

THE ADULT PROBATIONER IN ONTARIO

Prepared by

JOHN C. RENNER, Ph.D.
RENNER AND ASSOCIATES

Under Contract to
PLANNING AND RESEARCH BRANCH



MINISTRY OF
CORRECTIONAL
SERVICES

Honourable Frank Drea
Minister
Glenn R. Thompson
Deputy Minister

539/6

MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO



PLANNING AND SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION

M. J. Algar
Assistant Deputy Minister

PLANNING AND RESEARCH BRANCH

James J. Hug, Ph.D.
Director

A. C. Birkenmayer
Chief, Research Services

January 1978

THE ADULT PROBATIONER IN ONTARIO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
OVERVIEW	1-1
The Average Probationer	1-1
Criminal History	1-1
Probationers' Problems	1-2
Predictors of Success	1-2
INTRODUCTION	2-1
Background	2-1
Purpose	2-1
Descriptive Data	2-1
Outcome Research	2-3
METHOD	3-1
Sample Selection	3-1
Questionnaire Development	3-1
Data Collection	3-2
Data Analysis	3-3
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	4-1
Personal	4-1
Education	4-1
Living Conditions	4-1
Family	4-2
Criminal Contacts	4-2
EMPLOYMENT	5-1
Employment Status	5-1
Occupation and Employment	5-1
CRIMINAL HISTORY	6-1
Background	6-1
Pre-Probation Offences	6-1
Offences Leading to Probation	6-1
PROBATION PROCESS AND PROBLEMS	7-1
Time	7-1
The Process	7-1
The Problems	7-2
PROBATION OFFENCES	8-1
Failure to Comply	8-1
Convictions and Charges	8-2

	<u>Page</u>
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PERCEIVED OUTCOME	9-1
Judging Probation Success	9-1
Interpretation of Data	9-2
Personal	9-2
Education	9-3
Living Conditions	9-3
Family	9-4
Criminal Contacts	9-4
EMPLOYMENT AND OUTCOME	10-1
Employment Status	10-1
Employment History	10-1
Occupation and Availability	10-1
CRIMINAL HISTORY AND OUTCOME	11-1
Prior Offences	11-1
Type of Offence	11-1
PROBATION PROCESS AND OUTCOME	12-1
Probation Decisions	12-1
Decisions to Charge	12-1
APPLICATIONS	13-1
Sample Validation	13-1
Case-Load Management	13-1
Probation Outcome Research	13-2
Program Development	13-2
Inter-Population Comparisons	13-2

* * * * *

Appendix

MEASURE OF FAMILY STABILITY	A
SCALE CONSTRUCTION	B
TECHNICAL APPENDIX	C

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table		Page
4.1	Age	4-3
4.2	Sex	4-3
4.3	Apparent Racial Origin	4-3
4.4	Predominant Language	4-4
4.5	Marital Status	4-4
4.6	Educational Status at the Time of Probation	4-5
4.7	Highest Level of Educational Achievement	4-5
4.8	School Grade Level at the Time of the Most Recent Enrollment	4-5
4.9	Experience in Special School Settings	4-6
4.10	School Discipline Problems	4-6
4.11	Community Population Where Client Lives	4-7
4.12	Living Facilities at Start of the Probation Order	4-7
4.13	Status of Neighbourhood in Which the Client Lives	4-8
4.14	Earnings During the Year Preceding the Start of the Probation Order	4-8
4.15	Yearly Household Income at Probation Termination	4-9
4.16	Reliance on Social Assistance Income by Client's Family	4-9
4.17	Cohesiveness of the Client's Family	4-9
4.18	Living Companions at the Time of the Probation Order	4-10
4.19	Family Instability During the Client's Childhood	4-10
4.20	Criminal or Delinquency Record of the Client's Father	4-11
4.21	Criminal or Delinquency Record of the Client's Mother	4-11
4.22	Criminal or Delinquency Record of the Client's Siblings	4-11
4.23	Client's Contacts with Criminals/Delinquents	4-12
4.24	How Leisure Time is Spent	4-12
5.1	Usual Employment Status of the Client	5-2
5.2	Employment Status at Termination of Probation	5-2
5.3	Length of Time Employed on Current, or Most Recent, Job	5-3
5.4	Occupation of Those Currently, or Previously Employed	5-3
5.5	Reason for Not Being Available for Full-Time Employment at Termination	5-4
5.6	Reason Given for Leaving Previous Full-Time Employment	5-4
5.7	Time Spent in Seeking the Job Held at Termination	5-5
5.8	Time Spent Not Working Between Last Full-Time Job and Termination of Probation	5-5
6.1	Probation Officer's Knowledge of Client's Criminal History	6-2
6.2	Age at First Recorded Evidence of Difficulty With the Law	6-2
6.3	Previous Convictions by Type of Crime	6-3
6.4	Number of Sentences Received for Offences Committed Prior to that Leading to the Probation Order	6-4
6.5	Type of Most Recent Sentence	6-4
6.6	Type of Offence Committed Which Led to the Probation Order	6-5
6.7	Number of Offences Committed Which Led to the Probation Order	6-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table		Page
7.1	Time Extension of the Original Probation Order . . .	7-4
7.2	Reason for Termination of the Order	7-4
7.3	Period of Time for Which the Probation Order was Made	7-5
7.4	Actual Time Spent on Probation to Termination of the Order	7-5
7.5	Number of Months Actually Spent by the Probation Officer in "working with" the Client	7-6
7.6	Amount of Supervision Required by the Client . . .	7-6
7.7	Level of Supervision and Length of the Probation Order	7-7
7.8	Level of Supervision and Time Spent Actively Working with Probationer	7-7
7.9	Incidence of Problems and Change During Probation Period	7-8
7.10	Areas that were Considered to be Important for Success or Failure During Probation.	7-9
7.11	Clients Who Are Transfer Cases	7-10
7.12	Frequency of Contact with Social Agencies Concerning the Client	7-10
7.13	Setting the Conditions of Probation	7-10
8.1	Items Included in Probation Orders, and Frequency of Violations, Charges and Legal Actions	8-3
8.2	Decision of the Probation Officer to Charge With "Failure to Comply" Due to Judge	8-4
8.3	Decision of the Probation Officer to Charge for "Failure to Comply" for Reasons Other Than Possible Sanctions	8-4
8.4	Probation Officer's Perceptions of Severity of Sanctions Imposed After Charging a Client With "Failure to Comply"	8-5
8.5	Months, After Start of the Probation Period, Before Charges Laid for a New Offence	8-6
8.6	Number of Charges Laid During Probation Period . .	8-6
8.7	Number of Court Appearances, as a Result of New Charges Laid During the Probation Period	8-7
8.8	Number of Offences for Which the Client was Convicted During the Probation Period	8-7
8.9	Type of Offences for Which the Client was Convicted During the Probation Period	8-8
9.1	Probation Officer's Evaluation of Client's Probation Success	9-5
9.2	Marital Status and Outcome	9-5
9.3	Racial Characteristics and Outcome	9-5
9.4	School Status and Outcome	9-6
9.5	Most Recent Graduation and Outcome	9-6
9.6	Technical/Opportunity School Experience and Outcome	9-7
9.7	School Discipline and Outcome	9-7
9.8	Quality of Housing and Outcome	9-8
9.9	Neighbourhood Status and Outcome	9-8
9.10	Household Income and Outcome	9-9
9.11	Pre-Probation Earnings and Outcome	9-9
9.12	Reliance Upon Social Assistance and Outcome . . .	9-10
9.13	Living Companions at the Time of the Offence and Outcome	9-10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
9.14 Level of Family Stability During Childhood and Outcome	9-11
9.15 Family Cohesiveness During Probation and Outcome	9-11
9.16 Family Criminal History and Outcome	9-12
9.17 Socializing Pattern and Outcome	9-12
9.18 Use of Leisure Time and Outcome	9-12
10.1 Usual Employment Status of Client	10-3
10.2 Employment Status at Termination of Probation and Outcome	10-3
10.3 Time Spent in Seeking Current Job and Outcome	10-4
10.4 Length of Time Employed on Current Job and Outcome	10-4
10.5 If Unemployed, Length of Time Employed on Most Recent Job and Outcome	10-5
10.6 Occupation and Outcome Among the Unemployed	10-5
10.7 Occupation and Outcome Among the Employed	10-5
10.8 Reason for Unavailability for Full-Time Employment at Termination and Outcome	10-6
10.9 Reasons Given for Leaving Previous Full-Time Employment and Outcome	10-6
11.1 Age at First Recorded Evidence of Difficulty with the Law and Outcome	11-3
11.2 Most Recent Sentence and Outcome	11-3
11.3 Probation Outcome and Number of Sentences Received for Offences Committed Prior to the Probation Order	11-4
11.4 Probation Outcome and Number of Offences Committed Which Led to the Probation Order	11-4
11.5 Specific Offence Committed and Probation Outcome	11-5
11.6 Summary of Type of Offence and Probation Outcome	11-5
11.7 Probation Outcome and Type of Offence Committed Leading to Probation	11-6
12.1 Level of Supervision Required During Probation and Outcome	12-3
12.2 Magnitude of Probationer's Problems and Outcome	12-4
12.3 Reason for Termination of the Order and Outcome	12-4
12.4 Importance of Specific Problems Among Probationers	12-5
12.5 Outcome and Decision to Charge with "Failure to Comply" for Reasons Other Than Possible Sanctions	12-6
12.6 Outcome and Decision to Charge with "Failure to Comply" Influenced by Judge	12-6

OVERVIEW

The primary objective of this project was to develop a descriptive profile of the average Ontario probationer. A secondary objective was to identify the predictors of the successful, versus the unsuccessful, probationer.

Data were collected on a random sample of 1,905. All of the data were provided by each client's Probation Officer.

THE AVERAGE PROBATIONER

The average probationer was male, under the age of 24, unmarried, and living in a poor part of town.

Most probationers had not graduated from high school and, as a consequence, worked in poor paying, low level occupations. They were frequently unemployed, and many exhibited negative attitudes toward seeking or holding a job.

Prior to their most recent probation sentence, about one-fourth of this population had been convicted of other offences. Those who had had previous conflicts with the law, had usually experienced this contact at about age 16.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

There were a wide range of offences - over 50 - for which this sample had been placed on probation. However, the most frequently cited offences included breaking and entering, theft, possession of stolen goods, drug offences, and alcohol related offences.

Most Probation Orders were made for a period of one year or less. However, about one-quarter of the Probation Orders were terminated before expiry date. This was usually because the probationer had either committed another offence, or had performed in such an exemplary manner during probation, that the court had agreed to an early termination of probation.

While on probation, a few individuals were convicted for failing to comply with the conditions of the Probation Order. However, most of the convictions which occurred while the Probation Order was in effect were for the same types of offences for which the individual had been placed on probation in the first place - breaking and entering, theft, etc.

PROBATIONERS' PROBLEMS

The probationer's problem areas, most frequently cited by the Probation Officers, were in the areas of employment, relationships with friends, use of leisure time, and use of alcohol and drugs. Of course, the most important problem was that of avoiding being convicted of new offences.

About one-fifth of the probationers were said to have required intensive supervision from their Probation Officer. About one-third of the probationers were considered, by their Probation Officer, to have completed the probation period in a less than successful fashion.

The more supervision a probationer was given, the more likely he or she was considered by the Probation Officer, to have completed the probation period unsuccessfully. Also, individuals who had committed an offence during the probation period, or who had encountered difficulties in drinking or drug use, were very seldom ever considered by their Probation Officer to have completed the probation period successfully.

PREDICTORS OF SUCCESS

The probationers who were most likely to complete the probation period successfully were older, married, and had good family relationships. They were also better educated, earned more money, and were more likely to be employed than other probationers. In short, the more closely the characteristics of the probationer approached those of the "average" Ontario citizen, the more likely he/she was to complete the probation period successfully.

The Employment Factor

The most important predictor of success was employment status. That is, successful probationers were those who tended to be employed at the termination of probation. Even those who were employed part-time were more likely to be considered to have completed their probation period successfully than those who were unemployed but actively seeking a full-time job.

Attitudes and work habits were proved to be important predictors of success. That is, individuals who had a work history of being "usually" employed and/or those who were actively looking for work rather than attempting to "get by" without working, often completed their probation period successfully, even though they may have been unemployed at the termination of probation.

There were many other clusters of problem areas and predictors of probation success which are documented in detail in the report.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

As of April, 1972, the Ministry of Correctional Services became responsible for the operation of Ontario's Probation Service.

In recent years, the Ministry has concentrated on evolving an effective organizational and administrative structure to provide probation supervision to a population of well over 20,000 individuals each year.

Having successfully implemented the necessary changes to service this massive influx of clients, the Ministry has recently been focusing its attention upon the quality of programs and services provided for probationers.

PURPOSE

To evaluate and improve existing services, it is important to have systematic information about the characteristics and problems of the population being served. There have been no such sources of information, which are readily available to the Ministry, concerning probationers in Ontario.

The primary focus of this study then, was to collect descriptive data about Ontario's probationers. Considerable emphasis and effort was placed upon the collection of those data which are presumed to bear some theoretical or empirical relationship to the process and objectives of probation.

The second focus of the study was to develop a better understanding of the factors associated with successful, and unsuccessful, probation outcomes. This was done by examining the inter-relationships of the probationer's characteristics, criminal and court history and the probation process as these factors related to the success or failure of the probation experience.

DESCRIPTIVE DATA

Previous research and practical experience have suggested the type of data to be collected in a descriptive study. These data have usually been considered useful the world over, in assisting judges and Probation Officers to make assessments of a probation "risk", and in formulating the approach to be taken toward handling the offender on probation.

Pre-Sentence Reports

In Ontario, one need only look at Outerbridge's Handbook for Provincial Probation Officers for guidelines on the data to be collected. This information, which is generally considered to be sufficiently important for inclusion in pre-sentence reports to be prepared for the judge, includes:

- family and personal history
- educational history
- employment history
- marital history
- financial status
- leisure time activities
- health
- religious affiliation
- major personality strengths and weaknesses
- extenuating circumstances surrounding the offence
- nature of the immediate offence
- prior criminal history.

The outline for pre-sentence reports in the United States and the "social inquiry" reports used in the British courts, identify the need for virtually the same information. Although such data have become standard in court reports, there is little systematic research evidence which clearly identify which pieces of information are more important or less important, from the standpoint of predicting a successful or unsuccessful probation outcome.

Availability in Ontario

Historically, Ontario's Probation Service has focused upon servicing local and regional courts. For this reason, files on individual probationers are not available through any single location in the Province.

Since pre-sentence reports are seldom prepared on everyone who is placed on probation, the information required for a descriptive study is available only through the personal casebooks and recollections of individual Probation Officers throughout the Province. Preliminary research indicated that the type of information collected and recorded on each probationer may vary considerably from one Probation Officer to another. Also, the information requirements of the court vary from one location to another, depending upon the demands and interests of the court systems and judges.

To collect any consistent, and reasonably comprehensive, data on probationers obviously requires that the researcher must rely on more than simply the written records of the Probation Officer. It is

essential then that request for information on probationers concentrate only upon a Probation Officer's more recent cases.

