

Spring 1931

Success or Failure on Parole Can be Predicted: A Study of the Records of 3,000 Youths Paroled from the Illinois State Reformatory

Clark Tibbitts

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Clark Tibbitts, Success or Failure on Parole Can be Predicted: A Study of the Records of 3,000 Youths Paroled from the Illinois State Reformatory, 22 Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 11 (1931-1932)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

SUCCESS OR FAILURE ON PAROLE CAN BE PREDICTED: A STUDY OF THE RECORDS OF 3,000 YOUTHS PAROLED FROM THE ILLINOIS STATE REFORMATORY¹

CLARK TIBBITTS

The recent study of the Illinois Parole System seemed to indicate that the observance or violation of parole could be predicted on the basis of the past records of the paroled men. It seemed to the writer, for reasons to be stated later, desirable to carry this study further. At the invitation of Dr. Herman M. Adler, then State Criminologist, the present study was made under the auspices of the Institute for Juvenile Research and the Behavior Research Fund.

In the Parole Study the writer was associated with Professor Ernest W. Burgess in collecting and preparing the material for that part of the study called, "Factors Making for Success or Failure on Parole." This division of the study sought to determine whether or not certain factors in the past experiences of the individual parolee would be associated with success on parole and whether or not others would be correlated with failure. There was the further assumption that if a number of factors were discovered indicative of favorable or unfavorable outcome, it might be possible by combining them to develop a method of predicting outcome on parole before the release of the individual from the institution.

In the conclusion of the study Dr. Burgess suggested that because of the detailed classifications under several of the factors, one thousand cases might not be a sufficient basis for purposes of practical prediction. The present study, then, is based on the examination of three thousand cases of youths paroled from the Illinois State Reformatory at Pontiac. Besides several minor changes in sub-classifications, four new factors were included: the use of alcohol, the community to which the individual was to be returned, the last work assignment in the institution, and the first job on parole. The last three of these provided valuable additional material on success or failure of men when on parole.

In the present study the material has been subjected to further analysis and the tables have been presented in greater detail.

¹Studies from the Institute for Juvenile Research, Series B, No. 172.

Method

The method of gathering the data was the same as that employed in the previous study. The individual jacket containing the record of each parolee was examined in the light of the face sheet, or the outline of the points to be covered. The items subsidiary to each classification were coded so that the information could be punched on cards for electrical sorting. The face sheet for the present study was basically the same as that previously employed with the exception of the changes already mentioned.

The three thousand cases cover a period of slightly longer than the seven years from January 1, 1921 to December 31, 1927. The cases were divided into two groups, one of two thousand, and the other of one thousand, although the two were combined in the final tabulation and analysis. The reason for this division into two groups was as follows: Until the year 1926 the parolees, with few exceptions, remained under supervision for twelve months after their release from the reformatory. When Mr. Clabaugh became chairman of the Parole Board he inaugurated the policy of requiring the parolees to serve under parole the remainder of his maximum sentence (the sentence imposed by the court less the statutory "good time"). The ruling was made retroactive to all paroles granted after July 1, 1925. This meant that many individuals who had left the institution after that date were still on parole while the study was being made. For the purposes of the study, however, it was necessary to consider cases that were closed, i. e., cases that had either violated or that had been discharged as successful. It was also desirable that the cases should be of as recent date as possible in order that they be representative of the present period.

But experience had taught that by far the greater number of those who violated the parole agreement did so within the first six months of the parole period. Moreover, an inspection of the records seemed to indicate that among those who had been released to serve the period of the maximum sentence on parole, most violations had occurred before the end of the twelfth month. Hence it was decided to use July 1, 1925 as a starting point for both groups. The first group ran consecutively backward from that date until two thousand cases had been reached. The second group ran consecutively forward until one thousand had been obtained. Then, in order to put the two groups on as equal a footing as possible so that they might be combined, all in the second group who had violated parole after the

twelfth month were not considered as violators but were placed among those successful on parole. Further, all those who, at the time of the study, were still on parole were also considered as successful.

Having determined the procedure this far and having collected the cases, we were able to determine the per cent of violation for the entire number and for each of the component groups. Of the entire 3,000, the number that had failed reached 742, or 24.7 per cent. Of the first group of 2,000, some 490 had violated parole, or 24.5 per cent, while among the second group 252, or 25.2 per cent, were unsuccessful in keeping the parole agreement. It might be added that when the violations among the second group were figured regardless of whether the violation occurred before or after the twelfth month, the number breaking the parole agreement was 310, or 31.0 per cent.

