

THE BAY AREA PAROLE STUDY

PRELIMINARY REPORT

A Comparison of the Violational Records of Two Groups--

One Discharged Early From Parole and the

Other Continued on Regular Supervision

May 1978

58920

State of California  
Department of the Youth Authority

**State of California**

**EDMUND G. BROWN JR.**  
GOVERNOR

**Health and Welfare Agency**

**MARIO OBLEDO**  
SECRETARY



**Department of the**

**Youth Authority**

**PEARL S. WEST,**  
DIRECTOR

**ROBERT H. MABBUTT,**  
CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

**JAMES C. BARNETT,**  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY  
CORRECTIONS BRANCH

**RUTH E. KRANOVICH,**  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
PAROLE SERVICES BRANCH

**CHARLES A. KUHL,**  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
INSTITUTIONS AND CAMPS BRANCH

**FREDERICK F. MILLS,**  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
PLANNING, RESEARCH, EVALUATION  
AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

**GEORGE R. ROBERTS,**  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
MANAGEMENT SERVICES BRANCH

**KEITH S. GRIFFITHS**  
Chief of Research

**ELAINE DUXBURY**  
Research Manager III

**JOACHIM P. SECKEL**  
Research Manager II

**JAMES K. TURNER**  
Research Analyst II

\* \* \* \* \*

*Principal Author:*

**PATRICK G. JACKSON**  
Graduate Student Assistant

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY .....	1
Limitations .....	i
Results .....	ii
Implications .....	ii
BACKGROUND .....	1
RESEARCH PROCEDURE .....	4
STUDY POPULATION LOSSES .....	5
BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDY GROUPS .....	6
RESULTS .....	10
Arrest Record .....	10
Severity of Arrest Charges .....	11
Type of Offense .....	12
Time to Arrests .....	14
Disposition of First and Most Serious Arrests .....	15
Disposition of All Arrests .....	19
Arrest Record by I-Level .....	21
CONCLUSIONS .....	23
APPENDIX I - Exclusions from Random Assignment .....	24
APPENDIX II - Letter of Discharge .....	25
APPENDIX III - Severity of Offense Scale .....	26
APPENDIX IV - Disposition Code .....	31

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table Number</u>		
1	STUDY POPULATION LOSSES .....	5
2	SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDY GROUPS .....	7
3A	ARREST RECORD .....	10
	NUMBER OF ARRESTS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH ONE OR MORE ARREST(S) .....	11

LIST OF TABLES  
(Cont.)

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page</u>
4A	FIRST ARREST SEVERITY .....	12
4B	MOST SERIOUS ARREST SEVERITY .....	12
5A	FIRST ARREST CHARGE .....	12
5B	MOST SERIOUS ARREST CHARGE .....	13
6A	MONTHS TO FIRST ARREST .....	14
6B	MONTHS TO MOST SERIOUS ARREST .....	15
7A	DISPOSITION STATUS OF FIRST ARREST FOR STUDY GROUPS .....	15
7B	DISPOSITION STATUS OF MOST SERIOUS ARREST FOR STUDY GROUPS .....	16
8A	TYPE OF DISPOSITION FOR FIRST ARREST .....	17
8B	TYPE OF DISPOSITION FOR MOST SERIOUS ARREST..	17
8C	DISPOSITION STATUS OF MOST SERIOUS ARREST OF THOSE WITH KNOWN DISPOSITIONS .....	18
9A	NUMBER OF SENTENCES INVOLVING PROBATION, JAIL, OR STATE LOCKUP FOR STUDY GROUPS .....	19
9B	TOTAL MONTHS SENTENCED TO JAIL AND PROBATION .....	21
10	ARREST RECORD BY I-LEVEL FOR STUDY GROUPS ...	22
11	EXCLUSIONS FROM RANDOM ASSIGNMENT .....	24

DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY  
4241 WILLIAMSBURG DRIVE  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95823

JUN 12 1978

ACQUISITION

For more information  
Call: Art German or  
Fred Torrisi  
Information Officers  
(916) 445-8826

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

YA-78-47

May 19, 1978

SACRAMENTO--A preliminary report, which will be issued May 22 by the California Youth Authority, indicates that it may be feasible to reduce time on parole for less serious youthful offenders committed to the CYA without increasing the risk to the public. However, additional studies of longer duration will be required to validate the feasibility of considering a policy change.

The Bay Area Parole Study preliminary report, which was authored by the Youth Authority's Division of Research, analyzed the offense records of two groups of Youth Authority wards, selected from the less serious offenders who were on parole in the Richmond, Hayward and Oakland Parole units. One group of 100 wards was discharged early from parole and another group of 102 wards continued on regular parole supervision. For purposes of this study, an early discharge was defined as a discharge from parole that occurred at least six months prior to the anticipated expiration of Youth Authority jurisdiction over a ward.

Prior to the implementation of this study, individuals in each of the two groups had spent varying lengths of time on parole. However, both the discharge group and the regular parole group had been under parole supervision for a median time of over a year. Consequently, the study results are limited to a comparison of the offenses of those discharged early from parole with those who continued under parole supervision.

Overall, the wards who were discharged and the wards who remained on parole had similar subsequent arrest records. The two groups did not differ significantly in the types of sentences given. However, the wards remaining on parole were somewhat more likely to be sentenced to Youth Authority or Department of Corrections' institutions. The two groups showed no differences in the total length of sentences to jail or probation.

This preliminary study is one of an on-going research effort to seek more effective Youth Authority policies and programs, according to Dr. Keith S. Griffiths, chief of Research for the Department.