Previous Research

It would seem that there should be an abundance of studies describing characteristics of probationers - if not in Ontario, at least in other parts of the world. This is not the case. Most probation research does not focus on a collection of descriptive data, but rather on the identification of variables which predict probation success or failure. Even when descriptive data are available, they are of questionable value for the Ontario situation.

Eligibility Differences

One of the problems in generalizing from the findings of other studies is that in different locations, eligibility for the probation sentence varies considerably. For example, much of the research on probation has been done in the United States. A few of the states impose no statutory restrictions on the use of the probation sentence, but about one-half of the states establish prohibitions on probation if the offender has previously been convicted of other crimes, or has previously been imprisoned. A number of jurisdictions bar the use of probation if specified types of felonies have been committed. Also, a few jurisdictions restrict the use of the probation sentence for crimes which are punishable by more than a specific period of imprisonment.

Differences in Inclination

Even in areas where the laws concerning the use of the probation sentence are identical, there are other sources of bias. For example, researchers in England have demonstrated that the process of selection for probation varies considerably from one court to another, and within the same court by different magistrates. In the State of Texas, in Federal cases alone, the use of probation varied from 14% in the western district of Texas to 60% in the eastern district of Texas. There is little reason to believe that such differences among courts and judges in Texas and England do not also exist in the Province of Ontario.

OUTCOME RESEARCH

There have been many research projects concerned with the prediction of success or failure in probation. However, many of the "classics" in this field were completed in the 1930's, or were carried out in a vastly different cultural milieu from that of Ontario. Thus, previous research was not particularly useful in helping the Ministry understand the current situation of probation in Ontario, but proved helpful in suggesting hypotheses for study.

Success Rates

There are many different ways to define whether or not a probation period has been completed successfully or not. Some researchers concentrate strictly upon whether or not the probationer has been convicted

of a new offence. Other researchers concentrate upon evidence of personal development or adjustment, overlooking the issues of whether or not the individual has been reconvicted or not.

However probation success has been defined, there seems to be some consistency, in all parts of the world, in success rates. In one review of 22 such studies which have been conducted since 1920, the average success rate is between 70 and 80%. In Ontario, researchers have previously demonstrated that the results of probation over a 5-year period have consistently shown that from 70 to 80% of all probationers complete their probation periods successfully.

Prediction Studies

To date, the research conducted on the prediction of success in probation has been lacking in both continuity and sophistication. In the 1930's, a major research project found that, in the United States, married persons over 35 with steady employment and no previous history of incarceration were least likely to violate probation. The race of the offender, and the nature of the offence, proved to be without any special significance. Subsequent research studies, however, have identified race and nature of the offence as highly significant predictors of the probation outcome. Other studies have shown that the marital status of the probationer is entirely irrelevant in predicting probation outcome. The point is not to review all the studies which have been done but to simply indicate that the findings vary considerably according to both time and location. Updating is essential.

The existing knowledge concerning prediction of probation success or failure is limited because research in this field has not generally been carried forward in a systematic manner. This is in contrast to some of the research conducted in the field of parole. For example, the Division of Corrections in Illinois has been carrying out systematic prediction research on its parolees since 1933. For years, they have successfully applied prediction formulas to help them in determining which offenders should or should not be given parole. One point which the researchers in this field have continually emphasized, however, is that the formula - to be useful - must be continually upgraded by a continuing research program in order to incorporate the effects of a constantly changing social milieu and type of offender.

METHOD

SAMPLE SELECTION

To ensure that information was collected on a representative sample of probationers, every full-time Probation Officer in Ontario was asked to provide information on the last ten of their clients whose probation orders had been terminated.

This information was collected only from Probation Officers who were actively working with probationers. Those individuals who had only recently become Probation Officers, or those who had transferred from other offices, had often not yet closed ten cases in their present location. They were asked to submit information on just those few cases which they had closed. Also, those individuals who were primarily in supervisory positions, or those who were assigned to special projects, were not asked to provide such data.

Each Probation Officer received a copy of the questionnaire, the coding instructions, and set of ten Answer Sheets. The Probation Officers were asked to use their written records as well as their own personal recollections of each client to complete the Answer Sheets and mail them to the researchers.

QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

In preparation for the development of the questionnaire, the researchers reviewed the existing literature on probation research, and reviewed questionnaires used by others in this field.

Initial drafts of the questionnaire were discussed with research staff in the Ministry. Drafts of the questionnaire were then sent to Probation Officers located in the city core of Toronto, suburban communities, and rural communities in the area. Meetings were then held at these locations with groups of Probation Officers who had been informed as to the general intent of the project and had been given an opportunity to study the questionnaire. The suggestions made in these group meetings proved to be extremely useful, and the original draft underwent a series of major revisions.

Pre-Test

To make certain that, in practice, both the questionnaire and the data collection method would be feasible, a small pre-test was conducted. Ten probation offices, representing a cross-section of geographical locations and urban/rural differences, were selected for inclusion in the pre-test. Following discussions with the manager of each office, arrangements were made for two or three Probation Officers at each location, to receive a questionnaire and the appropriate instructions

and Answer Sheets. They were asked to provide data on their ten most recent clients. In addition, they were asked to suggest improvements which could be made in the instructions, the questionnaire, the coding sheets, or the Answer Sheets. They also recorded the amount of time spent in completing the Answer Sheets.

The average time spent by each Probation Officer in completing the materials was between four and five hours. The researchers incorporated many of the suggestions for change in the materials made by the Probation Officers. The final draft of the materials was then prepared and distributed.

DATA COLLECTION

The manager of every probation office received a detailed outline of the rationale and the procedures for the research project. Also, each Probation Officer received a letter from the Ministry of Correctional Services which briefly explained the project, requested the assistance of the officer, and informed them that further detailed information was available through materials that had been sent to the manager of the office. Ten days later, each Probation Officer received a package of materials with a covering letter which explained the means by which the materials were developed and which indicated that the Answer Sheets should be completed within three weeks.

Follow-up

Standard follow-up procedures were used for encouraging the completion and return of the Answer Sheets. That is, one week before the deadline date, the Probation Officers received another letter from the researchers which reminded them of the deadline date and encouraged them to call one of the researchers if problems were encountered. Beginning on this last week prior to the deadline, a member of the research staff from the Ministry telephoned the larger offices which had not yet mailed in any materials.

Shortly after the deadline date, the researchers mailed another letter to the Probation Officers encouraging them not to discard their materials if they had inadvertently missed the deadline date, but rather to complete the materials and send them in as quickly as possible. Due to various combinations of illness, vacations, and other reasons, some respondents took longer than others to complete the materials. The cut-off date for acceptance of materials was set at April 21, 1977. In total then, the respondents were given up to seven weeks to return the materials.

Response Rate

Approximately 250 questionnaires, with 10 Answer Sheets each, were mailed to Probation Officers working with adults.

Some of these individuals had either just recently become Probation Officers, or they had been recently transferred from other offices. Therefore, not everyone of the respondents had yet had the opportunity to terminate 10 clients at their present office. The number of responses per Probation Officer averaged about 9. We received a total of 1,905 responses. At a rate of 9 responses per officer, that indicates a response rate of at least 85%. This is an exceptionally good response rate for a mail survey.

During the period of data collection, we maintained active telephone contact with the managers of probation offices from which the response rate was lower than average. In such cases, we discovered that some of the questionnaires had been inadvertently sent to individuals who were not actively involved in a standard caseload situation - such as supervisors or individuals working on special projects. There were a number of other cases of individuals who had just been recently transferred, or who had just been employed as Probation Officers, who also were unable to provide data for the project. No attempt was made to contact every individual who did not complete a questionnaire. However, through our contacts with the managers of the offices, we were assured that there were always good reasons for not having received a complete set of Answer Sheets from a Probation Officer.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis concentrated on two areas. First, the intent was to generate data which would simply describe the probationer's personal characteristics and the Probation Officers' evaluation of the probationer's problem areas and relative success or failure of the probation experience.

Other forms of data analysis were directed to an examination of the success/failure issue. Individual variables which were significantly related to success or failure during the probation period were identified by means of Chi-square analyses and linear multiple regression analyses. In addition, some of the data were subjected to factor analyses to determine whether or not certain clusters of problem areas were associated with success or failure during probation.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Detailed information concerning the personal characteristics of probationers are presented in the tables in this chapter. The following few paragraphs will present some of the highlights of these data.

PERSONAL

The adult probationer was relatively young. The mean age was 23.6 (standard deviation = 8.62). Only 16.9% of this population was 30 years of age or over, while 42.4% were under the age of 20.

The probationers were predominantly male (83%), and unmarried (83.7%). Almost all of them were caucasian (92.7%) and had as their predominant language either English (86.7%) or French (7.2%).

EDUCATION

The educational experience and achievements of probationers were not high. Many of them (67.1%) had quit school. Many of them had attended technical or special opportunity schools (21.7%) designed for children lacking in motivation and/or ability. While many Probation Officers were not aware of whether or not a probationer had been a discipline problem at school, at least 13.6% of the probationers were known to have been suspended and/or expelled from school at some time.

The mean grade level attained by probationers was 10 (standard deviation = 2.36). Only 8.1% of the probationers had attained a grade level of 13 or over, and 3.1% had not gone beyond the grade 6 level.

LIVING CONDITIONS

Probationers tended to be distributed relatively evenly between large cities and smaller communities, with 52.4% of the population living in cities of 100,000 or more. At the start of the probation order over half of the probationers lived in either detached (50.6%) or row houses (8.1%).

The status of the neighbourhood where the probationer lived was generally poor, with 80.7% living in lower-middle class, lower class, or slum* condition neighbourhoods. Their personal earned income during the year preceding the start of the probation order was generally low. Thirteen and a half per cent did not work at all, while only 14.2% had incomes of \$9,000 a year or more.

*The term "slum" was suggested by Probation Officers, during per-testing, as a more commonly used term than the more academic label of "lower-lower class". Thus "slum" is a relative, judgemental term and is not to be taken literally to imply an absence of plumbing, heating, etc.

Household income, from all sources, was also relatively low. Fully 19.5% made frequent use of some form of social assistance. Those having a household income of less than \$15,000 a year constituted 59% of the population.

FAMILY

At the time the probation order was made, many probationers were either living at home with both parents (36.4%) or were married or living common-law (23.2%). While it may be intuitively felt that those living alone, or living with friends, might be particularly prone to run afoul of the law, only 9.2% and 8.0% respectively of the population fell into either of these two categories.

Probationers often had an unstable family life during their childhood. For example, 20.2% had parents who were divorced or separated. There was a prolonged absence of at least one parent in 16.0% of the cases and one or both parents had died in 13.3% of the cases. It should be noted that these are circumstances which had been brought to the attention of the Probation Officer. In approximately 20% of all cases, the Probation Officer was not able to report on these details of the probationer's family life. Estimates of the present cohesiveness of family life during probation tended to reflect these indicators of family instability during childhood. Fully 60.4% of the probationers were considered by Probation Officers to have families which were only rated as "somewhat" or "not" cohesive.

CRIMINAL CONTACTS

In approximately 30% of all cases, the Probation Officers did not know whether the probationer's father, mother or siblings had criminal or delinquency records. It was reported, however, that 7.9% of the fathers and 2.2% of the mothers definitely had a record. The situation was much more striking for siblings. Of the 1,251 cases in which the Probation Officer knew whether the sibling did or did not have a record, fully 342, or 27.6% reportedly had a criminal or delinquency record.

In 35.5% of the cases probationers were seen to spend their leisure time in an aimless, non-productive manner. Only 31.2% were reported spending their leisure time primarily with individuals who had no criminal or delinquency record. Those who mixed primarily with criminals in their leisure time accounted for 23.0% of the population.

TABLE 4.1

<u>AGE</u>		
<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Under 17	202	10.7
18 to 19	594	31.5
20 to 21	352	18.7
22 to 29	419	22.2
30 and Over	318	16.9
No Response	20	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.2

<u>SEX</u>		
<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Female	320	17.0
Male	1,562	83.0
No Response	23	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.3APPARENT RACIAL ORIGIN*

<u>Race</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
East Indian	9	0.5
North Amer. Indian/Metis	80	4.3
Asian	13	0.7
Black	36	1.9
Caucasian	1,742	92.7
No Response	25	-
Total	1,905	100.0

*In the Probation Officer's opinion

TABLE 4.4
PREDOMINANT LANGUAGE

<u>Language</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
French-Quebecois	136	7.2
English	1,639	86.7
North Amer. Indian Dialect	21	1.1
Italian	21	1.1
Portugese	16	0.8
Greek	13	0.7
Other European	27	1.4
East Indian	2	0.1
Asian	9	0.5
Other	6	0.3
No Response	15	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.5
MARITAL STATUS

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Single	1,243	65.8
Separated	136	7.2
Divorced	31	1.6
Living Common-Law	161	8.5
Married	308	16.3
Widowed	5	0.3
Not Stated	21	
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.6EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT THE TIME OF PROBATION

<u>Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Still Enrolled	267	14.2
Quit No Intent of Returning	1,038	55.3
Quit with Intent of Returning	222	11.8
Graduated	296	15.8
Don't Know	55	2.9
No Response	27	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.7HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

<u>Completed</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Grade School	1,203	66.2
Vocational High	156	8.6
High School	231	12.7
Apprenticeship	34	1.9
Community College	16	0.9
University	19	1.0
Don't Know	159	8.7
No Response	87	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.8SCHOOL GRADE LEVEL AT
THE TIME OF THE MOST RECENT ENROLLMENT

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 6	52	3.1
7 to 8	164	9.8
9 to 10	828	49.3
11 to 12	500	29.7
13 and Over	137	8.1
No Response	224	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.9EXPERIENCE IN SPECIAL SCHOOL SETTINGS

<u>School Type</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Technical/Special Opportunity School	407	21.7
Standard School Setting	1,090	58.2
Don't Know	376	20.1
No Response	32	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.10SCHOOL DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Suspended	155	8.2
Expelled	31	1.6
Suspended and Expelled	72	3.8
None of the Above	650	34.5
Don't Know	978	51.9
No Response	19	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.11
COMMUNITY POPULATION WHERE CLIENT LIVES

<u>Population</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
500,000 and Up	504	26.8
100,000 to 499,999	483	25.6
50,000 to 99,999	204	10.8
10,000 to 49,999	274	14.5
5,000 to 9,999	107	5.7
1,000 to 4,999	148	7.9
Less Than 1,000	164	8.7
No Response	21	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.12
LIVING FACILITIES AT START OF THE PROBATION ORDER

<u>Living Facilities</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detached	956	50.6
Duplex or Row	152	8.1
Apartment or Condominium	386	20.4
Flat or Room, with Cooking	149	7.9
Single Room	53	2.8
Hostel	30	1.6
Correctional Institution	7	0.4
No Fixed Abode	22	1.2
Don't Know	133	7.0
No Response	17	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.13STATUS OF NEIGHBOURHOOD
IN WHICH THE CLIENT LIVES

<u>Neighbourhood Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Upper Class	18	1.0
Upper-Middle Class	227	12.1
Lower-Middle Class	1,105	58.9
Lower Class	384	20.5
Lower-Lower Class	44	2.3
Don't Know	98	5.2
No Response	29	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.14EARNINGS DURING THE YEAR
PRECEDING THE START OF THE PROBATION ORDER

