

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

Job Therapy, Inc.  
An Evaluation of Efforts to Rehabilitate Public Offenders\*

\* The evaluation was made possible by funding from LEAA through Washington State Law and Justice Planning Office



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The current evaluation of Job Therapy programs represent the efforts of many cooperating individuals and agencies over an extended period of time.

Particular thanks go to Kelley B. Ballard, Jr., and Vincent A. VanDerHyde who were major influences in the early conceptualization of the overall evaluation and research design, and to Marlin Anderson and Ray Carney of the Washington State Office of Information Systems and Arthur Hixson of the State Office of Research for their designing and structure of the computerized data base used in this evaluation.

Appreciation is expressed to Candace Corn for providing substantial field research and to Donald Johns of the Adult Corrections Planning Office, the Office of Research staff, and several correctional institution counselors who provided expertise in the collection and analysis of data.

Special thanks go to the secretarial staff of the Office of Research which provided invaluable clerical support throughout the study period.

Finally, much gratitude is expressed to Richard J. Simmons and the staff of Job Therapy who patiently gave many hours of their time to explain the function and philosophy of Job Therapy, and who made their records available for this research effort.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables .....	iii
Summary .....	vi
Introduction .....	1
Job Therapy, Inc. ....	1
The Person-to-Person Program .....	2
The Job Start Program .....	8
Research Design and Procedure .....	12
Source and Selection of Data .....	12
Evaluation Strategy .....	13
Comparison of Study Groups .....	16
Age .....	17
Race .....	19
Marital Status .....	19
Highest School Grade Completed .....	19
Prior Juvenile Record .....	23
Alcohol and Drug History .....	23
Type of Offense .....	26
Base Expectancy Score .....	30
Summary of Group Comparison .....	35
Analysis of Recidivism Rates .....	37
Age at Parole .....	40
Race .....	42
Marital Status, Highest Grade, Employment History .....	42
Histories of Drug and Alcohol use .....	46
Prior Juvenile and Adult Commitment .....	48
Type of Admission .....	48
Offense .....	53
Base Expectancy Scores .....	56
Summary of Parole Outcome Data .....	56
References.....	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Mean Age of Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions.....	18
2	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Age At Parole and By Study Group Designation.....	20
3	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Race and By Study Group Designation.....	21
4	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Marital Status and By Study Group Designation.....	22
5	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Highest Grade Completed and By Study Group Designation	24
6	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Prior Commitment To Washington Juvenile Institution and Study Group Designation.....	25
7	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Alcohol History and Study Group Designation.....	27
8	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Drug History and Study Group Designation.....	28
9	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Offense At Last Commitment and Study Group Designation	29
10	Definition of 4-Variable Base Expectancy Scores.....	30
11	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By The 4 Variable Base Expectancy and Study Group Designation	31
12	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Employment History Over The Past Two Years and By Study Group Designation.....	32

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
13	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Prior Adult Commitment and Study Group Designation...	33
14	Individuals Paroled From Washington Adult Correctional Institutions During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 By Type of Admission and Study Group Designation.....	34
15	Comparison of Non-Client and M-2 Study Groups By Parole Success-Failure Classification.....	38
16	Comparison of Non-Client and Job Start Study Groups By Parole Success-Failure Classification.....	38
17	Comparison of M-2 and Job Start Study Groups By Parole Success-Failure Classification.....	39
18	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Age at Parole For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.....	41
19	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Race For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.....	43
20	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Marital Status For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.....	44
21	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Highest Grade Completed For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.....	45
22	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Employment History For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.....	47
23	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Alcohol History For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.....	49
24	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Drug History For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.....	50
25	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Prior Juvenile Commitments For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971..	51

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
26	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Prior Washington Adult Commitments For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.....	52
27	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Type of Admission For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.....	54
28	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By Offense At Last Commitment For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971..	55
29	Job Therapy Client and Non-Client Comparison Groups By Parole Outcome and By 4 Variable Base Expectancy Score For Those Paroled During Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.....	57

## SUMMARY

The Department of Social and Health Services, State of Washington has undertaken an evaluation of the effectiveness of Job Therapy, Incorporated, in reducing the number of returns to correctional institutions. Job Therapy is a private, non-denominational, religiously oriented organization that has been under contract to provide citizen volunteer sponsorship and job finding services to paroled offenders since July 1, 1970. The sponsorship program is called the Person-to-Person or M-2 program. The aim of this program is to provide community contact through periodic visits of citizen volunteers with those correctional inmates who have inadequate family or other personal ties with the community. The Job Finding services are called the Job Start program, and the object of this program is to help ex-prisoners obtain jobs in the community after their release from the correctional institution. The Job Therapy staff express the ultimate aim of both programs as the rehabilitation of their clients with the intended result of reducing the rate of recidivism among those given service. Among other goals are those of helping the client make an easier transition from prison to society, encouraging the parolee to realize a better work attitude, persuading employers to hire ex-felons, and presenting correctional problems and alternatives to existing correctional programs to the public at large.

The current evaluation examines the recidivism rates for persons paroled during fiscal years 1970 and 1971. The population for each fiscal year was subsequently separated into three groups: (1) those who did not have contact with Job Therapy; (2) those who were recipients of Job Therapy services and were primarily involved in the Person-to-Person program; (3) those who had contact with Job Therapy only through the Job Start program.

The three study groups for each fiscal year were compared for the purpose of discovering differences which might be predictive of parole success. Twelve personal characteristics descriptive of personal history and criminal career were selected for the basis of this comparison.

In comparing those persons who received person-to-person services with those persons who had no contact with Job Therapy, it was found that Job Therapy clients were more likely to be younger offenders with juvenile records and were less likely to have been committed to an institution for crimes against persons. When comparing the Job Start clients with those who had no Job Therapy contact, similar results were found in that Job Start clients were also more likely to be younger offenders with prior juvenile records. These variables might indicate that the Job Therapy client groups were predisposed to parole failure, but it was also found that the groups which had no contact with Job Therapy services were much more likely to have a history of excessive alcohol use. This might be sufficient to compensate for the variables listed above and make the Job Therapy client groups and the groups which had no contact with Job Therapy comparable in their proneness to fail on parole. Some support for this assumption comes from a comparison of the study groups by their parole base expectancy scores.

The base expectancy for parole success was developed through previous research by the Office of Research and takes into account the four variables found to be most predictive of parole success. Those variables include type of offense for which committed, prior criminal record, history of alcohol use, and employment histories. When the parole success base expectancy scores of those who participated in Job Therapy services are compared to those of non-participants, no significant differences are found. This was true for both the M-2 and the Job Start groups. From the variables examined, it appears

that no real determination can be made as to whether the Job Therapy client groups are more or less prone to fail on parole than the non-client population.

The study groups were followed onto parole for an average of 24 months for the purpose of examining actual parole performance. The major variable for evaluating the effectiveness of Job Therapy services was recidivism, which was defined as whether or not clients avoided future incarceration. When the parole success rates of those who received Job Therapy services were compared with the success rates of those who received no such services, it was found that there was no significant difference between the Job Start client group and the non-client group. It was also found that the Person-to-Person (M-2) client group had a significantly higher parole failure rate than the non-client population.

It was further found that in comparing differential parole success rates between study groups for various subject characteristics, the Job Start program appeared to have relative success with younger offenders who had prior juvenile records and who scored low (high parole risk) on the base expectancy scale. The M-2 program on the other hand, did not appear to have relative success with any segment of their client population, but in fact had significantly higher parole failure rates for whites, for those who had completed between 9-11 grades in school, as well as for those who had generally been employed during the two years prior to incarceration. The M-2 parole success rate was also lower than that of the non-client population for those who had no prior juvenile record, those who had no prior adult record, and lower for those who were first admission. Finally, the success rate on parole for M-2 clients was significantly lower than that of the non-client group for those persons whose B.E. Scores were 60 or above (low risk).

It would appear that while the M-2 program is not significantly more successful with any group, it has a significant negative effect on those persons who would seem to have the highest probability of success. Those with higher educational level, those with records of prior employment, those who have no prior criminal record, and those who score highest on the base expectancy scale, all had lower success rates in the M-2 group than in the non-client population.

Job Therapy, Inc.

An Evaluation of Efforts to Rehabilitate Public Offenders

Ralph W. Smith and Robert T. Nowell

INTRODUCTION

Job Therapy, Incorporated, is a non-profit organization with a nondenominational religious orientation which, under contract with the Department of Social and Health Services, has been providing sponsorship for and job finding services to parolees from adult correctional institutions since July 1, 1970. The sponsorship program is called the Person-to-Person program, and the aim of the program is to provide friendship and community contact through periodic visits of citizen volunteers with those correctional institution inmates who have inadequate family or other personal ties with the community. The program includes the recruitment, screening and continued guidance of the volunteers.

The job finding services is called the Job Start program. The object of this program is to assist ex-prisoners in obtaining jobs in the face of the special difficulties that they encounter. The services include the writing of resumes, properly preparing job applicants for approaching prospective employers, and providing job referrals to employers selected from a list of those who have shown a willingness to employ ex-prisoners.

