



success on parole

The influence of self-reported attitudes, experiences and background characteristics on the parole behaviors of youthful offenders.

FINAL REPORT

February, 1983

**State of California
DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY**

State of California
GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN,
GOVERNOR



Youth and Adult Correctional Agency
N. A. CHADERJIAN,
SECRETARY

Department of the

Youth Authority

**DIVISION OF
PROGRAM RESEARCH AND REVIEW**

KEITH S. GRIFFITHS
Chief

ELAINE DUXBURY
Research Manager III

* * *

MARK R. WIEDERANDERS
Principal Investigator

* * *

CANDACE CROSS-DREW
DAVID W TSUE
Graduate Student Assistants

IDA

JAMES ROWLAND,
DIRECTOR

GEORGE R. ROBERTS,
CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

FRANCISCO J. ALARCON,
Deputy Director
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
BRANCH

JAMES C. BXRNETT,
Deputy Director
PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY
CORRECTIONS BRANCH

WILBUR A. BECKWITH
Deputy Director
PAROLE SERVICES BRANCH

C. A. TERHUNE,
Deputy Director
INSTITUTIONS AND CAMPS
BRANCH

SUCCESS ON PAROLE

**The influence of self-reported attitudes, experiences
and background characteristics on the parole behaviors
of youthful offenders.**

FINAL REPORT

MARK R. WIEDERANDERS, PH. D.

FEBRUARY 1983

**Prepared under Grant Number BM-3 from the
United States Department of Justice
Bureau of Prisons
National Institute of Corrections**

**Points of view or opinions stated in this document
are those of the authors and do not necessarily
represent the official position or policies
of the United States Department of Justice.**

CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| SUMMARY | i |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| METHOD | 5 |
| The Sample | 7 |
| The Interview | 9 |
| The Procedure | 13 |
| RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 16 |
| How Much Parole Success Was There? | 16 |
| What Words Told Us During The Interviews | 25 |
| What Explains Parole Success? | 36 |
| IMPLICATIONS | 46 |
| REFERENCES | 55 |
| APPENDIX A - Success on Parole Interview Data Sheet | 57 |
| Pre-Parole Form | 58 |
| Followup Interview Form | 73 |
| APPENDIX B - Privacy Notification | 83 |
| APPENDIX C - Multiple Regression Statistics From Tests of Five Theory-Sets to Predict Parole Performances | 84 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| TABLE 1 | Comparisons Between the Sample and Youth Authority Statewide Characteristics | 8 |
| TABLE 2 | Percentage of Wards Arrested for One or More Offenses of Various Types During 24-Month Parole Followup Period..... | 19 |
| TABLE 3 | Disposition and Relative Success Measures of Parole Behavior.. | 20 |
| TABLE 4 | Intercorrelations Between Parole Performance Measures..... | 23 |
| TABLE 5 | Responses to Questions About Pre-Youth Authority Life..... | 26 |
| TABLE 6 | Responses to Questions About Life in Youth Authority Institutions and Camps | 29 |
| TABLE 7 | Responses to Questions About Life During the First Three to Six Months on Parole | 34 |
| TABLE 8 | Statistically Significant Predictors of 24-Month Parole Performance ("Good Street-Time") Derived From Differential Association Theory..... | 41 |
| TABLE 9 | Statistically Significant Predictors of 24-Month Parole Performance ("Good Street-Time") Derived From Social Ecology Theory..... | 42 |
| TABLE 10 | Statistically Significant Predictors of 24-Month Parole Performance ("Good Street-Time") Derived From Social Competence Theory..... | 44 |

SUMMARY

This study used a simple strategy to learn more about why some Youth Authority parolees succeed in staying out of trouble with the law whereas others are returned to confinement. The strategy was to personally interview a cohort of young persons at the end of their first stay in Youth Authority institutions and camps and again after several months on parole. Measures of subsequent parole performances were made for a two-year period. Then, interrelationships between the interview material and parole performances were examined to see what combinations of interview responses would best explain parole outcomes.

The cohort included 193 male first-commitments who were paroled from Youth Authority institutions and camps during the summer months of 1979. Their ages, ethnicities, committing offenses, geographic locations, and other background items were closely comparable to the backgrounds of all Youth Authority wards in recent years. The interviews covered topics that theorists have considered important causes of delinquency: early as well as present associations, ties to legitimate societal institutions, economic conditions, environmental conditions, and social competence measures.

Statistics on arrests and incarcerations showed that many of the youth in this sample were highly delinquent, both before and after their Youth Authority stays. Before coming to Youth Authority, the 193 males had accounted for 760 arrests and 337 sentences in secure facilities. This high rate of arrest and confinement continued after Youth Authority incarceration, for the sample taken as a whole. However, some of the parolees were turning away from delinquency--23.4% avoided all types of arrest for the two-year followup period, an additional 34.1% were arrested but subsequently continued

on parole status. Four different parole behavior measures were discussed and compared, including arrests, official dispositions toward arrests, "good" (confinement-free) street-time, and self-reported criminal acts.

Interview responses were analyzed in two ways. First was to simply summarize responses by topic area and thus get an overall picture of the backgrounds, attitudes, and experiences of the Youth Authority ward population. The second type of analysis tested five alternative theoretical models of the influences on parole performance.

Regarding the first analysis, some of the highlights were as follows. Respondents reported a good deal of father-absence in both their past and present lives. Regular visits while they were incarcerated were typically made by mothers, seldom by fathers. School performance and attendance on the outside was generally poor, although real school progress was made and attitudes toward school were good while respondents were in Youth Authority facilities. Wards tended to perceive their institution or camp environments as safe places with helpful programs. Similarly, both institutional and parole staff were evaluated positively and as having been helpful. Attitudes ran strongly against doing further crimes when assessed during the confinement-period, although almost half of the respondents admitted doing illegal acts when interviewed during the early parole period.

The second analysis showed that alternative theories of delinquency could be used with some success in accounting for parole outcomes (as measured by good parole street-times). Specifically, three collections of items, or equations, were about equally successful in explaining parole behavior as measured by good parole street-time (all three explained over 30% of the variance). Each of these equations included the same demographic items, namely, age, number of offenses prior to Youth Authority, type of

committing offense, and ethnicity, to control for "fixed" influences on parole outcomes, plus some unique items taken from delinquency theories. The first useful theory was Differential Association, whose key predictors were: describing pre-Youth Authority friends as having been delinquent, not belonging to gangs while in Youth Authority facilities, positive ratings of one's parole agent, and describing current friends as being nondelinquent. The second useful theory was Social Ecology, and key predictors were: neighborhood education level, residing outside of Parole Regions III (Los Angeles County) and IV (most other southern California counties), and no problems with drugs or alcohol. The third useful theory was Social Competence, whose key predictors were: wards' own estimates of their chances of parole success, absence of disciplinary transfers from living units or institutions during Youth Authority stays, no problems with drugs or alcohol, and proportion of time on parole spent employed or in school.

Some implications that were discussed in the final section were: First, that wards reveal much about how they will do on parole by their descriptions of friends, their own forecasts, and their institutional behaviors; and that staff should take more seriously what wards have to say. Second, local environments need to be studied for why they produce different parole success rates, and how this information can be used to improve the overall success rate. Third, personal performances in the areas of work, school, drugs and alcohol can be used as barometers of parole performance, and they can perhaps be changed to bring about better parolee performances. Fourth, wards were very generous in their perceptions of Youth Authority staff, which was not surprising considering the general lack of adequate parenting and absence of good role models that many wards reported of their home environments. This status of being a valued role

model might be more fully exploited by staff in bringing about positive changes among wards. Fifth, future research could be improved by carefully measuring the strength of personal decisions to change delinquent behavior patterns into law-abiding ones.

Finally, the report concluded by urging readers with special interests to review carefully the interview responses which were summarized in their entirety in the Appendix. For example, persons interested in ward employment, ward perceptions of institution programs, early backgrounds of wards, and perceptions of parole programs can find extensive questions and responses devoted to these topics.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to learn more about processes leading to parole success rather than to failure and reincarceration. The study began, in mid-1978, because there was very little information in the research literature about a very significant question: Why do some youth, having been judged delinquent enough to warrant Youth Authority commitment, begin to steer away from further trouble when they get out on parole, whereas others commit new offenses? It was a surprise to find out that this basic question has scarcely been addressed in the sixty or so years of corrections research. Since the first equation to predict parole behavior was published over 50 years ago (Burgess, Harno & Leindesco, 1928), much attention has been given to identifying characteristics that would predict parole success or failure, but little attention has been focused on understanding the processes leading to various parole outcomes. In order for a youth corrections system to apply research findings to programs and policies, at some point we need to get beyond simple prediction to an understanding of parole influences.

Concerning prediction, criminologists have done quite well. Diverse studies over the past half-century point to some fairly stable indicators of parole outcome such as age, prior offense history, and substance abuse (Pritchard, 1979). Put together in equations, these predictors have been used with some accuracy to identify high-risk vs. low-risk groups of parolees much as actuarial tables have been used by life insurance companies to identify groups of people with different risks of early death. However, problems develop when one tries to use actuarial parole predictors to formulate programs or policies regarding delinquent youth.

One problem is that the best predictors of parole behavior used in actuarial or "base expectancy" formulas-are givens such as age, prior record, and type of committing offense. Since youth come to the Department with these characteristics already determined, there are no imaginable programs to change these givens to yield a better prognosis.. Therefore, a major feature of the current study was to measure the effect of changeable characteristics, such as the attitudes and economic resources of parolees.

But suppose there was no concern for treatment or "correction" of behavior at all, and that a correctional system simply wished to use actuarial predictors to incarcerate for longer terms those with the higher expectancy of recidivism while releasing earlier those having higher prognoses for success. Couldn't straightforward actuarial formulas be used to formulate such a policy and thereby achieve better, more efficient protection of the public? A brief look at the effects that such a policy would have on those incarcerated reveals its danger. Using material to be presented later in this report, this incapacitation strategy would incarcerate for the longest terms those who are youngest, those who are Black and those who happen to come from certain towns rather than from other towns. Such a policy would be seen by many citizens as being morally repugnant and discriminatory, and would likely be challenged on constitutional grounds.

Considering these problems in applying actuarial predictors to policy, we believed that the field of corrections lacked a "theory of parole success." That is, corrections needs a coherent understanding of why some personal characteristics and life events correlate with parole success while others correlate with failure. For example, what is it about increasing age that often "cures" delinquency?

Looking through the literature for theories of parole behavior was very disappointing. The best known and most heavily researched theories of delinquency are, primarily, meant to explain how delinquency develops rather than what makes delinquency go away.

Different theories might be needed to account for the cessation of delinquency within a group of already seriously delinquent youth. (Keep in mind that the average Youth Authority ward has had five prior law contacts before his first state commitment). For example, a delinquency theory favored by many criminologists today is Hirschi's (1969) "social control" theory, which says that delinquency develops because of the absence of such bonds to conventional society as school, family, and employment. But when applied to the Youth Authority ward population, in which the typical ward has already failed school, comes from a broken home and whose family tends to be unemployed or in other ways economically disadvantaged, the theory might be hard pressed to account for any "good" behaviors that occur! The same problem pertains to other delinquency theories--namely, the causes of delinquency among a population sample such as all youth in California cannot be considered as synonymous with the causes of recidivism among a population that is already delinquent.

This final project report will examine parole outcomes from the standpoint of understanding. While we cannot develop a full-blown, validated "theory of parole success" from this one project, we will offer some interpretations of the parole outcomes reached by a sample of youth who have been intensively studied by means of personal interviews. In exploring possible reasons behind alternative parole outcomes, we will try to go beyond the computing of risk-formulas. Eventually, if the much-needed theory of parole success is fully developed, public policies toward

delinquent youth can be more intelligently made than if we simply know that certain categories of youth are better risks on parole than other categories of youth.

METHOD

The project method was naturalistic rather than experimental. In other words, we studied the effects of attitudes, events, and characteristics of parolees simply as they were rather than studying their effects by manipulating them in a controlled experiment. This distinction is important, because the project was aimed at finding out what general processes explain parole outcomes; it was not intended to test the effectiveness of any given correctional program

In fact, we were just as interested in learning more about the influences on parole outcome that originated from unofficial sources (family, friends, other pre-incarceration events) as we were to learn about Youth Authority influences. From the standpoint of policy, we considered it important to know something about the proportionate importance of official and unofficial influences on parole outcomes. Then, subsequent attempts to improve the way that official influences are delivered can be judged in relation to what they can realistically be expected to change. In earlier decades of experimentation with various rehabilitation programs, corrections innovators probably assumed that what they could affect, by means of any single new program, was far greater than they had any right to expect, given the power of unofficial influences that we now know to exist. More about this topic will be provided in a later section.

To tap influences that were unofficial as well as official, in a naturalistic way as they occurred over a period of time, we chose a short-term longitudinal design. Although there was considerable effort put to

the development of the interview form and to obtaining information from members of the sample, the design itself was very simple. Three assessments were made of a representative sample of male wards. The wards were identified as they left Youth Authority facilities for their first paroles in 1979. The assessments were:

First assessment: pre-parole. Each ward was extensively interviewed in his final few days of incarceration. The purpose of this interview was to get detailed information about events, programs, and people that wards had encountered before and during their first Youth Authority stay. In addition, we had access to information from each ward's file, such as prior offenses, records from the institutional stay, and aspects of the area or town from which wards had been sent.

Second assessment: early parole. Each ward was contacted and interviewed in his parole community at some point between the third and sixth month of parole. This was to get information about jobs, school, peers, family, attitudes, and problems encountered in the initial parole period.

Third assessment: parole performances at 12 and 24 months. Detailed information was gathered from parole sources about the parole-period arrests, convictions, and sentences served by those in the sample. This information was referenced to two points-in-time, namely, the first and second anniversaries of parole.

To analyze data, we assumed that parole performance was the result of all of the experiences, attitudes, and characteristics assessed in the earlier interviews (plus a component of other unknown, unmeasured influences). Using a complicated sequence of computer calculations, we looked at alternative models or theories to explain the various parole performances that were observed.

The Sample

During the Summer months of 1979, Research staff identified 221 youth eligible for the study by reviewing computer lists of those scheduled for parole hearings. Eligibles included all male wards who were to be paroled to locations within California during a one-month period. The sample was limited to those in Youth Authority institutions and camps for the first time.

Between the first contact with the sample and this report, the sample has shrunk to 193. For consistency, all findings discussed in this report are for the 193 persons with whom we maintained contact. Cases dropped from the sample in various ways. Twelve were denied parole after we had interviewed them, leaving us with a paroled sample of 209. After leaving for their home communities, 16 more became unavailable for the parole-period interviews. Of these 16: two wards were murdered; one was discharged from supervision six weeks after being paroled because of a legal case reversal; two disappeared from parole supervision; three wards refused to be interviewed while on parole; and the remaining eight moved out-of-state early in the parole period. We are confident that shrinkage from the original sample has not biased the results to any appreciable extent, since inspection of the characteristics of those that were dropped revealed that, like the remaining 193 wards, they were representative wards in terms of ages, ethnicities, prior offenses, and other background variables.

Background characteristics of the 193-ward sample resemble the characteristics of all first commitments to the Youth Authority during the time period when the sample was identified. Some comparisons of the sample to all wards first committed to the Department in 1978 (the same year as most of the sample were committed) are listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Comparisons Between the Sample and Youth Authority,
Statewide Characteristics

| | <u>Sample</u> | <u>Statewide 1978 First Commitments</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Median Age | 17.9 | 17.8 |
| Mean Reading Comp. Level | 6 . 8 | 7.0 |
| <u>Ethnicity (%)</u> | | |
| White | 37.8 | 38.8 |
| Black | 32.6 | 31.8 |
| Hispanic | 28.0 | 27.0 |
| Asian | 1.6 | 2.4 |
| | <u>100.0</u> | <u>100.0</u> |
| <u>Area of Commitment (%)</u> | | |
| Los Angeles County | 33.3 | 37.0 |
| Other Southern Counties | 25.5 | 21.9 |
| San Francisco Bay Area | 24.0 | 22.0 |
| Other Northern Counties | 17.2 | 19.1 |
| | <u>100.0</u> | <u>100.0</u> |
| <u>Committing Offenses (%)</u> | | |
| Violent Type | 40.6 | 45.9 |
| Property Type | 56.2 | 47.4 |
| Narcotics & Other Misc. | 3.2 | 6.7 |
| | <u>100.0</u> | <u>100.0</u> |
| <u>Parental Configuration (%)</u> | | |
| No parents in home | 6.1 | |
| One-parent home | 40.9 | 42.7 |
| Two-parent home | 53.0 | 48.0 |
| | <u>100.0</u> | <u>100.0</u> |
| <u>Income Level of Home (%)</u> | | |
| Less than adequate | 43.6 | 42.8 |
| Adequate | 53.6 | 53.1 |
| More than adequate | 2.8 | 4.1 |
| | <u>100.0</u> | <u>100.0</u> |

Note. Source of statewide statistics: California Youth Authority, Information Systems Report, "A Comparison of Admission Characteristics of Youth Authority Wards 1972-1981," May 1982.

