

RECEIVED 7 1977

EVALUATION OF A STUDY RELEASE CENTER

Panel 15 Evaluating Parole Programs

Karen Morell, Ph.D.
Director, Prisoner Education Program
University of Washington

Co-author, not participating
William Hodge, Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Sociology
University of Washington

53747

The authors wish especially to thank William Schill, James Robison, and Jim Patrick for their assistance during various stages of this evaluation. In addition we appreciate the time given to the project by Stanley Cohen and Wayne Dotts, as well as Ray Messegee, Richard Stevens, Jess Mincks and their staffs and the entire staff of the Resident Release Project. We also appreciate the support of the following offices or agencies: the Department of Social and Health Services, State of Washington; the Bureau of Prisons; the Federal Office of Probation and Parole; the University of Washington's Office of Minority Affairs; and the state of Washington's Law and Justice Planning Office.

This evaluation was supported in part by grant 75-C-0111 from the state of Washington's Law and Justice Planning Office.

The following paper presents a preliminary analysis of data on the University of Washington's study release facility. No measures of program success other than recidivism rates are given at this time. The focus of this analysis is directed towards determining which variables, if any, can predict both an inmate's academic achievements and ability to avoid reinvolvement with the criminal justice system.

OVERVIEW OF THE RESIDENT RELEASE PROJECT

The Resident Release Project began in January, 1972, within the University of Washington's Office of Minority Affairs as an early release educational program for offenders. It developed from the immediate needs of residents on training release who were attending the University of Washington. The state of Washington's Probation and Parole Office housed these offender-students at a local half-way house designed primarily for men on work release. The distance from campus, physical environment, and working men's atmosphere did little to encourage the student's academic success.

During the Fall Quarter of 1971, Cons Unlimited (the ex-offender student organization on campus which included men and women on parole and post-parole status) discussed their concerns about the situation of the offender-students with the University's Vice President for Minority Affairs. This initial meeting was followed by a series of discussions with the University President and other members of his cabinet. Additionally, a series of meetings were held with interested faculty, legislative representatives, and professionals in the criminal justice system; three of these persons made an on-site visit at the Oregon Project NewGate (the federally funded program which provided higher education to inmates on parole and pre-parole status). These meetings culminated in a contract with the state of Washington to provide custody and educational opportunity to men and women in the four state prisons. In 1973 the Resident Release Project became a contract agency of the Bureau of Prisons and thereafter expanded its services to include those federal prisoners who were eligible for parole to the western region of the state of Washington. The first federal releasee arrived during Winter Quarter 1974 at about the same time as the first probationers from the state and federal courts. By the end of March, 1974, the University

was providing custody, counseling, and educational opportunity to state and federal prisoners and probationers.

This Project, like most others, was not designed under optimal conditions for research and evaluation. The basic parameters of the Project were established by legislative statute or agency policy. University administrators agreed to operate a program in which they had to accept the state's initial screening of applicants, custody requirements, parole dates and other regulations. There were no written goals and objectives when the Project began; the assumption was that it should have the same "success" as work release programs and would provide "better" educational opportunity than had previously been possible to men and women on work release.

From Winter Quarter 1971 through Spring Quarter 1976 the Resident Release Project admitted 173 men and 30 women. Of these 203 students, 167 were state prisoners, 29 federal prisoners, 6 state probationers, and 1 federal probationer. They ranged in age from 59 to 18 and averaged 4 months in the Project. From its inception the Project staff made a special effort to encourage the application of American citizens who are racial minorities. The population has been comprised of the following percentages from each ethnic group: 7% Native American, 2% Asian American, 29% Black, 4% Chicano, 57% Caucasian.

The Resident Release Project is a unit in the Office of Minority Affairs. The Vice President for Minority Affairs reports directly to the President of the University and is the director of the campus' Educational Opportunity Program. In addition to the counseling provided at the project itself, residents can utilize the EOP's study skills center, tutorial center, ethnic cultural center, and additional counseling services. Upon parole from the Project, residents are still considered a part of the EOP.