The Job Therapy staff express the ultimate aim of both programs as the rehabilitation of their clients with the intended result of reducing the rate of recidivism among those given service.

In addition to sponsorship and job finding services, Job Therapy has

been engaged in both public information and public educational activities. Job Therapy has also assumed a leading role in the preparation and successful passage of recent state legislation permitting payments of stipends, similar to unemployment compensation, to persons released from state prisons and seeking work, and has been a strong advocate of prison reform. The organization does not receive financial support from the State of Washington for these activities.

The State of Washington's contractual support of this evaluation of Job Therapy's effectiveness has been limited to the sponsorship and job finding services. These two services are the major concern of this report.

Partial funding for these Job Therapy services was provided by the Department of Social and Health Services. Major funding came from the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency (LEAA), and a substantial portion of available resources was provided by private contributions and services donated by volunteers. Job Therapy also provided the same services to clients from city and county jails and from Federal Correctional Institutions, but the State did not participate in funding services to these clients.

#### The Person-to-Person Program

The Man-to-Man (M-2) program is selected as an illustration of the several volunteer sponsor programs fostered by Job Therapy because it was the first established. Other volunteer programs started by Job Therapy are the Woman-to-Woman (W-2) program, the Youth-to-Youth (Y-2) program and the Family-to-Family (F-2) program. In the case of M-2, the purpose was to provide volunteer sponsors as friends and counselors of the ex-prisoner with the aim of effecting a change for the better in both attitude and morale.

The Man-to-Man program is active throughout the State of Washington, and while any ex-offender living in Washington may apply, the program has specialized in servicing residents of Washington Adult Correctional Institutions. Headquarters for the program are located in Seattle, and are near the two state adult correctional institutions for males at Monroe and Shelton, and near a federal penitentiary at McNeil Island. The primary activities of the M-2 are concentrated therefore, in the area of King County, Kitsap County, Pierce County, Snohomish County, and Thurston County.

A cooperative effort has existed between the M-2 and the institutional counseling staffs over the establishment of operational procedures and responsibilities. Job Therapy has been assigned the role of locating applicants to serve as volunteer sponsors. The institutional counseling staffs have been assigned the responsibility of both recruiting resident clients and matching resident clients with sponsors. Both Job Therapy and the Institutional staffs attempt to screen applicants to eliminate those unsuited to the program. The role of the M-2 program is to get volunteer sponsors and facilitate a beneficial relationship between the client and sponsor, with emphasis on the client's welfare. The techniques used to recruit volunteers include speaking engagements at churches and civic groups and canvassing through radio and television time donated by local stations.

The speaking engagement has proven to be the most effective recruiting method because of the speakers direct personal contact with the audience. This allows him to obtain a showing of interest, such as the signing of an inquiry card, while interest is high. The inquiry card requests those completing it to signify interest in volunteering for citizen sponsorship, Volunteer Job Finder, or Cash Donations and is the entry point of sponsor recruit-

ment. A secretary from M-2 collects the sign-up cards and sends a form letter to each respondent notifying them of monthly orientation meetings. The meetings not only explain the nature of a sponsor's responsibilities but also provide initial screening during which only those who have an active interest are encouraged to continue.

Job Therapy states that all applications undergo a review by the M-2 staff. This review consists of contacting references which are sometimes followed up with a detailed investigation. During the evaluation, the M-2 staff considers the tentative sponsor's character, personality, and ability to sustain relationships. This information is referred to the M-2 Supervisor for an approval or rejection of the applicant. While outright rejections are uncommon, those applicants who are elderly, infirm, or live in remote locations nowhere near a Washington Adult Institution are not encouraged to continue. Before the applications are forwarded to the proper agency, the Mobilization Coordinator makes a final check and adds any information to the form he feels would be useful.

Once cleared at M-2, the sponsor application is routed to the Supervisor of Classification and Parole at the appropriate institution. Within the Classification and Parole Section, the applications are reviewed and distributed among the classification counselors who then compare sponsor applications with resident applications and establish matches.

Recruitment of DSHS applicants is quite different. Persons entering the adult correctional system are transferred to their assigned institution from the Reception Center on a Friday. The following Monday, during the prisoner's orientation to living in the institution, one of the classification counselors describes the M-2 program. Further encouragement to enter the

program may come by word of mouth circulated through the cell blocks, or from information displayed or otherwise related via special service, such as the multi-service center at Monroe. The resident may be motivated to join the M-2 program either because he is lonely or otherwise feels a need for social support and wishes to make use of available programs or because he wishes to make a positive impression on the counseling staff and parole board.

All applications are submitted to the prisoner's regularly assigned classification or pre-parole counselor who collects them while waiting for an opportune match. Based on his knowledge of the residents personality, the counselor tries to select a likely sponsor for his client from a limited list of sponsor applications. Each counselor has his own criteria for evaluating sponsor applications. These criteria include such considerations as: the nature of the sponsor's work causes him to move suddenly or creates critical demands on his available time, the applicant is over fifty, he lives too far from the institution, he lives too far from the proposed parole area, is a farmer and therefore thought undesirable since his rural background would not relate to the clients who are mainly from cities, or he is himself unemployed.

Another factor considered by counselors is the sponsor's ability to resist manipulation by a client since many inmates are seen attempting to manipulate their sponsor. It should be noted that the resident applicants who are seen by the counselor as interested primarily for exploiting the sponsor are rejected. In case of severe problems during the course of the client-sponsor match, the counselor may intercede by advising the client or by breaking up the match.

The counselor often has a problem in creating matches because the resident's needs differ from the sponsor's background. Two examples of this problem are the shortage of blacks and trade union members as sponsors. Parolees tend to express desires for assistance and advice from persons whose background, skills and abilities are similar to their own. This is not always possible since most sponsors are caucasian, middle class professional types whose backgrounds and resources differ sharply from those of most residents.

Many of the residents of state institutions lack strong, sympathetic family ties. Some come from distant states but are scheduled to be paroled in Washington. Others are 'drifters' and are seen as needing a sponsor's direction. In other instances, the residents have little or no money, are unskilled or are otherwise relatively helpless and seen as needing sound advice and moral support. Residents with these characteristics are advised to apply for M-2 services and they receive prime consideration for sponsor matches. Accordingly, some sponsor applicants are seen as particularly desirable, especially those who have good resources such as a business, a stable home, training in sociological problems, those who do not exaggerate their qualifications, and appear to be sincere in their effort to contribute to the program.

Upon notification by the institution of the sponsor-resident match, Job Therapy alerts the sponsor and shift its efforts to training the sponsor and maintaining the client-sponsor relationship. The sponsor is expected to give a fair amount of time and effort and is encouraged to write once a week and to visit the resident at least once a month. Job Therapy gives advice to its volunteers in the form of literature that is designed to aid them in

adequately handling visits to institutions. Monthly meetings in the community are held to answer specific questions not covered by the literature. The Job Therapy staff is available daily, by telephone or visit, when a quick answer is necessary. In addition, Job Therapy schedules visits, forms car pools, and arranges air flights to get sponsors to institutions.

When a problem that requires intervention arises between the sponsor and the client, the sponsor temporarily withdraws and the Institution Liaison Officer personally contacts both parties and gathers information concerning the problem. The Mobilization Coordinator supervises this activity and makes the ultimate decision regarding rematches and the resolution of existing problems between the sponsor and the inmate. Upon parole from the institution, the sponsor-client relationship continues until either it becomes apparent the relationship is no longer needed or the client or sponsor voluntarily withdraws.

As a compliment to the M-2 program, the W-2 (Woman-to-Woman) program arranges matches between female felons and volunteers. W-2 is a relatively new program which was initiated at Walla Walla in the fall of 1970. Soon after the inception of the W-2 program, the Women's Correctional Center at Purdy was completed. The W-2 is also active at the King County Jail and with women parolees and probationers in the State of Washington.

The W-2 program has a unique matching process. Where M-2 sends sponsor applications to the institutional counselor, W-2 brings sponsors directly to Purdy and lets natural friendships arise between sponsors and residents. After the initial meeting, the clients identify the sponsor with whom they want to be tentatively matched. A trial period of the month follows, and, if satisfactory to both parties, the match becomes permanent.

A liaison has been established between the W-2 staff and the Purdy institution. It is called the Resident Advisory Staff which is composed of two administrators from Purdy, four residents and two W-2 staff members. The staff functions primarily as a catalyst between W-2 and Purdy to create interest and to handle problems in the sponsorship program.

For the purposes of this evaluation whenever data are presented representing the Person-to-Person program they include only M-2 data. Female participants were excluded from the evaluation.

#### The Job Start Program

As a compliment to the Person-to-Person program, Job Therapy has organized a second program called Job Start. When the parolee re-enters society, he needs work in order to make an adequate transition from institutional life to community living. The Job Start organization has been established to act as an employment service for ex-felons.