The Interview

Development of the structured interview forms that were used in the pre-parole and parole-period assessments was a one-year research project in itself. This process was fully described in an Interim Report (Wiederanders, Cross-Drew, & Luckey, 1979). Rather than bore some readers by presenting that material in its entirety here, we will only describe enough of the philosophy and major steps to that procedure to put the rest of the report in proper context.

The interview was based on an extensive review of the literature on the causes of crime, delinquency, and the literature on the correlates of recidivism. The major criminology theories that resulted in interview questions were as follows:

Differential association theory (Sutherland & Cressey, 1960) states that criminal behavior results because some people learn definitions of their situations that are favorable to lawbreaking. This learning takes place in association with intimate groups, and the longer or more intense this learning is, the stronger. This influential viewpoint, which as Glaser (1962) pointed out many years ago has proven quite useful in predicting delinquency, resulted in many interview items about early and current peer involvements (including street-gang involvements); about family and school associations; and about the duration and quality of time spent in nondelinquent associations, such as with institution and parole staff.

Social control theory (Hirschi, 1969) claims that all people have tendencies toward lawbreaking and would do so if they 'dared.' However, most people do not dare to be delinquent because of having some stakes in conformity. In other words, illegal behavior puts at risk people's

attachments to other people, to jobs, to school enrollments, and to other valued legitimate pursuits. From this theory, we hypothesized that the more attachments to such social controls as jobs, school, family, and legitimate organizations that were reported to us in an interview, the more likely would a parolee become a parole success.

Economic theory has resulted in some thought-provoking hypotheses about crime, such as those detailed by Jan Palmer (1977). Economic models describe any crime as the result of a decision, based on a person's weighing perceived costs of the behavior against the perceived benefits. When a person perceives the benefits (monetary as well as psychological) as outweighing the costs (likelihood and severity of punishment, time away from other activities, etc.) of a potentially criminal course of action, choosing that course of action is more likely than choosing another perhaps legitimate action that has a poorer balance of benefits to costs. From this theory came many interview questions about wards' economic situations, such as about their job histories, earnings, and economic support available from parents and other legitimate sources. In addition, the concept of deterrence goes with an economic model of delinquency, so we obtained data on how long each ward had been incarcerated. Presumably, those who had served longer time would perceive new criminal behavior as more risky than those who had served shorter time.

Social ecology is a more loosely articulated viewpoint of behavior that explains deviance as due to environmental upsets in the natural order of things. Although textbooks in social psychology (such as Baron, Byrne, & Griffitt, 1974) have recently described measurements of the negative effects of urban blight, crowding, and even climatological changes in human behavior, how these dynamics affect parole outcomes is an open

question. So, we included interview questions on the institutional environment and on living conditions while on parole. U.S. Census Bureau information was obtained on parolees' neighborhoods (median income, education level, and percent below poverty level). Finally, questions about drug and alcohol use were included as social ecological questions, since chemicals are environmental influences with well-documented effects on behavior.

Finally, theories of Social Learning and Social Competence Learning emphasize personality development through two processes. The first is imitation of role models and then getting reinforced (positively or negatively) for the imitated behavior. The second process is the development of a general sense of competence and mastery over one's environment. From this perspective (discussed as it related to delinquency by Conger, 1976), we developed questions about role models, such as parents, heroes, counselors, foster parents, teachers, other adults; and about achievements or "milestones of competence," such as school achievements, program achievements while in Youth Authority facilities, and various community achievements.

The final list of interview questions was determined by extensive field-testing in project Phase 1. The actual interview schedules are included in Appendix A; a summary of the information collected in the three assessments is as follows:

Background information; including age, ethnicity, county of commitment, prior offense record, reading level, base expectancy score, committing offense, and committing court (juvenile or criminal);

Pre-incarceration information; including socio-economic status of hometown; parental situation; reported closeness to parents and family

members; number of moves; presence of "heroes" or other positive role models; reported quality of school experiences, including relationships with teachers, involvements in school activities, time spent on homework, highest grade completed; peers, delinquent associations, involvement in street gangs, whether physically abused as a child; drinking and drug involvements; stated motives for doing crimes; employment of parents and economics of the family; ages and descriptions of early delinquent identification; and employment history;

Incarceration information; including length-of-stay; evidence of family support (visits, etc.) during stay; perceived helpfulness of various staff; educational-vocational involvements and achievements while at the institutions; expressed attitudes toward doing further crime; religious involvements; prison gang membership; quality and importance of any relationship with girlfriends/wives during incarceration; counseling; group therapy; and similar program involvements; disciplinary problems; and perceptions about fights, threats, and safety from other persons while incarcerated;

Parole information; including assessments of current living situation; relationship to parents; information about current neighborhood from U.S. Census Bureau; romantic attachments; peer associations, including both negative (gang or delinquent) ones as well as positive ones (joining local organizations, employed friends); school/vocational training involvements and achievements; an account of all jobs, job-titles, durations of jobs, and wages earned; perceived helpfulness of past correctional training and educational programs in "making it on the streets;" other sources of economic support; various aspects of the parole agent relationship; perceived negative "labeling" by people in the community; drug/alcohol dependencies; and various indications of lawbreaking and problems with local law enforcement and parole program requirements.

The Procedure

During the first or pre-parole assessment, all interviews were conducted in private administrative offices within Youth Authority facilities. Those meeting the criteria for being in the sample were contacted with the help of their living unit staff and asked for their participation. Then, staff introduced each ward to one of the interviewers. The interviewer explained the purpose of the study and that, if the ward agreed to participate, research staff would contact him after a few months on parole for another interview. Each ward was offered \$5.00 for the interview as an incentive to participate and to ensure a more representative sample than had we simply asked for unpaid volunteers. At this point in the project, no one refused to participate. Before the actual interviews, a written privacy notice (Appendix B) was given to each ward and explained. (This was also done in the later, parole-period interviews.)

In this phase and in the parole-period assessment, each interview was conducted by one of the research staff, composed of the principal investigator, two graduate student assistants, and the Youth Authority's Research Division Chief. All interviewers had participated in the pilot-testing and development of the form. A series of interjudge reliability tests during the development phase assured that the interview material collected from respondents was comparable across all interviewers.

The followup interviews were planned to take place between each ward's third and sixth month on parole. Except for a few parolees who turned out to be extremely difficult to schedule and who were interviewed somewhat later than six months, we met this schedule. In tune with our naturalistic research design, we offered to meet and interview parolees wherever it was convenient for them. We were able to successfully suggest the local parole

office to many of them, but we met others in fast food restaurants, parked cars, park benches, front porches, and other less likely locations. One researcher found the yards of a rural dairy farm a little bit too naturalistic for her, but got through the interview nonetheless. Alternatively, an outdoor cafe in Palm Springs got no gripes from a staff member as the location for a February interview.

The thousands of travel miles which were logged to make contact with wards in home communities was difficult work that had its highs and lows. Highs were when parolees would brag about landing new jobs, introduce us to wives or new babies, show us cars they had bought with their own earnings. Lows were when a parent told us that her son could not be interviewed because he had been murdered on the street, when wards told us about losing jobs, and when we were informed of parolees having been arrested, occasionally for violent crimes. Simple logistics of travel provided some frustrating and bizarre experiences. One rental car ran out of gas a block from the dealer, while another had to be towed away after the entire gear-shift lever fell off and stuck the thing in high gear. One research staffer put in a claim for "goods damaged in the line of duty" after having his briefcase run over and crushed by a taxi whose driver was a little bit too fast off-the-mark.

Certainly the project's labor-intensive design does not suit this method for all studies. Findings and implications of the study, which we feel are valuable, must be balanced against costs. A description of the efforts made to interview the 42 wards in one parole region provides an idea of the amount of time spent in tracking all parolees. We made approximately 250 attempts to contact these 42 parolees for an average of approximately six attempted contacts per parolee. Attempts included calls to parole agents for information

about whereabouts, as well as calls and letters to the parolees. Eventually, we succeeded in interviewing 40 of the original 42 parolees in this region. While researchers never reached the point of complete travel burnout, it is easy to see why very few studies have gathered parolee data through personal contact. (In fact, we know of only one other study, Glaser's (1964) followup of federal parolees, in which a large prison release cohort was followed to numerous home communities and interviewed.)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section will move from a general description of results to a more inferential discussion of influences on parole outcomes. First will be a description of the levels of "parole success" actually achieved. Then, general responses to various parts of the interview will be examined to get clues into the experience of being a Youth Authority ward. Finally, we will present some statistical models of parole outcome and discuss what the models mean in the attempt to develop an initial theory of parole success.

How Much Parole Success Was There?

One discouraging aspect of research into parole outcomes is that, no matter how many different definitions of parole success one considers, the most accurate ones involve negatives. That is, success is most accurately defined as the absence of failure. Were we to use the term success as it is used in school yearbooks ("most likely to succeed"), and count things like academic honors, professional degrees, high-paying jobs, and community status, we would have precious few successes in this sample. Or, were we to try to ignore recidivism and define success strictly in terms of dollar earnings on parole, we could not escape the fact that those youth who stay out of trouble on parole are the ones free to make the most legitimate dollars. (As we stated in earlier project reports, earnings and nonrecidivism are significantly correlated.)

By anybody's definition, this sample of youth was highly delinquent. In the average space of four and one-half years between first contact with the police and first Youth Authority commitment, the 193 males had been arrested a total of 760 times and had served time in a secure facility a

total of 337 times. Then, they spent a total of 226 years in Youth Authority facilities (average stay, 1.16 years). Although available file materials do not allow summarizing the exact pattern of arrests leading up to first Youth Authority commitment, it is clear that the overall trend was one of acceleration. That is, the average sample member began getting into fairly minor scrapes with the law slightly after the age of twelve. Typically, contacts with the law remained as troublesome "scrapes" for a few years, with the nature of the acts becoming increasingly serious. Finally, something like a burglary, car theft, or assault would result in a stay or two at a local juvenile hall or camp at some point in the final year or year-and-one-half before the Youth Authority committing offense. These data bear out the description of Youth Authority as the "place of last resort" in the justice system for very troublesome youth before they are sent to state prison.

Unfortunately, after the first Youth Authority stay, some members of the sample continued breaking laws. This is where things get complicated as well as controversial. Depending on which statistics one decides to use, parole behavior in the sample of wards can be made to look quite good, especially considering the high levels of pre-Youth Authority crime, or quite bad. For example, we could accurately report that only 13% were sent to state prison for parole-period offenses committed during the 24 months of the followup, resulting in an 87% "success rate" by this criterion. (Some correctional jurisdictions who report spectacularly high success rates, in fact, use such a restricted measure.) Alternatively, regarding the same sample we could accurately report that 77% of the sample had been arrested or temporarily detained during the 24 months, leaving a "success rate" by this criterion of only 23%.

A lengthy paper could be written about the problems involved with alternative definitions and measures of parole behavior. The point to keep

in mind is that any single statistic used to describe parole behaviors fails to give an adequate comprehension of what has really taken place. Probably the best that we can do, in terms of accuracy, is to describe some ranges and parameters of parole behaviors. In Tables 2 and 3 are three ways of doing this.

The first way was to measure arrests. Table 2 shows that over a two-year period, only 23.4% of the sample had avoided any type of arrest (see the "Any Type of Offense" column). Interestingly, the distributions of arrests within the three different types of offense-categories (serious person offenses, serious property offenses, minor offenses) were very similar. Each category of arrests contained a similar proportion of the sample that had no arrests for that type of offense (57.8%, 60.4%, and 59.9%), and the next-largest proportion within each category was those who had been arrested once for that type of offense (32.8%, 28.1%, 26.1%).

The second way to measure parole behavior was to consider dispositions that parolees reached during the two years of followup. Table 3 shows the 193-person sample divided into five such categories, ranging in good-bad outcomes from the 20.2% who were honorably discharged from parole supervision to the 13.0% who ended up in adult state prison for parole-period offenses. For some uses, disposition statistics are better than arrest data. For example, corrections planners and evaluators usually use such statistics since they can be used to estimate the expected flow of releases who return to state correctional facilities, to jails, or to apparently trouble-free living. However, disposition statistics result from various levels of decision-making about parolee behaviors. This decision-dependent measure has some disadvantages and some advantages. Decisions of local police, parole agents, prosecutors and defense attorneys, judges, juries, and the Youthful Offender Parole Board are all represented in disposition data,

TABLE 2

Number and Percentage of Wards Arrested For Various Types of Offenses
During 24-Month Parole Followup Period

| Number of Arrests | Serious Person Offenses ^a | | Serious Property Offenses ^b | | Minor Offenses ^c | | Any Type of Offense | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| | No. of Wards With That No. Of Arrests | Percent of Wards With That No. Of Arrests | No. of Wards With That No. Of Arrests | Percent of Wards With That No. Of Arrests | No. of Wards With That No. Of Arrests | Percent of Wards With That No. Of Arrests | No. of Wards With That No. Of Arrests | Percent of Wards With That No. Of Arrests |
| 0 | 111 | 57.8 | 116 | 60.4 | 115 | 59.9 | 45 | 23.4 |
| 1 | 63 | 32.8 | 54 | 28.1 | 50 | 26.1 | 51 | 25.5 |
| 2 | 14 | 7.3 | 17 | 8.9 | 20 | 10.4 | 56 | 28.1 |
| 3 | 3 | 1.6 | 5 | 2.6 | 5 | 2.6 | 28 | 14.6 |
| 4 | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | 2 | 1.0 | 8 | 4.2 |
| 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | 3.7 |
| 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 |
| Total ^d | 192 | 100.0 | 192 | 100.0 | 192 | 100.0 | 192 | 100.0 |

Note. Each category of offense is treated independently.

^a Includes homicide and attempted homicide, various assault charges, various robbery charges, kidnap, rape and other violent sex crimes, and similar offenses.

^b Includes burglary, grand theft, auto theft, forgery, drug sales, and similar offenses.

^c Included petty theft, misdemeanor battery charges, trespass, vehicle code violations, simple possession of drugs, vandalism, curfew, technical parole violations, and similar charges.

^d Arrest data were missing for one parolee.

TABLE 3

Disposition and Relative Success Measures of Parole Behavior

| | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <u>Disposition Statistics</u> | | |
| Dishonorable discharges to state prison..... | 25 | 13.0 |
| Dishonorable discharges to county jails (16) or in jails out-of-state (10)..... | 26 | 13.5 |
| Returned to YA facilities..... | 31 | <u>16.1</u> |
| Total Parole Failures: | 82 | 42.5 |
| Still on parole..... | 62 | 32.1 |
| AWOL..... | 4 | 2.1 |
| General & miscellaneous discharges..... | 6 | <u>3.1</u> |
| Total Pending or Mixed Outcome: | 72 | 37.3 |
| Honorable discharges from parole supervision = | | |
| Total Parole Successes: | 39 | 20.2 |
| TOTAL SAMPLE: | 193 | 100.0 |

"Relative Success" Index Statistics

Total time (out of 24 months) spent outside of
any type of confinement ("good street-time")

Mean = 15.58 months

Mean percentage of "good street-time"
(15.58 / 24) = 65%

Standard Deviation = .31

which undoubtedly introduces some error or unreliability to the measures. Still, disposition statistics have the advantage of representing consensus of opinions and fact-findings about parole behaviors. It is possible that legal system decisions, although subject to some unreliability, more accurately discriminate the worst, the most serious, and the most guilty troublemakers from lesser ones than do arrest data because dispositions are the result of more deliberative processes than are arrests.

A third measure of parole behavior (Table 3) which is also a disposition-type measure, scores the relative success with which each parolee stayed out of all types of confinement. This score, "good street-time percent," was calculated by dividing each person's total weeks spent outside of confinement by the total weeks of the followup. This measure was useful for several reasons. First, it ignores where those considered guilty of offenses were sent (jail, Youth Authority, prison) but it does preserve differences between parolees in costs to the California justice system for time periods spent confined rather than on-the-streets. It is a simple measure that in a general way, reflects both the frequency and seriousness of misbehaviors in the sample. Statistically, the score has merit because it yields a continuous distribution of scores that fall between zero and 100. Besides being continuous, the scores are more normally distributed than are most justice-system outcome data, although there are slightly more scores bunched higher than the mean than lower (kurtosis = -1.32). For example, the arrest data (Table 2) show that the average ward had between zero and one arrest; street-time percent scores (Table 3) tend to smooth-out and normalize outcomes compared with arrests.

An alternative measure of parole behavior not displayed in Tables 2 and 3 is self-reported parole behavior. While detailed studies have been

conducted by others which have used self-reports of criminal behavior (for example, Peterson and Braiker, 1980), the only self-reported measure available to us results from two items in the parole-period interviews. One of these items asked whether the respondent had acquired any money or goods illegally since his parole date, while the other asked the parolee if he had done anything that could get him sent to Youth Authority or other confinement, were he caught. A single self-reported crime index was calculated by combining answers to the two questions, such that anyone who answered both questions "no" was categorized as crime-free while those answering yes to either or both questions was considered not crime-free. By this index, 53% were crime-free. (It should be kept in mind that this index is from the interview which only covered the first three-to-six months of parole, whereas the measures in Tables 2 and 3 cover 24 months.)

