	56.00	23.26	13.04		
1	11.63	4.00	25.58	19.57	49.57	0.000
2	11.63	40.00	51.16	67.39		
4-Pathological lying						
	b	a	a	a		
0	79.07	51.85	29.55	39.13		
1	16.28	18.52	31.82	15.22	30.03	0.000
2	4.65	29.63	38.64	45.65		
5-Conning/manipulative						
	b	b	a	a		
0	58.14	66.67	30.23	22.22		
1	20.93	14.81	18.60	20.00	24.74	0.000
2	20.93	18.52	51.16	57.78		

Table 13 cont'd/2

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>						
	SI (n=44) ‡	ES (n=27) ‡	CC (n=45) ‡	LS (n=47) ‡	X ² Value (df=6)	< P

6-Lack of remorse						
	b	a	a	a		
0	31.71	7.41	4.55	6.52		
1	21.95	25.93	18.18	10.87	23.28	0.001
2	46.34	66.67	77.27	82.61		
7-Shallow affect						
	b	a	a	a		
0	67.44	26.92	23.81	21.74		
1	16.28	50.00	50.00	43.48	28.01	0.000
2	16.28	23.08	26.19	34.78		
8-Lack of empathy						
	b	a	a	a		
0	41.46	15.38	6.82	0.0		
1	19.51	15.38	13.64	15.22	35.70	0.000
2	39.02	69.23	79.55	84.78		
9-Parasitic life style						
	b	a	a	a		
0	59.52	4.55	11.36	8.70		
1	30.95	54.55	65.91	60.87	47.57	0.000
2	9.52	40.91	22.73	30.43		
10-Poor behavioral controls						
	b	a&b	a&b	a		
0	69.77	48.00	37.21	37.78		
1	18.60	24.00	30.23	20.00	15.20	0.02
2	11.63	28.00	32.56	42.22		

Table 13 cont'd/3

<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>						
	SI (n=44) %	ES (n=27) %	CC (n=45) %	LS (n=47) %	χ^2 Value (df=6)	< P

11-Promiscuous sexual behavior						
	a&b	b	a&b	a		
0	23.81	34.62	11.38	2.22	15.85	0.02
1	4.76	3.85	4.55	4.44		
2	71.43	61.54	84.09	93.33		
12-Early behavior problems						
	b	a	a	a		
0	88.37	44.44	47.73	42.22	27.70	0.000
1	4.65	11.11	11.36	4.44		
2	6.98	44.44	40.91	53.33		
13-Lack of realistic long-term plans						
	b	a	a	a		
0	51.28	30.77	11.63	20.00	25.81	0.000
1	23.08	3.85	25.58	15.56		
2	25.64	65.38	62.79	64.44		
14-Impulsivity						
	c	b&c	a&b	a		
0	60.98	40.74	13.95	10.87	37.47	0.000
1	24.39	18.52	25.58	28.26		
2	14.63	40.74	60.47	60.87		
15-Irresponsibility						
	b	a	a	a		
0	67.50	31.82	23.26	14.89	33.39	0.000
1	17.50	31.82	25.58	23.40		
2	15.00	36.36	51.16	61.70		

Table 13 cont'd/4

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=44) %	ES (n=27) %	CC (n=45) %	LS (n=47) %	X ² Value (df=6)	< P

16-Failure to accept responsibility for own action						
0	35.00	40.74	13.95	27.66		ns
1	37.50	29.63	32.56	38.30		
2	27.50	29.63	53.49	34.04		
17-Many marital relationships						
	b	a&b	a&b	a	17.75	0.007
0	78.95	68.75	57.89	36.59		
1	2.63	12.50	21.05	21.95		
2	18.42	18.75	21.05	21.46		
18-Juvenile delinquency						
	b	a	a	a	54.87	0.000
0	79.07	23.08	20.93	21.28		
1	11.63	7.69	2.33	4.26		
2	9.30	69.23	76.74	74.47		
19-Poor risk for conditional release						
	b	a	a	a	50.92	0.000
0	66.67	14.81	11.36	10.64		
1	16.67	22.22	20.45	19.15		
2	16.67	62.96	68.18	70.21		
20-Criminal verstility						
	c	b&c	a&b	a	39.96	0.000
0	76.19	48.15	28.89	14.89		
1	14.29	22.22	22.22	31.90		
2	9.52	29.63	48.89	53.19		

a, b, and c= Scheffe's pairs of groups comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Table 14: Means, Standard Deviations, Results of ANOVAa and Pairs of Groups Comparisons of Offenders's Scores on the CMS Subscales By CMS subtypes

CMS SUBTYPE								
SI (n=44)		ES (n=27)		CC (n=45)		LS (n=47)		F (df=3)
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	
SI								
a		b		b		b		***
78.50	15.06	31.11	15.32	27.67	14.40	33.13	14.39	114.2
ES								
b		a		b		b		***
39.43	9.14	63.04	8.30	40.80	8.17	37.68	7.80	61.7
CC								
D		b		a		c		***
42.25	8.54	53.78	5.57	58.60	6.57	48.96	5.38	46.9
LS								
c		b		b		a		***
42.52	6.73	46.67	5.70	47.62	6.61	58.45	6.15	51.4

***= P is significant at 0.0001 level.

a, b and c = Scheffe's Pairs of groups comparisons.
Different letters indicat that means of these groups are significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the concurrent validity of the Wisconsin CMS as it applies to Canadian federal offenders. The important question was this: "Do offenders classified by the CMS differ in their demographics, criminal history, personality characteristics, three independent measures (the Level of Supervision Inventory, the General Statistical Information on Recidivism, and the Psychopathy Checklist), and on the Wisconsin Case Management Strategies?.

The results of the present study provided some support for the validity of only one of the four CMS subtypes. The Selective Intervention (SI) subtype was originally described by Lerner and his associates (1986) as the most benign subtype of the CMS subtypes. Their description of the predominant characteristics of the SI subtype was that they generally tend to have relatively stable and pro-social lifestyles, are usually steadily employed, and have minimal involvement with the law. A quick look at Table 9 clearly emphasize the distinctiveness of this subtype. The most notable observation is that the SI subtype is significantly different from the other subtypes on the total score of the three most important independent measures of this study

(i. e., Level of Supervision Inventory, The General Statistical Information on Recidivism and the Psychopathy Checklist). Furthermore, an item-by-item analysis of the SI responses on these as well the other measures (i. e., the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory and file and interview information) helps to expand the description of the offenders of the SI subtype as outlined below : they have a higher level of education, and much better participation and interactions with peers and authority in school. They have fewer financial problems and do not rely as much upon social assistance as the other subtypes. They are generally more satisfied with their parents and other family members' relationships. They are more involved in stable marital relationships. They have more dependents than the others. They have considerably lower numbers of criminals in their families than the other subtypes. They are more involved in leisure and recreational activities. They do not have as many criminal acquaintances and friends. Their substance abuse is generally not as severe as that of the other subtypes. They do not have as many emotional and personal problems. Their attitude is generally more conforming and not supportive of crime. They are generally older when they are convicted or admitted to the incarcerating institution. Unlike other subtypes, they have no record of previous

revocation of parole or mandatory supervision releases. Their adjustment on release is much better. They are significantly less deviant than the other subtypes on almost all the Hare's Psychopathy criteria of boredom, pathological lying, manipulativeness, lack of remorse, shallow affect, lack of empathy, parasitic life style, poor behavior control, promiscuous sexual behavior, early behavioral problems, impulsiveness, irresponsibility, acceptance of responsibility for their actions, record of juvenile delinquency, risk for release, criminal versatility, and long term plans. They are also more anxious less avoidant, more conforming, and more passive/aggressive than the other subtypes.

The present study also supported the validity of Lerner's et al's., (1986) claim that the SI includes a subgroup of offenders whose legal problems stem from a temporary lapse or unusually stressful circumstances [i. e., the Selective Intervention Situational (SI-S)].

In agreement with this description, this study found that offenders classified as the SI subtype are sentenced to a lengthier time, but involved in a lesser number of convictions than are other subtypes. They are involved in more major and serious convictions but fewer moderate and minor convictions than others. They have significantly fewer

prior convictions. They have generally a better profile on almost all criteria used for this study, particularly their scores on the Level of Supervision Inventory, the General Statistical Information on Recidivism, the Psychopathy Checklist and the antisocial potential scales of the Millon Clinical Inventory. From these results, one can safely conclude that the SI subtype involvement with crime was sudden, situational, violent and not as a result of longstanding involvement with criminal activities.

The results of this study also lead to the conclusion that the offenders of the SI subtype could be classified as over-controlled individuals. These individuals have been described by Megargee (1966, 1977) as usually avoiding violent behavior at all costs. However when overwhelmed by frustration, they react in an extremely violent manner. Blackburn (1968) found that those who committed murder or attempted murder, as compared to less extreme assaultive individuals, were significantly more controlled, inhibited and defensive on psychological tests. The SI offenders in this study fit nicely with Blackburn's description.

In spite of the support the results of this study gave to the validity of Lerner's and his associates' description of the SI subtype, other findings were decidedly negative. For example, Lerner et al.'s (1986) claim that the other

subgroup of the SI subtype [i.e., Selective Intervention-Treatment (SI-T)] consists of offenders whose offence was caused by a more continuing neurotic need or compulsion and offenders who have one or more of the following problems: a sexual offense history, serious drug or alcohol abuse, serious emotional disturbances, or an assaultive offence history, was not supported. It is true that results of this study reveals that the SI subtype committed more sex offences than other subtypes, but the difference between them and other subtypes was not decisive nor statistically significant (Table 6). In addition, there was no evidence that the SI subgroup had significantly more serious substance abuse problems, differed in fundamental personality patterns or emotional disturbance, or had worse assaultive histories than other subtypes. The findings of this study were quite contrary. The SI offenders were lower on the eight criteria used for substance abuse than the other subtypes (see Table 7). Regarding emotional disturbances, with the exception of a few interesting trends, there was no strong evidence that the SI subtype significantly differs in fundamental personality patterns or emotional disturbance (see Table 8). Furthermore, SI offenders have less serious assault records than other subtypes as indicated by two independent measures (i. e.,

the Level of Supervision Inventory and General Statistical Information on Recidivism; see Tables 8 and 9).

The rest of this study provided strong evidence against the concurrent validity of the CMS. The most important finding supporting this argument is that the Casework Control (CC) and the Limit Setting (LS) subtypes, which originally were claimed to be two distinct subtypes did not differ on virtually any of the criteria used by Lerner et al., (1986) for description of these subtypes nor did they differ on any other criteria measures. They did not statistically differ even on 137 out of 138 items of the independent criteria included in this study (Tables 5-through 14). Their scores on the criteria, which are supposed to differentiate between them, fluctuated with no clear direction for these subtypes. These results confirmed earlier findings by Loza and Andrews (1989) of the indistinguishability of these two groups. This suggests that both the CC and LS groups have predominantly the same characteristics, and essentially belong to the same criminal group.

However, the characteristics of these subtypes when lumped together were clearly consistent with those of career criminals and anti-social individuals whose prediction for further involvement with the law is quite reasonable. They

were significantly more likely to be arrested or involved with the law at a young age. This characteristic has been found to be related to further criminal activities as the offender grows older (Andrews, 1989; Farrington, 1983; Hamparian, Schuster, Dinitz, and Conrad, 1987; Mendelzys, 1979; Mulvey and Lidz, 1984; and Wolfgang, Filio, and Sellin, 1972). The present results also suggested that the history of criminal involvement and number of prior convictions were higher for CC and LS subtypes than for the other subtypes. These factors have been found to be reliable indicators of further criminal involvement (Andrews, 1984; Farrington, 1983; Monahan, 1981; and Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin, 1972). They were also higher on the history of committing violent offences. Previous studies have found that the probability of future assaultiveness increases with each act of violence (Blumstein, Farrington, and Moitra, 1985; Farrington, 1987; Hall, 1984; Monahan, 1981; and Shah, 1978). Both subtypes were also higher than other subtypes on number of earlier convictions. Several researchers reported a positive relationship between future crime rate and past commission of crime (Barnett and Lofaso, 1985; Barnett, Blumstein, and Farrington, 1986; Nuffield, 1982; and Waller, 1974). Both subtypes scored higher than other subtypes on history of childhood problems. Several studies have found a

relationship between history of childhood problems and embarking in a criminal career at an older age (Hellman and Blackman, 1966; Justice, Justice and Craft, 1974; Monahan, 1981; and Loeber and Dishion, 1983). The CC and LS subtypes also scored higher than other subtypes on criteria measuring socialization problems particularly with parents, spouses and immediate relatives. These problems have been found to be related to involvement with criminal acts (Andrews, 1989; Farrington, 1987; Blackman, Weiss, & Lambert, 1963; and Mulvey and Lindz, 1984). Both the CC and LS subtypes scored higher than other subtypes on the substance abuse criteria making a prediction about their future involvement with violent acts quite reasonable. The strong association between substance abuse and acts of violence has been reported by many researchers (Hall, 1984; Goodrick & Vigdal, 1976; Gendreau, Madden & Leipziger, 1979; Menuck, 1985; Ross, Gendreau, Ross and Shortt, 1982; Wolfgang, 1958; Voss & Hepburn, 1968; McDonald & Bygott, 1977; Amir, 1971; Johnson, Gibson & Linden, 1978; Pernanen; Fischer, 1983; Hoffman; 1983; and Pritchard, 1979).

Regarding the Environmental Structure (ES) subtype, consistent with Lerner et al.'s (1986) description they were found to have achieved the lowest level of education and had the least stable record of employment. Their employment

record was not, however, statistically different from the CC and LS subtypes. Also, to some extent in agreement with Lerner et al., the ES subtype mean scores were higher than the other subtypes on almost all the Millon Emotional Disturbance scales, but again with no statistical differences being attained.

In spite of these agreements and the fact that the ESs mean scores on most of the criteria were midway between SI and the CC and LS subtypes, the overall results of this study did not support the existence of a unique subtype described as Environmental Structure (ES). They were statistically distinguished from the other subtypes only on three items of the 138 criterion items. They fluctuated in their responses between the SI, CC and LS subtypes. They were statistically similar to the SI subtype on 69 items and indistinguishable from the CC and LS subtypes on 111 items of the total 138 criterion items (see Tables from 5 through 14).

The findings regarding the demonstrated indistinguishability between the ES, CC and LS subtypes are decidedly negative for the concurrent validity of the CMS. Such findings raise serious doubts about the ability of the CMS to differentiate between four distinct subtypes. The results of this study suggest that CMS may be valid to

measure two distinct forensic subtypes of Canadian offenders: the pro-social criminals and career criminals, not four subtypes.

CHAPTER 8

STUDY III

CMS and Offender Adjustment During Incarceration

Method

Subjects

One thousand and twenty-five male offenders who were incarcerated in the federal correctional system, Ontario region and had the CMS completed during the period from January 1, 1987 to December 31, 1989 were identified and formed the pool of subjects. Offenders who had the CMS completed in 1987 or 1988, remained incarcerated for at least a year after the completion of the CMS, and whose files were available within the federal correctional system, Ontario region were selected. Three hundred and sixty-two offenders met this criteria and comprised the sample for this study. Table 15 includes the number of offenders involved from each CMS subtype.

Instruments

Completed Case Management Strategies answer sheets and offenders' file information.

PROCEDURE

The predictor variable was offenders' scores on the CMS subtypes. The criterion variable was number of institutional

misconducts. This was measured by counting any of the following occurrences as indicators of misconduct:

Number of times the offender was found guilty of a major or minor institutional infraction. The document consulted to cover this part was the disciplinary report awarded to offenders involved in institutional infractions, Appendix O. Number of days the offender spent in the segregation area for reasons other than being found guilty of institutional infractions, such as for administrative reasons. These reasons vary from being segregated for the good order of the institution, awaiting a disciplinary hearing, protection from self, and being assaulted, to protection from others. Offender request for segregation or protection was also noted. The document consulted to cover this part was the dissociation log, Appendix P. Number of unsatisfactory performance notices the offender had received. This notice is completed by any staff member at any time. It indicates his rating of the inmate's performance. This notice is Appendix Q. Number of days of forfeited good time the offender received. According to Correctional Service of Canada directives (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980), each inmate is entitled to earn up to 15 days of remission for each month served. Inmates may lose all of these days or some of them if they are convicted of institutional

infractions or receive unsatisfactory performance notices. Each offender receives a monthly notice of earned remission. This document is Appendix R.

To collect the data all federal correctional institutions in Ontario with the exception of a camp in northern Ontario were visited. Data were collected every four months, for six periods, from the date the CMS was completed. The maximum follow-up period was two years. The follow-up period was terminated at the date of the offender's release on day or full parole, mandatory release, or sentence expiry date, if he was released, or at the date of reviewing his files for this study.

Statistical Analysis

Chi-square and Scheffe methods were used, with the number of institutional infractions arranged in ordinal levels. Kruskal-Wallis test and multipule comparisons procedure that follows the Kruskall-Wallis's test were also used.

Results

Institutional Adjustment and CMS Subtypes

Inspection of Table 15 suggests that there were significant differences between the CMS subtypes on criteria used to measure institutional adjustment, number of institutional infractions committed, number of days spent in segregation and number of days of forfeited good time and no significant differences on offenders' segregation for protection either by administrative decision or by their own request, and on number of unsatisfactory work reports. The Scheffe a posteriori test did not indicate any differences between the subtypes on which the Chi-square had indicated significant differences. Kruskal-Wallis test and multipule comparisons procedure that follows the Kruskall-Wallis's test produced identical results. Looking at the percentages of offender scores on the criterion variables suggests that the SI subtype in general had a better adjustment record than the other subtypes. The CC and LS groups were very close in their scores. Generally, they are the subtypes which had more adjustment problems than the other groups. The ES subtype fluctuated between the other subtypes.

Table 15: Subjects's scores on criteria of Institutional Adjustmen, Results of χ^2 and Pairs of Group Comparisons By CMS Subtypes

CMS SUBTYPE							
		SI (n=75) %	ES (n=28) %	CC (n=115) %	LS (n=144) %	2 X Value (df)	< P

Criteria							
Institutional							
Infractions		a	a	a	a		
0		14.67	25.00	27.83	39.58		
1-7	" "	82.67	75.00	66.96	55.56	18.76	0.005
> 7	" "	2.67	0	5.22	4.86	(6)	
# of days spent in segregation		a	a	a	a		
1-10	Days	2.67	3.57	6.09	6.25		
11-20	" "	86.67	78.57	68.70	62.50	15.12	0.02
>20	" "	10.67	17.86	25.22	31.25	(6)	
Offender requested segregation for protection							
Yes		2.67	0	8.70	6.94	4.91 (3)	ns
Offender segregated by administration for his protection							
yes		2.67	3.57	4.35	3.47	.38 (3)	n/s

Table 15 cont'd/2

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=75) %	ES (n=28) %	CC (n=115) %	LS (n=144) %	² X Value (df)	< P

# of Unsatisfactory work reports						
0	5.33	10.71	11.30	17.36		
1-7	94.67	85.71	86.09	80.56	9.32	n/s
>7	0	3.57	2.61	2.08	(6)	

# of days forfeited good time						
	a	a	a	a		
0	16.00	28.57	13.04	18.06		
1-7 days	80.00	57.14	68.70	52.78	26.64	0.000
> 7 days	4.00	14.29	18.26	29.17	(6)	

a,b and c = Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Discussion

The present study investigated the validity of the CMS pertaining to the prediction of offenders adjustment during incarceration. The most notable observation from the a posteriori results is that there were no significant differences between the subtypes virtually on any the criteria found to be significantly different between groups by the chi-square (see Table 15). These results are in contrast to the original characterization of the subtypes as described by Learner et al., 1936. For instance, there was no statistically convincing evidence that the LS subtypes adjust better in institutions than other subtypes as reported by Lerner and his associates, although their scores were relatively low on the measuring criteria. The present results were consistent with prior findings in this study (i. e., that the SI subtype is better than the other subtypes in adjustment. The results of this study shed serious doubts about the validity of the CMS to predict institutional adjustment).

CHAPTER 9

STUDY IV

CMS and Offender's Post-Release Adjustment and
Violent Recidivism
Method

Subjects

One thousand and twenty-five male offenders who were incarcerated in the federal correctional system, Ontario Region and had the CMS completed during the period from January 1, 1987 to December 31, 1989 were identified and formed the pool of subjects. Offenders who were released after the completion of the CMS during this period (i. e., from January 1987 to December 1989) and whose files were available at the National Parole Board (NPB) office, Ontario region were selected. Three hundred and fifty three offenders met these criteria and comprised the sample for the current study. Of this sample, 43 offenders (12.18 %) were identified as having recidivated by committing violent offences. Table 16 includes the number of offenders involved from each of the CMS subtypes.