Job Therapy organized the Job Start program into three major sections, including the Vocational Rehabilitation section, the Job Finding section, and the Success Clinic. The Vocational Rehabilitation Section was organized to help the applicant plot his work future and to help him achieve goals he had established, and if necessary to refer him to training programs. The Job-Finding Section lined up job openings and attempted to match applicants with particular jobs. The Success Clinic provided assistance to the applicants through counseling and by providing them with resumes.

In addition to the three major sections within Job Start, there were other peripheral groups not directly controlled by the Job Start that provided assistance. The Employer Relation Section, sought out potential

employers for the Job Finding Section, and the Community Relations Section acted as a publicity agency in advertising to the community the availability of Job Start services.

Often the applicant for Job Start services was contacted while still in the institution. Many institutional residents had difficulties in developing a successful plan of employment while institutionalized, and Job Start provided resources useful in developing a work plan which could be implemented upon parole.

Job Start Services are also available to the paroled individual who seeks employment. These persons are referred to Job Start by their parole officer, or they may be reached through referral from the Washington State Employment Service, from other state agencies, or through newspapers, T.V., and radio advertising.

When the applicant arrives at the Job Therapy offices, the receptionist notes his request and has him fill out a personal data and work history form. The completed form is given to the intake and filing section coordinator who interviews the applicant and refers him to the proper section such as Job Finding, or Vocational Rehabilitation. The coordinator starts a jacket file for the applicant and begins the necessary paper work. If the client is referred to the vocational rehabilitation section, a determination is made whether any further academic or vocational training is necessary, and if so, what type of program would best fit the clients need. For example, the client may be placed in a community program or referred to the State of Washington Department of Vocational Rehabilitation for help.

The client is usually referred to the Job Finding Section immediately for assistance in finding a job. Vocational re-training is often conducted

while the client holds a temporary job, in order that a better job placement can be made in the future. When the applicant first contacts Job Therapy he may be referred directly to the Job Finding Section, classified for employment, and prepared for job interviews. The Job Counselor advises him on the appropriate dress and behavior for the interview. If the applicant lacks clothes or a place to live, he may be referred to the Support-Services Section so that arrangements for that type of help can be made. It might be noted that the Support Services Section is separate from Job Start and is available to all Job Therapy clientele.

If no immediate employment is available, a counselor from the Employer Relations Sections prepares a resume using the previously completed personal data and work history form. After review, the resume is printed and circulated to prospective employers who have already been screened and found to accept ex-felons. When a resume brings a response from a prospective employer, a job interview is arranged. Once the client gains employment, he is offered the services of the Success Clinic. Counseling is available to help solve personal problems, and for the development of attitudes that will enable the client to retain his job and to improve his employment career.

The purpose of the Employer Relations Section is to develop new job sources and to maintain good relations with existing, cooperating companies. The employees of this section are responsible for canvassing prospective employers who would hire clients from Job Therapy. Employers are called and asked whether they are willing to employ ex-felons. If the response is encouraging, a list of prospective jobs is obtained during the telephone conversation, and entered on the job order form. These forms are kept on file and periodically renewed. Another function of the Employer Relations Section is to trouble-shoot problems that arise after clients are referred to

jobs and hired. A followup is made after each referral, and once the client is placed, periodic followups are made to deal with any problems that have occurred.

An average of 35 job referrals and 20 job placements were made per month directly by Job Therapy. Other agencies such as the State of Washington Department of Vocational Rehabilitation served in a referral role.

Job Therapy was reimbursed by the state for the services they provided at a rate of \$200 per service. Thus, if a client was provided a sponsor and received job finding assistance upon release from prison, the state paid Job Therapy \$400. The organization provided services to clients on an indefinite time basis. The department was billed only once for each service provided to an individual, and subsequent assistance was continued under the one-time fee.



## RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

This study was undertaken to make some determination as to the effectiveness of Job Therapy services in reducing parole failure rates for those who receive such services. In order to make this evaluation both the Man-to-Man (M-2) and the Job Start services of Job Therapy were examined.

The primary criterion of program effectiveness used in this study was recidivism, as measured in terms of the proportion of parolees returned to state and federal correctional institutions. The main question, therefore was whether the return rates of clients receiving services from Job Therapy indicated better or worse performance during a followup period than did the return rates of those individuals who did not receive those services. A secondary question was whether return rates of specific groupings of clients grouped on the basis of shared characteristics, indicated better or worse performance than rates for comparable groupings of individuals who did not receive those services. That is, was Job Therapy more effective with certain types of clients than with others.

To the extent that the test and comparison groups were comparable in parole risk, any differences in outcome found between the test groups receiving Job Therapy services and the comparison groups that did not receive those services must be attributed either to factors related to the services provided by Job Therapy, or to other variables not tested in this evaluation.

### Source and Selection of Data

The total population of those paroled from Washington State correctional institutions during the period beginning July 1969, and ending June 1971 were

selected for study. The data used include (1) client identification information (2) client characteristics recorded on institution admission summaries (3) institutional and parole population movement data, such as dates of admission to and release from confinement, returns from parole to the institution (used in computing recidivism rates) and (4) data from reports of Job Therapy activities submitted by clients, institution counselors, and Job Therapy sponsors.

These data are stored in the Department of Social and Health Services computer files and can be interfaced with other relevant DSHS files. Each individual paroled during the study period has a computer file describing his personal history, his personal characteristics, and his institutional and post-institutional behavior. Job Therapy clients were identified and the personal history data concerning them were extracted from the DSHS computer files, and placed on special computer tapes for analysis.

A list of personal characteristics was scanned and a preliminary analysis was made. Some information in the computer files, was not adequately maintained and those data elements were dropped. A list of those data elements selected for analysis include the following:

- Age at date of parole
- Race
- Marital Status
- Employment history during two years prior to arrest
- Highest school grade completed at time of latest commitment
- Prior record of commitments to Washington Office of Adult Corrections
- Prior record of commitments to Washington Juvenile Institutions
- Type of admission for latest offense
- Alcohol history
- Drug history
- Type of offense at latest commitment

#### Evaluation Strategy

All individuals paroled during the two year study period were assigned

to discrete groups by whether they had no contact with Job Therapy (called comparison or non-client group), and whether they did have contact with Job Therapy. Those who had such contact were separated into two study groups: those who were provided service by the Person-to-Person program (called the Man-to-Man or M-2 test group), and those who received Job Start services only (called Job Start test group).

The three study groups were then compared using the eleven data elements listed above. This comparison was for the purpose of discovering any differences between populations which might predispose one group or another to success or failure on parole. In all such comparisons throughout this evaluation, the chi-square test of independence was used as an indicator of whether or not observed differences between study groups were statistically significant.

In making such comparisons it should be noted that Job Therapy has been in operation since 1965, and that the fiscal year 1970 Job Therapy cohort groups (both M-2 and Job Start) represent individuals paroled during fiscal 1970 and contain persons who were enrolled in Job Therapy prior to the start of the formal contract period on July 1, 1970 (the start of fiscal 1971).

It should also be noted that in all Job Therapy cohort groups there exists the possibility that some of the individuals were enrolled subsequent to parole. That is, of those who were placed in the comparison group (no Job Therapy contact) at the time of parole, there were some few individuals who went to Job Therapy for services on their own initiative. It is likely that these persons were good parole risks, but whatever the bias introduced by their becoming part of the Job Therapy study groups, that bias remains largely undefined.

Finally, the three study groups were followed onto parole and their parole failure rates were compared. Such comparisons were made between study groups for each of the two fiscal years in the study period.

Whenever the terms "recidivism" or "parole failure rate" appear in this evaluation they are to mean the number of those paroled (excluding paroles to consecutive sentence and paroles to detainer) from Washington State correctional facilities who are returned to state custody for the commission of a new offense or as a parole violator, or who are subsequently incarcerated in a federal penitentiary. Those persons who have absconded and are still at large and those persons who may have since been incarcerated in other states are not included in these "recidivism rates".

It should be noted that each of the two paroled populations (those paroled in fiscal years 1970 and 1971) were followed on parole through June 30, 1972. This means that those paroled during fiscal 1970 were followed on parole for an average of 30 months while those paroled in 1971 were followed an average of 18 months. The data for each of the two fiscal years were examined separately and found to be so similar in characteristics as to justify the combining of the two year data in this evaluation. This means that the average followup for the two year population was 24 months.

It should be noted here that data were also gathered and analyzed for the 1972 population but due to the short followup period for these persons in addition to certain selection practices which made the 1972 Job Therapy client group considerably different from the client groups of the previous years, that group is not included in this evaluation.

It may be that the recidivism rates for the study groups paroled in fiscal year 1970 are the most meaningful, since the shorter the followup

period, the greater the impact of short run influences, such as court probation/incarceration policies, parole officers caseload, current parole revocation policies, etc. But whatever the effect of such influences, it is expected that they have equal effect on the Job Start, M-2, and non-client groups paroled during the same period of time.

The fact that the populations were followed onto parole for an average of only 24 months, may leave some questions unanswered. Previous studies of Washington State parolees show that while the first 24 months are certainly the most critical period for parole failure, even by the end of 24 months only about 60% of those who will eventually return to the system have done so. This could mean that if those who are supported by Job Therapy in the first months of parole are only having their failure postponed, that failure may not be detected in this evaluation.