While the three types of parole performance statistics shown in Tables 2 and 3 and the self-reports of criminal activity are derived in different ways, Table 4 shows that each measure significantly correlates with the others. The relative sizes of the correlations are worth a few comments. The highest correlation coefficient ($-.73$) was between dispositions and good street-time, probably because both of these measures depend on decisions of officials to incarcerate. However, the lowest correlation in the table ($.21$) was between arrests and self-reported criminal acts, even though both of these measures are relatively free of deliberative decision-making and both, it would seem, should yield similar estimates of the involvement of individuals in illegal behaviors.

The performance measure with the highest communality (that is, the highest correlations with all of the other variables) was good street-time.

TABLE 4
Intercorrelations Between Parole Performance Measures

| Item | Arrests | Dispositions | Street-Time | Self-Reported Criminal Acts |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| Number of Arrests (All Types) | 1.00 | .29 | -.35 | .21 |
| Dispositions* (State Recidivism) | | 1.00 | -.73 | .40 |
| Good Street-Time | | - | 1.00 | -.48 |
| Self-Reported Criminal Acts | | - | - | 1.00 |

*Coded "1" if returned to YA or sent to state prison, "0" if otherwise.

Note. All correlation coefficients are statistically significant at $p < .01$.

This was probably due to the fact that good street-time partially depended on all of the other measures; that is, it was partially due to the frequency of actual illegal acts (note that it correlate higher -.48, with self-reported criminal acts than did any of the other measures, getting arrested, and official dispositions toward the (caught) behaviors. Because of its higher communality with the other measures and because of its good statistical properties (more normally distributed than the others), good street-time was chosen as the best outcome measure for examining relationships between the interview responses and parole behaviors, a topic which is addressed in the next section.

There are two points deserving special emphasis when considering the behaviors in the sample. First is that the general level of delinquency was already high, and probably accelerating, at the time wards were committed to

the Youth Authority. Second, although the general level of delinquency remained high after release from incarceration, there were many individuals who were beginning to shift away from patterns of delinquency, toward either arrest-free behavior or at least toward committing less-frequent or less-serious offenses. We hoped that a careful analysis of interview material would give us clues to the influences on and processes behind these shifts.

Aside from the statistical ways of looking at success and failure, there were individual success stories that were always nice for interviewers to hear. For example, there was a young Hispanic who was committed for armed robbery but who became a successful college student, parttime book-keeper, and arrest-free citizen on parole. There were several younger wards who reentered regular high school programs and were doing well after two years. One Black parolee was so busy attending school and working as a roofer, that we had to wait for bad weather in order to schedule an interview with him. Another White parolee we interviewed while sitting in an old car that had bullet-holes in it from wild pre-Youth Authority days; now, he was interviewed while between classes in theater arts at a community college. Several parolees were so convinced that they had put delinquency behind them that they expressed an active interest in helping younger kids with problems and a few were actually involved in such programs. Some respondents requested copies of the eventual report. Many "successes" wanted to talk far longer than the time scheduled for each interview, and were obviously involved in the topic of personal reform. As we will later describe, the many and varied impressions gained by interviewing the 193 young men provided a valuable means for interpreting some of the statistical findings.

What Wards Told Us During The Interviews

The summarized interview responses represent a rare collection of the perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of typical Youth Authority wards. This section will examine responses to some of the major topics covered in the interviews. (Readers wanting more detail will find a summary of responses to all interview items in Appendix A, p. 61.)

Pre-Youth Authority life. The picture that emerged from questions asked about this time period was one of problems in all four areas shown in Table 5: family, school, peers, and economics.

Concerning family, there were marked differences between perceptions of mothers and fathers (these surface again in interview material to be presented later). While almost 80% of respondents said that they had felt close to their mothers before coming to Youth Authority, less than half reported such closeness toward fathers. Although it was beyond the purpose of the study to detail the reasons for this difference, based on impressions we can say that the sample suffered a high incidence of marital breakups, disinterested fathering, illegitimacy, and in a small number of cases the deaths of fathers; all of these reasons contributed to the low percentage of reported closeness to fathers. Unfortunately, we had no non-incarcerated control group against which we could have compared these responses, so we cannot conclude that poor relationships with fathers is unique to delinquents. However, other researchers (e.g., Silverman & Dinitz, 1974) have claimed that absence of fathers produces the "hyper-masculine" traits commonly seen among delinquents--physical aggressiveness and assaultiveness, swaggering, boastfulness, obsessions with weapons and toughness, authoritarianism - as an overcompensation for the absence. Judging from the responses in Tables 5, 6, and 7, there was a high level of father-

TABLE 5

Responses to Questions About Pre-Youth Authority Life

| Item | Yes | | No | | Mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | |
| <u>Parents and Role Models</u> | | | | | |
| Felt "close" or "very close" to father..... | 90 | 46.6 | 103 | 53.4 | |
| Felt "close" or "very close" to mother..... | 154 | 79.8 | 39 | 20.2 | |
| Ever placed in a foster home..... | 61 | 31.6 | 132 | 68.4 | |
| Ever hit with stick or object for punishment . . | 157 | 81.3 | 36 | 18.7 | |
| Ever bruised or really beaten-up when punished..... | 46 | 23.8 | 147 | 76.2 | |
| Had hero(es); admired someone..... | 92 | 47.7 | 101 | 52.3 | |
| Had at least one special, helpful adult friend..... | 129 | 66.8 | 64 | 33.2 | |
| <u>School Experiences</u> | | | | | |
| Had at least one special, helpful teacher..... | 133 | 69.6 | 58 | 30.4 | |
| Reading Level (from files)..... | | | | | 6.78 |
| Hours per week spent on homework..... | | | | | 1.90 |
| Attendance at school was regular..... | 53 | 27.6 | 140 | 72.5 | |
| Took part in organized school activities..... | 97 | 50.3 | 95 | 49.2 | |
| <u>Peers, Early Signs of Trouble</u> | | | | | |
| Friends were delinquent..... | 130 | 68.8 | 59 | 31.2 | |
| Was in street gangs..... | 66 | 34.4 | 126 | 65.6 | |
| Had a drinking or drug problem..... | 79 | 40.9 | 114 | 59.1 | |
| Age at first trouble with the law..... | | | | | 12.28 |
| <u>Economic Situation</u> | | | | | |
| Family ever received public assistance..... | 99 | 52.4 | 90 | 47.6 | |
| Had enough money for wanted things..... | 111 | 58.1 | 80 | 41.9 | |
| Parent(s) job title (On 6-pt. scale from 0=unemployed to 6=professional; e.g., 2= low skilled and 3=semi-skilled)..... | | | | | 2.94 |
| Any paid work experience..... | 153 | 79.7 | 39 | 20.3 | |

Note. Sample Size = 193. Percentages are based on the number who answered each question, since there were a few missing responses to some questions. Responses summarized in this table were from the pre-parole interviews.

absence, whether literal or psychological, in the backgrounds of the youth in the sample.

Almost one-third of respondents reported at least one foster home experience, another indicator of family problems. Regarding physical punishment and abuse, some readers may feel that the percentage of those who said they had been abused (23.8% "bruised or really beaten-up" when punished) underrepresents the true prevalence of abuse among Youth Authority wards. However, since over 80% reported physical punishment by being hit with with objects, the true incidence of what most people would consider abusive parental treatment probably falls somewhere between the 23.8% and 81.3% figures.

Less than half of the wards reported having heroes while growing up, although about two-thirds said that at least one adult had been a special and helpful friend to them. At the risk of stereotyping, it is fair to say that the overall picture of family life gained from these items is one of poor relationships with fathers, highly punitive environments, perhaps a foster home placement or two, and the likelihood that a nonfamily adult friend took up the slack left by poor or disinterested parenting.

Impressions of school were also negative. Lack of interest in school was demonstrated by the fact that only 27.6% of the sample described their school attendance as "regular." Only half had ever taken part in school activities (those who did usually mentioned sports), and the average ward reported spending less than two hours per week doing homework. The generally low reading level (mean = 6.78) obtained from objective file records fits with the self-reported indications that school was problematic for wards. One optimistic statistic is the 69.3% who said that at least one teacher had been special and helpful to them (although we might wish that figure to be 100%).

Table 5 items about Peers and Early Signs of Trouble are self-explanatory and will be discussed at some length when the topic turns to explaining parole outcomes.

Pre-Youth Authority economic situations were described in mixed terms. Over half said that their family had received public assistance, although in answer to another question, a larger proportion (58.1%) said that they "had enough money" for things that they wanted. The typical ward's parent(s) worked in a low-to-semiskilled occupation. Most wards (79.7%) had held at least one paying job. Although there was a wide range of family economic situations represented in this sample, the typical family seemed to live slightly above the subsistence level, on earnings gained from blue-collar work, with occasional periods of unemployment during which the family lived on public assistance.

Life in Youth Authority institutions and camps. (Table 6).

Interestingly, the difference between relationships to mothers and to fathers appeared again in reports of visits. Almost twice the proportion of respondents reported regular visits from mothers than reported such visits from fathers (57.4% compared to 32.8%). Still, less than half said that they had not seen enough outside visitors, and almost three-fourths of respondents said that they had stayed involved with a girlfriend or wife in their home communities during the time that they were incarcerated.

Respondents tended to evaluate the Youth Authority school programs very positively. Table 6 shows that almost three-fourths of wards considered their school program "important." Teachers were rated as somewhat or very helpful by 71.0% of the sample. Significant achievements were made in actual high school credits earned (mean = 3.26 credits per month of stay), which indicates that actual, behavioral involvements in the school Program took

TABLE 6
Responses to Questions About Life in Youth Authority
Institutions and Camps

| Item | Yes | | No | | Mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | |
| <u>Family and Supports from Outside</u> | | | | | |
| Father visited at least monthly..... | 63 | 32.8 | 129 | 67.2 | |
| Mother visited at least monthly..... | 108 | 57.4 | 80 | 42.6 | |
| Frequency of outside visitors was "not enough" | 81 | 42.0 | 112 | 58.0 | |
| Had a girlfriend or wife on the outside..... | 142 | 74.0 | 50 | 26.0 | |
| <u>Academic and Vocational School Programs</u> | | | | | |
| Was in academic (only) school programs..... | 142 | 76.3 | 44 | 23.7 | |
| Was in vocational or vocational-academic programs | 44 | 23.7 | 142 | 76.3 | |
| School program was "important to you"..... | 141 | 73.1 | 52 | 26.9 | |
| Youth Authority teachers were "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful" | 137 | 71.0 | 56 | 29.0 | |
| Number of months in (longest-attended) vocational class..... | | | | | 8.13 |
| Received help in planning for a job and/or career..... | 76 | 39.4 | 117 | 60.6 | |
| High school credits earned per month..... | | | | | 3.26 |
| <u>Living Unit Programs</u> | | | | | |
| Program seemed to emphasize counseling..... | 98 | 52.1 | 90 | 47.9 | |
| Estimated time (minutes) per week spent in planned, one-to-one counseling. | | | | | 21.98 |
| Estimated time (minutes) per week spent in unplanned, informal counseling. | | | | | 115.7 |
| Estimated time (minutes) per week spent in group discussions/meetings..... | | | | | 70.7 |
| Living unit programs was "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful"..... | 130 | 67.4 | 63 | 32.6 | |
| Youth Counselor was "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful" | 136 | 70.5 | 57 | 29.5 | |
| <u>Institutional Environment; Negative Behavior Indicators</u> | | | | | |
| Was able to get away from others and "be by myself" when wanted..... | 137 | 71.0 | 56 | 29.0 | |
| There were many fights on the living unit..... | 94 | 49.0 | 98 | 51.0 | |
| "Felt safe" on the living unit..... | 154 | 80.2 | 38 | 19.8 | |

TABLE 6 (continued)

| Item | Yes | | No | | Mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|------|------|
| | # | % | # | % | |
| Was transferred out of living unit for disciplinary reasons..... | 27 | 14.0 | 166 | 86.0 | |
| Was transferred out of the institution/camp for disciplinary reasons..... | 22 | 11.4 | 171 | 88.6 | |
| Was in a gang while incarcerated..... | 24 | 12.5 | 168 | 87.5 | |
| Attitudes and Values | | | | | |
| "Might have to do illegal things" for money when released..... | 22 | 11.4 | 171 | 88.6 | |
| Believe that "crime is not worth it"..... | 173 | 90.1 | 19 | 9.9 | |
| Decided that "crime is not worth it" during this stay..... | 104 | 54.5 | 87 | 45.5 | |
| Involved in any religious activity during this stay..... | 115 | 60.8 | 74 | 39.2 | |

Note. Sample Size = 193. Percentages are based on the numbers who answered each question, since there were a few missing responses to some questions. Responses summarized in this table were from the pre-parole interviews.

place in addition to more positive attitudes. The contrast between the generally positive experiences reported in Youth Authority schools vs. the truancy and other problems reported in pre-Youth Authority schools was spoken about by several wards in spontaneous remarks. These remarks tended to focus on three aspects of Youth Authority vs. public school programs; first, that there were fewer alternative ways of spending one's time while incarcerated compared to when one is free, making schoolwork a more likely pursuit; second, that there was far more individual attention given in Youth Authority classrooms vs. public school ones; and third, some wards appreciated an emphasis they had received on practical, basic skills that they had never mastered in public schools such as learning how to read.

Two educational statistics are less glowing, though, since they call into question the preparedness of wards to reenter the labor market. Only 39.4% reported receiving help in planning for a job or for a career, which says that unless many wards simply did not remember such training, the Department has a long way to go to before it claims that all wards receive training in job survival skills. Also, those wards who were in vocational classes, on the average, said that their longest attended vocational course was slightly over eight months. This suggests that few wards in the Youth Authority population are likely to receive enough training to put them beyond the trainee stage in any given trade.

Descriptions of living unit programs were particularly interesting. Most wards gave their youth counselors and living unit programs positive ratings (proportions who considered their youth counselors and programs helpful were 70.5% and 67.4%, respectively). However, when asked to describe the type of living unit program they had experienced, only about half (52.1%) described programs with a definite counseling emphasis. Two

other frequent responses were that programs had emphasized practical training issues (especially among those in fire crews at the camps) or that there had been "no emphasis at all." Also, individual counseling tended to be informally done. The average ward reported spending less than 22 minutes per week in individual counseling that was planned, but he reported over 115 minutes per week spent in informal conversations with his counselor.

There were vast differences in the descriptions of different living unit programs, but interviewers noticed that wards who came from within the same living unit tended to give the same evaluation of it. Despite the differences between programs, interviewers were left with an overall feeling that living unit programs were not too systematic or focused, but that wards highly valued their interactions with counselors. These interactions might have been especially valued given the high level of apparent disinterest by the wards' fathers both before and during the incarceration period.

Ward's views of the institutional environment (Table 6) might surprise some people. The vast majority of wards (80.2%) said that they had "felt safe" in their living units, even though about half (49.0%) reported seeing "many fights." These responses make sense when compared to the lives of most wards on the outside. In addition to the family, peer, and economic problems that were typical in pre-Youth Authority days, the reality was that the streets were more dangerous places to be than were Youth Authority facilities. We mentioned earlier that two out of the original sample of wards were murdered in street violence within six months of being paroled, whereas only three murders of incarcerated wards have taken place in the 40-year history of the Youth Authority.

Although few wards admitted to receiving disciplinary transfers out of living units (14.0%) or facilities (11.4%), and few admitted to gang

involvements while incarcerated (12.5%), these admissions became important factors in predicting parole failure, which will be discussed in a later section.

Finally, during this period it is interesting that most wards claimed that their attitudes and values were anti-crime. Table 6 shows that over 90% believed that crime was not worth the risks involved, and over half (54.5%) said that they had arrived at this belief during their Youth Authority stays (the others in the 90% said that they adopted the belief even before incarceration). When asked about how they would survive if things got tough financially, only 11.4% admitted that they might have to earn money by illegal means.

There are two ways to interpret the discrepancy between the high percentage of those claiming to have sworn-off crime when they were interviewed inside Youth Authority facilities, and the high percentage of those who were subsequently arrested for parole-period crimes. The first is that many respondents lied to us about their true intentions for when they got out. The second is that they were truthful about their intentions, but that many changed their minds after a period of time back on the streets. We will elaborate on the second possibility in the next section.

Life during the first six months of parole (Table 7). Reports of the family during this time period contain the same disparity between feelings toward mothers vs. fathers, even though wards reported slightly more closeness toward both mothers and fathers than in pre-Youth Authority days.

