THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL AIDS IN DETERMINING DISPOSITION OF ADULT OFFENDERS

PRESENTED TO:
TEXAS BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLES

PREPARED BY:
BIRKMAN-MEFFERD RESEARCH FOUNDATION

AUGUST 1978

Financial assistance for this project was made available by the Texas Criminal Justice Division, Governor's Office, under Grant Number DS-76-E04-0011. The fact that the Criminal Justice Division furnished financial support to the activities described in this report does not necessarily indicate the concurrence of the Criminal Justice Division with the statements or conclusions contained herein.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL AIDS IN DETERMINING DISPOSITION OF ADULT OFFENDERS

Presented to:
TEXAS BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLES
711 Stephen F. Austin Bldg.
P. O. Box 13401
Austin, Texas 78711
George G. Killinger, Ph.D., Chairman
Connie Jackson, Vice-Chairman
Clyde Whiteside, Member
Nelson Fayette, Project Director

Prepared by:
BIRKMAN-MEFFERD RESEARCH FOUNDATION
P. O. Box 27545, Houston, Texas 77027
Roy B. Mefferd, Jr., Ph.D., President

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL AIDS IN DETERMINING DISPOSITION (AIDD) OF ADULT OFFENDERS

Board of Pardons and Paroles, State of Texas

Final Report of Project COPE-AIDD[1]

Clemency officials are caught in the jaws of an inexorably closing vise. On one side are administrative and social pressures to clear our prisons promptly of offenders who have a low risk of returning to crime, and who, if released, may become productive responsible taxpaying people. On the other side is the pressure of public responsibility that officials must shield society by not releasing too soon, offenders who have a high probability of returning to crime. Both pressures are growing as our population increases and as our social philosophy changes. As these pressures increase, the work load of all concerned also increases, and less and less time can be devoted to individual cases.

Two requirements are evident: (1) improve the odds of making accurate decisions, and (2) organize the available information so as to expedite the decision process. The present project was a feasilibity study and a product development program aimed at both these requirements. As a result, new information is now available to the decision-makers to supplement their existing system -- to provide for "clinical override", as with the Salient Factor Score used by the U.S. Board of Parole (Hoffman & Beck, 1974). Further, the product was developed so as to facilitate future accomplishment of the second requirement (i.e., to expedite the decision process).

The new information concerns expected future behaviors of parolees. The decision-makers are provided with a series of estimations of relative risks of failure of a parole eligible inmate, i.e., if paroled, this person probably will behave in maladaptive ways that are historically related to a return to crime and prison. These independently estimated risks cover important potential behaviors: commission of new assaultive acts, poorly controlled aggressive tendencies, various maladjustments to the restrictions of the parole system, to society, and to work.

The variables within each predictor (e.g., Depression and Dominance) operate in a completely compensatory fashion -- a high score on one variable will compensate for a low score on another. The series of risk predictions themselves (e.g., poorly controlled aggression and poor self-control) may be used in a similar fashion, so that, when viewed together, a pattern of predicted behavior emerges. With a difficult parole decision, a pattern of low risks of maladaptive behaviors may suggest parole, whereas a predicted pattern of high risks to society may caution against parole.

The current state of predictive techniques is well developed in business and industry (e.g., Tatsuoka, 1970; Wiggins, 1973; Anastasi, 1976). Many important behaviors are now being predicted at significantly high levels: tenure, absenteeism, productivity, general work attitude, etc. (e.g., see Wittreich & Miner, 1971). These behaviors are also important for a successful parole. However, a successful parole involves much more than such work related behaviors.

Parole itself is always a prediction. The significant factors involved in making such a prediction focus upon the variables to be used, i.e., the information to be considered. Early efforts to predict parole behaviors were not especially rewarding (e.g., Gillin, 1943). At least six distinct reasons for this lack of success are apparent. One reason involves the fact that efforts were directed at a single global prediction of an end-result that can occur for many possible reasons (e.g., recidivism, violent acts, etc.), and the definitions of these end results has varied. Another factor involves the comparison of mixed groups. For example, relative to the prediction of violence, major sampling flaws have been failure to separate offenders committing qualitatively different kinds of violence and failure to screen the non-violent group to ensure that prior violent acts had not occurred as a juvenile or were obscured by administrative procedures such as plea-bargaining. Occassionally, the violent group contained many multiple offenders while the non-violent group contained many first offenders who had not had an equal opportunity to commit violent acts. A third reason for the lack of success concerns the comparison groups, which were not matched on significant variables such as age (e.g., see McCreary & Mensh, 1977), ethnic group (e.g., see McCreary & Padilla, 1977), length of imprisonment, number of offenses, etc. Fourth, parole success was loosely defined to include any person who completed parole whether by simple sentence discharge or by evidence of exemplary parole behavior (see e.g., Bennett, 1974; Sampson, 1974; Nicholson, 1968;

Evans, 1968). Another inadequacy was that parole failures were not identified as to the cause for revocation. Finally, offender samples were taken from a single facility, or they were small in number, and/or were not representative of different kinds of crimes or situations.

A primary cause for past shakiness of the predictor approach has been the basic inadequacy of the data used. Many efforts have relied entirely upon actuarial data -- population statistics, upon personal history and demographic data, or upon artificial and unreliable prison behavior. Recently, modern predictive and actuarial techniques have led to a significant improvement in the situation. Notably important systems are the Base Expectancy Score (California Department of Corrections, 1970), and the Salient Factor Score of the Federal Board of Paroles (Hoffman & DeGostin, 1974; Hoffman & Beck, 1974).

A significant aspect of the Salient Factor Score was provision for judgmental "clinical override" of the actuarial score on the basis of significant "other" data. Such intervention would permit, for example, the use of behavioral traits in the decision process. Some early efforts included crude personality measures (e.g., Burgess, 1928; Long, 1941; Jenkins, et al., 1942).

Recently, many reports have appeared that indicate successful predictions of various criminal and parole behaviors based on personality variables. Since Monahan's (1975) review, several positive reports of successful prediction of violence have appeared (e.g., Kunce, et al., 1976; McCreary, 1976; Heilbrun et al., 1976; Spellacy, 1978; Lothstein, et al., 1978). The same has occurred for "recidivism" (e.g., Holland & Holt, 1975; McWilliams, 1975; Adams, 1976) and for criminality in general (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1977). Intelligence has been implicated repeatedly in criminality (e.g., Witkin, 1976; Kunce et al., 1976).

Some of these studies had severe flaws: small sample size, failure to cross-validate, failure to consider the interactions of personality and situational variables. Especially overlooked is the basic sampling problem discussed by Megargee (1976). Criminal acts, and especially any particular kind of criminal act such as violence, actually are rare events committed by a small percentage of the population. As a result efforts to predict such rare acts as violence are subject to over-inclusiveness and gross over-prediction of the event among non-violent groups (e.g., large numbers of non-violent people are misidentified as violent). Even so, it is now

abundantly apparent that personality and temperament are vitally involved in criminality.

Largely neglected in current studies, but undoubtedly just as important as personality variables, are the array of motives, values, interests, perceptions of other people and of their motives, values, interests, etc. It appears unlikely that any particular personality type can be related either to a particular type of crime or even to crime itself. However, a person's behavior may become highly predictive, given a particular personality type upon which is superimposed patterns of maladaptive values, motives, interests and a general negative view of other people and of their feelings and rights.

General Objectives and Procedures of this Project

The procedures and methods used involve technical psychometric considerations that are of interest primarily to specialists. As much of this detail as possible has been removed from the forthcoming discussion and is presented in the form of Appendices and Footnotes at the appropriate places in the various tables. This was done so that a straight-forward and clear presentation could be made of the overall objectives, approaches and results of the Project, while simultaneously providing the information important to technical specialists. The following paragraphs describe, in broad terms, the assumptions involved in the conduct of the project and the procedures used.

(1) The parole decision was approached from a broad base of behaviors that historically have been related to parole failure and to renewed criminal activity. The behaviors targeted in this project were primarily those that are associated with a high risk of future damage to other people and to society. Secondly, behaviors were predicted that are associated with difficulties in adjusting to society and work, which in turn frequently lead to a parole failure. Finally, maladaptive behaviors were predicted that involve coping with the life "outside" and that frequently lead to excessive reliance on social programs, excessive use of alcohol and/or drugs, and family problems that may lead back to crime.

The behaviors that "passed" the rigorous series of validations and field tests to be described are shown in Table 1. These predict relative risks of exhibiting the indicated maladaptive behavior. A pattern of high risks

TABLE 1

PAROLE-RELEVANT BEHAVIORS IDENTIFIED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL AIDS FOR DETERMINING DISPOSITION (AIDD)[1]

Estimations of Risks of Parole Failure Due to Different Behaviors:

Risks Compared to Offender Groups

1. Risk of Assaultive Tendency[2]
2. Risk of Poorly Controlled Aggression[3]
3. Risk of Committing New Crimes[4]
4. Risk of Poor Parole Adjustment[5]

Risks of Offenders Compared with Comparable Workers in Business and Industry[6]

5. Risk of Poor Social Adaptability[7]
6. Risk of Poor Self-Control[7]

Risks Compared with Comparable Workers in Business and Industry[6]

7. Risk of Poor Work Attitude[8]
8. Risk of Poor Work Adjustment[9]
9. Risk of Poor Educational Rehabilitation[10]
10. Risk of Poor Marital Adjustment[11]

Risk Compared with Clinical Groups and Comparable Workers in Business and Industry

11. Risk of Susceptibility to Dependency[12]

Footnotes to TABLE 1

[1] These were identified by the Board of Pardons and Paroles (BPP).

[2] see Table 3

[3] see Table 4

[4] see Table 5

[5] see Table 6

[6] These data were made available by Birkman and Associates, Inc. (B&A), Houston, Texas (see paper Footnote 2).

[7] see Tables 4 and 7

[8] see Table 7

[9] see Table 8

[10] see Table 9

[11] see Table 7, B IV

[12] see Table 7, C

would suggest caution in releasing the inmate. A pattern of low risks to society would suggest release.

In lieu of a numerical scale, BPP elected to use a 3-point scale of High Risk (suggesting parole denial), Average Risk, and Low Risk (suggesting parole approval). The "cutting-points" for each predictor may be changed by the BPP as experience suggests. For the trial usage, these limits have simply been set at the upper and lower thirds of the sample used to develop the predictor.

(2) A primary concern was to improve some of the inadequacies noted in earlier efforts. In doing this the statistical predictive procedures were standard, straight-forward and in common use in the industrial psychology profession (e.g., multiple discriminant function analysis and multiple regression analysis (both step-wise), (e.g., see Nunnally, 1967; Guilford & Fructer, 1973, Cattell, 1973). The variable-to-subject ratio was kept high by limiting sharply the number of variables permitted to enter an equation. This has reduced the over-prediction problem.

(3) Sampling procedures were tailored to the overall problem of parole decisions. Samples were taken and compared from all the major points in time that are relevant to the parole process (e.g., immediately after prison entry, mid-sentence, at the time of parole eligibility and during parole (See Table 2 for the exact sampling points). Table 2 also shows the records available at each point.

Large offender samples, collected from across all prison units of the Texas Department of Corrections (TDC), were used. The samples of this project were representative of the current proportions of sex and ethnic groups in the TDC. (see Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 for the various offender samples, and Table 8 for the ethnic group and sexual compositions of the samples).

The "real" world samples were large and consisted of workers across many organizations in business and industry holding jobs at the level of and of the type that parolees would be expected to seek and obtain. The on-the-job performance of these workers had been evaluated by their employers. In these samples the proportions of ethnic groups were representative of

TABLE 2

THE PHASES OF THE PAROLE PROCESS AT WHICH SAMPLES WERE OBTAINED

AND THE SOURCE AND HISTORY OF THE RECORDS USED

Sample	PHASE
4a[1]	1. Entry into TDC prison system, including parole revocation. a. TDC interviews, tests, and compiles social and criminal history. b. TDC forwards to BPP a copy of the Commitment Data Form (Name, TDC number, sentence date and date of start, offense, minimum-maximum discharge dates, court of record, court of commitment). c. BPP computes parole eligibility data, informs inmate in writing of the initial review date by BPP under current laws, and establishes a parole file for the inmate.
1[2]	2. During early confinement in TDC system. a. Shortly after confinement, a BPP Institutional Parole Counselor conducts a question and answer parole orientation with groups of inmates. b. Soon after the orientation, the Parole Counselor interviews the inmate and completes a Case Summary -- social, criminal, and other information pertinent to parole determinations.
3[3]	3. Prior to Parole Eligibility date. a. BPP unit officials review the inmates' prison record and recommends parole or rejection. b. A BPP Parole Examiner interviews inmate and up-dates the Case Summary, prepares a Parole Placement Request (inmate's residential and employment plans) and the Parole Examiner's Summary. These are forwarded to BPP. c. The inmate's Parole File is reviewed for quality and completeness of the presentation by Parole Analysts.
	4. Formal Parole Procedure. a. A Parole Panel is established consisting of one Board Member and two Parole Commissioners. b. The Parole File is forwarded to the Parole Commissioner who reviews it, interviews the inmate and recommends approval or denial of parole. The Parole File with these recommendations is returned to the two other Members. After their review, they vote individually on whether or not to recommend parole to the Governor. c. If the majority vote is to deny parole, a date for possible review is set and the inmate is informed in writing of the Panel's decision and their reasons for the decision. d. If the majority of the Panel favors parole, a formal recommendation is forwarded with the Parole File to the Governor, who may approve or disapprove the Panel's recommendation.

TABLE 2 (cont.)

Sample	PHASE
2^4	5. Approved Parolee. a. TDC transfers inmate to a Pre-Release center. b. BPP assigns inmate to the supervision of a District Parole Officer or to a Parole Caseworker in the District of his indicated residence.
$4a^5$	c. Parolee's activities are monitored by the supervisor from the time of release until the sentence is completed and he is discharged, or in cases of exemplary behavior of at least 12-months, the BPP may place parolee on Annual Report Status. d. During active supervision the supervisor assists the parolee insofar as possible in adjusting to the requirements of the "free world."
	6. Governor Disapproved Parolee. a. Inmate re-enters the standard review system, with the next review usually set for one year later.

Footnotes to TABLE 2

[1] Parole recidivists, Failures of Table 6

[2] Mid-sentence at least 6-months after entry to Texas Department of Corrections (TDC).

[3] See Table 5

[4] See Table 4. Research Form S: (1) Collection Data Sheet on general pertinent data, and (2) a monthly follow-up form: Field Office Data Collection Form. These were used with this sample (see Supplement).

[5] Parole Successes of Table 6: Research Form -- Success Group Data Form. This was completed once for overall parole period (see Supplement).

those in Texas -- the groups into which the parolee must fit (See Table 7, p. 30 for these samples and Table 8, p. 34 for their composition).

(4) A new approach was made toward predicting the elusive and ambiguous constructs of violence and recidivism. The approach in this project was to break from the traditional global predictions, from the patterns of primary personality traits and from the actuarial characteristics of these over-broad end results of many situational and behavioral causes.

Rather, the focus was turned upon behaviors that set the stage for violence and for return to prison. This was done by enlarging and broadening the range of the samples, by arranging the samples in various ways for making different contrasts, by rigorous validation of the sample membership, and by targeted and incisive use of classification and predictive techniques. The overall success of this approach is shown in Table 10 (p. 49).

(5) Data in the inmates' files included scores on a widely used personality test -- the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) (Hathaway & McKinley, 1951), a general aptitude test and several measures of intelligence and educational level.

Attempts to use these scores in the development of predictive equations were disappointing. While one or more of these variables appeared in most predictive equations, many failed upon cross-validation. For example, in attempting to predict violence, six MMPI variables appeared on the equation. However, consider what variables they were: all three validity scales -- Lie, Frequency and K (Correction), indicating that the tests were badly sabotaged and faked; schizophrenia, with its unreliably large 78 items (i.e., the item to subject ratio is far too small), and which was "pulled" into the equation directly as result of the large number of "bizarrely" faked items (schizophrenia correlated r=0.80 with Frequency); Depression, which in this situation of stress and fear surely must have measured a state of depression rather than a stable trait of depression; and Masculinity/Femininity.