#### Comparison of Study Groups

This study includes the entire population of persons paroled from the Washington State Adult Correctional Institutions during the period beginning July 1, 1969 and ending June 30, 1971. Each of the two fiscal year populations were then categorized as to whether or not they had contact with Job Therapy. Those who did use Job Therapy services were then categorized as to whether they were primarily involved in the person-to-person (M-2) program or whether their contact was with the Job Start program only.

The M-2 and the Job Start populations are here compared with the non-client group (those who had no contact with Job Therapy) for the purpose of discovering those variables which might be characteristic of one group or another.

Recent studies in the State of Washington have isolated those variables which are most predictive of parole performance for Washington populations. These variables include: employment history, type of offense, history of excessive drinking, and prior criminal record. In addition to these, the current study examines seven other variables which have also been found to be related to successful parole performance.

Comparing the Job Therapy populations with the non-client groups using such variables, is essential in order to establish whether or not it is meaningful to compare them as to their respective parole performance. If, for example, such comparisons show the study groups to be substantially different in their characteristics, then any comparison between them with regard to parole performance becomes more difficult to interpret and may lose their meaning all together.

If on the other hand the study groups are comparable in characteristics, any differences in their parole performance can be attributed to either the effect of Job Therapy services or to variables which have not been tested.

The 1970 and 1971 population have been examined separately with regard to each of the variable discussed. However, due to the lack of major differences between them and considering the nature of this report it is felt that except where otherwise indicated the data can be most meaningful presented when the two years are combined.

#### Age

Table 1 shows that both the M-2 and Job Start programs served a younger clientele than the group which had no contact with Job Therapy.

The M-2 cohorts tended to be an average of 5.5 to 7.2 years younger and the Job Start cohorts an average of 3.1 to 5.6 years younger than the control group.

TABLE 1  
 MEAN AGE OF INDIVIDUALS PAROLED  
 FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Fiscal Year	Control Group- No Contact with Job Therapy	Test Groups	
		With Person to Person Job Therapy Contact.	With Job Start Job Therapy Contact
1970	31.9	26.0	26.3
1971	32.2	25.0	27.4

A look at the distribution by age in table 2 shows that of those in the M-2 and Job Start subgroup populations, most were under 30. Almost half of the individuals in the M-2 and 40% of the Job Start subgroups were between 21 to 25 years old compared to approximately 30% of the persons in the control group.

#### Race

An inspection of Table 3 shows that during the three years of the study, more blacks were served, and fewer of other minority races by the Person-to-Person and Job Start programs than were found in the comparison group. This difference was statistically significant only for the Job Start group. It appears that the Person-to-Person and Job Start test groups served approximately the same proportion of whites as the group having no contact with Job Therapy during Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971.

#### Marital Status

When comparing marital status, it was found that there was a higher proportion of individuals described as single in the Job Therapy test groups than in the group that had no Job Therapy contact (Table 4).

Both Job Therapy client groups had proportionately more single persons and fewer persons who were divorced, widowed or separated. All three groups had approximately the same proportion of married persons.

#### Highest School Grade Completed Prior to Arrest

Taking an overview of the educational background of individuals paroled during Fiscal 1970-1971 (Table 5), it is found that the largest

TABLE 2

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971\*  
 BY AGE AT PAROLE AND BY STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Age At Parole	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person To Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
16 - 20	196	8.0	30	18.4	20	15.3
21 - 25	715	29.4	79	48.5	53	40.4
26 - 30	507	20.8	32	19.6	35	26.7
31 - 66+	1017	41.8	22	13.5	23	17.6
Total	2435	100.0	163	100.0	131	100.0

M-2 and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 67.71$   
 $df = 3$   
 $p < .001$

Job Start and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 32.83$   
 $df = 3$   
 $p < .001$

\*Data for these years were also examined separately and those tables are available on request--the same is true for all subsequent tables.

TABLE 3

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
BY RACE AND BY STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Race	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Caucasian	1883	77.3	124	76.1	102	77.8
Black	315	12.9	27	16.6	25	19.1
Others	237	9.8	12	7.3	4	3.1
Total	2435	100.0	163	100.0	131	100.0

M-2 and Comparison Group

$X^2 = 2.45$   
df = 2

Not Significant

Job Start and Comparison Group

$X^2 = 9.46$   
df = 2

P < .01

TABLE 4

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
BY MARITAL STATUS AND BY STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Marital Status*	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Single	1088	44.7	98	60.1	72	55.0
Married	474	19.4	29	17.8	28	21.4
Divorced	769	31.6	30	18.4	23	17.5
Not Reported	104	4.3	6	3.7	8	6.1
Total	2435	100.0	163	100.0	131	100.0

Not reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

M-2 and Comparison Group

Job Start and Comparison Group

$X^2 = 16.73$   
df = 2  
P < .001

$X^2 = 11.21$   
df = 2  
P < .01

\* Note: Single includes only those who have never been married, Married includes common-law marriage, and Divorced includes widowed and separated.

group had between nine and eleven years of education. In addition, looking at the proportional representation of the groups studied, Job Therapy served a significantly larger group in the nine to eleven year educational bracket than the group which had no contact with Job Therapy.

It can be seen that Job Therapy clients were more likely to be in the nine to eleven grade range and less likely to be in the zero to eight grade range. Both the M-2 and the Job Start programs were less likely to provide service to the least educated group.

#### Prior Record of Commitments to Washington Juvenile Institutions

As reported on the admission summary at the time of the individuals' incarceration, data on prior record of commitments to Washington Juvenile Institutions are dichotomous answers - that is, the data show only a "yes" they did have a prior record, or "no" they did not have a prior record.

Table 6 shows that overall, the Job Therapy test groups had proportionately more persons with prior juvenile commitment records. This difference was statistically significant for both the M-2 and the Job Start groups.

#### Alcohol and Drug History

The data on alcohol and drug usage are based on case record sources, and the judgements are entered on the inmate's admission summary at the Reception Center.

Relative to alcohol, the main criterion is a judgement of whether or not drinking has caused social, psychological or economic stress to the individual. If, in the sociologist's judgement, the inmate's

TABLE 5

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
 BY HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED AND BY STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Highest Grade Completed	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0 - 8	812	33.3	35	21.5	26	19.8
9 - 11	1029	42.3	93	57.0	72	55.0
12 - 20	477	19.6	28	17.2	24	18.3
Not Reported	117	4.8	7	4.3	9	6.9

Not reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

M-2 and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 14.74$   
 $df = 2$   
 $p < .001$

Job Start and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 11.89$   
 $df = 2$   
 $p < .01$

TABLE 6

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
BY PRIOR COMMITMENT TO WASHINGTON JUVENILE INSTITUTION AND STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Prior Commitment to Wash- ington Juvenile Institution	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No	1818	74.7	61	37.4	75	57.2
Yes	459	18.8	95	58.3	47	35.9
Not Reported	158	6.5	7	4.3	9	6.9
Total	2435	100.0	163	100.0	131	100.0

Not Reported category was dropped for  
calculating chi-square values.

M-2 and Comparison  
Group  
 $\chi^2 = 137.79$   
 $df = 1$   
 $P < .001$

Job Start and  
Comparison Group  
 $\chi^2 = 23.47$   
 $df = 1$   
 $P < .001$

drinking habits appear to have been a major source of problems, such as drunk and disorderly conduct at home or in public, vagrancy or similar charges, then the individual is said to have a history of excessive drinking.

With reference to drug history, the yes or no answer indicates whether the individual has used benzedrine, seconal, codeine, phenobarbital, cocaine, heroin, opium, morphine, marijuana and so forth to such an extent that his is dependent upon or has illegally obtained such drugs.

Tables 7 and 8 show that proportionately fewer persons defined as having alcohol problems and more persons defined as having drug problems were provided service by Job Therapy programs.

It should be noted that while excessive alcohol use is an important predictor of parole failure, drug history has not been found to have such predictive power.

#### Type of Offense

The statutes comprising the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) are the codes governing the State of Washington. Within the RCW are chapters referring to crimes and criminal procedure. These statutes may be categorized under headings that describe types of crime such as arson, burglary, etc. These can be further defined in such a way as to categorize crimes as to whether they are "person" offenses such as murder, assault, etc. or "property" offenses such as burglary, forgery, etc. Previous research has shown that property offenders are more likely to fail on parole.

Table 9 shows that there was no significant difference between the non-client group and the Job Start group, but that the M-2 group have proportionately more property offenders than the non-client group.