<u>Earnings</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Did Not Work	254	13.5
Under \$1,000	259	13.8
\$1,000 to \$2,999	265	14.1
\$3,000 to \$5,999	296	15.7
\$6,000 to \$8,999	311	16.5
\$9,000 to \$11,999	151	8.0
\$12,000 to \$19,999	110	5.8
\$20,000 and Over	8	0.4
Don't Know	228	12.1
No Response	23	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.15YEARLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME AT PROBATION TERMINATION

<u>Household Income</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
\$8,000 or less	433	22.9
\$8,001 to \$15,000	682	36.1
\$15,001 to \$25,000	304	16.1
\$25,001 or Over	31	1.6
Can't Even Guess	344	18.2
Not Applicable	95	5.0
No Response	16	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.16RELIANCE ON SOCIAL ASSISTANCE
INCOME BY CLIENT'S FAMILY

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Frequent Use	369	19.5
Infrequent Use	1,295	68.6
Don't Know	225	11.9
No Response	16	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.17COHESIVENESS OF THE CLIENT'S FAMILY

<u>Cohesiveness</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very Cohesive	454	24.2
Somewhat Cohesive	632	33.7
Not Cohesive	519	27.7
Don't Know	270	14.4
No Response	30	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.18
LIVING COMPANIONS AT
THE TIME OF THE PROBATION ORDER

<u>Lived With</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
With Both Parents	685	36.4
With Mother Only	170	9.0
With Father Only	47	2.5
Mother & Other Male	14	0.7
Father & Other Female	7	0.4
Foster Home	17	0.9
Institute or Group Home	27	1.4
Relatives or Friends	130	6.9
Common-law, Married	417	22.2
With Friends	151	8.0
Alone	173	9.2
Don't Know	43	2.3
No Response	24	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.19
FAMILY INSTABILITY DURING THE CLIENT'S CHILDHOOD

<u>Indicators of Instability</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Don't Know</u> <u>No Response</u>
Client was Taken From Parents	(134) 7.0%	(1,335) 70.1%	(436) 22.9%
Client was Adopted	(56) 2.9%	(1,508) 79.2%	(341) 17.9%
Client was Abandoned	(48) 2.5%	(1,462) 76.7%	(395) 20.8%
One or Both Parents Died	(254) 13.3%	(1,329) 69.8%	(322) 16.9%
Parents Divorced or Separated	(385) 20.2%	(1,172) 61.5%	(348) 18.3%
Remarriage or New Common-law Union	(251) 13.2%	(1,229) 64.5%	(425) 22.3%
Parents Separated Intermittently	(186) 9.8%	(1,122) 58.9%	(597) 31.3%
Prolonged Absence of a Parent	(304) 16.0%	(1,047) 55.0%	(554) 29.0%

TABLE 4.20CRIMINAL OR DELINQUENCY RECORD OF THE CLIENT'S FATHER

<u>Father's Background</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Has Record	150	7.9
Has No Record	1,115	59.0
Don't Know	625	33.1
No Response	15	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.21CRIMINAL OR DELINQUENCY RECORD OF THE CLIENT'S MOTHER

<u>Mother's Background</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Has Record	41	2.2
Has No Record	1,268	67.1
Don't Know	581	30.7
No Response	15	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.22CRIMINAL OR DELINQUENCY RECORD OF THE CLIENT'S SIBLINGS

<u>Siblings' Background</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Has Record	342	18.1
Has No Record	909	48.1
Don't Know	584	30.7
Not Applicable	56	3.0
No Response	14	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.23CLIENT'S CONTACTS WITH CRIMINALS/DELINQUENTS

<u>Type of Contacts</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Is a "Lone Wolf"	256	13.6
Mixes with Criminals	435	23.0
Mixes with Non-Criminals	589	31.2
No Predominant Pattern	434	23.0
Don't Know	175	9.3
No Response	16	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 4.24HOW LEISURE TIME IS SPENT

<u>Leisure Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Productive, Organized Use	904	48.1
Aimless Use	667	35.5
Don't Know	309	16.4
No Response	25	-
Total	1,905	100.0

EMPLOYMENT

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

While 18.4% of the probationers were considered to be off the labour market with good reason (e.g., homemaker, student), fully 33.3% were frequently unemployed, though able to work.

When probation was terminated, 45.7% were employed full-time and 6.8% were employed part-time. This is a rather low level of employment, considering the fact that most of this population was male and beyond school age.

Those who were employed at termination seem to have had a significantly different job history from those who were not employed. For example, 16.7% of those who were employed at termination had worked at their current job for two years or more. In contrast, only 5.6% of those who were not working at termination, had worked on their most recent job for a period of two years or more. At the other end of the scale, these figures were reversed. Only 5.8% of those who were employed at termination, had held their present job for less than one month. In contrast, 16.8% of those who were not working at termination had held their most recent job for a period of less than one month.

OCCUPATION AND EMPLOYMENT

In examining the present (or most recent) occupation of the probationers, it was interesting to note the lack of differences between those who were, or were not, employed at termination. For example, in both groups, approximately 21.0% were labourers, 5% were service workers, 2% were sales workers, and so on. There were a few per cent more craftsmen than operatives in the employed group. However, it seems clear that those who had jobs were not in any "higher demand", or more skilled, occupations than those without jobs.

Of the entire population, only 58% were employed and/or available for employment at the time probation was terminated. Those who were unavailable simply because they preferred to "get by" without working constituted 7.1% of the population. Of those who were not available for work for good reason, 17.6% were either students or homemakers, and 5.3% were physically or mentally unfit for work.

Among those who were working at termination, fully 33.3% had spent less than one month looking for a job, while 55.7% had found a job in less than 3 months. On the other hand, among those who were not working at the termination of probation, most (53.9%) had been unemployed for 3 months or more.

TABLE 5.1USUAL EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE CLIENT

<u>Employment Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Seldom Unemployed, Seldom Changes Employer	544	28.6
Seldom Unemployed, Often Changes Employer	251	13.2
Seasonal Worker, but Otherwise Employed in "Off-Season"	78	4.1
Often Unemployed, Actively Seeks Employment	253	13.3
Often Unemployed, and Shows a Lack of Concern	238	12.5
Almost Always Unemployed, but Able to Work	142	7.5
Off the Labour Market (e.g. Homemaker, Student, Retired)	351	18.4
Don't Know/No Response	48	2.5
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 5.2EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TERMINATION OF PROBATION

<u>Employment Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Employed Full-Time	871	45.7
Employed Part-Time	130	6.8
Seeks Full-Time Employment	214	11.2
Seeks Part-Time Employment	56	2.9
Not Seeking Employment	528	27.7
Don't Know/No Response	106	5.6
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 5.3

LENGTH OF TIME EMPLOYED ON CURRENT, OR MOST RECENT, JOB

<u>Time Worked</u>	<u>Employed At Termination</u>	<u>Not Working At Termination</u>
Less Than One Month	(50) 5.8%	(105) 16.8%
One to Three Months	(127) 14.6%	(206) 32.9%
Three to Six Months	(207) 23.8%	(160) 25.6%
Six Months to One Year	(183) 21.1%	(90) 14.3%
One to Two Years	(157) 18.0%	(30) 4.8%
Two Years and Over	(145) 16.7%	(35) 5.6%
Not Applicable/Don't Know	(1,036) -	(1,279) -
Total	(1,905) 100.0%	(1,905) 100.0%

TABLE 5.4

OCCUPATION OF THOSE CURRENTLY, OR PREVIOUSLY, EMPLOYED

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Employed At Termination</u>	<u>Not Working At Termination</u>
Professional, Technical	(17) 0.9%	(11) 0.6%
Managers, Officials and Proprietors	(19) 1.0%	(5) 0.3%
Technical/Administrative Clerical	(4) 0.2%	(5) 0.3%
Clerical/Filing	(37) 1.9%	(21) 1.1%
Sales	(30) 1.6%	(29) 1.5%
Craftsmen, Foremen	(139) 7.3%	(43) 2.3%
Operatives	(142) 7.5%	(58) 3.0%
Service	(88) 4.6%	(101) 5.3%
Labourers	(400) 21.0%	(400) 21.0%
Private Household	(8) 0.4%	(22) 1.1%
Don't Know	(2) 0.1%	(16) 0.8%
Employed at Termination	- -	(886) 46.5%
Unemployed at Termination	(710) 37.3%	- -
No Previous or Current Occupation	(309) 16.2%	(309) 16.2%
Total	(1,905) 100.0%	(1,905) 100.0%

TABLE 5.5

REASON FOR NOT BEING AVAILABLE
FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AT TERMINATION

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Homemaker	86	4.5
Student	249	13.1
Recuperating (Accident, Illness)	21	1.1
Chronically Ill	31	1.6
Depressed/Disturbed/Retarded	49	2.6
Prefers to "Get By" Without Working	135	7.1
None of the Above Reasons	208	10.9
Employed	1,047	55.0
Available for Employment	58	3.0
Don't Know	21	1.1
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 5.6

REASON GIVEN FOR LEAVING
PREVIOUS FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Laid Off	386	36.8
Quit, No Health Problems	401	38.2
Quit, For Health Reasons	99	9.4
Fired or "Told to Resign"	164	15.6
Not Applicable	523	-
Don't Know	247	-
No Response	85	-
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 5.7TIME SPENT IN SEEKING THE JOB HELD AT TERMINATION

<u>Job Search Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less Than One Month	293	33.3
One Month, Less Than Three	199	22.4
Three Months or More	141	15.8
Not Employed at Termination	1,081	-
Don't Know	254	28.5
Total	1,905	100.0

TABLE 5.8TIME SPENT NOT WORKING BETWEEN
LAST FULL-TIME JOB AND TERMINATION OF PROBATION

<u>Non-Working Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less Than One Month	60	7.7
One Month, Less Than Three	170	21.9
Three Months or More	419	53.9
Don't Know	129	16.5
Not Applicable	1,127	-
Total	1,905	100.0

CRIMINAL HISTORY

BACKGROUND

Many probationers had a record of being in legal difficulties prior to the offence for which they were put on probation. For example, fully 12.2% of the probationers had a delinquency record of some sort before they were age 16.

It is not surprising that, due to the early involvement of many probationers with the law, that the Probation Officer's knowledge of an individual's criminal history was sometimes less than complete. In fact, in only 69.5% of the cases, did the Probation Officer report that they had an "accurate and complete" knowledge of the probationer's criminal history.

PRE-PROBATION OFFENCES

Prior to the probation offence, 29.7% of the probationers had been convicted of crimes against property. Crimes against public order and peace were committed by 11.7% of the population. And, crimes against the person were committed by 6.7% of the population.

Some individuals had been convicted more than once, at different times, and thus had received more than one sentence prior to the probation sentence. In fact, 15.1% of the population had received at least one prior sentence and 10.5% of the population had received two or more prior sentences.

In examining the type of most recent sentence received by this group of probationers, it is interesting to note that 11.8% had been on probation, but a significant proportion (4.2%) had served a jail or prison term.

OFFENCES LEADING TO PROBATION

Data were collected on the type of offence for which the client had been placed on probation. While over 55 different types of offences were recorded, almost 50% of the offences committed could be accounted for by the following: breaking and entering (15.2%), theft over and under \$200 (26.5%), possession over and under \$200 (7.9%), and drug offences (7.4%).

In most cases (73.5%), an individual was placed on probation for having been convicted of one offence. However, 16.7% were placed on probation for having been convicted of two offences and 4.0% were convicted for having committed three or more offences.

TABLE 6.1PROBATION OFFICER'S KNOWLEDGE
OF CLIENT'S CRIMINAL HISTORY

<u>Knowledge of History</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Accurate and Complete Knowledge	1,301	69.5%
Most Complete, Some Significant Gaps	289	15.4%
Not at all Complete or Accurate	133	7.1%
Know Only About Recent Offence	150	8.0%
No Response	32	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 6.2AGE AT FIRST RECORDED
EVIDENCE OF DIFFICULTY WITH THE LAW

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Under 11	29	1.8%
12 to 13	44	2.7%
14 to 15	124	7.7%
16 to 17	582	36.1%
18 to 19	342	21.2%
20 to 29	335	20.8%
30 to 49	126	7.8%
Over 50	31	1.9%
Don't Know	292	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 6.3

PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS BY TYPE OF CRIME

<u>Type of Crimes</u>	<u>Aware of No Convictions</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Two or More</u>	<u>Don't Know No Response</u>
Crimes Against the Person*	(1,775) 93.3%	(85) 4.5%	(42) 2.2%	(3) -
Crimes Against Property	(1,339) 70.3%	(316) 16.6%	(249) 13.1%	(1) -
Crimes Against Public Morals and Decency	(1,861) 97.7%	(25) 1.3%	(19) 1.0%	(1) -
Crimes Against Public Order and Peace	(1,680) 88.2%	(150) 7.9%	(74) 3.9%	(1) -
Liquor Offences	(1,746) 91.8%	(63) 3.3%	(94) 4.9%	(2) -
Traffic Offences	(1,778) 93.5%	(65) 3.4%	(59) 3.1%	(3) -
Status Offences	(1,888) 99.2%	(8) 0.4%	(8) 0.4%	(1) -

*All rows sum to 100%

TABLE 6.4

NUMBER OF SENTENCES RECEIVED FOR OFFENCES
COMMITTED PRIOR TO THAT LEADING TO THE PROBATION ORDER

<u>Number of Sentences</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
One Sentence	287	15.1%
Two Sentences	95	5.0%
Three Sentences	40	2.1%
Four Sentences	23	1.2%
Five Sentences or More	41	2.2%
No Previous Sentence	1,419	74.5%
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 6.5

TYPE OF MOST RECENT SENTENCE

<u>Type of Sentence</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Suspended Sentence	52	2.7%
Probation	224	11.8%
Fine	107	5.6%
Prison	79	4.2%
Combination of Above	24	1.2%
No Previous Sentence	1,419	74.5%
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 6.6

TYPE OF OFFENCE COMMITTED
WHICH LED TO THE PROBATION ORDER

<u>Type of Offence</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Offences Against the Person</u>		
Assault	88	4.6
Assault/Wounding	35	1.8
Other Offences Against the Person	13	0.7
<u>Offences Against Property</u>		
Break and Enter	289	15.2
Damage to Property	74	3.9
Fraud, Forgery	126	6.6
Possession: \$200 and Under	77	4.1
Possession: Over \$200	74	3.9
Robbery	17	0.9
Theft: \$200 and Under	371	19.5
Theft: Over \$200	134	7.0
Other Offences Against Property	64	3.4
<u>Offences Against Public Morals and Decency</u>		
All Offences Against Public Morals and Decency	60	3.2
<u>Offences Against Public Order and Peace</u>		
Breach of Probation	9	0.5
Breach of Recognizance	10	0.5
Marijuana	96	5.0
Other Restricted Drugs	46	2.4
Carrying Unlawful Weapons	36	1.9
Disorderly Conduct/Public Mischief	74	3.9
Other Offences Against Public Order and Peace	18	0.9
<u>Liquor Offences</u>		
Driving while Impaired	22	1.2
Other Liquor Offences	16	0.8
<u>Traffic Offences</u>		
All Traffic Offences	16	0.8
Other Offences	29	1.5
No Response	111	5.8
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 6.7
NUMBER OF OFFENCES
COMMITTED WHICH LED TO THE PROBATION ORDER

<u>Number of Offences</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
One Offence	1,400	73.5%
Two Offences	318	16.7%
Three Offences	50	2.6%
Four Offences	17	0.9%
Five Offences or more	9	0.5%
No Response	111	5.8%
Total	1,905	100.0%

PROBATION PROCESS AND PROBLEMS

TIME

Most probation orders (59.2%) were set for a period of 12 months or less. However, the actual amount of time spent on probation, prior to termination of the order, averaged somewhat less than the time set in the original order. For example, 65.8% of the probation orders were actually terminated in a period of 12 months or less. Conversely, only 4.1% of the probation orders were extended, either by extending the original order or by making a new order.