The situation was more promising with the existing measure of intelligence and educational attainment (EA). However, the conditions

and emotions surrounding the entry to prison indicated that this was not the best time in the parole cycle to obtain psychological data that would be predictive of distant parole behavior. This conclusion was confirmed using another test (Appendix 1) with a sample of parole revokees re-entering prison (Sample 4a Table 6, p. 27). Even though the revokees were volunteers, 19 percent of their answer sheets were judged to be at least questionable in reliability (Table 9, p. 39).

Extensive records were available of criminal activities. However, these are already available to the BPP, and it was desirable to keep the Special Aids as independent as possible of these records. In this way more new information became available.

(6) Traditionally, individual aptitude, intelligence, and personality tests have been viewed as separate independent measures. In this project a broader realm was exploited -- the interplay between a person's "admitted" Self-view (i.e., the standard personality inventory), and his/her beliefs about how Most People view the same questions (i.e., the social perception). When these batteries of interacting responses are considered simultaneously with an interest pattern, a very powerful predictive device emerges.

The approach also broke with the traditional psychiatrically oriented scales of many personality inventories -- psychopathic deviancy, schizophrenia, and with specific scales such as masculinity/femininity, manifest anxiety, and the like. The primary objections to such scales are: (1) they often are based on a large number of items which makes the item-to-subject ratio small and this leads to over-prediction problems; (2) these psychological concepts have seldom been validated as constructs, but even so, they are often reified -- "a person has a high score on the Schizophrenia scale of the MMPI, therefore, he/she is schizophrenic"; (3) these clinical scales fail to address the real problem of the parole decision -- how will this inmate adjust to parole and to the world of work?

An instrument was used that utilizes this entire set of measures, that is directed toward the world of work, that has been used successfully there

for more than a quarter of a century and for which there is an enormous commercial data base readily available for research purposes[1] (Appendix 1).

This instrument makes it possible to obtain from the interactions of the responses to the Self, Most People and Interests sections indirect estimates of values, motives, attitudes, and beliefs, that are all-important to a person's adjustment in society.

Criminality most likely is not a product of some given personality type, but rather of the interaction of a set of maladaptive values, motives, attitudes and beliefs with some particular personality type. An impulsive, self-indulgent, emotionally unstable personality type may or may not lead to a life out of step with authority. However, if a person of this temperament also has a poor value system, a negative or unconcerned attitude toward others and their feelings and rights, little ambition and a firm belief that everything is specially arranged to ensure his/her failure, society has a problem. The personality and social perceptions measures provide indirect estimates of these kinds of interactions.

In this project the stabilities and reliabilities of the instrument for use with offenders was re-established for Texas. Provision was made to identify answers that appear to be suspect or unreliable because of systematic or random answering patterns.

(7) Very careful and detailed attention was given by the respective staffs of BPP and TDC, to the records of each person included in the samples to be described. Offenders were removed from a given sample for two reasons, with the decisions being made by personnel not directly associated with the project:

(a) TDC (for Samples 1 (Table 3) and 2a (Table 4) and BPP (for Samples 3 (Table 5) and 4 (Table 6) examined inmate files for completeness, accuracy, and reliability according to predetermined criteria (e.g., offense of arrest not shown, evidence of plea bargaining, ambiguous evidence about juvenile offenses, etc.).

(b) The answer sheets were examined and removed when they were wrinkled, badly smudged, or mismarked (e.g., lines drawn through both True and False, lines drawn from top-to-bottom in the same column). The scoring routine also identified sheets where there was obvious systematic answering behavior (e.g., all True, all False, alternating True and False, skipped items, many erasures, the first choice on the Interest Survey always selected First, or Last, etc).

(8) A standardized procedure was followed for predictor development. The predictor equations were developed from a randomly selected subsample of 67 percent of the particular total sample. The predictor was cross-validated (i.e., applied to a different but comparable sample) using the remaining third of the total sample. Two measures of the accuracy of the predictor were computed: (a) the correlation between the actual criterion scores (e.g., violent acts), and the predicted violence scores, and (b) the respective "hit" rates for both categories, using X^2 to determine the significance levels of these rates (See Guilford & Fructor, 1973). The latter result is the more important one for practical use. The correlation coefficient shows that a relationship exists, but it varies with the size of the sample. The successful results of these validation procedures are shown in Table 10 (p. 49).

(9) All predictors that yielded statistically significant results were tested for utility and stability by at least two field tests (Note: there were three exceptions -- assaultive acts, marital stability and susceptibility to dependence -- because all available violent offenders were used for the predictor, and the data were not available for the offender samples for the other two predictors). The samples involved in these "actual usage" situations were quite different and were at different points in the parole cycle.

(10) The various legal and professional requirements concerning individual rights, preservation of confidentiality, and the use of paper-and-pencil procedures were observed (e.g., those contained in the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency (LEAA) guidelines (Federal Register, 1976). The analytical work was done by an independent, private professional

organization which included psychologists who were experienced in such work and who were licensed in the State of Texas[1].

Inmates were informed that they need not complete the questionnaire and that the results could not influence their parole decision in any way. Administration of the questionnaire was always under the close standardized supervision of either TDC or BPP (See Appendices 2, 3 and 4). Signed release statements were obtained (Appendix 5) from all subjects.

Specific Procedures

Samples

Five offender and five worker samples were used in this project. Two of the offender samples were collected specifically for the project (3 and 4) while two of the offender samples (2a and b) and all of the workers (5-9) were taken directly from a pre-existing private commercial data base[2]. One offender sample (Sample 1) was collected as part of the standardization base of another project -- Project Uplift-Outreach[3]. These samples are discussed in the order in which they appear in Table 1. Data collected on all offender samples are shown in Appendix 6.

"Sample 1" was developed from the approximately 2300 inmate sample collected as a part of Project Uplift-Outreach[3]. These were mid-sentence paid volunteers from across all TDC units tested under the supervision and control of TDC. One subsample of 112 was used to establish the test-retest reliability of questionnaires for offenders (see the Reliabilities section). Another subsample was developed which did not include this test-retest group for use in predicting violence-related tendencies. The records were screened very carefully by TDC for completeness and accuracy of criminal histories and for reliability of the answer sheets. This screening process left 1727 offenders (Table 3).

All offenders among the 1727 who had committed one or more violent crimes or who had threatened in a convincing way to use violence were retained for the sample. Then, from among those for whom there was no evidence or suspicion (e.g., evidence of plea bargaining) that they had ever committed a violent act as a juvenile or an adult, a group of non-violent offenders were taken. This resulted in 999 offenders with criminal records and reliable questionnaire results. Their sex and ethnic groups are shown in Tables 3 and 8, (pp. 16, 34).

TABLE 3

SAMPLE 1: PAID VOLUNTEER INMATES FROM ACROSS ALL UNITS OF THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (TDC)[1]

PURPOSE: To Develop a Predictor of Risk of NEW ASSAULTIVE ACTS

Total Number of TDC Inmates Paid for Completing the Questionnaires	2300
Less: Answer Forms either incomplete or a highly systematic response pattern[2]	308
Less: TDC problems with matching the name on the Forms and the TDC Inmate File	77
Less: Inadequate or ambiguous data on violence[3]	101
Less: Files with missing test or demographic data[4]	87
Net Sample Available:	1727

A. Sub-Sample for Assaultive Tendencies[5]

Type of Violence	Ethnic Group White	Black	Chicano	Other	Total
1. Multiple violence	66	63	20	2	151
2. Heinous violence	28	26	9	1	64
3. Single violence	71	84	24	4	183
4. Threatened violence	109	118	32	11	270
5. Sub-sample with no recorded violence tendencies[6]	164	102	57	8	331
Total Sample	438	393	142	26	999[7]

B. Prior Violent Parole Revokees After a New Violent Act (see Sample 3c, Table 5) 64

C. Worker Samples from Samples 5, 6, and 7 (see Table 7)

Weak and Poor Performers	600
Average and Good Performers	600
Total Sample	2263

Footnotes to TABLE 3

1

Sample consisted of male Inmates across all units in the Texas Department of Corrections (TDC). These Inmates had been in prison 6 months or more and were not eligible for parole. These Inmates were tested in supervised groups of 20-100 at a time. They completed the questionnaire during 1975; this was also used as part of the data base developed for Project UPLIFT by Birkman-Mefferd Research Foundation (BMRF) for the Criminal Justice Division, State of Texas, under LEAA Grant No. AC-77-E05-4207 and EA-77-04-4915.

2

Inmates were removed from the sample by BMRF personnel (who knew nothing about the Inmates) for the following reasons: answers were marked all TRUE or all FALSE, alternating of TRUE and FALSE answers, items skipped, too many erasures, etc.

3

Inmates were removed from sample by TDC personnel(who knew nothing about the other results) if an inmate's folder did not contain the following: the Inmate Summary with a version of current offense, arrest report from the Texas Department of Public Safety and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, official reports from the District Attorney of the convicting county, and/or Inmate offense reports containing information on institutional violence. Also, if the information regarding violence was absent or ambiguous, the Inmate was not used in the Final Sample.

4

Inmates were removed from the sample by TDC if the results of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), and the General Aptitude Test Battery were absent. These test results were used in comparison with the Birkman Results.

5

The careful, meticulous attention given to the selection and classification of this sample by TDC is gratefully acknowledged. TDC made use of five (5) criteria for which reliable decisions appeared possible:
(1) two or more commissions of direct physical harm upon another person by cutting, shooting, raping, clubbing, etc. (negligent homicides were not included); (2) the commission of a particularly brutal or heinous harmful act (e.g., multiple stabbing or shooting, bludgeoning or a vicious beating); this group contained some multiple violent offenders (crimes of passion were not included); (3) the commission of a violent act similar to that in Category 1, but only for one occasion (this category also included rape without other physical harm, husband shooting unfaithful wife, etc.); (4) direct threat of violence with apparent capability of fulfillment, or offender created a situation where physical harm could occur(e.g., robbery without physical harm, crime with a weapon on offender's person; (5) no history of violence either as juvenile or adult.

Footnotes to TABLE 3 (cont.)

6 Offenders were retained in this category only when the evidence of non-violent, non-aggressive behavior was clear-cut. Short-term first offenders and young offenders with no evidence of juvenile crime were not selected. The remainder were matched insofar as possible for age, education, and ethnic group. Those offenders without matches were not used to avoid over-weighting the sample with non-violent offenders.

7 None of the 112 Inmates used for the Test-Retest reliability determination were in this sub-sample.

TABLE 4

OFFENDER SAMPLES COLLECTED BEFORE THIS PROJECT

SAMPLE 2a: Offenders at a Pre-Release Facility, 1971[1]

PURPOSE: (1) Develop a predictor of POORLY CONTROLLED AGGRESSION, and

(2) Contrast with actively working people to develop various predictors of WORK ATTITUDES

Offenders with histories of aggressive and violent behavior	95
Offenders with no history of aggressive or violent behavior	78
TOTAL	173

SAMPLE 2b: Mid-sentence Inmates in Prison from Another State[2]

PURPOSE: To contrast with actively working people to develop various predictors of ADAPTIBILITY

Volunteer male offenders of unknown criminal histories	88

Footnotes to TABLE 4

1

This sample was described in Justice and Birkman (1972). The male Inmates were awaiting release on parole and the two groups were matched by groups for age (M= 29.4 yrs), education (M=8.7 yrs), and educational achievement test scores (M= 7.8 yrs). There were 93.6% Whites and 6.4% Blacks. Ten questionnaires were incomplete. While this predictor was originally intended to be of violence, the criteria were more of a general aggressive behavior than were the criteria used in this present project (based on Sample 1). For business and industry, Birkman & Associates, Inc. report that this score has proven to be a reliable indicator of "directed" vs. "uncontrolled" aggressive tendencies.

2

Male Inmates of the Federal Prison, Huntsville, Alabama, tested in 1968. There were 56.8% Whites and 43.2% Blacks. Nine questionnaires could not be used.

The multiple-violent category was expanded by including the 64 parole revokees of Sample 3c (Table 5, p. 22) who had committed prior violent acts and were being returned to TDC for a new violent crime. This resulted in 215 offenders with two or more different violent acts, 64 who had committed a particularly brutal or heinous crime (in some cases these had also committed other violent acts), 183 with one violent act, and 270 who had threatened violence, and well could have become violent. This heavy proportion of violent inmates in the sample led to marked over-prediction of violence in non-offender samples.

Therefore, the sample was further augmented with 1200 workers, from Samples 5, 6, and 7, (pp. 22, 27, 30) half rated as Weak or Poor by the employers, and half rated as Average or Good. Their ethnic groups and sex are also shown in Table 8 (p. 34). The final sample was 2263. The classification and distribution of these various groups used for the predictor -- 1-Assaultive Tendency will be described later.

Sample 2a was tested at one TDC pre-release unit in 1972. The criminal and prison records of this sample of white males and a few blacks (Table 8) were examined very carefully to classify the offenders as violent (95) or non-violent (78) (Justice and Birkman , 1972). The criteria used at that time were different from those used with Sample 1 -- aggressive behavior and fist-fighting were allowed to classify an inmate as violent. This sample was used to develop the predictor 2-Poorly Controlled Aggression.

Sample 2b was composed of 88 mid-sentence male inmates from a Federal penitentiary who were tested in another state in 1968. Criminal records were unknown, and they had been used in the preproject equations to be discussed. There were 50 White and 38 Black inmates in this sample (Table 8, p. 34).

Sample 3 was 1499 parole eligible volunteer inmates from across all the TDC units (Table 5). They were tested before they knew the outcome of their parole decision. Parole was denied to 129 of them. The testing was under the control and supervision of the BPP and, as with the other samples, this sample was informed that the results would not be available to BPP (See Appendix 3).

The criminal records and Birkman answer sheets were screened carefully and a sample of 1154 was established. The sex and ethnic groups of these are shown in

TABLE 5

SAMPLE 3: 18-month follow-up sample for the final test of the Special Aids for Determining Disposition (AIDD)[1]

PURPOSE: (1) Develop a predictor of RISK FOR NEW CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

(2) Provide a sample for a rigorous Field Test[2] of all Special Aids (Sample 3b)

Parole-eligible inmates volunteering to complete the questionnaires		1499
LESS those inmates denied parole	129	
TOTAL paroled		1370
LESS questionable Answer Forms[2]	145	
LESS incomplete or ambiguous data on criminal record	71	

SAMPLE 3a: Net 18-month follow-up parolees for development of predictor of Risk for NEW CRIMES[3]

Relative Risk Groups for Committing New Crimes[4]

Risk Level	Number
High	311
Average	482
Low	361
TOTAL	1154

SUB-SAMPLE 3b taken from 3a for rigorous Field Test[2] of Special AIDDS (Parolees from the two extremes of parole success)

Returned to prison within 6-months	108
Placed on Annual Report status[5]	71
Sample for Final Field Test	179

TABLE 5 (cont.)

SUB-SAMPLE 3c taken from 3b	
Returned to prison new violence	64
Non-violent, matches from Sample 1 (see Table 3)	64
TOTAL	128

Footnotes to TABLE 5

[1]See Footnote 1, Table 2. Volunteer samples of Inmates across all TDC units who had been recommended for parole by the BPP officials, completed the questionnaires during the 3-month period pending a parole decision. The Inmates were informed that the results would not be available to them or to the BPP during this parole decision process, and could in no way influence the results of this decision. Upon release, parolees in this sample were checked at monthly intervals for 12 months or until their parole status changed (see Appendix 7 for the Field Office Data Collection Form). The intake period for the follow-up sample was 6-months.

[2]See Footnote 3, Table 3.

[3]This group was a cross-section of typical Texas parolees. Some parolees discharged their sentences without problems; some were returned to prison; some remained under active supervision; and some had been placed on a form of reduced supervision. This sample was also used to Field-Test the predictor equations in which offender samples were contrasted with non-offender samples.