#####

## SUMMARY

This report provides a preliminary look at the violational record of two groups of California Youth Authority wards--a group of 100 wards discharged early from parole (Dischargees) and another group of 102 wards continued on regular parole supervision (Parolees). For the purpose of this study, an early discharge was defined as a discharge from parole that occurred at least six months prior to the anticipated expiration of Youth Authority jurisdiction over a ward.

### Limitations

Prior to the implementation of this study, individuals in each of the two groups had spent varying lengths of time on parole. However, both the discharge group and the regular parole group had been under parole supervision for a median time of over a year. Consequently, the results of this study are limited to a comparison of the violational performance of those discharged early from parole with those who continued under parole supervision.

Since the study was limited in its size and scope, the results should probably not be generalized beyond the Richmond, Hayward, and Oakland parole units where the study was conducted. In addition, the results are applicable only to a selected group of wards assigned to those units, since wards committed for the most serious offenses (such as Full Board cases), wards on violation status (in jail, for example) and other wards were excluded from the study. Further, this study was limited to a 13-month follow-up period for which Bureau of Criminal Identification data were available at the time of analysis.

## Results

Overall, the Dischargees and Parolees showed similar subsequent arrest records. A total of 62% of the Dischargees and 61% of the Parolees had one or more arrests during the 13-month follow-up period. Of those with an arrest record, a total of 56% of the Dischargees and 53% of the Parolees had two or more arrests.

The two groups did not differ significantly in type of sentences given, although Parolees were somewhat more likely to be sentenced to state institutions. There were no differences in total length of sentences to jail or probation.

## Implications

This preliminary study is part of an ongoing research effort to seek more effective Youth Authority policies and programs. The major implication of the preliminary findings of this study is that it may prove to be feasible to reduce time on parole for a selected group of wards without increased risk to the public, although more testing in a variety of locations and for a longer duration will be required to validate the feasibility of this policy alternative.

The Department of the Youth Authority plans to continue its effort to evaluate the effects of its treatment, intervention, and control policies and practices. The Department will continue to develop a series of experimental projects to test the efficacy of parole and institutional programs.

## BACKGROUND

In February 1976, preparations were underway in the California Youth Authority to undertake a project to experimentally evaluate the effectiveness of three post-institutional release conditions--regular parole, voluntary services without regular parole supervision, and straight discharge from institutions without parole. The objective of the project "The Differential Status Project,"<sup>1</sup> was to study and compare the differential effectiveness of three conditions of post-institutional releases: (1) regular parole as presently practiced in the CYA, (2) an alternate model in which all services provided to CYA wards would be on a voluntary basis, and (3) unconditional release whereby wards would receive a discharge from CYA ward status upon release from an institution.

The original study plan was that beginning March 1, 1976, Youth Authority wards on parole in the Richmond, Hayward, and Oakland parole units would be randomly assigned to three conditions, with those on Full Board or Special Services status (that is, the most severe offenders) excluded and retained on parole. In addition, beginning on March 1, 1976, eligible wards released from institutions to these units were to be assigned to one of the three conditions.

In preparation for the study, the files of all 726 wards on parole in the Richmond, Hayward, and Oakland parole units were reviewed. The purpose of this

---

<sup>1</sup>The original project design was developed by William C. McCord, Supervising Parole Agent located in Oakland, in a concept paper written in January 1974. McCord headed up the project until the decision not to implement was made.

review was to exclude cases which were not eligible for the study. A total of 413 (57%) of these were excluded from random assignment. Those excluded were those who were: (1) on Full Board (14.3%); (2) Special Service status (3.2%); (3) on violation (18.5%); (4) under jurisdiction of the Youth Authority only until July 1, 1976 (10%); (5) not living in the Bay Area at the time of assignment (3%); (6) out-of-state parolees (2%); and (7) those pending transfer to another unit outside the project area (5%). Wards over whom jurisdiction ended on or before July 1, 1976, were excluded because their additional parole exposure period would be less than six months--too brief for later comparisons. (See Appendix I).

The remaining wards (47%) were then randomly assigned to one of the three experimental conditions: regular parole, voluntary services, or discharge. The designated dischargees were sent letters on February 9, 1976, informing them of their discharge effective on March 1, 1976. (See letter in Appendix II).

At this point in the preparations for the study the then Director decided, because of pending legislation and administrative considerations, not to implement the project. Because the letters had been mailed, it was too late to revoke the orders which discharged 103 wards from CYA jurisdiction and supervision. Consequently a unique opportunity to study the violation behavior of approximately 200 CYA wards randomly assigned to two community conditions had presented itself. One group remained under parole supervision; the second group received a discharge from such supervision.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Since the voluntary services condition was not implemented, these wards received regular parole supervision. These wards were not studied for two reasons: (1) resource limitations on the present study; and (2) it is unclear, if wards knew of their assignment and what effect this might have on their subsequent behavior. In any event, these wards may be followed up at a later time.

While it was not possible to study directly the original question of the effectiveness of parole supervision as contrasted with two other post-release conditions, it was possible to pursue the question of the efficacy of early discharge versus continued parole supervision. The question became: What if CYA wards presently on parole were assigned randomly to (1) continued parole supervision or (2) early discharge from such supervision? Would there be differences in violational performance between the two groups?

## RESEARCH PROCEDURE

The research procedure was to obtain existing data from two principal data sources. The first data source was the CYA's Information Systems' files. Background information on the study population was obtained from these records. The second source was the California State Bureau of Criminal Identification. This agency provided violational information on the 202 wards included in the study. Along with other information, the nature, severity, date, and disposition of arrests was coded for the first and most serious arrest charge. The "nature of arrests" refers to whether the charges were a crime against a person, a crime against property, a drug or alcohol related crime, or "other." Severity of arrest charge was determined by coding booking charges according to the Severity of Offense scale utilized in the Community Treatment Project.<sup>3</sup> (See Appendix III.) Finally, dispositions were coded using a disposition code provided by the Center for the Administration of Criminal Justice at the University of California, Davis, which was later modified. (See Appendix IV.)