Instruments

Completed Case Management Strategies answer sheets and offenders' file information.

PROCEDURE

The predictor variable was offenders' scores on the CMS subtypes. The criterion variable for offenders' post release adjustment was success or failure upon release. This was measured by counting, from information recorded in offenders NPB files, any of the following occurrences as a failure: recidivism; return to a correctional institution (i. e., federal or provincial institutions including county jails) for any reason; committing a new offence; a new conviction for crime; a new sentence; any parole violation such as revocation and suspension of a parole or mandatory release program; and negative reports by parole supervisors. The criterion variable for the violent recidivism was committing a violent act which necessitates the offender's return to custody. A list Criteria of violent offences (Appendix S) currently being used by National Parole Board of Canada and Correctional Service of Canada was used as a guide for classifying the recidivism as either violent or non-violent.

Information about offenders' participation in institutional treatment and rehabilitation programs prior to release was also obtained from offenders' NPB files. The maximum follow-up period was two years. Data were collected every four months, for six periods, from the date the offender was released. The follow-up period was terminated

if the offender reached the warrant expiry date of his sentence, at the date of reviewing his file for this study or at the date of committing a "failing" incident.

Statistical Analysis

Three analyses were used. The first consisted of chi-square statistics and contingency tables. This method was used because the data collected were categorical (success or failure). The second analysis involved a general linear models procedure which was immediately followed by applying Scheffe's a posteriori test to detect where significant differences between the groups existed. Chi-square statistics using 2X2 contingency tables was also used for pairs of group comparisons. The third analysis involved a survival time analysis. This technique compensates for the loss of information inherent in using the chi-square particularly regarding the time to failure factor. For example, chi-square treats a person whose failure commenced one week after release in an identical fashion to others whose failures may have occurred several months after their release (Wheeler and Hissong, 1988).

Chi-square, scheffe and regression analyses were also used to test if there are significant differences between the subtypes on recidivism as a function of treatment and rehabilitation programs received prior to release. This was

completed to investigate the effect of participation in these programs on recidivism and to eliminate the possible confounding of program participation with adjustment of subtypes on release.

Statistical methods used to examine the validity of the CMS as it applies to committing violent behavior upon release were Chi-square for overall effect and for pairs of group comparisons and Scheffe. Due to the small number of offenders who committed violent offences, the survival analysis was not possible to apply.

Results

Adjustment Upon Release Criteria and CMS Subtypes

Inspection of Table 16 reveals that there were highly significant differences between the CMS subtypes on all criteria used to measure adjustment upon release. The a posteriori test of both the 2X2 Chi-square and the Scheffe suggested that the Selective Intervention subtype (SI) was responsible for the significant results. The SI subtype was significantly different from Environmental Structure (ES), Casework/Control (CC), and Limit Setting (LS) on recidivism, committing new offences, receiving new convictions, and receiving new sentences but similar to them on parole violations and getting negative parole reports. Also, there were no significant differences between ES, CC, and LS subtypes. Inspection of the offender scores clearly indicates that the Selective Intervention subtype had the lowest scores of all the subtypes on all measuring criteria used. Scores of the ES and CC subtypes were threefold and sometimes more than that of the SI group.

Recidivism, Treatment and Rehabilitation Programs, and CMS Subtypes

Testing for whether the differences between the subtypes, particularly the noted difference between the SI and the other subtypes, may have been due to participation

in treatment and rehabilitation programs prior to release indicated that there were no significant differences between the subtypes on programs received prior to release.

Furthermore, results of the regression analysis suggested that there were significant group differences between the SI and the ES, CC, and LS groups on recidivism $F(1, 351) = 26.83, P < 0.0001$. However, there was no significant interaction effect between treatment and subtypes on recidivism. Also, there were no significant differences between the SI and the ES, CC, and LS subtypes as a function of treatment received prior to release on recidivism. Table 17 reports the percentage of offenders who completed treatment or rehabilitation programs prior to release by subtype.

Recidivism, Time, and CMS Subtypes.

The results of survival analyses suggested that there were significant differences between the CMS subtypes as a function of time on the following criteria: recidivism ($\chi^2 = 39.03, P < 0.001$), committing a new offence ($\chi^2 = 13.06, P < 0.005$), and receiving negative reports from supervising officer ($\chi^2 = 12.31, P < 0.006$). However, there were no significant differences on the criteria of receiving a new conviction, receiving a new sentence, and violating the conditions of parole. Tables 18 through 23 summarize the

results of survival analyses completed on each of the measuring criteria by CMS subtypes. These tables clearly indicate that the percentages of subjects failing to complete each of the follow up periods were significantly lower among the SI subtype than among the ES, CC, and LS subtypes.

Violent Recidivism and CMS Subtypes

Inspection of Table 16 reveals that there were a significant differences among the CMS subtypes on violent recidivism. The Scheffe a posteriori test suggested that the Selective Intervention subtype was significantly different from the Casework/Control group. However, there were no significant differences between the SI and each of the ES and LS, nor was there a significant difference between the ES, CC, and LS subtypes. The pairs of group comparisons using chi-square 2X2 tables gave similar results to that reported in Table 16 but the SI subtype was significantly different from ES, CC, and LS subtypes. Inspection of the percentage of violent recidivism clearly indicates that the Selective Intervention subtype had the lowest percentage of violent recidivism of all the subtypes. Results of the effect of time for committing violent acts suggested a significant difference $\chi^2 = 19.58$, $P < 0.000$. Again, the a

posteriori test indicated that the SI subtype was significantly different from the other subtypes.

10000 COUNTY ROAD 5 SUDBURY, NH 02477 USA
TEL: 602 436 7002 FAX: 602 436 7002 TLE: 602 436 7002

Table 16: Offenders' Scores on Adjustment Upon Release and Violent Acts Criteria, Results of X^2 and Pairs of Group Comparisons By CMS Subtypes

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=108) ‡	ES (n=29) ‡	CC (n=110) ‡	LS (n=106) ‡	X^2 Value (df=3)	< P
Criteria						
Recidivism	b 17.59	a 51.72	a 51.82	a 43.40	42.99	0.000
Committed new offence	b 16.67	a 48.28	a 47.27	a 38.74	25.95	0.000
Received new conviction	b 12.04	a 37.93	a 37.27	a 31.13	20.37	0.000
Received new sentence	b 10.19	a 34.48	a 35.45	a 30.19	21.17	0.000
Parole violations	b 13.89	a 48.28	a&b 31.82	a&b 32.08	22.77	0.001
Negative parole reports	a 4.63	a 13.79	a 19.09	a 9.43	11.97	0.0074
Violent Acts	b 2.78	a&b 10.34	a 19.09	a&b 15.09	14.77	0.002

a, b and c = Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Table 17: Offenders Who Completed Treatment/ Rehabilitation programs Prior to Release By Subtypes.

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>			
	SI (n=108) %	ES (n=29) %	CC (n=110) %	LS (n=106) %

Programs				
Education upgrading	26.9	37.9	38.2	37.7
Vocational training	3.7	3.4	7.3	6.6
Alcohol Abuse	9.3	3.4	6.4	8.5
Drugs Abuse	36.1	20.7	41.8	32.1
Management of stress	1.9	0	0	2.8
Pre-release	1.9	0	0	2.8
Life skills	9.3	27.6	13.6	9.4
Sex treatment	5.6	0	4.5	1.9
John Howard Society group	4.6	0	4.5	2.8
Individual Therapy	.9	0	0	0
Other Programs	12.0	3.4	7.3	4.7

Table 18: Percentage of Offenders' Recidivism Over 6 X 4 Month Follow Up Period By CMS Subtypes

	<u>CMS subtype</u>			
	SI	ES	CC	LS
	(n=108)	(n=29)	(n=110)	(n=106)
	%	%	%	%
Periods				
First	6.48	27.59	28.18	19.81
Second	9.26	37.93	41.82	29.25
Third	12.25	51.23	50.67	39.18
Fourth	15.67	63.42	52.57	44.88
Fifth	18.74	N/A	55.96	47.78
Sixth	21.20	N/A	66.97	58.97

**Table 19: Percentage of Offenders Who Committed New Offences
Over 6 X 4 Month Follow Up Period By CMS Subtypes**

	<u>CMS subtype</u>			
	SI (n=108) %	Es (n=29) %	CC (n=110) %	LS (n=106) %
Periods				
First	14.81	20.69	27.27	18.87
Second	16.67	31.03	40.00	28.30
Third	19.75	48.28	46.52	38.92
Fourth	24.62	65.52	48.50	45.47
Fifth	27.05	N/A	50.48	47.65
Sixth	33.68	N/A	64.63	63.35

**Table 20: Percentage of Offenders Who Had New Conviction
Over 6 X 4 Month Follow Up Period By CMS Subtypes**

	<u>CMS subtype</u>			
	SI (n=108) %	Es (n=29) %	CC (n=110) %	LS (n=106) %
Periods				
First	15.75	17.24	23.64	16.98
Second	17.59	24.14	30.00	25.47
Third	19.68	34.98	36.60	35.13
Fourth	23.39	51.23	38.95	39.77
Fifth	25.86	N/A	41.30	N/A
Sixth	N/A	N/A	58.07	51.81

Table 21: Percentage of Offenders Who Had New Sentence Over 6 X 4 Month Follow Up Period By CMS Subtypes

	<u>CMS subtype</u>			
	SI (n=108) %	Es (n=29) %	CC (n=110) %	LS (n=106) %
Periods				
First	14.81	13.79	21.82	16.98
Second	16.67	20.69	28.18	25.47
Third	18.78	31.26	34.96	33.75
Fourth	21.28	46.54	37.37	38.32
Fifth	23.77	N/A	39.78	N/A
Sixth	N/A	N/A	56.98	50.66

Table 22: Percentage of Offenders Who Violated Their Parole Conditions Over 6 X 4 Month Follow Up Period By CMS Subtypes

	<u>CMS subtype</u>			
	SI (n=108) %	Es (n=29) %	CC (n=110) %	LS (n=106) %
Periods				
First	12.04	20.69	22.73	19.81
Second	20.37	31.03	30.91	28.30
Third	23.15	55.67	39.20	36.42
Fourth	25.12	62.00	N/A	40.96
Fifth	26.82	N/A	N/A	48.83
Sixth	N/A	N/A	N/A	55.2~

Table 23: Percentage of Offenders Who Had Negative Parole Reports Parole Over 6 X 4 Month Follow Up Period By CMS Subtypes

	<u>CMS subtype</u>			
	SI (n=108) %	Es (n=29) %	CC (n=110) %	LS (n=106) %
Periods				
First	17.59	27.57	29.09	23.58
Second	20.37	37.93	42.73	33.02
Third	23.39	51.23	51.64	43.13
Fourth	26.935	63.42	53.57	49.22
Fifth	30.33	N/A	57.14	52.61
Sixth	33.65	N/A	69.39	66.83

Discussion

The goal of this study was to examine the validity of the CMS as it applies to the offender's post release adjustment and violent recidivism. The results provided strong support to the Lerner et al.(1986) description of the SI subtype as the least criminal of subtypes. On all the measuring criteria they achieved substantially lower scores than the other subtypes. They were significantly different from other subtypes on all criteria according the Chi-square pairs of group comparisons or on four criteria according to the Scheffe. The ES, CC and LS subtypes, on the other hand, did not statistically differ from each other on virtually any of the criteria. This finding suggested that the CMS may be assessing two distinct groups rather than four as originally reported by its designers (Lerner et al., 1986). Furthermore, unlike the original description of the LS offenders, which portrays them as the worst criminal subtype, the present study found that members of the ES subtype achieved higher scores on all the criterion variables than did the LS subtype. The same observation was noted with the CC subtype. Offenders in this category achieved higher scores than those in the LS subtype on five criteria and were almost similar on the sixth criterion. Thus, according to the results of this study the LS subtype

comes immediately next to the most benign subtype (i. e., the SI subtype). This finding is definitely in sharp contrast to the original description of these subtypes. This result certainly calls into question the ability of the CMS to predict post-release adjustment.

The results also indicated that there was no significant treatment effect on the pre-release adjustment of the subtypes. Nor was there a significant interaction between subtypes and participation in treatment programs. This results suggest that treatment received prior to release did not play a role in the post-release adjustment of the subtypes. Again this finding is negative with regard to the ability of the CMS to predict post-release adjustment.

The overall results of the survival analysis supported the earlier findings of this study regarding the uniqueness of the SI subtype compared with the other subtypes. Inspection of Tables 18 through 23 clearly indicates that the percentage of SI offenders failing on the criteria measures as a function of time was substantially lower than other subtypes at virtually all of the six follow-up periods. This finding lends support to Lerner et al.'s (1986) description of SI as the least criminal subtype. Inspection of these tables also suggest that the SI subtype was solely responsible for the highly significant

differences found between the subtypes on recidivism, committing new offences, and receiving negative reports from supervising officers.

Also, a careful look at scores reported in these tables indicates that the LS subtype was not worse than CC or ES subtypes on post release adjustment as a function of time. In fact, the LS subtype came next to the most benign subtype (i. e., the SI subtype) on the majority of the criteria. This finding was surprising. Given that members of the LS subtype were characterized by their criminal orientation, general lack of commitment, their motivation toward success in crime, their lengthy criminal history, their violent and aggressive offences, and their comfort in correctional institutions, it was expected that this subtype would have a higher rate of failure as a function of time than other subtypes. Again, this finding questions the validity of the of the CMS in predicting post-release adjustment.

The second goal of this study was to investigate the validity of the CMS in predicting violent acts/recidivism upon release. The results are somewhat similar to those found utilizing post-release adjustment criteria. Members of the SI subtype committed substantially fewer violent acts than did the other subtypes, which is consistent with the original characterization of this subtype. Although the LS

subtype was expected to have more violent acts/higher recidivism than the other subtypes this study did not find the LS to be the worst among the subtypes (see Table 16). This would suggest that the CMS cannot validly predict violent acts upon release.

The other important observation was that although the between-groups comparison was significantly different, the a posteriori results were mixed. The SI subtype was significantly different from the CC subtypes but not from the ES and LS subtypes. In addition, the ES and LS subtypes were not distinguishable. These findings once again cast doubts on the usefulness of the CMS to predict violent acts/recidivism, which is of utmost concern to correctional workers.

Conclusion

The present study used a multifaceted approach to investigate the effectiveness of the Wisconsin Case Management Strategies for use with Canadian offenders. Many questions were asked but all received the same answer: the CMS is definitely reliable and valid for identifying only one of its original four subtypes. Whatever the research question was, the Selective Intervention subtype was always distinguishable from the other types. The other finding which was repeatedly demonstrated was that the Casework/Control and Limit Setting subtypes were almost identical. The Environmental Structure subtype fluctuated between the other subtypes, but was generally indistinguishable from the Casework/Control and Limit Setting subtypes. These findings raise questions about the reliability and validity of the CMS and serious doubts about its ability to differentiate between the four subtypes. The results of this study suggest that the CMS may be a valid measure to distinguish two subtypes of Canadian offenders: the pro-social criminals and career criminals. The CMS does not, however, distinguish the four subtypes originally described by its constructors.

While the CMS deserves credit for being one of the pioneer objective systems for classifying offenders, there

is considerable room for improvement. For example, future research on the CMS aimed at improving its effectiveness as a classifying tool, should concentrate on increasing its reliability and validity. This could be achieved by building on the items which were found to be valid for discriminating between the CMS subtypes and eliminating the other items.

Another suggestion to improve the CMS would be to drop its four classification titles (i. e., SI, ES, CC, and LS) and change the CMS to reflect those types that have consistently emerged in the literature. The theoretical examination of commonalties among most classification systems (c.f., chapter four) revealed the existence of five broad categories of offenders: the asocial aggressive type, the conformist nondelinquently-oriented and delinquently-oriented types, the antisocial-manipulator type, the neurotic type, and the situational type. These categories are in general agreement with those described by Van Voorhis (1990).

To achieve the goal of changing the CMS to reflect those types which were found to be the most valid and reliable across offender classification systems, it may be better to use relevant items and integrate them into the CMS. Such items would be those which have been found to be valid for classifying offenders to specific type. For example, items

relating to the Asocial Aggressive type (c. f., chapter four) or to the committed criminal type (Van Voorhis, 1990) could be borrowed from Quay's Asocial Aggressive subscale, Megargee's Charlie and Foxtort subscale, Jesness's Cultural Conformist subscale, and the I-level (interview) I4 Cultural Identifier subscale. Likewise, items relating to the Neurotic type could be borrowed from other scales of these same assessment instruments.

Another area of research to improve the efficacy of the CMS would be to tie the proposed CMS types to the principles of classification for effective rehabilitation devised by Andrews et al. (1990) who suggested reserving higher levels of service for higher risk cases. Targets of service are matched with the characteristics and criminogenic needs of offenders. In addition, styles and modes of service are matched to the learning styles and abilities of offenders. Thus, for example, the treatment strategy for an offender who has been identified as a neurotic anxious/high-anxiety type, should not include having him engage in therapeutic interventions which utilize stressful interpersonal confrontation. Similarly, the treatment strategy for the character disorder type should focus on providing intensive controls and target impulsivity, procriminal sentiments, and isolation from anti-criminal others (Andrews et al., 1990).

Another suggestion is to include a section in the CMs for institutional psychologists to provide their input regarding criminogenic factors, personality characteristics and possible treatment plans for different types of offenders. Psychologists, through their professional training and expertise, are equipped to provide valuable input regarding these factors. This is particularly true in identifying the neurotic type, the neurotic anxious/high-anxiety type, the character disorder type, the immature dependent type, and the psychologically or psychiatrically disturbed type. Providing such a section for psychologists may prove to be efficient for the smooth transfer of information between Case Managers and Psychologists, much of which is currently being collected independently by these personnel. Implementing this suggestion would allow Case Managers easier access to information necessary to complete classification and treatment plans for offenders.

A final area of research that deserves attention, following the successful implementation of the suggested changes, is the examination of the outcome of different treatment strategies on recidivism. This important area was beyond the scope of this study, but should be explored in future endeavors.

References

- Adams, K. (1983). Former mental patients in a prison and parole system. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 10, 358-384.
- Adams, T. C. (1977). Characteristics of state prisoners who demonstrate severe adjustment problems. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 1100-1103.
- Akman, D. D. (1977). Homicides and assaults in Canadian penitentiaries. Canadian Journal of Corrections, 8, 284-299.
- Amir, M. (1971). Patterns of forcible rape. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- American Psychiatric Association (1980). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, ed. 3,. American Psychiatric Association, Washington, D.c.
- Anastasi, A. (1982). Psychological Testing. (5th edition). New York: MacMillan Publishing.
- Anderson, D. B. (1982). The relationship between correctional education and parole success. Journal of Offender Counselling Services & Rehabilitation, 5, 13-25.
- Andrews, D. A. (1983). The level of supervisory inventory (LSI): 1. The first follow-up. Project 200. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Andrews, D. . (1989). What should we assess and why?: Evidence for the importance of assessing risk levels and need of offenders. Paper presented at the First Annual Corrections Research Forum, Ottawa: Correctional Service Of Canada.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., Hoge. R. D (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering Psychology. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17, (1), 19-52.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, S. (1987). Criminal behaviour. Notes for course #49.342. Ottawa: Carleton University, Department of Psychology.

- Andrews, D. A., Hoge, R. D., Robinson, D., and Andrews, F. J. (1988). The Case Management Strategies Survey. Research prepared for the Research Branch Communications and Corporate Development. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Andrews, D. A., Kiessling, J. J., Komisar, S. (1983). The level of supervision inventory (LSI-VI): Interview and scoring guide. Project 200. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Andrews, D. A., Kiessling, J. J., Mickus, S. G., Robinson, D. (1985). The Level of Supervision Inventory: Risk/Needs Assessment in Community Corrections. Ottawa: Laboratory for Research on Assessment and Evaluation in the Human Services, Carleton University.
- Andrews, D. A., Kiessling, J. J., Mickus, S., & Robinson, D. (1986). The construct validity of interview-based risk assessment in corrections. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 18, 461-473.
- Andrews, D. A., & Robinson, D. (1984-February). The level of supervision inventory: Second report. A report to Research Services and the Community division of the Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services
- Andrews, D. A., & Young, J. G. (1974). Short-term structured group counselling and prison adjustment. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 16, 5-13.
- Arnold, L.S., Quinsey, V. L., & Velner, J. (1977). Overcontrolled hostility among men found not guilty by reason of insanity. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 9, 333-340.
- Ashford, J. B., & LeCroy, C. W. (1988). An evaluation of the Wisconsin Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Risk Instrument. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15, 141-151.
- Austin, J. (1983). Assessing the new generation of prison classification models. Crime & Delinquency, 29, 561-576.
- Austin, J. (1986). Evaluating how well your classification system is operating: practical approach. Crime & Delinquency, 32, 302-322.