[4]To establish the predictor of Risk for NEW CRIMINAL ACTIVITY, the pre-release records were examined to determine prior criminal and parole histories. Only prior convictions were used--neither prior arrests nor prior incarcerations were used in establishing these categories (see TEXT). The risk levels were adjusted for the effects of age within each age group (see TEXT).

Footnotes to TABLE 5

(continued)

[5]In Texas, Annual Report status results from exemplary adjustment to parole (no new crime and a good attitude) over at least a 12-month period. The Parole Officer (PO) must recommend, and the Director, Division of Parole Supervision must approve this status. This essentially represents unsupervised parole status.

Table 8. Upon release, these individuals scattered across the entire state. The Parole Officers in Texas who supervised one or more of these parolees completed a monthly form on each of these individuals which covered aspects of parole adjustment (see Appendix 7).

This sample served two purposes:

(1) to develop from past criminal records the predictor 3-New Crimes to be described. All 1154 parolees were used for this purpose.

(2) to provide the offender sample for Field Test 2 -- Sample 3b (Table 5). This sample consisted of 108 parolees returned to TDC within 6-months (64 of these had committed prior violent acts, and were returned for new violent acts -- they are the group used to augment Sample 1 (Table 3) and of 71 parolees who were exceptionally successful on parole -- after at least 12 months of excellent monthly reports, including good attitudes about parole and no problems with the law, they had been placed on the essentially unsupervised Annual Report Status. This procedure required the concurrence of the Parole Officer and the supervisor. These represented two very extreme groups, since the large bulk of parolees are merely passing time, having difficulties adjusting, and finishing short sentences without fanfare. Persons who comprised this bulk group were not included.

Sample 4 was 802 offenders who were tested after parole (Table 6). The sample served two purposes: (1) to develop the predictor 4-Poor Parole Adjustment, and (2) to serve as the sample for Field Test 1. For the first purpose the criminal records and answer sheets were screened carefully resulting in a final sample of 668. However, for the Field Test 1 all 802 answer sheets were used "as was", since part of this test was to determine the validity of processing all forms without screening.

The sample was developed in two phases -- Failures and Successes. The Failure group were all parolees returning to TDC either with revocations or pre-revocation warrants within a given time-frame (viz., until 460 had completed the questionnaires). The questionnaires were administered on a voluntary basis as part of the regular entry process (see Appendix 4). Needless to say this sample was taken at a traumatic period in the parole cycle. However, this was an intentional part of the sampling plan whereby each major point in the parole cycle was sampled.

TABLE 6

SAMPLES 4a, b Post-release parolees from across the State of Texas

PURPOSE: (1) Develop a predictor equation for Risk of POOR PAROLE ADJUSTMENT

(2) To provide a sample for Field-Test 1 cross-validation of all Special Aids for Determining Disposition by the Texas Board of Pardons and Parole (BPP)

Total Post-Release Sample completing the questionnaires[1]		815
Less Inmates with unrecorded ethnic group		13
Net Sample 4a used for Field-Test 1 cross-validation[2]		802

Parole Results

Parole Failure (return to prison)[3]	460	
Less questionable Answer Forms[4]	89	
Net Failure Sample	371	
Parole Success[5] (as judged by parole officer)		342
Less questionable Answer Forms		45
Net Success Sample		297

FINAL Net Sample 3b for PAROLE ADJUSTMENT predictor: 668

Footnotes to TABLE 6

1

The control and supervision of the procedures and testing was under the BPP for the Parole Successes, and the TDC for the Parole Failures (those parolees who returned to prison).

2

Group: 802 Inmates. For the Field-Test there was no screening to remove the questionable Answer Forms -- all were processed "as was". All the recommended predictors (other than this one) were tested with this group.

3

The records of all parolees who returned to TDC were audited; some were returned on pre-revocation warrants pending actual recovation. These revokees completed the questionnaire as part of the regular diagnostic entry process of TDC. This represented a cross-section of post-parolees.

4

See Footnote 3, Table 3.

5

Parole Success was based on a judgment by the immediate Parole Officer (PO). This was obtained as follows: each PO in Texas was asked to select from among their caseload of parolees up to five whom they judged as most likely to succeed (they had to have had these parolees for at least 6-months). These nominated "Successes" were invited by their PO to complete the questionnaires (accompanied by the usual statements that the results would not influence their parole, etc. -- see Appendix .); the PO completed the Research Form -- Success Group Data Form (see Appendix). This Form covered the overall behavior and adjustment of the entire parole period. The PO's perceptions of what factors are relevant to success vary, so they were asked to list the important factors that they believed to be critical to success. Ten PO's had beliefs that clearly were either not relevant or were deviant from the other POs. Their nominees were not used. 115 PO's responded from across the ten major cities and 37 smaller communities in Texas.

The success group was developed differently. All Parole Officers/ Case Workers were asked to consider carefully their parolees who had been on parole at least 6 months, and nominate any (up to five) whom they believed were going to complete their parole successfully (see Appendix 8). They were asked further to select only the very best parolees they had -- ones who were really exemplary. The PO's perception of what is required to be successful on parole was obtained by asking them to indicate behaviors they believed were important in this respect for each parolee (see Appendix 9). The nominees of several parole officers were dropped from the sample due to the deviance of their responses from those of the other officers.

The nominated parolees were requested by the P.O. to complete the questionnaires, and almost all did so. After screening the answer sheets a sample of 297 parolees who appeared to be adjusting well to parole was developed.

These 668 Failures and Successfully Adjusting Parolees were contrasted to develop predictor 4-Poor Parole Adjustment. As noted above the entire 802 parolees were used for Field Test 1.

The worker samples from the commercial data base were of two time frames -- Samples 5, 6 and 7 were from the period 1969-1972, and were used either alone or in combination with the inmates of Samples 2a and 2b in the 1972 development of predictors 5, 6 and 7 (Table 7A). These workers were of approximately the same age, education and socio-economic background as the offenders. They were holding jobs of the same type and at the same level as parolees might seek and obtain. The proportions of the major ethnic groups were those of Texas rather than of the TDC population (Table 8). The rationale for this was that this is the population into which the parolee must fit -- not that of TDC.

The second time frame was 1969-1977 (Table 7B). Sample 5b consisted of the 1154 inmates of Sample 3a plus a new sample of 863 workers from the commercial data base matched for age and education with the inmate sample. This combined sample was used to cross-validate with a new sample the predictors 5, 6 and 7 of Table 7A.

The rest of the samples involved only workers or clinical samples from the data base drawn for the purposes indicated. Sample 6 was developed by

TABLE 7

SAMPLES 5, 6, and 7 from workers in business and industry[1]

PURPOSE: (1) To explain how the pre-project predictors were developed.

(2) To re-cross-validate these predictors

(3) To develop new parole-relevant predictors

PART A

Pre-project Samples (1969 - 1972) (Sample 5a)

Performance-evaluated workers in non-supervisory jobs (for at least 6-months):

Rated: Weak or Poor	446	
Average or Good	599	
TOTAL	1045	

Used for original development of predictors[2]

I. Social Adaptability:

Worker sub-sample of equal numbers of good, average, weak, and poor		573
Prison Inmates[3]		
TDC Parole eligible	173	
Alabama, mid-sentence	88	
	261	
		261
For Poor Social Adaptability:		834

II. Self-Control:

Prison Inmates, TDC[3]	173		
Weak and Poor Workers	446		
Poor Self Control		619	
Average and Good Workers		599	
For Poor Self-Control:			1218

TABLE 7 (cont.)

PART A (cont.)

III. Work Attitude:

Weak and Poor Workers	446
Average and Good Workers	599
For Poor Work Attitude:	1045

PART B

Industrial and Business Sample Developed for this Project (1969-1977)[1]

Total Sample: Workers in non-supervisory jobs for at least 6-months for whom sex, race, age, tenure, and other job related data were available

SAMPLE 5b 1734

I. For RE-CROSS VALIDATION of PREDICTORS I, II, and III of PART A, a sub-sample was developed of satisfactory workers who could be matched for age, sex, race, and education with parolled offenders of SAMPLE 3.

Matched working people	863
Paroled offender Sample 3[4]	1154
Total for General Adaptability:	2017[5]

II. For development of predictor of WORK ADJUSTMENT[6]

SAMPLE 6

Workers with at least 1-year tenure with same employer	1223
Workers with 2 or more employer changes within the same time span	511
Total for Poor Work Adjustment:	1734

III. For development of predictor of ATTITUDE TOWARD EDUCATIONAL REHABILITATION

SAMPLE 7

Sub-sample of workers balanced insofar as possible with SAMPLE 3 for age, race, and sex.

TABLE 7 (cont.)

PART B (cont.)

III. (cont.)

Years of Education	Number	
4 - 9	184	
10 - 11	138	
12	183	
13 - 15	194	
16+	125	
TOTAL		824

IV. MARITAL ATTITUDE:

SAMPLE 8

Married workers with:[7]		
No divorce	223	
Divorce	218	
TOTAL		441

PART C

Industrial and Business and Clinical Sample for Predictor of SUSCEPTIBILITY TO DEPENDENCY[8]

SAMPLE 9

Workers	188	
Chronic alcoholics	113	
Drug addicts	75	
TOTAL		376

Footnotes to TABLE 7

1 From the proprietary data base of Birkman & Associates, Inc. (B&A), Houston, Texas. In both the Pre-Project (1969-1972) and this Project (1969-1977), the workers were selected to match (age, education, sex, and race) the offender samples (this matching was much closer in the later Project sample due to the large increase in the size of the data base. The Pre-Project sample crossed 55 business and industrial organizations, while the Project sample crossed more than 150. These organizations had widely varying functions, products, policies, and philosophies. The workers consisted of a wide range of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs in operations, trades, maintenance and repair, driving, assisting in technical and health activities, clerking, selling, etc. All jobs were at the level and type that parolees might seek and obtain.

2 These predictors were developed by B&A first on a sub-sample of the indicated samples, then if the predictor significantly categorized the workers in the remainder, a new equation was developed using the entire sample. Since 1972 all three predictors have been cross-validated many times with different organizations and occupations by B&A (personal communication).

3 See Table 4

4 See Table 5

5 This sample was also used to Field-Test Predictors II and III of Part A of this Table.

6 The two categories of workers were matched roughly for age. In case of the minority and females, however, the matching was less rigorous in order to incorporate as many as possible in the sample.

7 Workers never married were excluded. The two married groups were matched for age and education. The age range was limited to 21-32 so as to be comparable with the Inmate samples. The proportions of ethnic groups reflects the current social and religious customs: White, Black, Chicano = 85 : 14 : 1. The Male : Female proportion was 65 : 35.

8 The sober alcoholics were volunteers from various alcohol abuse centers in Houston. The active hard-core drug addicts were paid volunteers from a Crisis Intervention Center in San Francisco, CA. The workers were matched for age and education with the clinical groups. The proportions by ethnic groups for White:Black:Chicano were 85:8:7. The Male:Female ratios were 86:14.

TABLE 8

COMPOSITION OF THE VARIOUS SAMPLES RELATIVE TO SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP

Category	SAMPLES (in percentages)												
	A	1a	2		3[2]		4		5		6	7	1b
			a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b			
White	43	44	94	57	54	52	44	50	81	61	75	72	39
Black	41	39	6	43	35	35	37	31	19	26	18	16	30
Chicano	0	14	0	0	11	13	18	19	0	12	6	11	30
Other	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Male	93	91	100	100	85	88	96	93	100	82	78	77	71
Female	7	10	0	0	15	12	4	7	0	18	22	23	29
Number	7580	999	173	88	1154	179	802	668	261	863	1734	824	112
Table No.		3	4		5		6		7		7	7	7

Footnotes to TABLE 8

1

The Samples were as follows:

(A) The total of 7580 Inmates released in Texas in 1977 (Texas BPP, 1977);
(1) Paid TDC Inmates for attempts to predict violence but which became ASSAULTIVE ACTS.
(2a) Pre-Project TDC offenders for attempt to predict violence, but which became POORLY CONTROLLED AGGRESSIVE TENDENCIES;
(2b) Alabama Inmates of a Federal prison for SOCIAL ADAPTABILITY;
(3a) 18-month follow-up sample of parolled TDC offenders for NEW CRIMINAL ACTIVITY and Field-Testing of developed predictors;
(3b) Sub-sample of 3a of parolees returned to prison within 12-months or placed on Annual Report status for Field-Tests;
(4a) Sample of post-release parolees with no answer Forms removed for any reason; these were used for a broad Field-Test;
(4b) Sub-sample of 3a for PAROLE ADJUSTMENT with questionable answer Forms removed and consisting of parolees either already returned to prison or those still on parole and judged by their PO to be exemplary and probably to be parole successes.
(5a) Pre-Project worker sample used for SOCIAL ADAPTABILITY, SELF-CONTROL, WORK ATTITUDE;
(5b) Project worker sample for re-cross-validation these same predictors;
(6) B&A Project worker sample for WORK ADJUSTMENT:
(7) B&A Project worker sample for EDUCATIONAL REHABILITATION ATTITUDE;
(1b) Sub-sample of Sample 1a to determine test-retest reliabilities of the questionnaires and of the predictors developed.

2

A sub-sample of 64 was taken from Sample 3b consisting of previously violent parolees who broke parole because of a repeated violent act(s). These were matched with non-violent repeat offenders of Sample 1a who had no record of violence. This sample of 128 was used for a cross-validation and Field-Test of assaultive and aggressive tendencies.

identifying workers in the data base of the same age who had been with the same employer for at least a year (1223) and workers with 2 or more employers without promotion within a year (511). This latter group are commonly characterized as Job Hoppers. It was used to develop predictor 8-Poor Work Adjustment. This construct is quite different from the preceeding predictor 7-Poor Work Attitude, since the former people may perform at satisfactory levels, but just cannot seem to adjust to one job.

Sample 7 was developed from the commercial data base by drawing workers balanced in-so-far as possible with Sample 3 for age and ethnic group, on the basis of their educational levels. This sample of 824 was used to develop the predictor 9-Poor Educational Rehabilitation. The intent of this predictor was to estimate how effective efforts might be to increase a parolee's qualifications by educational means.

Sample 8 was drawn from the commercial data base for workers between 21 and 32 years of age of similar educational level as Sample 3, and who were or had been married. These were separated into those still married to only one person, and those who had at least one divorce. The sample consisted of 223 not divorced and 218 divorced. This was used to develop predictor 10-Poor Marital Adjustment. Data were not reliable to validate this predictor with an inmate sample.

Sample 9 were two clinical samples -- 113 chronic alcoholics in various alcohol abuse centers, and 75 active drug addicts from a crisis intervention center -- an equal number of workers were matched for age, education, sex and ethnic group with the clinical group. This sample was used to develop the predictor 11-Susceptibility to Dependency. Data were not reliable to validate this predictor with an inmate sample.

Validities

Cross-validation is a necessary requirement for adoption of important predictors. This provides an estimate of the relative ability of the predictor to classify people correctly assuming that they really "took the test".

This is not enough for BPP. The important question is "How well will this battery of predictors work operationally in the field?" Two separate and quite different Field Tests were done. (Note: data were not available for testing the first and last two predictors of Table 1).

Field Test 1 (Table 6) was rigorous in three respects: (1) the questionnaires were completed after parole; (2) all answer sheets were processed "as was" without screening for reliability, etc., and (3) over half the sample (Table 5), 460, were volunteer parole revokees who were tested in groups in the regular diagnostic process upon their re-entry to prison. Their mood and attitudes at that time must have been negative to say the least, and the worst possible test-taking behavior might be expected. The other 342 "successful" parolees were at the opposite extreme -- it appeared that they were going to "make it". Furthermore, they were usually tested individually.

This critical field test showed that the recommended predictors had significant hit rates for both groups being contrasted, even though 19.3 percent of the answer sheets of the revokees were suspect or worse (Table 9A).

Field Test 2 (Sample 3, Table 5) involved parole eligible inmates tested during the hopeful period, before parole. Thus, the testing per se did not intrude into the process. This was especially important for those who later were returned to TDC. Two subsamples (Table 5) were used to establish: (1) validated samples of parole success and failure, (3b); and (2) an additional group of repeated violence (3c). The failures of this group had been returned to prison within 6 months after parole, while the successes had been placed on Annual Report after at least 12 months of exemplary parole. Note that "success" is still relative to on-going parole -- not to sentence completion.