Only those offenses which occurred between the date of discharge (March 1, 1976) and the cutoff point of March 31, 1977, are included in this report. In addition, minor offenses, such as loitering, some traffic violations, and truancy are excluded.

---

<sup>3</sup>Palmer, T., The Youth Authority's Community Treatment Project. Federal Probation, March 1974.

## STUDY POPULATION LOSSES

A total of 210 wards were randomly assigned to either continued parole supervision or discharge from parole. Of these, eight had to be excluded. As seen in Table 1, five Parolees and three Dischargees assigned to the respective experimental conditions either: (1) committed offenses which placed them on violation status between the time of random assignment (January, 1976) and the actual date of Discharge (March 1, 1976); or (2) had sealed records. Thus, only eight, or 3.8%, of those originally assigned were excluded. Leaving 202 for subsequent analysis. For their most recent parole stay, these remaining wards had an overall 13.8 median months of parole supervision prior to the study period.

TABLE 1  
STUDY POPULATION LOSSES

Study Status	Total		Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total randomly assigned ....	210	100.0	103	100.0	107	100.0
Exclusions .....	8	3.8	3	3.0	5	4.7
No follow-up records available <sup>a</sup> .....	2		1		1	
Other <sup>b</sup> .....	6		2		4	
Total less exclusions .....	202	96.2	100	97.0	102	95.3

<sup>a</sup>Records were sealed.

<sup>b</sup>Wards were on violation status after the time of random assignment but before March 1, 1976, the actual discharge date.

## BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDY GROUPS

The random assignment of wards produced an overall even distribution of selected background characteristics between the Dischargees and Parolees. Table 2 presents the age, sex, ethnicity, prior record, parole status, base expectancy score, committing court, and the number of prior months on parole for the most recent parole for each experimental group.

Both groups are distributed evenly across age and sex groupings. The median age of Dischargees is 19.6; and Parolees, 20.0. The two groups also compare favorably in ethnic composition.

The two groups reveal largely similar proportionate distributions with respect to the "prior record" of delinquent contacts and commitments to the Youth Authority and parole status. In these comparisons, however, Dischargees include a somewhat greater proportion of wards with one or more prior local commitments than the Parolees (65% versus 52%, respectively), and Dischargees are slightly more likely than Parolees to have prior parole records (64% versus 52%, respectively).

Base expectancy scores provide an index of the overall "parole risk" of each ward, taking into consideration age at admission, prior Youth Authority record of contacts and commitments, admission status, court of commitment, and sex. (Base expectancy scores are presented for males only.) The two groups again compare well; 24% of the Dischargees and 27% of the Parolees have a base expectancy score of one (low), while 10% and 11% of the Dischargees and Parolees, respectively, have a score of five (high).

The two groups do not differ greatly in committing court, although a greater proportion of Parolees than Dischargees were criminal court commitments (56% versus 46%, respectively).

TABLE 2  
SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDY GROUPS

Characteristics	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Age as of March 1, 1976</u>				
14-16 .....	3	3.0	3	2.9
17 .....	10	8.8	6	5.9
18 .....	13	13.0	14	13.7
19 .....	22	22.0	16	15.7
20 .....	24	24.0	23	22.5
21-24 .....	28	28.0	40	39.2
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0
MEDIAN AGE .....	19.6		20.0	
<u>Sex</u>				
Male .....	93	93.0	92	90.2
Female .....	7	7.0	10	9.8
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0
<u>Ethnicity</u>				
White .....	34	34.0	38	37.3
Black .....	54	54.0	57	55.9
Mexican-American .....	11	11.0	5	4.9
Other .....	1	1.0	2	2.0
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0
<u>Prior Record</u>				
None or unknown .....	4	4.0	8	7.8
Delinquent contacts, no commitments ....	31	31.0	41	40.2
One commitment .....	40	40.0	29	28.4
Two or more commitments .....	25	25.0	24	23.5
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0

TABLE 2 (Con't)

## SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDY GROUPS

Characteristics	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Parole Status</u>				
First Parole .....	36	36.0	49	48.0
Second Parole .....	40	40.0	29	28.4
Third Parole .....	15	15.0	15	14.7
Fourth Parole .....	9	9.0	9	8.9
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0
<u>Base Expectancy Score</u>				
Unknown (females) .....	7	7.0	10	9.8
1 (low risk) .....	24	24.0	27	26.5
2 .....	33	33.0	33	32.4
3 .....	9	9.0	11	10.8
4 .....	17	17.0	10	9.8
5 (high risk) .....	10	10.0	11	10.8
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0
<u>Court of Commitment</u>				
Juvenile .....	54	54.0	45	44.1
Criminal .....	46	46.0	57	55.9
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0
<u>Prior Months on Parole*</u>				
0-4 .....	18	18.0	15	14.7
5-8 .....	16	16.0	14	13.7
9-12 .....	13	13.0	17	16.7
13-16 .....	6	6.0	18	17.6
17-20 .....	15	15.0	12	11.8
21-24 .....	3	3.0	6	5.9
25-32 .....	10	10.0	8	7.8
33-40 .....	9	9.0	5	4.9
41 and over .....	10	10.0	7	6.9
TOTAL**	100	100.0	102	100.0
MEDIAN .....	15.0		13.3	

\*Refers to most recent parole period only.

