

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

POST INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT OF 155 BOYS
RELEASED ON PAROLE FROM THE
MINNESOTA HOME SCHOOL FROM 1966 THROUGH 1970



Prepared by the Division of Research

February 1972

013850

INTRODUCTION

The major purpose of this research was to evaluate the parole performance of 155 boys granted parole from the Minnesota Home School (MHS) by the Youth Conservation Commission between 1966 and 1971. Prior to 1966, the residents of the MHS were exclusively juvenile girls. It was in 1966 that the program became co-educational and has remained so since then. For comparative purposes, the subjects were divided into two groups: those who violated parole and those who did not violate parole within the first twelve months after their release from MHS. Of the total subject group, 95 (61%) violated their parole and 60 (39%) did not violate their parole. The twelve month follow-up period was selected because from the experience in Minnesota this appears to be the most critical period of parole adjustment.

Some of the questions considered at the outset of the study were:

1. Did the geographic location of subjects home and living situation prior to and after institutional placement make a difference in parole performance?
2. Did pre-Home School institutional experience affect parole outcome?
3. Did individual characteristics such as age, intelligence and academic school grade make a difference in parole performance?
4. Did individual intra-institutional behavior such as

indicated by number of disciplinary lockups and length of stay make a difference in adjustment?

5. Did the type of program to which subjects were exposed have an effect upon performance?

The majority of the information obtained was derived from individual case files available in the Department of Corrections Central Office. This was supplemented by information contained in the students' records at the Minnesota Home School.

Data analyzed in this study is contained in a series of tables which compare frequencies between violators and non-violators as related to specific variables. To determine whether or not differences found between the two groups were statistically significant, two simple tests were used; the Chi-Square and the Students *t*. Where statistically significant differences were found to distinguish between the two groups on a probability level of 95% or better, it was inferred that the variable examined was a factor in parole performance.

Each table is followed by a short narrative analysis of the findings. To provide additional information about the data, means, medians, modes, ranges, and percentages were also included.

Table 1. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-Violators by Living Situation Prior to Commitment

Living Situation	<u>VIOLATORS</u>			<u>NON-VIOLATORS</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>
Both Natural Parents	40	42.11	57.97	29	48.33	42.03	69	44.52	100.00
Mother Only	28	29.47	62.22	17	28.33	37.78	45	29.03	100.00
Father Only	5	5.26	55.56	4	6.67	44.44	9	5.81	100.00
Mother & Stepfather	5	5.26	50.00	5	8.33	50.00	10	6.45	100.00
Adoptive Parents	1	1.05	50.00	1	1.67	50.00	2	1.29	100.00
Relatives	3	3.16	60.00	2	3.67	40.00	5	3.23	100.00
Boarding - Foster Homes	11	11.58	100.00				11	7.10	100.00
Group Homes	1	1.05	50.00	1	1.67	50.00	2	1.29	100.00
Treatment Inst.	1	1.05	50.00	1	1.67	50.00	2	1.29	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

Table 2. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-Violators by Living Situation After Release

Living Situation	<u>VIOLATORS</u>			<u>NON-VIOLATORS</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>
Both Natural Parents	39	41.05	69.64	17	28.33	30.36	56	36.13	100.00
Mother Only	15	15.79	45.45	18	30.00	54.55	33	21.29	100.00
Father Only	5	5.26	83.33	1	1.67	16.67	6	3.87	100.00
Mother & Stepfather	5	5.26	55.56	4	6.67	44.44	9	5.81	100.00
Father & Stepmother				2	3.33	100.00	2	1.29	100.00
Relatives	14	14.74	60.87	9	15.00	39.13	23	14.84	100.00
Friends	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
Boarding, Foster Homes	8	8.42	72.73	3	5.00	27.27	11	7.10	100.00
Group Home	7	7.37	77.78	2	3.33	22.22	9	5.81	100.00
Correctional Inst.				2	3.33	100.00	2	1.29	100.00
Other	1	1.05	33.33	2	3.33	66.67	3	1.94	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

With regard to the living situation of subjects prior to commitment it was found that 42% of the violators and 48% of the non-violators respectively lived with their natural parents and 29% of the violators and 28% of the non-violators lived with their mother only. It was interesting to note that all 11 of the total group who were living in Boarding or Foster Homes violated their parole. No comparisons could be made with non-violators since none of these subjects were in such placement prior to MHS admission.