Even with the small sample sizes involved in Field Test 2, all the predictions were in the correct direction, and almost all were at a significant level. Importantly, there was no overprediction in either direction.

Both Field Tests confirmed the cross-validation results. Further, they showed that these predictive characteristics were stable, and that they could be expected to remain valid even in field usage. The question of reliability now becomes important.

Reliabilities

The reliability and dependability of any test depends on a number of factors:

(1) How cooperative is the inmate -- does he/she really "take" the test -- does he/she deliberately sabotage the test? This important question was examined at each major point in the parole cycle, and under highly varying conditions of testing and supervision.

The standard for comparison of this question was the worker Sample 5a (Table 7). The workers were very comparable to the inmates in age and education, and they were representative of the major ethnic groups. The results of the various comparisons are shown in Table 9A. According to the cutting points used in this project (see footnote to Table 9A), 2 percent of the answer sheets of the workers would have been returned for retesting, and about 2 percent would have been suspect. This corresponds well with the 1971 Pre-Release Sample 2A. This sample was tested just prior to release and was given detailed and repeated assistance in completing the sheets.

The Parole Eligible Sample 3 had small increases in each category. There were slight further increases in the numbers of suspect (i.e., more than the expected amount of systematic answering patterns) sheets in both the paid mid-sentence inmates of Sample 1 and Parole Successes (judged) of Sample 4a.

Thus, under conditions where the inmates were volunteers who were assured that their results will not even be known by Parole Officials, between 10 and 15 percent of the answer sheets were at least suspect. When it was administered at a very bad time in the inmate's parole cycle, and as a part of the regular routine entry process, this rate jumped to about 19 percent.

It would be expected that these rates would change during the trial use period. When all inmates begin to be tested, they will recognize that the testing has become a part of the parole process and some will make a more diligent effort, but some will attempt to "make themselves look better". There will be the usual crank-up problems associated with any large program. As it settles into the routine system (with taped-oral administration, use of the Spanish forms and some individual assistance as indicated), the rates of reliable results should settle back to around 10 percent of the sheets needing to be repeated and possibly 10 percent that are suspect.

A more serious problem is shown by the understandably high rate of sabotage in the TDC entry testing. This was noted earlier relative to

TABLE 9

RELIABILITIES OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE SYSTEM OF PREDICTORS

FOR ADULT OFFENDERS

PURPOSE: (1) To estimate the numbers of answer sheets that have various problems -- processing by automated equipment, sabotaging, too systematic an answering pattern.

(2) To determine whether Inmates answer the items throughout the test consistently, and whether they appear to "be taking" the test and not just marking items at random.

(3) To determine whether the Inmates answer the items the same way on the two occasions.

PART A

PURPOSE: Expected rates of unscorable (US), unreliable (UR), and suspect (S) answer sheets of the questionnaires[1].

Sample Point in the Parole Cycle	Supervision[a]	Rates (%)			
		US	UR	S	Total[b]
1 Early prison (paid)	G	2.1	2.7	8.6	13.4
3 Parole eligible	G	2.3	3.2	5.1	10.6
2a Pre-release	G	1.3	1.4	2.8	5.5
4a Post-parole:					
Failure (in prison)	Gp	2.2	7.7	9.4	19.3
Success (on parole)	I	1.1	3.9	8.2	13.2
5a Worker sample	I	0.9	1.1	1.9	3.9

[a] G= Groups; Gp = Groups, TDC entry; I = Individual.

[b] Unscorable (U), due to wrinkled or folded sheets, smudges, incorrect marking of sheets
Unreliable (UR), due to two or more responding patterns that are done by fewer than 10% of a large sample of Workers.
Suspect (S), due to one responding pattern that is done by fewer than 10% of the Worker sample.

TABLE 9 (cont.)

PART B

PURPOSE: Do Inmates answer the questions consistently throughout the Questionnaires?

Do they appear to be "taking" the test -- do their answers differ from random patterns?

Sample	Number	Correlation Coefficients of Questions Indicated	
		First: Last Half	Odd:Even
4a	802	0.80	0.84
5a III	1045	0.75	0.79
Random[a] Forms	500	0.01	-0.04

[a] Individual questions were answered at random to generate these forms.

PART C

PURPOSE: To determine whether Inmates answer the questions the same way (in general) on two different occasions.

1. Components[a]

Re-test Interval	Components	Sample	No.	Correlations (reliabilities) Range	Median
1 day	Primary(30)[b]	1	112	0.65-0.91	0.77
1 day	Primary	Stu.[c]	242	0.70-0.91	0.79
2 weeks	Primary	2a	42	0.69-0.94	0.81
1 day	Secondary(20)[d]	1	112	0.56-0.93	0.83
1 day	Secondary	Stu.	242	0.68-0.92	0.86
2 weeks	Secondary	2a	42	0.69-0.96	0.82

[a] These components constitute the input to the predictors but do not play a direct role in the procedures. However, it is necessary for the input to be reliable, as it is shown to be here.

TABLE 9 (cont.)

PART C (cont.)

b
These are basic constructs such as Sociability, Dominance, Materialism, Depression, Insistence, Persuasiveness, etc.

c
A special sample of tenth grade students whose parents were primarily blue-collar workers.

d
These are higher order constructs such as Extraversion, Neuroticism, Commanding, etc.

PART C

2. Predictor Equations

Sample: 112 Paid Inmates tested with a 1-day interval

	Predictor	Test-Retest Correlation
1	Assaultive Tendency	0.76
2	Control of Aggression	0.53
3	New Crimes	0.76
4	Parole Adjustment	0.75
5	Social Adaptability	0.87
6	Self-Control	0.74
7	Work Attitude	0.56
8	Work Adjustment	0.72
9	Educational Rehabilitation	0.73
10	Marital Adjustment	0.77
11	Susceptibility to Dependency	0.79

Footnotes to TABLE 9

1 There is no reason to expect that these rates would differ from those of any other questionnaires.

2 These components are not used directly, but their reliabilities reflect those possible to obtain on the predictor equations. The results of this and other reliability and validity studies are presented in detail in a Final Report made by BMRF to the National Science Foundation on a 3-year study at Austin College, Sherman, Texas.

3 These are Pearson product moment correlation coefficients between the test scores on the first and the second occasions. They reflect the tendency to answer the many questions the same way both times. As a general rule, this coefficient would be expected to be 0.70 or larger even though all here are actually highly significant. The relatively low reliabilities of the Aggression and Work Attitude predictors with offenders suggests that these results should be used with caution. These predictors were retained because the results of a multiple discrimination function analysis failed to discriminate between the two sets of results at even near-significant levels.

4 For example, Sociability, Self-Consciousness, Materialism, Persuasiveness.

5 For example, Extraversion, Neuroticism, Ego-strength.

the other test results currently available. A major factor must be the mental state of the inmate just entering prison. Self-reports would yield more reliable results after the inmate has adjusted to prison.

(2) Does the inmate really "take" the test and not just ramble around with random answers? This question was approached in two ways -- by comparing the first and last half of the answer sheets to determine whether the answers were consistent throughout, and by comparing the odd and even answers throughout the answer sheet.

Random answers would yield very low correlations, while highly systematic response patterns would yield very large correlations (or zero correlations with certain kinds of responses). Typically, people who take the questionnaires in a serious way will yield correlations in the range of 0.70 to 0.80 for various comparisons. As shown in Table 9B the inmates of Sample 4a were slightly higher, but really essentially like the workers of Sample 5a. As a group, they were decidedly not giving random answers. Recall that this sample contained the 460 parolees who had been returned to TDC. This group had 19 percent of their answer sheets that were at least suspect, and this probably accounts for their slightly elevated correlations.

(3) The test-retest reliabilities were done at two levels -- at the basic input into the predictor equations -- the construct scores -- and at the final predictor scores themselves. The construct scores are of two kinds -- primary personality, social perception and interest components (e.g., sociability, depression, self-consciousness, persuasiveness, mechanical), and secondary -- higher order scores such as extraversion, that are derived from the primary scores of the different kinds. The correlations among these variables on the two occasions were all significant, and more than half were above r=0.80.

The scores obtained from the various predictor equations result from a mixture of all the different kinds of scores, and consequently, the correlations between two occasions were expected to be somewhat lower than that of the separate risk scores.

Even so, the correlations were significant, and all but two were above r=0.70. The results of the two predictors with low correlations -- Poorly Controlled Aggression and Poor Work Attitude -- show that they should be viewed only as part of the overall pattern.

Test Taking Behavior of Offenders

Paper-and-pencil tests are easily sabotaged: (1) the forms may be folded, smudged, marked in the wrong place, answers marked both True and False, etc., so that they cannot be processed automatically; (2) answers may be systematic (all True or False, alternating True and False, first half True, second half False, etc., or (3) they may result from a random skipping around. These test-taking behaviors are readily identified and are "flagged" in the present project. Four systematic responses are identified: too many True or False answers, identical answers for the Self and Most People questions, and a systematic choice pattern in the Interest Survey. Random responding is identified by a low correlation between the odd versus the even responses (see Table 9.B).

Forms are identified as "Suspect -- Retesting Recommended" when one response pattern of the type noted is outside the 10-90 percentile range of Sample 5a of 1045 workers. When more than one of these patterns exceeds this limit, the Form is not scored and is identified as "Results Unreliable -- Must Repeat Test". These limits are arbitrary and subject to change by BPP.

There is no reliable way to identify a deliberate effort to falsify the results of a personality inventory in a directional way, such as trying to "make me look good". However, many experiments have shown that with well constructed questionnaires it is very difficult "to look better" by faking (Cattel, 1973). It is especially difficult to accomplish this with the questionnaires used, since the tendency usually will extend toward "making me look even better" by "making Most People look worse". This actually will cause the faker "to look worse".

Response behaviors influence the reliability of the original predictor in poorly defined ways (e.g., the mere sabotaging of forms by a large proportion of a sample may be predictive in-and-of-itself). The primary thrust of this project, however, was to arrive at reliable differences in temperaments, values, motives, interests, etc., rather than at the hostility evidenced by sabotage. Therefore, stringent standards were set for whether to retain a given answer sheet for

predictor development. This is evident from the large rejection rates of Forms in each sample. This ensured that the remainder really "took the test". However, for Field Test 1 (Sample 4, Table 6), all Forms were processed "as was".

Using the cut-off limits set in this project, about 1-2 percent of the answer sheets were unscorable for various reasons (e.g., bent, smudged, mismarked) (Table 9A). The rejection rates of the other two response patterns were markedly influenced by the phase of the parole cycle sampled. Among the pre-release offenders, Sample 2a, the percentages of Suspect or Unreliable answer sheets were essentially the same as for the worker Sample 5a (Table 9A). At the period when it is expected BPP will do its testing, the parole eligible period, the questionable rates were only slightly higher than they were for workers. The worst period was at entry, where the questionable rate was 19 percent, even though the inmates were volunteers.

SPECIFIC PROCEDURES AND RESULTS
PREDICTOR DEVELOPMENT

Violence

A major problem with a generalized global approach to the prediction of violence is that any given violent act is the end result of any of dozens of possible starting points and of subsequent pathways toward the violent act. There simply appears to be nothing in common between all these starting points and all the ensuing march of events that leads to a particular violent act.

In this project the global prediction of violence was attempted, of course. It proved to be quite easy to classify the violent inmates among inmate samples, just as many reports in the literature claim. However, when the resulting predictor was applied to a comparable sample of workers in business and industry, an incredible number were "found" to be "violent" -- 78 percent. Were this result valid, there are more criminally violent people outside than inside prison. This over-inclusive "prediction" resulted for a number of reasons that have been discussed quite adequately by others (e.g., Megargee, 1976; Scott, 1977).

The next approach used was to "quantitate" the violent acts of prison inmates. A scale was developed among offenders -- at one extreme were those

who had committed at least two violent acts on different occasions; four steps down the scale were offenders with no record of juvenile or adult violence.

This predictor also identified the violent inmate quite well -- the 5-step violence criterion correlated with the predicted violence scores in the cross-validity group of 167 at a significant level (r=0.17) and the "hit" rates for the Multiple Violent (1) Heinous Violent (2) and the No Known Violence (5) groups of offenders were 67, 69 and 61 percent, respectively. However, the predictor "hit" only 42 percent of the Single Violent (3) offenders. In Field Test 2 with this tentative predictor, both the correlation and the hits were in the correct direction, but they were not significant. When it was applied to Sample 2a violent and non-violent TDC inmates -- it correctly identified 96 percent of the violent offenders but, alas, it also predicted that 96 percent of the non-violent offenders were violent.

A different approach was adopted based on the following line of reasoning. The commission of a violent act is the end result of any one of dozens of possible starting points (e.g., deciding to carry a weapon). The course and general patterns of events and behaviors that lead from that initial point to a violent act have some common qualitative features: many violent acts occur within a family; acts against the defenseless often are more brutal than those against strong victims. Some appear to be purposeless, almost accidental, while others appear to be quite purposeful; some occur as the acts of one individual, while others occur as a result of the acts of organized groups; some occur in association with alcohol, and/or drugs; some are associated with personality disorders or psychoticism; some appear to be the work of amateurs, while others carry the marks of skilled professionalism.

The commission of crime itself is dangerous. At all stages -- planning, perpetration, escaping and hiding -- a high state of anxiety, excitement, and fear may increase the effects of personality traits that otherwise might be kept under control. Crime in-and-of-itself also increases the opportunity for committing a violent act, or of graduating into increasingly violent situations.

Other maladaptive attitudes, motives, and behaviors increase the risk of committing crimes. The point at which poor social or marital adjustment leads to crime is ill-defined. Some people live poorly adjusted lives without ever

committing a crime; others try to augment their inadequacies with crime; others try to solve their problems by committing violence upon the offending people; some violent acts involve direct physical contact, while others are committed from a distance, or even indirectly.

While it may be impossible to predict a particular violent act, various high risk pathways can be identified. Predictors can be developed of the patterns of temperaments, values, motives, attitudes about others and so on, that are associated with these high risk maladaptive behaviors.

Two behavior patterns deal directly with a high risk of committing violent acts -- assaultive tendencies and poorly controlled aggression. The behavioral differences between these two predictors is that the first one deals with the tendency to solve problems by personal force or the threat of it. The second deals with the relative degree of control an individual has of his/her drive level and its application.

Predictor 1. The predictor Risk of Assaultive Tendencies is made only on inmates who have already committed a violent act. Since this predictor is really of events rather than tendencies, it must be interpreted in that context. An inmate who "looks like" proven assaultive inmates may never commit another assault. If he/she is intelligent, determined to leave crime for good, and carefully avoids situations which he/she has learned are personally risky, high assaultive tendencies may be curbed. However, having committed a violent act, society is obliged to remain wary of the ever-present chance that he/she may repeat the violence.

The predictor was developed as follows:

(1) From Sample 1 (Table 3), Categories 1,2 and 3 were combined after multivariate analyses (multiple discriminant function and Factor analyses) had failed to show significant differences; the 64 violent revokees of Sample 3c (Table 5) were combined with this group;

(2) Categories 4 and 5 were pooled for similar reasons;

(3) Two subsamples were developed from Samples 5, 6 and 7 (Table 7) consisting of 600 workers (of roughly comparable age and education, and holding jobs at the level and of the kind parolees might seek and obtain) who were judged by their employers to be performing at a weak or poor level, and of 600 comparable workers who were performing at average or good levels;

(4) A series of multiple discriminant function analyses were used to contrast the four groups: Violent Offenders, Non-Violent Offenders, Weak and Poor Workers, and Average and Good Workers. Individuals who were "missed" between adjacent categories of offenders and workers, respectively, were shifted into intermediate groups. In this way six groups were established ranging from offenders who had both historical and predicted assaultive tendencies to workers who had highly rated performance and predicted non-violence.

(5) These six groups were scaled 6 = Violent to 1 = Non-Violent Good Workers.

(6) The predictive equation was developed (multiple regression analysis) on 67 percent of this sample, and

(7) It was cross-validated on the other 33 percent (Table 10).