\*\*Based on the statistical test used (the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test), the difference between categories of the two samples was no greater than would occur by chance, or five times out of 100, ( $D = .10$ , using a two-tailed test). See S. Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, McGraw-Hill, 1956, p. 131.

There is considerable variation in the number of months of prior parole supervision for both groups. For example, 18% of the Dischargees and 15% of the Parolees had 4 or less months of prior supervision, while 19% and 12% of the respective groups had 33 or more prior months supervision. Although the Dischargees show a higher median prior months of parole supervision (15.0) than Parolees (13.3), a statistical test of scores indicates no significant difference between the two groups. In the analysis to follow, then, it should be clear that we are examining the effect of a discharge from parole supervision on recidivism among individuals who have spent varying lengths of prior time on parole.

Overall, then, these data suggest that Dischargees comprise a slightly higher risk group than Parolees in terms of our knowledge about the effects of age, prior record, number of prior parole stays, and the summary measure of base expectancy on recidivism. However, with both the small number of exclusions and the lack of significant differences between the background characteristics of the Parolees and Dischargees, one can conclude that the two samples are adequate for comparison on recidivism measures.

## RESULTS

In what follows, we examine the differences between the Dischargees and Parolees with respect to their subsequent records, including arrest, number of arrests, severity of charge, type of charge, time to arrest for selected offenses, disposition of arrests, and interpersonal maturity level by arrest records.

Arrest Record

If the condition of being discharged from parole were more effective in reducing arrests than continued parole supervision, one would expect Dischargees to have fewer arrests than Parolees; conversely, if continued parole supervision were more effective than discharge from parole, Parolees would have fewer arrests. Table 3A does not support either of these hypotheses. Sixty-two percent of Dischargees and 61% of Parolees had at least one arrest during the 13-month follow-up period.

TABLE 3A

## ARREST RECORD\*

Arrest Record	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total without arrest .....	38	38.0	40	39.2
Total with arrest .....	62	62.0	62	60.8
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0

\*These data exclude minor offenses such as loitering, truancy, minor traffic violations, etc. This only includes offenses between March 1, 1976, and March 31, 1977.

There is also no significant difference in the number of arrests per individual (Table 3B). Of those with an arrest, 56% of the Dischargees compared to 53% of the Parolees had two or more arrests. According to these measures, then, continued parole supervision versus discharge from such supervision has an insignificant effect on the likelihood of arrest.

TABLE 3B

## NUMBER OF ARRESTS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH ONE OR MORE ARREST(S)

Number of Arrests	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
One arrest .....	27	43.5	29	46.8
Two or more arrests .....	35	56.5	33	53.2
TOTAL	62	100.0	62	100.0

Severity of Arrest Charges

There are no large differences in severity ratings of the first and most serious arrest charges, as shown in Tables 4A and 4B. Dischargees are slightly more likely to have higher severity ratings for both arrests, but these differences are not significant. Moreover, the mean scores for severity ratings do not differ significantly<sup>4</sup> for the first or most serious arrests. For all practical purposes there are no differences in severity ratings between the two groups.

<sup>4</sup>Statistical significance was determined by chi square tests. Chi square or  $\chi^2$  is a statistical test which measures the deviations of observed frequencies within categories from their expected frequencies. A "significant" deviation of observed from expected frequencies is usually considered to be one which occurs less than five times out of a hundred, and is expressed as  $p < .05$ . Only those  $\chi^2$ 's in which  $p \leq .20$  are included in this report.

TABLE 4A  
FIRST ARREST SEVERITY

Severity of Charge	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
2-3 .....	12	19.4	12	19.4
4-5 .....	28	45.2	38	61.3
6-10 .....	22	35.5	12	19.4
TOTAL	62	100.0	62	100.0
MEAN SEVERITY RANK .....	5.05		4.81	
STANDARD DEVIATION .....	1.62		1.36	

$$\chi^2 = 4.4, df = 2, p < .10.$$

TABLE 4B  
MOST SERIOUS ARREST SEVERITY

Severity of Charge	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
2-3 .....	4	6.4	4	6.4
4-5 .....	21	33.9	28	45.2
6-10 .....	37	59.7	30	48.4
TOTAL	62	100.0	62	100.0
MEAN SEVERITY RANK .....	5.89		5.77	
STANDARD DEVIATION .....	1.54		1.57	

Type of Offense

Parolees and Dischargees do differ in the nature of offenses committed for both the first and most serious arrests, as shown in Tables 5A and 5B. Dischargees were charged with more drug and alcohol related offenses than Parolees

for the first and most serious arrest, while Parolees were charged with more crimes against property than Dischargees. Dischargees were also more likely to be charged with crimes against the person than Parolees for the most serious arrest. None of these differences, however, are significant, or greater than would ordinarily be expected to occur by chance.

TABLE 5A  
FIRST ARREST CHARGE

Type of Charge	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Person .....	13	21.0	12	19.4
Property .....	21	33.9	28	45.2
Drugs and alcohol .....	17	27.4	7	11.3
Other .....	11	17.7	15	24.2
TOTAL WITH ARREST	62	100.0	62	100.0

$\chi^2$  5.8, df - 3 p < .20.

TABLE 5B  
MOST SERIOUS ARREST CHARGE

Type of Charge	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Person .....	23	37.1	18	29.0
Property .....	17	27.4	30	48.4
Drugs and alcohol .....	14	22.6	7	11.3
Other .....	8	12.9	7	11.3
TOTAL WITH ARREST	62	100.0	62	100.0

$\chi^2$  = 6.6, df. - 3, p < .10.