After release 41% of the violators and 28% of the non-violators respectively lived with their natural parents and 15% of the violators and 30% of the non-violators lived with their mothers only. The major differences were in the decreased percentage of non-violators (20%) who were living with their natural parents, and also a decreased percentage of violators (14%) who were living with their mothers only. These decreases would imply that there may have been increased emphasis on placing parolees in homes other than with one or both of their natural parents. The data in Tables 1 and 2 support this inference since there was an increase of from 7% pre-institutional non-family living situation to 30% post institutional non-family placement for non-violators. The same increase from 16% to 32% non-family living situation applied to violators.

Table 3. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-Violators by Place of Residence Prior to Commitment

Place of Residence	<u>VIOLATORS</u>			<u>NON-VIOLATORS</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>
Metropolitan	54	56.84	67.50	26	43.33	32.50	80	51.61	100.00
Urban	30	31.58	52.63	27	45.00	47.37	57	36.77	100.00
Rural Non-Farm	8	8.43	57.14	6	10.00	42.86	14	9.03	100.00
Rural Farm	3	3.16	75.00	1	1.67	25.00	4	2.58	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

Table 4. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-Violators by Place of Residence After Release

Place of Residence	<u>VIOLATORS</u>			<u>NON-VIOLATORS</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>
Metropolitan	50	52.63	64.94	27	45.00	35.06	77	49.68	100.00
Urban	23	24.21	52.27	21	35.00	47.73	44	28.39	100.00
Rural	18	18.95	66.67	9	15.00	33.33	27	17.42	100.00
Rural Farm	4	4.21	57.14	3	5.00	42.86	7	4.52	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

The place of residence prior to commitment shows that 56% of the violators lived in metropolitan (over 50,000) area while 31% lived in urban (over 2,500) areas, comprising 87% of the violators. Non-violators had 43% living in Metropolitan areas with 45% from urban areas. Both groups were almost identical in their areas of residence prior to institutionalization. Comparing these figures to place of residence after release, 52% of the violators returned to the metropolitan areas with 24% returning to urban areas and 45% of non-violators returned to metropolitan areas with 35% returned to urban areas. There was an increase in percentage of farm returnees (from 8-18%). Thus the total percentage of both groups of returnees to metropolitan and urban areas did not differ significantly from pre-commitment percentages. These data again reflect the preponderance of youngsters who are committed to state institutions from urbanized areas.

Table 5. Comparison of Parole Violators & Non-Violators by Pre-Institutional Experience to Minnesota Home School Admission

Pre-Institutional Experience	VIOLATORS			NON-VIOLATORS			TOTAL		
	Number	Column %	Row %	Number	Column %	Row %	Number	Column %	Row %
None	42	44.21	52.50	38	63.33	47.50	80	51.61	100.00
State Corr. Inst.	10	10.53	71.43	4	6.67	28.57	14	17.20	100.00
Minn. Home Sch.	3	3.16	50.00	3	5.00	50.00	6	3.87	100.00
MRDC*	5	5.26	83.33	1	1.67	16.67	6	3.87	100.00
STSB**	2	2.11	100.00				2	1.29	100.00
County Corr. Inst.	34	35.75	73.91	12	20.00	26.09	46	29.68	100.00
Hennepin Co.									
Home School	27	28.42	69.23	12	20.00	30.77	39	25.16	100.00
Sheriff's Boys Ranch	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
Totem Town	6	6.32	100.00				6	3.87	100.00
Mental Hospitals	2	2.10	40.00	3	5.01	60.00	5	3.24	100.00
Willmar State Hospital	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
Anoka State Hosp.	1	1.05	50.00	1	1.67	50.00	2	1.29	100.00
Owatonna State Hospital				1	1.67	100.00	1	.65	100.00
St. Peters				1	1.67	100.00	1	.65	100.00
Private Child Care Agencies	6	6.31	66.67	3	5.00	33.33	9	5.82	100.00
St. Joseph's	3	3.16	75.00	1	1.67	25.00	4	2.58	100.00
Maplewd.Child.Ho.	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
Bar-None Ranch	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
St. James	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
McCrossan's				2	3.33	100.00	2	1.29	100.00
State Group Homes	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
Group Home	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