- Babst, D. V., Moseley, W. H., Scheidler, J., Neithercutt, M. G., Koval, M. (1976). Assessing length of institutionalization in relation to parole outcome: A study of drug users paroled in the United States in 1968 and 1969. Criminology, 14, 41-53.
- Baird, C. (1981). Probation and parole classification: The Wisconsin model. Corrections Today, 43, 36-41.
- Baird, S. C. (1982). Probation and parole classification: The Wisconsin model. American Correctional Association. Maryland: College Park.
- Baird, S. C. (1985). Classifying juveniles: Making the most out of an important management tool. Corrections Today, 47, 32-38.
- Baird, S. C., Heinz, R. C., & Bemus, B. J. (1981). The Wisconsin case classification /staff development project : A two- years follow-up report. American Correctional Association Monographs. Maryland: College Park 1 (4).
- Barnett, A. & Lofaso, A. (1985). Selective incapacitation and the Philadelphia Cohort Data. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 1, 3- 36.
- Barnett, A., Blumstien, A., & Farrington, D. P. (1987). Probabilistic models of youthful criminal careers. Criminology.
- Baum, M. S., Hosford, R. C., & Moss, C. S. (1982). Predicting violent behavior within correctional setting. Unpublished manuscript, Santa Barbara : University of California.
- Beck, J. L & Hoffman, P. B. (1976). Time served and release performance: A research note. Journal of research in Crime and Delinquency, 13, 127-132.
- Blackman, N., & Weiss, J. M., & Lambert, J. W. (1963). The sudden murder. Clues to previntive interaction, Arch. Gen. Psychiatry, 8, 289-294.S
- Blumstein, A. & Larson, R. C. (1971). Problems in modeling and measuring recidivism. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 8, 124-132.

- Blumstein, A., Farrington, D. P. & Moitra, S. (1985). Delinquency careers : Innocents, desisters, and persisters. In M. Tory, and N. Morris (Eds.). Crime and Justice : An Annual Review of Research, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bohn, M. J. Jr. (1979). Management classification for young adult inmates. Federal Probation, 43, 53-59.
- Bonta, J., & Motiuk, L. L. (1983). Assessing incarcerated offenders for half way houses. A report to research services, Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Bonta, J., & Motiuk, L. L. (1985). The utilization of an interview-based classification instrument: A study of correctional halfway houses. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 12, 333-352.
- Booth, R. J., & Howell, R. J. (1980). Classification of prison inmates with the MMPI: An extension and validation of the Megargee typology. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 7, 407-422
- Brennan, T. (1987). Classification: An overview of selected methodological issues. In D. M. Gottfredson & M. Tonry (Eds.) Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Brown, F. G. (1976). Principles of Educational and Psychological Testing (2nd edition). New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.
- Buck, J. A., & Graham, J. R. (1978). The 3-4 MMPI profile type: A failure to replicate. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 344.
- Buss, A. H. & Durkee, A. (1957) An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21, 343-349.
- Carbonell, J. L. (1983). Inmate classification system: A cross-tabulation of two methods. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 10, 285-292.

- Carbonell, J. L., Megargee, E. I., and Moorhead, K. M. (1984). Predicting prison adjustment with structured personality inventories. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 280-294.
- Carey, R. J., Garske, J. P., & Ginsberg, J. (1986). The prediction of adjustment to prison by means of an MMPI-based classification. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 13, 347-365.
- Clayton, O., & Carr, T. (1987). An empirical assessment of the effects of prison crowding upon recidivism utilizing aggregate level data. Journal of Criminal Justice, 15, 201-210.
- Clements, C. B. (1981). The future of offender classification. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 8, 15-38.
- Clements, C. B. (1988) The Measurement and Resource Management. Classification: Innovative Correctional programs. Eastern Kentucky University: Department of Correctional Services..
- Clinard, M. B. & Quinney, R. (1973) Criminal Behavior Systems: A Typology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Clinard, M. B. & Quinney, R. (1986) Criminal Behavior Systems: A Typology. Second Edition. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Cohen, A.K. and Short, J. F. (1958). Research on delinquent subculture. Journal of Social Issues, 3, 2-37.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1980). Case Management, Policy and Procedure Manual. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1984). Essentials of Psychological Testing (4th edition). New York : Harper & Row Publishers.
- Dahlstorm, W. G., Panton, J. H., Bain, K. P., & Dahlstorm, L. E. (1986). Utility of the Megargee-Bohn MMPI typological assignments: Study with a sample of death row inmates. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 13, 5-17.
- Davis, G. F. (1980). Assessing parole violation rates by means of the survivor cohort method. Federal Probation, 44, 26-32.

- Davis, K. R., & Sines, J. O. (1971). An antisocial behavior pattern associated with a specific MMPI profile. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 196-202.
- Dershowitz, A. (1974). The origins of preventive confinement in Anglo-American law. Part I: The English experience. University of Cincinnati Law Review, 43, 1-60.
- Dix, G. (1977). Administration of the Texas death penalty statues: Constitutional infirmities related to the prediction of dangerousness. Texas Law Review, 55, 1343-1414.
- Edinger, J. D. (1979). Cross-validation of the Megargee et al., MMPI typology for prisoners. J. of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47, 234-242.
- Edinger, J. D., & Auerbach, S. M. (1978). Development and validation of a multidimensional multivariate model for accounting for infractory behavior in a correctional setting. J. of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 1472-1489.
- Edinger, J. D., Reuterfors, D., & Logue, P. E. (1982). Cross-validation of the Megargee MMPI typology: A study of specialized inmate population. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 9, 184-203.
- Ekland, O., Barrick, S. D., & Cohen (1983). Prison overcrowding and disciplinary problems: an analysis of the Texas prison system. Journal of applied Behavioral Science, 19, 163-176.
- Farrington, D. P. (1983). Offending from 10 to 25 years of age. In K. T. Van Dusen and S. A. Mendick (Eds.) Prospective Studies of Crime and Delinquency. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Farrington, D. P. (1987). Predicting Individual Crime Rates. In D. M. Gottfredson & M. Tonry (Eds.) Prediction and Classification. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ferdinand, T. C. (1966). Typologies of Delinquency: A critical Analysis. New York: random House.

- Fischer, D. R. (1983). The use of actuarial methods in early release screening. Unpublished. Statistical analysis centre, Office for planing and programing, State of Iowa.
- Flanagan, T. J. (1980). Time served and institutional misconduct: patterns of involvement in disciplinary infractions among long-term and short-term inmates. Journal of Criminal Justice, 8, 357-367.
- Flangan, T. J (1983). Correlates of institutional misconduct among state prisoners. Criminology, 21, 29-39.
- Fruchtman, L. (1982). Use of the MMPI in predicting violence in incarcerated delinquents. Dissertation, University Microfilm International.
- Gendreau, P., & Leipziger, M. (1978). The development of a recidivism measure and its application in Ontario. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 20, 3-17.
- Gendreau, P., Madden, P. G., & Leipziger, M. (1979). Norms and recidivism for first incercerates: Implications for programing. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 21, 416-441.
- Gendreau, P., Madden, P. G., & Leipziger, M. (1980) Predicting recidivism with social history information and a comparison of their predictive power with psychometric variables. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 22, 328-336.
- Ghiselli, E. E., Campbell, J. P. & Zedeck, S. (1981). Measurmenets Theory for Behavioral Science. Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Company.
- Gibbons, D. C. (1965). Changing the Lawbreaker: The Treatment of delinquents and Criminals. Englewood cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Gibbons, D. C. (1975). Offender typologies-two decades later. British J. of Criminology, 15, 141-156.
- Gibbons, D. C. (1988). Some critical observations on criminal types and criminal careers. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15, 8-23.

- Glueck, S. and Glueck, E. (1952). Delinquents In The Making: Paths To Prevention. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Goodrick, D. & Vigdal, G. (1976). The problem drinking offender: Self-identification, motivation for treatment, and treatment choice of responsible abstinence versus responsible drinking. Work in progress on Alcoholism: Annals of the New York Academy of Science, 273, 488-491.
- Gottfredson, D. (1987). Prediction and classification in criminal justice decision making. In D. M. Gottfredson & M. Tonry (Eds.) Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gynther, M. D., Altman, A., & Warbin, R. W. (1973). A new actuarial-empirical automated MMPI interpretative program : The 4-3/ 3-4 code type. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 27, 234-237.
- Gynther, M. D., & Gynther, R. A. (1983). Personality inventories. In I. B. Weiner (Ed.), Clinical Methods in Psychology (2ed) 152-232, NY: Wiley.
- Hamparian, D. A., Schuster, R., Dinitz, S., & Conrad, J. P. (1978). The Violent Few. Lexington, Mass. : Heath.
- Hall, H. V. (1984). Predicting dangerousness for the courts. American Journal of Forensic Psychiatry, 77-96.
- Hann, R. G. & Harman, W. G. (1989). Release risk prediction: A test of the Nuffield Scoring system. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Hanson, R. W., Moss, C. S., Hasford, R. E., & Johnson, M. E. (1983). predicting inmate penitentiary adjustment: An assessment of four classificatory methods. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 10, 293-309.
- Hare, R. D. (1985a). Comparison of procedures for the assessment of psychopathy in criminal population. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 7-16.
- Hare, R. D. (1985b). The Psychopathy Checklist. Unpublished manuscript. University of British Columbia.

- Harris, P. W (1983). The interpersonal maturity of delinquents and nondelinquents. In W. S. Laufer & J. M. Day (Eds.), Personality, moral development and criminal behavior. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
- Harris, P. W. (1988). The interpersonal maturity level classification system. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15, 58-77.
- Hellman, D., Blackman, N. (1966). Enuresis, firesetting, and cruelty to animals: A trait predictive of adult crime. American Journal of Psychiatry, 122, 1431-1435.
- Hill, G. (1985) Predicting recidivism using institutional measures. In D. P. Farrington & R. Tarling (Eds.). Prediction in Criminology. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Hinton, J. W. (1983). The need for a multi-disciplinary approach to the study of dangerousness. In J. W. Hinton (Ed.). Dangerousness: Problems of Assessment and Prediction. U. K: George Allen & Unwin Publishers.
- Hofman, P. B. (1983). Screening for risk. A revised factor score (SFS 81). Journal of Criminal Justice, 11, 539-547.
- Honig, A. L. (1982). Assessing future dangerous behavior: Do the experts agree?. Dissertation, University Microfilms International.
- Holland, T. R., & Holt, N. (1980). Correctional classification and prediction of institutional adjustment. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 7, 51-60.
- Jayewardene, C. H. S. (1975). On the feasibility of classifying offenders for diversionary purposes. A report prepared for the Research Division, Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Jesness, C. F. (1974). The sequential I-level classification manual. Sacramento: American Justice Institute.
- Jesness, C. F. (1988). The Jesness inventory classification system. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15, 78-91

- Johnson, S., Gibson, L., & Linden, R. (1978). Alcohol and rape in Winnipeg, 1966-1975. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 39, 1877-1894.
- Johnson, D. L., Simmons, J. G., & Gordon, B. S. (1983). temporal consistency of the Meyer-Megargee inmate typology. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 10, 263-268.
- Justice, B., Justice, R., & Craft, J. (1974). Early warning signs of violence: Is a triad enough ?. American Journal Of Nervous and Mental Disease, 160, 324-341.
- Kepple, G (1982). Design and Analysis: A Researcher's Handbook, second ed., Prentice-Hall Inc, NJ: Englewood Cliffs.
- Kirk, R. (1982). Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Science. Brooks/Cole Publishing Comp., Belmont: California.
- Krakowski, M., Volavka, J., & Brizer, D. (1986). Psycopathy and violence: A review of literature. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 27, 131-148.
- Lerner, K., Arling, G., & Baird, C. (1986). Client Management Classification Strategies For Case Supervision. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Wisconsin: Madison.
- Levine, M (1984). The adversary process and social science in the courts: Barefoot V. Estelle. Journal of Psychiatry and Law, 12, 147-181.
- Levinson, R. B. (1982). A clarification of Classification. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 133-141.
- Levinson, R. B (1988). Development in the classification process: Quay's AIMS approach. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15, 24-38
- Loeber, R., & Dishion, T. (1983). Early predictors of male delinquency: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 94, 68-99.
- Lothstein, L. M., & Jones, P. (1978). Discriminating violent individuals by means of various psychological tests. Journal of Personality Assessment, 42, 237-243.

- Louscher, P. K., Hosford, R. E., Scott, C. M. (1983). Predicting dangerous behavior in a penitentiary using the Megargee typology. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 10, 269-284.
- Loza, W (1981). The Reliability and Validity of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory. Ontario: Kingston Penitentiary, Unpublished Manuscript.
- Loza, W., & Andrews, D. (1989). Some Clinically-Relevant Personality Correlates of Case Management Strategy Subtypes: An Exploration With the Millon Inventory. Ontario: Kingston Penitentiary, Unpublished Manuscript.
- MacGuigan, M. (1977) Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, Sub-Committee on the Penitentiary System in Canada. Report to Parliament. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- Mack, J. (1969). The MMPI and recidivism. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 5, 612-614.
- MacKenzie, D. L., Posey, C. D., Rappaport, K. R. (1988). A theoretical revolution in corrections: varied purpose for classification. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 15, 125-136.
- McCreary, C. P. (1976). Trait and type differences among male and female assaultive and nonassaultive offenders. Journal of Personality Assessment, 40, 617-621.
- McDonald, G., & Bygott, J. (1977). Impact of beverage alcohol on the criminal justice system: A pilot study. Canada. Toronto : Secretariat for Justice.
- McGuire, J. (1976). Prediction of dangerous behavior in a federal correctional institution. Unpublished Dissertation Department of Psychology .Florida State University.
- Megargee, E. I. (1966). Uncontrolled and overcontrolled personality types in extreme antisocial aggression. Psychological monographs, 80, no. 611.
- Megargee, E. I. (1970). The prediction of violence with psychological tests. In C. D. Spielberger (Ed.), Current topics in clinical and community psychology, 2, 101-121. New York: Academy Press.

- Megargee, E. I (1977a). A new classification system for criminal offenders, I: The need for a new classification system. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 4, 107-114
- Megargee, E. I (1977b). A new classification system for criminal offenders, V: Directions for further research. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 4, 211- 216
- Megargee, E. I. (1984). A new classification system for criminal offenders, VI: differences among the types on the adjective checklist. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 11, 349-376
- Megargee, E. I. and Bohn, M. J.(1979). Classifying Criminal Offenders. A new system based on the MMPI. Sgae Publication, Beverly Hills.
- Megargee, E. I. & Carbonell, , J. L. (1985). Predicting prison adjustment with MMPI correctional scales. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 874-883.
- Megargee, E. I. & Cook, P. E. (1975). Negative response bias and the MMPI overcontrolled-hostility scale: A response to Deiker. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43, 725-729.
- Megargee, E. I., Cook, P. E., & Mendelson, G. A. (1967). Development and evaluation of an MMPI scale of assaultiveness in overcontrolled individuals. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 72, 519-528.
- Mendelzys, N. (1979). Correlates of offense serverity and recidivism probability in a Canadian sample. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 35, 897-907.
- Menuck, M. (1985). Clinical assessment of dangerous behavior. In M. H. Ben-Aron, S. J. Hucker, & C. D. Webster (Eds.) Clinical Criminology, Assessment & Treatment of Criminal Behavior. Toronto : Clark Institute of Psychiatry.
- Millon, T. (1982). Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory Manual. Minneaplis : National Computer Systems Inc.
- Monahan, J. (1981). The clinical prediction of violent behavior. U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. Rockville, Maryland.

- Morris, A. (1965). The comprehensive classification of adult offenders. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 56, 197-202.
- Moss, C. S., Johnsr M. E., Hosford, R. E. (1984). An assessment of the Megargee typology in lifelong criminal violence. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 11, 225-234.
- Motiuk, L. L., Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (1986). Classification in correctional half way houses: The relative and incremental predictive criterion validities of the Megargee- MMPI and LSI systems. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 13, 33-46.
- Mrad, D. F., Kabacoff, R., & Duckro, P. (1983). Validation of the Megargee typology in a halfway house setting. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 10, 252-262.
- Mulvey, E. P., and Lidz, C. W. (1984). Clinical considerations in the prediction of dangerousness in mental patients. Clinical Psychology Review, 4, 379-401.
- National Advisory Commission on criminal justice Standard and Goals (1973). Corrections, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
- Nuffield, J (1982). Parole decision-making in Canada. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill Book.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). Multipule Regression In Behavioral Research. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Pernanen, K. (1979). Experience of violence and their association with alcohol use in the general population of a community. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of American Society of criminology, Philadelphia.
- Persons, R. W., & Marks, P. A. (1971). The violent 4-3 MMPI personality type. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 36, 189-196.
- Pritchard, D. A. (1979). Stable predictors of recidivism: A Summary. Criminology, 17, 15-21.

- Quay, H. C. (1964). Personality dimensions in delinquent males as inferred from the factor analysis of behavioral ratings. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1, 33-37.
- Quay, H. C. (1984). Managing adult inmates : Classification for housing and program assignments. American Correctional Association.
- Quinsey, V. L. (1979). Assessments of the dangerousness of mental patients held in maximum security. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 2, 389-406.
- Quinsey, V. L., & Maguire, A. (1986). Maximum security psychiatric patients : Actuarial and clinical prediction of dangerousness. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1, 143-171.
- Roebuck, J. B. (1967). Criminal typology: The legalistic, physical-constitutional-heredity, psychological-psychiatric and sociological approaches. Illinois, Springfield: Charles. C. Thomas.
- Ross, R., Gendreau, P., Ross, B., & Shortt, J (1982). Alcohol abuse treatment in corrections: Programs and results. Canada: Correctional Services, Offender Programs, 3-9.
- Roucek, J. S. (1958). Juvenile Delinquency. New York: physiological library Inc.
- Schaffer, C. E., Pettigrew, C. G., Blouin, D., & Edwards, D. W. (1983). Multivariate classification of female offender MMPI profiles. Journal of Crime and Justice, 6, 57-66.
- Schroeder, M., Schroeder, K., And Hare, R. D. (1983). Generalizability of a checklist for assessment of psychopathy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 51, 511-516.
- Sechrest, L. (1987). Classification for treatment. In D. M. Gottfredson & M. Tonry (Eds.) Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Serin, R. C. (1990). Hare's checklist interview formate. Unpublished manuscript. Joyceville Institution, Ontario.

- Shah, S. (1978). Dangerousness: A Paradigm for exploring some issues in law and psychology. American Psychologist, 33, 224-238.
- Simmons, J. G., Johnson, D. L., Gouvier, W. D., & Muzyczka, M. J. (1981). The Meyer-Megargee inmate typology: Dynamic or unstable?. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 8, 49-54.
- Voss, H., & Hepburn, J. (1968). Patterns in criminal homicide in Chicago. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 59, 499-508.
- Waller, I (1974). Men released from prison. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Walters, G. D. (1986). Correlates of the Megargee criminal classification system: A military correctional setting. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 13, 19-32.
- Walters, G. D., Scapansky, T. A., & Marrow, G. A. (1986). The emotionally disturbed military criminal offender: Identification, background and institutional adjustment. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 13, 261-285.
- Warren, M. Q. (1971). Classification of offenders as an aid to efficient management and effective treatment. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 62, 239- 258.
- Webster, C. D., & Addario, S. (1985). Constructing dangerousness: scientific, legal, and policy implications. Research report of the centre of criminology. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Wheeler, G. R., & Hisson, R. V. (1988). A survival time analysis of criminal sanctions for misdemeanor offenders: A case for alternatives to incarceration, Evaluation Review, 12, 510-527.
- Wolfgang, M. (1958). Patterns in criminal homicide. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia.
- Wolfgang, M. ., Filio, R. M. & Sellin, T. (1972). Delinquency in a British Cohort. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

- Wormith, S., & Goldstone, C.S.(1984). The clinical and statistical prediction of recidivism. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 11, 3-34.
- Wright, K. N.(1988). The relationship of risk, needs, and personality classification systems and prison adjustment. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15, 454-471.
- Wright, K. N., Clear, T. R. & dickson, P. (1984). Universal applicability of probation risk-assessment instruments. Criminology, 22, 113-134.r
- Van Voorhis, P. (1988). A cross classification of five offender typologies: Issues of construct and predictive validity. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15, 109-124.
- Van Voorhis, P. (1990). Psychological Classificaion of the Adult Male Prison Inmate. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati.
- Zager, L. D. (1983). Response to Simmons and associates: Conclusions about the MMPI-based classification system's stability are premature. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 10, 310-315.
- Zager, L. D. (1988). The MMPI-based criminal classification system: A review, current status, and future directions. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15, 39-57.

Appendix A.