Concerning peers and other involvements, Table 7 shows a marked drop-off in the proportion of those claiming to have delinquent friends in this time period compared to pre-Youth Authority days (21.8% compared with the

TABLE 7
Responses to Questions About Life During the First Three
To Six Months on Parole

| Item | Yes | | No | | Mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|------|----------------------|
| | # | % | # | % | |
| <u>Parental Closeness & Support</u> | | | | | |
| Feels "close" or "very close" to father..... | 107 | 55.4 | 86 | 44.6 | |
| Feels "close" or "very close" to mother..... | 160 | 86.5 | 33 | 13.5 | |
| Receives much or all of financial support from parent(s) | 98 | 50.8 | 95 | 49.2 | |
| <u>Peers; Positive & Negative Involvements</u> | | | | | |
| Most or all of present friends have been in serious trouble with the law..... | 42 | 21.8 | 151 | 78.2 | |
| Involved in street gang..... | 16 | 8.5 | 173 | 91.5 | |
| Belong to (positive) organization (club, charity, etc.) | 37 | 19.4 | 155 | 80.7 | |
| Enrolled in school or training..... | 73 | 38.2 | 118 | 61.8 | |
| Involved in any religious activity..... | 54 | 28.1 | 138 | 71.9 | |
| Current drinking or drug problem..... | 34 | 17.6 | 159 | 82.4 | |
| <u>Job Experiences</u> | | | | | |
| Has had at least one job since parole date... , Number of weeks before finding first job..... , Hourly wage (\$) of best-paying job so far.... , Duration of first job (weeks)..... | 146 | 76.8 | 44 | 23.2 | 3.43 4.71 7.78 |
| <u>General Economic Situation</u> | | | | | |
| Much of financial support comes from his own job..... | 95 | 49.2 | 98 | 50.8 | |
| Partial support comes from public assistance. | 20 | 10.4 | 173 | 89.6 | |
| Is at least "somewhat satisfied" financially. | 115 | 59.6 | 78 | 40.4 | |
| Sometimes get money by illegal means..... | 52 | 26.9 | 141 | 73.1 | |
| <u>Attitudes Toward Parole Agents</u> | | | | | |
| See parole agent weekly (vs. less than weekly)..... | 53 | 27.5 | 140 | 72.5 | |
| Parole Agent is "helpful" or "very helpful"... , Parole Agent acts like a helper (rather than "a cop") | 142 | 75.1 | 47 | 24.9 | |
| | 156 | 85.7 | 26 | 14.3 | |

Note. Sample Size = 193. Percentages are based on the numbers who answered each question, since there were a few missing responses to some questions. Responses summarized in this table were from the parole-period interviews.

68.8% in Table 5). Only 8.5% admitted to involvement in street gangs. However, positive, "social control" involvements were also low. Only 18.1% were in (positive, legal) organizations and only 38.2% continued their seemingly positive Youth Authority educational experiences by enrolling in school or training while on parole. Also, the 28.1% who reported religious activities while on parole was down sharply from the 60.8% who claimed religious activity while incarcerated.

Information about jobs and general economic situations presents a mixed picture. On the one hand, 76.8% of parolees had found at least one job during this time period (and some of those who had not worked were fulltime students or very young). Those who had worked had found their first jobs after an average time of only 3.43 weeks after parole release. And, those who had worked reported having at least some better-than-minimum wage jobs (mean wage of "best-paying job so far" was \$4.71 per hour). On the other hand, jobs tended to end quickly (average duration of jobs was less than eight weeks), and 26.9% of respondents admitted sometimes using illegal means to get money. Interviewers heard widely varying reports about earnings and finances. The most typical pattern was intermittent work at low-paying jobs having low potential for future security or advancement. At the extremes were those who had not worked at all, and those who had been steadily employed at well-paying jobs with good apparent futures. Some of the latter wards included a jet airplane mechanic, a bookkeeper, a computer operator, a few small store managers, and a few skilled tradesmen.

Finally, the items in Table 7 concerning parole agents got strong positive responses. Three-fourths of respondents said that their parole agents had been helpful to them. An even higher proportion (85.7%) rated the style of their parole agents as being that of "helper" rather than policeman.

From all of the responses to the interview questions discussed so far, a few summary characteristics stand out as deserving special emphasis. First was the strikingly different perception of wards' mothers and fathers which was true across time periods. Next was the change in perceptions of school involvements and achievements, from mostly negative perceptions and poor achievements in pre-Youth Authority schools to positive perceptions and encouraging accomplishments while in Youth Authority education programs. The third striking characteristic was the strong tendency of wards to perceive their living units as safe places with helpful programs. Another interesting response was that the vast majority of wards expressed anti-crime beliefs while incarcerated. Finally, most wards rated Youth Authority staff in both facilities and community parole settings as having been helpful to them

What Explains Parole Success?

In the previous project report, we established that some of the information obtained from wards in the interviews correlated significantly with their subsequent performances during the first twelve months of parole. Specifically, eight different interview topics, when combined in a multiple regression equation, predicted the proportions of time that parolees stayed out of further confinement with a reasonable degree of accuracy. Information that especially predicted parole success at twelve months included having shorter prior records, not reporting problems with drugs or alcohol, being paroled to northern areas of the state, staying employed, and reporting positive things about one's parole agent.

These and other findings described in the Phase 2 report suggested some program possibilities, such as programs aimed at getting wards to find and keep jobs, and programs to reduce alcohol and drug use. Also, some interesting questions were raised about the parole agent-client relationship. Did poor

relationships between parole agent and parolee cause lawbreaking, or merely reflect that those wards headed for trouble were less pleasant to work with and thus ended up disliking their agents? Another area of concern was raised by the regional findings; that is, by the alternative possibilities that parolee misbehaviors were dealt with more leniently in some areas than in others, or that some regions were really more conducive to good parole behavior than others.

Similar multivariate tests were made to see how strongly parole performances after 24 months were related to the interview and demographic background information which had been collected prior to and during the first year of parole. In making these tests, two sometimes conflicting concerns were present. First, we needed to reduce the dozens of items of information collected about each ward to the ones that made a real difference in parole performance scores. At the same time, our objective was to achieve meaningful, interpretable results. As an example of the way that data reduction and meaningfulness can conflict, suppose we wanted to reduce the "parole success equation" to only two variables. The strongest two predictors would be age and the number of prior offenses. Unfortunately, knowing only that older wards with fewer priors do better on parole than younger wards with many priors contributes little understanding of the processes that lead some wards toward law-abiding behaviors.

Methodologists (such as Cohen & Cohen, 1975) have pointed out that overly cryptic, not-too-meaningful equations are most likely to result when researchers put the responsibility for reducing large data sets solely on the computer. That is, computer programs will handily search through a large number of items for a few that, when combined into an equation, will efficiently predict an outcome-variable such as parole performance. The

problem is that stepwise regression programs, as these programs are called in statistics jargon, have only efficiency "in mind," and they cannot be infused with the purpose of getting interpretable results.

Therefore, we returned to the delinquency theories that we had used to develop the interview items. Rather than try to jam all items into one equation, this time we tested five separate equations, each made up by reassembling the interview items into sets, according to the theory from which each had been drawn. This way we could see which items from each theory-set would stand out from the others in successfully explaining parole outcomes. Then, those items, and the theory behind them, could be more carefully examined for implications to further research and possible Youth Authority programs and policies.

In each of the five equations tested, an identical set of demographic and base-expectancy variables was simultaneously entered along with the theoretical items to control for the influence of these "fixed" characteristics. These control-variables were age, number of priors, type of committing offense (property vs. non-property) and ethnicity. Two dummy-coded ethnic variables were used, Black/non-Black and Hispanic/non-Hispanic, leaving White ethnicity as a reference category. These demographic variables were put in each equation because as described in early sections in this paper, they have been found to significantly predict parole outcomes but they are fixed. That is, nothing can be done to change ages, ethnicities, or prior offense histories when persons arrive at Youth Authority. Therefore, we wanted to know what in addition to these demographics seemed to make a difference in parole performances. In separate computer runs, these demographic items were entered, alone, in multiple regression equations and they accounted for 15.1% of the variance. This is about half of the total accuracy

of predictions that was achieved in the three best equations, as will now be elaborated.

Proponents of the five theories might not agree with the content of items put in each grouping, but the study's purpose was applied and did not involve making a thorough test of the merits of any given theory. The five collections tested were:

1. Differential association items. These pertained to the reports of family, school, peer, institutional, and parole relationships.
2. Social control items. These were items measuring the extent of parolees' stakes in (legitimate) conformity (school, jobs, organizational memberships, romantic attachments, others).
3. Economic items. These measured the extent of legitimate resources, including family economics, personal employment variables, and "ability resources" such as reading level and training.
4. Social ecology items. These were measures of environmental conditions, such as neighborhood census material, perceptions of Youth Authority institutional environments, parole living situation, region of parole, and abuse of chemicals (drugs/alcohol).
5. Competence items. These had to do with family, schooling, reading level, achievements and behaviors in Youth Authority facilities, and productivity on parole.

There was some overlap; some items were included in more than one collection. For example, proportion of productive time on parole (time spent either in school or employed) was included in three collections, namely, the social control, economic, and competence groupings. Another source of overlap was the demographic items previously described.

Complete statistics associated with all five regression equations are reported in Appendix C, pp. 84 to 89. For purposes of the present discussion, statistically significant predictors of parole performance have been abstracted from three of these equations and presented in Tables 8, 9, and 10. These correspond to the regression equations calculated for the Differential Association (Appendix Table C-1), Social Ecology (Appendix Table C-4), and Social Competence (Appendix Table C-5) sets of items. The other two equations, using Social Control and Economic Theory items (Appendix Table C-2 and C-3, respectively), produced significant predictors that were redundant with those from the other three equations. Thus, the tables and discussion will be confined to the three solutions that were most unique in terms of content.

This does not imply that Social Control Theory or Economic Theory proved inadequate. In fact, all five theories proved useful in that each set of items explained a highly significant proportion of the total variance in parole performance scores (R-Squares of between 25.8 and 32.9, $F's < .001$). Also, it is likely that project staff happened to develop more sensitive measures within some theory-sets than within others, which is why results should not be used to make comparative judgments about the merits of these theories.

1. Differential association items (Table 8). Besides the two significant demographic items (age and prior record, which were significant in all five equations), three of the four other significant predictors of good parole street-time involved descriptions of peers. The fourth item was a composite item made up of ratings by respondents of their parole agents. Regarding peers, an interesting reversal from what might have been expected took place. Namely, parole successes (those who stayed on the streets proportionately longer) tended to describe their pre-Youth Authority friends as being in

trouble more than did parole failures. However, successes also claimed to have not been involved in gangs while incarcerated, and they were likely to describe their current (parole-period) friends as nondelinquent. While these response tendencies seem contradictory, they may have indicated a growing consciousness among successes that they had undergone change. Those who, during their institutional stay, had decided to put delinquency behind them were aware that their past associations had been delinquent ones compared with their current nondelinquent ones. Wards who had not undergone such a change were not inclined to make sharp distinctions between past and present friends.

TABLE 8

Statistically Significant Predictors of 24-Month Parole Performance ("Good Street-Time") Derived From Differential Association Theory

| <u>Predictors</u> | <u>Relationship of Predictor To Better Parole Performances</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Older Age at Release to Parole | Positive |
| Longer Prior Record | Negative |
| Friends Described as "in trouble" (Pre-YA Period) | Positive |
| Been in Any Gang While in YA | Negative |
| Parole Agent was: Seen often, rated as helpful, rated more as a helper than as a policeman | Positive |
| Friends Described as Non-Delinquent (Parole Period) | Positive |

Note. Significant predictors were derived from an initial test of the simultaneous effects of 18 items (five demographic "givens" and 13 items derived from theory) on parole performance. See Table C-1, P. 85, of the Appendix for technical details.

The significance of the parole agent items might also be evidence of positive attitude change. Those who had decided against criminal lifestyles were more likely to maintain good relationships with parole agents. Of course, it is possible that the better, more effective parole agents produced more successes as well as positive ward evaluations; realistically, it is more likely that parole agent-ratings as well as parolee behaviors reflected changes in overall parolee attitudes and lifestyles.

2. Social ecology items (Table 9). That this collection of items was significantly related to parole performances is interesting, since all of the significant predictors except for drug/alcohol problems are non-behavioral ones. In this formula which stresses environmental conditions, physical location appears to have been a strong determinant of parole performances. Specifically, living in neighborhoods with higher education levels and living in northern parole regions (I and II) were associated with higher street-time scores. This could have happened for various reasons. First, crime-producing

TABLE 9

Statistically Significant Predictors of 24-Month Parole Performance ("Good Street-Time") Derived From Social Ecology Theory

| <u>Predictors</u> | <u>Relationship of Predictor To Better Parole Performances</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Older Age at Release to Parole | Positive |
| Longer Prior Record | Negative |
| Higher Neighborhood Education Level (Census) | Positive |
| No Problem or Heavy Use of Drugs or Alcohol (Parole) | Positive |
| Region III Parole Location | Negative |
| Region IV Parole Location | Negative |

Note. Significant predictors were derived from an initial test of the simultaneous effects of 18 items (five demographic "givens" and 13 items derived from theory) on parole performance. See Table C-4, p. 88, of the Appendix for technical details.

conditions might have been less prevalent in these areas. Or, these areas could have sent the less serious delinquents to the Youth Authority to begin with than did other areas, which would mean that area of residence during the parole period did not matter so much as earlier selection and commitment factors. Finally, it is possible that different localities react differently to parolee misbehavior. Some apprehend youth sooner, incarcerate them at a higher rate, and keep them locked up for longer times than do other localities for the same misbehaviors. Whatever the reason, the fact that location correlated significantly with time spent free from confinement is a finding that deserves further study.

3. Social competence items (Table 10). In this equation, besides age and prior record, Black ethnicity showed up as a predictor of less time spent outside of confinement during the followup period. Readers should keep in mind that in multiple regression, the weights (beta) that describe the relative contribution of each item reflect its importance with other items controlled. This is why Black ethnicity could have barely reached statistical significance in this equation ($p < .05$; see Appendix Table C-5) but not in the others. In the other equations, some of the other items more fully accounted for the variance in street-time scores that Black ethnicity accounted for in the social competence equation. Because of this sometimes confusing aspect of multiple regression the weights within each equation must be interpreted only in the context of that equation.

The other significant predictors in this equation have to do with performance. One of these was a self-prophecy of performance, that is, the self-stated chances of success that were described to us by wards before they left Youth Authority facilities for parole. That these forecasts were significantly related to two subsequent years of parole street-time

TABLE 10

**Statistically Significant Predictors of 24-Month Parole
Performance ("Good Street-Time") Derived From
Social Competence Theory**

| <u>Predictors</u> | <u>Relationship of Predictor To Better Parole Performances</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Older Age at Release to Parole | Positive |
| Longer Prior Record | Negative |
| Black Ethnicity* | Negative |
| Higher Self-Stated Chances for Parole Success | Positive |
| Any Disciplinary Transfers in YA Facilities | Negative |
| No Problem or Heavy Use of Drugs or Alcohol (Parole) | Positive |
| Proportion of First Parole Year Spent Working or in School | Positive |

Note. Significant predictors were derived from an initial test of the simultaneous effects of 17 items (five demographic "givens" and 12 items derived from theory) on parole performance. See Table C-5, p. 89, of the Appendix for technical details.

* Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic) was tested in all five original equations but was statistically significant in only one. See text, p. 43, for a discussion of the statistical reason for this.

suggests that wards can evaluate their own abilities to stay out of future trouble as well as or better than other persons, such as officials, can evaluate them. It also supports an idea mentioned earlier, that wards tend to make decisions about future behavior at some point during incarceration. If so, the self-stated chances represented evidence of those decisions. Supporting this idea was the fact that disciplinary transfers while in Youth Authority facilities predicted poorer parole performances.

Finally, a highly significant performance variable was the proportion of time spent working or enrolled in school. There are several imaginable reasons for the importance of this item. Working provides legitimate income

which alleviates at least one motive for crime. Working or school enrollment keeps youth busy during times which could 'be used for delinquent activity. Jobs and education can lead to increased self-esteem Or, those most successful in keeping jobs and staying in school might simply have more intelligence and/or motivation for achievement, which qualities show up in less delinquency as well as more legitimate productivity.

IMPLICATIONS

Here are some implications for programs, policies, and future research. First is that wards reveal much about how they will do on parole by their descriptions of friends, their own forecasts, and their institutional behaviors. Second, local environments need to be studied for why they produce different success rates and how these differences might be used to bring about overall better rates. Third, personal performances in the areas of drugs, alcohol, work, and school can be used as barometers of parole performance, and perhaps they could be manipulated to get better parole performance. Fourth, wards were very generous in their ratings of Youth Authority programs and staff, a fact which could be more fully exploited by staff. Finally, future research could be improved by making more sensitive measurements of the personal decisions made by exoffenders that more immediately affect parole behaviors than do environmental influences.