This fact brought up a further point, incidental only to this study, but of sufficient import to command attention. Violations are of two sorts: technical violations, such as leaving a job, leaving the county, being intoxicated, or in the company of other parolees; and what has been called major violation, or the commission of a new crime. In discussing the effect of the extended parole period in his section of the committee report, Professor Burgess gave warning of the likelihood of there being a greater number of technical violations. The figures gathered in the present study completely bear this out. In the older group of 2,000 cases only 31.2 per cent of the violations were of a technical nature, while among the newer group of youths who are serving the longer period on parole, 42.9 per cent were technical violations. Or, stated in another way, the major violations rose from 16.8 per cent to 17.7 per cent, only .9 per cent, while the minor violations rose from 7.7 per cent to 13.3 per cent or 5.6 per cent. It was not a serious matter, then, to omit those who had violated after the twelfth month.

One more point should be clarified. Success or failure on parole was determined by examination of the records in the institution. In many cases it is not only hypothetical but certain that many who were discharged as successful merely escaped detection in technical violations or in the commission of new offenses. Certain methods of following up so-called "successful" cases in connection with the earlier study revealed the fact that in all probability at least 40 per cent of those paroled were in subsequent trouble either during or after the parole period.

The present study was statistical throughout, yet in presenting the report it is desirable to employ certain case material. Many of the

classifications employed in collecting the material are vivified by the inclusion of brief resumes or characterizations of the types they represent. This material will be presented in the next section following a listing of the factors selected for the study and an explanation of the basis of selection.

After the rate of violation had been determined as already explained, each factor or characteristic of the individual was correlated with the record on parole. The result was a series of percentages indicating by their size relative to the rate for the entire group, whether the factor was found more frequently with success or failure. For example, the violation rate for the group of 3,000 men, as previously stated, was 24.7 per cent. Correlating the Record on Parole with the Type of Criminal, we find that among the first offenders only 12.9 per cent violated parole, while among the habitual and professional group 58.8 per cent failed. Twelve and nine-tenths per cent is considerably lower than the rate of 24.7 per cent for the entire group, and 58.8 per cent is high. By calculating a tetrachoric coefficient of correlation between first offender and recidivist and violation and non-violation, we have $r = +.179$. The factor, Type of Criminal, then, correlates quite well and may be said to have a bearing upon the outcome on parole. Judging by this single factor chances certainly favor the first offender and are decidedly against the habitual or professional criminal. In the body of this paper the factors will be presented singly in this fashion together with the percentage tables as computed.

The method of predicting outcome will be outlined in the last section of the paper. Certain recommendations will also be made which, if carried out, should form a basis for securing more exact knowledge of the individual and providing thereby a sounder basis for prediction.

The Factors: Selection and Illustration

In the original study the committee was concerned less with making an empirical selection of the factors which might be correlated with outcome than with choosing those upon which the records would yield information and which might then be selected through statistical examination. Moreover, while the earlier study might have been taken as a basis for the present one, that was not done because of the belief that the size of the sample might not have been sufficiently large to warrant drawing conclusions as to the validity of the percentages. With three times one thousand cases one might consider

himself justified in neglecting factors which statistically seemed to have little or no bearing upon the parole record.

Consequently the face sheet was constructed in such manner as to cover virtually all of the information found in the jackets.

In the present study two factors, Marital Status and Use of Alcohol, seemed to have little bearing upon outcome on parole. Of the 3,000 cases of young men considered in this study, 2,568 were single at the time of the commission of the crime for which they were sentenced. Of this number 634, or 24.7 per cent, failed to keep the parole agreement. This percentage is exactly the same as that of the violation rate for the entire group, and hence since single men violate at a rate neither higher nor lower than all parolees, the consideration of their being single has no value for determining, in advance, success or failure on parole. Moreover, married youths are only 1.4 per cent more likely to violate parole than the entire group, and those who have been divorced or separated are only 2.3 per cent less likely than the group as a whole.

In working out the scoring scheme for Use of Alcohol it was decided to adopt the plan of rating employed by the psychiatrist at the reformatory. His three classifications are: (1) Abstinent, when the youth denies the use of alcohol, (2) Moderate, where its use was admitted but seemed to have no bearing on the crime, and (3) Intemperate, when it was determined that alcohol was a contributory cause in the commission of the crime.

The percentages resulting from the classification were wholly unsatisfactory for the purpose of characterizing the youth who had succeeded or failed. Of the total number 1,897 denied its use, and 23.4 per cent of the group failed on parole, only 1.3 per cent less than the average rate. Among the remainder 26.9 per cent of those who admitted the moderate use of alcohol violated parole, while in the cases where alcohol was considered a cause of the crime, 26.5 per cent of the outcomes were unfavorable. About all this shows, and that not conclusively, is that if the use of alcohol is admitted, intemperance has a lower violation rate than moderation.

There are real difficulties, however, in the way of gathering information on the use of alcohol. In the first place, many of the jackets did not contain the report of the psychiatrist, and the information could be gained only from the examination blank. The answers to the questions on this blank are voluntary admissions on the part of the youth. His answer is more than likely to be colored by what those wiser than himself have told him, as well as by his own idea

of what will look least bad in his jacket when it is examined by the Parole Board.

Omitting these two factors from consideration twenty-three remain for analysis and to be used in predicting outcome.