The staff consists of a Director, an Academic Counselor, an Institutional Liaison Officer, a Program Assistant, and four Counselor Aides. One state parole officer also works full-time with the Project. All of these staff have offices in a dormitory cluster which is adjacent to the clusters in which the residents live. The development and administration of grants, contracts, and research affecting the Project are carried on by other staff in a separate office.

A resident obtains acceptance into the Project after the University certifies the person's academic acceptability, the appropriate federal or state authority approves the individual for early release, and the Project and Minority Affairs

Office accept the candidate. Only rapists are excluded automatically from consideration. Residents live in a wing of a campus dormitory, are full-time students, and may move about the campus as normal students. They must, however, sign-in at the Project every four hours and are not allowed to leave the campus grounds without permission. The only special program imposed upon the residents is a Graduated Responsibility Program; an individual is given more freedom of movement after proving to a committee of staff and resident representatives that he/she will not abuse the trust of the Project. Special counseling is given only as an individual need arises.

Residents receive an orientation booklet during their first week which states the rules of the Project. Each person signs a contract stating he/she will abide by the rules and any special individual requirements, such as submitting to urinalysis. People may be returned to the institution following a hearing if they break the federal or state work/training release rules or Project rules. Residents recidivated from the project for such charges as academic failure, drug or alcohol use, repeated violation of curfew, and probability of a new offense. Persons who are judged to have made an effort but have failed academically are transferred instead, if possible, to a work release program.

EVALUATION GOALS, DESIGN, AND IMPLIMENTATION

The evaluation was designed both to assist the Project staff in improving the program and to determine the degree and kind of success or failure experienced by persons admitted to the program. The staff would be aided if the evaluators could determine what types of individuals and background tend to produce residents who parole from the project and do average or better academic work. This information would be determined through analysis of traditional kinds of data. (It should be noted, however, that no one intends to use predictive items, should they emerge, to exclude an individual from the Project, but rather to provide that individual with special support in order to help her/him to succeed.) The Project staff also needed a statement of the goals of the program other than "to reduce recidivism," since none had been formally established for the project; it was expected that these would be determined through interviews with staff, agency personnel, and residents. The results of these interviews are not pertinent to this paper. The above goals have been substantially met, but it will not be until completion of the second phase of the evaluation that the evaluators can determine the success of residents in this program in comparison with other programs.

Traditional data was obtained from state, federal, and university files after completing the arduous task of submitting and obtaining clearance from the three agencies' Human Subjects Review or Research Office committees. The evaluation could not have been accomplished if the evaluators had not been judged as employees of the federal and state agency because the impossible task of obtaining written consent forms would have been required from all present and former Resident Release Project members before access was permitted to the files. Upon obtaining clearance, the evaluators found that many files were not complete. Although there are still Missing Cases on selected background variables, the most significant data was obtained for almost all former residents by traveling to several different offices which hold portions of a person's file.

The evaluation is an *ex post facto* analysis since, as described above, it was not possible for the University to participate in the initial screening of applicants for the project. We chose not to test a hypothesis or theory but rather to follow an inductive approach to determine what variables available in official records might predict Project, parole, and academic success. We were familiar with the items selected for various Base Expectancy models but knew that they were not as valid for extreme cases as for the average prisoner. Since we had no data to determine how like the general population the group in the RRP was, we decided to examine as many variables as possible. This study includes all residents admitted to the Project from its inception in Winter Quarter 1972 through Spring Quarter 1976. The follow-up period extends through August, 1976. File material was searched to obtain background data on criminal history, academic history, demographic variables, and other readily quantifiable information recorded during the in-take period at prison. (Base Expectancy scores, which have been part of the analysis in other studies, are just being generated in the state and are not available for most federal Project members because of their relatively recent use within the Bureau of Prisons.) Work/Training Release files and Project records were examined to determine the degree of official difficulty a resident experienced while in the Project. All residents have been followed after release from the Project both to obtain recorded information on status relative to the criminal justice system and to determine academic progress at the University of Washington.