This predictor was both reliable (Table 9), and passed the rigorous validation procedure (Table 10). It did not over-predict violence in the samples tested (II., 1 of Table 11). The non-violent group of Sample 1 had a mean score of only 34, while that of Sample 5b (workers) was 20 percent. Sample 1 which was loaded with inmates who had already committed violent acts, had a mean score of 65 percent.

The second violence related predictor 2-Risk of Poorly Controlled Aggression, has been used in industry for some years. It is an unusual measure of drive: if drive is applied in a controlled way (as with many workers and managers whose performance is judged to be good), the drive is productive. However, even with such people, circumstances may arise in which the self-control will be lost and the drive becomes non-productive aggression. At this point threatening and even assaultive behavior may erupt. A person with a high score may never lose control, but the odds are that he/she will do so with sufficient provocation.

The predictor "passed" the validity tests (Table 10) in an especially rigorous way -- the validation was based on the assumption that poorly controlled aggression was directly related to the commission of violent acts. While the Field Test correlation was not significant, its' hit rates were. More troublesome was the relatively low test-retest reliability -- 0.53 (Table 9C). This indicates

TABLE 10

VALIDITIES OF THE FAMILY OF PREDICTOR EQUATIONS FOR USE WITH OFFENDERS

	Predictor	Sample No.	Table No.	N	r[1]	Hit Rate/Group[2] High Risk	Low Risk
1	Assaultive Tendencies (1561)						
	Concurrent	1 & 5b[3]	3	1043	.77*	74*	72*
	Cross-validity	1 & 5b	3	518	.75*	79*	63*
2	Aggressive Tendency						
	Concurrent	2a	4	173	.70*	77*	77*
	Cross-validity	1	3	999	.14*	70*	55*
	Field-Test 1[4]	3b	5	179	.09	61*	61*
	Field-Test 2	3c	5	128	.52*	84*	75*
3	New Crimes (1154)						
	Concurrent	3a	5	770	.15*	57*	60*
	Cross-validity	3a	5	384	.10*	55	58*
	Field-Test 1	4a	6	802	.18*	60*	60*
	Field-Test 2	3b	5	179	.12*	60*	59*
4	Poor Parole Adjustment (668)						
	Concurrent	4b	6	445	.46*		
	Cross-validity	4b	6	223	.28*	72*	60*
	Field-Test 2	3b	5	179	.18*	61*	57*
5	Poor Social Adaptability (834)[4]						
	Concurrent	5a	7a	834	.75*	77*	74*
	Cross-validity	5b	7b	2017	.56*	95*	78*
	Field-Test 1	4a	6	802	.26*	65*	61*
	Field-Test 2	3b	5	179	.19*	52	72*
6	Poor Self-Control (1218)[4]						
	Concurrent	3b-5a	7a	1218	.67*	74*	70*
	Cross-validity	5b	7b	2017	.58*	70*	67*
	Field-Test 1	4a	6	802	.18*	60*	61*
	Field-Test 2	3b	5	179	.27*	60*	63*

TABLE 10 (cont.)

Predictor	Sample No.	Table No.	N	r[1]	Hit Rate/Group[2] High Risk	Low Risk
7 Poor Work Attitude (1045)						
Concurrent	5a	7a	1045	0.69*	66*	67*
Cross-validity	5b	7b	2017	0.48*	72*	68*
Field-Test 1	4a	6	802	0.27*	59*	60*
Field-Test 2	3b	5	179	0.31*	51	55
8 Poor Work Adjustment (1734)						
Concurrent	6	7b	1156	0.27*	78*	70*
Cross-validity	6	7b	578	0.23*	71*	60*
Field-Test 1	4a	6	802	0.21*	57*	59*
Field-Test 2	3b	5	179	0.26*	58	68*
9 Poor Educational Attitude (824)						
Concurrent	7	7b	550	0.58*	75*	82*
Cross-validity	7	7b	274	0.42*	94*	72*
Field-Test 1	4a	6	802	0.18*	62*	58*
Field-Test 2	3b	5	179	0.22*	55	54
10 Poor Marital Adjustment (441)[5]						
Concurrent	8	7b	294	0.40*	72*	68*
Cross-validity			147	0.14	68*	53
11 Susceptibility to Dependency (376)[5]						
Concurrent	9	7c	251	0.84*[6]	91*	96*
Cross-validity			125	0.79*	88*	89*

Footnotes to TABLE 10

1 Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the actual criterion values and the values predicted by the use of the regression equation. An asterisk signifies that the correlation is significantly different from chance. ($p<.05$).

2 This is the percentage of the relevant groups that is correctly classified by the predicted scores in the upper and lower thirds, respectively (i.e., in the High Risk for parole problems vs. a Low Risk of problems and a good chance for a successful parole. These are actual predictions made in both directions and none of the equations appears to over-predict in either direction. An asterisk signifies a greater than chance rate ($p<.05$).

3 Sub-samples of Samples 1 + Samples 5b. There were no samples for Field Testing of this equation at this time.

4 Assumes that parole failure or parole success is related to the control of aggression.

5 Data was not available for the Field-Test.

6 These unreliably high validities reflect the extreme "over-confessing" behavior of the clinical groups.

that over a 2-week period the overall questionnaire answers relating to this behavior changed materially. (One immediate conclusion might be that the inmates were 2-weeks nearer parole). This result suggests caution against placing too much emphasis on this score alone.

However, the results of Table II 1.2 show that in inmate samples all are near the average value of the Sample 2a (Table 4), used to develop the predictor, while the worker sample, Sample 5b had a mean score of only 32 percent. This indicates that most of the worker sample appeared to have more control over their aggression than did the inmate samples.

Recidivism

Recidivism is one of the most difficult concepts in the criminal justice literature. In Texas this is considered to be a return to prison anytime in a person's life. Because its consequence is absolutely unambiguous -- a person is returned to prison -- the term continues to confuse the issue of why a person returns to prison. Like violence, recidivism is a result -- the culmination of some preparatory event, or of a whole string of events, even accidents, each leading inexorably toward the end result -- a return to prison. Of course, a single impulsive act also can percipitate the issuance of a warrant.

Just as with violence, an effort was made to predict recidivism, but its over-prediction of weak and poor workers as recidivists was atrocious. Therefore, the approach used with violence was extended to recidivism.

3-Risk of Committing New Crimes

The past criminal activities of a representative sample of parole eligible inmate volunteers were used to establish the criterion for this predictor (Sample 3, Table 5). Recidivism is not an either/or factor (Gottfredson & Ballard, 1965; Glaser, 1964; Laulicht, 1962). Therefore, three levels of risk of renewed criminal activity after release were established: 1, 2 or more than 2 convictions. This was done using the number of prior convictions of a crime, either as a juvenile or an adult -- conviction with a jail sentence, a detention commitment, probation, or a revocation or probation with incarceration.

TABLE 11

APPLICATION OF RECOMMENDED PREDICTORS TO DIFFERENT SAMPLES

Predictor Risk of:	Sample (Mean Score)[1]				
Number:	4a	1	2a[2]	1(5)[3]	5b[4]
Size:	802	999	173	331	863
No. Name (Table 1)					
I. Predictors Existing before this Project:					
2 Poorly Controlled Aggression	46	47	50	45	32
5 Poor Social Adaptibility	76	79	78	78	46*
6 Poor Self-Control	65	69	72	66	33
7 Poor Work Attitude	71	72	69	72	51[5]
II. New Predictor Developed from Offender and Worker Samples:					
1 Committing New Assaults	59	65	60	34	20
III. New Predictors Based on Worker Samples Only:					
8 Poor Work Adjustment	52	62	55	59	40[6]
9 Poor Educational Rehabilitation	68	69	69	68	56
10 Poor Marital Adjustment	66	70	71	65	49
IV. New Predictors Based on Offender Samples Only:					
2 Committing New Crimes	58	57	50*	60	51[7]
4 Poor Parole Adjustment	50	56	58	55	21
V. New Predictor Based on Clinical and Worker Samples:					
11 Susceptibility to Dependency	66	64	60	70	39
VI. Other Relevant Variables:					
Age (Years)	26	26	26	27	25
IQ (Estimated)	84	83	85	82	98

Footnotes to TABLE 11

1 These are the average centile (i.e., 1 to 100) scores for each predictor for the respective group. The scale for each predictor was developed directly from the distribution of standard scores (i.e., with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of 1.00). An average of 50 here indicates that the particular sample was very similar to the original concurrent. Mean of group used to develop predictor are underlined. Groups similar to the group used to develop predictor are asterisked.

2 1a = multiple violent; 1b = no recorded violence.

3 Non-violent Inmates of Sample 1.

4 Workers

5 Sample 7, III had an average of 50.

6 This low score may mean that this predictor under-predicts this behavior.

7 This score suggests that this predictor may over-predict this behavior, since the expected score for this group was below the mean.

Numbers of arrests were not used for this categorization because they would lead to too broad a definition. Arrest rates vary from person to person for different reasons; they vary depending on the time and situation; innocent people may be arrested; arrests, for many reasons, may simply not be pursued with further legal action.

Numbers of incarcerations were eliminated because they would lead to too narrow a definition. Some people who commit the same crime are sent to prison, others are placed on probation, while others may merely be fined (see Willbach, 1942).

Age is correlated with the number of convictions. Accordingly, each of the three risk groups was adjusted for age by distributing the entire sample into age groups and then assigning the inmates with the most convictions of each group in the extreme risk group, and so on (See Table 5).

4-Risk of Poor Parole Adjustment

The preceeding sample was composed of parole eligible inmates tested before they knew the outcome of their parole. For the present predictor, parolees were tested after parole (Sample 4, Table 7). The procedures used to establish a failure group and a success group were described earlier.

This Failure/Success contrast represents extremes in attitudes, outlook, coping behavior, and adjustment. The resulting predictor was reliable (Table 9), and it cross-validated well. Note that Field Test 1 could not be done since it involved the same sample. The significant result with Field Test 2 was especially important for this predictor since the Successes in Sample 3b (Table 5) had maintained their exemplary parole for at least 12 months and had been placed on the essentially unsupervised Annual Report Status. This particular group of Failures was especially interesting, since 64 of the 107 (Sample 3b) had prior convictions for violence, and were returned for having committed new violent acts (Sample 3c).

The norms for this predictor were those established by Sample 4b, and the mean for the entire Sample 4a, 802 offenders (Table 6) was also 50 percent. The other offender samples were slightly higher, but that of the worker sample Sample 3b was only 40 percent (Table 11, p. 53).

The predictors discussed above asked the question: "Relative to other inmates, what are the odds that this particular one will . . . .?" The next series of

predictors ask a different question: "Relative to workers in the outside world of work who are of comparable age, and education, what are the odds that this particular inmate will . . .?"

Ordinarily, a series of specific predictors would be developed, such as Inmates vs. Factory Workers, to cover major categories. A different approach was used in this project -- one which aimed at isolating general attitudes and adaptabilities. The procedures were as follows.

Samples of workers were drawn from the commercial data base as described above in the Sample descriptions (Table 7A). These workers' performance had been evaluated by their employers after at least 6 months on-the-job. They were working for organizations that varied greatly in size, product or service produced, standards of performance, policies, etc. The workers were variously in unskilled or semiskilled labor, a trade, repair and maintenance, driving, clerking, selling, etc.

It was assumed that workers who were rated as good regardless of their job, organization, ethnic group or sex, must have some attitude in common about work qua work. The corollary assumption should also be valid -- workers rated poor across all these jobs and organizations must have some general, maladaptive attitude about work. In groups as large as were used for these predictors, many factors such as personality clashes must have been "averaged-out". Likewise, it appears unlikely that large numbers of workers would be performing poorly solely because they were holding a job for which their temperament, aptitude or training was inappropriate -- the square peg in the round hole. Many must have had some attitude in common about work qua work that resulted in continual poor performance. The contrast -- good-and-average versus weak-and-poor workers -- was the basis for the Predictor 7-Work Attitude.

This idea may be extended to other general behavioral patterns that reflect attitudes and adaptabilities by contrasting groups in which almost everything except the general targeted factor was "averaged-out". For example, when a group of inmates with various criminal records are contrasted with workers of various jobs and performance levels, the contrast is of some general adaptability that serves to keep the workers working and out of prison - while this adaptability may include "being smart enough not to be caught", this effect is greatly diluted by the large sample. The basic factor could be considered to be the ability to adjust to our

society and its stern requirements - Predictor 5-Social Adaptability (Table 7A 1).

Inmates may be considered to be people who, among other things, have serious problems in coping with the world of work. If this assumption is extended to include workers who stay out of prison and usually get up and go to work, but who do not, and possibly cannot, perform well, they could be combined with the inmates to yield a generalized sample of people who have a common difficulty in coping with society. A general difference between such non-coping people and those who are otherwise comparable, but who get to work on time every day, work steadily and reliably all day, abide by the rules and regulations, cope with daily situations, get along with their fellow employees, plan and program their work so that it gets done on time, do not "job hop", etc., might be considered to be a matter of self-discipline - Predictor 6-Self Control.

All three of the above predictors were cross-validated for workers in 1972 when they were developed.[2] In this project they were validated for inmates. Predictors 5 and 6 were reliable (Table 9) and passed the validity tests (Table 10). Predictor 7-Work Attitude had a relatively low reliability -- sufficient to suggest caution in its use alone until it has been tested in actual use. Although its correlation was significant between the criterion and the predicted scores of Field Test 2, the "hit" rate was not significant. This may have been due to two factors: (1) the relatively small sample size of this test, and (2) the relative small range of the inmate scores.

When these three predictors were applied to the various samples shown in Table 11, the mean of the Work Attitude for workers was surprisingly close to the mean of the original Sample 5a (i.e., the mean of the 1972 sample was set at 50 percent, and the mean was 51 percent for the new sample developed for this project). This indicates that the predictor is remarkably stable. This is a tough, real-world predictor for prison inmates to pass, and, as might have been expected, all inmate samples showed a high risk -- about 70 percent having a Poor Work Attitude.

Social Adaptability, being developed with mixed groups of inmates and workers, had a mean of 46 percent for Sample 5a (workers) -- a slightly lower than average risk that these workers would have a Poor Social Adaptability. Inmates, on the other hand, had a risk of poor adaptability of almost 80 percent.

Predictor 6-Self Control yielded somewhat surprising results. The worker sample had the expected low mean -- only a 33 percent risk that individual workers

would have poor Self-Control. However, the inmates had lower scores than expected -- 65-72 percent. This result suggests that predictors 5 and 6 may be out-of-sequence. Trial usage will determine whether this is true.

With the above three predictors, a parole eligible inmate who "looks like" adequate (i.e., average or good) workers should have a better chance of a successful parole than those who do not "look like" such workers. However, several unknowns run through these assumptions -- some of the poor workers were simply not in a job that "fitted" their temperament, interests, aptitude, some of the workers undoubtedly had had encounters with our criminal justice system, or could be expected to have encounters in the future, and so on. Likewise, some inmates are in prison by accident, or may be innocent of the offense. Some committed crimes that may have been possible because of "good" work habits (e.g., embezzlement). In any case, the proportions of such chance misclassifications is small due to the large sample sizes used. This "averaging-out" feature provides a safeguard against undue slippage in the predictions.

These comparisons with the "outside" world may be expected to reflect the artificial and alien environment of prison in which the inmate may have been living for years. Accordingly, it may be desirable also to consider the inmate's relative position from two viewpoints: (1) relative to that of the other parole eligible inmates, and (2) relative to the "real" world in which the parolee will have to compete. This depends only on which group is used to establish the norms or cutting point.

For this project, a new battery of predictors was developed for which only worker samples currently were available -- Predictors 8-11. During the trial use period, data for inmates will be available to permit complete validation of these potentially useful behavioral predictors.

Predictor 8-Poor Work Adjustment differs from 7-Poor Work Attitude in a significant way. Work attitude refers to a generalized problem with holding a given job for an extended period. It reflects a restless need for change that may be independent of the level of performance while on a given job.