TABLE 7

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
 BY ALCOHOL HISTORY AND STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Alcohol History	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No	1041	42.8	95	58.3	69	52.7
Yes	1276	52.4	62	38.0	54	41.2
Not Reported	118	4.8	6	3.7	8	6.1
Total	2435	100.0	163	100.0	131	100.0

Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

M-2 and Comparison Group  
 $X^2 = 14.37$   
 $df = 1$   
 $p < .001$

Job Start and Comparison Group  
 $X^2 = 5.88$   
 $df = 1$   
 $p < .02$

TABLE 8

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
BY DRUG HISTORY AND STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Drug History	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No	1793	73.6	99	60.7	78	59.6
Yes	535	22.0	58	35.6	46	35.1
Not Reported	107	4.4	6	3.7	7	5.3
Total	2435	100.0	163	100.0	131	100.0

Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

M-2 and Comparison Group

Job Start and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 15.78$   
df = 1  
P < .001

$\chi^2 = 12.97$   
df = 1  
P < .001

TABLE 9

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
BY OFFENSE AT LAST COMMITMENT AND STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Offense At Last Commitment*	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Person	534	21.9	26	16.0	20	15.2
Property	1638	67.3	124	76.1	91	69.5
Other	219	9.0	5	3.0	15	11.5
Not Reported	43	1.8	8	4.9	5	3.8
Total	2434	100.0	163	100.0	131	100.0

Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

M-2 and Comparison Group

Job Start and Comparison Group

$X^2 = 12.90$

$X^2 = 3.48$

df = 2

df = 2

p < .01

Not Significant

\* Person offenses include: Murder, Manslaughter, Assault, Robbery, Rape, Indecent Liberties, and Carnal Knowledge.

Property offenses include: Burglary, Larceny, Auto Theft, and Forgery.

Other offenses include: Drug violations, Non-Support, Other sex offenses and all other offenses.

TABLE 11

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
 BY THE 4 VARIABLE BASE EXPECTANCY AND STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

4 Variable Base Expectancy	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
73 - 80	65	2.6	2	1.2	5	3.8
60 - 72	606	24.9	38	23.3	37	28.2
47 - 59	666	27.4	42	25.8	34	26.0
35 - 46	551	22.6	51	31.3	33	25.2
29 - 34	547	22.5	30	18.4	22	16.8

M-2 and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 7.60$

df = 4

Not Significant

Job Start and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 3.41$

df = 4

Not Significant

TABLE 12

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
 BY EMPLOYMENT HISTORY OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS AND BY STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Employment History	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Employed	420	17.2	24	14.7	23	17.5
Intermittent	1026	42.1	70	42.9	64	48.9
Institutionalized	642	26.4	56	34.4	25	19.1
Not Reported	347	14.3	13	8.0	19	14.5

Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

M-2 and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 3.32$   
 $df = 2$

Not Significant

Job Start and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 3.87$   
 $df = 2$

Not Significant

Note: Employed category includes all those employed continuously or seasonally, those primarily active as students and those in the armed forces; Intermittent category includes those who were employed sporadically over the last two years; the Institutionalized category includes those who were primarily incarcerated in jails and state or federal institution.

TABLE 13

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
BY PRIOR ADULT COMMITMENT AND STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Prior Adult Commitments	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No Prior Commitments	1617	66.4	113	69.3	92	70.2
One or more prior Commitments	612	25.1	43	26.4	29	22.1
Not Reported	206	8.5	7	4.3	10	7.7

Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values

M-2 and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 0.00$   
df = 1  
Not Significant

Job Start and Comparison Group

$\chi^2 = 0.70$   
df = 1  
Not Significant

TABLE 14

INDIVIDUALS PAROLED FROM WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971  
 BY TYPE OF ADMISSION AND STUDY GROUP DESIGNATION

Type of Admission	Having No Contact With Job Therapy		Having Person to Person Services		Having Only Job Start Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
First Admission	1450	59.5	91	55.8	80	61.1
Readmission	200	8.2	15	9.2	14	10.7
Return From Parole	722	29.7	49	30.1	31	23.6
Other	63	2.6	8	4.9	6	4.6

M-2 and Comparison Group  
 $\chi^2 = 3.56$   
 df = 3  
 Not Significant

Job Start and Comparison Group  
 $\chi^2 = 4.31$   
 df = 3  
 Not Significant

Job Therapy client and non-client groups are shown by base expectancy scores in Table 11.

It can be seen that there is no statistically significant difference between the Job Therapy and the non-client groups, but that the Job Therapy populations have fewer persons in the low success prediction category. This might indicate that Job Therapy tended to exclude those persons who were least likely to succeed.

Tables 12, 13, and 14 are also presented because the variables involved (employment history, prior adult commitments, and type of admission) have been found in previous studies to be important predictors of parole success. As can be seen, there is no statistically significant difference between the client and non-client groups.

#### Summary of Client, Non-Client Group Comparison

In summarizing the comparisons made between Job Therapy client and non-client groups at least three points must be made. The first is that in terms of characteristics the M-2 and the Job Start programs are serving almost identical populations. The M-2 population had a slightly higher proportion of property offenders than the Job Start group, but there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups for any of the other variables tested.

The second point of interest is the comparison of Job Therapy clients and non-client groups. The data show the Job Therapy client groups to be generally younger and more likely to have prior juvenile records. Job Therapy clients are also more likely to be single and to have a history of drug use. The data also show the Job Therapy client to be less likely to have a history

of excessive alcohol use and less likely to have less than a ninth grade educational level than the non-client group.

These data are not easily interpreted. Some differences might suggest that Job Therapy worked with more difficult clients while others suggest the opposite. It might be concluded from this that no real differences which might be predictive of parole success exist between the client and non-client groups. This conclusion is supported by the third point of interest, which is the fact that for most of the variables which have previously been found to be predictive of parole performance there are no significant differences between the client and non-client groups. These variables include employment history, prior adult confinement record, type of admission, and parole base expectancy scores.

From the variables examined it appears that while the Job Therapy client population differs significantly from the non-client group on several variables, there does not seem to be a pattern which might predispose one group or the other to success on parole.

## ANALYSIS OF RECIDIVISM RATES

We have seen to this point that the M-2 population and the job start population are very similar in characteristics. We have also found that while these two groups differ significantly from the non-client groups in several characteristics, no clear trend which might lead to the conclusion that Job Therapy worked with particularly difficult or particularly easy clients is discernible. For most of those variables which have proven predictive of parole success, the client and non-client groups are similar.

In the following analysis the recidivism rates for each study group are examined not only for the purpose of determining differences in overall group performance, but also to discover those variables related to parole success, and to determine whether Job Therapy services are most successful with any particular type of individual.

Table 15 shows the non-client and the M-2 study groups by parole success-failure classification. It can be seen that while those who had no contact with M-2 services had a 74.9% success rate on parole, the M-2 group had only 66.3% success. This difference is statistically significant and shows the M-2 group to have an 8.6% higher failure rate.

Table 16 compares the non-client group and the Job Start group by parole success-failure classification. While the Job Start group had a slightly higher rate of success than those who received no Job Therapy services, the difference was not statistically significant. That is, the differences can be attributed to chance rather than to any effect of the Job Start program.

TABLE 15

COMPARISON OF NON-CLIENT AND M-2 STUDY GROUPS BY PAROLE  
SUCCESS-FAILURE CLASSIFICATION

Study Group	Parole Outcome				Total	
	Success No.	(%)	Failure No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Non-Client	1824	(74.9)	611	(25.1)	2435	(100)
M-2	108	(66.3)	55	(33.7)	163	(100)
Total	1932		666		2598	

$$\chi^2 = 6.00, \text{ df} = 1, \text{ p} < .02$$

TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF NON-CLIENT AND JOB START STUDY GROUPS  
BY PAROLE SUCCESS-FAILURE CLASSIFICATION

Study Group	Parole Outcome				Total	
	Success No.	(%)	Failure No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Non-Client	1824	(74.9)	611	(25.1)	2435	(100)
Job Start	101	(77.1)	30	(22.9)	131	(100)
Total	1925		641		2566	

$$\chi^2 = 0.32, \text{ df} = 1, \text{ Not Significant}$$

In Table 17 the M-2 and the Job Start populations are compared as to parole outcome. Keeping in mind that these two groups are highly comparable in characteristics it is particularly interesting to observe that the difference between the 66.3% success rate for the M-2 group and the 77.1% success rate for the Job Start group is statistically significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 17  
COMPARISON OF M-2 AND JOB START STUDY GROUPS BY PAROLE  
SUCCESS-FAILURE CLASSIFICATION

Study Group	Parole Outcome				Total	
	Success No.	(%)	Failure No.	(%)	No.	(%)
M-2	108	(66.3)	55	(33.7)	163	(100)
Job Start	101	(77.1)	30	(22.9)	131	(100)
Total	209		85		294	

$$\chi^2 = 4.15, \text{ df} = 1, \text{ p} < .05$$

In comparing the three study groups it can be seen that, while neither of the Job Therapy client groups did significantly better on parole than the non-client group, the man to man or M-2 clients did significantly worse on parole than either those who received Job Start services or those who received no Job Therapy services at all.

In order to discover which variables are related to parole success and to determine whether or not Job Therapy services are more successful with any particular classifications of individuals, the following tables are presented showing the Job Therapy client and non-client groups by

parole outcome and by each of the twelve variables defined in previous sections. The tables are arranged with chi-square values below each study group showing whether or not the variable under consideration is related to parole success for that particular study group.