PRINCIPLES OF CLASSIFICATION

Quay (1984)

- 1- There must be a clear definition of goals and objectives of the total correctional system.
- 2- There must be detailed written procedures and policies governing the classification process.
- 3- The classification process must provide for the collection of complete, high-quality, verified, standardized data.
- 4- Measurement and testing instruments used in the classification decision-making process must be valid, reliable, and objective.
- 5- There must be explicit policy statements structuring and checking the discretionary decision-making powers of classification team staff.
- 6- There must be provision for screening and further evaluating prisoners who are management problems and those who have special needs.
- 7- There must be provisions to match offenders with programs; these provisions must be consistent with risk classification needs.
- 8- There must be provisions to classify each prisoner at the least restrictive custody level.

Appendix A (cont'd)

- 9- There must be provision to involve the prisoner in the classification process.
- 10- There must be provision for systematic, periodic reclassification hearings.
- 11- The classification process must be efficient and economically sound.
- 12- There must be provisions to continuously evaluate and improve the classification process.
- 13- Classification procedures must be consistent with constitutional requisites.
- 14- There must be an opportunity to gain input from administration and line staff when undertaking development of a classification system.

Appendix B

COMPREHENSIVE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

**Source: National Advisory commission on Criminal
Justice Standard and Goals. Report on
Corrections, 1973, p.210. Cited in Clements
(1981).**

**1- Classification should be designed to operate on a
practicable level and for realistic purposes, guided by the
principle that:**

**a. No offender should receive more surveillance or "help"
than he requires**

and

**b. No offender should be kept in a more secure condition
or status than his potential risk dictates.**

**2- The classification system should be... issued in written
form so that it can be made public and shared. It should
specify:**

**a. The objectives of the system based on a hypothesis for
the social reintegration of offenders, detailed methods for
achieving the objectives, and a monitoring and evaluation
mechanism to determine whether the objectives are being met.**

b. The critical variables of the typology to be used.

**c. Detailed indicators of the components of the
classification categories.**

Appendix B (cont'd)

d. The structure (committee, unit, team, etc.) and the procedures for balancing the decisions that must be made in relation to programming, custody, personal security, and resource allocation.

3- The system should provide full coverage of the offender population, clearly delineated categories, internally consistent groupings, simplicity, and a common language.

4- The system should be consistent with individual dignity and basic concepts of fairness (based on objective judgements rather than personal prejudices).

5- The system should provide for maximum involvement of the individual in determining the nature and direction of his own goals, and mechanisms for appealing administrative decisions affecting him.

6- The system should be adequately staffed, and the agency should be trained in its use.

7- The system should be sufficiently objective and quantifiable to facilitate research, demonstration, model building, intra system comparisons, and administrative decision-making.

Appendix B (cont'd)

8- The correctional agency should participate in or be receptive to cross-classification research toward the development of a classification system that can be used commonly by all correctional agencies.

Appendix C

MINIMUM REQUIRED COMPONENTS OF A CLASSIFICATION PLAN

Source: Court order in Pugh V. Locke, 406 F. Supp. 318.

Cited in Clemments (1981)

1- A comprehensive classification system is required and shall include:

a. due consideration of age, offense, prior criminal record; vocational, educational and work needs; and physical and mental health care requirements of each inmate;

b. methods of identifying aged, infirm, and psychologically disturbed or mentally retarded inmates who require transfer to a more appropriate facility, or who require special treatment within the institution; and

c. methods of identifying those inmates for whom transfer to a pre-release, work release, or other community-based facility would be appropriate.

2- The classification of each inmate shall be reviewed at least annually.

Appendix D

FUNDAMENTAL POLICY PRINCIPLES FOR CLASSIFICATION

Source: Preliminary Draft, Inmate Classification Project, Minnesota Department of Corrections, 1978.

Cited in Clements (1981).

- 1. Minimize risk to the public.**
- 2. Minimize risk to other inmates and institution staff.**
- 3. Minimize breaches of security.**
- 4. Minimize system risk.**
- 5. Minimize security levels.**
- 6. Maximize fairness (Similar offenders treated in a similar manner).**
- 7. Maximize the objectiveness and quantitative nature of all classification criteria.**
- 8. Maximize inmate understanding of the classification system and inmate participation in program decisions.**

Appendix E

CRITERIA FOR A "GOOD" CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Megargee and Bohn (1979)

1. The classification system should be sufficiently complete so that most offenders can be classified.
2. There should be clear operational definitions of each category so that offenders may be classified with a minimum of ambiguity.
3. The system must be reliable so that several different judges or raters will arrive at the same classification for a given offender.
4. It must be valid. Individuals placed in a given classification category should be shown to possess the attributes and behavior predicted by the classification scheme.
5. The system should be dynamic so that changes in attributes, behavior or status would be reflected by a change in classification status.
6. Each classification category should carry implications for treatment or intervention.
- 7- The system should provide for the economical classification of large numbers of offenders

Appendix F

Wisconsin Case Management Strategies

Correctional Service
Canada

Service correctionnel
Canada

CASE MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT INTERVIEW

CASE MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT INTERVIEW

The purpose of CMAI is to provide the case manager with an efficient and effective case management system. CMS includes procedures for developing individualized strategies for the quality supervision of adult offenders. This process is accomplished through the completion of three system components: an assessment procedure, a supervision planning process, and supervision according to one of five strategies, depending on individualized case needs.

CMAI INSTRUCTIONS

There are four parts to the CMAI instrument. Whenever possible, the following sequence (A to D) should be followed.

- A. Attitude interview (45 items)
- B. Objective history (11 items)
- C. Behavioral observations (8 items)
- D. Officer impressions of contributing factors (7 items)

The Attitude Section

Column One:

A SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW with suggested questions has been developed to elicit attitude information about the offense, the offender's background, and about present plans and problems. The average interview takes about forty-five minutes and the scoring about five minutes.

Use a natural open, conversational style of interviewing which is comfortable for both you and the offender. If the offender presents some important or interesting information requiring follow-up, feel free to do so before returning to the structural sequence. While free-flowing communication should be stressed, some structuring is required to insure the reliability and validity of the instrument. Therefore, make every effort to preserve the meaning when transposing them into your own words.

In the interview, each section is introduced by one or two open-ended questions which are intended to encourage discussion on a particular subject. If the information needed to score the items is not obtained from the open-ended questions, one or two specific questions are provided for each item. If those questions fail to elicit the needed information, continue to inquire with increasingly direct questions unless you see the word - STOP -. "- STOP -" means to discontinue inquiry (except to repeat or clarify a misunderstood question).

For some items, "a" and "b" questions are included. If the "b" question is asterisked (*), always ask it unless the answer to the "a" makes the "b" questions meaningless (e.g. "no" to question 10a). If the question "b" is not asterisked, ask it if the needed information was not elicited from question "a".

Column Two:

THE ITEM OBJECTIVES AND RESPONSES are listed in column two. Many times the suggested questions will approach the item objective in an indirect manner in order to elicit the most valid response.

Column Three:

A SCORING GUIDE is included to provide criteria and assistance in scoring ambiguous responses. When scoring, you must choose only one alternative for each item. If you cannot choose an alternative, do not rate the item.

ATTITUDES ABOUT OFFENSE

Could you tell me about the offense that got you into trouble?

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	SCORING GUIDE
<p>1a. How did you get involved in this offense?</p> <p>1b. (If denied) What did the police say that you did?</p>	<p>1. Motivation for committing the offense</p> <p>(a) emotional motivation (e.g., anger, sex offense, etc.)</p> <p>(b) material (monetary) motivation</p> <p>(c) both emotional and material motivation</p>	<p>1. a. - Possession of drugs for own use.</p> <p>- Assault (not for robbery).</p> <p>b. - Prostitution.</p> <p>- Car theft (except for joy riding).</p> <p>- Selling drugs or stealing to support a habit.</p> <p>c. - Stealing from parents for revenge.</p> <p>- Stealing primarily for peer acceptance.</p> <p>- Man who won't pay alimony primarily because he's angry with his ex-wife.</p> <p>- Theft of alcohol.</p>
<p>2a. How did you decide to commit the offense?</p> <p>2b. Could you tell me more about the circumstances that led up to the offense?</p>	<p>2. Acceptance of responsibility for current offense</p> <p>(a) admits committing the offense and doesn't attempt excuses</p> <p>(b) admits committing the offense, but emphasizes excuses (e.g., drinking, influence by friends, family problems, etc.)</p> <p>(c) denies committing the offense</p>	<p>2. a. Explain circumstances but takes responsibility.</p> <p>b. Blames circumstances and does not take responsibility.</p> <p>c. Offenders who deny any significant aspect of the offense are scored "c" (e.g., the offender admits that he helped to jimmy a car window but denies responsibility for removing valuables because his friends removed them).</p>
<p>3. Looking back at the offense, what is your general feeling about it? - STOP -</p>	<p>3. Expression of guilt about current offense</p> <p>(a) expresses guilt feelings or spontaneous empathy toward victim</p> <p>(b) expresses superficial or no guilt</p> <p>(c) victimless crime</p>	<p>3. a. Offender must feel some personal shame and regret (not just verbalization to impress the officer).</p> <p>b. - "I feel bad because now I have a record."</p> <p>- "People are disappointed in me." (Indicates some regret but not necessarily guilt.)</p> <p>- "I know it was wrong" (Emphasis is on having done wrong, but not on feeling bad because one has done wrong.)</p> <p>c. - Using drugs (never drug trafficking)</p> <p>- Sexual activities between consenting adults.</p>

OFFENSE PATTERN

I'd like to talk to you about your prior offenses. Have you been in trouble before? (Obtain a complete picture of offenders' convicted offense style, including current offense and juvenile convictions, when scoring items 4 - 8.)

4 - 8 Include juvenile and serious traffic offenses (e.g., drunk driving). Don't count dismissals.

- 4a. What prior offenses are on your record? (Most recent first)
- 4b. Were you ever in trouble as a juvenile? (List on grid below)

4. Offense and severity
- (a) no prior offenses (Skip items 5, 6, 7, and 8.)
 - (b) mainly offenses resulting in sentences less than six months
 - (c) no consistent pattern
 - (d) mainly offenses resulting in sentences of six months or more

4. b. Should not be used if offender has more than two offenses resulting in sentences of six months or more. (Use choice "c" or "d")
- d. Over 50% of offender's offenses resulted in sentences of six months or more.

Offense	(Item 4) Sentence: Under/ Over 6 Months	(Item 5) Assaultive?	Circumstances of Offense	(Item 6) Planned?	(Item 7) Drugs/ Alcohol	(Item 8) Accomplices?

- 5a. Have you ever been armed or hurt someone during these offenses?
- 5b. Did you ever threaten anyone?

5. Was offender ever involved in an offense where he (she) was armed, assaultive, or threatened injury to someone?

5 - 8 Use current and prior offense factors to score 5 - 8.

- 6a. How did you decide to commit the most recent of your prior offenses? (Discuss offenses individually until a clear pattern emerges.)
- Could you tell me more about the circumstances that led up to the offense?

6. Offenses were generally
- (a) planned
 - (b) no consistent pattern
 - (c) impulsive

6. Officer's judgement based on all factors.
- a. - Exhibitionist who drives around in a car looking for a girl to which to expose himself.
 - Person who decides to commit an offense, then drinks to build courage
 - c. - Exhibitionist who is driving to work, suddenly sees a girl and pulls over and exposes himself.
 - Person gets drunk and into a bar fight.

7. Were you drinking or on drugs when you committed this offense? (Discuss each offense individually.)

7. Percent of offenses committed while drinking or on drugs
- (a) never
 - (b) 50% or less
 - (c) over 50%

7. Count offenses where there was any drug/alcohol use regardless of whether person was intoxicated or not.

8. Did you do the offense alone or with others? (Discuss each offense individually.)

8. Offenses were generally committed
- (a) alone
 - (b) no consistent pattern
 - (c) with accomplices

SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT

Now, I'd like to find out some things about your background. Let's begin with school. How did you like school?

9. What was your favorite subject in school? - STOP -.	<p>9. Favorite subject
(a) vocational
(b) academic
(c) gym
(d) no favorite subject</p>	<p>9. a. - Score business courses as "a".
b. - Score music or art as "b".</p>
<p>10a. Did you have a favorite teacher in high school?
• 10b. What did you like about him (her)?</p>	<p>10. Attitude toward teachers
(a) no favorite teacher
(b) teacher chosen because of certain qualities that the offender admired
(c) teacher chosen because of close relationship with the teacher</p>	<p>10. b. - "She would help kids."
c. - "She would help me."</p>
<p>11a. How far did you go in school?
• 11b. Did you have any problems with schoolwork? (If offender did not graduate from high school, find out why not.)</p>	<p>11. Offender's school performance
(a) no problems
(b) learning problems (difficulty performing schoolwork)
(c) lack of interest, behaviour, or other problems</p>	<p>11. a. Don't use for offender who didn't complete high school.
b. For offender whose learning problems result from a lack of capacity (not just from lack of interest or behavioral problems). If offender has both a lack of capacity and behavioral problems, score "b". Lack of capacity takes precedence when scoring.</p>

VOCATIONAL AND RESIDENTIAL ADJUSTMENT

Now I'd like to find out about your work history. What kinds of jobs have you had? (Use grid below to organize items 12 - 14.)

12. What is (was) your most recent job? (Start with most recent job and go backwards until a clear pattern emerges.)	<p>12. Primary vocation
(a) unskilled labor
(b) semi-skilled
(c) skilled labor or white collar
(d) no employment history (homemaker) (Skip 13 & 14)
(e) student or recent graduate (Skip 13 & 14)</p> | <p>12. a. - Average person could do job without training.
- Offender's been in the job market for over six months, but has no employment history. (Also score items 13 and 14.)
c. Rule out jobs requiring no training and/or experience.
d. For homemaker, use prior vocational history, if any. If none, check "d" and skip items 13 and 14.
e. Offender was recently (within 6 months) a student and hasn't had the opportunity to establish an employment pattern. (Skip items 13 and 14.)</p> |
|---|---|--|

- 13.a How long did you work on your most recent job?
 13.b How long between that job and your previous job?
 13c. What is the longest time you have been without work?
13. Percent of working life where offender was employed full time
 (a) over 90%
 (b) over 50% to 90%
 (c) 50% or less
13. "Working Life ...", i.e., time period society would expect one to be working. Subtract time in school, institutions, etc.
- 14a. What was the reason for leaving your most recent job?
 14b. Have you had any trouble getting jobs?
14. Primary vocational problem
 (a) none (Can be used only if 13 is scored "a".)
 (b) problems due to lack of skills or capacity
 (c) attitude or other problems
14. a. Don't use "a" if working less than 90%.
 c. - Because of my drinking problem.
 - Emotional problems.
 - Drug use.

(Item 12) (Start with most recent) Jobs and Job Responsibilities	(Item 13) Duration	(Item 14a) Reason for Leaving
(Item 13b) Unemployment Interval ▶		
(Item 13b) Unemployment Interval ▶		
(Item 13b) Unemployment Interval ▶		

- 15a. Where do you live now?
 15b. Have you moved around much? (Deal with time period after offender turned 18.)
15. Living stability background
 (a) essentially stable living arrangements
 (b) some unstable periods
 (c) essentially unstable living arrangements
15. Consider what is stable for the offender's age group.
- 16a. Have you had trouble supporting yourself or received welfare?
 16b. (If applicable) How did you support yourself when you were unemployed?
16. History of being self-supporting
 (a) offender has usually been self-supporting
 (b) offender has had several periods where he (she) wasn't self-supporting
 (c) offender has essentially not been self-supporting
16. Illegal activities and welfare are not counted as self-supporting. For offender who has not had the opportunity to support (her) himself (e.g., homemaker or person living with relatives), estimate the likelihood of (her) his being able to support (her) himself.

FAMILY ATTITUDES

Now I'd like to know about your childhood. Can you tell me what it was like?

17a. How do (did) you get along with your father?	17. Present feelings toward father
(a) close
(b) mixed or neutral
(c) hostile	17. In multi-father families, use the person whom the offender identifies as father.
b. - "we get along (without implication of closeness).
17b. How do you feel about your father now?		
18a. If you did something wrong as a teenager, how did your father handle it?	18. Type of discipline father used (during offender's teenage years)
(a) verbal or privilege withdrawal
(b) permissive (generally let offender do as he (she) pleased)
(c) physical	18. If the offender didn't live with father or father figure during at least part of his (her) adolescent years, do not rate item 18.
b. - "He always left it to Mom."
18b. What kind of discipline did he use?		
19a. How do (did) you get along with your mother?	19. Present feelings towards mother
(a) close
(b) mixed or neutral
(c) hostile	19. In multi-mother families, use the person whom the offender identifies as mother
b. - "We get along" (without implication of closeness).
19b. How do you feel about your mother now?		
20a. If you did something wrong as a teenager, how did your mother handle it?	20. Type of discipline mother used (during offender's teenage years)
(a) verbal or privilege withdrawal
(b) permissive (generally let offender do as he (she) pleased)
(c) physical	20. If offender didn't live with mother or mother figure during at least part of his (her) adolescent years, do not rate item 20.
b. - "She always left it to Dad".
20b. What kind of discipline did she use?		
21a. Were you ever abused by either of your parents?	21. Was offender ever physically abused by a biological, step, or adoptive parent
(a) yes
(b) no	21. Item 21 should be based on facts described and not on whether the offender felt abused or not.
a. - cuts on face
- severe body bruises
- sexual abuse
- starved
- locked in closet for long period
21b. Did either of them ever go overboard on the punishment?
- STOP -		
22a. How would your parents have described you as a child (before you were a teenager)?	22. Parental view of offender (prior to adolescence)
(a) good child
(b) problem child
(c) parents differed	22. a. - No special problems.
- "Like anybody else."
b. - "My parents were always complaining about me."
- Seen as "strange kid."
22b. Did both of your parents see you the same way?		

<p>23. How would you describe yourself as a child (before you were a teenager)?</p> <p>24a. How do you get along with your brothers and sisters?</p> <p>24b. How do you feel about them?</p> <p>25. Would you describe your early childhood (before you were a teenager) as happy or unhappy?
- STOP -</p> <p>26. If you could change anything about your childhood, what would you change?</p> <p>27. Can you describe your father's personality? (If answer is unclear, ask offender to describe another person he (she) knows well.)</p> | <p>23. As a child, offender describes self as
(a) good child (normal or average)
(b) problem child</p> <p>24. General feelings toward siblings
(a) close
(b) neutral or mixed
(c) hostile
(d) no siblings</p> <p>25. General attitude toward childhood
(a) happy
(b) not happy</p> <p>26. Satisfaction with childhood
(a) basically satisfied (would change little)
(b) dissatisfied with material aspect
(c) dissatisfied with self, family, or emotional climate</p> <p>27. Offender's description of personality
(a) multi-faceted
(b) superficial (e.g., "good", "bad", "nice", etc.)</p> | <p>23. Accept what the offender says even if his (her) behavior does not match his (her) perception (Examples from item 22 also apply here.)</p> <p>24. Include half-siblings; exclude step-siblings.
b. - "Like some, not others"</p> <p>25. Accept the offender's view. (If offender cannot express an opinion, officer's judgment.)</p> <p>26. c. - "I should've gone to school."</p> <p>27. The focus of this item is the complexity with which the offender views people. The ability to describe attributes, or explain the reasons for behavior, is being measured. "Superficial" indicates a lack of capacity to perceive depth in personality and not just an evasion of the question. One or two complex statements are sufficient for an "a" score.

a. - "Ambitious and honest."
- "Sensitive to others."
- "Dad was strict because that is the way he was brought up."

b. - "No-good drunk" (with no further elaboration).
- "Kind."
- "Don't know."</p> |
|---|---|--|

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

Let's talk about your friends. Do you spend much time with them?