In comparing the pre-institutional experience, the figures show that 44% of the violators and 63% of the non-violators had no previous institutional experience of any kind. Violators had the greatest amount of pre-institutional correctional experience: 35.75% had spent some time at the county correctional institutions, while 10.53% had been in the State correctional institutions. Non-violators had 20% with experience in county correctional institutions while 6.67% had been in State correctional institutions. This represented a statistically significant difference and would imply a relationship between parole adjustment and previous correctional institutionalization.

Table 6. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-Violators by IQ Estimates

IQ	<u>VIOLATORS</u>			<u>NON-VIOLATORS</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>
Superior	2	2.11	66.67	1	1.67	33.33	3	1.94	100.00
Bright Normal	10	10.53	76.92	3	5.00	23.08	13	8.39	100.00
Average	45	47.37	68.18	21	35.00	31.82	66	42.58	100.00
Dull Normal	27	26.32	62.50	15	25.00	37.50	40	25.81	100.00
Borderline	7	7.37	36.84	12	20.00	63.16	19	12.26	100.00
Unknown	6	6.32	42.86	8	13.33	57.14	14	9.03	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

χ^2 (Chi Square) = 7.39 degrees of freedom 1 Table value .05 = 5.99
 Therefore the probability of the existing relationship is greater than 95%

Analysis of intelligence shows that 47% of the parole violators were of average intelligence while 26% were dull normal as compared to 35% of the non-violators who were classified as average and 25% as dull normal. The difference between these distributions does appear to be indicative of intelligence as a primary determinative factor. An important point to note is the percentage of boys classified as borderline where 20% of the successful parolees were considered as borderline cases in comparison to 7% of the violators. There appears to be an inverse relationship between intelligence level and parole-violation proneness. The authors have noted this possible relationship in other studies now under way. If this is borne out, perhaps this area of investigation should be more intensively explored.

Table 7. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-Violators by Commitment Age

<u>Age</u>	<u>VIOLATORS</u>			<u>NON-VIOLATORS</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>
11	4	4.21	66.67	2	3.33	33.33	6	3.87	100.00
12	26	27.37	81.25	6	10.00	18.75	32	20.65	100.00
13	37	38.95	72.55	14	23.33	27.45	51	32.90	100.00
14	24	25.26	42.11	33	55.00	57.89	57	36.77	100.00
15	4	4.21	44.44	5	8.33	55.56	9	5.81	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

Means	$\bar{x} = 12.97$	$\bar{x} = 13.53$	$\bar{x} = 13.20$
Mode	13	14	14
Range	11-15	11-15	11-15
Median	12.9	13.7	13.3

t (student's test) = 8.88

Table Value .20 level of confidence = 1.282
 .05 level of confidence = 1.960
 .02 level of confidence = 2.326
 .01 level of confidence = 2.576
 .001 level of confidence = 3.291

∴ the probability of the existing relationship is greater than 99%

Table 8. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-Violators by Release Age