Wards reveal much about how they will do on parole. When research staff first began this project, a supervisor of one parole office telephoned to take issue with the concept of interviewing wards. His comments went something like, "Why interview wards? They're not very articulate, and besides, they'll just exaggerate and tell you tall tales. You should be talking to experts!" By this last term naturally, he was referring to parole agents and other officials. His comments were partially correct. Most wards were not very articulate, which was expected given their generally poor academic histories. But regardless of how well they said it, some of what they said had definite meaning in predicting their subsequent parole

outcomes. The information given during the interviews represented a type of coded message from respondents.

Perhaps those who described themselves as non-gang-affiliated while inside, as behaving well in their living units (no disciplinary transfers), and as having higher chances for success on parole were describing tentative decisions to try to be "good" on parole. After a few months on parole, those who reported good relationships with parole agents, no problems with alcohol or drugs, non-delinquent friendships, and involvements with jobs and school were the ones whose earlier, tentative decisions were now being positively reinforced in their parole communities. Of course, there was much that could go wrong in this process. Tentative, weak decisions to give legal living a chance might have been reversed when jobs were lost or other disappointments or rebuffs took place. Alcohol or drug use, at such times, would have compounded these frustrations.

The implication of this coded-message-idea is that staff should pay serious attention to what wards in institutions and on parole have to say. Sure, the parole supervisor quoted earlier was right in saying that wards will exaggerate. But what is important is not the precise accuracy of wards' self-reports, but the overall quality or slant of the conversation. Staff should pay special attention to general optimism expressed about any key areas of adjustment--friends, drugs, alcohol, jobs, school, parole agents--and make sure that wards are reinforced for these expressions. It is possible that some people who work with wards on a routine basis tend to overlook or discount some of the minor signals that good (or bad) things are beginning to happen. Of course, experienced parole agents and institutional staff have been listening to wards and acting on what they have heard for years; these findings simply provide formal support for that process.

Local environments need to be studied for why they produce different success rates and how these differences might be used. For example, a logical but not-too-likely way to improve statewide parole street-time scores would be to reduce the numbers of wards accepted from Regions 3 and 4 (which include primarily southern California counties) and from localities with low median education levels (see Table 11). A more likely, more deliberate step would be to find out why some areas seem to produce more successful parolees than other areas. The significance of the neighborhood education level (Table 11) suggests that economic conditions are involved. If further studies confirm that living in, or coming from, poorer neighborhoods reduces chances for parole success, then effective prevention policies might include relocating parolees from blighted areas to better areas, helping parolees escape high-recidivism areas during the day by public transportation, or improving the conditions of these areas.

However, before getting carried away with the idea that urban blight causes higher recidivism, another likely reason for the effects of geography on parole outcomes has to do with local justice systems. Some systems probably reacted to parolee misbehaviors more quickly and were more likely to incarcerate than other local systems. If so, it would be helpful to know how much this source of bias comes from different Youthful Offender Parole Board members, how much from different parole agents and parole offices, how much from local police practices, and how much the bias comes from local courts and judges. This gets to be a complicated question, since justice system elements are interdependent. Perhaps several elements, such as police, courts and parole agents, shared common political and legal philosophies toward parolees that produced the regional differences in good street-time that were observed in this study. The financial and social

implications of different parole performances, and the cost of reincarceration at different rates across localities, suggests the need for further analysis of the functioning of various justice system units within California.

Personal performances in the areas of drugs, alcohol, work, and school can be used as barometers of parole performances, and perhaps manipulated to improve performances. Findings confirm the simple idea that success or failure in finding and keeping jobs, in staying in school, and in avoiding abuse of alcohol and drugs is closely related to success in staying out of trouble with the law. As with other findings, it is impossible to know how much this is due to general personality or motivational characteristics that lead to success in all areas of life, and how much the findings are due to jobs, school, and lack of substance problems causing parole success. The theory of social competence learning stresses the developmental nature of successfully passing society's milestones, such as learning to read, learning to relate to others, graduating from school, and getting a job. This theory also maintains that these achievements relate to each other like building-blocks, with the earlier ones becoming a necessary foundation for later ones.

Accordingly, the highly delinquent sample which was studied probably represents a group of young people that missed or delayed many of these critical mastery experiences, so that some of the basic foundations for competent citizenship had still to be set. During the short time of our study, some of the youth made some major achievements, such as finding their first jobs and staying off of alcohol long enough to do well in the jobs. These achievements might have had a multiplier-effect on other areas of their lives, such that delinquent activities became less and less attractive to them

Implications are that the Department should ensure that their programs and supervision styles enhance and encourage the process of development. Although findings do not prove the effectiveness of classic "rehabilitation," which was a concept that usually meant psychotherapy or similar focused attempts to change attitudes, they indicate the importance of having practical skills with which to make basic achievements. Accordingly, institution and parole staff should continue to actively encourage and reinforce school enrollment, employment, and participation in substance abuse programs.

Wards were generous in evaluating the Youth Authority and realistic in evaluating themselves. Lending validity to the interviews was the fact that wards freely described past school, family, peer, and economic difficulties (pp. 25-36). Interestingly, their evaluations of Youth Authority staff, programs, and personal safety at the institutions were quite positive. These evaluations might have reflected actual conditions, that is, very good staff and programs, or they might have reflected relative perceptions of conditions in Youth Authority compared with wards' lives on the streets. As was discussed earlier (pp. 25-36), Youth Authority facilities and staff might have appeared as being very safe, humane, and helpful when compared to poor, frightening conditions in many wards' home environments.

Regardless of the reason for the positive evaluations, the result has one simple implication for programs and staff. Namely, staff should more fully exploit their status as positive, valued role-models for delinquents. The interview responses indicated that for many wards, in addition to a public school teacher that might have taken an interest in the youth, the Youth Authority counselor or parole agent was among the most caring non-parent adults with whom the youth had significant contact. Social learning theory indicates that this position can be a very powerful and

influential one, especially since many wards might have "missed" some earlier stages of socialization and positive attitude-formation. In other words, staff might more accurately be attempting what some writers call "habilitation," that is, primary teaching of prosocial values, rather than "rehabilitation" or changing of previous ones.

Implications to future research on delinquent behavior change and prediction. A few years ago, a noted criminologist summarized decades of research on predicting crime and recidivism by saying that, regardless of how adequate the measures of criminal behaviors or how well-thought-out the list of predictors, researchers have only been able to push the success of prediction to about 30%-of-variance-explained (Hirschi, 1980). The current study is no exception and, were the study to be replicated and the same predictors and beta weights (relative importance of each variable) used on a new sample, the percentage of variance explained would probably drop below that. In other words, even though 30%-of-variance is a strong enough relationship to be of practical significance, the fact remains that the intensive, expensive way that data were collected gave us no edge over cheaper methods, at least in terms of producing better mathematical interrelationships.

The advantage to using personal interview methods was not in producing more powerful mathematical results, but in providing strong leads as to where we should go from here. Researchers using archival methods could go on putting together statistics from files to produce prediction equations for a long time and still not figure out why the success of prediction never improves beyond 30%. But talking to wards for hundreds of hours provided research staff with valuable impressions about this problem

Often during the interviews, when parolees were asked to describe the effects that persons, programs, or experiences had had on their current

attitudes or behaviors, they answered by saying something like "No, that [person/program] didn't help me change at all. I decided to change! Nothing changes guys until they decide to change; then everything helps." Initially, interviewers thought that these statements represented bragging, that is, that respondents wanted to claim personal credit for any good changes that had taken place. But these ideas were repeated so often that they became difficult to discount. We began to feel that some interviewees had made such strong personal decisions that the environmental influences that we were so interested in, such as family, peers, staff, and programs, had been effectively tuned-out. Other respondents seemed to have made some tentative decisions, but not strongly enough to withstand environmental influences. In fact, decisions about doing crime changed from day-to-day or moment-to-moment with some persons, judging from the number of those who seemed to have cycled in and out of the justice system with short, sporadic periods of good accomplishments (school enrollments, jobs) spliced in between arrests.

It may be that our lack of ability to measure and update knowledge about these personal decisions, rather than the well-documented inaccuracies in measuring environmental social influences, accounts for most of the 65-75% of the variance in parole outcomes that could not be explained in the various equations tested in this study. Also likely is that personal degrees of competence in the skills necessary to survive in the legitimate world--vocational, social, and intellectual skills--strongly interact with personal decisions, in a dynamic way, to affect actual behaviors. Relatively weak, tentative decisions to give up delinquency might have a good chance among those parolees having the skills to thrive in legitimate pursuits. But decisions against crime would have to be much stronger among those

having poor survival skills in order to be realized in consistently non-delinquent behaviors. How the strength of anti-crime beliefs and survival-skill-levels interact to affect behaviors is an open question. Judging from impressions gained in the interviews, the writer believes that further study and better measures of this interplay between beliefs and skills would greatly improve the accuracy of predictions.

The state-of-the-art in measuring skills is more advanced than in measuring decisions or beliefs. That is, vocational, social, and intellectual abilities can be measured by tests, or they can be estimated from past accomplishments in these areas. But measuring the strength of beliefs is more elusive than merely asking respondents whether they "agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly" about something. Such a technique is fine for opinion surveys, but fails to get at the intensity of feelings that accompany basic values and value-changes,

The field of experimental social psychology has shown the payoffs that can be derived from measuring belief intensity. For example, Harvey and his associates (Harvey, 1967; Harvey and Felknor, 1970; Miller and Harvey, 1973) have demonstrated that stated beliefs could be used to predict actual behaviors when the intensity or "ego-involvement" (as Harvey termed it) in the beliefs was taken into account, and that intensely held beliefs predicted behavior across a variety of situations. Being able to measure intensity of anti-crime beliefs would be a powerful addition to criminal justice evaluative research, since what many corrections programs implicitly attempt is to instill the type of beliefs that will operate on behavior across situations to keep exoffenders away from doing further crime.

Although it is beyond the scope of this discussion to detail ways of making improved belief measurements, the social psychological literature

provides a few clues. Harvey (see previous citations) has demonstrated that making assessments under conditions of mild stress has improved the predictive value of stated beliefs. (Stress was induced by strictly limiting the time allowed to respondents for giving answers to some fairly complex topics. Or, stress during assessment was directly measured; the greater the stress, the greater the inferred ego-involvement and' predictive strength of the stated belief.)

Of course, such refinements in the way individual clients are assessed may be unnecessary and too costly for many criminal justice purposes. At the policy level, for example, using demographics to make predictions about large numbers of offenders at even the 15%-of-variance-accuracy-level can still be very useful. But at the level of individual casework, where those such as parole agents or parole board hearing officers must work, measurement of demographics or environmental conditions might never provide accurate enough information to be useful, which gets back to the need for measuring personal beliefs and skills.

Implications to practitioners with special purposes. The summaries of interview responses contained in this report can be useful to persons with specialized purposes. To cite just a few examples, staff or program planners interested in ward employment will find detailed information about the pre-Youth Authority job history of wards (Items 36-47 of Pre-Parole Form Appendix A) and similar information about their parole-period jobs (Items 18-28 of the Followup Interview Form), including duration of jobs, wages, job-title-levels, and length of time between jobs. Or, institution staff might be interested in detailed ward descriptions of staff, educational programs, and living unit programs, which can be found in Items 60-75 and 86-100 in the Pre-Parole Form Appendix A.

REFERENCES

- Baron, R. A., Byrne, D., & Griffitt, W. Social Psychology: understanding human interaction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.
- Burgess, E. W., Harno, A. J., and Leindesco, J. A study of the indeterminate sentence and parole in the State of Illinois. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1928, 19.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: Wiley, 1975.
- Conger, R. D. Social control and social learning models of delinquent behavior. Criminology, 1976, 14, 17-40.
- Glaser, D. The effectiveness of a prison and parole system New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964.
- Glaser, D. The differential-association theory of crime. In Arnold M Rose (Ed.), Human behavior and social processes. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1962.
- Harvey, O. J. Conceptual systems and attitude change. In M Sherif and C. W Sherif (Eds.), Attitude, ego-involvement and change. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Harvey, O. J., & Felknor, C. Parent-child relations as an antecedent to conceptual functioning. In G. A. Milton and R. A. Hoppe (Eds.), Early experience and the processes of socialization. New York: Academic Press, 1970, 167-203.
- Hirschi, T. Issues in crime prediction. Presentation at the American Society of Criminology 1980 annual meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Hirschi, T. Causes of delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- Miller, A. G. & Harvey, O. J. Effects of concreteness-abstractness and anxiety on intellectual and motor performance. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 3, 444-451.
- Palmer, J. Economic analyses of the deterrent effect of punishment; a review. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1977, 14, 4-21.
- Peterson, M A., & Braiker, H. B. Doing crime: a survey of California prison inmates. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1980.
- Pritchard, D. A. Stable predictors of recidivism Criminology, 1979, 17, 15-21.

Silverman, I. J., & Dinitz, S. Compulsive masculinity and delinquency. Criminology, 1974, 11, 498-515. .

Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. Principles of criminology (6th ed.), Chicago: 3. B. Lippincott Co., 1960.

Wiederanders, M R., Cross-Drew, C. J., & Luckey, A. V. Success on parole: a study of the process of change from delinquent to lawful behavior; interim report. State of California, Department of the Youth Authority. Sacramento, 1979.

Wiederanders, M R., Cross-Drew, C. J., & Tsue, D. W Success on parole: results of a one-year longitudinal study of influences on parole behavior. State of California, Department of the Youth Authority. Sacramento, 1981.

APPENDIX A

SUCCESS ON PAROLE

INTERVIEW DATA SHEET

Pre-Parole Form

NOTES -- This Appendix contains the structured interview schedules used in the Pre-Parole and Parole assessments. In the right-hand margin are response-frequencies, with the percentage of respondents shown in parentheses. Percentages were calculated based on the total number who responded to each question. Those who did not answer the question, or for whom the question was not applicable, are shown as NA/M ("not applicable" or "missing"). Means and standard deviations (S.D.) are shown for continuous (non-categorical) items. Although these are the original responses on which Tables 5, 6, and 7 of the text are based, percentages may differ because all questions were collapsed to a "yes/no" format in the text for simplicity of presentation.

SUCCESS ON PAROLE

INTERVIEW DATA SHEET

Pre-Parole Form

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| Name _____ | YA number _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 1-5) | | |
| _____ | Interview Date _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 6-11) | | |
| Today's Date _____ | Institution _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 12-13) | | |
| Institution _____ | Age _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 14-15) | | |
| Age _____ | Ethnicity _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 16) | | |
| Ethnicity _____ | OBITS: | | | |
| | Parole Date _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 17-22) | | |
| Interviewer's Initials _____ | Parole Office _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 23-25) | | |
| Intended Parole Office _____ | Comm. Court _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 26) | | |
| _____ | County _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 27-28) | | |
| | Priors _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 29) | | |
| | Last Offense _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 30-31) | | |
| | Reading Level _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 32-34) | | |
| | I - Level _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | | (Col. 35-36) | | |
| | BE Group _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

PRE-INCARCERATION

1. Where did you grow up? (Name of town or area) _____

2. Did you live primarily with:

- 1 = both natural parents until going to YA
- 2 = G-natural parent
- 3 = raised by relatives (or similar)
- 4 = none of these (specify: _____)

1 = 78 (40.4)
 2 = 102 (52.8)
 3 = 9 (4.7)
 4 = 4 (2.1)

3. As you grew up, were you in any foster homes (or similar placements, not counting fail or detention)?

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

1 = 61 (31.6)
 2 = 132 (68.4)

4. At the time you were sent to the Youth Authority, how close were you to your parents (or parent figures)? (Interviewer: probe and rate closeness to the following persons that were relevant at the time of first YA incarceration.)

| | | Very Close | Somewhat Close | Somewhat Distant | Very Distant |
|---------------------------------|------|------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|
| Father | NJ/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| (or equivalent) | | | | | |
| Mother | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| (or equivalent) | | | | | |
| Overall family or pseudo family | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| <u>Father</u> | | <u>Mother</u> | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1 = 49 (30.6) | 1 = 119 (63.0) | 2 = 41 (25.6) | 2 = 35 (18.5) |
| 3 = 29 (18.1) | 3 = 20 (10.6) | 4 = 41 (25.6) | 4 = 15 (7.9) |
| NA/M = 33 | NA/M = 4 | | |

Overall Family
 1 = 83 (45.1)
 2 = 66 (35.9)
 3 = 28 (15.2)
 4 = 7 (3.3)
 NA/M = 9

(Interviewer: clarification here, if necessary. _____)

5. About how many times did you move during your school years? _____

mean = 3.97
 S.D. = 4.52

6. As you grew up, did you have a hero or heroes (someone you really admired or looked up to?)

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

1 = 92 (47.7)
 2 = 101 (52.3)

Who? _____

7. Why was this (were these) your heroes? _____

8. Besides your family, did you have any special adult friends, like maybe a neighbor or family friend who really helped you or that you were close to?