This predictor may have special significance and meaning for parolees who have a good work attitude. They will probably have the expected difficulties with holding a job because of the prison record. In their case, the predictor may indicate a

special tenacity and persistance in seeking and obtaining successive jobs irrespective of the consequences of their record "following" them.

This predictor "passed" the validation procedures (Table 10). However, data must be obtained on actual job histories of parolees for final validation. As might be expected, inmates had higher estimated risk of "job hopping" than did the workers in Sample 5b (Table 11).

Predictor 9-Poor Educational Rehabilitation was developed from the commercial data base by predicting the level of education attained by workers of equated levels of age and, in-so-far as possible, of the proportions of ethnic group and sex. The predictor is designed to provide an estimate of the parolee's likelihood of taking advantage of training and educational opportunities to improve his/her work skills and qualifications. The predictor was reliable and "passed" the major validity tests.

In its trial application, this predictor estimated that workers in Sample 5b were not especially interested in using this pathway to success (Table 11). This result was expected in view of the low educational level of these workers. The inmate samples appeared to be even much less interested in such opportunities. On the other hand, about 30 percent of the inmate samples were indicated candidates for such efforts. This suggests that a screening process could identify inmates with the motivation, interest and determination to benefit from rehabilitative educational efforts.

Predictor 10-Poor Marital Adjustment was developed from the commercial data base. Given the present general large increase in divorces and unmarried living "arrangements" the data well may be quite unreliable. It was based entirely on self-reported divorce and marriage data, and does not include common-law marriages and "divorces". It also is influenced between ethnic groups and by strong religious-related differences. In many cases of marriage there may be a practical break-down without a divorce. However, there is little question that family adjustment is a major factor in both crime and parole success, so this was an initial effort to provide estimates of this important behavior.

The Marital Adjustment predictor was developed from workers between 22 and 35 who had been or were still married. Its cross-validity was of marginal significance -- it predicted poor adjustment and it at least did not over-predict good adjustment. It should be used with caution pending the development of more comprehensive and reliable data, especially for an adequate inmate sample.

Predictor 11-Susceptibility to Dependency was developed using worker and clinical samples as described earlier. It was intended to provide a foundation upon which to develop the important relationships between dependency on alcohol and/or drugs. The differences of the questionnaire variables between the worker and the clinical samples were so large that the validities are unreliably high.

Available information was judged unreliable for inmate samples. Re-examination of Inmate Files and field follow-up of such data would seem to be a major priority for future work. Pending the accumulation of reliable inmate data, caution is advised in the application of this potentially valuable predictor. Even so, inmate samples appeared to have much higher risks of Susceptibility to Dependency (60-70 percent) than did the worker samples (39 percent).

It should be noted that dependency may extend far beyond alcohol and drugs. It may be a basic need that could extend to interpersonal and societal relationships. It well may be a major feature of criminality in general.

Potential Utility of Existing Scores on Other Tests

Early in the project, efforts were made to incorporate the test scores already available for the inmates. One of these was the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, (MMPI, Hathaway & McKinley, 1951). This is a questionnaire similar to the Self portion of the questionnaires used here (Appendix 1). Several MMPI variables appeared to be significant in the concurrent stage (i.e., in the development of the predictor equation itself), but unlike the present variables, these failed to be significant upon cross-validation (i.e., when the predictor equation was applied to a similar group of people not in the concurrent sample) (see Antastasi, 1976).

One explanation for the above result is that the MMPI was taken during the stressful period of prison entry, while most of the present questionnaires were completed under less-stressful conditions. This conclusion is strengthened by taking note of the variables of the MMPI that were significant in the concurrent equations -- all three scales that reflect faking or systematic response patterns (i.e. , Lie, K (Correction), and Frequency) , Schizophrenia (bizzare answers on 78 items, indicating that it was significant undoubtedly as a direct reflection of the poor general response behavior), Masculinity/Femininity and Depression (not a surprising mood for entering inmates).

Several general aptitude and intelligence scores were significant in the concurrent equations, but did not cross-validate. Possibly, intelligence, education and age failed to be predictive because their ranges were very small -- there just was very little difference in these between the inmates within any of the samples.

Potential Utility of Existing Records of Criminal Activities

From among the large amount of data available on prior and prison behaviors, only seven items appeared in tentative concurrent equations, and none of these cross-validated. Even so, the following variables appear to be potentially useful for future consideration: maximum sentence; numbers of prior confinements in both reformatories and adult prisons, and numbers of parole revocations, probations and retainers; and changes in the Point Incentive Program scores during the current incarceration.

However, the BPP already has these records available and it was desirable to keep the predictive AIDDs independent so that they really provide new and additional information.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A battery of eleven predictor equations has been developed to estimate future potential risks to society resulting from new criminal acts and poor parole adjustment. All of these were cross-validated with other comparable samples at statistically significant levels. They were subjected to rigorous Field Tests comparable to conditions that may be expected to occur in routine usage. The results of these Tests were all in the expected direction and with a few exceptions, they discriminated the respective groups at significant levels. Caution was advised in the use of several of these predictions until additional samples of offenders were integrated into the analysis. There was evidence that none of the predictors would over-predict either of the groups compared.

A form was developed that presents the various estimations in word form -- High, Average, or Low Risk for Parole Failure for eleven possible reasons. The predictions are all in the same direction to avoid ambiguity -- Low Risks suggests parole. In any case it must be noted that these results are estimations -- predictions of future behaviors that may never happen. They are risk factors. They should be viewed in toto -- no one predictor should shape a parole decision. A sobering fact is that a 65 percent hit rate is accompanied by a 35 percent miss rate. The pattern of the estimates is the feature to use -- not the results of any one risk estimate individually.

The predictors at present are recommended for use only with difficult cases -- they are not recommended for use when the existing system provides a clear-cut decision. However, following carefully monitored use and improvement, it well may become possible to place sufficient reliance on the AIDDs that they can become a direct part of the overall decision process.

It is recommended that these Special Aids In Determining Disposition (AIDD) be placed into trial operational use for two years. BPP needs to designate initial cutting points for (1) the risk categories of each predictor, (2) identification of suspect and unreliable answer sheets and, (3) establishment of uniform guidelines for weighting and applying the estimates of all 11 risk factors.

Year 1

The first year should be one of introduction, of smoothing trouble spots, of adjusting procedures, training test administrators, and of determining exactly how and where to administer the Questionnaires. During this Introductory Year data should be collected on such matters as the number of answer sheets that are unreliable or suspect; on how decisions made solely on the current basis would be modified by the use of the Special AIDDs; on the comparative results for the different ethnic groups and for males and females; of the influence of using different cutting points for (1) what is designated as High and Low Risks for each predictor, and (2) what is designated as an Unreliable or Suspect answer sheet.

During this introductory year another series of projects are possible due to the massive data already existing as a result of this project. These involve the predictor equations themselves. Especially important are:

(1) Continued follow-up of the Sample 3 parolees, and especially of those who had committed prior violent acts but were still on parole when this project ended, and of those who had been placed on Annual Parole Status. This group is unique -- it provides an excellent opportunity for obtaining the data badly needed to determine the role of alcohol and drug abuse in crimes of violence, for family and job adjustment behaviors.

(2) Examination of the files and records of the inmates in Sample 4 especially for data relative to violence, alcohol and drugs, and for the weapon used and the identity of the victim of violent acts.

(3) Re-examine the files of Sample 1 for the following: drug and alcohol involvement, the identity of the victim(s), the weapon(s) used, the situation surrounding the crime, the economic conditions at the time of commission, the age at first crime and violence, the prior succession of crimes, and evidence of marital problems.

(4) Develop a debriefing procedure (and validate its associated Form), for parolees returned to TDC that aims directly at the causes for the parole failure.

(5) Develop a procedure for and survey both of the earlier samples and those of the Introductory year for suicides, homicide and involvement in serious accidents.

(6) Continue to collect data on parole violations, but supplement it with the data obtained in the development of the Parole Debriefing procedure.

Year 2

The second year should involve the recomputation and revalidation of all equations utilizing the more accurate and greatly enlarged data base collected during the Introductory Year.

(1) Track the results of the revised equations.

(2) Drop predictors that do not appear to be of value, or devise new ones where a need appears (e.g., Risk of Irrational and Dangerous Behavior, Risk of Suicide, Risk of Responsibility for Serious Accidents Involving Injury to Others, etc.).

(3) Modify the Report Format for maximal utility.

(4) Commence full procedural use of the finalized AIDDs.

(5) Develop procedures for processing the answer sheets and for producing the AIDD in-house in the BPP.

APPENDIX I

THE BIRKMAN METHOD

APPENDIX I

Birkman Method Questionnaire

The Birkman Method Questionnaire is a proprietary psychometric instrument developed some 25 years ago for business and industrial application. The easily administered instrument consists of 125 self-report items, 125 social perception items, and 48 occupational interest items -- all of which are presented in non-threatening terms. A present data base of over 100,000 individuals across the United States, Canada, Mexico and Iran who have completed the questionnaire allows continual monitoring of the instrument's reliability, validity, stability of internal factors and cultural fairness.

The Birkman Method Questionnaire is unusual in that it has been developed and refined specifically as an adjunct to employee selection and development instead of as a psychiatrically oriented clinical instrument. Consequently, scoring and interpretation are oriented toward a normal population rather than toward clinical efforts to discriminate various forms of psychopathology.

The Birkman Method Questionnaire is also unusual in that it not only measures self report behavior, as do most other personality instruments, but, at the same time, it also measures social perception and interests. Forty-eight components, or scores, are produced in the scoring of the Birkman Method Questionnaire as well as a "verbal proficiency" score generated by a short vocabulary test administered along with the questionnaire. Basic components are derived from item clusters within the self perception (Self), social perception (Most People), and interests portions of the questionnaire. Except for the Individuality component, an item is used in only one component. Additional component scores are generated from interactions occurring between certain of the item-based scores. Table I lists the components from the Birkman Method Questionnaire which were employed in this study.

TABLE 1

BIRKMAN METHOD QUESTIONNAIRE COMPONENTS

	Social Perceptions	
1	Individuality	(MIN)
2	Self-Consciousness	(MSC)
3	Dominance	(MDO)
4	Materialism	(MMT)
5	Insistence	(MII)
6	Sociability	(MSO)
7	Restlessness	(MRE)
8	Energy	(MEN)
9	Indecision	(MID)
10	Feeling	(MFE)

	Interests	
21	Persuasive	(PER)
22	Social Service	(SS)
23	Scientific	(SCI)
24	Mechanical	(MEC)
25	Outdoors	(OTD)
26	Numerical	(NUM)
27	Clerical	(CLE)
28	Artistic	(ART)
29	Literary	(LIT)
30	Musical	(MUS)

	Self Perception	
11	Individuality	(SIN)
12	Self-Consciousness	(SSC)
13	Dominance	(SDO)
14	Materialism	(SMT)
15	Insistence	(SII)
16	Sociability	(SSO)
17	Restlessness	(SRE)
18	Energy	(SEN)
19	Indecision	(SID)
20	Feeling	(SFE)

	Derived Scores	
31	Derived Score 1	(D 1)
32	Derived Score 2	(D 2)
33	Derived Score 3	(D 3)
34	Derived Score 4	(D 4)
35	Derived Score 5	(D 5)
36	Derived Score 6	(D 6)
37	Derived Score 7	(D 7)
38	Derived Score 8	(D 8)
39	Derived Score 9	(D 9)
40	Derived Score 10	(D10)
41	Derived Score 11	(D11)
42	Derived Score 12	(D12)
43	Derived Score 13	(D13)
44	Derived Score 14	(D14)
45	Derived Score 15	(D15)
46	Derived Score 16	(D16)
47	Derived Score 17	(D17)
48	Derived Score 18	(D18)
49	Verbal I.Q. (Estimated)	

In addition to the components, the interactions between how a person views himself, how he views others, and his occupational interest choices are utilized in the formation of computer-generated reports. The Birkman Method Questionnaire has a lengthy history of successful usage in the selection of employees in a number of business and industrial settings and in personal and vocational counseling, including use by a wide range of criminal justice agencies in the state of Texas. In addition, the instrument has the necessary flexibility for use in research and experimental settings.

The Birkman Method is supplied to institutions at special rates through the not-for-profit Birkman-Mefferd Research Foundations (BMRF), an organization that is oriented toward the conduct of research projects in areas of social and educational concern. BMRF has established a contractual relationship with Birkman & Associates, Inc., (B&A) a Houston based management consulting firm, to provide The Method and its processing, and to provide consulting services by its team of professional psychologists, statisticians, computer programmers and management specialists.

BMRF has conducted extensive validation work of The Method under a variety of public applications. (Note: B&A has, of course, conducted dozens of such studies for its clients in business and industry in accordance with the requirements of fair employment laws and regulations). BMRF has been funded under grants from the National Science Foundation for validation of The Method for academic use (No. 72-195 Institutional Grant to Austin, College, Sherman, Texas) and by the Texas Educational Agency (Grant to Sheldon Independent School District, Sheldon, Texas) for public school use. Its use in Medical Schools was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (Health Professions Special Grant No. 1 D08 PE 00394-01 to Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas). Its use in the Criminal Justice System has been supported by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (Grant No. DS-J6-E04-011 to the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles, and No. EA-77-E04-4915 through the Texas Criminal Justice Divison). The results of these various studies are contained in the annual reports of BMRf to these agencies.

APPENDIX 2

INSTRUCTIONS USED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BIRMAN METHOD QUESTIONNAIRE TO SAMPLE 1 AND TO THE TEST-RETEST SAMPLE

PROJECT A.I.D.D.
TEST-RETEST ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS

(FIRST DAY)

I. GREETINGS AND GIVE NO SMOKING INSTRUCTIONS.
(NUMBERS PUT ON CHALKBOARD)

II. The Board of Pardons and Paroles is engaged in a research project to investigate the use of the Birkman Method Questionnaire. We have 1626 TDC inmates who completed this Questionnaire; 1472 of these were paroled (206 women and 1266 men). We need a couple hours of your time during the next two days to administer a check on this Questionnaire. You all were selected to ensure the non-discriminatory coverage of the age, ethnic, and sex factors of this Questionnaire usage.

Your participation is voluntary! All of you are due for parole consideration in April, 1977. Your participation in this testing of the Questionnaire will neither enhance nor detract in that evaluation. We realize that you've had few, if any, situations lately where you could say, "No, I don't want to do that!" But, don't say, "No!" just for that reason.

III. DETERMINE VOLUNTEERS IN REQUIRED CATEGORIES FROM "TDC PRINT-OUT" AND RELEASE THOSE EXCESS PERSONNEL & NON-VOLUNTEERS.

IV. DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS ON COMPLETING FORMS & QUESTIONNAIRE.

A. "BPP RELEASES" - Please, read the Prospective Participation Agreement as I talk about it. If you agree, sign your name AS THE NAME OF COMMITMENT TO TDC where it shows "Authorizing Signature" and put your TDC number beside that. Put the date in as: ___/ ___/ 7__. Then act as the Witness for each other's signature and again date. If you have any question, raise your hand and we will answer your question.

B. "BMRF INFORMATION SHEET" - Fill-in your TDC number on the upper right. Next, PRINT in your name (last name first) and the other information requested within this boxed area. You will notice there is another release here, for Birkman & Associates, Inc.; please, sign and date.

C. "COMMUNICATION SKILL" - Turn your forms over and answer the questions here as best you can. READ THROUGH THE INSTRUCTIONS WITH THE INMATES. Answer as many as you can! Do not be afraid to guess in defining these words, since we know more words than we use in speaking and writing!

D. "THE BIRKMAN METHOD QUESTIONNAIRE" - THIS IS A QUESTIONNAIRE, NOT A TEST! IT IS NOT TIMED, YOU'LL WORK AT YOUR OWN SPEED. PLEASE WAIT TILL I TELL YOU TO BEGIN! SINCE THIS IS NOT A TEST, THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS -- ONLY YOUR ANSWERS! YOUR FIRST THOUGHTS ARE MOST LIKELY TO BE THE BEST ANSWERS FOR YOU. ANSWER ALL OF THE QUESTIONS!