The factors which have more or less well stood the test of correlation with the individual's record on parole are: (1) nature of the offense; (2) number of associates in committing the offense for which convicted; (3) nature and length of the sentence imposed; (4) length of time served before parole; (5) whether or not commitment was upon acceptance of a lesser plea; (6) statement of trial judge and prosecuting attorney with reference to recommendation for or against leniency; (7) his previous criminal record; (8) his punishment record in the institution; (9) his previous work record; (10) whether or not he was employe at the time the crime was committed; (11) type of criminal, as first, occasional, or habitual offender, or professional criminal; (12) his age at time of parole; (13) the nationality of his father; (14) social type, as hobo, ne'er-do-well, gangster; (15) size of residential area; (16) resident or transient in the community when arrested; (17) type of neighborhood in which he lived; (18) type of neighborhood into which he was paroled; (19) his first job on parole; (20) his last work assignment in the institution; (21) his mental age according to psychological examination; (22) his personality type according to psychiatric examination; and (23) psychiatric prognosis.

The bases for most of the items listed are obvious; some, however, may well be developed a little more fully. Such factors as offense, previous criminal record, nationality of father, work assignment, first job on parole, are representative of nearly all which require little comment. The information in the jackets was complete with regard to practically all these items, and the material was tabulated just as it was found.

The results of the psychiatrist's examination covering the last three points mentioned in the listing are given on one sheet from which they may be readily taken. The classifications "type of criminal" and "social type" required interpretation of the records. All of the records in the jackets were used, staff reports were consulted, as well as letters from home or from friends, letters from social agencies, the reports of the social service division of the Cook County Criminal Court. In all cases the records were sufficiently complete to score type of criminal, but in one-seventh of the cases there was not sufficient data to establish the individual according to a definite social type.

Moreover, it was necessary to consider the youth of the Pontiac offender. The classifications generally applicable to men of all ages did not always strictly conform to this younger group. Only a few were classified as Drunkards because it is a rather questionable procedure to call a youth of twenty-one or twenty-two a confirmed alcoholic. Still fewer were called Drug Addicts, yet the validity of either type is borne out by relatively high violation rates. In the same way few were classed as boy Hobos.

On the other hand, almost half of the youths studied were set down as Gangsters, and almost one-sixth as Ne'er-do-wells. Of course, in only a few cases were the records complete with information covering the individual's membership in a formal gang. There was no intimate account of the habits of the youth, no record of his role among his associates, only a bare account of his leisure time activity, seldom a record of the attitudes in the family, almost no information as to school record, and certainly very little covering his childhood development. Nevertheless, it was possible to establish the social type in the majority of cases, and by means of certain symptoms to classify others accordingly.

Frequently more than one classification was possible, but because of the desirability of keeping them exclusive only the most pertinent one was used. A youth who might otherwise have been rated as a Farm Boy was frequently found to be a member of a town gang breaking into the general store, stealing automobiles, or participating in sex crimes.

The youth was scored as a Criminal by Accident when the characteristics of no other type seemed to furnish sufficient cause for the delinquency, and when, although the crimes may have been of a serious nature, circumstances seemed to point against a repetition of it. On the other hand, this delinquency may have marked the beginning of a criminal career.

The following case characterized by the psychiatrist as one of emotional instability, is in point. An Austrian youth, who bore a good reputation in the neighborhood and in the family where the father was dead, visited his mother in the hospital after she had undergone a series of operations. Finding her unconscious and not likely to live, he decided to leave home. Unable to find a job on a farm, he returned to the city where he did his first serious thinking about crime. Unable to trust anyone else he broke into his first house alone; after the seventh job he was caught. Much of his loot could not be converted

into money because of his unfamiliarity with "fences" and other means of disposing of it.

After several months in the reformatory this lad was released into the same broken home from which he had come. With the knowledge he had gained at Pontiac he left home and was apprehended in another state, and refused to waive extradition.

This lad had previously been of good work habits. His favorable characteristics lead one to believe that had a little care been exerted in placing him on parole, he would have made it successfully. Only 17.7 per cent of the Criminals by Accident violated parole.

Then there is the case of the Ne'er-do-well, directly opposite in type. B came from a very respectable family in which the father had died while the lad was very young. As a boy B had evidently not been in serious trouble, but later had received a dishonorable discharge from the army. Following this he committed a number of burglaries of homes in a well-to-do section of the city. He was placed on probation, but failed to reform. The self-respect of the family was injured, and they desired to have him confined. After serving a term at Pontiac he violated parole by breaking into freight cars and by passing checks. His burglary technique was such as to cause comment among the police.

Here, where the family was sufficiently intact to hold the youth they were unable to do it, and he continued his career of crime. Among the Ne'er-do-wells 46.4 per cent failed on parole.