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

1 = 129 (66.3)
 2 = 64 (33.2)

9. What sorts of things did this person do for you or with you? _____

10. Interviewer: Rate apparent modeling of heroes and other adults:
- | | |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 - Very positive influence | 1 = 2 (1.0) |
| 2 - Somewhat positive influence | 2 = 76 (39.6) |
| 3 - Neutral influence or none mentioned | 3 = 89 (46.4) |
| 4 - Somewhat negative influence | 4 = 22 (11.5) |
| 5 - Very negative influence | 5 = 3 (1.6) |
| | NA/M = 1 |
11. How did you get along with teachers at school?
- | | |
|------------------|----------------|
| 1 - Great | 1 = 4 (2.1) |
| 2 - Good | 2 = 106 (55.2) |
| 3 - Not too good | 3 = 58 (30.2) |
| 4 - Awfully | 4 = 24 (12.5) |
| | NA/M = 1 |
12. Were any of your teachers special friends with you, did any of them really seem to take an interest in you and help you?
- | | |
|---------|----------------|
| 1 - Yes | 1 = 133 (69.6) |
| 2 - No | 2 = 58 (30.4) |
| | NA/M = 2 |
- Comments: _____

13. About how many hours per week do you think you spent on homework while you were in high school?
- mean = 1.90
S.D. = 3.72
14. How was your attendance at school?
- | | |
|-----------------|---------------|
| 1 - Regular | 1 = 53 (27.6) |
| 2 - so-so | 2 = 43 (22.4) |
| 3 - Not regular | 3 = 96 (50.0) |
| | NA/M = 1 |
15. Did you think of school as being important in getting a good job later, or in getting a good start in life?
- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 0 - Don't know or no response | |
| 1 - Yes, very important | 1 = 42 (21.8) |
| 2 - Yes, somewhat important | 2 = 37 (19.2) |
| 3 - No, not too important | 3 = 24 (12.4) |
| 4 - No, not at all | 4 = 90 (46.6) |
16. What was the last grade you completed in school before coming to Youth Authority? _____
- mean = 9.73
S.D. = 2.01

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 17. Were you in any organized activities at school like athletics or clubs? | |
| 1 - Yes | 1 - 97 (50.5) |
| 2 - No | 2 - 95 (49.5) |
| | NA/M = 1 |
| 18. Interviewer: Rate apparent quality of school experience. | |
| 1 - Very good, positive experience | 1 = 3 (1.6) |
| 2 - Somewhat good and positive | 2 = 42 (21.8) |
| 3 - Neutral or equally mixed experience | 3 = 50 (25.9) |
| 4 - Somewhat poor, negative experience | 4 = 66 (34.2) |
| 5 - Very poor, negative experience | 5 = 32 (16.6) |
| 19. As you were growing up, were your friends in trouble too sometimes, or were they straight? | |
| 1 - Very straight | 1 = 13 (6.9) |
| 2 - Somewhat straight | 2 = 46 (24.3) |
| 3 - Somewhat unstraight | 3 = 82 (43.4) |
| 4 - Very unstraight (crooked) | 4 = 48 (25.4). |
| | NA/M = 4 |
| 20. Were you in any gangs? | |
| 1 - Yes | 1 = 66 (34.4) |
| 2 - No | 2 = 126 (65.6) |
| | NA/M = 1 |
| 21. When you were a child, were you ever physically punished? (spanking, "the belt", etc.) | |
| 1 - Yes | 1 = 169 (87.6) |
| 2 - No | 2 = 24 (12.4) |
| '22. If yes, were you ever hit with something like a belt or stick, or closed fist? | |
| 1 - Yes | 1 = 157 (81.3) |
| 2 - No | 2 = 36 (18.7) |
| 23. Were you ever bruised or really beaten-up when you were punished? | |
| 1 - Yes | 1 = 46 (23.8) |
| 2 - No | 2 = 147 (76.2) |
| 24. Have you ever had a drinking or drug problem? | |
| 1 - Yes | 1 = 79 (40.9) |
| 2 - No | 2 = 114 (59.1) |
| 25. What offense got you into Youth Authority? | |

| | | |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 26. | One thing that we are very interested in is your own opinion about what got you into trouble. Thinking back to when this offense took place, why do you think that you did it? | |
| | 0 - N/A | |
| | 1 - Economic frustration or deprivation | 1 - 55 (28.8) |
| | 2 - Revenge, anger, other expressive need | 2 - 28 (14.7) |
| | 3 - Political or ideological reason | 3 = 0 (0.0) |
| | 4 - Thrill or enjoyment | 4 = 14 (7.3) |
| | 5 - Forced or pressured | 5 = 0 (0.0) |
| | 6 - Drugs/alcohol influence | 6 = 37 (19.4) |
| | 7 - Boredom | 7 = 10 (5.2) |
| | 8 - Got involved with "wrong crowd"; negative peer influence (but not pressured) | 8 = 26 (13.6) |
| | 9 - Other (specify) _____ | 9 = 21 (11.0) |
| | | NA/M = 2 |
| <hr/> | | |
| 27. | Did your parents (or stepparents; whoever was essential "family") usually work? | |
| | 1 - Yes | 1 = .163 (85.3) |
| | 2 - No | 2 = 28 (14.7) |
| | | NA/M = 2 |
| 28. | Job title(s) of wage earner(s). (Range: from _____ 1 - unskilled labor to 6 = professional) | |
| | | mean = 2.94 |
| | | S.D. = 1.70 |
| 29. | Did your family ever receive public assistance? | |
| | 1 - Yes | 1 = 99 (52.4) |
| | 2 - No | 2 = 90 (47.6) |
| | | NA/M = 4 |
| 30. | Did you have enough money for the things you wanted as you grew up? | |
| | 1 - Yes | 1 = 111 (58.1) |
| | 2 - No | 2 = 80 (41.9) |
| | | NA/M = 2 |
| 31. | How old were you when you first got in trouble with the law? _____ | |
| | | mean = 12.28 |
| | | S.D. = 2.83 |
| 32. | Was there ever a time when people began thinking of you as a delinquent or criminal? | |
| | 0 - N/A | |
| | 1 - Yes | 1 = 134 (69.8) |
| | 2 - No | 2 = 58 (30.2) |
| | | NA/M = 1 |
| 33. | If so, about how old were you when people began seeing you this way? | |
| | 0 - N/A | |
| | | mean = 13.59 |
| | | S.D. = 2.30 |

34. Did police ever know you as a "trouble-maker" and watch you extra closely?
0 = Don't know or no response
1 = Yes
2 = No
1 = 98 (50.8)
2 = 95 (49.2)
35. If so, how old were you when the police began watching you closely?
0 = N/A
mean = 14.63
S.D. = 2.07
36. Did you have any jobs before coming to YA?
1 = Yes
2 = No, because was either too young, or a continuous student before YA. (skip to Item 53)
3 = No, was 17 or more and/or not student but had not worked. (skip to Item 53)
1 = 153 (79.7)
2 = 35 (18.2)
3 = 4 (2.1)
NA/M = 1
37. First job: title (Range 1=unskilled to 6=professional)
37--mean=1.37
S.D.= .67
38. " " wage _____
38--mean=2.79
S.D.=1.33
39. " " How long? (wks) _____
39--mean=7.20
S.D.=6.94
40. " " Reason for leaving _____
41. Second job: title _____
41--mean=1.64
S.D.= .69
42. " " wage _____
42--mean=3.30
S.D.=1.56
43. " " How long? (wks.) _____
43--mean=5.60
S.D.=7.36
44. " " Reason for leaving _____
43. **Third job:** title _____
45--mean=1.85
S.D.= .79
46. " " wage _____
46--mean=3.35
S.D.=1.51
47. " " How long? (wks.) _____
47--mean=4.13
S.D.=3.68
48. " " Reason for leaving _____
49. Fourth job: title _____
49-51--too few entries
for analysis
50. " " wage _____
51. " " How long? (wks.) _____
52. " " Reason for leaving _____

53. Thinking about these questions so far, is there anything else about your pre-Youth Authority life that you think is important in understanding why you got into trouble and incarcerated, or has it already been said?

INCARCERATION EVENTS

(Possible lead-in: "Now I'd like to ask you some questions about your Youth Authority stay.")

34. How long (months) have you been at _____ now? (referring to current institution).

Mean = 10.18
S.D. = 6.19

55. Were you transferred here from another YA facility not long ago? If transferred here less than 60 days ago, note name of previous institution here, _____, and refer to it in remaining questions.

While you have been inside, how often have the following people visited you?

| <u>Father</u> | | <u>Mother</u> | |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| 1 = 12 (7.3) | 1 = 18 (9.6) | | |
| 2 = 35 (21.2) | 2 = 56 (29.8) | | |
| 3 = 16 (9.7) | 3 = 34 (18.1) | | |
| 4 = 24 (14.5) | 4 = 25 (13.3) | | |
| 5 = 19 (11.5) | 5 = 18 (9.6) | | |
| 6 = 59 (35.8) | 6 = 37 (19.7) | | |
| NA/M = 28 | NA/H = 5 | | |
| <u>Girlfriend/Wife</u> | | | |
| 1 = 9 (7.0) | | | |
| 2 = 15 (11.6) | | | |
| 3 = 12 (9.3) | | | |
| 4 = 11 (8.5) | | | |
| 5 = 14 (10.9) | | | |
| 6 = 68 (52.7) | | | |
| NA/M = 64 | | | |

56. Father (or acting father) _____

57. Mother (or acting mother) _____

58. Girlfriend/wife _____

- 0 = N/A
- 1 = weekly or more often
- 2 = more than once per month (but less than weekly)
- 3 = monthly
- 4 = every few months
- 5 = once or twice per year
- 6 = never

59. Over all, do you think that the amount of contact that you have had with people outside has been about right, or has there been not enough contact or too much contact?

- 0 = N/A or no response
- 1 = not enough contact with outsiders
- 2 = about right
- 3 = too much contact with outsiders
- 4 = not sure

| |
|---------------|
| 1 = 81 (42.0) |
| 2 = 98 (50.8) |
| 3 = 11 (5.7) |
| 4 = 3 (1.6) |

60. Has there been a staff member who has taken a special interest in you?

- 0 - No
- 1 - Group supervisor
- 2 - Youth counselor
- 3 - Senior youth counselor
- 4 - TTS
- 5 - Vocational teacher
- 6 - Educational teacher
- 7 = Psychologist
- 8 - Case worker
- 10 - Institutional parole agent
- 99 = Other (specify) _____

0 = 59 (30.7)
 1 = 6 (3.1)
 2 = 92 (47.9)
 3 = 10 (5.2)
 4 = 2 (1.0)
 5 = 3 (1.6)
 6 = 5 (2.6)
 7 = 1 (0.5)
 8 = 2 (1.0)
 10 = 3 (1.6)
 99 = 9 (4.7)
 NA/M = 1

61. What kinds of things has he/she done that have been especially helpful to YOU?

62--1 = 71 (36.8)
 2 = 65 (33.7)
 3 = 26 (13.5)
 4 = 31 (16.1)

Considering your YA stay, rate the following staff on how helpful they have been to you:

62. Youth counselor: _____

63--1 = 65 (35.5)
 2 = 60 (32.8)
 3 = 21 (11.5)
 4 = 37 (20.2)

NA/M -

63. Senior youth counselor: _____

64--1 = 36 (66.7)
 2 = 13 (24.1)
 3 = 2 (3.7)
 4 = 3 (5.6)

64. Vocational teacher: _____

65. Educational teacher: _____

NA/M = 139

- 0 = N/A or no contact
- 1 = Very helpful
- 2 = Somewhat helpful
- 3 = Not very helpful
- 4 = Not at all helpful

65--1 = 89 (50.9)
 2 = 48 (27.4)
 3 = 20 (11.4)
 4 = 18 (10.3)

NA/M = 18

66. Interviewer: From all questions about staff helpfulness, rate apparent overall degree of help from institutional staff received by respondent, using same 4-point scale as questions 62 through 65. _____

66--1 = 44 (23.2)
 2 = 94 (49.5)
 3 = 42 (22.1)
 4 = 10 (5.3)

NA/M = 3

67. have you attended school during your Youth Authority stay? (If no, go on to Question 75).

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

1 = 184 (95.8)
 2 = 8 (4.2)
 NA/M = 1

68. Type of school program!

- 0 = N/A
- 1 = Academic
- 2 = Vocational (if at YTS, Preston, DWN, at Holton)
- 3 = Both
- 9 = Other (specify) _____

1 = 142 (75.9)
 2 = 9 (4.8)
 3 = 35 (18.7)
 9 = 1 (0.5)
 NA/M = 6

69. If above question included academic:
- 0 - N/A
 - 1 - College program
 - 2 - High school program and graduated while inside
 - 3 - High school program
 - 9 - Other (specify) _____
70. Do you feel that your academic school program has really been important to you?
- 0 - N/A
 - 1 - Yes
 - 2 - No
 - 3 - Not sure
71. If question 68 included vocational: Length of time in longest program (months) _____
(Note: Blank if N/A.)
72. If question 68 included vocational: type of course (auto, welding, etc.) _____
73. If question 68 included vocational, was a certificate of completion received, or does it sound like a total course of instruction was completed?
- 0 - N/A
 - 1 - Yes
 - 2 - No
74. If question 68 included vocational, do you think it will be helpful in getting a job?
- 0 - N/A
 - 1 - Yes
 - 2 - No
75. Did your counselor, teacher or anyone inside, help you plan for a job?
- 1 - Yes
 - 2 - No
- If yes, discuss. _____
-
76. Are you worried about who will support you or how you will get by when you get out?
- 1 - Yes
 - 2 = No
77. Do you believe that having a straight job will get you enough money to live on?
- 1 - Yes
 - 2 - No

1 = 13 (7.3)
2 = 18 (10.1)
3 = 136 (76.4)
9 = 11 (6.2)
NA/M = 15

1 = 141 (78.8)
2 = 25 (14.0)
3 = 13 (7.3)
NA/M = 14

mean = 8.13
S.D. = 5.88

1 = 17 (36.2)
2 = 30 (63.8)
NA/M = 146

1 = 34 (73.9)
2 = 12 (26.1)
NA/M = 137

1 = 76 (39.4)
2 = 117 (60.6)

1 = 45 (23.3)
2 = 148 (76.7)

1 = 168 (88.9)
2 = 21 (11.1)
NA/M = 4

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 78. | Do you think that you might have to hustle or do illegal things in order to get by? | |
| | 1 - Yes | 1 = 22 (11.4) |
| | 2 - No | 2 = 143 (74.1) |
| | 3 - Not sure | 3 = 28 (14.5) |
| 79. | At the time that you were sentenced to the YA, what did you expect as a punishment for what you did? (Offer choices here:) | |
| | 1 - Punishment received | 1 = 38 (19.7) |
| | 2 - Less punishment than received | 2 = 63 (32.6) |
| | 3 - More punishment than received | 3 = 73 (37.8) |
| | 4 - No punishment at all | 4 = 19 (9.8) |
| | 5 - Other (specify) _____ | 5 = 0 (0.0) |
| 80. | Was there ever a time when you decided that crime really wasn't worth it anymore? | |
| | 1 - Yes | 1 = 173 (90.1) |
| | 2 - No | 2 = 12 (6.3) |
| | 3 - Not sure or answer was very qualified | 3 = 7 (3.6) |
| | | NA/M = 1 |
| 81. | If so, when did you decide this? | |
| | 0 - N/A | |
| | 1 - During this incarceration | 1 = 104 (59.4) |
| | 2 - After arrest, but before YA incarceration | 2 = 39 (22.3) |
| | 3 - After the crime but before arrest | 3 = 6 (3.4) |
| | 9 - Other (specify) _____ | 9 = 26 (14.9) |
| | | NA/M = 18 |
| 82. | While incarcerated, have you been involved in any religious activity? | |
| | 1 = Yes | 1 = 115 (60.8) |
| | 2 = No | 2 = 74 (39.2) |
| | | NA/M = 4 |
| 83. | Have you been in any gangs during your YA stay? | |
| | 1 - Yes | 1 = 24 (12.5) |
| | 2 - No | 2 = 168 (87.5) |
| | | NA/M = 1 |
| 84. | Have you had a girlfriend/wife while incarcerated? | |
| | 1 - Yes | 1 = 142 (74.0) |
| | 2 - No | 2 = 50 (26.0) |
| | | NA/M = 1 |
| 35. | How important has your relationship with your girlfriend, wife been while you've been here? | |
| | 0 = N/A | |
| | 1 = Very important | 1 = 61 (41.5) |
| | 2 = Somewhat important | 2 = 30 (20.4) |
| | 3 = Neutral | 3 = 16 (10.9) |
| | 4 = Somewhat unimportant | 4 = 16 (10.9) |
| | 5 - Very unimportant | 5 = 24 (16.3) |
| | | NA/M = 46 |

86. Could you describe your living unit program on _____
_____ during this stay? Have you
had counseling sessions with your youth counselor?
Small groups? Describe: _____

- 1 = Counseling emphasis, such as individual, small group sessions to work on personal problems.
- 2 = Some counseling, but emphasis is on practical problems such as preparation for work.
- 3 = No program as such; more of "doing time" kind of thing: rules and privileges, perhaps, but no rehabilitative program.
- 9 = Other (specify) _____

1 = 98 (50.8)
2 = 59 (30.6)
3 = 31 (16.1)
9 = 5 (2.6)

87. Please estimate about how much time per week you have spent in these activities (minutes):

- a. One-to-one counseling that is planned or part of the living unit program: _____ minutes.
- b. One-to-one counseling or "rapping" that is informal or unplanned: _____ minutes.
- c. Group sessions on the living unit: _____ minutes.