28a. What are your friends (associates) like? • 28b. Have any of them been in trouble with the law? (if offender has no current associates, use prior associates.)	28. Offender's associates are (a) essentially non-criminal (b) mixed (c) mostly criminal	28. Don't count marijuana use (alone) as criminal. a. Don't use "a" if offender committed offence(s) with accomplices.
29a. How do you get along with your friends? • 29b. How do they act towards you?	29. In interaction with friends, offender is (a) used by others (b) withdrawn (c) other problems (d) normal	29. This item should be based on officer's judgement of the quality of the offender's interactions. If the officer thinks the offender is used by friends even though the offender thinks he (she) gets along "ok", check choice "a".
30a. Do you have a closest friend? • 30b. What do you like best about him (her) - STOP -	30. Description of offender's relationship with his (her) closest friend (a) talk (share feelings) or help each other (b) do things together (less emphasis on talking or sharing feelings) (c) has none	30. a. - "His character and personality." - "We do things for each other." - "We're like brothers." b. - "He's a hunter too." - A more action-oriented relationship.
31. Are you satisfied with the way you get along with people?	31. Satisfaction with interpersonal relationships (a) feels satisfied (b) feels dissatisfied	31. Accept the offender's statement.
32. In general, do you tend to trust or mistrust people? - STOP -	32. General outlook toward others (a) basically trusting (b) mixed or complex view (c) basically mistrusting	32. b. A complex view of people (e.g., trusts in some situations and not in others). - "I trust people too much." - "It takes awhile to get to know them."
33a. Can you tell me about your relationship with women (men)? 33b. Do you generally go out with a lot of women (men) or date the same person for long periods?	33. Offender's opposite sex relationship pattern generally is (a) long term (over 6 months) or serious relationships (b) short or long term relationships (c) short term, less emotionally involved relationships, or little dating experience	33. c. Short-term intimate relationships with no solid commitments.
34. In you relationship with your wife/girlfriend (husband/boyfriend), who tends to make the decisions?	34. In opposite sex interactions, offender generally (a) dominates (b) is average or adequate (c) is nonassertive or dominated	34. Officer's judgement. Do not accept the offender's response without exploring his (her) relationships or seeing how some specific decisions are made (e.g., who decides what to do or with whom to socialize; or who controls the money).

FEELINGS

Now, I'd like to ask you about your feelings. Have you had any problems handling you feelings?

35. Do you consider yourself to be a nervous person?
- STOP -	35. Does offender view self as a nervous (or anxious) person?
(a) yes
(b) no	35. Accept the offender's statement.
a. - "I worry a lot."
- "I'm hyperactive"
36a. What kinds of things get you depressed?	36. What does offender do when feeling depressed?
(a) seeks someone to talk to, or tries to figure it out
(b) seeks an activity to distract self
(c) drinks or uses drugs
(d) isolates self	36. b. - "Forget about them."
- "Watch T.V."
d. - "I pray."
- "I go to sleep."
37a. Have you ever thought seriously about hurting or killing yourself?	37. Self destructive behavior
(a) never seriously contemplated suicide
(b) has had definite thoughts of suicide
(c) has attempted it	37. c. Requires overt action which resulted in self-harm or clear intent toward suicide.
37b. (If offender says yes to above). Have you ever tried it?		
38a. What do you do when you are feeling angry with people?	38. In handling anger, offender
(a) is physically aggressive
(b) avoids expression to others or has trouble expressing anger appropriately
(c) responds appropriately (normal reaction)	38. Based on all sources of reliable information (e.g. offense history) and not just on offender's statement. Physically aggressive problems should take precedence in scoring. If offender says, "I leave," find out if/how he (she) deals with the anger later.
b. - "I break things."
38b. Have you ever hurt anybody when you were angry?		
39a. Can you describe your personality?	39. In describing self, offender
(a) emphasizes strength
(b) emphasizes inadequacy (probationer tends to downgrade self)
(c) can't describe self	39. If the offender gives both positive and negative statements about (him) herself, choose the one emphasized most. If the positive and negative have equal emphasis, choose the first response given.
c. Choice "c" is designed to identify the offender who is incapable of showing insight or complexity into [him] herself; (e.g., "I'm okay," and can't elaborate); "I'm nice", "I get into too much trouble", etc.
39b. What do you like and what do you dislike about yourself?
- STOP -		
40. (No question asked. Rate your impression of offender's openness in discussing feelings.)	40. Openness in discussing feelings
(a) discusses as openly as able
(b) is evasive	40. a. If the officer felt that the offender was fairly straightforward in talking about his (her) feelings.
b. If the officer thought the offender was evasive or tried to give an impression of openness.

PLANS AND PROBLEMS

<p>41. Aside from your legal problems, what is the biggest problem in your life right now?
- STOP -</p>	<p>41. What does the offender view as his (her) most important problem area right now?
(a) personal
(b) relationships
(c) vocational-educational (including employment)
(d) financial
(e) no big problems presently
(Score item 42 as "a")</p>	<p>41. a. Offender names several important problems.
- Drinking or drugs.
- "Get my head together."
b. - "Get things straightened out with my fiancée."
- "Try to get along better with my parents."</p>
42. How do you expect this problem (from item 41) to work out?	<p>42. Attitude toward solving problems
(a) optimistic; expect to succeed (include 41.e.)
(b) unclear
(c) pessimistic; expects to fail</p>	<p>42. a. - "O.K., because I've got a better paying job."
b. - "O.K., I hope."
- "I'll be O.K. if I get a better paying job."
c. Offender is pessimistic about outcome or can't figure out solution.</p>
<p>43a. What goals do you have for the future?
• 43b. What are your plans for achieving your goals?
- STOP -</p>	<p>43. Future plans
(a) short-term goals (most goals can be fulfilled within about 6 months) or no goals
(b) unrealistic goals
(c) realistic, long-term goals (most goals are well developed and extend beyond 6 months)</p>	<p>43. a. - "Just live day to day." Poorly developed goals with no plans for achieving them.
b. - Strange, way out, or impossible to achieve : goals.
c. Offender is able to, 1) set a goal within the realm of possibility and, 2) lists the steps necessary to achieve the goal.</p>
44. (No question asked. Rate the item based on follow-through on jobs, education, training programs, treatment programs, etc., based on all sources.)	<p>44. Offender usually sticks with, or completes, things he (she) begins
(a) yes
(b) no</p>	44. Compared to the average offender.
<p>45a. How will being in prison/on conditional release affect your life?
45b. What do you expect to get from being in prison/on conditional release?
- STOP -</p>	<p>45. Offender's general expectations about supervision
(a) no effect
(b) monetary, counselling, or program help
(c) incarceration has taught him/her a lesson
(d) negative expectations
(e) mixed or unclear expectations</p>	<p>45. a. "No effect because now I'm back on the right track."
d. "No effect because I don't let anybody tell me what to do."</p>

OBJECTIVE BACKGROUND ITEMS

Instructions: Ask direct questions to obtain the following information.

QUESTIONS

SCORING GUIDE

Legal history

46. Age of earliest court appearance:

- (a) 14 or younger
- (b) 15 - 17
- (c) 18 - 22
- (d) 23 or older

46. Include juvenile offenses and serious traffic offenses (e.g., drunk driving, hit and run)

47. Number of prior offenses:

- (a) none
- (b) 1 - 3
- (c) 4 - 7
- (d) 8 or more

47. Exclude the offender's present offense in rating this item. Include juvenile and serious traffic offenses.

48. Number of commitments to provincial or federal correctional institutions for six months or longer:

- (a) none
- (b) 1
- (c) 2 or more

48. Include juvenile commitments. Include commitments of six months or longer even if time served was less than six months.

49. Time spent under probation or parole supervision:

- (a) none
- (b) 1 year or less
- (c) over 1 year; up to 3 years
- (d) over 3 years

49. Include juvenile supervision.

- a. Use "a" for offender with no previous record.

Medical History

50. (Circle all applicable choices.)

- (a) frequent headaches, back or stomach problems
- (b) serious head injuries
- (c) prior psychiatric hospitalization
- (d) out-patient psychotherapy
- (e) none of the above

50. a. Vague complaints not diagnosed by a physician

- b. Skull fractures
Head injuries which required treatment (beyond X-ray)

c. In-patient hospital treatment program

d. Professional in-patient or out-patient drug/alcohol treatment

School History

51. Highest grade completed:

- (a) 9th or below
- (b) 10th to 12th
- (c) high school graduate (exclude GED)
- (d) some post high school training leading toward a degree

52. Did offender ever receive special education or remedial help in school?

- (a) yes
- (b) no

52. Include special programs for learning deficiencies (rather than behavior problems). Do not include English-as-a-second-language.

Family History

53. Offender was raised primarily by:

- (a) intact biological family
- (b) other

53. Choice "a" requires both natural parents in an intact home until offender reached about 16 years of age.

54. Did either parent have a history of:
(Circle all applicable choices)

- (a) being on welfare
- (b) criminal behavior
- (c) psychiatric hospitalization
- (d) suicide attempts
- (e) drinking problems
- (f) none of the above

54. Includes step and adoptive parents.

55. Have brothers or sisters (including half- and step-brothers or sisters) ever been arrested?

- (a) none
- (b) some
- (c) most
- (d) not applicable

Marital Status

56. Currently offender is:

- (a) single (never married)
- (b) single (separated or divorced)
- (c) married (including common-law)

_____ **END INTERVIEW** _____

BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS

Instructions: Rate the following behaviors as observed during the interview. Use (b) for the average offender. Use (a) and (c) for distinct exceptions to the average.

57. Grooming and Dress

(a)	Below average	(b)	Average	(c)	Above Average
-----	---------------	-----	---------	-----	---------------

58. Self-Confidence

(a)	Lacks Confidence	(b)	Average	(c)	Overly Confident
-----	------------------	-----	---------	-----	------------------

59. Attention Span

(a)	Easily Distractable	(b)	Average	(c)	Very Attentive
-----	---------------------	-----	---------	-----	----------------

60. Comprehension

(a)	Below Average	(b)	Average	(c)	Above Average
-----	---------------	-----	---------	-----	---------------

61. Thought Processes

(a)	Sluggish	(b)	Average	(c)	Driven (Accelerated)
-----	----------	-----	---------	-----	----------------------

62. Affect

(a)	Depressed	(b)	Average	(c)	Elated
-----	-----------	-----	---------	-----	--------

63. Self Disclosure

(a)	Evasive	(b)	Average	(c)	Very Open
-----	---------	-----	---------	-----	-----------

64. Cooperation

(a)	Negativistic	(b)	Average	(c)	Eager to Please
-----	--------------	-----	---------	-----	-----------------

IMPRESSIONS

Instructions: On the continuum below, rate the significance of each factor with regard to the offender on two (2) criteria: 1] Does the offender have a problem in this area? 2] Did (does) this problem contribute to the offender's legal difficulties? In order for the factor to receive an "a" rating, it must have significance on both criteria. To receive an "e" rating, the factor must have significance on neither criterion. At least one item be rated an "a", and at least one item must be rated an "e".

65. SOCIAL INADEQUACY

Socially inept. Unable to perceive the motives and concerns of others. Unable to survive in society and care for self.

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Socially adept. Able to assert self and to perceive the motives and concerns of others. Able to survive in society and care for self.

Do not merely rate performance in social situations. Rate ABILITY.

66. VOCATIONAL INADEQUACY

Lacks the capacity to obtain and maintain relatively permanent and reasonably paying employment.

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Has the capacity to obtain and maintain relatively permanent and reasonably paying employment.

Do not merely rate job performance. Rate CAPACITY.

67. CRIMINAL ORIENTATION

Criminal behavior is an acceptable and common part of the probationer's life and s/he attempts to live off crime without sustained attempts to make it in a pro-social way.

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Criminal behavior is not acceptable nor common part of his/her life, nor does s/he attempt to live off of crime without trying to make it in a pro-social way.

Do not merely rate the frequency of offences. Rate VALUES and ORIENTATION.

68. EMOTIONAL FACTORS

Emotional problems (e.g., chemical dependency, sex, fear, depression, low self-esteem, anxiety, self-destructiveness) contributed highly to the offense (pattern).

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Emotional factors did not contribute significantly to the offense (pattern).

69. FAMILY HISTORY PROBLEMS

Parental family problems of childhood and adolescence contributed significantly to the offense (pattern).

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Parental family problems of childhood and adolescence did not contribute significantly to the offense (pattern).

70. ISOLATED SITUATIONAL (TEMPORARY CIRCUMSTANCES)

Unusual or temporary circumstances in the probationer's life, which are unlikely to be repeated, contributed significantly to the offense.

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Offense is not a result of unusual or temporary circumstances (i.e., offense is part of a continuing pattern).

Do not merely rate infrequency of offenses. Rate OVERALL PATTERN.

71. INTERPERSONAL MANIPULATION

Consciously uses, controls, and/or manipulates others to gain his/her own ends with little regard for the welfare of others.

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Misuse of others, manipulation, and control, did not contribute significantly to offense (pattern).

Appendix G
Scoring Key for The Subscales of The
CMS Inventory By Questions

	SI +	SI -	ES +	ES-	CC +	CC-	LS +	LS -
Q1 a							b	c
2			b	a			c	
3 a+C(3) b(2)								
4 a(3) b(2)+c						a	d(3)	a+b(3)
5		a(3)					a(2)	b
6		a+b+c(3)		a			a(2)	c(3)
7					b+c(2)			
8		b	c(2)		a(3)		b(2)	
9								a
10								
11 a(3) c(2) b(3) a+c(2)								
12 e a c(2)								c(2)
13 a(3) b+c(3)								
14 a(3) c(2) b(2) c(2)								
15 a(3) b+c(3)								
16					b+c	a		
17					c(2)			
18		c(3)		b		a(2)		a(2)+b
19					b	a		
20			c	b		b		

Appendix G Cont'd/2

SI +	SI -	ES +	ES-	CC +	CC-	LS +	LS -

21	a(2)		b(2)		b(2)		a(2)
22	a(2)	b+c	c(2)				
23	a(2)	b(2)				b	a
24				c(2)	a(2)		
25	a	b					
26				c	a		
27		b(2)	a(2)				
28	a(3)	b+c(3)					
29	d		a(2)	d(2)		d	b
30		a(3)	b(2)			c	b
31							
32		a		c(2)			
33		c(2)	b(2)				
34		c(3)				a	c
35		b(3)		a	b		
36		b		c(2)		a	d
37				b+c			
38	a(3)		a(3)				b(2)
39		c(2)	a(2)			a(2)	b(2)
40	b(2)		a(2)		b(2)		a(2)

Appendix G Cont'd/3

SI +	SI -	ES +	ES-	CC +	CC-	LS +	LS -

41 b	a	c(3)	a				
42				b	a(2)		
43 c(2)	a(2)+b						
44				b	a		a(2)
45	d(2)	c(2)	a				e
46 c(3)	a(3)					a(2)	
	d(3)	b(2)					
47 a(3)	c+d(3)		c				
48 a(3)	b(2)+c(3)		c(3)				a(2)
49 a(3)	b(3)+d(3)		d(3)			c(2)	a(2)
50 e				a(2)		e	
51 c(3)	b(3)	a(3)	d(2)				
52		a	b				
53 a(3)	b(3)						
54 f(3)	a					b	
55 a(3)	b(2)+c(3)		c(3)				
56 c		a(3)	b+c				c
57					c		
58		a(2)				c	a(2)
59		a(3)					

	SI +	SI -	ES +	ES-	CC +	CC-	LS +	LS -
60								
61			a(3)	c				
62					a			
63							a(2)	
64			c					
65			a(3)+b	c+	c	e(2)		
				d(3)+				
				e(3)				
66	e(2)	c(2)	a(2)+	c+				
			b(2)	d(3)+				
				e(2)				
67	e(3)	a+b(3)+ c(2)					a(3)	c(2)+d+ e
68			b	a	a(3)	c+d+ e	d(2)+ e	a
69					a(3)+b	d+e(2)		
70	a(3)	e(3)			d(3)		e(3)	
71	e		e		d(3)		a(3)+ b(3)	e(2)

Appendix H

Item/Total Correlations For Parts of the CMS Subscales

Appendix H-1a: Item/Total correlations for the SI+ part of the SI Subscale.

1. Motivation for crime:

a-Emotional .05

3. Expression of guilt

a-express guilt .22

c-victimless crime .11

4. Prior offences

a-none .60

11. School performance

a-no problem .45

12. Primary vocation

e-student .09

13. Working

a-> 90% .60

14. Vocational problems

a-none .56

15. Living stability

a-stable .47

22. Parental view

a-good child .44

23. Describe self

a-good child .38

25. Attitudes toward childhood

a-happy .33

28. S's associates

a-non-criminal .49

29. Interactions with friends

d-normal .25

41. S'view of immediate problems

b-relationships .02

Appendix H-1b

43. Future plans

c-long term .23

46. Age of earlist court appearance

c-18-22 .11

d-23 or > .59

47. # of prior offenses

a-none .60

48. # of commitments

a-none .49

49. Time spent on parole

a-none .60

50. Medical history

e-none of above -.05

51. Highest grade completed

c-higst school graduate .17

53. S raised by

a-biological family .33

54. Parents history

f-none of the above .27

55. Have brothers/sister arrested

a-none .27

56. Marital status

c-married .10

66. Vocational inadequacy

e-not signif .41

67. Criminal orientation

e-not signif .57

70. Temporary circumstances

a-v.significant .66

71. Interpersonal manipulation

e-not signif .25

Appendix H-2a. Item/Total correlations for the SI- part of the SI Subscale.

3. Expression of guilt	
b- express no guilt	.32
4. Prior offences	
b-summary	-.09
c-no pattern	-.04
5. Violence used	
a-yes	.32
6. Offences	
a-planned	-.04
b-no pattern	.04
c-impulsive	.15
8. Offences committed	
b-no pattern	.14
11. School performance	
c-lack interest	.36
12. Primary vocation	
a-unskilled	.31
13. Working	
b-50%-90%	.32
c-50% or <	.42
14. Vocational problems	
c-attitude	.46
15. Living stability	
b-some instablity	.08
c-unstable	.36
18. Discipline used by father	
c-physical	.09
21. Abuse by parents	
a-yes	.29
22. Parental view	
b-problem	.42
c-parents differed	.11

Appendix H-2b

23. Describe self	
b-problem child	.39
25. Attitudes toward childhood	
b-not happy	.34
28. S's associates	
b-mixed	.09
c-criminals	.31
30. Relations with friends	
a-share feelings	-.18
38. In handling anger	
a-aggressive	.32
40. Openness in discussing feelings	
b-evasive	.17
41. S'view of immediate problems	
a-personal	.07
43. Future plans	
a-short term	.09
b-unrealistic	.15
45. Expectation re supervision	
d-negative	.16
46. Age of earliest court appearance	
a-14 or <	.34
b-15-17	.13
47. # of prior offenses	
c-4-7	-.07
d- 8 or >	.52
48. # of commitments	
b-1	-.04
c-2 or >	.37
49. Time spent on parole	
b-1 year or <	.02
d-> 3 years	.25

Appendix H-2c

51. Highest grade completed
b-10-12 -.04

53. 8 raised by
b-others .34

54. Parents history
a-being on welfare .19

55. Have brothers/sister arrested
b-some .19
c-most .18

66. Vocational inadequacy
c-somewhat " .10

67. Criminal orientation
a-v.significant .28
b-significant .16
c-somewhat " .04

70. Temporary circumstances
e-not signif .51

Appendix H-3a: Item/Total correlations for the ES+ part of the ES Subscale.

2. Acceptance of responsibility

b-Use excuses .05

8. Offences committed

c-with others .12

11. School performance

b-learning probs .32

14. Vocational problems

b-lack skills .28

20. Discipline used by mother

c-physical .07

27. Own description of personality

b-superficial .14

29. Interactions with friends

a-used by others .23

30. Relations with friends

b-do things together .06

32. Outlook toward others

a-trusting -.07

33. Relationships with opposite sex

c-short term .23

34. Interaction w opposit sex

c-dominated .14

35. Client view self as anxious

b-yes -.14

36. When depressed

b-seek activity -.09

39. Description of self

c-can't describe .16

Appendix H-3b

41. S'view of immediate problems

c-voc/ed/employ .08

45. Expectation re supervision

c-keep him out of trouble
.04

51. Highest grade completed

a-9 or < .26

52. Special education

a-yes .27

56. Marital status

a-never married .15

58. Self-confidence

a-lacks .30

59. Attention span

a-easily distracted .25

61. Thought process

a-sluggish .26

64. Cooperation

c- eager to please -.03

65. Social inadequacy

a-v.significant .26

b-significant .20

66. Vocational inadequacy

a-v.significant .28

b-significant .27

68. Emotional factors

b-significant .13

71. Interpersonal manipulation

e-not signif .03

Appendix H-4a: Item/Total correlations for the ES- part of
the ES Subscale.

2. Acceptance of responsibility

a-Admits .004

6. Offences

a-planned .13

11. School performance

a-no problem -.06

c-lack interest .07

12. Primary vocation

c-skilled .13

14. Vocational problems

c-attitude .12

18. Discipline used by father

b-permissive .03

20. Discipline used by mother

b-permissive .14

21. Abuse by parents

b-no -.03

22. Parental view

c-parents differed .05

27. Own description of personality

a-multi-faceted .02

29. Interactions with friends

d-normal .11

33. Relationships with opposite sex

b-mixed .04

38. In handling anger

a-aggressive .01

39. Description of self

a-emphasizes strength .15

Appendix H-4b

40. Openness in discussing feelings

a-open .02

41. S'view of immediate problems

a-personal .04

45. Expectation re supervision

a-no effect .12

47. # of prior offenses

c- 4-7 -.11

48. # of commitments

c-2 or > .01

49. Time spent on parole

d-> 3 years .01

51. Highest grade completed

d-post secondary .06

52. Special education

b-no .12

55. Have brothers/sister arrested

c-most .11

56. Marital status

b-divorced/sep .06

c-married .02

61. Thought process

c-accelerated .10

65. Social inadequacy

c-somewhat " -.14

d-of little " -.02

e-not signif. .00

66. Vocational inadequacy

c-somewhat " -.20

d-of little " .03

e-not signif .04

68. Emotional factors

a-v.significant -.01

Appendix H-5a: Item/Total correlations for the CC+ Part of
the CC Subscale.