(ALSO HANDOUT QUESTIONNAIRE)

1. "BMRF FORM 2 (ANSWER SHEET)" - On the front side and turning it sideways, where it calls for your name; please PRINT your name, last name first. Now note that on the front, it has "Questionnaire" at the top of the answer area. OPEN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE FIRST PAGE TO THE DIAGRAMS. These questions in the beginning part of the booklet ask how you think MOST PEOPLE think and act. Use the world's population as MOST PEOPLE. Now, looking at the answer sheet, you'll see an area of answers that are covered by the word MOST, printed vertically. Next you'll note is a section which has SELF printed vertically; where you'll be asked similar questions, but as you think and act YOURSELF. Both of these areas are answered as simply TRUE or FALSE and again, every question must be answered! Turn your answer sheet over now, so the title "Interests" is at the top. These questions deal with your work interests. Here you do not regard your training or qualifications; ONLY YOUR INTERESTED CHOICES! Looking at the diagram on the first page of the Questionnaire, see how we are to answer these. Be careful when we do this section -- make sure to answer each question and that each answer is in two parts, which are off-set with one another. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW TO ANSWER THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF QUESTIONS? If you have a question later, raise your hand and we'll assist you. Now, lay your answer sheet down on the table with the "Interests" title up. Place your booklet on top of the answer sheet, covering it up except for the righthand column (Page L) and open the booklet to Page L (pages are marked on righthand side in the middle). Read the instructions and start answering, when I say, "Begin" in a moment. After you complete this side of the answer sheet, check and make certain that you have not made a mistake or missed an answer. Then turn the sheet over; set the booklet on top as before only exposing the Page A column; opening the booklet to Page A; and answer the questions for MOST & SELF. When finished, again check to see that all are answered.

2. When you've completed the checking, bring the materials to me. You'll be dismissed individually, since you are working at your own rate. The Board of Pardons and Paroles thanks you all for helping us with this project! You may now BEGIN!

FOR THE TEST-RESTEST SAMPLE

(SECOND DAY)

V. We would like to compete the Questionanire that you took yesterday again. Remember, this is a test of the Questionnaire. Just read the questions and answer them the way you believe. Don't be concerned about how you answered the questions yesterday. Now, let's go over how you complete the Questionnaire one more time.

VI. REPEAT IV.

APPENDIX 3

INSTRUCTIONS USED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BIRKMAN METHOD QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE PAROLE ELIGIBLE INMATES OF SAMPLE 3

SCRIPT FOR ADMINISTERING BIRKMAN METHOD

(GREETING)

Good Evening (applicable factor), I'm (Name & Psn.) for the Institutional Services Section, Board of Pardons and Paroles. There will be no smoking during this meeting! You may smoke during this meeting! (dependent upon the particular TDC Unit).

(INTRODUCTION)

All of you have been, at this point, recommended for parole to the Governor. While you are being considered by his staff, we are going to administer, at no charge to you and voluntarily-completed, the Birkman Method Questionnaire. The Birkman Method is a privately owned approach for classification, assessment, motivation, and management primarily for counseling and job/training placement areas. It has been used widely and successfully in business and industry for twenty years.

The non-profit Birkman-Mefferd Research Foundation will contractually assist the Board of Pardons and Paroles by processing data and providing print-outs of information. Our Parole Officers can better assist you in gaining success on parole by utilizing this counseling and vocational information. You will individually receive the six Guide Pages or print-outs, from the Parole Officer.

(NOTE: STRESS! NO OTHER PERSON OR AGENCY IS INVOLVED OR GIVEN ANY OF THIS INFORMATION!

The Guide Pages cover six topic areas of sytle of behavior:

Getting Along with Others
Giving and Receiving Directions
Handling Conflict and Competition
Emotional and Physical Stamina
Organizing and Planning
Decision Making

These Guide Pages tell us how we, personally, operate in that specific topic area, both when in routine and when in stress situations. As you realize, these help us to see exactly where we are coming from in regard to our personal traits!

This Questionnaire asks you to respond to ideas as you think MOST PEOPLE think or would do and as you (meaning yourself or I) think or would do. It also questions you as to your interest areas. Since you will be giving information to us for use, we need to have individual releases.

NOTE: PASS OUT "RELEASE FORMS" AND PENCILS

"RELEASE": Please read the Prospective Parolee Participation Agreement form, as I talk about it. If you agree, sign where it shows "Authorizing Signature" in the name you were committed under and date beside on the other line. Acting as Witness of Signature for one another, please sign and date appropriately. If you do not agree or have a question, please raise your hand. I'll answer the questions and those declining will be dismissed, after returning the materials.

(NOTE: IF YOUR PENCIL POINT BREAKS, I HAVE A SHARPENER HERE! ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS FORM OR WHAT IS TO BE DONE? LET'S PROCEED WITH THE FORM COMPLETION.

The other is the Prospective Participation Agreement form for the Birkman firm. Read it and complete it, if you are in agreement. You'll note this does not require witnessing.

(NOTE: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS FORM OR WHAT TO DO? AFTER SUFFICIENT TIME, COLLECT THE FORMS AND PASS OUT ANSWER SHEETS AND QUESTIONNAIRES.)

(NOTE: STRESS! DO NOT MARK THE BOOKLET IN ANY MANNER! MARK ONLY THE ANSWER SHEET. THIS IS NOT TIMED! BUT PLEASE WAIT, UNTIL I TELL YOU TO BEGIN. THIS IS NOT A TEST, THEREFORE THERE ARE NOT RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS. IT IS A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR YOU TO INDIVIDUALLY PROVIDE INFORMATION WITH. YOUR FIRST THOUGHTS ARE MOST LIKELY TO BE THE BEST ANSWERS FOR YOU. ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS.

(BIRKMAN)

Place the Booklet on the desk/table. Next, everyone fill-in the Answer sheet data, as we go through these items.

(NOTE: USE ANSWER SHEET FOR ITEM-BY-ITEM PROCESS (NAME, ETC.)

Now opening your Birkman Method Questionnaire, look at "how to place your Answer Sheet and Booklet" and set yours so that the PAGE A column of the answer sheet sticks out from under your booklet's right side.

(NOTE: ANY QUESTIONS ON THIS? VISUALLY CHECK FOR PROPER PSN).

Then let's read in the booklet "how to mark your answers", but again, DO NOT MARK IN THE BOOKLET!

(NOTE: USING THE BIRKMAN METHOD QUESTIONNAIRE, READ THROUGH SAMPLES. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS ON WHAT OR HOW TO DO THIS?)

Turning the page, which has Questionnaire items 1-25 and A at the righthand middle of the page, you should have aligned with the same on the Answer Sheet. If so, begin and when finished, bring your materials to me for checking before you leave the area.

APPENDIX 4

INSTRUCTIONS USED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BIRKMAN METHOD QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE FAILURES IN PAROLE SAMPLE 4

PROJECT A.I.D.D.

PHASE III (PAROLE FAILURES) ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS AND SCRIPT

I. GREETINGS AND GIVE THE SMOKING INSTRUCTIONS FOR THAT SPECIFIC UNIT.

(PUT NUMBERS ON CHALK BOARD)

II. The Board of Pardons and Paroles is engaged in a research project to investigate the use of the Birkman Method Questionnaire. In our initial phase we had 1625 TDC inmates completing this Questionnaire; 1468 of these were paroled (205 women and 1263 men). In this phase, we need a few hours of your time and your participation in completing this Questionanire, so that comparisons can be made with parolees who are continuing on parole with parolees who have had problems on parole. As implied here, this project is to evaluate the Birkman Method Questionnaire as a possible device to assist the Board of Pardons and Paroles in helping parolees to be more effective in succeeding on parole.

Your participation in this is to be voluntary. Regardless of your parole violation hearing or parole revoked status; your participation in this research project will neither enhance nor detract the Board of Pardons and Paroles' considerations and evaluations of your individual cases. Realizing that your participation here may not have any personal direct effect, but may help other parolees, we ask you to participate. Don't say "No" to participating today just because of your problems or just to be able to say, "No".

III. DETERMINE VOLUNTEERS FROM "TDC PRINT-OUT" AND RELEASE THOSE NON-VOLUNTEERS.

IV. DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS ON COMPLETING FORMS AND QUESTIONNAIRE.

A. "BPP RELEASES" - Please, read the Prospective Participation Agreement as I talk about it. If you agree, sign your name AS THE NAME OF COMMITMENT TO TDC where it shows "Authorizing Signature" and put your TDC number beside that. Put the date in as: __ __/7__. Then act as the Witness for each other's signature and again date. If you have any question, raise your hand and we will answer your questions.

B. "BMRF INFORMATION SHEET" - Fill-in your TDC number on the upper right. Next, PRINT in your name (last name first) and the other information requested within this boxed area. You will notice there is another release here, for Birkman & Associates, Inc.; please, sign and date.

C. "COMMUNICATION SKILL" - Turn your forms over and answer the questions here as best you can. READ THROUGH THE INSTRUCTIONS WITH THE INMATES. Answer as many as you can! Do not be afraid to guess in defining these words, since we know more words than we use in speaking and in writing.

D. "THE BIRKMAN METHOD QUESTIONNAIRE" - THIS IS A QUESTIONNAIRE, NOT A TEST! IT IS NOT TIMED, YOU'LL WORK AT YOUR OWN SPEED. PLEASE WAIT TILL I TELL YOU TO BEGIN! SINCE THIS IS NOT A TEST, THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS -- ONLY YOUR ANSWERS! YOUR FIRST THOUGHTS ARE MOST LIKELY TO BE THE BEST ANSWERS FOR YOU. ANSWER ALL OF THE QUESTIONS!

(ALSO HAND OUT QUESTIONNAIRE)

1. "BMRF FORM 2 (ANSWER SHEET)" - On the front side and turning it sideways, where it calls for your name; please PRINT your name, last name first. Now note that on the front, it has "Questionnaire" at the top of the answer area. OPEN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE FIRST PAGE TO THE DIAGRAMS. These questions in the beginning part of the booklet ask how you think MOST PEOPLE think and act. Use the world's population as MOST PEOPLE. Now, looking at the answer sheet, you'll see an area of answers that are covered by the word MOST, printed vertically. Next you'll note is a section which has SELF printed vertically; where you'll be asked similar questions, but as you think and act YOURSELF. Both of these areas are answered as simply TRUE or FALSE and again, every question must be answered! Turn your answer sheet over now, so the title "Interests" is at the top. These questions deal with your work interests. Here you do not regard your training or qualifications; ONLY YOUR INTERESTED CHOICES! Looking at the diagram on the first page of the Questionnaire, see how we are to answer these. Be careful when we do this section -- make sure to answer each question and that each answer is in two parts, which are off-set with one another. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW TO ANSWER THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF QUESTIONS? If you have a question later, raise your hand and we'll assist you. Now, lay your answer sheet down on the table with the "Interests" title up. Place your booklet on top of the answer sheet, covering it up except for the righthand column (Page L) and open the booklet to Page L (pages are marked on righthand side in the middle). Read the instructions and start answering, when I say, "Begin" in a moment. After you complete this side of the answer sheet, check and make certain that you have not made a mistake or missed an answer. Then turn the sheet over; set the booklet on top as before only exposing the Page A column; opening the booklet to Page A; and answer the questions for MOST and SELF. When finished, again check to see that all are answered.

2. When you've completed the checking, bring the materials to me. You'll be dismissed individually, since you are working at your own rate. The Board of Pardons and Paroles thanks you all for helping us with this project! You may now BEGIN!

V. ACCEPT MATERIALS FROM INDIVIDUALS AS THEY COMPLETE THEIR WORK; CHECKING TO INSURE ALL MATERIALS HAVE BEEN RETURNED: AND VERBALLY CHECKING WITH EACH INMATE AS TO THEIR HAVING COMPLETED ALL QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS AND CHECKING THE ANSWER SHEET FOR PROPER PATTERNS. THANK EACH INDIVIDUAL AS THEY DEPART FOR PARTICIPATING IN THE PROJECT.

APPENDIX 5
PROSPECTIVE PAROLEE PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT

PROSPECTIVE PAROLEE PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT

I hereby authorize the Board of Pardons and Paroles of the State of Texas or their representatives to utilize the results of the professional analyses obtained through the use of the Birkman Method Questionnaire to assist the Board of Pardons and Paroles or their representatives in evaluations and planning in a manner to best aid me toward successful completion of my parole.

I FURTHER FULLY UNDERSTAND THAT MY COMPLETION OF AND PARTICIPATION IN THE BIRKMAN METHOD WITH THE BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLES DOES NOT ENHANCE NOR DECREASE MY CONSIDERATION FOR PAROLE RELEASE.

_____ _____

Authorizing Signature Date

_____ _____

Witness to above Signature Date

APPENDIX 6

COLLECTION DATA SHEET FOR ALL SAMPLES

COLLECTION DATA SHEET

TDC# _____

DATE: _____

INFO. IDENT. #	CODING	ITEM IDENTIFICATION
1.		Present Age of Offender (in years).
2.		County of Conviction (Code of Texas' Counties).
3.		Number of Counts on Current Incarceration.
4.		Nature of Major Current Offense (Code of Felonies).
5.		Maximum Sentence (in years).
6.		Number of Jail Sentences/Detention Commitments.
7.		Number of Offenses Involving Narcotics.
8.		Number of Times on Probation.
9.		Number of Probation Revocations.
10.		Number of Times on Parole.
11.		Number of Parole Revocations.
12.		Number of Co-Defendants.
13.		Number of Court Martials in Military Service.
14.		Type of Military Discharge (List of Variables' Coding).
15.		I.Q. Score.
16.		Number of Hospitalizations for Mental Treatment.
17.		Number of Hospitalizations for Alcoholic Treatment.
18.		Number of Hospitalizations for Narcotics/Drug Treatment.
19.		Number of Incarcerations as Adult.
20.		Number of Incarcerations as Juvenile.
21.		Offender's Age at Time of Current Offense(s) (in years).
22.		Age at Initial Arrest.
23.		County Paroling to (Code of Texas' Counties).
24.		Usage of Narcotics/Drugs (List of Variables' Coding.
25.		Type of Release Plan (List of Variables' Coding).
26.		Physical Limitation or Defect (List of Variables' Coding).
27.		Minimum Expiration of TDC Sentence (List of Variables' Coding).
28.		Highest Grade Level Attained Prior to TDC (in years of schooling).
29.		Highest Grade Level Attained During Present Incarceration (in years of schooling).
30.		TDC Vocational Training (List of Variables' Coding).

APPENDIX 7

MONTHLY FIELD OFFICE DATA COLLECTION FORM FOR SAMPLE 3

TO: FIELD PAROLE OFFICERS
TEXAS BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLES

RE: FIELD DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES
Instructions for Completing the FIELD OFFICE DATA COLLECTION FORM: PROJECT COPE-AIDD

The purpose of this form is to collect information on parolees who were administered the Birkman Method Questionnaire as a part of Project COPE-AIDD. One or more of the parolees in this research project have been identified as being under your supervision. Each month, you will be requested to complete a FIELD OFFICE DATA COLLECTION FORM on each of the parolees in the research sample. The form applies to the month following the rating period indicated on page 1 and should be returned to your District Supervisor. The forms will then be collected and forwarded to the Birkman-Mefferd Research Foundation for use in the analysis phase of the project.

For the most part, completion of the FIELD OFFICE DATA COLLECTION FORM should be self explanatory. All information on the form should accurately reflect your knowledge of these parolees for the month in which follow-up data is being collected. Respond to each item based on both your personal knowledge of the parolee and the information which is in his or her file. Please do not leave any items unanswered. In regard to "Supervision Status", check the appropriate box or if none is applicable, i.e., parole has been revoked or completed, so indicate immediately following the question.

For each "description" such as "In vocational training", check one (and only one) category of "Yes", "No", or "No Info". Keep in mind that these descriptions apply only to the month during which the particular follow-up form applies. If any of the descriptions are accurate, even if only for part of the month, mark "Yes" for that description. Some instances will require clarification and in those cases, comment briefly in the spaces provided.