The Drug Addict frequently lends himself to classification as a professional criminal. Although cases of this type are rarely found in the reformatory, C "seems quite generally inclined to have adopted a criminal career." Before his present conviction he had already served a sentence at Pontiac and another in a middle-western penitentiary. He had been fined by a federal court for having narcotics in his possession, and later found himself in the hands of the same court. He had no work record, was arrogant, self-centered, and evasive, and violated parole by committing a new crime. On trial he turned state's evidence probably in order to get a lighter sentence. The usual method of procedure could hardly be expected to reform C. Thirty-three and three-tenths per cent failed to keep the parole agreement.

Greater in number than those of any other group are those representing the Gang Type. There are also more likely to be stories of the gang boy in the record. Perhaps it is because he ordinarily commits the crime with associates, and when he comes to the Board

generally attempts to let them share the blame for his induction into crime.

D was quite young, indeed, the youngest of a group of six. His father had been dead since the time D started to school. He loafed around in pool halls and saloons with his associates, and become intoxicated. While on one of these drinking sprees the gang broke into several buildings. All the other boys were sent to the Bridewell, but D, a newcomer in crime and without money or friends, was given a Pontiac sentence without a lesser plea.

D expected to do better on parole, but the odds were against him. His mother had died, and he lived with a married sister. He accepted a ride home one night with the old gang, but police investigated the group and the car was proved to have been stolen.

Cases of this type, although few facts are given, closely parallel many of the accounts in Professor F. M. Thrasher's book, *The Gang*. Undoubtedly D's reform could have been brought about by paroling him into an unfamiliar neighborhood and by providing him leisure time activity.

While D was apparently of a phlegmatic type, E was alert, intelligent appearing, and quick of movement. His parents came to the United States from Central Europe sometime before 1900, and were economically successful in the new world. They provided a comfortable home for a large family, two other members of which had been in trouble. E progressed well in school and was not excessively truant. He worked at two trades, but found more adventure on the street than in the shop.

He belonged to one or two large gangs that met in a park after closing hours to talk over crimes and fights. His association with the gang brought him into frequent conflicts with the police.

He was apparently succeeding on parole until he met two members of the old gang. He expressed himself well at all times, and diagnosed his own trouble as "too much gang." The figures showed that among the group classified as gangsters, only 19.4 per cent failed to keep the parole agreement.

Although it will be seen later that the gangster was one of the least likely social types to violate parole, he occasionally did develop into a repeated offender as in the case of F. F was one of eight children of parents of one of our earlier immigrant groups. He was medium-sized and not sluggish either in movement or speech. None of the other children was ever in trouble. F attended public and parochial schools for seven years when he was not a truant.

He associated with a street-corner group for several years, but seldom entered a pool room. He worked occasionally at unskilled labor. At the age of seventeen he was arrested for burglary and discharged. After serving three times in the House of Correction he was sentenced to Pontiac on a serious felony charge. In stating his own case he said that he had formed a habit of stealing and it was impossible to break it.

Despite a good home, a mental age of fourteen and a half years, and the opportunity of going to school, F had spent his time with the more vicious type of gang and had become a habitual criminal. There is very little in the way of rehabilitation or of after-care provided for the youth of this type. Extended incarceration seems to be the only present means of keeping him out of trouble.

G was a graduate of the parental school and of St. Charles, and had been given probation on another felony charge. In the hands of a well-known gangster he developed rapidly into a desperado. At the time of his capture, G was doubly armed, and had a string of hold-ups to his credit. Two of his victims had been killed.

G was unchanged by his sojourn in the reformatory. Three times he violated parole by the commission of a new crime. He took great pride in his hard-boiled demeanor, and attacked anyone who thwarted his activities. While the indications were that G would become a professional criminal, he was classified as a Habitual Offender, chiefly because of his youth, because he did not specialize in one type of crime, and because he did have a casual work record.

The cases here presented are mere sketches, but are indicative of the case material available for classifying types. Of course, the more formal material like the previous criminal record, the number of associates, and the institutional punishment record, was always present. The mischievous Farm Boy who goes out on his first chicken-stealing escapade was easy to classify and almost as easy to reform. The new immigrant almost unknowingly led into crime was also easily assigned a place in the scheme.

Perhaps one other factor among those listed calls for explanation. From what type of neighborhood did the youth come and how were the classifications arrived at? For the past five or six years the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago has been studying the development and the nature of the urban community. A city like Chicago divides itself into several distinct types of areas. There is the Black Belt on the South Side, which is extending into other sections of the city; there is the immigrant community where from thirty to forty-five per cent of the population is foreign born; the

apartment-house area in which fifty per cent or more of the population lives in apartment buildings; and the residential community characterized by single family dwellings, pride in upkeep of homes, and neighborhood life. The rooming house districts have grown up around the loop and other bright-light centers, and finally Hobohemia extends along one thoroughfare, like Madison Street, in three directions from the loop. It has been possible to determine the boundaries of these areas with a fair degree of accuracy and to portray them on a map.

Since more than a third of the cases were from Chicago this factor seemed to be well worth consideration, and, indeed, the violation rates for the different areas showed a remarkable variation. Some knowledge of the smaller cities of Illinois made it possible to classify nearly two-thirds of the cases according to one of the above types.