Percentages are also shown so that differences between study groups in their success rates for each classification characteristic can be readily observed. Chi-square calculations have been run (not shown) to determine whether these observed differences are significant, and these findings will be presented in the narrative as each variable is discussed, and in the summary at the conclusion of this section.

#### Age at Date of Parole

It is found in Table 1 that M-2 and Job Start served clientele averaging 4 to 7 years younger than the control group. In addition to serving younger clientele, the distribution of the Job Therapy population is clustered tightly about the age bracket 21-25, which contrasts with the broader age distribution in the control group.

In a parole base expectancy study published by the Department of Social and Health Services in the State of Washington (Reed and Ballard, 1972), age was not found to be significantly related to parole performance, but others, including Daniel Glaser (1964), have found a relationship between age and parole success, with the younger offenders being more likely to fail on parole.

In Table 18 we see that for the non-client group the 16 to 20 year-old group had a significantly higher failure rate than the older populations. However, age is not related to success on parole for either of the Job Therapy client groups.

TABLE 18

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY AGE AT PAROLE FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Age at Parole	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP				M-2 CLIENT GROUP				JOB START GROUP			
	PAROLE OUTCOME				PAROLE OUTCOME				PAROLE OUTCOME			
	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)		SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)		SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	
16 - 20	126 (64.3)	70 (35.7)	196 (100.0)		18 (60.0)	12 (40.0)	30 (100.0)		16 (80.0)	4 (20.0)	20 (100.0)	
21 - 25	539 (75.4)	176 (24.6)	715 (100.0)		52 (65.8)	27 (34.2)	79 (100.0)		43 (81.1)	10 (18.9)	53 (100.0)	
26 - 30	388 (76.5)	119 (23.5)	507 (100.0)		20 (62.5)	12 (37.5)	32 (100.0)		29 (82.9)	6 (17.1)	35 (100.0)	
31 - 66+	771 (75.8)	246 (24.2)	1017 (100.0)		18 (81.8)	4 (18.2)	22 (100.0)		13 (56.5)	10 (43.5)	23 (100.0)	
TOTALS	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)		108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)		101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)	

$X^2 = 13.00$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $p < .01$        $X^2 = 3.12$ ,  $df = 3$ , Not Significant.       $X^2 = 6.76$ ,  $df = 3$ , Not Significant

cant

It can be seen that while 64.3% of the 16-20 year old non-clients were successful on parole, 60.0% of the M-2 population and 80.0% of the Job Start population were successful. When these differences, as well as those for each of the other age categories, are examined using chi-square, only the difference between the non-client and the Job Start success rates for those over 31 were found to be statistically significant.

#### Race

It was found in Table 3 that the Job Therapy test groups tended to have the same proportion of whites, more blacks and fewer other races than the non-client group. Table 19 shows that for the non-client and Job Start groups there was no significant relationship between race and parole success. There was such a relationship for the M-2 group, which had a higher success rate for its non-white population. None of the comparisons between study groups were found to be significant.

#### Marital Status, Highest Grade, Employment History

Table 20 shows that while significantly more singles failed on parole in the non-client group, there was no significant relationship between marital status and parole success in the Job Therapy populations, and none of the differences in success rates between the non-client and client study groups were found to be significant.

Table 21 shows the highest school grade completed to be related to success for the non-client group but not for either of the client groups. The only significant difference between client and non-client groups is that the M-2 program was significantly less successful with those who

TABLE 19

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY RACE FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Race	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP			M-2 CLIENT GROUP			JOB START GROUP		
	PAROLE OUTCOME			PAROLE OUTCOME			PAROLE OUTCOME		
	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)
Caucasian	1417 (75.3)	466 (24.7)	1883 (100.0)	77 (62.1)	47 (37.9)	124 (100.0)	78 (76.5)	24 (23.5)	102 (100.0)
Others	407 (73.7)	145 (26.3)	552 (100.0)	31 (79.5)	8 (20.5)	39 (100.0)	23 (79.3)	6 (20.7)	29 (100.0)
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)	108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)	101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)

$\chi^2 = 0.52$ ,  $df = 1$ , N.S.

$\chi^2 = 4.01$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$

$\chi^2 = 0.10$ ,  $df = 1$ , N.S.

NOTE: Due to the low number of non-whites in the two client populations who were not Negro they have been added to the Black group to produce the "other" category.

TABLE 20

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY MARITAL STATUS FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Marital Status	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP			M-2 CLIENT GROUP			JOB START GROUP		
	PAROLE OUTCOME			PAROLE OUTCOME			PAROLE OUTCOME		
	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)
Single	798 (73.3)	290 (26.7)	1088 (100.0)	67 (68.4)	31 (31.6)	98 (100.0)	52 (72.2)	20 (27.8)	72 (100.0)
Married	369 (77.8)	105 (22.2)	474 (100.0)	19 (65.5)	10 (34.5)	29 (100.0)	24 (85.7)	4 (14.3)	28 (100.0)
Divorced	594 (77.2)	175 (22.8)	769 (100.0)	20 (66.7)	10 (33.3)	30 (100.0)	18 (78.3)	5 (21.7)	23 (100.0)
Not Reported	63 (60.6)	41 (39.4)	104 (100.0)	2 (33.3)	4 (66.7)	6 (100.0)	7 (87.5)	1 (12.5)	8 (100.0)
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)	108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)	101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)

$\chi^2 = 6.80, df = 2, p < .05$

$\chi^2 = 0.38, df = 2, N.S.$

$\chi^2 = 2.09, df = 2, N.S.$

NOTE: Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

TABLE 21

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Highest Grade Completed	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP				M-2 CLIENT GROUP				JOB START GROUP			
	PAROLE OUTCOME				PAROLE OUTCOME				PAROLE OUTCOME			
	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)
0 - 8	593 (73.0)	219 (27.0)	812 (100.0)	25 (71.4)	10 (28.6)	35 (100.0)	16 (64.0)	9 (36.0)	25 (100.0)			
9 - 11	772 (75.0)	257 (25.0)	1029 (100.0)	59 (63.4)	34 (36.6)	93 (100.0)	59 (81.9)	13 (18.1)	72 (100.0)			
12+	407 (85.3)	70 (14.7)	477 (100.0)	21 (75.0)	7 (25.0)	28 (100.0)	17 (73.9)	6 (26.1)	23 (100.0)			
Not Reported	52 (44.4)	65 (55.6)	117 (100.0)	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	7 (100.0)	9 (81.8)	2 (18.2)	11 (100.0)			
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)	108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)	101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)			

$\chi^2 = 27.30$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p < .001$

$\chi^2 = 1.65$ ,  $df = 2$ , N.S.

$\chi^2 = 3.46$ ,  $df = 2$ , N.S.

NOTE: Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

had completed from 9-11 years of school. It might be noted that both client groups had considerably lower success rates for those who have 12 years of education or over - although these differences are not statistically significant.

Employment history over the two years prior to incarceration (Table 22) was also related to parole success for the non-client group but not for either of the client groups. The M-2 population was significantly less successful with those in the "employed" category than was the non-client group.

#### Histories of Drug and Alcohol Use

Base expectancy studies conducted by the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services show that a significant relationship exists between parole outcome and prior history of alcohol problems. It was found that persons having a prior history of alcohol problems were a high parole risk and that persons having no prior alcohol history were a lower parole risk.

During fiscal years 1970 and 1971, M-2 and Job Start were found to have served proportionately fewer individuals with alcohol problems than were in the non-client group. In this sense, Job Therapy served a clientele with a lower parole risk. It is possible that in the process of selecting clients for Job Therapy programs at the institutions, the classification counselors steered certain persons with alcohol problems away from Job Therapy programs. At the same time, Job Therapy has served proportionately more persons with histories of illegal drug use. Use of drugs, however, has not proven to be predictive of parole success.

TABLE 22

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY EMPLOYMENT HISTORY FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Employment History *	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP				M-2 CLIENT GROUP				JOB START GROUP			
	PAROLE OUTCOME				PAROLE OUTCOME				PAROLE OUTCOME			
	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)		SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)		SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	
Employed	1143 (79.0)	303 (21.0)	1446 (100.0)		62 (66.0)	32 (34.0)	94 (100.0)		68 (78.2)	19 (21.8)	87 (100.0)	
Unemployed	436 (67.9)	206 (32.1)	642 (100.0)		39 (69.6)	17 (30.4)	56 (100.0)		20 (80.0)	5 (20.0)	25 (100.0)	
Not Reported	245 (70.6)	102 (29.4)	347 (100.0)		7 (53.8)	6 (46.2)	13 (100.0)		13 (68.4)	6 (31.6)	19 (100.0)	
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)		108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)		101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)	

$\chi^2 = 29.89, df = 1, p < .001$

$\chi^2 = 0.22, df = 1, N.S.$

$\chi^2 = 0.04, df = 1, N.S.$

NOTE: Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

\* Employed category includes all those employed continuously or seasonally, those primarily active as students and those in the armed forces; Intermittent category includes those who were employed sporadically over the last two years; the Institutionalized category includes those who were primarily incarcerated in jails and state or federal institution.