Age	VIOLATORS			NON-VIOLATORS			TOTAL		
	Number	Column %	Row %	Number	Column %	Row %	Number	Column %	Row %
11				1	1.67	100.00	1	.65	100.00
12	5	5.26	71.43	2	3.33	28.57	7	4.52	100.00
13	24	25.26	80.00	6	10.00	20.00	30	19.35	100.00
14	37	38.95	58.73	26	43.33	41.27	63	40.65	100.00
15	26	27.37	55.32	21	35.00	44.68	47	30.32	100.00
16				4	6.67	100.00	4	2.58	100.00
17	3	3.16	100.00				3	1.94	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

Means	$\bar{x} = 14.01$	$\bar{x} = 14.23$	$\bar{x} = 14.10$
Mode	14	14	14
Range	12-17	11-16	11-17
Median	14	14.3	13.9

t (student's test) = 1.819

Table Value .20 level of confidence = 1.282

. . . the probability of the existing relationship is greater than 20%

The mean age at commitment is slightly higher (approximately .5 year) for boys who did not violate parole; and about the same for both violators and non-violators (see Table 7) when released. For commitment age there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups. However, the comparison of release age shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups. This indicates that violators served more institutional time than non-violators. The range of age at commitment is identical for both violators and non-violators. At release the violators' ages range between 12-17 while the non-violators range between 11-16. Finally in comparing the highest frequency at commitment we find that it is greatest among 13 year-olds for violators and greatest among 14 year-olds for non-violators. At release the greatest age frequency for both groups is at the 14 year old level.

Table 9. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-Violators by Academic Grade

Academic Grade	VIOLATORS			NON-VIOLATORS			TOTAL		
	Number	Column %	Row %	Number	Column %	Row %	Number	Column %	Row %
4				2	3.33	100.00	2	1.29	100.00
5	7	7.37	77.78	2	3.33	22.22	9	5.81	100.00
6	35	36.84	72.92	13	21.67	27.08	48	30.97	100.00
7	29	30.53	50.88	28	46.67	49.12	57	36.77	100.00
8	18	18.95	60.00	12	20.00	40.00	30	19.35	100.00
9	3	3.16	100.00				3	1.94	100.00
other	3	3.16	50.00	3	5.00	50.00	6	3.87	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00
Excluding "other", Means	$\bar{x} = 6.72$			$\bar{x} = 6.68$			$\bar{x} = 6.75$		
Mode	6			7			7		
Range	5-9			4-8			4-9		
Median	6.78			7			6.7		

t (student's test) = .032

There is no significant difference between the \bar{x} (means) at the various probability levels.

The mean of the academic grade of both violators and non-violators in the Home School is the 6th grade. Application of the t test shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups on academic grade achievement. However the frequency distributions show a slight difference where the highest frequency among the violators was in the 6th grade while the highest frequency among the non-violators was in the 7th grade. This grade classification does not indicate actual academic achievement while the students are in the institution, thus it does not seem to have any clear indication as to its role in terms of either success or failure of parole.

A handout prepared by the Home School elaborates on and clarifies the academic status of MHS.

"Most students at the Home School are academically retarded. A typical student in the boys' population would be a boy who is thirteen or fourteen years of age and is placed in the seventh grade but is functioning at the third and fourth grade level in most of his school subjects. Most of these students have experienced a great deal of failure all of their school days. They are mostly of average potential but for various reasons they have not become engaged in the community school program to the extent where they could feel they were competent academically. Although school and school related difficulties do not account for a very large percentage of the commitment offenses of these boys, nearly all of these boys have experienced a great deal of difficulty in school sometime prior to their commitment."

James Arneson, "Villa Van Cleve Program" April 1, 1970
(unpublished handout)

By comparing attained academic school grade with obtained age, it is possible to determine the extent of acceleration or deceleration in grade placement. The formula generally used to determine correct grade placement is: Attained age- 6, since 6 years seems to be the age of primary school admission.

When this technique is employed in analyzing grade placement of subjects studied, it was found that non-violators have the greatest degree of retarded grade placement. Since there was a statistically significant difference ($<.05$) found in intelligence between the two groups (non-violators with lower mean intelligence) this result could be expected.