87.a. mean = 21.98
S.D. = 60.91
b. mean = 115.71
S.D. = 191.47
c. mean = 70.70
S.D. = 108.30

88. Have you been able to get as much of your counselor's time as you wanted or needed?

- 1 - Yes
- 2 - No

1 = 117 (60.6)
2 = 76 (39.4)

89. How helpful has the living unit program been to you?

- 0 - N/A or no response
- 1 - Very helpful
- 2 - Somewhat helpful
- 3 - Not very helpful
- 4 - Not at all helpful

1 = 65 (33.7)
2 = 65 (33.7)
3 = 30 (15.5)
4 = 33 (17.1)

90. If transferred between institutions, why?

- 0 - Was not transferred (except from Reception Ctr.)
- 1 - Disciplinary: negative reasons
- 2 - Neutral reasons
- 3 - Positive reasons (college, camp, etc.)

0 = 134 (69.4)
1 = 22 (11.4)
2 = 22 (11.4)
3 = 15 (7.8)

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 91. If transferred between living units, why? | |
| 0 - Was not transferred (except from Reception Ctr.) | 0 - 133 (68.9) |
| 1 - Disciplinary: negative reasons | 1 - 27 (14.0) |
| 2 - Neutral reasons | 2 - 19 (9.8) |
| 3 - Positive reasons (college, camp, etc.) | 3 - 14 (7.3) |
| 92. What institution activities have you participated in? | |
| 0 - None | 0 - 29 (15.0) |
| 1 - Sports | 1 - 57 (29.5) |
| 2 - Music | 2 - 66 (34.2) |
| 3 - Art activities | 3 - 20 (10.4) |
| 4 - Religious activities | 4 - 17 (8.8) |
| 5 - Reformist activities (e.g. YAAC) | 5 - 2 (1.0) |
| 6 - Dorm or other ward government | 6 - 2 (1.0) |
| 7 - Grievance or legal work | 7 - 0 (0.0) |
| 8 - Charitable or help activities | 8 - 0 (0.0) |
| 9 - Other (specify) _____ | 9 - 0 (0.0) |
| 93. Which programs, if any, have you actually completed while in YA? | |
| 1. _____ | |
| _____ | |
| 2. _____ | |
| _____ | |
| 3. _____ | |
| _____ | |
| 94. Have you received any time-adds? | |
| 1 - Yes | 1 = 69 (35.8) |
| 2 - No | 2 = 124 (64.2) |
| 95. Have you been in an individual room or an open dorm? | |
| 1 - Individual room | 1 = 67 (34.7) |
| 2 - Open dorm | 2 = 88 (45.6) |
| 3 - Individual for honor/lockups only | 3 = 38 (19.7) |
| 96. Have you been able to get away from the other wards and be by yourself when you wanted to? | |
| 1 = Yes | 1 = 137 (71.0) |
| 2 = No | 2 = 56 (29.0) |

97. Have there been many fights between guys on your unit?

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

1 = 94 (49.0)
2 = 98 (51.0)
NA/M= 1

98. Have you felt safe on your unit?

- 1 - Yes
- 2 - No

1 = 154 (80.21)
2 = 38 (19.8)
NA/M = 1

99. Interviewer: Rate apparent extent to which respondent felt that ecology of the institution was too crowded, "a jungle", and/or a negative influence.

- 1 = Very positive influence
- 2 = Somewhat positive influence
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Somewhat negative influence
- 5 = Very negative influence, a real jungle

1 = 6 (3.1)
2 = 75 (39.1)
3 = 54 (28.1)
4 = 53 (27.6)
5 = 4 (2.1)
NA/M = 1

100. Other comments about your institution program:

PAROLE EXPECTATIONS

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 101. | What will your living situation be on parole? | |
| | 1 - Parents | 1 - 151 (80.3) |
| | 2 - With other relatives | 2 - 14 (7.4) |
| | 3 - Alone | 3 - 3 (1.6) |
| | 4 - With roommate | 4 - 0 (0.0) |
| | 5 - With wife/girlfriend | 5 - 4 (2.1) |
| | 6 - Foster parents | 6 - 2 (1.1) |
| | 7 - Group home | 7 - 11 (5.9) |
| | 9 - Other _____ | 9 - 3 (1.6) |
| | | NA/M = 5 |
| 102. | Will this be the same living situation as before you were incarcerated? | |
| | 1 - Same | 1 = 132 (70.6) |
| | 2 - Different | 2 = 55 (29.4) |
| | | NA/M = 6 |
| 103. | Is this the type of living situation you want? | |
| | 1 - Yes | 1 = 145 (77.5) |
| | 2 = No, would not have been my choice | 2 = 38 (20.3) |
| | 3 - Unsure or mixed feelings | 3 = 4 (2.1) |
| | | NA/M = 6 |
| 104. | What do you plan to do during your first few months of parole? | |
| | (Interviewer: Rate plans on the following dimensions.) | |
| | 1 - Explicit and appropriate sounding plans | 1 = 59 (30.9) |
| | 2 - Less than explicit plans, but appropriate goal! | 2 = 116 (60.7) |
| | 3 - Explicit but inappropriate sounding plans (poor intentions) | 3 = 5 (2.6) |
| | 4 - Less than explicit and inappropriate (poor intentions) | 4 = 11 (5.8) |
| | | NA/M = 2 |
| | (Briefly describe: _____) | |
| 105. | Do you plan to go to school or vocational training while on parole? If so, what type of program? | |
| | 0 - No | 0 = 22 (11.4) |
| | 1 - High school | 1 = 100 (51.8) |
| | 2 - Junior College; academic | 2 = 22 (11.4) |
| | 3 - Junior College; vocational | 3 = 29 (11.4) |
| | 4 - Four-year college | 4 = 9 (4.7) |
| | 5 - Public vocational training besides junior college | 5 = 8 (4.1) |
| | 6 - Private trade training | 6 = 4 (2.1) |
| | 7 - Training for business or white-collar field | 7 = 1 (0.5) |
| | 9 - Other (specify) _____ | 9 = 5 (2.6) |
| 106. | Do you have a job waiting for you when you get out? | |
| | 1 - Yes | 1 = 88 (45.6) |
| | 2 - No | 2 = 98 (50.8) |
| | 3 - No, because in school or training | 3 = 7 (3.6) |

107. Do you think that being an exoffender will stop you from doing the things you want to do?

- 1 - Yes
- 2 - No

1 = 64 (34.2)
2 = 123 (65.8)
NA/M = 6

If yes, give example: _____

108. Can you give me a very honest guess about what your chances are of staying out of trouble when you are paroled: that is, what are your chances of not coming back (or going to CDC)? _____%

mean = 80.01
S.D. = 22.82

(in percent, e.g., "50-50" = 50%, "90%", etc.)

109. What do you think your biggest problem will be on parole?

- 1 - No problems at all
- 2 - Economic or job-related
- 3 - Drinking/drugs
- 4 - Finding friends and fitting-in
- 5 - Staying away from bad peers
- 6 - Parent problems
- 7 = Parole agent relationship
- 8 - School performance or related
- 9 = Other _____

1 = 38 (19.7)
2 = 29 (15.0)
3 = 36 (18.7)
4 = 2 (1.0)
5 = 34 (17.6)
6 = 5 (2.6)
7 = 13 (6.7)
8 = 5 (2.6)
9 = 31 (16.1)

110. Interviewer's estimate of ward's chances of SUCCESS ON PAROLE (in percent).

mean = 62.25
S.D. = 21.47

APPENDIX A (Continued)

SUCCESS ON PAROLE

INTERVIEW DATA SHEET

Follow-Up Interview Form

SUCCESS ON PAROLE

INTERVIEW DATA SHEET

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW FORM

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| Name _____ | YA# _____ |
| | (Col. 1-5) |
| Interview # (1 = first follow-up, 2 = 2nd follow-up, etc.) _____ | _____ |
| | (Col. 6) |
| Today's date _____ | |
| | (Col. 7-12) |
| Parole date _____ | |
| | (Col. 13-18) |
| Parole location (Office) _____ | _____ |
| | (Col. 19-21) |
| Interviewer's initials _____ | |

1. What is your present living situation?

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Parents | 1 = 129 (66.8) |
| 2 - With other relatives | 2 = 19 (9.8) |
| 3 - Alone | 3 = 9 (4.7) |
| 4 - With roommate | 4 = 6 (3.1) |
| 5 - With wife/girl friend | 5 = 12 (6.2) |
| 6 - Foster parents | 6 = 3 (1.6) |
| 7 - Group home | 7 = 11 (5.7) |
| 9 - Other _____ | 9 = 4 (2.1) |

2. Are you satisfied with this living situation?

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 - Yes, or mostly yes. | 1 = 147 (76.2) |
| 2 - No, would rather be in a different situation. | 2 = 46 (23.8) |

3. How do you get along now with your parents? (Probe and rate current closeness):

| | | | | | | <u>Father</u> | <u>Mother</u> |
|--------------------|-----|------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| | | very close | somewhat close | somewhat distant | very distant | 1=61(39.1) | 125 (67.6) |
| father | n/a | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2=46 (29.5) | 35 (18.9) |
| (or equivalent) | | | | | | 3=23(14.7) | 17 (9.2) |
| mother | n/a | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4=26(16.7) | 8 (4.3) |
| (or equivalent) | | | | | | NA/M = 37 | NA/M = 8 |
| Overall family | n/a | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | <u>Overall Family</u> | |
| (or pseudo family) | | | | | | 1 = 104 (55.0) | |

(Interviewer: clarification here, if necessary.) _____

4. What town do you live in now? _____

5. Could you describe your neighborhood? (Interviewer: probe)

6. On a line going from really rich or exclusive at one end (point out/give examples) to really rundown (rats, cockroaches, etc.) on the other, where do you place your neighborhood?



6-7. (U.S. Census Bureau Information was substituted for these. See text

7. Researcher's rating of ecology.



8. In the past few months, have you had a steady girlfriend or wife?

- 1 - Yes
- 2 - No

1 = 139 (72.4)
 2 = 53 (27.6)
 NA/M = 1

9. In the past few months, have you broken up with or had serious problems with your girl friend or wife?

- 0 - n/a
- 1 - Yes
- 2 - No

1 = 39 (24.2)
 2 = 122 (75.8)
 NA/M = 32

10. Have any of the friends you now have been in serious trouble with the law? (probe)

- 0 - n/a or no friends
- 1 - most or all have been in trouble
- 2 - one or some have been in trouble
- 3 - none have been in trouble

1 = 42 (23.7)
 2 = 70 (39.5)
 3 = 65 (36.7)
 NA/M = 16

11. How many of your friends hold down regular jobs?

- 0 - n/a
- 1 - none
- 2 - one, "a few", "some"
- 3 - most
- 4 - all

1 = 11 (6.1)
 2 = 56 (31.1)
 3 = 77 (42.8)
 4 = 36 (20.0)
 NA/M = 13

12. Have you been in any gangs lately?

- 0 - no response
- 1 = Yes
- 2 - No

1 = 16 (8.5)
 2 = 173 (91.5)
 NA/M = 4

13. Have you been in any organizations lately (clubs, charities, churches, etc.)?

- 0 - none
- If yes, list: _____

0 = 155 (80.7)
 1 or more = 37 (19.3)
 NA/M = 1

14. Have you attended school or training in the past few months? If the answer is no, go on to # 18. (interviewer: do not count brief enrollment, then quit as yes.)

- 1 - Yes
- 2 - No

1 = 73 (38.2)
 2 = 118 (61.8)
 NA/M = 2

15. Type of school/training:

- 0 - n/a
 - 1 - part-time high school
 - 2 - full-time high school
 - 3 - part-time junior college - academic
 - 4 - full-time junior college - academic
 - 5 - four-year college
 - 6 -part-time j. c. or other vocational training
 - 7 - full-time (or combined work experience and training that together are full-time) j. c., or other vocational training
 - 8 - training for business or white collar
 - 9 - other (specify) _____
- 1 = 24 (33.3)
 2 = 14 (19.4)
 3 = 4 (5.6)
 4 = 6 (8.3)
 5 = 4 (5.6)
 6 = 8 (11.1)
 7 = 7 (9.7)
 9 = 5 (6.9)
 NA/M = 121

16. List any achievements that you have made in school/training so far while on parole:

- 0 = n/a
 - 1 = none
 - 2 = high school diploma
 - 3 = AA degree
 - 4 = trade certificate or course completion
 - 5 = trade apprenticeship
 - 6 = academic course(s) completed with "C" grade or above
 - 9 = other
- 1 = 50 (83.3)
 2 = 1 (1.7)
 3 = 0 (0.0)
 4 = 1 (1.7)
 5 = 1 (1.7)
 6 = 4 (6.7)
 9 = 3 (5.0)
 NA/M = 133

17. Has your school attendance while on parole been:

- 0 = n/a
 - 1 = regular
 - 2 = so-so
 - 3 = not regular
- 1 = 54 (77.1)
 2 = 9 (12.9)
 3 = 7 (10.0)
 NA/M = 123

18. Have you been employed at all since parole?

- 1 = Yes (including paid training programs)
 - 2 = No
 - 3 = No, because in a full-time school or unpaid training program
- 1 = 146 (77.2)
 2 = 36 (19.0)
 3 = 7 (3.7)
 NA/M = 4

(If no, go on to question # 39.)

- 19. Approximate # of weeks before first job: _____
 - 20. Job title of 1st job: _____
 - 21. Wages (hourly or equivalent) of 1st job: _____
 - 22. 1st job was/is: 0 = n/a
1 = part-time
2 = full-time
 - 23. Duration of 1st job (approximate wks.) : _____
(Any other jobs? If no, go on to # 39.)
 - 24. Approximate # of wks. before found 2nd job: _____
 - 25. Job title of 2nd job: _____
19. mean = 3.43
 S.D. = 4.69
 20. mean = 1.84
 S.D. = 1.10
 21. mean = 4.71
 S.D. = 4.28
 22--1 = 42 (28.2)
 2 = 107(71.8)
 NA/M = 44
 23. mean = 7.78
 S.D. = 3.51
 24. mean = 2.03
 S.D. = 2.44
 25. mean = 1.98
 S.D. = .93

- 26. Wages (hourly or equivalent) of 2nd job: _____
- 27. 2nd job was/is: 0 - n/a
1 - part-time
2 - full-time
- 28. Duration of 2nd job: (approximate wks.) _____
(Any other jobs: If no, go on to # 39.)
- 29. 3rd job: Approximate # of wks. before found 3rd job: _____
- 30. 3rd job: Job title: _____
- 31. 3rd job: Wages - hourly or equivalent: _____
- 32. 3rd job was/is: 0 - n/a
1 - part-time
2 - full-time
- 33. 3rd job: Duration of job: (wks.) _____
(Any other job? If no, go on to # 39)
- 34. 4th job: approximate # of _____ before found 4th job.
- 35. 4th job: job title: _____
- 36. 4th job: wages (hourly or equivalent) _____

- 37. 4th job was/is: 0 = n/a
1 = part-time
2 = full-time
- 38. 4th job: duration of job (approximate # of wks.) _____
- 39. HOW many wks. (approximately) have you been out of work since you: last job? (or, since parole date if not yet employed?) _____
- 40. How much did any Youth Authority training help in getting or keeping any jobs so far?
0 = n/a
1 = not at all
2 = a little bit
3 = quite a bit
4 = a lot; led to direct placement, or provided all skills necessary, or similar response
- 41. How much did any Youth Authority staff help in getting Or keeping any jobs so far?
0 = n/a
1 = not at ail
2 = a little bit
3 = quite a bit
4 = a lot; led to direct placement
- 42. Are you going to be able to live the way you want to by working?
1 = Yes
2 = No

26. mean = 4.58
S.D. - 2.71

27. --1 = 18 (27.3)
2 = 48 (72.7)
NA/M - 127

28. mean = 5.75
S.D. = 5.46

29-38 too few entries for analysis.

mean = 4.76
S.D. - 7.31

1 = 105 (70.9)
2 = 13 (8.8)
3 = 19 (12.8)
4 = 11 (7.4)
NA/M = 45

1 = 119 (79.3)
2 = 12 (8.0,
3 = 7 (4.7)
4 = 12 (8.0)
NA/M = 43

1 = 153 (84.5)
2 = 28 (15.3)
NA/M = 12

Please try to estimate the amount of support that you get from each of the following sources. By support, we mean food, clothes, spending money, transportation, the whole bit.