Time to Arrests

The number of months from the beginning of the follow-up period to the first arrest is presented in Table 6A. The time to the first arrest was longer for Dischargees (median = 6.4 months) than Parolees (median = 4.8 months), but the difference is not significant. Nineteen percent of the Dischargees compared to 40% of the Parolees were arrested during the first three months of the study period. The time to the most serious arrest, however, is only a little longer for Parolees (median = 7.7) than Dischargees (median = 7.4) (not statistically significant). It appears, then, that discharge from parole may have a delaying effect upon the first arrest but not the most serious arrest. This could be due to the speedier processing of Parolee arrests or some factor not explored in this report.

TABLE 6A  
MONTHS TO FIRST ARREST

Months to Arrest	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-3 .....	12	19.4	25	40.3
4-6 .....	20	32.3	14	22.6
7-9 .....	11	17.7	11	17.8
10-13 .....	19	30.6	12	19.4
TOTAL	62	100.0	62	100.0
MEDIAN .....	6.4		4.8	

$$\chi^2 = 7.2, df = 3, p < .07.$$

TABLE 6B  
MONTHS TO MOST SERIOUS ARREST

Months to Arrest	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-3 .....	10	16.1	15	24.2
4-6 .....	16	25.8	11	17.7
7-9 .....	17	27.4	13	21.0
10-13 .....	19	30.6	23	37.1
TOTAL	62	100.0	62	100.0
MEDIAN .....	7.4		7.7	

Disposition of First and Most Serious Arrests

Evidence relevant in determining the existence of a delaying effect can also be found in examining the disposition of arrests. Table 7A and 7B indicate how many individuals in each of the study groups have dispositions reported on "rap sheets" for the first and most serious arrests. The known dispositions refer to arrests followed by reported action, including dismissals, acquittals, probation, fines, and state incarcerations.

TABLE 7A  
DISPOSITION STATUS OF FIRST ARREST FOR STUDY GROUPS

Dispositions	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total known dispositions .....	32	51.6	38	61.3
Total unknown dispositions .....	30	48.4	24	38.7
TOTAL WITH ARREST	62	100.0	62	100.0

As noted earlier, the time to the first arrest was longer for Dischargees than Parolees; it follows that Parolees had a longer time in which to have an arrest cleared, and one would thus expect Parolees to have more dispositions for their arrests during the study period. As shown in Table 7A, although the relationship is not statistically significant, the proportion of dispositions for Parolees that are known is almost ten percentage points greater than that of Dischargees.

A somewhat different pattern emerges for the disposition of the most serious arrest (Table 7B). In this case, as noted earlier, the time to the most serious arrest was similar between the Parolees and Dischargees. One would, then, expect that the two groups would have a nearly equal proportion of dispositions per arrest during the study period. The results, however, show that only 60% of the Dischargees compared to 76% of the Parolees have a known disposition for the most serious arrest, which suggests that Parolee arrests may be more quickly processed.

TABLE 7B

## DISPOSITION STATUS OF MOST SERIOUS ARREST FOR STUDY GROUPS

Dispositions	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total known dispositions .....	37	59.6	47	75.8
Total unknown dispositions .....	25	40.3	15	24.2
TOTAL	62	100.0	62	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 3.7, df = 1, p < .06.$$

Thus, the data suggest that both the time to the first arrest and the disposition of the most serious arrest are delayed for Dischargees rather than

Parolees. Put simply: Parolee arrests are disposed of more quickly in the justice system. For this reason, data on dispositions must be interpreted cautiously.

The differential processing of Parolees and Dischargees may account for the divergent patterns of sentencing between the two groups. A sentence refers to a fine, probation, jail, or state institutionalization resulting from the disposition of an arrest. A "not" sentenced refers to a dismissal, acquittal, or arrest and release on own recognizance. Table 8A and 8B show how many in each experimental group had a sentence during the study period.

TABLE 8A  
TYPE OF DISPOSITION FOR FIRST ARREST

Disposition	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sentenced .....	20*	62.5	24	63.2
Not Sentenced .....	12	37.5	14	36.8
TOTAL KNOWN DISPOSITION	32	100.0	38	100.0

\*Includes one suspended sentence.

TABLE 8B  
TYPE OF DISPOSITION FOR MOST SERIOUS ARREST

Disposition	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sentenced .....	17	45.9	30	63.8
Not Sentenced .....	20	54.1	17	36.2
TOTAL	37	100.0	47	100.0

$\chi^2 = 2.7$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .10$ .

While there are no differences between the two groups for the first arrest in their respective proportion of sentences per arrest, Parolees are more likely to be sentenced for the most serious arrest than Dischargees. The difference, however, is not significant. Forty-six percent of the Dischargees compared to 64% of the Parolees were sentenced for the most serious arrest during the study period.

A breakdown of the type of sentence given for the most serious arrest is presented in Table 8C. The two groups do not differ greatly in sentences involving fine, probation, or probation and jail. If sentences to the California Youth Authority (CYA) and the California Department of Corrections (CDC) are combined, Parolees are far more likely to be sentenced. Only five Dischargees for whom a disposition was known were sentenced to either the CYA or CDC, while 12 Parolees received a similar sentence. The number of cases is small, however, and the difference in sentences to the CYA or CDC may be a result of speedier processing of Parolee arrests.

TABLE 8C  
DISPOSITION STATUS OF MOST SERIOUS ARREST  
OF THOSE WITH KNOWN DISPOSITIONS

Disposition	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sentenced .....	17	45.9	30	63.8
Fine only .....	1		1	
Probation only .....	2		4*	
Jail .....	3		7	
Probation and jail .....	6		6	
CYA commitment .....	4		6	
CDC commitment .....	1		6**	
Not sentenced***.....	20	54.1	17	36.2
TOTAL	37	100.0	47	100.0

\*Includes one suspended sentence.