Table 10. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-Violators by Length of Stay at Minnesota Home School

<u>No. of Months</u>	<u>VIOLATORS</u>			<u>NON-VIOLATORS</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>
1-3	5	5.26	45.45	6	10.00	54.54	11	7.11	100.00
4-6	27	28.42	54.00	23	38.34	46.00	50	32.26	100.00
7-9	35	36.84	66.03	18	30.00	33.96	53	34.19	100.00
10-12	12	12.63	57.14	9	15.01	42.85	21	13.55	100.00
13-15	10	10.53	90.90	1	1.67	9.09	11	7.10	100.00
16-18	3	3.16	100.00				3	1.94	100.00
19-21	1	1.05	33.33	2	3.33	66.66	3	1.94	100.00
22-24	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
25	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
Other				1	1.67	100.00	1	.65	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

Mean	$\bar{x} = 8.58$	$\bar{x} = 7.08$	$\bar{x} = 7.88$
Mode	7-9	4-6	7-9
Range	1-25	1-21	1-25
Median	7.2	6.6	6.9

t (student test) = 11.904

Table Value	.20 = 1.282
	.05 = 1.960
	.02 = 2.326
	.01 = 2.576
	.001 = 3.291

. . the probability of the existing relationship is greater than 99%

The mean length of stay within the institution was 8.58 months for parole violators and 7.08 months for non-violators. There is a statistically significant difference between parole violators and non-violators on the variable of length of stay. Among violators the modal length of stay interval was 7-9 months in the institution while among non-violators the mode was 4-6 months. The figures indicate that prolonged length of stay appears to correlate with the probability of parole violation. This supports the findings discussed in tables 7 and 8 pertaining to length of stay.

Table 11. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-violators by Number of Lockups

No. of Lockups	<u>VIOLATORS</u>			<u>NON-VIOLATORS</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	Number	Column %	Row %	Number	Column %	Row %	Number	Column %	Row %
None	13	13.68	56.52	10	16.67	43.48	23	14.84	100.00
1	12	12.63	48.00	13	21.67	52.00	25	16.13	100.00
2	12	12.63	54.55	10	16.67	45.45	22	14.19	100.00
3	9	9.47	45.00	11	18.33	55.00	20	12.90	100.00
4	5	5.26	38.46	8	13.33	61.54	13	8.39	100.00
5-9	26	27.37	81.25	6	10.00	18.75	32	20.65	100.00
10-14	10	10.53	83.33	2	3.00	16.67	12	7.74	100.00
15-19	1	1.05	100.00				1	.65	100.00
20-24	4	4.21	100.00				4	2.58	100.00
25+	3	3.16	100.00				3	1.94	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

Mean $\bar{x} = 5.94$
 Mode 5-9
 Range 0-25+
 Median 4.1

$\bar{x} = 2.90$
 2
 0-14
 2.8

$\bar{x} = 4.70$
 5-9
 0-25+
 3.6

t (student's test) = 22.686

Table alue .20 = 1.282
 .05 = 1.960
 .02 = 2.326
 .01 = 2.576
 .001 = 3.291

. . the probability of the existing relationship is greater than 99%

In October 1971, the Administration of the Home School changed it's policy on lockups. According to the new policy the boy or girl is not locked up, but is taken to the discipline cottage where a staff member stays with them until the crisis is resolved and they are returned to the open program. This, according to the administration, has not resulted in an increase in misbehavior, and crises are resolved in a relatively short period of time indicating that lockups are not as necessary as they were once thought to be in controlling misbehavior.

Analysis of the number of lockups in the study shows that the average number of lockups was twice as high among violators as among non-violators. The t test indicates a very significant statistical difference between the two groups. The range of lockups indicated a larger spread among violators (0-25) than non-violators (0-14). This analysis indicates that the number of lockups has a direct relationship to success or failure on parole. It may indicate the variation in the student's willingness or ability to comply with a set of individualized rules given him by the institution.