Data in the Appendix gives the frequency rate on many variables included in this study. The variables can be grouped under the following headlines: recidivism, criminal history, academic history, and other background data.

1. Recidivism.(pp. i-ii) Data available from state of Washington and Federal Probation and Parole files did not permit us to utilize the seven categories to classify legal outcome which are used by the California Department of Corrections and many other studies. Instead we began with the following parole categories: no official problem on parole, parole suspension, suspended absconder, revoked, Conditional Discharge from Supervision, and Final Discharge from Supervision. Since "parole suspension" and "suspended absconder" led to "revoked" if there was a technical violation or new offense, we reclassified persons into a "no recidivism" and "recidivated" category. The "recidivated" group includes persons who were returned to prison for less than three months on technical violations. The "no recidivism" group includes the few persons who were "suspended absconders" in August, 1976, if they had not recidivated at an earlier period. To the best of our knowledge, this study has identified all persons in custody outside their original jurisdiction.

The following were established to determine legal categories before a person paroled: jailed for less than three days, a violation report was filed, a violation report was filed and a disposition hearing held, more than 1 of the above, revoked from the project, transferred to another work release facility, escaped, and no problem. Since only 18 persons fell into the first four categories and were not later revoked, we also collapsed the above into "no recidivism" and "recidivated."

The data show that 47 of 203 persons, 23%, were returned to prison from the Project. The change in due process required for a disposition hearing led to inconsistency in recording the reason for revocation. More specifically, why a person was removed from the Project may only in part be due to the instant violation of Project rules. A legitimate charge of infraction of these rules can serve as an appropriate and more efficient manner of removing "troublesome" elements from the Project community than the due process route for say "small theft," missing office materials and equipment, strong arming other residents, etc. Therefore,

we summarized that the records in this instance would not be reliable for our purposes. We then did a validity check against interviews with staff and personnel regarding each resident's behavior and subsequent status within the Project and upon exiting. Based on this data, we can state that approximately one half were returned for drug or alcohol violation, one quarter for probability of a new offense, usually theft or grand larceny, and one quarter for violating Project rules--including academic failure.

Twenty residents, 12.7%, of the 158 who achieved parole status--whether from the Project, prison, or another work release facility--recidivated on parole. The follow-up period ranges from over four years for the first residents admitted to the program to less than three months for new parolees. Sixty five percent, 13 of these 20 parolees, recidivated during their first year on parole. Five of the 20 also had recidivated earlier while in the project. Twenty one percent of those who paroled from prison or another facility recidivated on parole while ten percent of those who paroled from the Project later recidivated.

2. Criminal History. (p.iii) As Table 2 shows, Project members were sentenced for 85 property offenses, 65 drug offenses, 79 person or violent offenses (including robbery), and 33 parole violations. The offense types total more than 203 since all charges for the current sentence were recorded. Sixty seven percent (136) have a drug-alcohol related offense. Fifty five percent (111) are first commitments to prison. An exact comparison of the criminal history of Project members with those in other release facilities and perhaps with the total prison population awaits future data gathering and analysis. However, preliminary review and interviews suggest a larger portion of drug offenders for federal residents and person offenders for the state. Seventy percent of the residents served 2.5 years or less for their current sentence, 22% served 2.6 to 5 years, and 7 % served over 5 years. There is, however, missing or questionable data for one quarter of the study group. Thirty seven percent of the residents were 21-25 years old at time of sentence, 23% 26-30 years.

3. Academic History. (p.v) The Project received 116 (57%) freshmen, 48 (24%) sophmores, 28 (14%) upperclassmen, and 4 (2%) graduate students. Approximately one third of the freshmen had no transferable college credit. (This does not mean, however, that they were not involved in an academic program inside the institution.) Sixty nine percent (124) of the residents graduated from a regular high school program, 32% (57) obtained a GED (a

high school equivalency) before or in prison; there are 22 missing cases for this variable. Reading, Language, and Math Achievement tests are administered in the state and federal prisons during the in-take process. They are frequently administered poorly and are on occasion given to residents who are sedated or under some other medication. In addition, residents are under considerable anxiety at the time of testing. The test results show that 24% of the Project residents were tenth grade and below in reading level, 49% were tenth and below in language level, and 47% were below in math.