Only 74.3% of the probation orders actually terminated because the original period set for probation expired. Most (20.8%) of the remaining cases were terminated early because of the Court's agreement with the Probation Officer that the probationer had demonstrated, through his or her attitudes and/or behaviours, that surveillance for the full period of the probation order would be unnecessary.

THE PROCESS

The Probation Officer may vary considerably the amount of time he or she spends with a probationer between the beginning and the termination of the Probation Order. The data indicate that interaction between the Probation Officer and the probationer was more frequent at the beginning of the Probation Order when the Probation Officer was actively involved in trying to assist the probationer in some way. Before the Probation Order was terminated, however, the interaction between probationer and Probation Officer frequently amounted to little more than the strict adherence to the legal requirements of the Probation Order, such as reporting to the Probation Officer once a month. For example, 6 months after the start of the Probation Order, 37.2% of the probationers were no longer actively involved with their Probation Officer. In 15.1% of the cases, the Probation Order was terminated 6 months or less after it had been made. In the remaining 22.1% of the cases, the Probation Order was still in effect. However, in these cases the Probation Officer was no longer actively working with the probationer, but was merely attending to the minimal legal requirements of the Probation Order.

Probationers differed significantly in the amount of supervision the Probation Officer felt they required. Probation Officers felt that 17.5% of the probationers required intensive supervision while 9% required no supervision at all.

It would be expected that the decision of the Court concerning the length of the probation period should reflect the amount of supervision required by the probationer. This seemed in fact to be the case. Of those individuals who were on probation for 6 months or less, only 6.9% were reported by the Probation Officer to have required intense supervision. Conversely, among those who were placed on probation for a period of 19 to 24 months, 24.7% were judged to have required intensive supervision during the probation period.

The Probation Officers were also asked to indicate the number of months which they had actually actively worked with the client. The relationship between this period of time and the judgements as

to the intensity of supervision required, were similar to those noted above. That is, among those individuals with whom the Probation Officer actively worked for a period of 6 months or less, 34.5% required intense or medium supervision, while 65.5% required only minimal or no supervision. Conversely, for those individuals with whom the Probation Officer worked for a period of 19 to 24 months, 84.4% required intense or medium supervision, while only 15.6% required minimal or no supervision.

THE PROBLEMS

Probation Officers were asked to identify the areas in the probationers' life which represented a problem. These might include problems in finding employment, maintaining good relationships with friends, avoiding further criminal activity, and so on.

The most frequently cited problems were in relationships with friends (73.7%), in the use of leisure time (74.0%), and in maintaining or gaining self-confidence (74.0%). Those problem areas which were cited least frequently included relationships with co-workers (53.0%), finding acceptable living quarters (53.8%) and progressing with school work (31.8%).

Improvement/ Deterioration

The Probation Officers were also asked to indicate those areas in the probationers' life which, during the period of probation, had become less of a problem than had been the case at the beginning of the probation period. Probationers were reported to be most likely to improve in self-confidence (34.7%), and in abstaining from further criminal activity (33.2%), and in their relationships with authority figures (30.7%).

Probation Officers were also asked to indicate those areas which became more of a problem for the probationer during the probation period, than had been the case at the start of the probation period. The area most frequently cited as becoming a problem was that of finding employment (11.7%). Another area which was likely to become a problem was that of committing further criminal offences (11.3%). A third frequently cited problem area was that of drug or alcohol abuse (9.0%).

Important Problems

Probation Officers were asked to identify those problem areas which they felt were most important for judging the success or failure of the client's progress during the probation period. Those areas which were considered to be most important for determining whether or not the client would be successful included the client's ability to find employment (49.3%), the avoidance of further criminal activity (44.1%), and the control, or avoidance of, drugs or alcohol (33.7%).

It is obvious from the findings stated above that probationers are frequently successful at avoiding further criminal activity, and that Probation Officers consider this to be an important factor in judging whether or not the probation period was successful. It is interesting to note, however, that of the clients who experienced problems during the probation period, one of the more frequently encountered problems was in committing further crimes.

In each of the problem areas, approximately 10% of the Probation Officers felt that they could not state whether or not the probationer had a problem in that area. This is not surprising since approximately one-fifth (21.9%) of the Probation Officer's cases were individuals who had been transferred from another Probation Officer or from another office. Thus Probation Officers often did not have the opportunity to learn about each probationer's background in detail. It is quite conceivable that an individual could have had a problem and solved it, before the present Probation Officer was assigned the case.

During the course of their work, the Probation Officer often found it necessary to contact social agencies concerning the probationer. In 26.2% of these cases, the Probation Officer had made repeated contacts with social agencies on behalf of the client.

TABLE 7.1TIME EXTENSION OF THE ORIGINAL PROBATION ORDER

<u>Extension</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Original Order Extended	20	1.1%
Extension by New Order	57	3.0%
No Extension of Time	1,792	95.9%
No Response	36	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 7.2REASON FOR TERMINATION OF THE ORDER

<u>Reason Given</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Expiry of Probation Period	1,376	74.3%
Court Agreed, no Need for Continuing Surveillance or Improvement	164	8.9%
Court Agreed, Client Greatly Improved	221	11.9%
Court Agreed, Client Refuses to Cooperate with Probation Officer	22	1.2%
Committed to Correctional Institution for New Offence	43	2.3%
Committed to Correctional Institution for "Failure to Comply"	18	1.0%
Original Order Revoked, New Order Made	8	0.4%
No Response	53	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 7.3

PERIOD OF TIME
FOR WHICH THE PROBATION ORDER WAS MADE

<u>Period of Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
6 Months or Less	233	12.3%
7 to 12 Months	886	46.9%
13 to 18 Months	257	13.6%
19 to 24 Months	454	24.0%
Over 24 Months	58	3.2%
No Response	17	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 7.4

ACTUAL TIME SPENT
ON PROBATION TO TERMINATION OF THE ORDER

<u>Period of Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
6 Months or Less	283	15.1%
7 to 12 Months	952	50.7%
13 to 18 Months	317	16.9%
19 to 24 Months	290	15.4%
Over 24 Months	36	1.9%
No Response	27	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 7.5

NUMBER OF MONTHS ACTUALLY SPENT
BY THE PROBATION OFFICER IN "WORKING WITH" THE CLIENT

<u>Active Working Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Three Months or Less	329	18.7%
4 to 6 Months	326	18.5%
7 to 9 Months	257	14.6%
10 to 12 Months	464	26.4%
13 to 18 Months	214	12.1%
Over 18 Months	171	9.7%
No Response	144	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 7.6

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION REQUIRED BY THE CLIENT

<u>Supervision</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Intensive Supervision	330	17.5%
Medium Supervision	746	39.5%
Minimal Supervision	643	34.0%
No Supervision Required	169	9.0%
No Response	17	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 7.7

LEVEL OF SUPERVISION AND LENGTH OF THE PROBATION ORDER

<u>Supervision</u>	<u>6 Months or Less</u>		<u>7-12 Months</u>		<u>13-18 Months</u>		<u>19-24 Months</u>		<u>Over 24 Months</u>	
Intense Supervision	16	4.9%	120	36.5%	63	19.1%	112	34.0%	18	5.5%
Medium Supervision	60	8.1%	341	45.8%	106	14.2%	210	28.2%	28	3.8%
Minimal Supervision	107	16.7%	337	52.5%	77	12.0%	110	17.1%	11	1.7%
No Supervision	49	29.0%	87	51.5%	10	5.9%	22	32.0%	1	0.6%

$$\chi^2 = 157.75 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 7.8

LEVEL OF SUPERVISION AND
TIME SPENT ACTIVELY WORKING WITH PROBATIONER

<u>Supervision</u>	<u>6 Months or Less</u>		<u>7-12 Months</u>		<u>13-18 Months</u>		<u>19-24 Months</u>		<u>Over 24 Months</u>	
Intense Supervision	67	22.0%	60	19.7%	96	31.6%	38	12.5%	43	14.1%
Medium Supervision	159	22.8%	187	26.8%	206	29.5%	81	11.6%	65	9.3%
Minimal Supervision	283	47.3%	170	28.4%	110	18.4%	22	3.7%	13	2.2%
No Supervision	146	90.7%	10	6.2%	5	3.1%	0	0	0	0

$$\chi^2 = 387.86 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 7.9

INCIDENCE OF PROBLEMS AND CHANGE DURING PROBATION PERIOD

<u>Problem Areas</u>	<u>Not A Problem</u>		<u>Some Improvement</u>		<u>No Change</u>		<u>Some Deterioration</u>		<u>Don't Know</u>		<u>No Response</u>	
Relationship with Friends*	(496)	26.3%	(383)	20.3%	(682)	36.1%	(95)	5.0%	(232)	12.3%	(17)	-
Relationship with Parents	(579)	30.8%	(385)	20.5%	(511)	27.2%	(144)	7.7%	(263)	14.0%	(23)	-
Relationship with Co-workers	(875)	47.0%	(160)	8.6%	(357)	19.2%	(57)	3.1%	(413)	22.2%	(43)	-
Relationship with Friends of the Opposite Sex	(627)	33.3%	(244)	12.9%	(416)	22.1%	(84)	4.5%	(514)	27.3%	(20)	-
Relationship with Authority Figures	(598)	31.7%	(579)	30.7%	(468)	24.8%	(157)	8.3%	(85)	4.5%	(18)	-
Use of Leisure Time	(491)	26.0%	(443)	23.5%	(608)	32.2%	(144)	7.6%	(201)	10.7%	(18)	-
Acceptable Living Quarters	(873)	46.2%	(305)	16.1%	(504)	26.7%	(109)	5.8%	(99)	5.2%	(15)	-
Progress in Employment	(611)	32.7%	(542)	29.0%	(431)	23.1%	(218)	11.7%	(65)	3.5%	(38)	-
Progress in School Work	(1,181)	68.2%	(186)	10.7%	(168)	9.7%	(59)	3.4%	(137)	7.9%	(174)	-
Drug/Alcohol Use	(723)	38.5%	(433)	23.0%	(371)	19.7%	(169)	9.0%	(184)	9.8%	(25)	-
Self-confidence	(491)	26.0%	(654)	34.7%	(550)	29.2%	(81)	4.3%	(109)	5.8%	(20)	-
Control of Hostility	(695)	36.9%	(552)	29.3%	(391)	20.7%	(142)	7.5%	(106)	5.6%	(19)	-
Avoiding New Crimes	(670)	35.5%	(626)	33.2%	(307)	16.3%	(213)	11.3%	(70)	3.7%	(19)	-

*All rows sum to 100%

TABLE 7.10

AREAS THAT WERE CONSIDERED
TO BE IMPORTANT FOR SUCCESS OR FAILURE DURING PROBATION

<u>Problem Areas</u>	<u>Very Important</u>		<u>Fairly Important</u>		<u>Not Important</u>		<u>Not Applicable</u>		<u>No Response</u>	
Relationship with Friends*	(462)	24.5%	(741)	39.4%	(470)	25.0%	(209)	11.1%	(23)	-
Relationship with Parents	(421)	22.4%	(627)	33.3%	(467)	24.8%	(366)	19.5%	(24)	-
Relationship with Co-workers	(172)	9.2%	(488)	26.1%	(609)	32.5%	(604)	32.2%	(32)	-
Relationship with Friends of the Opposite Sex	(271)	14.2%	(546)	29.0%	(657)	34.9%	(409)	21.7%	(22)	-
Relationship with Authority Figures	(571)	30.4%	(765)	40.7%	(401)	21.0%	(144)	7.7%	(24)	-
Use of Leisure Time	(622)	33.1%	(764)	40.6%	(346)	18.4%	(148)	7.9%	(25)	-
Acceptable Living Quarter:	(310)	16.5%	(639)	34.0%	(624)	33.2%	(307)	16.3%	(25)	-
Progress in Employment	(922)	49.3%	(456)	24.4%	(203)	10.8%	(290)	15.5%	(34)	-
Progress in School Work	(229)	12.7%	(187)	10.4%	(293)	16.3%	(1,090)	60.6%	(104)	-
Drug/Alcohol Use	(698)	37.3%	(465)	24.8%	(366)	19.6%	(343)	18.3%	(33)	-
Self-confidence	(607)	32.3%	(764)	40.7%	(328)	17.5%	(176)	9.5%	(28)	-
Control of Hostility	(656)	35.0%	(529)	28.2%	(371)	19.8%	(318)	17.0%	(31)	-
Avoiding New Crimes	(826)	44.1%	(479)	25.6%	(321)	17.1%	(246)	13.1%	(33)	-

*All rows sum to 100%

TABLE 7.11CLIENTS WHO ARE TRANSFER CASES

<u>Source of Transfers</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
From Within Ontario	185	9.8%
From Another Province	12	0.6%
From Another Country	1	0.1%
From Another Probation Officer	215	11.4%
Not a Transfer Case	1,472	78.1%
No Response	20	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 7.12FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH
SOCIAL AGENCIES CONCERNING THE CLIENT

<u>Contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Frequently	177	9.4%
Several Times	317	16.8%
Seldom	460	24.4%
Never	932	49.4%
No Response	19	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 7.13SETTING THE CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

<u>Probation Conditions</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Set Entirely by Court	1,706	92.6%
Some Set by Court, Others by Officer	131	7.1%
Set By Probation Officer	3	0.2%
Don't Know	3	0.1%
No Response	60	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

PROBATION OFFENCESFAILURE TO COMPLY

Very few probation orders were alike. While almost every probation order contained the conditions that the probationer should report to a Probation Officer (97.2%), there were few other areas of strong agreement. The next three most frequently mentioned conditions of probation were that the probationer should remain in the jurisdiction (39.0%), find/maintain employment (35.4%) and avoid associating with specific individuals (30.9%).

One condition of probation which is so basic to the sentence that it is often not written in as a specific condition is that the probationer should "keep the peace". In only 58.6% of the cases did the Probation Officer indicate that this was a condition of probation. It is felt that this low response rate probably reflects an interpretation on the part of some Probation Officers that they should note only those conditions of probation which were specifically set by the Court for a particular individual. Perhaps many viewed the condition of "keeping the peace" as being just an integral part of the sentence of probation.

The conditions of probation violated most frequently included those of restitution (15.5%), avoidance of alcohol (13.4%), failure to adhere to a curfew (9.9%), and failure to report to the Probation Officer (9.2%). Of course, these figures represent percentages of only those individuals whose probation order actually included these conditions.