7. Offences while on Alco/drugs

b-50% or <	-.07
c-> 50%	.26

8. Offences committed

a-alone	.12
---------	-----

16. Self supporting

b-not always	.11
c-not	.15

17. Feelings - father

c-hostile	.16
-----------	-----

19. Feelings - mother

b-neutral	.18
-----------	-----

24. Feelings - siblings

c-hostile	.10
-----------	-----

26. Satisfaction with childhood

c-disatisfied with self & others	.25
-------------------------------------	-----

32. Outlook toward others

c-mistrusting	.19
---------------	-----

35. Client view self as anxious

a-yes	.21
-------	-----

36. When depressed

c-use alco/drugs	.12
------------------	-----

37. Self destructive behavior

b-had thoughts	.06
c-attempted it	.27

42. Attitudes to solving problems

b-unclear	.10
-----------	-----

44. Complete things he begins

b- no	.24
-------	-----

Appendix H-5b

50. Medical History

a-headaches/back/
stomack problems .11

62. Affect

a-depressed .13

65. Social inadequacy

c-somewhat " .11

68. Emotional factors

a-v.significant .41

69. Family history problems

a-v.significant .14

b-significant .11

70. Temporary circumstances

d-of little sig .03

71. Interpersonal manipulation

d-of little " .04

Appendix H-6a: Item/Total correlations for the CC- Part of the CC Subscale.

4. Prior offences

a-none .31

16. Self supporting

a-always .38

18. Discipline used by father

a-verbal .30

19. Feelings - mother

a-close .32

20. Discipline used by mother

b-permissive .16

21. Abuse by parents

b-no .29

24. Feelings - siblings

a-close .29

26. Satisfaction with childhood

a-satisfied / .38

35. Client view self as anxious

b-no .20

40. Openness in discussing feelings

b-evasive -.16

42. Attitudes to solving problems

a-optimistic .21

44. Complete things he begins

a-yes .33

57. Grooming

c-above average .10

65. Social inadequacy

e-not signif. .35

Appendix H-6b

68. Emotional factors

c-somewhat "	.08
d-of little "	-.00
e-not signif	.33

69. Family history problems

d-of little "	-.03
e-not signif	.38

Appendix H-7a: Item/Total correlations for the LS+ Part of the LS Subscale.

1. Motivation for crime:

b-Material .17

2. Acceptance of responsibility

c-Denies -.01

4. Prior offences

d-indictable .35

5. Violence used

a-yes .20

6. Offences

a-planned .19

8. Offences committed

b-no pattern .08

23. Describe self

b-problem child .21

29. Interactions with friends

d-normal -.16

30. Relations with friends

c-has none .01

Appendix H-7b

34. Interaction W opposit sex
a-dominants .11

36. When depressed
a-seek help -.04

39. Description of self
a-emphasizes strength -.07

46. Age of earlist court appearance
a-14 or < .26

49. Time spent on parole
c-1-3 years .18

50. Medical history
e-none of above -.06

54. Parents history
b-criminals .07

58. Self-confidence
c-overly conf. .08

63. Self disclosure
a-evasive .14

67. Criminal orientation
a-v.significant .44

68. Emotional factors
d-of little " .18
e-not signif -.06

70. Temporary circumstances
e-not signif .47

71. Interpersonal manipulation
a-v.significant .14
b-significant .24

Appendix H-8a: Item/Total correlations for the LS- Part of
the Ls Subscale.

1. Motivation for crime:	
c-Both	.05
4. Prior offences	
a-none	.23
b-summary	.15
5. Violence used	
b- no	.19
6. Offences	
c-impulsive	-.06
9. Favorite subject in school	
a-vocational	.06
12. Primary vocation	
c-skilled	.12
18. Discipline used by father	
a-verbal	.08
b-permissive	-.10
21. Abuse by parents	
a-yes	-.17
23. Describe self	
a-good child	.11
29. Interactions with friends	
b-withdrawn	-.05
30. Relations with friends	
b-do things together	-.09
34. Interaction W opposit sex	
c-dominated	.07
36. When depressed	
d-isolate self	-.07
38. In handling anger	
b-has trouble	.08

Appendix H-8b

39. Description of self	
b-emphasizes inadequacy	.02
40. Openness in discussing feelings	
a-open	.10
44. Complete things he begins	
a-yes	.23
45. Expectation re supervision	
e-mixed	.01
48. # of commitments	
a-none	.32
49. Time spent on parole	
a-none	.27
56. Marital status	
c-married	-.05
58. Self-confidence	
a-lacks	.08
67. Criminal orientation	
c-somewhat "	-.06
d-of little "	.02
e-not signif	.38
68. Emotional factors	
a-v.significant	.05
71. Interpersonal manipulation	
e- not signif	.21

Appendix I

The Distribution of Positive Responses to Items Which
Actually Contributed to Parts of CMS Subscales, Results
of $\bar{X}$ and Pairs of Group Comparisons of CMS By CMS
Subtypes

Appendix I-1a: Distribution of Positive Responses to Items of the SI+ Subscale, Results of X² and Pairs of Group Comparisons By CMS Subtypes

	CMS SUBTYPE				X²	
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	Value (df= 3)	<P
1. Motivation for crime:						
	a	a&b	a&b	b		
a-Emotional	50.69	35.14	45.40	27.01	21.44	.000
3. Expression of guilt						
	a	b	b	b		
a-express guilt	48.98	25.64	20.61	21.84	38.41	.000
	a	a	a	a		
c-victimless crime	17.01	10.26	8.48	6.32	10.74	.01
4. Prior offences						
	a	b	b	b		
a-none	41.33	5.00	1.86	2.87	135.64	.000
11. School performance						
	a	b	b	b		
a-no problem	64.34	18.92	20.00	14.02	108.79	.000
12. Primary vocation						
e-student	2.65	0.0	.61	.57	4.47	ns
13. Working						
	a	b	b	b		
a-> 90%	73.47	2.70	15.43	14.29	180.52	.000
14. Vocational problems						
	a	b	b	b		
a-none	74.29	16.67	16.25	15.38	158.40	.000
15. Living stability						
	a	b	b	b		
a-stable	82.00	28.21	28.22	44.89	101.47	.000
22. Parental view						
	a	b	b	b		
a-good child	92.67	57.50	49.69	51.74	78.98	.000

Appendix I-1b

CMS SUBTYPE						
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡	X ² Value (df= 3)	<P
23. Describe self						
a-good child	a 95.36	b 62.50	b 65.03	b 59.20	60.18	.000
25. Attitudes toward childhood						
a-happy	a 94.59	b&c 62.50	c 57.50	b 76.44	59.49	.000
28. S's associates						
a-non-criminal	a 71.52	b 15.38	b 20.13	b 19.43	130.29	.000
29. Interactions with friends						
d-normal	a 86.00	b 55.00	b 64.42	a&b 71.43	25.08	.000
41. S'view of immediate problems						
b-relationships	16.56	17.95	19.63	15.82	.96	ns
43. Future plans						
c-long term	a 66.23	b 32.50	b 36.81	b 41.14	34.95	.000
46. Age of earliest court appearance						
c-18-22	a 27.33	a 25.00	a&b 12.80	b 9.66	22.13	.000
d-23 or >	a 48.00	b 0.0	b 3.66	b 3.98	159.12	.000
47. # of prior offences						
a-none	a 36.24	b 2.50	b 2.44	b 1.14	124.31	.000
48. # of commitments						
a-none	a 68.46	b 30.00	b&c 12.00	c 15.24	148.06	.000

Appendix I-1c

CMS SUBTYPE					
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡	X ² Value (df= 3) <P
49. Time spent on parole					
a-none	a 54.73	b 12.50	b 7.93	b 2.27	165.48 .000
50. Medical history					
e-none of above	a 57.62	a 62.50	b 31.52	a&b 49.15	26.89 .000
51. Highest grade completed					
c-higst school graduate	a 11.41	b 0	b 1.22	a&b 4.52	19.65 .000
53. S raised by					
a-biological family	a 86.58	b 55.00	b 49.69	b 54.29	53.86 .000
54. Parents history					
f-none of the above	a 74.00	a&b 60.00	c 34.76	b&c 48.02	52.72 .000
55. Have brothers/sister arrested					
a-none	a 78.91	b 45.00	b 46.30	b 48.30	43.71 .000
56. Marital status					
c-married	a 32.60	a 22.50	a 25.00	a 40.68	14.01 .003
66. Vocational inadequacy					
e-not signif	a 71.81	c 0	b 32.72	b 36.72	105.61 .000
67. Criminal orientation					
e-not signif	a 51.01	b 7.69	b 6.21	b 1.13	167.02 .000

Appendix I-1d

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				² X	
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡	Value (df= 3)	<P
70. Temporary circumstances						
	a	b	b	b		
a-v.significant	59.46	0	4.32	2.84	218.69	.000
71. Interpersonal manipulation						
	a	a	b	b		
e-not signif	41.61	53.85	20.00	10.80	59.32	.000

a, b and c= Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

**Appendix I-2a. Distribution of Positive Responses to Items
of the SI- Subscale, Results of χ^2 and Pairs of Group
Comparisons By CMS Subtypes**

	CMS SUBTYPE				χ^2 Value (df=3)	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %		
3. Expression of guilt						
b-	b	a	a	a		
" " no "	34.01	64.10	70.91	71.84	60.14	.000
4. Prior offences						
b-summary	b	a	b	c		
	23.33	40.00	24.22	4.02	42.31	.000
c-no pattern	13.33	12.50	11.80	12.64	.17	ns
5. Violence used						
a-yes	b	b	a&b	a		
	40.18	42.50	56.44	67.63	23.75	.000
6. Offences						
a-planned	b	a&b	b	a		
	27.36	30.00	17.79	30.00	33.99	.000
b-no pattern	20.75	17.50	20.25	16.18	1.30	ns
c-impulsive	a&b	a&b	a	b		
	51.89	52.50	61.96	36.99	21.29	.000
8. Offences committed						
b-no pattern	15.53	17.95	18.40	24.71	4.05	ns
11. School performance						
c-lack interest	b	b	a	a		
	13.61	37.84	73.13	75.00	93.77	.000
12. Primary vocation						
a-unskilled	b	a	a	a		
	19.21	65.00	52.73	47.43	50.66	.000

Appendix I-2b

	CMS SUBTYPE				¹ X Value (df=3)	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %		
13. Working						
b-50%-90%	a 21.09	a 32.43	a 35.80	a 30.86	8.34	.04
c-50% or <	b 5.44	a 64.86	a 48.77	a 54.86	104.18	.000
14. Vocational problems						
c-attitude	b 20.71	b 33.33	a 74.38	a 78.11	134.39	.000
15. Living stability						
b-some instablity	b 11.33	a&b 23.08	a 30.67	a&b 25.00	17.47	.001
c-unstable	c 6.67	a 48.72	a&b 41.10	b 30.11	56.16	.000
18. Discipline used by father						
c-physical	b 17.02	a&b 30.30	a 44.76	a&b 33.33	25.51	.000
21. Abuse by parents						
a-yes	b 8.67	a&b 25.64	a 38.27	a&b 24.57	37.13	.000
22. Parental view						
b-problem "	b 5.33	a 37.50	a 41.61	a 43.60	67.52	.000
c-parents differed	2.00	5.00	8.70	4.65	7.26	ns
23. Describe self						
b-problem "	b 4.64	a 37.50	a 34.97	a 40.80	60.18	.000
25. Attitudes toward childhood						
b-not happy	c 5.41	a&b 37.50	a 42.50	b 23.56	59.49	.000

Appendix I-2c

	CHS SUBTYPE				χ^2 Value	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	(df=3)	
29. S's associates						
	b	a&b	a	a		
b-mixed	23.84	35.90	50.31	49.14	29.24	.000
	c	a	b	b		
c-criminals	4.64	48.72	29.56	31.43	51.42	.000
30. Relations with friends						
	a	b	a&b	a&b		
a-share feelings	58.00	32.50	46.95	40.68	13.50	.004
38. In handling anger						
	c	b&c	a&b	a		
a-aggressive	8.67	15.00	27.44	36.57	37.12	.000
40. Openness in discussing feelings						
	c	a&b	b&c	a		
b-evasive	3.31	22.50	10.91	25.99	37.58	.000
41. S'view of immediate problems						
	a	a	a	a		
a-personal	30.46	35.90	47.24	36.72	9.73	.02
43. Future plans						
	b	a	a&b	a&b		
a-short term	29.80	55.00	46.63	37.71	13.66	.003
	b	a&b	a&b	a		
b-unrealistic	3.97	12.50	16.56	21.14	20.76	.000
45. Expectation re supervision						
	b	a	a&b	a&b		
d-negative	4.76	17.50	10.98	14.12	9.47	.02
46. Age of earliest court appearance						
	b	a	a	a		
a-14 or <	7.33	42.50	32.32	50.00	70.31	.000
	b	a&b	a	a&b		
b-15-17	17.33	32.50	51.22	36.36	39.63	.000

Appendix I-2d

	CMS SUBTYPE				X² Value	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	(df=3)	
47. # of prior offences						
c-4-7	17.45 c	17.50 b	20.12 a&b	16.48 a	.81	ns
d- 8 or >	11.41	55.00	65.24	76.70	153.14	.000
48. # of commitments						
b-1	20.13 c	32.50 b	26.22 a	20.00 a	4.59	ns
c-2 or >	11.41	37.50	58.54	68.00	117.02	.000
49. Time spent on parole						
b-1 year or <	18.92 b	27.50 a	29.27 a	29.55 a&b	5.89	ns
d-> 3 years	8.11	27.50	31.10	23.30	25.60	.000
51. Highest grade completed						
b-10-12	40.27 b	17.50 a	45.12 a	42.94 a	10.60	.01
53. S raised by						
b-others	13.42 b	45.00 a	50.31 a	45.71 a	53.86	.000
54. Parents history						
a-being on welfare	4.00 a	17.50 a	15.85 a	16.38 a	14.60	.002
55. Have brothers/sister arrested						
b-some	17.01 b	50.00 a	39.51 a	41.48 a	29.67 a	.000
c-most	0 b	2.50 a&b	10.49 a	6.82 a&b	16.94	.001
66. Vocational inadequacy						
c-somewhat "	6.04	15.00	13.58	11.30	5.58	ns

Appendix I-2e

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2	
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	Value (df=3)	<P
67. Criminal orientation						
a-v.significant	c 6.71	b 33.33	c&b 18.63	a 63.84	140.50	.000
b-significant	c 5.37	a 33.33	a&b 27.33	b&c 15.25	33.37	.000
c-somewhat "	b 16.11	b 15.38	a 34.78	b 15.25	24.37	.000
70. Temporary circumstances						
e-not signif	c 11.49	b 56.41	b 59.26	a 82.95	168.69	.000

a, b and c= Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

**Appendix I-3a: Distribution of Responses to ES+ Items,
Results of χ^2 and Pairs of Group Comparisons of Case
Management Strategies By CMS Subtypes**

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2 Value (df=3)	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡		
2. Acceptance of responsibility						
b-Use excuses	a 34.00	a 51.28	a 46.95	a 38.29	7.68	.05
8. Offences committed						
c-with others	a&b 25.24	a 43.59	b 21.47	a&b 37.36	14.70	.002
11. School performance						
b-learning probs	b 7.69	a 43.24	b 6.88	b 10.98	42.28	.000
14. Vocational problems						
b-lack skills	b 5.00	a 50.00	b 9.38	b 6.51	69.63	.000
20. Discipline used by mother						
c-physical	a 10.42	a 20.51	a 18.37	a 9.70	7.91	.05
27. Own description of personality						
b-superficial	b 22.22	a 58.97	a 55.63	a 48.26	42.21	.000
29. Interactions with friends						
a-used by others	b 4.67	a 25.00	a&b 15.34	a&b 13.71	15.57	.001
30. Relations with friends						
b-do things	b 19.33	a 47.50	b 20.12	b 27.68	16.28	.001
32. Outlook toward others						
a-trusting	a 67.79	a&b 48.72	b 40.24	b 44.57	27.18	.000

Appendix I-3b

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				¹ X Value (df=3)	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %		
33. Relationships with opposite sex						
c-short term	^c 8.67	^a 45.00	^b 27.61	^{b&c} 22.16	31.11	.000
34. Interaction W opposite sex						
c-dominated	^b 9.40	^a 27.50	^{a&b} 18.40	^b 8.67	15.83	.001
35. Client view self as anxious						
b-yes	^a 28.00	^{a&b} 33.33	^b 27.12	^a 48.78	21.89	.000
36. When depressed						
b-seek activity	46.90	39.47	36.20	46.02	4.82	ns
39. Description of self						
c-can't describe	^b 11.26	^a 45.00	^b 27.44	^b 22.03	24.86	.000
41. S'view of immediate problems						
c-voc/ed/employ	^b 10.60	^a 30.77	^b 6.75	^b 10.17	19.07	.000
45. Expectation re supervision						
c-keep him out of trouble	22.45	30.00	22.56	18.64	2.71	ns
51. Highest grade completed						
a-9 or <	^c 26.17	^a 80.00	^b 48.78	^b 48.02	42.77	.000
52. Special education						
a-yes	^b 10.14	^a 41.03	^b 24.07	^b 23.73	21.43	.000
56. Marital status						
a-never married	^b 33.78	^a 67.50	^a 56.71	^{a&b} 48.02	23.04	.000

Appendix I-3c

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2 Value	$<P$
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	(df=3)	
<hr/>						
58. Self-confidence						
a-lacks	b 7.38	a 35.00	b 11.73	b 7.34	28.47	.000
59. Attention span						
a-easily distracted	b 2.68	a 17.50	b 6.83	b 4.52	13.74	.003
61. Thought process						
a-sluggish	b 4.03	a 17.50	b 5.00	b 5.08	11.40	.01
64. Cooperation						
c- eager to please	a 20.55	a 10.53	a 10.83	a 8.72	11.09	.01
65. Social inadequacy						
a-v.significant	b 4.70	a 45.00	b 8.02	b 6.82	64.59	.000
b-significant	b 4.70	a 25.00	a 19.75	a&b 13.64	19.36	.000
66. Vocational inadequacy						
a-v.significant	b 2.68	a 35.00	b 11.11	b 10.17	36.11	.000
b-significant	b 4.03	a 45.00	b 15.43	b 8.47	53.64	.000

Appendix I-3d

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				² X Value	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡	(df=3)	
<hr/>						
68. Emotional factors						
	b	a	b	b		
b-significant	6.71	35.00	6.25	18.75	34.43	.000
71. Interpersonal manipulation						
	a	a	b	b		
e-not signif	41.61	53.85	20.00	10.80	59.32	.000
<hr/>						

a, b and c= Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

**Appendix I4-a: Distribution of Responses to ES- Items,
Results of X and Pairs of Group Comparisons of Case
Management Strategies By CMS Subtypes**

	CMS SUBTYPE				² X Value (df)	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %		
2. Acceptance of responsibility						
a-Admits	55.33	43.59	46.95	46.29	3.65	ns
6. Offences						
a-planned	b 27.36	a&b 30.00	b 17.79	a 30.00	33.99	.000
11. School performance						
a-no problem	a 64.34	b 18.92	b 20.00	b 14.02	108.79	.000
c-lack interest	b 27.97	b 37.84	a 73.13	a 75.00	93.77	.000
12. Primary vocation						
c-skilled	a 41.72	b 0.0	b 13.94	b 10.86	68.02	.000
14. Vocational problems						
c-attitude	b 20.71	b 33.33	a 74.38	a 78.11	134.39	.000
18. Discipline used by father						
b-permissive	12.77	18.18	20.98	21.01	4.27	ns
20. Discipline used by mother						
b-permissive	c 12.50	b&c 17.95	a&b 32.65	a 41.82	35.68	.000
21. Abuse by parents						
b-no	a 91.39	a&b 75.00	b 62.42	a&b 75.71	37.13	.000
22. Parental view						
c-parents differed	2.00	5.00	8.70	4.65	7.26	ns

Appendix I4-b:

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2 Value (df)	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡		
27. Own description of personality						
a-multi-faceted	a 77.78	b 41.03	b 43.75	b 51.74	42.21	.000
29. Interactions with friends						
d-normal	a 86.00	b 55.00	b 64.42	a&b 71.43	25.08	.00
33. Relationships with opposite sex						
b-mixed	a 16.67	a 12.50	a 26.99	a 26.14	8.39	.04
38. In handling anger						
a-aggressive	c 8.67	b&c 15.00	a&b 27.44	a 36.57	37.12	.000
39. Description of self						
a-emphasizes strength	a 65.56	b 20.00	b 37.20	a 61.58	48.46	.000
40. Openness in discussing feelings						
a-open	a 96.39	b&c 77.50	a&b 89.09	c 74.01	37.58	.000
41. S'view of immediate problems						
a-personal	a 30.46	a 35.90	a 47.24	a 36.72	9.73	.02
45. Expectation re supervision						
a-no effect	a 27.89	b 5.00	a 24.39	a 27.68	9.90	.02
47. # of prior offences						
c-4-7	17.45	17.50	20.12	16.48	.82	ns
48. # of commitments						
c-2 or >	11.41	37.50	58.54	68.00	117.02	.000

Appendix I4-c:

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2 Value	χ^2 (df)	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡			

49. Time spent on parole							
	b	a	a	a&b			
d-> 3 years	8.11	27.50	31.10	23.30	25.60		.000
51. Highest grade completed							
	a	b	b	b			
d-post secondary	22.15	2.50	4.88	4.52	39.43		.000
52. Special education							
	a	b	a	a			
b-no	90.07	60.00	76.36	76.27	21.43		.000
55. Have brothers/sister arrested							
	b	a&b	a	a&b			
c-most	0	2.50	10.49	6.82	16.94		.001
56. Marital status							
	a	b	a&b	a&b			
b-divorced/sep	26.35	10.00	18.29	11.30	14.32		.002
	a	a	a	a			
c-married	39.86	22.50	25.00	40.68	14.01		.003
61. Thought process							
c-accelerated	6.04	0	3.95	3.13	3.60		ns
65. Social inadequacy							
	b	b	a	b			
c-somewhat "	8.72	10.00	25.93	11.36	22.39		.000
	a	a	a	a			
d-of little "	17.45	12.50	25.31	28.41	8.43		.04
	a	c	c	b			
e-not signif.	64.43	7.50	20.99	39.77	79.63		.000

Appendix I4-d:

	CMS SUBTYPE				² X Value	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡	(df)	
66. Vocational inadequacy						
c-somewhat "	6.04	15.00	13.58	11.30	5.58	ns
	b&c	c	a&b	a		
d-of little "	15.44	5.00	27.16	33.33	23.07	.000
	a	c	b	b		
e-not signif	71.81	0	32.72	36.72	90.65	.000
68. Emotional factors						
	b	b	a	b		
a-v.significant	48.99	50.00	90.00	46.02	83.85	.000

a, b and c= Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

**Appendix I-5a: Distribution of Responses to CC+ Items,
Results of X² and Pairs of Group Comparisons of Case
Management Strategies By CMS Subtypes**

	CMS SUBTYPE				X² Value (df)	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %		
7. Offences while on Alco/drugs						
	b	a	a&b	a&b		
b-50% or <	14.02	41.03	24.54	26.44	12.54	.006
	b	b	a	b		
c-> 50%	40.19	33.33	61.35	33.33	30.32	.000
8. Offences committed						
	a&b	b&c	a	c		
a-alone	59.22	38.46	60.12	37.93	22.40	.000
16. Self supporting						
	b	a	a	a		
b-not always	10.00	37.50	47.88	38.98	55.21	.000
	b	a	a	a		
c-not	2.00	42.50	26.67	27.68	51.30	.000
17. Feelings - father						
	b	b	a	a&b		
c-hostile	.69	5.00	17.61	7.36	29.30	.000
19. Feelings - mother						
	c	b&c	a	a&b		
b-neutral	8.84	20.51	40.63	32.95	42.97	.000
24. Feelings - siblings						
c-hostile	.68	7.69	1.85	2.84	7.14	ns
26. Satisfaction with childhood						
	b	a	a	a		
c-dissatisfied with self&others	25.50	65.00	67.50	64.79	71.05	.000
32. Outlook toward others						
	b	a	a	a		
c-mistrusting	8.05	28.21	38.41	32.57	40.63	.000

4

of/de

4

PM-1 3 1/2"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

PIONEERS IN METHYLENE BLUE TESTING SINCE 1974

MicroD
CORPORATION

15800 COUNTY ROAD 5, BURNINGWELL, MN 56337, USA
TEL: 612/436-7567 FAX: 612/436-7567 TOL: 800/666-4465

Appendix I-5b:

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				χ^2	
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	Value (df)	<P
35. Client view self as anxious						
a-yes	b 28.00	a&b 33.33	a 27.12	b 48.78	21.89	.000
36. When depressed						
c-use alco/drug	a 10.34	a 13.16	a 23.31	a 12.50	12.01	.007
37. Self-destructive behavior						
b-had thoughts	8.05	7.69	13.58	9.77	3.04	ns
42. Attitudes to solving problems						
b-unclear	b 15.28	a 35.00	a 33.54	a&b 20.93	17.36	.001
44. Completes things he begins						
b-no	b 9.33	a 62.50	a 63.41	a 56.50	113.52	.000
50. Medical history						
a-headaches/ back/stomach problems	a 33.77	a 30.00	a 47.27	a 33.90	9.53	.02
62. Affect						
a-depressed	6.04	5.00	5.56	2.84	2.21	ns
65. Social inadequacy						
c-somewhat "	b 8.72	b 10.00	a 25.93	b 11.36	22.39	.000
68. Emotional factors						
a-v.significant	48.99	50.00	90.00	46.02	83.85	.000

Appendix I-5c:

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				² X Value	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡	(df)	
69. Family history problems						
	c	a&b	a	b&c		
a-v.significant	.67	17.99	27.16	10.17	49.89	.000
	b	a&b	a	a&b		
b-significant	9.40	20.51	27.78	22.03	16.98	.001
70. Temporary circumstances						
	a	a	a	a		
d-of little "	8.11	17.95	16.67	5.68	13.90	.003
71. Interpersonal manipulation						
	a&b	b	a	b		
d-of little "	19.46	15.38	33.75	10.23	29.44	.000

a, b and c= Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

**Appendix I-6a: Distribution of Responses to CC- Items,
Results of χ^2 and Pairs of Group Comparisons of Case
Management Strategies By CMS Subtypes**

	CMS SUBTYPE				χ^2 Value	$<P$
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	(df=3)	
4. Prior offences						
a-none	a 41.33	b 5.00	b 1.86	b 2.87	135.65	.000
16. Self supporting						
a-always	a 88.00	b 20.00	b 25.45	b 33.33	157.16	.000
18. Discipline used by father						
a-verbal	a 70.21	a&b 51.52	b 34.27	b 45.65	38.27	.000
19. Feelings - mother						
a-close	a 90.48	b 69.23	b 51.25	b 61.85	56.96	.000
20. Discipline used by mother						
b-permissive	c 12.50	b&c 17.95	a&b 32.65	a 41.82	35.68	.000
21. Abuse by parents						
b-no	a 91.33	a&b 74.36	b 61.73	a&b 75.43	37.13	.000
24. Feelings - siblings						
a-close	a 74.83	a&b 66.67	c 36.42	b&c 47.16	48.30	.000
26. Satisfaction with childhood						
a-satisfied	a 69.13	b 32.50	b 31.25	b 32.77	59.98	.000
35. Client view self as anxious						
b-no	a 72.00	a&b 66.67	b 51.22	a 72.88	21.89	.000

Appendix I-6b:

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				$\bar{X}$ Value (df=3)	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡		
40. Openness in discussing feelings						
b-evasive	c 3.31	a&b 22.50	b&c 10.91	a 25.99	37.58	.000
42. Attitudes to solving problems						
a-optimistic	a 80.56	b 60.00	b 60.25	a&b 73.26	17.77	.000
44. Completes things he begins						
a-yes	a 90.67	b 37.50	b 36.59	b 43.50	113.52	.000
57. Grooming						
c-above average	11.41	2.50	4.94	7.34	6.34	ns
65. Social inadequacy						
e-not signif.	a 64.43	c 7.50	c 20.99	b 39.77	79.63	.000
68. Emotional factors						
c-somewhat "	a 12.08	a 7.50	a 1.88	a 11.93	14.09	.003
d-of little "	a&b 4.70	b 0	b .63	a 13.07	27.18	.000
e-not signif	a 27.52	b 7.50	b 1.25	b 10.23	52.04	.000
69. Family history problems						
d-of little "	a&b 18.12	b 7.69	b 9.26	a 26.55	20.35	.000
e-not signif	a 60.40	b 41.03	c 19.75	b&c 25.99	65.83	.000

a, b and c= Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

**Appendix I-7a: Distribution of Responses to LS+ Items,
Results of X² and Pairs of Group Comparisons of Case
Management Strategies By CMS Subtypes**

	CMS SUBTYPE				X² Value (df)	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡		
1. Motivation for crime:						
	a&b	a&b	b	a		
b-Material	37.50	43.24	27.61	56.90	30.98	.000
2. Acceptance of responsibility						
	a	a	a	a		
c-Denies	10.67	5.13	6.10	15.43	9.17	.03
4. Prior offences						
	d	c	b	a		
d-indictable	22.00	42.50	62.11	80.46	117.49	.000
5. Violence used						
	b	b	a&b	a		
a-yes	40.18	42.50	56.44	67.63	23.75	.000
6. Offences						
	b	a&b	b	a		
a-planned	27.36	30.00	17.79	30.00	33.99	.000
8. Offences committed						
b-no pattern	15.53	17.95	18.40	24.71	4.05	ns
23. Describe self						
	b	a	a	a		
b-problem "	4.64	37.50	34.97	40.80	60.18	.000
29. Interactions with friends						
	a	b	b	a&b		
d-normal	86.00	55.00	64.42	71.43	25.08	.000
30. Relations with friends						
c-has none	22.67	20.00	32.93	31.64	6.34	ns

Appendix I-7b:

	CMS SUBTYPE				¹ X ² Value (df)	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡		
34. Interaction W opposite sex						
	a&b	b	a	a		
a-dominants	25.50	7.50	27.61	32.95	10.95	.01
36. When depressed						
	a	a	a	a		
a-seek help	22.76	7.89	12.27	15.34	8.57	.04
39. Description of self						
	a	b	b	a		
a-emphasizes strength	65.56	20.00	37.20	61.58	48.46	.000
46. Age of earliest court appearance						
	b	a	a	a		
a-14 or <	7.33	42.50	32.32	50.00	70.31	.000
49. Time spent on parole						
	b	a&b	a&b	a		
c-1-3 years	18.24	32.50	31.71	44.89	26.11	.000
50. Medical history						
	a	a	b	a&b		
e-none of above	57.62	62.50	31.52	49.15	26.89	.000
54. Parents history						
	b	a	a	a&b		
b-criminals	.67	15.00	17.68	11.86	25.13	.000
58. Self-confidence						
c-overly conf.	8.67	9.76	3.66	11.11	4.10	ns
63. Self disclosure						
	b	a	a&b	a		
a-evasive	4.03	20.00	9.88	18.75	19.74	.000
67. Criminal orientation						
	c	b	b&c	a		
a-v.significant	6.71	33.33	18.63	63.84	140.50	.000

Appendix I-7c:

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				² X Value	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡	(df)	
68. Emotional factors						
	a&b	b	b	a		
d-of little "	4.70	0	.63	13.07	27.18	.000
	a	b	b	b		
e-not signif	27.52	7.50	1.25	10.23	52.04	.000
70. Temporary circumstances						
	c	b	b	a		
e-not signif	11.49	56.41	59.26	82.95	168.69	.000
71. Interpersonal manipulation						
	b	b	b	a		
a-v.significant	6.71	0	3.13	22.16	42.24	.000
	b	b	b	a		
b-significant	6.71	12.82	15.63	35.23	45.96	.000

a, b and c= Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

**Appendix I-8a: Distribution of Responses to LS- Items,
Results of X² and Pairs of Group Comparisons of Case
Management Strategies By CMS Subtypes**

	CMS SUBTYPE				X² Value	<P
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	(df=3)	
1. Motivation for crime:						
c-Both	a 11.81	a 21.62	a 26.99	a 16.09	12.85	.005
4. Prior offences						
a-none	a 41.33	b 5.00	b 1.86	b 2.87	135.65	.000
b-summary	a 23.33	b 40.00	b 24.22	c 4.02	42.31	.000
5. Violence used						
b- no	a 59.82	a 57.50	a&b 43.56	b 32.37	23.75	.000
6. Offences						
c-impulsive	a&b 51.89	a&b 52.50	a 61.96	b 36.99	21.29	.000
9. Favorite subject in school						
a-vocational	13.33	12.82	19.51	13.71	3.21	ns
12. Primary vocation						
c-skilled	a 41.72	b 0.0	b 13.94	b 10.86	68.02	.000
18. Discipline used by father						
a-verbal	a 70.21	a&b 51.52	b 34.27	b 45.65	38.28	.000
b-permissive	12.77	18.18	20.98	21.01	4.27	ns
21. Abuse by parents						
a-yes	b 8.67	a&b 25.64	a 38.27	a&b 24.57	37.13	.000
23. Describe self						
a-good child	a 95.36	b 62.50	b 65.03	b 59.20	60.18	.000

Appendix I-8b:

	<u>CMS SUBTYPE</u>				¹ X Value	<P
	SI (n=151) ‡	ES (n=40) ‡	CC (n=165) ‡	LS (n=177) ‡	(df=3)	
29. Interactions with friends						
b-withdrawn	a 2.67	a 12.50	a 9.82	a 7.43	7.98	.05
30. Relations with friends						
b-do things together	b 19.33	a 47.50	b 20.12	b 27.68	16.28	.001
34. Interaction W opposite sex						
c-dominated	b 9.40	a 27.50	a&b 18.40	b 8.67	15.83	.001
36. When depressed						
d-isolate self	20.00	39.47	28.22	26.14	6.71	ns
38. In handling anger						
b-has trouble	b&c 28.00	a 60.00	a&b 46.34	c 26.29	29.06	.000
39. Description of self						
b-emphasizes inadequacy	23.18	35.00	35.37	16.38	18.44	.000
40. Openness in discussing feelings						
a-open	a 96.39	b&c 77.50	a&b 89.09	c 74.01	37.58	.000
44. Completes things he begins						
a-yes	a 90.67	b 37.50	b 36.59	b 43.50	113.52	.000
45. Expectation re supervision						
e-mixed	21.77	25.00	20.73	16.38	2.42	ns

Appendix I-8c:

	CMS SUBTYPE				χ^2	
	SI (n=151) %	ES (n=40) %	CC (n=165) %	LS (n=177) %	Value (df=3)	<P
<hr/>						
48. # of commitments						
	a	b	b&c	c		
a-none	68.46	30.00	12.00	15.24	148.06	.000
49. Time spent on parole						
	a	b	b	b		
a-none	54.73	12.50	7.93	2.27	165.49	.000
56. Marital status						
	a	a	a	a		
c-married	39.26	22.50	25.00	40.68	14.01	.003
58. Self-confidence						
	b	a	b	b		
a-lacks	7.38	35.00	11.73	7.34	28.47	.000
67. Criminal orientation						
	b	b	a	b		
c-somewhat "	16.11	15.38	34.78	15.25	24.37	.000
	a	a&b	a&b	b		
d-of little "	20.81	10.26	13.04	4.52	20.34	.000
	a	b	b	b		
e-not signif	51.01	7.69	6.21	1.13	167.02	.000
68. Emotional factors						
	b	b	a	b		
a-v.significant	48.99	50.00	90.00	46.02	83.85	.000
71. Interpersonal manipulation						
	a	a	b	b		
e-not signif	41.61	53.85	20.00	10.80	59.32	.000

a, b and c= Scheffe's Pairs of group comparisons. Same letters indicate that means of these groups are not significantly different at least at the 0.05 level.

Appendix J

The Level Of Supervision Inventory

The Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI-VI)

CRIMINAL HISTORY

- 1 Any prior convictions, adult/number _____
- 2 Two or more prior convictions _____
- 3 Three or more prior convictions _____
- 4 Three or more present offences/number _____
- 5 Arrested under age 16 _____
- 6 Ever incarcerated upon conviction _____
- 7 Escape history - institution _____
- 8 Ever punished for institutional misconduct/number _____
- 9 Charge laid or parole suspended during prior community supervision _____
- 10 Official record of assault/violence _____

EDUCATION/EMPLOYMENT

When in labour market:

- 11 Currently unemployed _____
 - 12 Frequently unemployed _____
 - 13 Never employed for full year _____
 - 14 Ever fired _____
- School or when in school:
- 15 Less than grade 10 _____
 - 16 Less than regular grade 12 _____
 - 17 Suspended or expelled at least once _____

Homeowner, pensioner: 18 only
School, work, unemployed:
18, 19, 20

- 18 Participation/Performance () _____
- 19 Peer interactions () _____
- 20 Authority interactions () _____

FINANCIAL

- 21 Problems () _____
- 22 Reliance upon social assistance _____

FAMILY/MARITAL

- 23 Dissatisfaction with marital or equivalent situation () _____
- 24 Nonrewarding, parental () _____
- 25 Nonrewarding, other relatives () _____
- 26 Criminal - Family/Spouse _____

ACCOMMODATION

- 27 Unsatisfactory () _____
- 28 3 or more address changes last year/number _____
- 29 High crime neighbourhood _____

LEISURE/RECREATION

- 30 No recent participation in an organized activity _____
- 31 Could make better use of time () _____

COMPANIONS

- 32 A social isolate _____
- 33 Some criminal acquaintances _____
- 34 Some criminal friends _____
- 35 Few anti-criminal acquaintances _____
- 36 Few anti-criminal friends _____

ALCOHOL/DRUG PROBLEMS

- 37 Alcohol problem, ever _____
- 38 Drug problem, ever _____
- 39 Alcohol problem, currently () _____
- 40 Drug problem, currently () _____
Specify drug _____

- 41 Law violations _____
- 42 Marital/Family _____
- 43 School/Work _____
- 44 Medical _____
- 45 Other clinical indicators - Specify: _____

EMOTIONAL/PERSONAL

- 46 Moderate interference _____
- 47 Severe interference _____
- 48 Psychiatric treatment, past _____
- 49 Psychiatric treatment, current _____
- 50 Psychological assessment indicated
Area _____

PROBATION/PAROLE CONDITIONS

- 51 Improvement indicated
Specify conditions: _____

- 52 _____
- 53 _____
- 54 _____

ATTITUDES/ORIENTATION

- 55 Supportive of crime _____
- 56 Unfavourable toward convention _____
- 57 Poor toward sentence _____
- 58 Poor toward supervision _____

TOTAL LSI SCORE _____

- 59 _____
- 60 _____
- 61 _____
- 62 _____
- 63 _____

Negative/Positive circumstances not given sufficient attention in the LSI

Appendix K

General Statistical Information On Recidivism

Government
of CanadaNational
Parole BoardGouvernement
du CanadaCommission nationale des
libérations conditionnelles