4. Background Characteristics.(pp. vi-viii) The following marginal percentages are based on N=203. Most residents (73%) lived in the state of Washington for five or more years before their arrest and 87% were from an urban environment. Roughly one third were 25 years old or less at time of admittance to the Project, one third 26 to 30, and one third over 30, (compared to age at sentence when 54% were less than 25, 23% were 26-30, and 18% were over 30). Approximately one third served in the military. Sixty two percent lived with their families while in high school but 53% of all residents for whom we have data reported they had a poor relationship with their family. The in-take summaries report that 64% have a history of drug-use problems and 23% have a drinking problem; this data, however, should be interpreted with caution because of the lack of reliability between prison counselors in assessing what constitutes "a problem." Eighteen percent are reported to have been married at the time of incarceration. Sixty eight percent reported they had no dependents at this time. As was stated above, 57% of the residents are white, 29% black, and 14% Native American, Asian American or Chicano; this data is in conflict with official state and federal records. The Project asks residents to state their ethnicity for Project records, an activity which leads to a statement of more non-whites than other records indicate. The evaluators observations indicate these Project records are the most valid.

The following summarizes the results of selected cross tabulations. Additional data is reported in the appendix (pp. ix-xii).

1. Academic Data with Academic Background and Selected Variables.

These conclusions reflect information through the 1974 academic year. Since there were no strong variable relationships at that time, no attempt has been made to replicate this study. However, because of the greatly increased number of residents who will be part of the study group by the end of the 1976-1977 academic year, the evaluators will take a second look at the academic success of the residents and the ability of background variables to predict that success.

There was no significant relationship between the following variables:

1) in-prison GPA with higher education GPA prior to prison, 2) in-prison GPA with university GPA, 3) in-prison GPA with in-project or parole recidivism, 4) entering class with GPA, 5) math, language, and reading test scores with pre-prison higher education and university GPA, 6) pre-prison higher education, test scores, and institution GPA, each separately, with post project participation in higher education, 7) cumulative project GPA's with offense type.

2. Selected Variables with Recidivism. Age at sentence has a low to no association with recidivism. The only promising statistic is the association with overall recidivism (Chi square = 6.19, 1 degree of freedom (d.f.), level of significance (sig.) at .18, with a positive gamma of .19).

Ethnicity shows a low but significant relationship with recidivism, especially in-Project (Chi square = 13, 4 d.f., sig. = .01). However, ethnicity shows no relationship with parole recidivism although some relationship with overall recidivism (Chi square = 6.59, 4 d.f., sig. .13). This must be interpreted with caution because some categories of ethnicity are under-represented, suggesting that more analysis is needed.

Marital status at incarceration is not significantly related to either in-Project or parole recidivism.

The number of dependents (spouse and children, other) at the time of incarceration correlates significantly with in-project recidivism and overall recidivism but little with parole recidivism. The statistics are respectively: 6.5, 108; 6.30, 109; 1.0, .08; d.f. =3. The respective gammas were .387 and .312.

Military record shows little correlation with either category of recidivism, but parole recidivism and overall recidivism show a significant

though slight relationship. Parole and overall recidivism have Chi squares of 3.09, sig. .21 and 2.45, sig. .29 respectively. Tested with in-Project recidivism the statistics became very low.

Chi squares were low and not significant for drinking excessively as a predictor of recidivism. But the data on drug use problems proved to be more fruitful in predicting in-Project recidivism and overall recidivism, with in-Project recidivism Chi square of 3.47, 1 d.f., sig. .06. The Proportionate Reduction of Error measures ranged from 1.7 to .20. Here the evaluators refer to drug use history and not the instant offense. As was stated above, however, this variable should be interpreted with caution because of poor reliability. In addition it should be mentioned that persons with a history of drug use are given frequent urinalysis while in the Project and, hence, will not go undetected if they continue their use.