In many cases, it appeared that the Probation Officers lacked either the evidence or the inclination to lay charges against the probationer when violations occur. For example, of the 170 cases who failed to report to the Probation Officer, only 73 had charges laid against them by the officer. In 64 cases in which abuse of alcohol occurred, in violation of the probation order, charges were laid in 14 cases. However, the probationer is usually convicted, once the Probation Officer lays charges against him or her. For example, charges were laid, for alcohol abuse in 14 cases, and convictions ensued in 15 cases (of course, the probationer can be convicted as a result of charges which are laid by someone other than the Probation Officer). Convictions occurred in 10 cases out of 13 cases in which the probationer failed to reside at a specified residence. Also, 63 convictions were made when there were 73 cases in which charges were laid for failure to report to the Probation Officer.

In some cases, the Probation Officer did not charge the probationer with failure to comply because it was anticipated that the Court would be either "too easy" or "too hard" on the probationer (4.1%). In 7.8% of the cases, the Probation Officer did not charge the probationer when justified because the Probation Order was almost expired or because the effort would simply not be worth the trouble.

When the probationer did receive a conviction, there were many cases (26.2%) in which the Probation Officer felt that the sanctions imposed by the Court were either too severe, too lenient, or inappropriate.

CONVICTIONS AND CHARGES

During probation, approximately 70% of the probationers were not charged with a new offence or with failing to comply with the conditions of the Probation Order. It should be noted that this figure can only be approximate, since there are no province-wide provisions for informing Probation Officers about the charges which may be laid against their clients. Also, it must be kept in mind that in at least 20% of the cases, the probationer was a transfer case. This would further reduce the probability that the Probation Officer would have completely accurate information about each client.

Approximately 30% of the probationers had charges laid against them and 22% were actually convicted of one or more offences during this period. In fact, 9.8% of the probationers were convicted of two or more offences and 6.4% of the probationers made four or more court appearances as a result of new charges laid during the probation period.

While the sample of probationers studied were convicted of well over 50 different offences while on probation, six of these accounted for almost 60% of all of the convictions. These offences were: break and enter (10.4%), theft over and under \$200 (14.5%), breach of probation (9.5%), breach of recognizance (5.6%), and violation of drug (7.3%) and liquor (10.9%) laws.

TABLE 8.1

ITEMS INCLUDED IN PROBATION ORDERS,
AND FREQUENCY OF VIOLATIONS, CHARGES AND LEGAL ACTIONS

<u>Summary of Conditions of Probation</u>	<u>Condition of Probation **</u>		<u>Violations Occurred ***</u>		<u>Charges Laid ***</u>		<u>Convictions*</u>	
Restitution	(316)	16.6%	(49)	15.5%	(33)	10.4%	(34)	10.8%
Report to Probation Officer	(1,851)	97.2%	(170)	9.2%	(73)	3.9%	(63)	3.4%
Support Dependents	(72)	3.8%	(4)	5.6%	(0)	0	(0)	0
No Alcohol	(478)	25.1%	(64)	13.4%	(14)	2.9%	(15)	3.1%
No Weapon	(108)	5.7%	(2)	1.1%	(1)	0.9%	(0)	0
Remain in Jurisdiction	(743)	39.0%	(24)	3.2%	(1)	0.1%	(9)	1.2%
Find/Maintain Employment	(675)	35.4%	(30)	4.4%	(1)	0.1%	(2)	0.3%
Adhere to Curfew	(253)	13.3%	(25)	9.9%	(5)	2.0%	(5)	2.0%
Not Enter Forbidden Premises	(249)	13.1%	(12)	4.8%	(3)	1.2%	(2)	0.8%
Avoid Specific Persons	(589)	30.9%	(31)	5.3%	(2)	0.3%	(3)	0.5%
Reside at Specified Residence	(403)	21.2%	(24)	6.0%	(13)	3.2%	(10)	2.5%
Attend Treatment Facility	(193)	10.1%	(4)	2.1%	(2)	1.0%	(2)	1.0%
Attend School	(170)	8.9%	(3)	1.8%	(0)	0	(1)	0.6%
Not Own/Operate Vehicle	(57)	3.0%	(5)	8.8%	(0)	0	(1)	1.8%
Avoid Specific Neighbourhoods	(31)	1.6%	(1)	3.2%	(0)	0	(0)	0
Keep the Peace	(1,117)	58.6%	(91)	8.1%	(25)	2.2%	(39)	3.5%
Other Conditions	(216)	11.3%	(9)	4.2%	(3)	1.4%	(2)	0.9%

*a conviction may result from charges laid by someone other than Probation Officer

**percentage of total 1,905

***percentage of those with condition

TABLE 8.2DECISION OF THE PROBATION OFFICER TO CHARGE
WITH "FAILURE TO COMPLY" DUE TO JUDGE

<u>Decisions</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No Charge Was Ever Justified	1,525*	84.3%
Always Charged Client, if Justified	210	11.6%
Did Not Charge, Because Judge Would be "Too Easy"	32	1.8%
Did Not Charge, Because Judge Would be "Too Hard"	41	2.3%
No Response	97	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 8.3DECISION OF THE PROBATION OFFICER
TO CHARGE FOR "FAILURE TO COMPLY"
FOR REASONS OTHER THAN POSSIBLE SANCTIONS

<u>Decisions</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No Charge was Ever Justified	1,496*	82.2%
Always Charged if Justified	184	10.1%
Did Not Charge Because Probation Order was Almost Expired	65	3.6%
Did Not Charge Because the Effort Would Not be Worth It	76	4.1%
No Response	84	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

*The precise number of responses in this category differs somewhat for each of these questions. The differences are small and are probably due in part to respondent error, and in part to the different interpretations of the term "justified" which could reasonably be made depending upon the slightly different context of each question.

TABLE 8.4

PROBATION OFFICER'S PERCEPTIONS
OF SEVERITY OF SANCTIONS IMPOSED
AFTER CHARGING A CLIENT WITH "FAILURE TO COMPLY"

<u>Perception of Sanctions</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No Charge Ever Justified	1,507*	-
Sanctions too Severe	5	2.2%
Sanctions too Lenient	30	13.1%
Sanctions Inappropriate or Inconsistent	25	10.9%
Sanctions Were Fair & Appropriate	125	54.6%
Don't Know	44	19.2%
No Response	169	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

*See footnote on Page 8-4.

TABLE 8.5MONTHS, AFTER START OF THE PROBATION PERIOD,
BEFORE CHARGES LAID FOR A NEW OFFENCE

<u>Months</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Was Never Charged	1,154	69.1%
3 Months or Less	149	8.9%
3 Months to 12 Months	275	16.4%
12 Months or More	65	3.9%
Don't Know	27	1.6%
No Response	235	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 8.6NUMBER OF CHARGES LAID DURING PROBATION PERIOD

<u>Number</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No Charges Laid*	1,372	72.0%
One Charge	216	11.3%
Two to Three Charges	134	7.1%
Four or More Charges	80	4.2%
Don't Know	103	5.4%
Total	1,905	100.0%

*Due to the structure of the question, this includes the "No Response" category.

TABLE 8.7

NUMBER OF COURT APPEARANCES, AS A
RESULT OF NEW CHARGES LAID DURING THE PROBATION PERIOD

<u>Number of Appearances</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No Court Appearances	1,099	70.0%
One Court Appearance	96	6.1%
Two to Three Court Appearances	158	10.1%
Four or More	101	6.4%
Don't Know	117	7.4%
No Response	334	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 8.8

NUMBER OF OFFENCES FOR WHICH THE
CLIENT WAS CONVICTED DURING THE PROBATION PERIOD

<u>Convictions</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No Convictions	1,390	73.0%
One Conviction	208	10.9%
Two to Three Convictions	113	5.9%
Four or More Convictions	66	3.9%
Don't Know	128	6.3%
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 8.9

TYPE OF OFFENCES FOR WHICH THE CLIENT
WAS CONVICTED DURING THE PROBATION PERIOD

<u>Type of Offence</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Offences Against the Person</u>		
Assault	24	3.6
Assault/Wounding	9	1.4
Other Offences Against the Person	6	1.0
<u>Offences Against Property</u>		
Break and Enter	68	10.4
Damage to Property	10	1.5
Fraud, Forgery	35	5.4
Possession: \$200 and Under	24	3.7
Possession: Over \$200	12	1.8
Robbery	10	1.5
Theft: \$200 and Under	61	9.3
Theft: Over \$200	34	5.2
Other Offences Against Property	11	1.7
<u>Offences Against Public Morals and Decency</u>		
All Offences Against Public Morals and Decency	11	1.7
<u>Offences Against Public Order and Peace</u>		
Breach of Probation	62	9.5
Breach of Recognizance	37	5.6
Marijuana	33	5.0
Other Restricted Drugs	18	2.8
Carrying Unlawful Weapons	4	0.6
Disorderly Conduct/Public Mischief	35	5.4
Other Offences Against Public Order and Peace	16	2.4
<u>Liquor Offences</u>		
Driving while Impaired	24	3.7
Other Liquor Offences	47	7.1
<u>Traffic Offences</u>		
All Traffic Offences	44	6.7
Other Offences	20	3.0
Total	655*	100.0%

*This is the total number of offences which were found, by the Court, to have been committed by the 1,905 probationers. It is possible that some probationers committed several offences, and thus were represented more than once in the table.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PERCEIVED OUTCOME

The Probation Officers were asked if "on the whole, would you consider that by the time the Probation Order of this individual was terminated, he or she was viewed in your eyes as a success or a failure?". The Probation Officer rated the probationer into one of the following categories:

- Unqualified Success 1
- Qualified Success 2
- There was change, but I could not
say whether the overall results
lean more in the direction of success
or in the direction of failure 3
- Showed definite movement toward
being a success during the probation
period, but showed marked deteriora-
tion by termination 4
- Unqualified Lack of Success:
significant deterioration in attitudes
or behaviours which were not balanced
by improvements in other areas 5

JUDGING PROBATION SUCCESS

It is important to note that these judgements of probation success or failure were made about the probationer at a specific point in time - when the Probation Order was terminated. Also, the Probation Officer's judgement clearly reflects much more than a casual or subjective opinion. The data clearly indicate that probationers that were judged to be failures were most likely to be those who had had a number of charges laid against them during the probation period, had been convicted of further offences during the probation period, had exhibited an increase in various personal problems during the probation period, and who had required intensive supervision during the probation period. In short, the Probation Officer's perceived judgement of success or failure was an accurate presentation, and summary, of a wide variety of "hard data" indicators of probation outcome.

For purposes of this analysis, the probation outcome was considered to be either a success or failure depending upon the rating of the probationer given by the Probation Officer. A probationer was considered to be a "success" if he or she were given a rating of 1 or 2. Ratings of 3, 4, or 5 indicate that the Probation Officer saw no obvious signs of success, even "qualified success". For purposes of this report everyone receiving a rating of 3, 4, or 5 will be referred to as a probation "failure".

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

In this chapter, data are presented which demonstrate statistically significant relationships between certain personal characteristics and the outcome of probation. The relationship between each personal characteristic and the outcome (e.g., success or failure) of probation was examined by means of a Chi square analysis. Only those relationships between variables which were found to be statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level or less are presented in this report.

For those readers who are not familiar with the concept of "p values", it might be of some assistance to note that the concept refers to a measure of statistical reliability, or degree of confidence, which the researcher can have in the results. In this study, the Chi square analysis is used to determine whether or not there are any statistically significant differences in the incidence of probation success among one sub-group, compared to another sub-group (e.g., males versus female probationers).

For example, assume that 80% of all probationers in our sample completed probation successfully. Now, assume that the males in this sample have a success rate of 78% and the females have a success rate of 82%. Are these differences meaningful, or do they just represent random or chance deviations which normally occur when one compares data from parts of a population to a total population. That is, does the fact that the males in our sample are less successful than the females in our sample allow us to infer that the difference in success rates applies to the total population of Ontario probationers?

The Chi square analysis is used to determine whether such differences between sub-samples from one's larger sample are sufficiently large to warrant the interpretation that the difference is probably not due to mere chance variations in sampling. Assume that the Chi square analysis of the aforementioned data has a p value of 0.05. This means that the probability is only 5 out of 100 that the difference between 78% and 82% could have occurred by chance, and chance alone. If the p value were 0.001 this would mean that the difference between the values would be so large that it would occur by chance only 1 in 1,000 times.

In this chapter, data are presented which demonstrate statistically significant relationships between certain personal characteristics and the outcome of the probation.

Overall, the Probation Officers reported a success rate of 67.3% and a failure rate of 32.7%. Major deviations from these "averages" will be of particular interest in examining the following tables.

PERSONAL

There was a significant relationship between marital status and outcome. The data indicate that individuals who had previously married, or who were living in a common-law relationship, were less likely to be successful in probation than were those individuals who were married, or single.

Another significant relationship of interest exists between racial characteristics and outcome. There was one racial group which deviated significantly from the average, and this was the North American Indian/Metis group. They had a success rate of only 42.5%.

EDUCATION

The success rate among those who were either still enrolled in school or who have graduated from school was over 82%. Those who had quit school had success rates of approximately 61% - the interesting point being that it did not make any difference whether an individual quit school with an intent of returning or whether he or she quit school with no intent of returning.

Also, the more education a probationer had, the more likely he or she is to be successful on probation. For example, those who graduated from university had a success rate of 94.7%, while those who just completed grade school, had a success rate of only 62.6%. If the probationer had, to the knowledge of the Probation Officer, spent some time in a special opportunity or technical school, the success rate was much lower (50.4%) than among those who had just been enrolled in regular schools (76.7%).

LIVING CONDITIONS

The quality of housing in which the probationer lived, and the status of his or her neighbourhood, were important predictors of probation success. For example, those who lived in detached houses had a success rate of 71.0% - significantly higher than those living in a single room (57.7%) or those having no fixed abode (31.8%). Differences were even more striking when one examines the quality of the neighbourhood in which the probationer lived. Of those living in upper-class neighbourhoods, the success rate was 83.3%, while for those living in slum conditions, the success rate was only 31.8%.

As one would expect from the preceding results, the level of household income and personal income were closely related to probation success. The point of particular interest was not simply that there was a relationship, but rather that the predicted relationship was so extreme at the lowest income levels.

That is, for household incomes ranging anywhere between \$8,001 and \$25,000, the success rate averaged approximately 75%. However, if the annual household income was \$8,000 or less, the success rate dropped to 52.2%.

Similarly, when examining the probationer's personal earnings for the year preceding the start of the Probation Order, those earning more than \$9,000 a year had a success rate of around 80%, those earning between \$1,000 and \$9,000 a year had a success rate of around 70%, but those earning under \$1,000 a year had a success rate of only 52.3%. In a similar vein, it was of no surprise to note that when the family of a probationer relied frequently upon social assistance, the success rate was only 46.7%.

FAMILY

Probation outcome was also related to the individuals with whom the probationer was living at the time that the probation offence was committed. Probationers who were married, those who were living with both parents, or those living in a group home, all had success rates of approximately 70%. However, those living with one parent or in a foster home, had success rates of only approximately 50%.

The above data are in keeping with the finding that the level of family stability which the probationer experienced in childhood significantly affects probation outcome. Probation Officers were asked a series of questions about the client's childhood - such as whether as children they had been adopted or abandoned, whether their parents had been divorced or frequently separated, and so on (Appendix A). The number of "yes" responses were summed to provide an index of family stability.

For the highest levels of family stability in childhood, the success rate was approximately 70%. At the lower levels of stability, the success rate was approximately 40%. The level of family cohesiveness during the probation period was also a predictor of success, with a success rate among families which were not cohesive being 50.4%.