Tables 23 and 24 show that for the three study groups neither alcohol use nor drug use was related to parole success or failure, and in no case were the differences between groups found to be significant.

#### Prior Juvenile and Adult Commitments

Tables 25 and 26 present the data related to success-failure rates on parole by prior juvenile and by prior adult commitment records. In previous studies, prior criminal record has proven to be a reliable predictor of parole performance, and continues to be so for the non-client group for both juvenile and adult commitments. Prior juvenile commitments are also related to parole performance for the Job Start group but are not in the case of the M-2 population. A record of prior adult commitments was not related to parole performance for either of the Job Therapy groups.

It was found that, while Job Start had significantly better success with persons who had prior juvenile commitments, the M-2 population had significantly higher failure rates for both those who had no prior juvenile record and those who had no prior adult record. None of the other differences observed on these two tables were statistically significant.

#### Type of Admission

As mentioned previously, most admissions to Washington Adult Correctional Institutions are first admission, readmissions, and parole returns for technical violations. Individuals with a first admission are considered a low parole risk and persons with a readmission, return from parole or any other type of admission are considered higher risks.

It was found in Table 14 that there was no significant difference between the non-client and client groups with regard to type of admission.

TABLE 23

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY ALCOHOL HISTORY FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Alcohol History	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP			M-2 CLIENT GROUP			JOB START GROUP		
	PAROLE OUTCOME			PAROLE OUTCOME			PAROLE OUTCOME		
	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)
No	787 (75.6)	254 (24.4)	1041 (100.0)	61 (64.2)	34 (35.8)	95 (100.0)	57 (82.6)	12 (17.4)	69 (100.0)
Yes	951 (74.5)	325 (25.5)	1276 (100.0)	45 (72.6)	17 (27.4)	62 (100.0)	37 (68.5)	17 (31.5)	54 (100.0)
Not Reported	86 (72.9)	32 (27.1)	118 (100.0)	2 (33.3)	4 (66.7)	6 (100.0)	7 (87.5)	1 (12.5)	8 (100.0)
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)	108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)	101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)

$\chi^2 = 0.35, df = 1, N.S.$

$\chi^2 = 1.20, df = 1, N.S.$

$\chi^2 = 3.34, df = 1, N.S.$

NOTE: Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

TABLE 24

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY DRUG HISTORY FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Drug History	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP						M-2 CLIENT GROUP						JOB START GROUP					
	PAROLE OUTCOME						PAROLE OUTCOME						PAROLE OUTCOME					
	Success No. (%)	Failure No. (%)	Total No. (%)	Success No. (%)	Failure No. (%)	Total No. (%)	Success No. (%)	Failure No. (%)	Total No. (%)	Success No. (%)	Failure No. (%)	Total No. (%)	Success No. (%)	Failure No. (%)	Total No. (%)			
Yes	390 (72.9)	145 (27.1)	535 (100.0)	37 (63.8)	21 (36.2)	58 (100.0)	38 (82.6)	8 (17.4)	46 (100.0)	101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)						
No	1358 (75.7)	435 (24.3)	1793 (100.0)	69 (69.7)	30 (30.3)	99 (100.0)	57 (73.1)	21 (26.9)	78 (100.0)									
Not Reported	76 (71.0)	31 (29.0)	107 (100.0)	2 (33.3)	4 (66.7)	6 (100.0)	6 (85.7)	1 (14.3)	7 (100.0)									
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)	108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)	101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)									

$\chi^2 = 1.78, df = 1, N.S.$

$\chi^2 = 0.58, df = 1, N.S.$

$\chi^2 = 1.47, df = 1, N.S.$

NOTE: Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

TABLE 25

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY PRIOR JUVENILE COMMITMENTS FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Prior Juvenile Commitments	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP						M-2 CLIENT GROUP						JOB START GROUP					
	PAROLE OUTCOME						PAROLE OUTCOME						PAROLE OUTCOME					
	Success (%)	No. (%)	Failure (%)	No. (%)	Total (%)	No. (%)	Success (%)	No. (%)	Failure (%)	No. (%)	Total (%)	Success (%)	No. (%)	Failure (%)	No. (%)	Total (%)		
Yes	295 (64.3)	164 (35.7)	459 (100.0)	66 (69.5)	29 (30.5)	95 (100.0)	41 (87.2)	6 (12.8)	47 (100.0)									
No	1412 (77.7)	406 (22.3)	1818 (100.0)	39 (63.9)	22 (36.1)	61 (100.0)	52 (69.3)	23 (30.7)	75 (100.0)									
Not Reported	117 (74.1)	41 (25.9)	158 (100.0)	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	7 (100.0)	8 (88.9)	1 (11.1)	9 (100.0)									
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)	108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)	101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)									

$\chi^2 = 35.05$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .001$

$\chi^2 = 0.52$ ,  $df = 1$ , N.S.

$\chi^2 = 5.11$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$

NOTE: Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

TABLE 26

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY PRIOR WASHINGTON ADULT COMMITMENTS FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Prior Washington Adult Commitments	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP						M-2 CLIENT GROUP						JOB START GROUP												
	PAROLE OUTCOME						PAROLE OUTCOME						PAROLE OUTCOME												
	Success No. (%)	Failure No. (%)	Total No. (%)	Success No. (%)	Failure No. (%)	Total No. (%)	Success No. (%)	Failure No. (%)	Total No. (%)	Success No. (%)	Failure No. (%)	Total No. (%)	Success No. (%)	Failure No. (%)	Total No. (%)										
None	1266 (78.3)	351 (21.7)	1617 (100.0)	76 (67.3)	37 (32.7)	113 (100.0)	70 (76.1)	22 (23.9)	92 (100.0)	418 (68.3)	194 (31.7)	612 (100.0)	23 (79.3)	6 (20.7)	29 (100.0)	140 (68.0)	66 (32.0)	206 (100.0)	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	7 (100.0)	8 (80.0)	2 (20.0)	10 (100.0)	
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)	108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)	101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)																

$\chi^2 = 24.00$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .001$

$\chi^2 = 0.00$ ,  $df = 1$ , N.S.

$\chi^2 = 0.13$ ,  $df = 1$ , N.S.

NOTE: Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

Table 27 shows that admission type was indeed predictive of parole performance for the non-client group, with the first admission having a significantly higher rate of success than the other categories. However, type of admission was not related to parole performance for either of the Job Therapy client groups.

It was also found that the rate of failure on parole was significantly higher among first admissions for the M-2 population than it was for the group which received no Job Therapy services.

#### Offense at Last Commitment

The offense for which the individual was last committed has generally been found to be significantly related to parole outcome. If an individual had been committed for a property type crime, such as burglary, larceny, auto theft, or forgery, then he is considered a higher parole risk. If the individual had been committed for a person type crime such as murder, manslaughter, assault and sex crimes, he is considered a lower parole risk.

It was found (Table 9) that the M-2 group had a significantly higher proportion of property offenders and that the Job Start group was not significantly different from the non-client group.

Table 28 shows that type of offense is significantly related to parole outcome for the non-client group with the property offenders having the highest rate of failure on parole. There was no such relationship for the M-2 or the Job Start populations.

It was also found that none of the observed differences between the client and non-client groups in parole outcome were statistically significant.

TABLE 27

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY TYPE OF ADMISSION FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Type of Admission	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP			M-2 CLIENT GROUP			JOB START GROUP		
	PAROLE OUTCOME			PAROLE OUTCOME			PAROLE OUTCOME		
	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)
First Admission	1155 (79.7)	295 (20.3)	1450 (100.0)	60 (65.9)	31 (34.1)	91 (100.0)	62 (77.5)	18 (22.5)	80 (100.0)
Readmission	129 (64.5)	71 (35.5)	200 (100.0)	11 (73.3)	4 (26.7)	15 (100.0)	12 (85.7)	2 (14.3)	14 (100.0)
Return from Parole	498 (69.0)	224 (31.0)	722 (100.0)	31 (63.3)	18 (36.7)	49 (100.0)	22 (71.0)	9 (29.0)	31 (100.0)
Other	42 (66.7)	21 (33.3)	63 (100.0)	6 (75.0)	2 (25.0)	8 (100.0)	5 (83.3)	1 (16.7)	6 (100.0)
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)	108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)	101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)

$\chi^2 = 55.53, df = 3, p < .001$

$\chi^2 = 0.52, df = 2, N.S.$

$\chi^2 = 1.24, df = 2, N.S.$

NOTE: Due to the low frequency of cases in the "other" category for the Job Therapy client groups that category was dropped for calculating those chi-square values.