\*\*Includes one mental hospital commitment.

\*\*\*Includes acquittals, releases, and dismissals.

Disposition of All Arrests

Another perspective from which to view the disposition of arrests is based on the total number of sentences given for all arrests during the study period. Table 9A shows the total number of sentences involving probation, jail, and state institutionalization.

TABLE 9A  
NUMBER OF SENTENCES INVOLVING  
PROBATION, JAIL, OR STATE INSTITUTIONALIZATION FOR STUDY GROUPS

Number of Sentences	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Jail</u>				
No Jail Sentence .....	81	81.0	84	82.4
One or more .....	19	19.0	18	17.6
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0
<u>Probation</u>				
No Probation .....	81	81.0	87	85.3
One or more .....	19	19.0	15	14.7
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0
<u>State Institutionalization</u>				
No State Institutionalization* .....	89	89.0	86	84.3
State Institutionalization .....	11	11.0	16	15.7
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0
<u>Reasons for State Institutionalization</u>				
Recommitment to CYA .....	0	0.0	9	8.8
New Commitment to CYA .....	9	9.0	0	0.0
Commitment to CDC .....	2**	2.0	7***	6.9
No State Lockup .....	89	89.0	86	84.3
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0

\*State Institutionalization here refers to the Youth Authority, the Department of Corrections, or a Department of Corrections placement in a Department of Health facility. Two Dischargees and one Parolee were in the latter category (see below).

\*\*Includes two diagnostic placements in a Department of Health facility by CDC.

\*\*\*Includes five dishonorable discharges to CDC, one new commitment, and one diagnostic placement.

There are no significant differences between Dischargees and Parolees in the number of jail sentences or the number of times placed on probation. Parolees are somewhat more likely to be given a sentence involving state institutionalization than Dischargees, but the difference is not statistically significant. Eleven percent of the Dischargees compared to 16% of the Parolees received such a sentence. All of these sentences were mandated by court action. Once again, however, these small differences may be due to differential processing of Dischargee and Parolee arrests.

The two groups do not differ significantly in total time sentenced to jail and probation, as can be seen in Table 9B. Nineteen percent of Dischargees compared to 18% of Parolees were placed in jail at least once. Dischargees were sentenced to an average of 5.4 months in jail, compared to 5.1 months for Parolees. Nineteen percent of the Dischargees and 15% of the Parolees were placed on probation at least once. Dischargees were sentenced to an average of 15.3 months on probation; Parolees 14.6. None of these differences are statistically significant.

TABLE 9B

## TOTAL MONTHS SENTENCED TO JAIL AND PROBATION

Total Months	Dischargees		Parolees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Jail</u>				
No Jail Sentence .....	81	81.0	84	82.4
1 to 6 months .....	13	13.0	13	12.7
7 or more months .....	6	6.0	5	4.9
TOTAL	100	100.0	102	100.0
MEDIAN .....	5.4		5.1	
<u>Probation</u>				
No Probation given .....	81	81.0	87	85.3
6 to 12 months .....	6	6.0	6	5.9
14 or more months .....	13	13.0	9	8.8
	100	100.0	102	100.0
MEDIAN .....	15.3		14.6	

Arrest Record by I-Level

Interpersonal Maturity Level (I-Level) scores were available for 91% of the study subjects. Previous studies have found the I-Level typology to be a useful tool for predicting outcomes under various treatment conditions. However, these studies have been limited to wards on parole with variations in caseload sizes and supervisory styles of parole agents. The question naturally arises as to how well Dischargees and Parolees of a given I-Level will do relative to one another in the present study.

As shown in Table 10, the data indicate that I-Level scores have a negative relationship with the existence of an arrest record. I<sub>3</sub>'s do worse, for example, than I<sub>4</sub>'s across both groups, and this difference is statistically

significant ( $\chi^2 = 4.5$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$ ). However, the two experimental groups do not differ within a given subtype. Seventy percent of the I<sub>3</sub> Dischargees and 70% of the I<sub>3</sub> Parolees had an arrest record; 52% of the I<sub>4</sub> Dischargees and 55% of the I<sub>4</sub> Parolees also had an arrest record. These data suggest that I-Level did not offer a relative advantage to either experimental group.

TABLE 10

## ARREST RECORD BY I-LEVEL FOR STUDY GROUPS

Arrest Record	Total		I-Level							
			Unknown		I <sub>2</sub>		I <sub>3</sub>		I <sub>4</sub>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Dischargees</u>										
Arrest .....	62	62.0	9	47.4	4		35	70.0	15	51.9
No arrest .....	38	38.0	10	52.6	0		15	30.0	13	48.1
TOTAL	100	100.0	19	100.0	4		50	100.0	27	100.0
<u>Parolees</u>										
Arrest .....	62	60.8	8	44.4	2		35	70.0	17	54.8
No arrest .....	40	39.2	10	55.5	1		15	30.0	14	45.2
TOTAL	102	100.0	18	100.0	3		50	100.0	31	100.0

\*Too few to percentage.

## CONCLUSIONS

This preliminary 13-month follow-up study finds no systematic differences in the subsequent violational records between 100 wards discharged early from parole and 102 similar wards retained under parole supervision. This subsequent violational record includes: the number of arrests per individual, the severity of the first and most serious arrest charges, the time to the first and most serious charges, sentences involving state institutionalization, probation or jail, and total time sentenced to probation or jail.