CRIMINAL CONTACTS

When a probationer's mother, father or siblings were known to have a delinquency or criminal record, success rates were only about 50%. Also, if the probationer tended to spend most of his leisure time aimlessly and tended to socialize mainly with individuals who had criminal or delinquency records, the success rates were only about 30%.

TABLE 9.1
PROBATION OFFICER'S
EVALUATION OF CLIENT'S PROBATION SUCCESS

<u>Evaluation</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Unqualified Success	493	26.2%
Qualified Success	772	41.1%
Neither Success Nor Failure	360	19.1
Successful Start, Followed by Deterioration	75	4.0
Clear and Definite Failure	180	9.6
No Response	25	-
Total	1,905	100.0%

TABLE 9.2
MARITAL STATUS AND OUTCOME

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Single	(827) 66.9%	(410) 33.1%
Previously Married	(97) 56.7%	(74) 43.3%
Common-law	(96) 60.4%	(63) 39.6%
Married	(243) 79.4%	(63) 20.6%

$$\chi^2 = 32.71 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.3
RACIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND OUTCOME

<u>Racial Characteristics</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
East Indian	(7) 77.8%	(2) 22.2%
Indian or Metis	(34) 42.5%	(46) 57.5%
Asian	(10) 76.9%	(3) 23.1%
Black	(25) 69.4%	(11) 30.6%
Caucasian	(1,183) 68.3%	(548) 31.7%

$$\chi^2 = 24.30 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.4
SCHOOL STATUS AND OUTCOME

<u>School Status</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Still Enrolled in School	(224) 83.9%	(43) 16.1%
Quit With No Intent of Returning	(627) 60.8%	(404) 39.2%
Quit With Intent of Returning	(135) 61.1%	(86) 38.9%
Graduated	(243) 82.7%	(51) 17.3%

$$\chi^2 = 88.98 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.5
MOST RECENT GRADUATION AND OUTCOME

<u>Graduated</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Grade School	(748) 62.6%	(447) 37.4%
Vocational High	(115) 73.7%	(41) 26.3%
Regular High School	(200) 87.3%	(29) 12.7%
Apprenticeship	(24) 70.6%	(10) 29.4%
Community College	(13) 81.3%	(3) 18.7%
University	(18) 94.7%	(1) 5.3%

$$\chi^2 = 65.13 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.6TECHNICAL/OPPORTUNITY SCHOOL EXPERIENCE AND OUTCOME

<u>Technical/opportunity School Experience</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Yes	(205) 50.4%	(202) 49.6%
No	(831) 76.7%	(252) 23.3%

$$\chi^2 = 95.80 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.7SCHOOL DISCIPLINE AND OUTCOME

<u>Type of Discipline</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Suspended	(77) 49.7%	(78) 50.3%
Expelled	(15) 48.4%	(16) 51.6%
Suspended and Expelled	(32) 44.4%	(40) 55.6%
Neither of the Above	(521) 80.5%	(126) 19.5%

$$\chi^2 = 95.60 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.8QUALITY OF HOUSING AND OUTCOME

<u>Quality of Housing</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Detached	(677) 71.0%	(277) 29.0%
Duplex or Row	(96) 63.2%	(56) 36.8%
Apartment or Condominium	(254) 66.3%	(129) 33.7%
Flat or Room, with Cooking	(90) 61.2%	(57) 38.8%
Single Room	(30) 57.7%	(22) 42.3%
Hostel or Group Home	(20) 66.7%	(10) 33.3%
Correctional Institution	(2) 28.6%	(5) 71.4%
No Fixed Abode	(7) 31.8%	(15) 68.2%
No Response	(2) 66.7%	(1) 33.3%

$$\chi^2 = 29.19 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.9NEIGHBOURHOOD STATUS AND OUTCOME

<u>Neighbourhood Status</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Upper Class	(15) 83.3%	(3) 16.7%
Upper-Middle Class	(178) 78.4%	(49) 21.6%
Lower-Middle Class	(793) 72.1%	(307) 27.9%
Lower Class	(188) 49.5%	(192) 50.5%
Lower-Lower Class	(14) 31.8%	(30) 68.2%
No Response	(12) 80.0%	(3) 20.0%

$$\chi^2 = 107.40 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.10
HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND OUTCOME

<u>Household Income</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
\$8,000 or Under	(225) 52.2%	(206) 47.8%
\$8,001 to \$15,000	(508) 74.6%	(173) 25.4%
\$15,001 to \$25,000	(234) 77.7%	(67) 22.3%
\$25,001 or Over	(26) 83.9%	(5) 16.1%

$$\chi^2 = 80.40 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.11
PRE-PROBATION EARNINGS AND OUTCOME

<u>Pre-Probation Earnings</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Under \$1,000	(135) 52.3%	(123) 47.7%
\$1,000 to 2,999	(180) 67.9%	(85) 32.1%
\$3,000 to 5,999	(206) 70.1%	(88) 29.9%
\$6,000 to 8,999	(241) 77.5%	(70) 22.5%
\$9,000 to \$11,999	(125) 82.8%	(26) 17.2%
\$12,000 to 19,999	(94) 87.0%	(14) 13.0%
\$20,000 and Over	(6) 75.0%	(2) 25.0%

$$\chi^2 = 74.72 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.12

RELIANCE UPON SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AND OUTCOME

<u>Frequent Use of Social Assistance</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Yes	(172) 46.7%	(196) 53.3%
No	(960) 74.6%	(327) 25.4%

$$\chi^2 = 101.43 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.13

LIVING COMPANIONS AT THE
TIME OF THE OFFENCE AND OUTCOME

<u>Living With</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Both Parents	(492) 72.0%	(191) 28.0%
Mother Only	(108) 63.5%	(62) 36.5%
Father Only	(25) 53.2%	(22) 46.8%
Mother and Other Male	(7) 50.0%	(7) 50.0%
Father and Other Female	(3) 42.9%	(4) 57.1%
Foster Home	(9) 52.9%	(8) 47.1%
Institute or Group Home	(19) 70.4%	(8) 29.6%
Relatives or Friends	(77) 60.2%	(51) 39.8%
Common-law, Married	(294) 70.8%	(121) 29.2%
Friends	(91) 60.3%	(60) 39.7%
Alone	(111) 65.3%	(59) 34.7%
No Response	(8) 80.0%	(2) 20.0%

$$\chi^2 = 27.65 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.14LEVEL OF FAMILY STABILITY
DURING CHILDHOOD, AND OUTCOME

<u>Level of Stability</u>		<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Higher levels of Stability	0.	(826)	73.4%	(300)	26.6%
	1.	(188)	62.3%	(114)	37.7%
	2.	(140)	64.8%	(76)	35.2%
	3.	(59)	51.3%	(56)	48.7%
	4.	(39)	46.4%	(45)	53.6%
	5.	(8)	30.8%	(18)	69.2%
Lower Levels of Stability	6.	(5)	45.5%	(6)	54.5%

$$\chi^2 = 71.01 \quad p. < .001$$

TABLE 9.15FAMILY COHESIVENESS
DURING PROBATION AND OUTCOME

	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Very Cohesive	(386)	85.2%	(67)	14.8%
Somewhat Cohesive	(445)	70.6%	(185)	29.4%
Not Cohesive	(260)	50.4%	(256)	49.6%

$$\chi^2 = 137.71 \quad p. < .001$$

TABLE 9.16

FAMILY CRIMINAL HISTORY AND OUTCOME

	<u>Siblings^a</u>		<u>Father^b</u>		<u>Mother^c</u>	
<u>Has Record</u>						
Success	(178)	52.5%	(75)	50.3%	(21)	52.5%
Failure	(161)	47.5%	(74)	49.7%	(19)	47.5%
<u>Has No Record</u>						
Success	(680)	75.0%	(823)	74.0%	(904)	71.5%
Failure	(227)	25.0%	(289)	26.0%	(361)	28.5%
	$\chi^2 = 60.90^a$ $p < .001$		$\chi^2 = 34.78^b$ $p < .001$		$\chi^2 = 5.87^c$ $p < .05$	

TABLE 9.17

SOCIALIZING PATTERN AND OUTCOME

<u>Socializing Pattern</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Lone Wolf	(159)	62.8%	(94)	37.2%
Mixes With Criminals	(140)	32.2%	(295)	57.8%
Mixes with Non-criminals	(514)	87.6%	(73)	12.4%
None of the Above	(351)	80.9%	(83)	19.1%

$$\chi^2 = 396.56 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 9.18

USE OF LEISURE TIME AND OUTCOME

<u>How Leisure Time is Used</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Productively	(799)	88.5%	(104)	11.5%
Aimlessly	(264)	29.8%	(399)	60.2%
Don't Know/No Response	(5)	45.5%	(6)	54.5%

$$\chi^2 = 416.70 \quad p < .001$$

EMPLOYMENT AND OUTCOME

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Those probationers who were employed were much more likely to be considered to be successes than were those who are unemployed. Thus, probationers who were employed full-time at the end of their probation period, were judged to be successes in 82.6% of the cases. Those who were seeking employment were successful 59.0% of the time and those who were not seeking employment were rated as "probation successes" only 46.9% of the time.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Even more important than the probationer's actual employment status at the termination of probation, was the Probation Officer's estimate of the "usual" employment status. The success rate among those individuals who seldom changed employers and were seldom unemployed was 89.5%. However, it is interesting to note that the success rate among "usually employed" individuals who make frequent changes in employers, and probationers who were "often unemployed" but actively seek employment, was about 68%. These figures suggest that attitudes toward and habits concerning employment (and not just whether one actually has a job) are of importance. Incidentally, in contrast to those who were often unemployed, but seeking work, the success rate among those who were often unemployed but do not actively seek work, was approximately 20%.

The success rate is a function of both current employment status and the amount of time one has spent on a job. Those individuals who were employed at termination, but had held their job for less than one month, were considered to be successes in only 59.2% of the cases. If the individual was unemployed at the termination of the probation, and if the previous job had been held for less than one month, his or her success rate was only 22.9%.

OCCUPATION AND AVAILABILITY

The importance of employment status for success was also noted in the relationship between one's type of occupation and success rates. If an individual was employed at the termination of probation, his or her success rate was high - whether the individual's occupation fell in the technical/professional field, clerical/sales, or the labourer/operatives field. That is, for those who were employed, there was a difference of only a few percentage points (7%) in the success rates between "high status" occupations requiring extensive education and/or job experience and those occupations requiring the least education and experience. There were, however, marked differences in success rates, depending upon one's most recent occupation, among those

individuals who were unemployed at the termination of probation. The success rate for unemployed technical/professional people was 64.5%, while for labourers/operatives, it was 46.5%.

The reasons for which an individual was not available for full-time employment at the termination of probation was significantly related to probation outcome. The success rate was above average for those who were students (84.7%) or homemakers (72.1%). However, even though others provided good reasons for being unemployed - for example, recuperating from an accident, being chronically ill, or having no work available in the area - the success rate was far below average, at just a bit over 50%. Those who were unavailable for work for no reason other than that they simply preferred to "get by" without working, had a success rate of only 16.4%.

TABLE 10.1

USUAL EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE CLIENT

<u>Employment Status</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Seldom Unemployed, Seldom Changes Employer	(484)	89.5%	(57)	10.5%
Seldom Unemployed, Often Changes Employer	(173)	69.5%	(76)	30.5%
Seasonal Worker, but Otherwise Employed in "Off-Season"	(51)	66.2%	(26)	33.8%
Often Unemployed, Actively Seeks Employment	(171)	67.9%	(81)	32.1%
Often Unemployed, and Shows a Lack of Concern	(73)	30.7%	(165)	69.3%
Almost Always Unemployed, but Able to Work	(20)	14.3%	(120)	85.7%

$$\chi^2 = 426.63 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 10.2

EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT
TERMINATION OF PROBATION, AND OUTCOME

<u>Employment Status</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Employed Full-Time	(716)	82.6%	(151)	17.4%
Employed Part-Time	(94)	72.3%	(36)	27.7%
Seeks Full-Time Employment	(125)	59.0%	(87)	41.0%
Seeks Part-Time Employment	(36)	64.3%	(20)	35.7%
Not Seeking Employment	(246)	46.9%	(279)	53.1%
Don't Know/No Response	(37)	82.2%	(8)	17.8%

$$\chi^2 = 207.27 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 10.3TIME SPENT IN SEEKING CURRENT JOB, AND OUTCOME

<u>Job Search Time</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Less Than One Month	(254) 86.7%	(39) 13.3%
One to Three Months	(154) 77.4%	(45) 22.6%
Three Months or More	(107) 77.0%	(32) 23.0%

$$\chi^2 = 9.39 \quad p < .01$$

TABLE 10.4LENGTH OF TIME EMPLOYED
ON CURRENT JOB AND OUTCOME

<u>Employed on Present Job</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Less Than One Month	(29) 59.2%	(20) 40.8%
One to Three Months	(90) 70.9%	(37) 29.1%
Three to Six Months	(169) 81.6%	(38) 18.4%
Six Months to a Year	(161) 88.5%	(21) 11.5%
One to Two Years	(133) 85.3%	(23) 14.7%
Two Years and Over	(125) 86.8%	(19) 13.2%

$$\chi^2 = 36.03 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 10.5

IF UNEMPLOYED, LENGTH OF TIME
EMPLOYED ON MOST RECENT JOB AND OUTCOME

<u>Employed on Last Job</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Less Than One Month	(24) 22.9%	(81) 77.1%
One to Three Months	(93) 45.6%	(111) 54.4%
Three to Six Months	(87) 54.4%	(73) 45.6%
Six Months to One Year	(53) 58.9%	(37) 41.1%
One to Two Years	(22) 73.3%	(8) 26.7%
Two Years and Over	(22) 64.7%	(12) 35.3%

$$\chi^2 = 45.42 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 10.6

OCCUPATION AND OUTCOME AMONG THE UNEMPLOYED

<u>Recent Occupation, Now Unemployed</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Technical/Professional	(40) 64.5%	(22) 35.5%
Clerical/Sales	(29) 58.0%	(21) 42.0%
Labourers/Operatives	(269) 46.5%	(309) 53.5%

$$\chi^2 = 8.99 \quad p < .01$$

TABLE 10.7

OCCUPATION AND OUTCOME AMONG THE EMPLOYED

<u>Present Occupation, Now Employed</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Technical/Professional	(155) 87.1%	(23) 12.9%
Clerical/Sales	(56) 83.6%	(11) 16.4%
Labourers/Operatives	(509) 80.2%	(126) 19.8%

$$\chi^2 = 4.63 \quad p < .05$$

TABLE 10.8

REASON FOR UNAVAILABILITY
FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AT TERMINATION AND OUTCOME

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Homemaker	(62) 72.1%	(24) 27.9%
Student	(211) 84.7%	(38) 15.3%
Recuperating	(9) 42.9%	(12) 57.1%
Chronically Ill	(18) 58.1%	(13) 41.9%
Depressed, Disturbed, Retarded	(11) 22.4%	(38) 77.6%
"Get By" Philosophy	(22) 16.4%	(112) 83.6%
No Work Available	(32) 55.2%	(26) 44.8%
None of The Above	(82) 40.6%	(120) 59.4%
Don't Know/No Response	(6) 28.6%	(15) 71.4%

$$\chi^2 = 222.55 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 10.9

REASONS GIVEN FOR LEAVING PREVIOUS FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT,
AND OUTCOME

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Laid Off	(244) 63.9%	(138) 36.1%
Quit	(275) 68.6%	(126) 31.4%
Quit, Health Reasons	(66) 67.3%	(32) 32.7%
Fired	(73) 44.5%	(91) 55.5%
No Response	(55) 78.6%	(15) 21.4%

$$\chi^2 = 37.59 \quad p < .001$$

CRIMINAL HISTORY AND OUTCOME

PRIOR OFFENCES

The age at which the probationer had first encountered difficulties with the law was related to success levels. Generally speaking, the older an individual was when he or she first acquired a criminal or delinquency record, the higher the success rate. If the first contact with the law occurred after the age of 15, the success rate was always better than average. However, if the first contact occurred at age 14 to 15, the success rate dropped to 43.5% and if the first contact occurred at younger ages, the success rate dropped to approximately 30.0%.