TABLE 28

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY OFFENSE AT LAST COMMITMENT FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Offense at Last Commitment	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP				M-2 CLIENT GROUP				JOB START GROUP			
	PAROLE OUTCOME				PAROLE OUTCOME				PAROLE OUTCOME			
	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	TOTAL (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	TOTAL (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	TOTAL (%)
Person	412 (77.6)	119 (22.4)	531 (100.0)		18 (69.2)	8 (30.8)	26 (100.0)		19 (76.0)	6 (24.0)	25 (100.0)	
Property	1202 (73.4)	436 (26.6)	1638 (100.0)		85 (68.5)	39 (31.5)	124 (100.0)		64 (74.4)	22 (25.6)	86 (100.0)	
Other	182 (82.0)	40 (18.0)	222 (100.0)		4 (80.0)	1 (20.0)	5 (100.0)		14 (93.3)	1 (6.7)	15 (100.0)	
Not Reported	28 (63.6)	16 (36.4)	44 (100.0)		1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	8 (100.0)		4 (80.0)	1 (20.0)	5 (100.0)	
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)		108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)		101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)	

$\chi^2 = 9.97$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p < .01$

$\chi^2 = 0.30$ ,  $df = 2$ , N.S.

$\chi^2 = 2.60$ ,  $df = 2$ , N.S.

NOTE: Not Reported category was dropped for calculating chi-square values.

#### 4 Variables Parole Base Expectancy Scores

As previously mentioned, the term "parole base expectancy" refers to a statistical formula used to derive predictions for parole success. The formula used in this study was developed in a previous Washington State Department of Social and Health Services study and consists of four variables that were found to have a statistically significant relationship with parole outcome.

The parole base expectancy formula is expected to provide a profile of risk in the non-client and Job Therapy populations as well as a means of comparing parole outcome and thereby a measure of Job Therapy's success in lowering recidivism. From Table 29 it can be seen that the base expectancy score is highly predictive of parole outcome for the non-client group, but is not significantly related to parole performance for the two client groups.

It was found that when the Job Start group is compared to the non-client group, the parole success rate for those with a B.E. score of 35 to 46 was significantly higher for the Job Start group. It appears that while the Job Start program was not any more or less successful with those who were low parole risks, it did tend to be good for those with low B.E. scores.

On the other hand, when the M-2 group is compared to the non-client group, it is found that when those who have a B.E. score of 60 or above are combined into one category, those who received M-2 services have a significantly higher rate of failure than those who received no such services.

#### Summary of Parole Outcome Data

In undertaking an evaluation of Job Therapy (as expressed in the Man-to-Man and Job Start programs), recidivism rates have been used as

TABLE 29

JOB THERAPY CLIENT AND NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUPS BY PAROLE OUTCOME AND BY 4 VARIABLE BASE EXPECTANCY SCORE FOR THOSE PAROLED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

4 Variable BE Score	NON-CLIENT COMPARISON GROUP			M-2 CLIENT GROUP			JOB START GROUP		
	PAROLE OUTCOME			PAROLE OUTCOME			PAROLE OUTCOME		
	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)	SUCCESS No. (%)	FAILURE No. (%)	TOTAL No. (%)
73 - 80	60 (92.3)	5 (7.7)	65 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0)	3 (60.0)	2 (40.0)	5 (100.0)
60 - 72	508 (83.8)	98 (16.2)	606 (100.0)	24 (63.2)	14 (36.8)	38 (100.0)	31 (83.8)	6 (16.2)	37 (100.0)
47 - 59	526 (74.0)	140 (21.0)	666 (100.0)	30 (71.4)	12 (28.6)	42 (100.0)	25 (73.5)	9 (26.5)	34 (100.0)
35 - 46	354 (64.2)	197 (35.8)	551 (100.0)	33 (64.7)	18 (35.3)	51 (100.0)	27 (81.8)	6 (18.2)	33 (100.0)
29 - 34	376 (68.7)	171 (31.3)	547 (100.0)	19 (63.3)	11 (36.7)	30 (100.0)	15 (68.2)	7 (31.8)	22 (100.0)
Totals	1824 (74.9)	611 (25.1)	2435 (100.0)	108 (66.3)	55 (33.7)	163 (100.0)	101 (77.1)	30 (22.9)	131 (100.0)

$\chi^2 = 86.39$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $p < .001$       $\chi^2 = 0.70$ ,  $df = 3$ , N.S.      $\chi^2 = 2.01$ ,  $df = 3$ , N.S.

NOTE: Ranges 60 - 72 and 73 - 80 were combined for the M-2 and the Job Start Groups for calculating chi-square values.

the basis for judging program effectiveness. While reducing recidivism may be expressed as the ultimate aim of the Job Therapy staff in the rehabilitation of their clients, there were other goals, such as helping the parolee make a successful transition to society, encouraging him to realize a better work attitude, persuading employers to hire ex-felons and presenting correctional problems and alternatives to existing correctional problems to the public at large.

While each of these additional goals is important, the goal of reducing recidivism rates is not only more easily measured, but it is felt that if in fact these other goals are being achieved, that will also be reflected in the rates of failure on parole.

In comparing the parole performance of those persons who received Job Therapy services with those who were paroled during the same time period but received no such services, it was found that there was no significant difference between the Job Start group and the non-client group. The difference between the parole performance of those who received M-2 services and the non-client group was found to be statistically significant in favor of the non-client group. That is, those who received no M-2 contact had a higher rate of parole success than those who did.

If in fact the most important variables have been examined in comparing the client and non-client groups, and there is no discernible trend in population selection which might predispose one group or another to failure on parole, then it can be concluded that while the Job Start program has no measurable effect on parole performance, the M-2 program has a negative effect. However, as discussed previously, the study groups are quite different with regard to several variables, and differences in parole outcome are not easily interpreted.

In order to help clarify the problem, recidivism rates were then shown by each of 12 variables. In this way it was possible to discover those variables related to parole success as well as to determine which types of clients (personal characteristics) are affected most by Job Therapy services.

It was found that ten of the twelve variables tested were significantly related to parole outcome for the non-client group. Quite predictably, it was found that of the persons in this group, those most likely to succeed on parole were those who were older, those who were or had been married, those who had completed more years of schooling and who were generally employed during the two years prior to commitment, those who had no prior juvenile or adult records and were first admissions, those who had committed offenses other than property offenses and those who had high Base Expectancy scores. All of these variables were related to parole success for the non-client group.

For the M-2 and the Job Start groups no such relationships were found. The only variable related to parole outcome for the M-2 group was race. For that group, non-whites were more likely to succeed on parole than whites. For the Job Start group, those who had prior juvenile records were more likely to succeed on parole. For the two Job Therapy groups, there was no relationship between parole outcome and any of the other variables tested. This means that other than the two specific variables mentioned above, an individual with any particular set of characteristics would not be any more likely to succeed or fail on parole than an individual with any other set of characteristics.

The final objective of the current study was to compare the three study groups by parole outcome and by each of the variables of concern. The two client groups were compared to the non-client group in order to

discover which persons (those with which characteristics) are more likely to benefit from Job Therapy services.

It was found that the Job Start program was significantly less successful with persons over 31 years of age, but significantly more successful with persons who had prior juvenile records. In addition, and perhaps most important, of those persons who had base expectancy scores of 35-46 (high risk), those who received Job Start services were significantly more successful on parole than were those in the non-client group.

For those who participated in the M-2 program, it was found that parole success rates were not significantly higher than those of the non-client group for any of the variables or characteristics examined. There were, however, some important differences. The success rate on parole for M-2 clients was significantly lower than that of those persons who had completed between 9-11 grades in school, as well as for those who had generally been employed during the two years prior to incarceration. It was lower for those who had no prior juvenile record, those who had no prior adult record, and lower for those who were first admissions. Finally, the success rate on parole for M-2 clients was significantly lower than that of the non-client group for those persons whose B.E. scores were 60 or above (low risk).

It would appear that while the M-2 program is not significantly more successful with any group, it has a significantly negative effect on those persons who would seem to have the highest probability of success. Those with higher educational level, those with records of prior employment, those who have no prior criminal record, and those who score highest on the base expectancy scale, all had lower success rates in the M-2 group than in the non-client population.

The Job Start program has no significant pattern of negative effect, and does in fact appear to have a measure of success with those who are younger offenders who have prior juvenile records and who have low scores on the base expectancy scale.

## REFERENCES

Adams, Stuart

- 1970 "A Comparative Study of Recidivism Rates in Six Correctional Systems", District of Columbia, Department of Corrections, Research Report No. 21.

Glaser, Daniel

- 1964 The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, Bobbs-Merrill.

Jaffe, A. and A. Reed

- 1969 "Jamming the Revolving Door", Federal Probation, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 32-36.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals

- 1973 Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., January 23, 1973.

Ohlin, Lloyd E.

- 1951 Selection for Parole: A Manual of Parole Prediction, Russell Sage Foundation.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice

- 1967a "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, A Report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice", Washington, D.C., February.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice

- 1967b "Task Force Report: Corrections", Task Force on Corrections, final report, Washington, D.C.

Reed, Judy A. and Kelley B. Ballard, Jr.

- 1971 "Washington State Parole Base Expectancy Study", State of Washington, Research Office, Research Report Vol. 3, No. 21.

Smith, Ralph W.

- 1971 "A Study of Escapes from Washington State Adult Correctional Facilities", State of Washington, Research Office, Research Report, Vol. 3, No. 20.

Smith Ralph W.

- 1973 "Vocational Training and Parole Success: A Study of Vocational Rehabilitation for Adult Offenders", Unpublished Masters Thesis, Brigham Young University.