Special Forms of Correlation. It was hoped that at least part of the material would lend itself to a calculation of the Pearsonian coefficient of correlation. An examination of the classifications under the various factors make it obvious that only two, age and the number of months served, could be so correlated. No others are of the regular quantitative sort. In the case of these two factors it is quite obvious that the longer time the youth spends in the reformatory the older he will be when he is released. Hence the correlation would not be enlightening.

Between several factors, however, it was possible to calculate a tetrachoric "r." Where the classifications may be combined in such a manner as to form a positive and a negative group like Working or Not Working at the Time of Arrest, First Offender or Recidivist, or Associates or No Associates, they may be correlated with Violation or Non-Violation. The several factors which lent themselves to this calculation together with the result are given in the following table:

TABLE I
COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN RECORD ON PAROLE AND VARIOUS OTHER FACTORS

Factor	
Working or Not Working when Arrested.....	$r + .043$
Lesser Plea or No Lesser Plea.....	$-.068$
Resident or Transient.....	$+.078$
Eleven Months or More than 11 Months.....	$+.101$
Favorable or Not Favorable Prognosis.....	$+.104$
Skilled Workman or Not Skilled.....	$+.137$
Associates or No Associates.....	$+.138$
No Punishment or Punishment.....	$+.150$
No Previous Criminal Record or Previous Criminal Record.....	$+.153$
First Offender or Recidivist.....	$+.179$

Apparently, then, there are some very definite relationships between Record on Parole and the various factors considered. Many did not even admit of a dichotomous arrangement and could not be treated in this way. Just how the tables bore out these promising relationship will be seen in the next section.

THE FACTORS AND THEIR RELATION TO SUCCESS OR FAILURE ON PAROLE

Offense Named in the Indictment

The Committee Report brought out very strikingly the fact that those guilty of the crimes that shock society are the least likely to violate parole. The present study is even more convincing by reason of the extremely low violation rate of 8.0 per cent for those sentenced for sex crimes. This figure is the lowest obtained for any crime in any of the three Illinois penal institutions.

TABLE II
OFFENSE IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

Record on Parole									
Offense	Total	Dis-charge	Per cent	Vio-lation	Per cent	Minor	Per cent	Major	Per cent
1. Larceny	646	473	73.2	173	26.8	68	10.5	105	16.3
2. Robbery	776	639	82.3	137	17.7	46	5.9	91	11.8
3. Burglary	1233	884	71.7	349	28.3	113	9.2	236	19.1
4. Fraud	235	174	74.0	61	26.0	19	8.1	42	17.9
5. Sex	50	46	92.0	4	8.0	2	4.0	2	4.0
6. Homicide	47	33	70.2	14	29.8	8	17.0	6	12.8
7. Other	13	9	69.2	4	30.8	2	15.4	2	15.4
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

The violation rates of the six other classifications stand in virtually the same relation to the average rate as they did in the previous study. The somewhat high rate for Homicide cases is partly explained by the fact that murderers may not be committed to the reformatory, but are sent to the penitentiary.

Number of Associates in Crime

In two-thirds of the cases (1,995) the crime for which the sentence was imposed was committed by more than one youth. In a little more than one-third of the cases (1,092) there was on associate, in 588 cases there were two associates, in 232 cases there were

three associates, while in 83 cases there were four or more partners in the crime. Table III bears out the conclusion of the previous study that the offender who operated as a "lone wolf" was much more likely to violate parole than he who had confederates.

TABLE III
NUMBER OF ASSOCIATES IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Number of Associates</i>	<i>Record on Parole</i>							
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Dis- charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Vio- lation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major cent</i>
0. None	1005	672	66.9	333	33.1	118	11.7	215
1. One	1092	948	77.7	243	22.3	86	7.9	157
2. Two	588	484	82.3	104	17.7	33	5.6	71
3. Three	232	185	79.7	47	20.3	15	6.5	32
4. Four or more,	83	68	81.9	15	18.1	6	7.2	9
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484

It is also interesting to note that 45.8 per cent of all Larcenies, 46.7 per cent of the Homicides, 56.9 per cent of the Sex Crimes, and 83.1 per cent of the Frauds were committed by "lone wolves." Were the number of associates the only criterion of success or failure in our possession, we should expect the perpetrators of sex crimes to show a very high violation rate. As a matter of fact, 83.3 per cent of the violators who had been sent up for sex crimes had no associates. Knowing that the rate of violation for those guilty of sex crimes is low, we had added reason to look for other factors than this one that might have a bearing.

National or Racial Origin

More than one-half (1,672) of the cases represented young men whose fathers were of American birth.