Prior to having committed the offence which led to being placed on probation, approximately 25% of the population had received at least one prior sentence. The success rate depended upon the nature of that prior sentence. For example, if they had previously received a suspended sentence, the success rate was 63.5%, but if they had previously served a jail term, the success rate decreased to 33.3%.

Of course, some individuals had been sentenced for several offences prior to the probation offence. For those with four or five previous sentences, the probability of success was approximately 40%, while for those who had received no prior sentences, the success rate was 72.6%.

Individuals whose Probation Order was based upon having been convicted of only one offence, have a success rate of 69.2%. However, the success rate dropped to 47.1% for those whose Probation Order was based upon having been convicted of four offences.

TYPE OF OFFENCE

The type of crime committed, for which the individual was placed on probation, did have some bearing upon the outcome of probation. That is, the success rate for crimes committed against the person (60.0%) was somewhat lower than success rate for crimes against property (66.5%) and other crimes (68.9%). In interpreting these data, however, it is well to keep in mind that crimes against the person constituted only 7.5% of all crimes for which this sample of probationers was placed on probation.

In carrying out a more detailed analysis of success rates as related to specific offences, there were only three types of offences which led to a significantly lower rate of success among probationers. These include 'breaking and entering', with a success rate of 60.9%, all 'offences against the person', with a success rate of 60.0%, and liquor offences with a success rate of 57.9%. Other frequently performed offences, and their success rates, were theft over and under \$200 (74.0%), drug offences (75.0%), and possession of stolen goods over and under \$200 (71.1%). Those aforementioned offences which had success rates of approximately 10% lower than average, constituted approximately 26% of all those offences committed for which these probationers were placed on probation.

While probation outcome was related, to a certain degree, to the type of offence committed, it was a rather unimportant variable when compared to the impact of other variables. For example, a high proportion of the probationers were poorly educated, unemployed, and were living in lower status neighbourhoods. As predictors of probation outcome, it was obvious that such factors as these would have to be taken into account before drawing conclusions about the probationer's chance of success, simply based upon the type of offence which he or she had committed.

TABLE 11.1AGE AT FIRST RECORDED EVIDENCE
OF DIFFICULTY WITH THE LAW AND OUTCOME

<u>Age</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Under 11	(9) 31.0%	(20) 69.0%
12 to 13	(13) 29.5%	(31) 70.5%
14 to 15	(54) 43.5%	(70) 56.5%
16 to 17	(398) 68.7%	(181) 31.3%
18 to 19	(238) 70.0%	(102) 30.0%
20 to 29	(261) 78.4%	(72) 21.6%
30 to 49	(99) 79.8%	(25) 20.2%
Over 50	(25) 80.6%	(6) 19.4%

$$\chi^2 = 110.31 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 11.2MOST RECENT SENTENCE AND OUTCOME

<u>Type of Sentence</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Failure</u>
Suspended	(33) 63.5%	(19) 36.5%
Probation	(113) 53.8%	(97) 46.2%
Fine	(65) 60.7%	(42) 39.3%
Jail	(26) 33.3%	(52) 66.7%
Other	(11) 45.8%	(13) 54.2%

$$\chi^2 = 18.43 \quad p < .01$$

TABLE 11.3

PROBATION OUTCOME AND NUMBER OF SENTENCES
RECEIVED FOR OFFENCES COMMITTED PRIOR TO THE PROBATION ORDER

<u>Number of Sentences</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
One Sentence	(160)	56.3%	(124)	43.7%
Two Sentences	(44)	47.3%	(49)	52.7%
Three Sentences	(20)	50.0%	(20)	50.0%
Four Sentences	(9)	39.1%	(14)	60.9%
Five Sentences or More	(17)	41.5%	(24)	58.5%
No Prior Convictions*	(1,015)	72.6%	(384)	27.4%

$$\chi^2 = 76.8 \quad p < .001$$

*Includes "don't know" responses.

TABLE 11.4

PROBATION OUTCOME AND NUMBER OF OFFENCES
COMMITTED WHICH LED TO THE PROBATION ORDER

<u>Number of Offences</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
One Offence	(962)	69.2%	(428)	30.8%
Two Offences	(186)	58.7%	(131)	41.3%
Three Offences	(25)	50.0%	(25)	50.0%
Four Offences	(8)	47.1%	(9)	52.9%
Five Offences or More	(6)	66.7%	(3)	33.3%
No Response	(78)	80.4%	(19)	19.6%

$$\chi^2 = 30.55 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 11.5SPECIFIC OFFENCE COMMITTED
AND PROBATION OUTCOME

<u>Type of Offence</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Assault/Threatening	(81)	60.0%	(54)	40.0%
Break & Enter	(176)	60.9%	(113)	39.1%
Theft (Over & Under \$200)	(372)	74.0%	(131)	26.0%
Possession of Stolen Goods (Over & Under \$200)	(106)	71.1%	(43)	28.9%
Drug Offences	(106)	75.7%	(34)	24.3%
Liquor Offences	(22)	57.9%	(16)	42.1%

$$\chi^2 = 25.12 \quad p < .01$$

TABLE 11.6SUMMARY OF TYPE OF
OFFENCE AND PROBATION OUTCOME

<u>Type of Offence</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Crimes against the Person	(81)	60.0%	(54)	40.0%
Crimes against Property	(811)	66.5%	(409)	33.5%
Other Crimes	(295)	68.9%	(133)	31.1%

$$\chi^2 = 3.7 \quad p = \text{not statistically significant, but included for reader's interest}$$

TABLE 11.7

PROBATION OUTCOME AND TYPE OF
OFFENCE COMMITTED LEADING TO PROBATION

<u>Type of Offence</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
<u>Offences Against the Person</u>				
Assault	(49)	56.3%	(38)	43.7%
Assault/Wounding	(24)	68.6%	(11)	31.4%
Other Offences Against the Person	(8)	61.5%	(5)	38.5%
<u>Offences Against Property</u>				
Break and Enter	(176)	60.9%	(113)	39.1%
Damage to Property	(41)	56.9%	(31)	43.1%
Fraud, Forgery	(71)	56.3%	(55)	43.7%
Possession: \$200 and Under	(59)	76.6%	(18)	23.4%
Possession: Over \$200	(47)	65.3%	(25)	34.7%
Robbery	(10)	58.8%	(7)	41.2%
Theft: \$200 and Under	(282)	76.4%	(87)	23.6%
Theft: Over \$200	(90)	67.2%	(44)	32.8%
Other Offences Against Property	(35)	54.7%	(29)	45.3%
<u>Offences Against Public Morals and Decency</u>				
All Offences Against Public Morals & Decency	(46)	76.7%	(14)	23.3%
<u>Offences Against Public Order and Peace</u>				
Breach of Probation	(2)	22.2%	(7)	77.8%
Breach of Recognizance	(2)	20.0%	(8)	80.0%
Marijuana	(69)	72.6%	(26)	27.4%
Other Restricted Drugs	(37)	82.2%	(8)	17.8%
Carrying Unlawful Weapons	(21)	58.3%	(15)	41.7%
Disorderly Conduct/Public Mischief	(49)	67.1%	(24)	32.9%
Other Offences Against Public Order & Peace	(11)	64.7%	(6)	35.3%
<u>Liquor Offences</u>				
Driving while Impaired	(14)	63.6%	(8)	36.4%
Other Liquor Offences	(8)	50.0%	(8)	50.0%
<u>Traffic Offences</u>				
All Traffic Offences	(12)	75.0%	(4)	25.0%
Other Offences	(24)	82.8%	(5)	17.2%
No Response	(78)	80.4%	(19)	19.6%

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

PROBATION PROCESS AND OUTCOME

It was generally the case that the longer the individual remained on probation and the more work the Probation Officer did with the individual, the more likely was he or she to be considered unsuccessful on probation. For example, among those probationers who the Probation Officer rated as requiring virtually no supervision during the probation period, 92.2% were considered to be successes. In contrast, those probationers who required intense supervision were considered to be successes in only 33.6% of the cases.

Probation Officers were asked to indicate what kinds of problems the probationers had, and how important these problems were to the probationer's success or failure. A 'magnitude of probationer's problems' scale was then developed by weighing each individual's problem by its relative importance for probation success, and then summing the weights. The details of scoring, and relation to other questionnaire items, are described in Appendix B.

The success rate among those probationers who had few important problems was 89.1%, while the success rate among those who had the largest number of important problems was only 49.9%. It is probably reasonable to assume that those with the largest number of problems were the subjects of the most intensive care by the Probation Officers. As noted above, those probationers requiring intensive supervision were seldom considered to be successes.

PROBATION DECISIONS

The failure rate was high among those probationers whose Probation Order was terminated because they refused to cooperate with the Probation Officer (86.4%), were committed to a correctional institution for either a new offence (97.7%) or for "failure to comply" (100.0%) or because the original Probation Order was revoked and a new Order was made (87.5%). Note that even among this population of "early terminations", there were still a few individuals who were considered to have completed the probation period successfully. These findings reflect a conviction expressed by many Probation Officers during the development of the questionnaire for this project - i.e., a client can show such marked improvement during the probation period that a re-conviction for a minor offence can be seen, in context as relatively unimportant for judging probation outcome.

DECISIONS TO CHARGE

Occasionally, the Probation Officer did not charge a client with "failure to comply" with the Probation Order. This may have occurred because there was insufficient evidence to lay charges, or the Probation Officer may have felt that the judge would be too "easy" or too "hard" on the client. Alternatively, the Probation Officer may have felt that there was nothing to be gained by laying charges.

For those probationers who had failed to comply with the conditions of the Probation Order, the success rate was somewhat less than 30% - whether the probationer was actually charged or not. The exception was when a probationer was not charged because the Probation Officer felt that the judge would be "too hard". In such cases, the success rate was 47.5%. These data probably indicate that the offence committed by the probationer was very trivial in the eyes of the Probation Officer and did not warrant either laying a charge or considering the probationer to have been a probation failure.

TABLE 12.1LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
REQUIRED DURING PROBATION AND OUTCOME

<u>Level of Supervision</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Intense Supervision	(111)	33.6%	(219)	66.4%
Medium Supervision	(465)	62.8%	(275)	37.2%
Minimal Supervision	(534)	83.4%	(106)	16.6%
No Supervision	(154)	92.2%	(13)	7.8%

$$\chi^2 = 299.66 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 12.2MAGNITUDE OF PROBATIONER'S PROBLEMS AND OUTCOME

<u>Magnitude of Problems</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Few Important Problems	(391)	89.1%	(48)	10.9%
Several Important Problems	(359)	72.1%	(139)	27.9%
Many Important Problems	(323)	57.9%	(235)	42.1%
Largest Number of Important Problems	(192)	49.9%	(193)	50.1%

$$\chi^2 = 175.28 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 12.3

REASON FOR TERMINATION
OF THE ORDER AND OUTCOME

<u>Reason Given</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
Expiry of Probation Period	(901)	65.8%	(468)	34.2%
Court Agreed, No Need for Continuing Surveillance or Improvement	(144)	88.3%	(19)	11.7%
Court Agreed, Client Greatly Improved	(204)	92.3%	(17)	7.7%
Court Agreed, Client Refuses to Cooperate with Probation Officer	(3)	13.6%	(19)	86.4%
Committed to Correctional Institution for New Offence	(1)	2.3%	(42)	97.7%
Committed to Correctional Institution for "Failure to Comply"	(0)	0.0%	(18)	100.0%
Original Order Revoked, New Order Made	(1)	12.5%	(7)	87.5%

$$\chi^2 = 258.72 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 12.4
IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC PROBLEMS AMONG PROBATIONERS

<u>Possible Problem Areas</u>	<u>Not A Problem</u>	<u>An Unimportant Problem</u>	<u>Fairly Important Problem</u>	<u>Very Important Problem</u>
Relationship with Friends	(781) 41.0%	(191) 10.0%	(548) 28.8%	(385) 20.2%
Relationship with Parents	(912) 47.9%	(177) 9.3%	(465) 24.4%	(351) 18.4%
Relationship with Co-workers	(1,381) 72.5%	(144) 7.6%	(271) 14.2%	(109) 5.7%
Relationship with Friends of the Opposite Sex	(1,199) 62.9%	(156) 8.2%	(329) 17.3%	(221) 11.6%
Relationship with Authority Figures	(725) 38.1%	(124) 6.5%	(558) 29.3%	(498) 26.1%
Use of Leisure Time	(742) 39.0%	(129) 6.8%	(514) 27.0%	(520) 27.3%
Accepted Living Quarters	(1,029) 54.0%	(216) 11.3%	(421) 22.1%	(239) 12.5%
Employment	(776) 40.7%	(48) 2.5%	(307) 16.1%	(774) 40.6%
School Work	(1,560) 81.9%	(53) 2.8%	(113) 5.9%	(179) 9.4%
Drug or Alcohol Use	(960) 50.4%	(57) 3.0%	(295) 15.5%	(593) 31.1%
Self-confidence	(662) 34.8%	(105) 5.5%	(596) 31.3%	(542) 28.5%
Control of Impulsive or Hostile Tendencies	(852) 44.7%	(90) 4.7%	(389) 20.4%	(547) 30.1%
Avoiding Charges for new Crimes or Confrontations with Police	(787) 41.3%	(85) 4.5%	(335) 17.6%	(698) 36.6%

Note: All percentages are based upon the total sample of 1,905

TABLE 12.5

OUTCOME AND DECISION TO CHARGE
WITH "FAILURE TO COMPLY"
FOR REASONS OTHER THAN POSSIBLE SANCTIONS

<u>Decisions</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
No Charge was Ever Justified	(1,143)	76.8%	(346)	23.2%
Always Charged if Justified	(45)	24.7%	(137)	75.3%
Did Not Charge Because Probation Order was Almost Expired	(20)	31.3%	(44)	68.8%
Did Not Charge Because the Effort Would not be Worth it	(18)	24.0%	(57)	76.0%

$$\chi^2 = 314.20 \quad p < .001$$

TABLE 12.6

OUTCOME AND DECISION TO CHARGE
WITH "FAILURE TO COMPLY" INFLUENCED BY JUDGE

<u>Decisions</u>	<u>Success</u>		<u>Failure</u>	
No Charge was Ever Justified	(1,149)	75.7%	(369)	24.3%
Always Charged Client if Justified	(52)	25.0%	(156)	75.0%
Did Not Charge Because Judge Would be "Too Easy"	(9)	28.1%	(23)	71.9%
Did Not Charge Because Judge Would be "Too Hard"	(19)	47.5%	(21)	52.5%

$$\chi^2 = 250.50 \quad p < .001$$

APPLICATIONS

In the introduction to this report, a statement was made concerning the general objectives of this project. The purpose of this chapter is to identify in further detail some of the most obvious applications for these research data.