Table 12. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-violators by Time Since Release to Study Time

Time in Months Since Release	<u>VIOLATORS</u>			<u>NON-VIOLATORS</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	Number	Column %	Row %	Number	Column %	Row %	Number	Column %	Row %
1	3	3.16	100.00				3	1.94	100.00
2	7	7.37	87.50	1	1.67	12.50	8	5.16	100.00
3	13	13.68	100.00				13	8.39	100.00
4	10	10.53	100.00				10	6.45	100.00
5	9	9.47	100.00				9	5.81	100.00
6	8	8.42	88.89	1	1.67	11.11	9	5.81	100.00
7	5	5.26	62.50	3	5.00	37.50	8	5.16	100.00
8	6	6.32	85.71	1	1.67	14.29	7	4.52	100.00
9	3	3.16	60.00	2	3.33	40.00	5	3.23	100.00
10	5	5.26	55.56	4	6.67	44.44	9	5.81	100.00
11	2	2.11	66.67	1	1.67	33.33	3	1.94	100.00
12	24	25.01	33.80	47	78.33	66.20	71	45.81	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

Mean	$\bar{x} = 7.31$ mo.	$\bar{x} = 11.16$ mo.	$\bar{x} = 8.57$ mo.
Mode	12 (3)	12 (10)	12 (3)
Range	1-12 months	2-12+ months	1-12+ months
Median	6.1	11.8	10.1

t (student's test) = 38.50

Table Value	.20 = 1.282
	.05 = 1.960
	.02 = 2.326
	.01 = 2.576
	.001 = 3.291

. . the probability of the relationship existing is greater than 99%

Table 12 indicates that of those who violated parole and were revoked, 24.2% did so within the first three months after release; 28.4% did so between three and six months after release; 14.7% were revoked between the sixth and ninth month after release; and 7.4% between ninth through the eleventh month after release. A total of 74.9% of all violators violated and had their parole revoked within eleven months after release. Twenty-five percent of the students had their parole violated within the twelfth month.

As of the time of this study, the average time on parole for violators was 7.31 months to violation and revocation and for non-violators was 11.16 months.

Table 13. Comparison of Parole Violators and Non-violators by Minnesota Home School Cottage Assignment

<u>MHS Program</u>	<u>VIOLATORS</u>			<u>NON-VIOLATORS</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Row %</u>
Villa Van Cleve	27	28.42	52.94	24	40.00	47.06	51	32.90	100.00
Dubois (Petit)	68	71.58	65.38	36	60.00	34.62	104	67.10	100.00
TOTAL	95	100.00	61.29	60	100.00	38.71	155	100.00	100.00

The Minnesota Home School has two cottages for housing its boys: Villa Van Cleve Cottage, and Dubois Cottage. Each of these cottages has a separate and unique program for its residents.

The Villa Van Cleve program has two main purposes: a) to accelerate the educational process for boys who are retarded in their academic achievement level by increasing their grade level to their proper grade achievement, b) to use operant conditioning techniques to change unacceptable behavior in preparation for return to the community. The emphasis is on establishing a positive environment where boys are continually rewarded for good behavior with little negative sanction imposed for unacceptable behavior.¹

The Dubois Cottage, previously the Pettit Cottage Program, uses the Boy Scout program applying its philosophy as a part of the every day living situation. Besides following the Boy Scout philosophy, each boy is required to earn two merit badges: a) The Scholarship Badge - requires a student to reach certain academic goals which are set for him at an initial review. Besides the academic goals, a certain level of class behavior and attitude has to be achieved. b) Citizenship-in-the-Home Badge - this requirement is modified to fit the institutional structure and measures the behavioral change of the student within the cottage program which is specified in eight requirements.²

¹James Arneson Ibid.