TABLE IV
NATIONALITY IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

Record on Parole									
Nationality	Total	Dis-charge	Per cent	Viol-ation	Per cent	Minor	Per cent	Major	Per cent
1. American (wh.)	1672	1284	76.8	388	23.2	148	8.9	240	14.3
2. American (col.)	460	296	64.3	164	35.7	57	12.4	107	23.3
3. Austrian	38	26	68.4	12	31.6	3	7.9	9	23.7
4. British	57	47	82.5	10	17.5	3	5.3	7	12.2
5. French-Canadian..	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	2	66.7
6. Czech	21	18	85.7	3	14.3	1	4.8	2	9.5
7. German	119	94	89.0	25	21.0	6	5.0	19	16.0
8. Greek	11	10	90.9	1	9.1	1	9.1	0	0
9. Hungarian	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0	1	50.0
10. Irish	100	69	69.0	31	31.0	8	8.0	23	23.0
11. Italian	110	91	82.7	19	17.3	5	4.5	14	12.8
12. Jewish	57	48	84.2	9	15.8	3	5.3	6	10.5
13. Jugo-Slav	9	8	88.9	1	11.1	1	11.1	0	0
14. Mexican	25	21	84.0	4	16.0	1	4.0	3	12.0
15. Lithuanian	11	10	90.9	1	9.1	1	9.1	0	0
16. Polish	186	140	75.3	46	24.7	13	7.0	33	17.7
17. Russian	37	26	70.3	11	29.7	2	5.4	9	24.3
18. Scandinavian	53	46	86.8	7	13.2	2	3.8	5	9.4
19. Slovak	4	0	0	4	100.0	0	0	4	100.0
20. Other	25	22	88.0	3	12.0	3	12.0	0	0
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

The next largest group were the negro with 460. This group showed also a greater tendency to violate than any other, 35.7 per cent of them having been unsuccessful on parole. Other groups with high rates were the Austrian, 31.6 per cent; the Irish, 31.0 per cent; and the Russian (not Jewish), 29.7 per cent. The figures also disclosed that several groups had violation rates considerably lower than the average rate. The Greeks and the Lithuanians with 9.1 per cent, the Jugo-Slavs with 11.1 per cent, the Scandinavians with 13.2 per cent, the Czechs with 14.3 per cent, the Jews with 15.8 per cent, the Mexicans with 16.0 per cent, the Italians with 17.3 per cent, and the British with 17.5 per cent, are all significantly low. The seven remaining groups hovered with the white Americans around the average or were represented by too few cases to make their inclusion valid.

Type of Offender

The three thousand cases were divided into the four classifications, first offender, occasional offender, habitual offender, and professional criminal. The first offender is the one who, according to

the records of local or federal Identification Bureaus, the statement of the prosecuting attorney, the psychiatrist's examination, or the examination of the record clerk, has never previously been guilty of committing a serious crime whether he was convicted or not. The occasional offender is the one who maintains a fairly good record save when at relatively widespread intervals he lapses into crime. The habitual offender is the unstable individual of vicious and pertinacious habits, like the gambler and the alcoholic, who seem unable or unwilling to hold a job, and who continually revert to criminal practices. The professional criminal supports himself through his illegal practices. Because of the youth of the vast majority of the young men committed to Pontiac, it was assumed and later proved by examination of the records that few had established themselves as professional criminals. More than half, 1,638 or 54.6 per cent, were first offenders, 1,124 or 37.5 per cent were occasional offenders, while 238 or 7.9 per cent were habitual or professional criminals. Because the number of professional criminals was so small they were included with the habitual offenders. Table V indicates how telling are these classifications in determining outcome on parole.

TABLE V
TYPE OF OFFENDER IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Type of Criminal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Record on Parole</i>							
		<i>Dis-charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Violation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
1. First Offender	1638	1348	82.3	290	17.7	126	7.7	164	10.0
2. Occasional Offender	1124	812	72.2	312	27.8	103	9.2	209	18.6
3. Habitual and Professional Criminals	238	98	41.2	140	58.8	29	12.2	111	46.6
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

The first offender appears at once to be more likely to make good than the occasional, while the habitual and professional criminals combined disclose a violation rate higher than that for any other point throughout the entire list of factors. Furthermore, almost half of the first offenders who were violators ran afoul technical points in the parole agreement, while one-third of the violations among the occasional offenders were of the technical sort. But among the habitual and professional offenders nearly four times as many violated parole by the commission of a new crime as through a minor infraction. It

is quite apparent, then, that the habitual criminal, because of his excessively high rate and because of the seriousness of his violation, is a very poor risk on parole.

It is interesting to note in passing that 79.7 per cent of the habitual criminals and 81.2 per cent of the professional criminals were sentenced for Burglary or Robbery, both serious crimes carrying relatively long sentences.

Social Type

The records were often sufficiently complete or "the earmarks" of a type were so pronounced that it was possible to classify 2,600 of the cases according to one of the nine social types suggested by the examination of the cases during the earlier study.