Nonetheless, during this follow-up period, Parolee arrests were disposed of more quickly than Dischargee arrests by the justice system. Even though these data suggest that Parolee arrests may be more quickly processed, the difference between the two groups in the proportions of arrests having dispositions may diminish when a planned 24-month followup of the violational records is conducted.

Other key issues not addressed in this preliminary study will be addressed in the 24-month followup. For example, this preliminary report has not analyzed the data to determine how much the length of prior time on parole affects the subsequent violational record.

Followup for a longer duration and additional data analysis are likely to aid in determining if it is feasible for the Youth Authority to reduce time on parole for a selected group of wards without increasing the risk to the public.

## APPENDIX I

## Exclusions from Random Assignment

The original study design called for a more extended and comprehensive study of the ex-offenders, and the reasons for exclusions, in part, reflect this goal. The table below shows the exact number and percentage of exclusions.

TABLE 11

## EXCLUSIONS FROM RANDOM ASSIGNMENT

Total wards on parole lists .....	726	(100.0%)
Exclusions from random assignment .....	413	(56.6%)
Reasons for exclusion:		
1. On Full Board .....	104	(14.3%)
2. Special Service .....	23	(3.2%)
3. On Violation .....	134	(18.5%)
4. End jurisdiction by 7/1/76 .....	73	(10.0%)
5. Transfer pending .....	36	(5.0%)
6. Residence outside area .....	23	(3.2%)
7. Out-of-state cases .....	15	(2.1%)
8. No file .....	5	(0.7%)
Total Eligible Wards .....	313	(43.4%)

## DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AUTHORITY



February 9th 1976

Dear

Enclosed is a copy of the Youth Authority Board Order granting you a General Discharge from parole effective March 1st, 1976. A limited number of persons including you have been selected for a study to see whether young people now on parole could do just as well on their own.

We hope you will make good use of this opportunity to remain a free, law-abiding citizen, making your own decisions and responsible for your own actions. After you have gone at least one year with no arrests; contact Mr. Lee Shipman, Youth Authority, 12730 San Pablo Avenue, Richmond, California 94805, phone 232-2279 to change your discharge classification from General to Honorable.

If you have more questions get in touch with your parole agent before March 1st.

Very truly yours,

Allen F. Breed, Director

by:

Parole Agent

WCM/bc  
2/4/76

## APPENDIX III

## SEVERITY OF OFFENSE SCALE

In 1957, a Severity of Parolee Violation Behavior Scale was developed by Martin Warren and Ernest Reimer of the California Department of Corrections. (Details of scale development are reported in Warren, M., "Severity of Parolee Violation Behavior: An Instrument for Its Assessment", unpublished Master's Thesis, University of California, January 1964.) Bertram Johnson of the Youth Authority later revised the adult version for use with a juvenile population, via the addition of 14 items peculiar to youthful delinquency and by rewording two items of the adult scale. The scale was further adapted for use in the Community Treatment Project in 1962 and again in 1965.

Severity	Code No.	Offense
1	010	Medical
1	011	Protection
1	012	Preventive (Ward's request)
1	013	Preventive (Agent's request)
1	014	Uncooperative attitude
1	015	Missed group meeting
1	016	Home adjustment
1	017	Poor school adjustment
1	018	Simple runaway
1	019	Investigation
1	210	Traffic - parking violation
1	211	Traffic - signaling violation
1	212	Traffic - improperly equipped or defective vehicle
1	213	Traffic - turning violation
1	214	Traffic - passing or following violation
1	215	Traffic - light usage
1	216	Traffic - stopping or right-of-way violation
1	217	Traffic - no license
1	218	Forcible incest victim
1	219	Forcible rape victim

APPENDIX III  
(Continued)

## SEVERITY OF OFFENSE SCALE

Severity	Code No.	Offense
2	020	Loitering around a school
2	021	Curfew violation, loitering, trespassing
2	022	Runaway, whereabouts unknown
2	023	Fighting, no weapons
2	024	Drinking, possession of alcohol
2	025	Malicious mischief, disturbing the peace, etc.
2	220	Unlawful assembly
2	221	Begging
2	222	Causing traffic accident - property damage only
2	223	Speeding
2	224	Driving car with suspended - revoked license
<hr/>		
3	030	Intoxication (alcohol, glue, etc.)
3	031	Riding in stolen car
3	032	Petty theft, unplanned
3	033	Missing, suspicious circumstances
3	034	Escape, no force
3	035	Parole revoked, suspicion property theft
3	036	Receiving stolen property
3	230	Causing traffic accident - minor injuries
3	231	Possession of alcohol, transporting and consumption violation
3	232	Prowling
3	233	Vehicle tampering
3	234	Female partner, statutory rape
3	235	Arson - unintentional
3	236	Illegal or forcible entry
3	237	Possession of burglary tools
3	238	Interfering with Peace Officer
3	239	Possession of fictitious identification
3	330	False crime report
3	331	Contributing to delinquency of minor - alcohol
3	332	Contributing to delinquency of minor - obscene matter
3	333	Contributing to delinquency of minor - runaway
3	334	Child harassment
<hr/>		

APPENDIX III  
(Continued)