The "COMPARED TO THE REST OF YOUR CASELOAD" questions are designed to elicit your perceptions about the parolee's attitudes and behaviors in various areas. Please answer these items from the standpoint of your experience with the parolee and how he or she compares to other parolees. The omission of an "average" category is intentional and is designed to better measure the distinction between those who are slightly below or slightly above average in regard to a particular factor.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. The information you provide on this sample of parolees will be analyzed together with criminal history and psychological data in order to attempt to identify factors which influence and predict parolee success and failure. Please use the "Additional Comments" section on the form to make any further clarifications regarding a parolee or to document success and failure related data regarding a parolee which might be useful to the project but is not collected. Any questions you may have regarding this form may be directed to your District Supervisor. Please do not complete this form in front of a parolee and keep all forms secure and confidential. Please send completed forms to:

Birkman-Mefferd Research Foundation
Project AIDD
P.O. Box 27528
Houston, Texas 77027

PROJECT COPE-AIDD

FIELD OFFICE DATA COLLECTION FORM

BMRF USE
FN _____
FO _____
FPO _____

District Office_____

Parole Officer Completing this form_____ DPO Number or Caseworker Number_____

Date this form completed_____/_____/_____
MO. DAY YR.

Parolee's Name _____
Last First Middle

TDC Number_____

Supervision Status ☐ Minimum ☐ Medium ☐ Normal ☐ Intensive

This report reflects the month of _____

The above parolee may be described during this month as follows:
(Check all applicable information)

	Yes	No	No Info.	Comments
In school or college	☐	☐	☐	_____
In vocational training	☐	☐	☐	_____
Employed	☐	☐	☐	_____
Attending special programs (A.A., etc.)	☐	☐	☐	_____
Existence of marital problems	☐	☐	☐	_____
Financial problems due to insufficient income	☐	☐	☐	_____
Financial problems due to poor money management	☐	☐	☐	_____
Has failed to appear for scheduled appointments	☐	☐	☐	_____
Have been unable to contact	☐	☐	☐	_____
Has been classified as absconded	☐	☐	☐	_____

	Yes	No	No Info.	Comments
Known to have evidenced minor violation(s) of parole rules/conditions (other than arrests).	☐	☐	☐	_____
Known to have evidenced serious violation(s) of parole rules/conditions (other than arrests).	☐	☐	☐	_____
Is in poor health	☐	☐	☐	_____
Has been hospitalized this month	☐	☐	☐	_____
Is receiving public assistance payments	☐	☐	☐	_____
Appears to have unexplained sources of income	☐	☐	☐	_____
Receives cash from relatives or other sources (list)	☐	☐	☐	_____
Rearrested, minor offense (traffic, violation of city ordinance, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	_____
Rearrested, major misdemeanor	☐	☐	☐	_____
Rearrested, felony offense	☐	☐	☐	_____
Rearrested, crime involves violence	☐	☐	☐	_____
In jail	☐	☐	☐	_____
In prison	☐	☐	☐	_____

If employed, what does he/she do?_____

Number of hours per week_____.

Hourly earnings_____.

Number of personal contacts with parolee this month_____.

Number of phone contacts with parolee this month_____.

Number of mail contacts with parolee this month _____.

Is parolee employed on same job as last month: ☐ Yes ☐ No

For most of this month, this parolee has resided: (Check One)

- ☐ Alone
- ☐ With friends or roommate (of same sex)
- ☐ With spouse (common law)
- ☐ With parents
- ☐ With relative other than parents
- ☐ In halfway house
- ☐ In other residential facility (YMCA,etc.)
- ☐ With spouse (legally married)

Comments: _____

COMPARED TO THE REST OF YOUR CASELOAD RATE THIS PAROLEE IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS:			
Amount of supervision required this month (i.e., amount of attention needed, etc.)			
☐ Low	☐ Below Average	☐ Above Average	☐ High
Emotional (psychiatric) stability of this parolee:			
☐ Poor	☐ Below Average	☐ Above Average	☐ High
Overall, this parolee's potential for criminal violence is:			
☐ Low	☐ Below Average	☐ Above Average	☐ High
Overall, this parolee's probability of successfully completing parole appears to be :			
☐ Low	☐ Below Average	☐ Above Average	☐ High
Level of marital and family stability:			
☐ Low	☐ Below Average	☐ Above Average	☐ High
Level of financial security (e.g., steady income, employment, etc.) :			
☐ Low	☐ Below Average	☐ Above Average	☐ High
Apparent attitude toward parole:			
☐ Negative	☐ Below Average	☐ Above Average	☐ Positive

Additional Comments:

APPENDIX 8

PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING THE SUCCESSES IN SAMPLE 4

BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLES - PROJECT AIDD
PROCEDURE FOR TESTING "SUCCESSFUL" PAROLEES

Since the inception of Project AIDD, several predictors of important parole-related behaviors have been developed. The refinement of those predictors depends, in large part, upon District Parole Officers and Parole Caseworkers who complete monthly Field Office Data Collection Forms on a large sample of parolees. Field staff members are to be commended for their cooperation during the follow-up phase of the project.

The final step in predictor development concerns establishing a predictor or predictors of technical parole success. Toward that end, all District Parole Officers and Parole Caseworkers are requested to administer The Birkman Method to five of their parolees who, in the opinion of the Officer or Caseworkers, are exemplary parolees and are likely to discharge parole successfully. This will give Parole Officers and Parole Caseworkers the opportunity to directly contribute to developing a predictor of parole success, since the officers and caseworkers will define success. The following procedures should be followed in selecting and testing parolees:

1) Each District Parole Officer and Parole Caseworker should select his or her "top five" parolees who have been on parole at least six months and who, in the opinion of the officer will discharge parole successfully. If an officer does not have five successful candidates, he should test as many as he has.

2) Complete a BMRF Information Sheet (yellow form). Name, TDC Number, and signature must be completed.

3) Administer The Birkman Method to each parolee selected.

4) Complete a Success Group Data Form on each parolee tested. Circle those criteria on the form which in your opinion explains why you selected the parolee as a successful parolee.

5) Return all material to:

Birkman-Mefferd Research Foundation
Project AIDD
P.O. Box 27545
Houston, Texas 77027

6) Notify Mr. Tapscott, via a memo, of the number of forms you sent and the day they were mailed.

7) Any extra materials which were not used should be sent to Mr. Tapscott's office.

Thank you for your cooperation in this project. Your work will contribute significantly to the development of parole predictors.

APPENDIX 9

DATA FORM FOR NOMINATED "PAROLE SUCCESSES" OF SAMPLE 4

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

PROJECT COPE-AIDD

BMRF USE

SUCCESS GROUP DATA FORM

FN _____

FO _____

FPO _____

District Office _____

Parole Officer Completing this form _____

DPO Number or Caseworker Number _____ Date this form completed ____/____/____
MO. DAY YR.

Parolee's Name _____
Last First Middle

TDC Number _____ Date of Parole ____/____/____ Discharge Date ____/____/____
MO. DAY YR. MO. DAY YR.

FOR THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOXES AND CIRCLE THOSE CHECKED BOXES ON EACH PAGE WHICH, IN YOUR OPINION, MAKE THIS PAROLEE A SUCCESS.

Compared to the rest of your caseload, rate this parolee in the following areas:

Amount of supervision required (i.e., amount of attention needed, etc.):

☐ Low ☐ Below Average ☐ Above Average ☐ High

Emotional (psychiatric) stability of this parolee:

☐ Poor ☐ Below Average ☐ Above Average ☐ High

Overall, this parolee's potential for criminal violence is:

☐ Low ☐ Below Average ☐ Above Average ☐ High

Overall, this parolee's probability of successfully completing parole appears to be:

☐ Low ☐ Below Average ☐ Above Average ☐ High

Level of marital and family stability:

☐ Low ☐ Below Average ☐ Above Average ☐ High

Level of financial secruity (e.g., steady income, employment, etc.):

☐ Low ☐ Below Average ☐ Above Average ☐ High

Apparent attitude toward parole:

☐ Negative ☐ Below Average ☐ Above Average ☐ Positive

FOR THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOXES AND CIRCLE THOSE CHECKED BOXES WHICH, IN YOUR OPINION, MAKE THIS PAROLEE A SUCCESS:

During the course of the parole period, this parolee has:

	Yes	No	Info.	Comments
Been employed	☐	☐	☐	_____
Attended a vocational training program	☐	☐	☐	_____
Attended school or college	☐	☐	☐	_____
Attended special programs (A.A., etc.)	☐	☐	☐	_____
Experienced marital problems	☐	☐	☐	_____
Experienced financial problems due to insufficient income	☐	☐	☐	_____
Experienced financial problems due to poor money management	☐	☐	☐	_____
Experienced financial problems due to extraordinary expenses	☐	☐	☐	_____
Received public assistance payments	☐	☐	☐	_____
Appeared to have unexplained sources of income	☐	☐	☐	_____
Received cash from relatives or other sources	☐	☐	☐	_____
Been in poor health	☐	☐	☐	_____
Been hospitalized	☐	☐	☐	_____
Often failed to appear for scheduled appointments	☐	☐	☐	_____
Often been difficult to contact	☐	☐	☐	_____
Been classified as an absconder	☐	☐	☐	_____
Been known to have evidenced minor violation(s) of parole rules/conditions (other than arrests)	☐	☐	☐	_____

During the course of the parole period, this parolee has:

	Yes	No	No Info.	Comments
Been known to have evidenced serious violation(s) of parole rules/conditions (other than arrests)	☐	☐	☐	_____
Been rearrested, minor offense (traffic, violation of city ordinance, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	_____
Been rearrested, major misdemeanor	☐	☐	☐	_____
Been rearrested, felony offense	☐	☐	☐	_____
Been rearrested, crime involves violence	☐	☐	☐	_____
Been in jail during course of parole	☐	☐	☐	_____
Been in prison during course of parole	☐	☐	☐	_____
Has parolee maintained stable employment during the course of his parole?	☐	☐	☐	_____

For most of the parole period, this parolee has resided: (Check One)

- ☐ Alone
- ☐ With friends or roommate (of same sex)
- ☐ With spouse (legally married)
- ☐ With spouse (common law)
- ☐ With parents
- ☐ With relative other than parents
- ☐ In halfway house
- ☐ In other residential facility (YMCA, etc.)

If employed, what does he/she do? _____

Current Supervision Status ☐ Minimum ☐ Medium ☐ Normal ☐ Intensive

Average number of personal contacts with parolee each month _____

Average number of phone contacts with parolee each month _____

Average number of mail contacts with parolee each month _____

FOOTNOTES

[1]This report was prepared by the Birkman-Mefferd Research Foundation, (BMRF) Houston, Texas, Roy B. Mefferd Jr. Ph.D., President, under a contract from the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles as part of an L.E.A.A. Grant, Criminal Justice Division Grant No. DS-76-E04-0011.

[2]Birkman & Associates, Inc. (B&A), 3637 W. Alabama, Suite 230, P.O. Box 27528, Houston, Texas 77027, made their existing confidential data base of more than 100,000 people available to BMRF for research purposes for this project. B&A also is making use of the predictor equations entitled POORLY CONTROLLED AGGRESSIVE TENDENCIES, POOR SOCIAL ADAPTABILITY, POOR SELF-CONTROL, AND POOR WORK ATTITUDE, which it developed in 1972 on its own resources, available to public institutions at special institutional rates, through BMRF. In doing this B&A in no way relinquishes ownership of or its rights associated with its data base or the predictive equations that were developed using this data base.

[3]Project Uplift-Outreach of the Birkman-Mefferd Research Foundation was supported by the Criminal Justice Division of Texas from grants from the LEAA, Criminal Justice Division Grant Nos. AC-77-E04-4207 and EA-77-E04-4915.

REFERENCES

Adams, T. Some MMPI differences between first and multiple admissions with a state prison population. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1976, 32, 555-558.

Anastasi, Anne. Psychological Testing. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co. 1976.

Bennett, L.A. Self-esteem and parole adjustment. Criminology, 1974, 12, 346-360.

Burgess, E.W. Factors making for success or failure on parole. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1928, 12, 239-306 (Part 2).

California Department of Corrections. The Base Expectancy Scale: BE61A. Research Measurement Unit, 1970.

Cattell, R.B. Personality and Mood by Questionnaire. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing Co., 1973.

Eysenck S.B., & Eysenck, H.J. Personality differences between prisoners and controls. Psychological Reports, 1977, 40, 1023-1028.

Gillin, J. Prediction of parole success in Wisconsin. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1943, 34, 235-239.

Glaser, D. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1964.

Guilford, J.P., & Fruchter, B. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, 5th Edition. New York: Mc-Graw-Hill, 1973.

Gottfredson, D.M., & Ballard, K.B., Jr. The Validity of Two Parole Prediction Scales. Vacaville, California: Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, 1965.

Hathaway, S.R., & McKinley, J.C. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Manual (revised). New York: Psychological Corp., 1951.

Heilbrun, A.B., Knopf, I.J., & Bruner, P. Criminal impulsivity and violence and subsequent parole outcome. British Journal of Criminology, 1976, 16: 367-377.

Hoffman, P.B., & Beck, J.L. Parole decision-making: a salient factor score. Journal of Criminal Justice, 1974, 2, 195-206.

Hoffman, P.B., & DeGostin, Lucille R. Parole decision-making: structuring discretion. Federal Probation, 1974, 38, 7-15.

Holland, T.R., & Holt, N. Prisoner intellectual and personality correlates of offense severity and recidivism probability. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1975, 31, 667-672.

Jenkins, R.L., Hart, H.H., Sperling, P.I., & Axelrad, S. Prediction of parole success: inclusion of psychiatric criteria. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1942, 33, 38-46.

Justice, B., & Birkman, R.W. An effort to distinguish the violent from the non-violent. Journal of Southern Medical Association, 1972, 65, 703-706.

Kunce, J.T., Ryan, J.J., & Eckelman, C.C. Violent behavior and differential WAIS characteristics. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 42-45.

Laulicht, J. A study of recidivism in one training school: Implications for rehabilitation programs. Crime and Delinquency, 1962, 8, 161-171.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice. Confidentiality of identifiable research and statistical information. Federal Register, 1976, 41: 54846-54847.

Long, H.L. A proposed rating scale for measuring parolee adjustment. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1941, 31, 693-695.

Lothstein, L.M., & Jones, P. Discriminating violent individuals by means of various psychological tests. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1978, 42, 237-243.

McCreary, C.P., & Mensh, I.N. Personality differences associated with age in law offenders. Journal of Gerontology, 1977, 32, 164-167.

McCreary, C.P. Trait and type differences among male and female assaultive and non-assaultive offenders. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1976, 40, 617-621.

McCreary, C. & Padilla, E. MMPI differences among Black, Mexican-American, and White male offenders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33, 171-177.

McWilliams, W. Sentencing and recidivism: an analysis by personality type. Journal of Social Work, 1975, 5, 311-324.

Megargee, E.I. The prediction of dangerous behavior. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 1976, 3, 3-22.

Monahan, J. The prediction of violence. In Chappel, D., & Monahan, J. (Ed.), Violence and Criminal Justice. Lexington, Mass: D.C. Health and Co., 1975.

Nicholson, R.C. Use of prediction in caseload management. Federal Probation, 1968, 32, 54-58.

Nunnally, J.c. Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Scott, P.P. Assessing dangerousness in criminals. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1977, 131, 127-142.

Simon, F.H. Statistical methods of making prediction instruments. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1972, 9, 46-53.

Spellacy, F. Neuropsychiatrical discrimination between violent and non-violent men. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1978, 34, 49-52.

Tatsuoka, M.M. Discriminant Analysis: the study of l. Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.

Wiggins, J.S. Personality Prediction: Principles of Personality Assessment. Readings, Mass.: Wesley Publishing Co., 1973.

Willbach, H. What constitutes recidivism? Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1942, 33, 32-27.

Witkin, H.A. Criminality in XYY and XXY men: the elevated crime rate of XYY males is not related to aggression. It may be related to low intelligence. Science, 1976, 193, 547-555.

Wittreich, W.J., & Miner, J.B. People: the most mismanaged asset -- rational selection and promotion. Business Horizons, 1971, 69-77.

END