Whether or not the residents reported a good relationship with their family during high school years shows a very slight though significant relationship with recidivism: an in-project Chi square 7.21, 1 d.f., .007; an overall Chi square 2.86, 1 d.f., .09. Parole recidivism bore no significant relationship.

Of the above determinants only ethnicity, age, number of dependents and drug use seem promising but their predictive powers are quite low.

Regarding the academic data, none of the usual criteria for admissions reveal any correlations of significance. However, the class level admitted to the university shows some relationship though slight, with in-Project recidivism (Chi square = 5.12, d.f. 6, .52; parole 5.46, d.f. 6, .48; and, overall 5.35, d.f. 6, .49). Reading level, language level, and math level were highly un-correlated with recidivism for all categories.

The data show low, not significant Chi squares for the relationship between the sentence for the current offense with recidivism and time served for current offense with parole violations before coming to the project.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The variables usually included in a Base Expectancy model are not significantly related to the parole success of Project members. Therefore, the power of a model based on the cumulative prediction values of these variables is also questionable. We do not suggest that such a model is without value but we should seriously question the variables used in these models. Were we using the same variables as in the models presently available, we would have to question the validity and reliability of the scores when it is suggested that decisions are to be made with such models using such data.
2. Some persons who recidivated in the Project perform satisfactorily on parole. We find that the conclusion in Richard Bass' study of work furlough for the California Department of Corrections applies to study release as well. They state: "Work furlough procedures place more stringent restrictions on work furloughee behavior than parole places on parolee behavior. Though the stringent restrictions are supposed to only help in identifying likely parole failure, they also identify some work fuloughees as likely parole failures who are not likely parole failures." (pp.51a-51b) Both intense supervision and rules not applicable to parolees contribute to Project failure. (It is difficult to determine whether the in-Project recidivism led to more time-served, as was true in California. We suspect that it did to some degree but cannot test this since state residents do not have a parole date when entering this Project.)
3. Many persons with characteristics which tend to preclude their acceptance into other release facilities perform satisfactorily in the Project and on parole. Most citizens and persons responsible for screening early release applicants prefer property offenders for these programs. We found that these inmates have an offense type which makes them the most likely to recidivate on parole and more likely than drug offenders to recidivate in the Project. Persons convicted of drug offenses (a variable which is different from "history of drug useage") were least likely to recidivate in the Project and on parole; more person and property offenders recidivated.
4. There are more variables which have a slight significance with in-Project recidivism than with parole recidivism, a fact which further reinforces the notion

that the person who fails on work or study release is not necessarily the same type who fails on parole. Those variables which show some correlation with in-Project recidivism can be viewed as components of the same trait: a failure to develop positive social bonds. The variable most highly correlated with in-Project recidivism is Poor Relationship with Family; others less correlated but significant are No Dependents, Lack of Military Service, being Asian American, Chicano, or American Indian, and Drug-Use History. One explanation of the relationship between these factors and recidivism is that in the Project one is more likely to fail if one cannot adapt or does not know how to adapt to a program and system (education and criminal justice) which are part of the American mainstream and in which one is constantly in contact with other people. On parole it is possible to be a loner and live within a subculture; at the University and in the Project it is not.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Stuart, "Evaluation of Work Release," in *Criminal Justice Research*, Emilio Viano, ed., Lexington Books, 1975.
- Bass, Richard A., *An Analysis of the California Department of Corrections Work Furlough Program in Fiscal Year 1969-1970*. Research Report #57, Bay Area Research Unit, California Department of Corrections, November, 1975.
- Baker, Keith, John Irwin, et. al., *Summary Report: Project NewGate and Other Prison College Education Programs*, Office of Economic Opportunity.
- Smith, Ralph W., *Who Returns? A Study of Recidivism for Adult Offenders in the State of Washington*, Office of Research, Department of Social and Health Services, Olympia, Washington, 1976.