## SEVERITY OF OFFENSE SCALE

Severity	Code No.	Offense
4	040	Auto theft, unplanned
4	041	Check passing, unplanned
4	042	Male partner, statutory rape
4	043	Unplanned theft other than petty or auto
4	044	Reckless driving, not intoxicated
4	045	Attempted felony offense, no threat or force
4	240	Alimony or child support payment failure
4	241	Participant in riot
4	242	Altering or counterfeiting documents for profit
4	243	Perjury
4	244	Sexual immorality or promiscuity
4	245	Causing traffic accident - major injury
4	246	Contribute to delinquency of minor - inter- course, mutual consent
4	247	Contribute to delinquency of minor - petty theft
4	248	Contribute to delinquency of minor - auto theft
4	249	Possession of illegal weapons
4	340	Possession of concealed weapons
4	341	Possession of narcotics paraphernalia
<hr/>		
5	050	Petty theft, planned
5	051	Purse snatch, victim unharmed
5	052	Possession of marijuana
5	053	Hitting a teacher
5	054	Resisting arrest
5	055	Burglary, 2nd degree
5	250	Contribute to delinquency of minor - 2nd degree burglary
5	251	Contribute to delinquency of minor - grand theft (excludes auto)
5	252	Pimping
5	253	Fraudulent solicitation of funds
5	254	Peeping Tom
5	255	Growing marijuana
5	256	Prostitution solicitation
5	257	Sale of altered or counterfeit documents
<hr/>		

APPENDIX III  
(Continued)

## SEVERITY OF OFFENSE SCALE

Severity	Code No.	Offense
6	060	Homosexual act, same age partners
6	061	Narcotics addiction
6	062	Check passing, planned
6	063	Selling marijuana
6	064	Grand theft auto, planned
6	065	Battery
6	260	Suicide - attempted
6	261	Suicide - accidental
6	262	Prostitution
6	263	Extortion - no threat or force
6	264	Contribute to delinquency of minor - grand theft auto
6	265	Cough syrup addiction
6	266	Sexual act with animals
6	268	Inciting riot
<hr/>		
7	070	Male participant, group statutory rape, no force
7	071	Drunk driving
7	072	Abnormal sex act with minor, mutual consent
7	073	Negligent action causing death
7	074	Burglarly 1st degree, unplanned
7	075	Grand theft (not auto, planned)
7	270	Contribute to delinquency of minor - marijuana
7	271	Contribute to delinquency of minor - 1st degree burglary
7	272	Indecent exposure
7	273	Incest - willing participant
7	274	Incest act aggressor - no force
7	275	Arson, wilfull
<hr/>		
8	080	Possession of narcotics
8	081	Parole revoked, potential for violence
8	082	Selling narcotics to support own addiction
8	083	Burglary 1st degree, planned
8	084	Sex act with minor, no threat or force
8	085	Escape, with force
8	280	Suicide, intentional
8	281	Contribute to delinquency of minor - narcotics

APPENDIX III  
(Continued)

SEVERITY OF OFFENSE SCALE

Severity	Code No.	Offense
9	090	Purse snatch, victim harmed
9	091	Assault with deadly weapon, armed robbery
9	092	Assault to commit robbery, grand theft, rape, etc.
9	093	Attempted murder, administering poison
9	094	Selling narcotics, large scale
9	095	Forcible rape
9	290	Extortion with threat or force
9	291	Kidnapping - attempted
9	292	Kidnapping
9	293	Incest act, aggressor with force
<hr/>		
10	100	Attempted murder while committing another felony
10	101	Sex act with minor, with force
10	102	Voluntary manslaughter
10	103	Murder, 2nd degree
10	104	Assault with caustic chemical
10	105	Murder, 1st degree
10	300	Train wrecking, attempted
10	310	Mayhem

## APPENDIX IV

DISPOSITION CODE: RANK ORDER CODE, HIGHEST NUMBER TAKES PRECEDENCE

- 01 Warrants, disposition unknown
- 02 Don't know if charged or convicted, no information (excludes warrants)
- 03 Charges not yet filed, warrant outstanding
- 04 Escaped, returned to commitment without charging
- 05 Investigative arrests only, released
- 06 849(b) (1) - released, deemed not an arrest
- 07 Released by police other than 849 (b) (1)
- 08 Released to juvenile authorities or petition requested, no further information
- 09 Charges filed, but; off-calendar, certified to Juvenile Court, insane at commission, insane pending trial, warrant outstanding
- 10 Dismissed at intake
- 11 Informal probation by probation intake
- 12 Case dismissed or discharged at court (UNLESS 13)
- 13 Case dismissed or "disappeared" at same time other charge(s) sustained
- 14 Acquitted
- 15 Convicted, don't know sentence
- 16 Fine 0-\$99
- 17 Fine \$100-199
- 18 Fine \$200-299
- 19 Fine \$300+
- 20 Choice of fine or jail, choice unspecified
- 21 Formal probation without wardship
- 22 Formal probation with wardship (CODE 21 IF UNCERTAIN)

APPENDIX IV  
(Continued)

## DISPOSITION CODE: ...

23	Jail (1-29)
24	Jail (30-179)
25	Jail (180-365)
26	Jail (1-29) and Probation (1-6 months)
27	" " " " (6 months to one year)
28	" " " " (1-2 years)
29	" " " " (2+ years)
30	Jail (30-179) and Probation (1-6 months)
31	" " " " (6 months to one year)
32	" " " " (1-2 years)
33	" " " " (2+ years)
34	Jail (180-365) and Probation (1-6 months)
35	" " " " (6 months to one year)
36	" " " " (1-2 years)
37	" " " " (2+ years)
38	County-level boys facility commitment (boys ranch, senior boys camp, 24-hour boarding school, etc.)
39	Mental Hospital Commitment
40	California Rehabilitation Center (CRC) commitment
41	California Youth Authority (CYA) commitment
42	California Department of Corrections (CDC) commitment
43	No actual sentence - everything suspended
44	OTHER (specify)

NOTE: If combination involving three or more components: code the most serious (highest ranking). Jail is most serious, probation next, and Fine least serious.

Code only actually imposed sentences except when suspended (43)

**END**