²"Boy Scout Program Proposal - Dubois Cottage." (unpublished manuscript)

The boys studied actually were exposed to a "point-system" behavior program in Pettit Cottage since the Dubois program was instituted after the subjects were released on parole.

The majority of the subjects studied (104) were exposed to the Dubois Cottage program: sixty-eight violators (65.4%) and 36 non-violators (34.6%). In the Villa Van Cleve group (51), 27 were violators (52.9%) and 24 were non-violators (47.1%). Any inference drawn on the basis of the above data relative to the merits of either program would be spurious since the groups were not drawn from the same population and were therefore not homogeneous nor comparable. Dubois was initiated in 1966 and was the only boys' cottage until June 1968 when Villa Van Cleve became the second boys' cottage.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study permits several general conclusions to be drawn relative to those factors which militate toward or against satisfactory parole performance.

One-hundred-fifty-five (155) boys who had been paroled from the Minnesota Home School from 1966 to 1970 were studied. They were classified as parole violators and non-violators with statistical comparisons made to elucidate those variables which significantly differentiated the two groups. These variables and whether they differentiated the two groups are discussed in the following general statements:

1. The percentage of violators (61.4%) as compared to non-violators is high. This could be due to a number of factors such as the young age group (11-14) with which the school deals who are generally still dependent upon adults for guidance and who are easily influenced by their peers. Another consideration which might have affected treatment outcome is the development of programs that specifically meet the wide variety of needs which such a young group of boys exhibit.

2. Although there was no difference between violators and non-violators relative to the size of population areas from which they came or returned, there was a significant change in the immediate home environment which they returned to as opposed to

that from which they came. The major change from pre-MHS to post-MHS living situation was in the numbers of both groups who moved from family living situations to non-family placements. Violators went from 16 to 32% non-family placement and non-violators went from 7 to 30% non-family placement.

3. Pre-institutional experience shows a significant difference between the groups. Violators had longer and earlier institutionalizations even though violators were a younger group. This could imply that youngsters who showed maladjusted behavior at early age were less likely to perform well while on parole.

4. An analysis of intelligence level showed that parole violators as a group had higher measured intelligence although there was no significant difference found between academic achievement of both groups. No valid inference can be drawn from these data without further inquiry.

5. Intra-institutional behavior problems as indicated by the number of disciplinary lockups showed that violators evinced more difficulty in institutional adjustment than did non-violators.

6. Violators as a group had an institutional length of stay of 1.5 months longer than non-violators. The average length of stay for violators was 8.58 months as compared with 7.08 months for non-violators.

SUPPLEMENT

7. Of those 95 who violated parole, 24.2% violated in the first three months, 28.4% did so between three and six months, 14.7% violated between six and nine months, 7.4% violated between nine and twelve months, and 25.1% after twelve months.

Please note three corrections to the study of the "Post Institutional Adjustment of 155 Boys Released on Parole from Minnesota Home School from 1966 through 1970," issued in February 1972.

1. Credit goes to the Staff of the Home School who initiated the research proposal and gathered the data. The Departmental Division collated, analyzed, and interpreted the data.

2. The period of study for violators and non-violators discussed on page one is to be changed to five years rather than twelve months. This five years period (1966 through 1970) was the time that elapsed between the initiation of the Boys' Program at Sauk Center and the gathering of the data for the study.

The percentages of 61% for violators and 39% for non-violators will thus apply to the five year period, and so will all the other data in the report.

If we consider a twelve month period as the cut off point of analysis i.e. consider "success" only those who have completed a twelve month period since they left the institution on parole, and "failure" those who failed before the one year was over, we find that the percentages differ from those for the five year period. Thus violators, 78 boys make up 50% of the total population; while non-violators, 64 boys form 41% of the total population. Thirteen (8%) of the boys are not included in these two categories since they had not completed the twelve month period cutoff and were still in their first year of parole when this data was collected.

3. The second total on the final column on page 8 is 9.03, rather than 17.20.

END