APPENDIX

RECIDIVISM DATA

i

CATEGORY LABEL	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE %	CUMULATIVE %
<u>RECIDIVATOR ON PAROLE</u>			
Yes	20	9.9	9.9
No	183	90.1	100.0

PAROLE QUARTER RECIDIVATED

Did not recidivate	183	90.1	90.1
1st Quarter on Parole	2	1.0	91.1
2nd Quarter on Parole	6	3.0	94.1
3rd Quarter on Parole	1	.5	94.6
4th Quarter on Parole	4	2.0	96.6
5th Quarter on Parole	2	1.0	97.5
6th Quarter on Parole	1	.5	98.0
7th Quarter on Parole	1	.5	98.5
8th Quarter on Parole	3	1.5	100.0

TOTAL RECIDIVATED--PROJECT, PAROLE, OR BOTH

NO	139	68.5	68.5
YES	64	31.5	100.0

IN PROJECT RECIDIVATOR

Yes	47	23.4	23.1
No	154	75.9	100.0

PROJECT QUARTER RECIDIVATED

Did Not Recidivate	154	75.9	75.9
1st Quarter in Project	19	9.4	85.2
2nd Quarter in Project	16	7.9	93.1
3rd Quarter in Project	8	3.9	97.0
4th Quarter in Project	5	2.5	99.5
5th Quarter in project	1	.5	100.0

RECIDIVISM DATA

	RESIDENTS PAROLED FROM PROJECT		RESIDENTS PAROLED FORM WORK RELEASE OR PRISON	
	#	%	%	#
No Recidivism on Parole	111	90	79	27
Recidivated on Parole	13	10	21	7
TOTAL	124	100	100	34

Residents Paroled from Project	124
Residents Paroled from Work Release or Prison	34
Recidivated in-Project and still in Prison or will be in Prison	20
Not Paroled	<u>25</u>
	203

TABLE 1

	In Project Recidivism	Parole Recidivism	Rec. Both In/Parole	Overall "OK"	TOTAL (#) %
1st Commitment	N (19)	(6)	(1)	(85)	(111)
	R 17.1	5.4	0.9	76.6	
	C 45.2	40.0	20.0	60.2	54.7*
Multiple Commitments	(17)	(9)	(4)	(35)	(65)
	25.8	13.6	0.6	53.0	
	40.5	60.0	80.0	24.8	32.0*
Unknown	(6)	(0)	(0)	(21)	(27)
	22.2			77.7	
	14.3			14.9	13.3*
TOTAL (N)	(42)	(15)	(5)	(141)	(203)
	% R 20.7	7.4	2.5	69.5	100.1*

TABLE 2

	In Project Recidivism	Parole Recidivism	Both In/Parole	Overall "OK"	TOTAL
Parole Violation	N (10)	(2)	(2)	(19)	(33)
	R 30.3	6.1	6.1	57.6	
	C 15.9	11.1	22.2	11.0	12.6
Property	(19)	(9)	(4)	(53)	(85)
	22.4	10.6	47.1	62.4	
	30.2	50.0	44.4	30.8	32.4
Drug	(15)	(3)	0	(47)	(65)
	23.1	4.6		72.3	
	23.8	16.7		27.3	24.8
Person	(19)	(4)	(3)	(53)	(79)
	24.1	5.1	3.8	67.1	
	30.2	22.2	33.3	30.8	30.1
TOTAL	N (63)	(18)	(9)	(172)	(262)
	24.0	6.9	3.4	65.6	100

* This table does not total to 100% (203); it instead reflects multiple offenses. An offender will be counted in as many categories as are consistent with his recorded criminal history.

ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

v

CATEGORY LABEL	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE %	CUMULATIVE %
<u>HIGH SCHOOL ATTAINMENT</u>			
Graduated	124	68.5	
Other Certifi- cation	57	31.5	
Missing cases	22	-	

Interpret with caution. Tests are administered under very poor conditions. The following includes both GATB and SAT scores. The GATB scores were adjusted by roughly 11% to reflect a crude SAT score.

READING GRADE LEVEL

Tenth and below	49	24.1	32.2
11th to 12th	62	30.5	73.0
13th and up	41	20.2	100.0
Missing cases	51	25.1	-

LANGUAGE GRADE LEVEL

Tenth and below	100	49.3	64.9
11th to 12th	37	18.2	89.0
13th and up	17	8.4	100.0
Missing cases	49	24.1	-

MATH GRADE LEVEL

Tenth and below	95	46.8	61.7
11th to 12th	30	14.8	81.2
13th and up	29	14.3	100.0
Missing cases	49	24.1	

CLASS AT ADMISSION

Freshman	116	57.1	58.1
Sophomore	48	23.6	81.8
Junior	23	11.3	93.1
Senior	5	2.5	95.6
5th year	1	.5	96.1
Graduate	3	1.5	97.5
Total	203	100.0	100.0

BACKGROUND DATA

vi

CATEGORY LABEL	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE %	CUMULATIVE %
<u>SEX</u>			
Female	30	14.8	
Male	173	85.2	
<u>ETHNICITY</u>			
Native American	15	7.4	
Asian	4	2.0	
Black	59	29.1	
Chicano	9	4.4	
Caucasian	116	57.1	
<u>BIRTHPLACE</u>			
California	22	12.0	
Idaho	2	1.1	
Nevada	2	1.1	
Oregon	3	1.6	
Washington	82	44.8	
Foreign	3	1.6	
Other	69	37.7	
Missing cases	20	-	
<u>MARITAL STATUS AT COMMITMENT</u>			
Married	36	17.7	20.1
Other	145	70.4	100.0
Missing Cases	24	11.8	-
Interpret with caution			
<u>NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS</u>			
None	138	68.0	140.1
One	20	9.9	89.3
Two or more	19	9.4	100.0
Missing cases	26	12.8	-
<u>VETERANS STATUS</u>			
Honorable Discharge	41	20.2	22.9
No Service	119	58.6	89.4
Other Discharge or Active Status	19	9.4	100.0
Missing Cases	24	11.8	-

BACKGROUND DATA

CATEGORY LABEL	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE %	CUMULATIVE %
<u>CHILDHOOD ENVIRONMENT</u>			
Urban	155	87.1	
Rural	22	12.4	
Missing cases	26	-	
<u>GOOD RELATIONSHIP WITH PARENTS</u>			
Yes	72	47.4	
No	80	52.6	
Missing cases	51	-	
<u>HIGH SCHOOL LIVING SITUATION</u>			
Alone	5	2.9	
Family	107	62.2	
Friends	3	1.7	
Relatives	28	16.3	
Other	28	16.3	
Missing cases	32	-	
<u>FAMILY CRIMINAL HISTORY</u>			
Yes	41	20.2	
No	112	55.2	
Cannot be deter- mined/Missing cases	50	-	
<u>OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD DURING RESIDENT'S ADOLESCENCE</u>			
Non-manual (continuous)	37	29.1	
Non-manual (intermittent)	0	-	
Manual (continuous)	62	48.8	
Manual (intermittent)	12	9.4	
More than one	1	.8	
Not Applicable	14	11.0	
Cannot be deter- mined/Missing cases	77	-	