Basically, the data will be used for:

- Sample Validation
- Case-Load Management
- Outcome Research
- Program Development
- Inter-population Comparisons

SAMPLE VALIDATION

In most research work, it is important to draw a representative sample from the population. The data collected for this project will serve as a baseline against which smaller samples drawn for research purposes can be assessed for their representativeness.

Sample validation is a particularly important problem when one is dealing with small, but important sub-groups - such as those who have been convicted of assault, or of those who have very low levels of education. In terms of program design in treatment, it will often be important to know, for example, regional differences in certain high-risk sub-groups which might have a significant impact on the approach taken by the Probation Officer.

Significant changes in the nature of the probation population over time can also be charted by having generated the present data base. For example, if subsequent research indicates that the proportion of emotionally unstable probationers is increasing in certain areas, then this would have significant implications for training programs and policy.

CASE-LOAD MANAGEMENT

While case-load management is - in implementation - an issue to be settled largely at the level of the local office, there are obviously province-wide policy decisions which must be made in terms of staffing and programs.

These data produced for this project have provided some critical preliminary information concerning the way in which Probation Officers spend their time, particularly with respect to the specific types of probationers who may or may not profit from more intense supervision by the Probation Officer.

These data will, in conjunction with other research currently being collected by the Ministry on the problems of case-load management, be extremely useful in restructuring policies and training programs to better reflect the problems and techniques developed over the years by Probation Officers in the field.

PROBATION OUTCOME RESEARCH

These data have provided direct information on the types of problems which probationers are most likely to encounter during the probation period. Problem areas which cause the greatest degree of difficulty for probationers have been identified, and success or failure in dealing with certain types of problems have been related to probabilities of re-conviction or other measures of probation failure.

This research has provided - among very few other attempts in this field - a basis on which to discuss the various ways in which Probation Officers view probation success or failure. This is still a highly controversial area in the research literature and has direct implications for training programs and policies. These data provide a solid basis on which to form preliminary hypothesis and generate a more precise clarification of this important and contentious issue.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

At the present time, programs and probations tend to be conceived of in terms of an undifferentiated population of "probationers". There has been no way of determining, for example, what the special characteristics of a high-risk failure group (like the poorly educated probationer) might be, or the size of the group - i.e., is the subgroup large enough to warrant special attention and program design?

It is well known that programs are much more effective if they are designed and administered with a specific target group in mind. Data collected for this report will help to identify the most relevant target groups (e.g., those which are known to constitute high-risk sub-populations) and will provide the basis for designing, and justifying specific programs for these groups.

INTER-POPULATION COMPARISONS

Prior to this report, it was necessary to generalize from inmate populations to the characteristics of probation populations. Research conducted in the United States has previously identified some of the specific differences between probation populations and inmate populations. However, the applicability of these data in

Ontario were never clear, since research on inmate populations has indicated that there are some significant differences between inmate populations in Ontario and those in the United States.

The present study has significantly increased the understanding among researchers of the differences between inmate and probationer populations in Ontario. These data will undoubtedly have implications for the development of future programs and with further research, will serve to identify the "pre-incarceration" pattern among probationers which may justify certain changes in levels of supervision and types of treatment.

APPENDIX A

MEASURE OF FAMILY STABILITY

MEASURE OF FAMILY STABILITY

While the client was being raised, did any of the following events occur:

Client taken from parents:	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know	3
Client adopted:	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know	3
Either one or both parents died:	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know	3
Parents divorced or separated:	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know	3
Remarriage or new common-law union, of parents:	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know	3
Parents separated intermittently:	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know	3
Prolonged absence of a parent:	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know	3

APPENDIX B

SCALE CONSTRUCTION

SCALE CONSTRUCTION

In some cases, separate items on the questionnaire were combined to form a single scale score. One scale was designed to measure family stability during the childhood of the probationer.

The family stability scale was constructed by summing the responses the questionnaire items listed in Appendix A. For each one of these items, a 'yes' response was given a score of '1' and other responses were given a score of '0'. The higher the score on the scale, the lower the level of family stability which the probationer experienced as a child.

Another scale was designed which was intended to measure the magnitude of a probationer's problems. The scale score was based upon two sets of questions, one of which dealt with the types of problems experienced by a probationer (Table 7.9, Pg. 7-7) and the problems which were considered to be important for the probationer's success or failure (Table 7.10, Pg. 7-8).

For each of the 13 problem areas, the individual was given a score of '3' if the Probation Officer felt that the problem was "very important" for the success or failure of the probationer during the probation period. If the problem was "important" the score assigned was '2' and a problem that was "not important" was given the score of '1'. Of course, those areas which were simply not problems for the probationer at all, were given a score of '0'. These scores were then summed to create a measure of the "magnitude of problems" experienced by the probationer. The relationship of this score to the outcome of probation is presented in Table 12.2 (Pg. 12-4).

APPENDIX C

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

It is obviously of critical importance to know the precise manner in which a variable is related to the probation process or probation outcome. Thus, it is already known, in a general way, that the probability of probation success decreases with a decrease in household income. Of particular interest is the fact that data collected for this project indicated, with some precision, that the decrease in probation success did not really show a precipitous drop until household income was \$8,000 or less, per year.

There are of course, limitations in restricting one's self to the examination of relationships between one or two variables at a time. Such analyses do little to provide a sense of the inter-relationship among variables or the relative importance of one variable as compared to another. The present chapter will concentrate upon the results of statistical analyses which can deal simultaneously with large numbers of variables for the purpose of examining issues of relationships and priorities.*

ANALYSES AND LIMITATIONS

Factor analysis, discriminant analysis, and multiple linear regression analysis all have certain limitations.

For example, the analyses cannot incorporate categorical data, such as race. Previous data has indicated that the probationers with characteristics of the North American Indian/Metis are much less likely to succeed at probation than individuals with other racial characteristics. Yet this type of data - race of the probationer - cannot be included in these analyses.

The data which can be used in these analyses include such data as the age at which the probationer had his or her first contact with the law. This data ranges from age 0 to age 90. Any such variables which show a "less to more" or a "better to worse" trend can be included in the analyses. One such variable, for example, is the status of the probationer's neighbourhood. In this case, neighbourhood status ranges from a score of 1 which is given for "high status" neighbourhoods to a score of 5 which is given for "slum neighbourhoods".

There is also quite a considerable degree of judgement on the part of the researcher which involves selecting variables to be included in the analyses. Approximately 150 pieces of information were collected

*The statistical tables summarizing these analyses are cumbersome and highly technical. They are available to interested readers through the Ministry of Corrections.

collected on each probationer. Preliminary analyses can assist the researcher in identifying those variables which would only be redundant, or completely unrelated, to the objective of the analysis being done. Of course, these preliminary analyses only provide guidelines for the researcher - the actual selection of variables to be analyzed depends upon the considered judgment of the researcher who is familiar with the data and the objectives of the project.

TYPES OF PROBLEMS

The Probation Officer was asked to indicate, on a list of 13 problems, those problems experienced by the probationer and whether or not there have been any improvement or deterioration in that problem area during the course of probation.

Preliminary analyses suggested that there were significant correlations between certain problems. That is, rather than speaking in terms of 13 separate problems, the changes which occurred during the probation period could probably be summarized by speaking in terms of common "problem clusters".

These data were subjected to a factor analysis and two major clusters of problems emerged.

One cluster can best be described as the "criminal personality" factor. This term seems to describe most effectively the types of problems which, for individual probationers, tend to cluster together. These problem areas are control of impulsive/hostile tendencies, avoidance of alcohol/drug abuse, improvement in self-confidence, avoidance of new offences, and improved relationships with authority figures.

The second cluster of problem areas seems to be best described as a "social competence" factor. This included the problem areas of improvement in school work, finding employment, improvement in use of leisure time, improvement in relationships with co-workers, and improvement in relations with friends.

The Probation Officers were also asked to indicate the specific problem areas which were important in their judging whether or not a particular probationer had completed the probation period successfully or unsuccessfully. Four clusters emerged.

One cluster, a "self-indulgence" factor included the control of drug/alcohol use self-confidence and impulsive/hostile action. The second cluster, a "family/independence" factor included the problem areas of relations with parents, finding a better place to live, and avoidance of new offences.

The third cluster, a "maturity" factor, included the resolution of relationships with authorities, improving one's employment

situation, improving use of leisure time; and avoidance of new offences. A fourth cluster is more difficult to name but can best be described as a "social" factor. It included improvement at school and relationships with members of the opposite sex and with co-workers.

PREDICTORS OF IMPROVEMENT

As mentioned above, there were 13 problem areas. The data were subjected to a linear multiple regression analysis to identify the combination of variables which would best predict an improvement of each problem area during probation.

The following variables were selected for inclusion in the analysis:

- most recent grade in school
- marital status
- number of months Probation Officer worked with client
- client's community size
- client's age
- client's experience in technical/opportunity school
- number of convictions during probation period
- reliance upon social assistance by the family
- family instability in childhood
- length of Probation Order
- father's criminal record
- clients with more than 5 previous sentences.

A finding of considerable significance was that there were no combinations of the above variables which were particularly useful in predicting improvement in any of the problem areas. That is, in only six problem areas was it possible to develop a prediction equation which would account for 10% or more of the variance in the improvement scores. It is nonetheless interesting to examine the predictors for these six areas.

In all six of the above-mentioned predictor equations, the shorter the period of time which the Probation Officer spent in working with the client, the more likely there was to be improvement in the problem area.

In five equations, the number of offences committed while on probation proved to be an effective predictor. As one might expect, the more crimes committed on probation, the less likely the probationer was to improve. In four of the six cases, the variables

included among the significant predictors of improvement in the problem areas included: being older, having achieved a higher grade at school, living in a small community, and being housed in an area outside the lower class or slum districts.

It is important to emphasize that while such predictors as those discussed above can be weighted in such a way as to help one predict whether or not the probationer is likely to improve or deteriorate during the course of the probation period, the application of the equation would result in such a small improvement over and above a pure guess, that it would be of little practical significance.

PROBATION SUCCESS AND PROBLEM IMPROVEMENT

There were 13 problem areas. Preliminary analyses suggested that those probationers who were judged to be successful in probation, had also shown an improvement in one or more of the problem areas. For purposes of this analysis, it was predicted that there would, on the average, be areas for improvement which were more important than others as far as being adjudged successful as a probationer. The multiple regression analysis, using scores on each of the improvement areas as predictors and the rating on the question having to do with probation success as the measure to be predicted, identified only two significant predictors - avoidance of drugs/alcohol abuse, and avoidance of convictions for new offences. In the prediction equation, these two variables can account for over 30% of the variance. The important point to note is that once the effects of just these two problem areas were accounted for, improvement in the other problem areas proved of little predictive value in discriminating between the successful and unsuccessful probationer.

A somewhat similar prediction effort was carried out, but this time using the Probation Officer's ratings of the importance which he or she had attached to each of the probationer's problems. That is, a probationer might show considerable improvement in the area of relationships with his or her parents, but the Probation Officer might rate that as being a relatively unimportant problem as far as the evaluation of his or her success while on probation was concerned.

While the prediction equation accounts for only 20% of the variance, the items which emerged as statistically significant predictors are of some interest. Probation success proved to be associated with an absence of problems having to do with relationships with authorities, avoidance of new offences, control of drug/alcohol abuse, finding new living quarters, and developing better relationships with friends. Probation success was positively related to the presence of important problems having to do with school and having to do with relationships

among co-workers. This means, for example, that if a probationer was seen as having an important problem having to do with his/her "relations to authority", he was less likely to be successful at probation than if the important problem was "progress at school".

PREDICTORS OF SUCCESS

How can one best combine information about a probationer which would most consistently discriminate the successful from the unsuccessful group? Dividing the population into the two groups, the following list of variables were entered into a discriminant analysis, as predictors:

- marital status
- most recent grade at school
- experience in technical/special opportunity school
- neighbourhood status
- reliance upon family assistance
- criminal record of father
- family instability in childhood
- family cohesiveness
- usual employment status
- job status at termination
- age at first experience with law
- number of crimes against property
- number of crimes against public order and peace
- number of liquor offences
- number of charges laid during probation
- time on probation before first charges laid
- amount of service required by the client
- number of months on probation.

After the appropriate analysis was carried out on this population, other analyses, using the same predictor variables, were carried out on "high risk" populations.

A "high risk" population is one which, on the basis of preliminary analyses, is known to include a higher than average population of probation failures. For example, the success rate among the population is almost 70%. However, among those who have completed

Grade 8 or less, the success rate is only 50%. Also, the success rate is only 50% among those who live in lower-class or slum neighbourhoods. Among those who are unemployed at the termination of probation, and are not looking for work - as well as among those who are able bodied but are usually unemployed - the success rates are, respectively, 46% and 25%.

The purpose in carrying out these analyses of high-risk sub-populations, is to determine just what it is about those who succeed "in spite of the odds" which may differentiate them from the average population.

Population Differences

The five discriminant analyses were conducted on the:

- total population
- those not completing the seventh grade
- those living in lower-class or slum level housing
- those unemployed at termination of probation
- those usually not interested in working.

In at least four of these five analyses, the following variables were included in the prediction equation which discriminated successful and unsuccessful probationers:

- usual employment status
- number of charges laid during probation
- time before first charge was laid after probation began
- level of supervision required
- amount of time on probation
- level of family cohesiveness
- employment status at termination.

There were only a few variables which appeared as effective predictors in the sub-populations, which did not appear as predictors in the total population.

For the sub-populations who either lived in lower status neighbourhoods or who had very low levels of education, the grade in school achieved was a significant predictor which did not appear in any of the other analyses. Thus, while we know from previous discussions concerning relationships between single variables and probation outcome, that grade level is related to probation success, these discriminant analyses indicate that grade level attained is a particularly crucial variable for those with Grade 8 or less, and/or for those living in poor neighbourhoods.

For the sub-populations of those individuals who are unemployed, and/or who are not interested in finding work, two variables which had not emerged in any of the other equations, proved to be effective predictors in these cases. The two variables in question were the marital status of the probationer and the level of family instability experienced by the probationer in his/her childhood.

Once again, from previous single-variable analyses, it was demonstrated that probationers who were married, and those who had experienced minimal family instability during childhood, have an increased probability of being successful during probation. However, the discriminant analyses indicate that, in relation to other possible predictors of probation success, the variables of marital status and family instability are of greater importance in predicting success for the sub-population of probationers who are not actively participating in the labour market, than for the average probationer.

Further Research

It must be noted that the analyses on high-risk sub-populations were carried out on relatively small numbers of individuals. Also, the level of detail, and the choice, of predictor variables was necessarily constrained by the primary purpose of the project: providing a general description of the average Ontario probationer. However, these preliminary analyses which attempt to identify predictors of success among populations at risk, are useful in identifying the specific variables, and combinations of variables, which - with further research work - could be refined to produce more accurate and useful sets of predictors.

END