- Codes: 0 - nothing from this source or n/a
- 1 - some part of support from this source
- 2 - much or all support from this source

43. job or paid training _____

43--0 - 56 (29.0)
 1 - 42 (21.8)
 2 = 95 (49.2)

44. parents/foster parents/relatives _____

44--0 - 28 (14.5)
 1 - 67 (34.7)
 2 - 98 (50.8)

45. Social Security, unemployment, disability, other public relief _____

45--0 = 165 (85.5)
 1 = 20 (10.4)
 2 = 8 (4.1)

46. parole office _____

46--0 = 91 (47.2)
 1 = 95 (49.2)
 2 = 7 (3.6)

47. scholarship, grant, ex-offender program stipend, etc.-

47--0 = 178 (92.2)
 1 = 12 (6.2)
 2 = 3 (1.6)

48. savings, inheritance _____

48--0 = 151 (78.2)
 1 = 37 (19.2)
 2 5 5 (2.6)

49. Considering all of the support for living expenses that you receive, how satisfied are you with your lifestyle?

- 1 = extremely dissatisfied; need much more
- 2 = somewhat dissatisfied; would like more
- 3 = somewhat satisfied; many needs are now met
- 4 = very satisfied

49 1 = 27 (14.2)
 2 = 48 (25.3)
 3 = 83 (43.7)
 4 = 32 (1.08)
 NA/M = 3

50. Without going into specifics, would you say that you sometimes add to these legitimate means of support by "activities" that you would not want your parole agent or the police to know about?

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

50 1 = 52 (26.9)
 2 = 141 (73.1)

51. On the average, how often have you seen your parole agent?

- 1 = weekly or more
- 2 = monthly to almost weekly
- 3 = less than monthly

51 1 = 53 (27.5)
 2 = 121 (62.7)
 3 = 19 (9.8)

52. Have you seen your parole agent as much as you needed?

- 1 = no, too little
- 2 = yes, just the right amount of contact
- 3 = no, too much contact

52 1 = 28 (14.6)
 2 = 126 (65.6)
 3 = 38 (19.8)
 NA/M = 1

53. How helpful has your parole agent been to you?

- 1 = not at all helpful
- 2 - not very helpful
- 3 = somewhat helpful
- 4 = very helpful

53 1 = 25 (13.2)
 2 = 22 (11.6)
 3 = 70 (37.0)
 4 - 72 (38.1)
 NA/M = 4

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 54. Would you say that your parole agent has been more of a policeman or more of a helper to you? (rate) | |
| 1 - almost always only a policeman | 1 = 10 (5.5) |
| 2 = usually a policeman | 2 = 16 (8.8) |
| 3 - usually a helper | 3 = 55 (30.2) |
| 4 - almost always only a helper | 4 = 101 (55.5) |
| | NA/M=11 |
| 55.. Do you think that your parole agent has made a difference in your staying out of trouble with the law? | |
| 1 - yes, or mostly yes | 1 = 63 (48.8) |
| 2 - no, or mostly no | 2 = 66 (51.2) |
| | NA/M = 64 |
| 56. Have the rules of parole seemed fair to you? | |
| 1 - not at all | 1 = 23 (12.1) |
| 2 - somewhat fair | 2 = 24 (12.6) |
| 3 = mostly fair | 3 = 73 (38.4) |
| 4 = completely fair | 4 = 70 (36.8) |
| | NA/M= 3 |
| 57. Do you feel like people now see you as a "delinquent" or "criminal" since getting out on parole? | |
| 1 = yes, or mostly yes | 1 = 73 (38.0) |
| 2 = no, or mostly no | 2 = 119 (62.01) |
| | NA/M = 1 |
| 58. Do you think that being an exoffender is stopping you from doing or getting things? (Provide examples if necessary, such as "getting a good job" or "being liked by certain people", etc.) | |
| 1 = yes, or mostly yes | 1 = 76 (40.2) |
| 2 = no, or mostly no | 2 = 113 (59.8) |
| | NA/M =4 |
| 59 . Do you believe that the police have been keeping a close eye on you lately? | |
| 1 = yes | 1 = 65 (33.7) |
| 2 = no, or don't know | 2 = 128 (66.3) |
| 60. How do you honestly feel now about doing crimes -- do you think that you might ever do them again? (Probe: "like, if you really had to or were pressured?") | |
| 1 = would never do crime again | 1 = 112 (58.6) |
| 2 = only if really destitute or pressured or aggravated | 2 = 43 (22.5) |
| 3 = perhaps would do crime again | 3 = 21 (11.0) |
| 4 = will probably do more crimes | 4 = 15 (7.9) |
| | NA/M = 2 |
| 61. Have you been involved in religious activity lately? | |
| 1 = yes | 1 = 54 (28.1) |
| 2 = no | 2 = 138 (71.9) |
| | NA/M = 1 |
| 62. Any problems or heavy involvement in drugs/alcohol Lately? | |
| 1 = yes | 1 = 34 (17.6) |
| 2 = no | 2 = 159 (32.4) |

63 1 Have any agencies, organizations, or volunteers been helpful to you lately?

- 1 - yes.
- 2 - no

1 = 61 (31.8)
 2 = 131 (68.2)
 NA/M = 1

64. Which ones? _____

65. When you aren't working or going to school, how do you spend your time? _____

66. Has there been any big change or happening in your life lately? If necessary, give examples, like "wrecked my car" or "mate had a baby" or "parents kicked me outa the house", etc.; either good or bad.) If so, describe:

67 - What would you say has been your biggest problem lately?

- 1 - no problems at all
- 2 - economic or job-related
- 3 - drinking/drugs
- 4 - finding friends and fitting-in
- 5 - staying away from bad peers
- 6 - parent problems
- 7 - parole agent relationship
- 8 - school or related
- 9 - other

1 = 42 (22.0)
 2 = 66 (34.6)
 3 = 7 (3.7)
 4 = 1 (0.5)
 5 = 18 (9.4)
 6 = 7 (3.7)
 7 = 12 (6.3)
 8 = 6 (3.1)
 9 = .32 (16.8)
 NA/M = 2

Looking back to the time you spent at _____
 (name of facility):

68 1. Has any of the counseling you received there been useful to you while on parole?

- 1 = yes
- 2 = no

1 = 109 (56.5)
 2 = 84 (43.5)

If so, in what way? _____

69 . Has any of your academic school programs been helpful to you while on parole?

- 1 - yes
- 2 - no

1 = 124 (65.3)
 2 = 66 (34.7)
 NA/M = 3

If so, in what way? _____

70. Has any other part of your Youth Authority experience been helpful to you while on parole?

- 1 - yes
- 2 - no

If so, what part and how? _____

1 = 88 (45.8)
2 = 104 (54.2)
NA/M = 1

71. In the past few months, have you had any parole violations or other problems with your parole program? or other law enforcement agency?

- 1 = no, completely clean program so far
- 2 = have had some conflicts with parole agent or warnings, but no violations
- 3 = have been or am now on violation status
- 4 = have been arrested for a crime; not found guilty
- 5 = have been arrested for a crime: trial or verdict pending

1 = 133 (70.7)
2 = 19 (10.1)
3 = 20 (4.3)
4 = 20 (10.6)
5 = 8 (4.3)
NA/M = 5

72. What would be your honest guess now about your chances of staying out of trouble and not being put back in YA or other jail? (in percent, e.g., "50-50", 75%, 90%, etc.)

mean = 89.73
S.D. = 25.08

73. Interviewer 's own estimate of ward's chance of success.

mean = 70.40
S.D. = 16.42

74. (Interviewer: turn off recorder.)

Have you done anything lately that could get you put back in YA if you were caught? (not including technical infractions like not meeting with parole agent or drinking a can of beer.)

- 1 = yes
- 2 - no

1 = 46 (24.5)
2 = 142 (75.5)
NA/M = 5

APPENDIX B
PRIVACY NOTIFICATION

The Information Practices Act of 1977 requires us to provide you with the following information about your participation in this research.

The purpose of our asking you for information is to increase our knowledge of the causes of delinquency, of what leads to rehabilitation, and how Youth Authority programs can be improved. The California Welfare and Institutions Code, Division 2.5, Article 1752.7 gives us the authorization to do these kinds of studies.

Answering these questions is voluntary. Your program with the Youth Authority will not be affected if you do not wish to participate. However, please be assured that if you answer our questions, the information you give us will be kept confidential. Your responses will not be quoted or discussed in any way that includes your name. In other words, your information will be added to other peoples' information and used for statistics only.

If for any reason you want to review your answers or to file a correction to the information, you may do so by contacting:

Keith Griffiths, Chief
Division of Research
California Youth Authority
Sacramento CA 95823
Telephone No. (916) 445-9626

APPENDIX C

Multiple regression statistics showing the relatedness of five sets of items (demographic "control" items in each set plus items derived from Differential Association, Social Control, Economic, Social Ecology, and Social Competence Theories) to parole performances at 24 months.

TABLE C-1

Prediction of 24-Month Street-Time Scores Using
Differential Association Items
(Simultaneous Multiple Regression)

Multiple R .574
R-Square .329
Adjusted R-Square .260
N = 193

| <u>Variable</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>t</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| Age | .23 | 3.40** |
| Prior Record | -.19 | -2.71** |
| Property-Type Committing Offense | .03 | .37 |
| Black Ethnicity | -.13 | -1.77 |
| Hispanic Ethnicity | -.06 | -.74 |
| Had a "Special" Teacher in Schools Prior to YA | .11 | 1.72 |
| Friends Were in Trouble (Pre-YA Period) | .18 | 2.58* |
| Involved in (Pre-YA) Street Gang | .03 | .48 |
| Closeness to (Pre-YA) Family | .09 | 1.31 |
| Family Member(s) had Criminal Record | .09 | 1.32 |
| Had a "Special" Staff Member in YA Facilities | .11 | 1.73 |
| Been in Any Gang While in YA | -.18 | -2.76** |
| Time Spent in One-to-One Counseling | .00 | .05 |
| Time Spent in Informal Talk With Counselor | -.05 | -.70 |
| Had Girlfriend/Spouse (parole-period) | -.02 | -.42 |
| Parole Agent was: Seen often; rated as helpful; rated more as a helper than as a cop | .22 | 3.29** |
| Friends Were Non-Delinquent (parole-period) | .21 | 2.96** |
| Closeness to (parole-period) Family | -.04 | .58 |

Notes. A brief explanation of the terms in Tables 8-12 follows:

The measure of parole performance used in the equation was percentage of "good street-time," that is, time spent outside of any jail, prison, juvenile hall, or other correctional facility divided by the 24-months of followup.

Multiple R is the correlation between the actual parole performance scores and the scores that were predicted (using all variables in this table combined).

R-Square is the percentage of total variance in parole performance scores explained by the equation.

Adjusted R-Square is an estimate of R-Square that corrects for relatively small sample size.

Beta indicates the direction (no *sign* means the effect is toward higher street-time scores; minus is toward lower scores) and the weight or relative importance of each variable with other variables controlled (simultaneous entry).

t tests the significance with which each variable makes an Independent contribution to the total equation.

TABLE C-2

Prediction of 24-Month Street-Time Scores Using Social Control Items
(Simultaneous Multiple Regression)

Multiple R .547
R-Square .300
Adjusted R-Square .226
N = 193

| <u>Variable</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>t</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| Age | .20 | 2.76** |
| Prior Record | -.17 | -2.43** |
| Property-Type Committing Offense | -.01 | -.18 |
| Black Ethnicity | -.11 | -1.40 |
| Hispanic Ethnicity | -.04 | -.48 |
| Pre-YA School Experiences (Scale) | .05 | .65 |
| Closeness to (Pre-YA) Family | .07 | .92 |
| Had a "Special" Staff Member in YA Facilities | .09 | 1.36 |
| Time Spent in One-to-One Counseling | -.03 | -.37 |
| Time Spent in Informal Talk with Counselor | .01 | .10 |
| Involved in Religion While in YA Facility | .04 | .64 |
| Number of Programs Completed in YA Facility | -.00 | .07 |
| Frequency of Parent Visits While in YA | -.04 | -.60 |
| Parole Agent was: Seen often; rated as helpful; rated more as a helper than as a cop | .21 | 3.19** |
| Belonged to (legal) organizations (parole-period) | .04 | .57 |
| Friends were Non-Delinquent (parole-period) | .11 | 1.54 |
| Closeness to (parole-period) Family | -.01 | -.12 |
| Proportion of First Parole Year Spent Working or in School | .23 | 3.15** |

Note. An explanation of terms is in Table C-1.

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE C-3

Prediction of 24-Month Street-Time Scores Using Economic Items
(Simultaneous Multiple Regression)

Multiple R .508
R-Square .258
Adjusted R-Square .199
N = 193

| <u>Variable</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>t</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| Age | .26 | 3.07k* |
| Prior Record | -.22 | -3.1zf* |
| Property-Type Committing Offense | -.04 | -.52 |
| Black Ethnicity | -.10 | -1.09 |
| Hispanic Ethnicity | -.02 | -.19 |
| Family Economic Status (pre-YA) | .05 | .71 |
| Had job(s) before YA Commitment | -.02 | -.23 |
| Reading Level | -.09 | -1.19 |
| High School Graduate | .01 | .16 |
| Vocational Program While in YA Facility | .00 | .01 |
| Length-of-Stay (YA) | -.15 | -1.88 |
| Weekly Earnings (first 3 mos. of parole) | -.10 | -1.28 |
| Supports Self | .03 | .71 |
| Proportion of First Parole Year Spent Working or in School | .34 | 3.98** |

Note. An explanation of terms is in Table C-1.

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE C-4

Prediction of 24-Month Street-Time Scores Using Social Ecology Items
(Simultaneous Multiple Regression)

Multiple R .570
R-Square .325
Adjusted R-Square .255
N = 193

| <u>Variable</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>t</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| Age | .25 | 3.61** |
| Prior Record | -.22 | -3.11** |
| Property-Type Committing Offense | .04 | .52 |
| Black Ethnicity | -.10 | -1.15 |
| Hispanic Ethnicity | -.01 | -.07 |
| Median Neighborhood Income (Census) | -.12 | -1.51 |
| Neighborhood Education Level (Census) | .23 | 2.73** |
| Closeness to (pre-YA Family) | .03 | .41 |
| Number of Siblings | .09 | 1.22 |
| "Felt Safe" in YA Facility | .05 | .76 |
| Frequency of Parent Visits While in YA | .00 | .04 |
| Saw "Many Fights" in YA Living Units | .10 | 1.40 |
| Overall Rating of YA Living Unit | .02 | .22 |
| Living Situation (parole-period) was "OK" | -.05 | -.70 |
| No Problem or Heavy Use of Drugs or Alcohol (Parole) | .22 | 3.24** |
| Region I Parole Location? | -.12 | -1.32 |
| Region III Parole Location+ | -.31 | -3.32** |
| Region IV Parole Location? | -.31 | -3.54** |

Note. An explanation of terms is in Table C-1.

*p < .05

**p < .01

'The mathematics of multiple regression prohibit entering all Parole Region identifiers in the same equation. Therefore, Region II was left out as a reference category. In separate runs with Region II put into the equation and another Region left out, Region II was not significantly related to parole street-time.

TABLE C-5

Prediction of 24-Month Street-Time Scores Using Social Competence Items
(Simultaneous Multiple Regression)

Multiple R .578
R-Square .334
Adjusted R-Square .265
N = 193

| <u>Variable</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>t</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| Age | .25 | 3.16** |
| Prior Record | -.26 | -3.66* |
| Property-Type Committing Offense | .00 | .05 |
| Black Ethnicity | -.20 | -2.17* |
| Hispanic Ethnicity | -.02 | -.28 |
| Pre-YA School Experiences (scale) | -.02 | -.32 |
| Closeness to (pre-YA) Family | .01 | .10 |
| Family Economic Status (pre-YA) | .02 | .34 |
| Had job(s) before YA commitment | -.01 | -.17 |
| Reading Level | -.13 | -1.70 |
| High School Graduate | .00 | -.04 |
| "Caught time" for trouble in YA facility | .01 | .19 |
| Self-Stated Chances for Parole Success | .17 | 2.45* |
| Number of Programs Completed in YA Facility | -.04 | -.54 |
| Any Disciplinary Transfers (in YA) | -.16 | -2.35" |
| "No Problem or Heavy Use" of Drugs or Alcohol (Parole) | .22 | 3.33** |
| Proportion of First Parole Year Spent Working or in School | .27 | 3.49** |

Note. An explanation of terms is in Table C-1.

*p < .05
**p < .01

'The mathematics of multiple regression prohibit entering all ethnic identifiers in the same equation. Therefore, White ethnicity was left out as a reference category. In separate runs with White ethnicity put into the equation and another ethnicity left out, White ethnicity was not significantly related to parole street-time. See text, p. 43, for a discussion of the statistical reason for Black ethnicity being significant in only one table.