GENERAL STATISTICAL INFORMATION ON RECIDIVISM

PROTECTED WHEN COMPLETED

PPS	NAME	DATE COMPLETED										
Family		Given										
1. RECENT OFFENCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+4 Arrested for: intercourse with underaged/sexual assault/incest+3 Homicide+2 Narcotics offences, Food & Drugs Act/Narcotic Control Act+2 Unarmed robbery, Armed robbery has a score of 0+2 Arson, kidnapping, hijacking, abduction, criminal negligence in operation of vehicle+2 Dangerous driving or obstructing peace officer+2 Receiving or possession of stolen goods+2 Theft+2 Break and enter, forcible entry, unlawfully in dwelling, legal possession of firearm carrying concealed weapon+4 Escape											
2. AGE AT ADMISSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+2 Over 30+2 Under 21											
3. PREVIOUS INCARCERATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+4 First time incarcerated+1 Has served sentences in all prison or penitentiary 3 or more times before+2 Has served sentences in all prison or penitentiary 5 or more times before											
4. PREVIOUS REVOCATION OR FORFEITURE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+2 Has previously had a term of day parole full parole or MS revoked or forfeited (does not include terminations)											
5. PREVIOUS ESCAPE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+2 Has been convicted of escape or attempted escape on one or more previous occasions											
6. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF INMATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+1 6 or maximum security at time parole hearing											
7. AGE AT FIRST ADULT CONVICTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+7 Was over 40+6 Was 31-40 inclusive+3 Was 21-30 inclusive+2 Was 18-20 inclusive+2 Was under 18											
8. PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS FOR ASSAULT DOES NOT INCLUDE SEXUAL ASSAULT	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+2 Had 1 previous conviction for assault+3 Had 2 or more previous convictions for assault											
9. CURRENT MARITAL STATUS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+1 6 married or has common law spouse at time of incarceration											
10. INTERVAL AT RISK	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+2 2 years or more between current conviction/incarceration and last release+1 Less than 2 months between current conviction/incarceration and last release											
11. NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS UNDER ONE ROOF	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+2 Had 3 or more dependents (including dependents from common law marriage)											
12. AGGREGATE SENTENCE FROM DATE OF CRIMINAL SENTENCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+3 Aggregate sentence is 5 years and up to 6 years+2 Aggregate sentence is 6 years or more											
13. PREVIOUS CONVICTION FOR VIOLENT SEX OFFENCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+4 Had only 1 previous conviction for any of rape or attempted rape or indecent assault or sexual assault or aggravated sexual assault											
14. PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS FOR BREAK AND ENTER INCLUDES WITH INTENT THEFT	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+2 Had no previous convictions for break and enter+3 Had 1-2 previous convictions for break and enter+4 Had 3-4 previous convictions for break and enter+6 Had 5 or more previous convictions for break and enter											
15. EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT ARREST	<ul style="list-style-type: none">+1 Was employed at time of arrest for current offence (full time or part time)											
NOTE: The values shown for each time above are only those which receive a non zero score. Therefore, items should be scored "0" if none of the stated values apply.		SUCCESS RATE FOR GROUPS OF OFFENDERS SCORED:										
		<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Score</th><th>Success Rate</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>+6 to +27</td><td>4 out of every 5 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release</td></tr><tr><td>+1 to 0</td><td>3 out of every 5 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release</td></tr><tr><td>0 to -3</td><td>1 out of every 2 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release</td></tr><tr><td>-3 to -6</td><td>2 out of every 5 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release</td></tr><tr><td>-6 to -9</td><td>1 out of every 3 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release</td></tr></tbody></table>	Score	Success Rate	+6 to +27	4 out of every 5 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release	+1 to 0	3 out of every 5 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release	0 to -3	1 out of every 2 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release	-3 to -6	2 out of every 5 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release
Score	Success Rate											
+6 to +27	4 out of every 5 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release											
+1 to 0	3 out of every 5 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release											
0 to -3	1 out of every 2 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release											
-3 to -6	2 out of every 5 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release											
-6 to -9	1 out of every 3 offenders will not commit an indictable offence after release											
TOTAL SCORE												

Appendix L

Hare Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R Scoresheet)

PCL-R SCORING SHEET

Subject: _____

Date: _____

Rater: _____

TOTAL SCORE: _____ / _____

Prorated score: _____ / 40

Prototypicality: _____ (0 of 2's)

ITEM:

SCORE:

1. Glibness/superficial charm	0	1	2	omit
2. Grandiose sense of self-worth	0	1	2	omit
3. Proneness to boredom/need for stimulation	0	1	2	omit
4. Pathological jealousy	0	1	2	omit
5. Conning/manipulative	0	1	2	omit
6. Lack of remorse	0	1	2	omit
7. Shallow affect	0	1	2	omit
8. Lack of empathy	0	1	2	omit
9. Parasitic lifestyle	0	1	2	omit
10. Poor behavioral controls	0	1	2	omit
11. Promiscuous sexual behavior	0	1	2	omit
12. Early behavior problems	0	1	2	omit
13. Lack of realistic long-term plans	0	1	2	omit
14. Impulsivity	0	1	2	omit
15. Irresponsibility	0	1	2	omit
16. Failure to accept responsibility for own actions	0	1	2	omit
17. Many marital relationships	0	1	2	omit
18. Juvenile delinquency	0	1	2	omit
19. Poor risk for conditional release	0	1	2	omit
20. Criminal versatility	0	1	2	omit

VALIDITY RATING

On the basis of the quality of the interview, file, and collateral information, rate your confidence in the validity of your PCL rating:

_____ / _____ / _____ / _____ / _____
 1 2 3 4 5
 Low Moderate High

Appendix M

SUBJECTS INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM

Purpose:

The purpose of the present research is to investigate the effectiveness of the Case Management Strategy which has been in use by Correctional Service of Canada since 1986.

Procedure:

You will be asked to participate in a personal and confidential interview with the researcher and to complete a paper-and pencil questionnaire which consists of 175 questions.

Duration:

Approximately two hours of your time will be needed to complete both the personal interview and the questionnaire.

Confidentiality:

This research is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. D. Andrews, professor in the Department of Psychology, Carleton University. It is being carried out by his Doctoral student, Wagdy Loza. Although Mr. Loza is normally employed as a Psychologist at Kingston Penitentiary, this research is not being conducted as part of his job. It is an independent research project in association with Carleton University.

All information obtained during the course of this research will be kept completely confidential and used only for the purpose of this research. This means that no information revealed by you will be given to anyone or entered into your files. The researcher however will not honor this commitment if you provide information which seriously threatens the security of the institution, yourself or others.

All information obtained from you will be maintained in such a way as to prevent disclosure of your identity.

Information from other sources:

Access to your classification files and may be psychological file are essential for the completion of this study.

Appendix K Cont'd/2

Withdrawal of participation

You may withdraw from participation in this study at any time, in any way and for any reason and without incurring any consequences or penalty. Your participation is voluntary.

Complaints:

If you have any complaints or criticism about the way you were treated or any aspect of this study, you may send your complaints to one of the following professors: Dr. D. Andrews, my research supervisor, Dr. W. Jones, Chairman of the Psychology department, Dr. C. Herdman, Chairman of the ethics committee. Their address is: Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa.

Consent:

I have read the above noted informations, fully understood them and I have no objection to participate in this study. Also I authorize you to have access to my classification and psychology files.

Name:

FPS:

Institution:

Signature

Appendix N

Offence Severity Scale

MODIFIED CSC OFFENCE SEVERITY SCALE

MAJOR OFFENCES

101	First, Second Degree Murder and attempted Murder
102	Kidnapping/Forcible Detention/Abduction and/or Hostage-Taking
103	Hijacking of Aircraft/Treason/Espionage
104	Illegal Possession and/or Detonation of Explosives which are likely to cause death
105	Violent Terrorist Activities
106	Armed Robbery (with extreme violence, organized/notorious)
107	Assault (with or without weapon) causing serious injury, risk of death or disfigurement/rutilation
108	Other

SERIOUS OFFENCES

201	Armed Robbery/Attempted Armed Robbery/Robbery with violence
202	Arson
203	Sabotage
204	Conspiracy to Traffic or Import a <u>dangerous drug</u>
205	Trafficking and Possession for the purpose of Trafficking <u>dangerous drugs</u>
206	Trafficking in Illegal Firearms
207	Manslaughter
208	Extortion

- 209 Sexual Assault Offences (i.e., Rape, Attempted Rape,
Sexual Assault, Aggravated Sexual Assault, Child
Molestation, etc.)
210 Assault (with or without weapon)/Wounding
211 Escape (medium or above)/or (minimum or below)/or from
escort with violence/Prison Breach/Participate in Riot
212 Use of Firearm during Commission of an offence
213 Other

MODERATE OFFENCES

- 301 Possession of dangerous drugs
302 Trafficking, Conspiracy, Possession for the purpose of
Trafficking (soft drugs)
303 Forgery/Possession of Instruments for Forgery
304 Fraud Offences/False Pretences
305 Bribery
306 Forcible Entry
307 Break and Enter/Breaking Out
308 Criminal Negligence causing death or resulting in
Bodily Harm/Dangerous Driving
309 Non-Violent Sex Offences (i.e., Gross
Indecency/Indecent Assault/Incest/Sex with a Minor
310 Robbery
311 Escape (minimum or below/or from escort) without
violence
312 Theft
313 Auto Theft/Conversion of Auto
314 Obstruction of Justice and Perjury/Resist
Arrest/Obstruct Peace Officer...etc.
315 Possession of Stolen Property Over

- 316 Possession of a Weapon to commit an Indictable Offence/Carry a Concealed Weapon
- 317 Assault causing Bodily Harm (no serious injury)
- 318 Other

MINOR OFFENCES

- 401 Possession of Stolen Property Under
- 402 Common Assault
- 403 Possession of Soft Drugs
- 404 Theft Under
- 405 Public Mischief/Damage to Property/Causing a Disturbance/Wilful Damage
- 406 Criminal Negligence not resulting in bodily harm
- 407 Possession of a Restricted or Prohibited Weapon
- 408 Possession of Forged Currency, Passports, Cheques
- 409 Driving while Impaired/Driving with over 0.08/Driving under Suspension/Take Auto without Consent/Careless Driving...etc.
- 410 Parole or Mandatory Supervision Revocation/Breach of Probation (Technical)
- 411 Unlawfully at Large/Failure of Attend Court/Failure to Comply with Undertaking or Recognizance/Failure to Appear
- 412 Failure to Remain at the Scene of an Accident
- 413 Other

NOTES

- Dangerous Drugs = Heroin and other
Opates/Cocaine/PCP/LSD/and other similar substances
- Escape Medium or Above = Maximum or Medium institutions

- **Escape Minimum or Below/or from Escort - minimum institution or program (e.g., work camps) and escape from an escort - ETA**
- **Assault Offences - classify according to seriousness of the assault**
- **If a Parole Violation is the result of a new offence, classify according to the new offence**
- **Attempt to Commit and Accessory Before and After the Fact are classified as the actual offence**
- **Violent Sexual Assaults - may be included in §107 - Assault**

Appendix O

Inmate Offence Report And Notification Of Charge

Correctional Service
Canada

Service correctionnel
Canada

PROTECTED WHEN COMPLETED PROTEGEE UNE FOIS REMPLI
PERSONAL INFORMATION BANK FICHIER DE RENSEIGNEMENTS PERSONNEL

INMATE OFFENCE REPORT AND NOTIFICATION OF CHARGE RAPPORT DE L'INFRACTION D'UN DETENU ET AVIS DE L'ACCUSATION

NOTE: Authority document C.D. 560

NOTE: Document autorité C.C. 560

Institution Établissement

Room Centre Case/Cas de centre de détention

Location of offence Lieu de l'infraction

PUT AWAY ON FILE
CLASSER AU DOSSIER

See reverse
voir verso

CPS Number

Numéro SCJ

Family Name

Nom de famille

Given Name

Prénoms

Date of birth

Date de naissance

Date & time of offence
Date et heure de l'infraction

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENCE including names of witnesses unusual behaviour of offender etc.
DESCRIPTION DE L'INFRACTION y compris des noms des témoins comportement inhabituel de l'inculpé etc.

Date report written
Date de la rédaction du rapport

Name of arresting officer Num. de l'agent/arrestant

Signature

Provided evidence
Fourni des preuves

Yes (if yes)
Oui (si oui)

No (if no)
Non (si non)

By Security Officer advised
Agent principal de sécurité avisé

Yes
Oui

By Admin. Sec.
Sec. Admin.

By Controlling Sec.
Sec. Contrôl.

By Normal Sec.
Sec. Normale

DECISION TAKEN - DECISION PRISE

Offence category Catégorie de l'infraction

Minor
Mineure

Serious
Grave

Normal
Normale

Aggravated
Aggravée

Other offence count
Autre infraction comptée

Discretionary count
Comptée discrétionnaire

For hearing of charge under section 36 of the Penitentiary Service Regulations
Pour l'audition du chef d'accusation en vertu du paragraphe 36 de la Loi sur le service pénitentiaire

Date of hearing
Date de l'audition

Time of hearing
Heure de l'audition

Signature

HEARING OF CHARGE - AUDITION DU CHEF D'ACCUSATION

By
Par

Guilty
Coupable

Not guilty
Non coupable

Refused to plead
Refus de plaider

Remarks of Auditor
Remarques de l'auditeur

Third party representation requested by inmate
Représentation par tiers demandée par le détenu

Yes
Oui

No
Non

Accepted
Accepté

Refused
Refusé

Witness
Témoin

PUNISHMENT AWARDED - PUNITION IMPOSÉE

Warning or reprimand
Avertissement ou réprimande

Loss of privileges
Perte de privilèges

Payment for damages
Paiement pour dommages

Dissemination
Autre punition

Loss of remission
Perte de réduction de peine

Payment of expenses
Paiement des dépenses

Other sentence
Autre peine

Period of sentence
Durée de la peine

Name of Disciplinary Board Members
Noms des membres du Comité de Discipline

Date of hearing
Date de l'audition

Time of hearing
Heure de l'audition

Name of presiding officer
Nom de l'agent principal

Signature of presiding officer
Signature de l'agent principal

CSC/SCC 222 R 90 07
7530-21-036-4518

DISTRIBUTION
SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE / VOIR INSTRUCTIONS À L'ENVERS

Appendix P

Dissociation Log

DISSOCIATION
LOG

JOURNAL
D'ISOLEMENT

Completing Operational Unit / Unité opérationnelle ayant rédigé le rapport

Current Institution or Address / Adresse de l'établissement actuel

Reason for Segregation /
Motif de l'isolement

Discipline P.S. 33
Discipline P.S. 33

Admin Segregation P.S. 33
Segregation Administrative P.S. 33

Date admitted /
Date d'admission

Signature of Prisoning / Admitting Officer / Signature du Prisonnier / Admetteur du Prisonnier

Hour / Heure

SEGREGATION - SEGREGATION

PROTECTION

PUNITIVE - PUNITIF

Reason - Motif

Reason - Motif

Sentence awarded - sanction

Unit given / Unité assignée

Good order & discipline
Bon ordre & discipline

Protection from self
Protection contre soi-même

Date

Starting /
Début

Unit given / Unité assignée

Waiting disciplinary hearing
Attendant de la commission disciplinaire

Protection from others
Protection contre autrui

Hour / Heure

Starting /
Début

Unit given / Unité assignée

Waiting outside court
Attendant de la cour d'extérieur

Self request
Demande du détenu

Particulars of sentence - Détails de la sanction

Unit given / Unité assignée

Temporary detention
Détention temporaire

As requested
Comme demandé

Regime
Régime

Unit given / Unité assignée

On transfer warrant
En transition mandat de transit

As requested
Comme demandé

Nights only
Nuits seulement

Unit given / Unité assignée

On transfer warrant
En transition mandat de transit

As requested
Comme demandé

Normal diet
Alimentation normale

Unit given / Unité assignée

Explain - Expliquer

Explain - Expliquer

Particulars /
Détails

Nights only
Nuits seulement

Weekends only
Fin de semaine seulement

Punishment suspended /
Suspension de la punition

No. of days - N° de jours

SEGREGATION - SEGREGATION

Reasons for decision - Motifs de la décision

Date

Hour / Heure

Inmate does not want to be released /
Le détenu ne veut pas sortir d'isolement

Decision /
Décision

Held over /
Retenu

Released /
Libéré

Date released - Date à laquelle la période /
d'isolement prend fin

Signature of Officer authorizing release - signature de l'agent qui autorise la sortie

Hour / Heure

DISPOSITION ON RELEASE - MESURES PRISES APRÈS LA PÉRIODE D'ISOLEMENT

General population /
Retour sans éducation disciplinaire

Psychiatric /
Soin psychiatrique

Medical /
Soin médical

Transfer to higher security /
Transfèrement - sécurité supérieure

Transfer within region /
Transfèrement au sein de la région

Transfer outside region /
Transfèrement à l'extérieur de la région

Positive discipline /
Séjour disciplinaire

Specify /
Préciser

Administrative segregation /
Segregation administrative

Protection

Released from Pen /
Libéré du Pen

OF - GENERAL INFORMATION - RENSEIGNEMENTS GÉNÉRAUX

Y /
Oui

N /
Non

R /
Refused by inmate /
Refusé par le détenu

G /
Good /
Bon

F /
Fair /
Passable

P /
Poor /
Médiocre

Day exercise - Exercice quotidien

Showers - Douches

Daily behaviour - Comportement quotidien

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

Appendix Q

Performance Notice

Correctional Service
Canada

Service correctionnel
Canada

**PERFORMANCE NOTICE
AVIS DE RENDEMENT**

PIB CM-8
FRP GCE-8

Inmate's Name — Nom du détenu

FPS Number — Numéro SED

Inst — Etablissement

Supervisor's name — Nom du surveillant

I have rated your performance today as. (Circle one)
J'ai évalué votre rendement aujourd'hui comme étant
(Encerclez U ou E):

U/I

E

Unsatisfactory — Insatisfaisant

Excellent

Reason(s) — Raison(s)

If rated as "U" what improvement is needed?
Si l'évaluation est "U" que doit-il faire pour s'améliorer?

Originator's sign. — Sign. de l'auteur de l'évaluation Date

You are reminded that ratings of unsatisfactory performance may result in earning less than full remission.

On vous rappelle que des évaluations de rendement insatisfaisantes peuvent faire en sorte que vous gagniez moins que le maximum possible de réduction de peine.

CSC/SCC 254 (R-88-07) 7530-21-894-4746

Appendix R

Monthly Notice of Earned Remission

Correctional Service
Canada

Service correctionnel
Canada

PROTECTED WHEN COMPLETED PROTEGE UNE FOIS REMPLIE
PERSONAL INFORMATION BANK FICHIER DE RENSEIGNEMENTS PERSONNELS

**MONTHLY NOTICE OF
EARNED REMISSION**

**AVIS MENSUEL DE
REDUCTION DE PEINE**

NOTE: Reference Document
CD 520

NOTA: Document de référence
DC 520

Competing Correctional Unit Unité concurrentielle ayant edge à l'admission

Current Institution or Address Adresse ou établissement actuel

PUT AWAY ON FILE
CLASSER AU DOSSIER

Canary Copy SA
Copie canari AP

Case Number
Numéro de cas

Family Name
Nom de famille

Given Name
Prénoms

Date of Birth
Date de naissance

ASSESSMENT PERIOD
PÉRIODE SOUS EXAMEN

FROM
DE

TO
À

1. This is to advise you that for the period indicated above you have been awarded
La présente a pour but de vous aviser que au cours de la période susmentionnée vous avez mérité

day(s) of remission based on your performance during this period

et il vous fut octroyé

jour(s) de réduction de peine compte tenu de votre rendement pour cette période

day(s) earned remission were not awarded for the following reasons

2. jour(s) de réduction de peine ne vous ont pas été octroyés pour les raisons suivantes

Charge(s) at Disciplinary Board under section(s)

Charge(s) at Minor Board under section(s)

Unsatisfactory Performance Notice(s)

NOTE TO INMATE

If you remain dissatisfied with the Board's decision you
have recourse to the grievance process

AVIS AU DÉTENU

Si vous n'êtes pas satisfait de la décision du comité vous
avez recours à la procédure de règlement de griefs

Chairperson of Remission Board Président du Comité de réduction de peine méritée

CSC/SCC 255 (R-90-01)
7530-21-894-4747

DISTRIBUTION

White copy Inmate
Copie blanche Détenu

Canary Copy Sentence Administration
Copie canari Gestion des peines

Appendix S

Criteria of Violent Offences

OFFENCE CATEGORIES

CATEGORY 1 OFFENCES

Revised Statutes of Canada 1970	Revised Statutes of Canada 1985	
79	81	Using Explosives
83	85	Use of Firearm During Commission of Offence
84	86	Pointing a Firearm
132	144	Prison Breach
203	220	Causing Death by Criminal Negligence
204	221	Causing Bodily Harm by Criminal Negligence
218	235	Punishment for Murder
219	236	Punishment for Manslaughter
220	237	Punishment for Infanticide
221	238	Killing Unborn Child in Act of Birth
222	239	Attempt to Commit Murder
228	244	Causing Bodily Harm with Intent
229	245	Administering Noxious Thing
230	246	Overcoming Resistance to Commission of Offence
231	247	Traps Likely to Cause Bodily Harm
232	248	Interfering with Transportation Facilities
243.2	268	Aggravated Assault
243.4	269.1	Torture
246.1	271	Sexual Assault
246.2	272	Sexual Assault with a Weapon, Threats to a Third Party or
246.3	273	Aggravated Sexual Assault <small>CAUSING BODILY HARM</small>
247	279	Kidnapping
247.1	279.1	Hostage Taking
	465(1)(a)	Conspiracy to Commit Murder

Offences Against Person and Reputation

245	266	Assault (former Common Assault -245)
245.1	267	Assault with Weapon or Causing Bodily Harm
245.3	269	Unlawfully Causing Bodily Harm
246	270	Assaulting Peace Officer
303	344	Punishment for Robbery (offence 302)

Arson and Other

389	433	Arson
390	434	Setting Fire to Other Substance
392	436	Setting A Fire by Negligence

Former Offences (RSC)

144	Rape
145	Attempt Rape
149, 156	Indecent Assault
243	Assault with Intent
	Dangerous Sexual Offenders
688	Dangerous Offenders

CATEGORY 2 OFFENCES

All other offences not listed above.

END

22.12.92

FIN