TABLE VI
SOCIAL TYPE IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Social Type</i>	<i>Record on Parole</i>							
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Dis-charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Violation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major</i>
0. No class.	412	302	73.3	110	26.7	42	10.2	68
1. Hobo	30	18	60.0	12	40.0	7	23.3	5
2. Ne'er-do-well	472	253	53.6	219	46.4	71	15.0	148
3. Drunkard	50	33	66.0	17	34.0	10	20.0	7
4. Gangster	1427	1150	80.6	277	19.4	80	5.6	197
5. Immigrant	28	22	78.6	6	21.4	3	10.7	3
6. Farm Boy	252	214	84.9	38	15.1	17	6.7	21
7. Black Sheep	137	109	79.6	28	20.4	9	6.6	19
8. Dope	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	1	16.66	1
9. Criminal by Accident	186	153	82.3	33	17.7	18	9.7	15
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484

The farm boy appears to be the most likely of all to succeed on parole with the criminal by accident quite closely second. The latter classification was used for those youths who, not because of vicious habits or of evil influences, but who through temporary instability or through circumstances seemingly beyond their control entered the field of crime for a short period. Frequently the youth had ceased his criminal activity before his arrest, and in all probability would have done as well without the punishment.

Again, despite the fact that among youths careers are not so well formed as among older men, several types show violation rates which

bear out the validity of the classifications. Among the drug addicts 33.3 per cent violate parole, 40.0 per cent of the hobos, and 46.4 per cent of the ne'er-do-wells fail, while among the drunkards 34.0 per cent are unfavorable.

Place of Residence

Chicago contributed 1,189 of the 3,000 parolees with which we are concerned in this study, while 348 were from the open country. Table VII shows that there is almost no difference in the violation rate between those sent from Chicago and from small cities.

TABLE VII
THE PLACE OF RESIDENCE IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

Size of Residential Area		Record on Parole								
		Total	Dis-charge	Per cent	Violation	Per cent	Minor	Per cent	Major	Per cent
0.	No record	121	71	58.7	50	41.3	35	28.9	15	12.4
1.	Open country	348	291	83.6	57	16.4	30	8.6	27	7.8
2.	Village	64	50	78.1	14	21.9	6	9.4	8	12.5
3.	Town	158	130	82.3	28	17.7	16	10.1	12	7.6
4.	Small city	1120	834	74.5	286	25.5	95	8.5	191	17.0
5.	Chicago	1189	882	74.2	307	25.8	76	6.4	231	19.4
Total		3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

The entirely or more nearly rural parts of Illinois do have, however, a more favorable rate. Only 16.4 per cent of the boys from the open country violated parole.

One-sixth, or 539, of the youths were not residents of the community in which the crime was committed. This seemed to be fairly important when correlated with record on parole for according to Table VIII 31.9 per cent of their number failed to make good.

TABLE VIII
MOBILITY IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

	Record on Parole.....								
Mobility	Total	Dis-charge	Per cent	Violation	Per cent	Minor	Per cent	Major	Per cent
0. No record	15	11	73.3	4	26.7	3	20.0	1	6.7
1. Resident	2446	1880	76.9	566	23.1	172	7.0	394	16.1
2. Transient	539	367	68.1	172	31.9	83	15.4	89	16.5
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

It must be observed, however, that the rate of minor violations among the transients is almost twice as high as the average. This is explained to some extent by the facts that many of these transients are not paroled to their homes (perhaps they have none) or else they are paroled out of state. Where either situation exists there seems to be less incentive to keep the parole agreement.

The Old Neighborhood and the New

The method of determining in what type of neighborhood the youth lived at the time he committed was explained in the previous section. The same plan was followed in determining the type of community into which the youth was paroled. Tables IX and X give striking evidence of the value of these factors.

TABLE IX
OLD NEIGHBORHOOD IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

Neighborhood	Total	Record on Parole.						
		Dis-charge	Per cent	Vio-lation	Per cent	Minor	Per cent	Major
0. No record	1290	998	77.4	292	22.6	124	9.6	168
1. Underworld	18	8	44.4	10	55.6	3	16.7	7
2. Hobohemia	32	22	68.8	10	31.2	5	15.6	5
3. Rooming House ..	185	107	57.8	78	42.2	34	18.4	44
4. Apartment House..	159	124	78.0	35	22.0	8	5.0	27
5. Immigrant	384	290	75.5	94	24.5	19	4.9	75
6. Negro	231	151	65.4	80	34.6	21	9.1	59
7. Residential	373	307	82.3	66	17.7	21	5.6	45
8. Small City Ind. Res.	328	251	76.5	77	23.5	23	7.0	54
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484

TABLE X
PAROLE COMMUNITY IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

Parole Community	Total	Record on Parole						
		Dis-charge	Per cent	Vio-lation	Per cent	Minor	Per cent	Major
0. No Record	1010	743	73.6	267	26.4	114	11.3	153
1. Rooming House ..	74	34	46.0	40	54.0	20	27.0	20
2. Apartment House..	147	116	78.9	31	21.1	7	4.8	24
3. Immigrant	363	265	73.0	98	27.0	17	4.7	81
4. Negro	219	143	65.3	76	34.7	19	8.7	57
5. Residential	404	334	82.7	70	17.3	21	5.2	49
6. Farm	465	386	83.0	79	17.0	39	8.4	40
7. Small City Ind. Res.	318	237	74.5	81	25.5	21	6.6	60
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484