BACKGROUND DATA

CATEGORY LABEL	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE %	CUMULATIVE %
<u>TIME IN WASHINGTON BEFORE ARREST</u>			
1 year	18	11.5	11.5
2 years	5	3.2	14.6
3 years	6	3.8	18.5
4-5 years	14	8.9	27.4
6-10 years	17	10.8	38.2
10 or more years	97	61.8	100.0
Missing cases	46	-	-
<u>DRINKING EXCESSIVELY BEFORE ARREST</u>			
Yes	41	23.2	
No	135	76.3	
Missing cases	27	-	
<u>DRUG USE-PROBLEMS BEFORE ARREST</u>			
Yes	112	63.6	
No	64	36.4	
Missing cases	27	-	
<u>EMPLOYMENT HISTORY</u>			
Non-manual (continuous)	20	12.7	
Non-manual (intermittent)	20	12.7	
Manual (continuous)	28	17.7	
Manual (intermittent)	49	31.0	
More than one of the above	3	1.9	
Not Applicable	38	24.1	
Missing Cases	45	-	
<u>AGE AT ENTRY TO PROJECT</u>			
25 and below	69	33.0	36.0
26 to 30	69	34.0	70.1
31 to 35	32	15.8	86.3
36 and above	27	13.3	100.

SELECTED VARIABLES CROSSTABULATED WITH RECIDIVISM

	Phi or Row Chi Square	Degree of Freedom	Level of Significance	Gamma
AGE AT SENTENCE				
In-Project Recidivism	4.59	4	.34	-.21
Parole	1.19	4	.87	-.01
Overall	6.19	4	.18	.19
ETHNICITY (RACE)				
In-Project	13.00	4	.01	
Parole	3.13	4	.53	
Overall	6.59	4	.13	
MARITAL STATUS AT INCARCERATION				
In-Project	\emptyset .059 x^2 .34	1	.55	
Parole	.08 .76	1	.38	
Overall	.003 .02	1	.88	
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS				
In-Project	6.5	3	.089	-.387
Parole	1.00	3	.80	-.100
Overall	6.30	3	.09	.312
VETERANS STATUS				
In-Project	1.40	2	.49	
Parole	3.09	2	.21	
Overall	2.45	2	.29	
DRINKING EXCESSIVELY (PROBLEM)				
In-Project	\emptyset .063 x^2 .04	1	.52	
Parole	.100 1.10	1	.29	
Overall	.044 .16	1	.68	

SELECTED VARIABLES CROSSTABULATED WITH RECIDIVISM

	Phi or Row Chi Square	Degree of Freedom	Level of Significance	Gamma
DRUG--USE (PROBLEM)				
*In-Project Recidivism	ϕ .209 x^2 6.77	1	.009	.52
Parole	.047 .1455	1	.70	
Overall	.15 3.47	1	.06	-.34
*Pre-measures yield from .20 to .173				
GOOD RELATIONSHIP WITH PARENTS OR GUARDIAN				
In-Project	.23 7.21	1	.0072	.50
Parole	.039 .060	1	.80	
Overall	.150 2.86	1	.090	.30
<u>ACADEMIC DATA:</u>				
CLASS LEVEL ADMITTED TO UNIVERSITY				
In-Project	x^2 5.12	6	.52	.26
Parole	5.46	6	.48	-.29
Overall	5.35	6	.49	.08
READING GRADE LEVEL				
In-Project	x^2 .707	2	.70	-.11
Parole	1.39	2	.49	.20
Overall	.49	2	.78	-.077

SELECTED VARIABLES CROSSTABULATED WITH RECIDIVISM

xi

	Phi or Row Chi Square	Degree of Freedom	Level of Significance	Gamma
LANGUAGE GRADE LEVEL				
In-Project Recidivism	.43	2	.80	.088
Parole	1.52	2	.46	.328
Overall	.08	2	.95	-.038
MATHEMATICS GRADE LEVEL				
In-Project	.009	2	.99	.008
Parole	2.23	2	.32	.36
Overall	.57	2	.74	-.039
SENTENCE CURRENT OFFENSE (COURT/JUDGE)				
In-Project	1.22	3	.74	-.126
Parole	1.30	3	.72	-.143
Overall	.41	3	.93	-.05
TIME SERVED FOR CURRENT OFFENSE				
In-Project	4.97	3	.173	.209
Parole	2.21	3	.52	-.25
Overall	.74	3	.86	-.04



END