The youth who is paroled into a rooming house community, as well as the youth who leaves one, is very likely to fail on parole. The rates for those leaving and entering Negro areas are very close, 34.6 per cent and 34.7 per cent. The farm community again is lowest with only 17.0 per cent of those violating who are sent into it. Probably a little more care in placement would reduce this even further. It happens quite frequently that a youth who has not seen his parents for several months is sent into a strange farm home to work out his parole amid the feeling of prejudice and sometimes of abusive dominance.

Youth coming from residential areas and youths returning to the same or similar areas are not likely to violate.

All of the Cook County cases were spotted on the map upon which the various types of neighborhoods had been outlined. While it is evident from the figures that the greatest concentration of cases was in the rooming house, apartment house, immigrant, and Negro areas; it is very striking to discover in looking at the map that the greater number of cases in the area designated as residential hover close to the boundary line between that and the less stable areas adjacent. It is quite probable that these sections marked by a fairly large number of cases are going through a transitional stage, and that this is one sign of deterioration.

Factors Involved in the Trial and the Sentence

The parole board rarely passes upon a case unless the statement of the prosecuting attorney and the trial judge is in the inmate's jacket. The statute requires that this statement concern itself with the circumstances of the crime, the character and associates of the individual. In two-thirds of the cases (2,052) this statement was purely factual, in more than half of the remainder there was entered a recommendation for leniency or a protest against it.

TABLE XI
STATEMENT OF THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Record on Parole</i>								
<i>Prosecuting Attorney</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Dis-charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Viol-ation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major Per cent</i>
0. No Statement	416	244	58.7	172	41.3	47	11.3	125 30.0
1. Factual	2052	1569	76.5	483	23.5	180	8.8	303 14.7
2. Recommendation ..	387	337	87.1	50	12.9	21	5.4	29 7.5
3. Protest	134	100	74.6	34	25.4	7	5.2	27 20.2
4. Withdraws	11	8	72.7	3	27.3	3	27.3	0
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484 16.1

The recommendation for leniency seems to be most indicative of the outcome on parole for only 12.9 per cent of the cases in this group have records of violation.

The acceptance or non-acceptance of a lesser plea seems to have become a significant factor with the accumulation of a larger number of cases. The youth who "copped a plea" is better off than the one who did not, but the one who "copped two" is exceptionally better off according to Table XII.

TABLE XII
LESSER PLEA IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Lesser Plea</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Record on Parole</i>							
		<i>Dis-charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Violation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
0. No Plea	2309	1701	73.7	608	26.3	208	9.0	400	17.3
1. One	501	392	78.2	109	21.8	35	7.0	74	14.8
2. Two	190	165	86.8	25	13.2	15	7.9	10	5.3
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

All save sixteen of the offenders represented by the three thousand cases were sentenced under the indeterminate sentence law. The parole law applies to all sentences, and it is therefore possible to compare the violation rates among the several types.

TABLE XIII
TYPE OF SENTENCE IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Sentence</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Record on Parole</i>							
		<i>Dis-charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Violation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
1-2 years	4	4	100.0						
1-3 years	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0		
1-5 years	49	33	67.3	16	32.7	8	16.35	8	16.35
1-10 years	1006	747	74.3	259	25.7	103	10.2	156	15.5
1-14 years	347	277	79.8	70	20.2	20	5.8	50	14.4
1-20 years	1040	752	72.3	288	27.7	93	8.9	195	18.8
2-15 years	8	8	100.0						
3-20 years	307	251	81.8	56	18.2	17	5.5	39	12.7
5-20 years	5	2	40.0	3	60.0	1	20.0	2	40.0
1 year to life.....	80	56	70.0	24	30.0	6	7.5	18	22.5
10 years to life.....	35	30	85.7	5	14.3	1	2.9	4	11.4
Two or more sentences	101	82	81.2	19	18.8	7	6.9	12	11.9
All flat sentences	16	15	93.8	1	6.2	1	6.2		
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

Although the definite sentences are few in number the rate of violation is low and, indeed, is less than half what it was in the previous study. In the main the heavier sentences, three to twenty years and ten years to life and two or more consecutive or concurrent sentences, exhibit lower rates of failure, while the very short sentence like the one to five shows the highest rate of all.

The offender sentenced on a one to ten sentence may remain in the reformatory from eleven months to ten years. The nature of the sentence, then, may not be as valid a factor for comparison as the actual time served.

Table XIV seems to indicate that the offender who remains in the institution only eleven months is far more likely to make a successful parolee than those who remain incarcerated over longer periods. The question still remains open whether the shorter period in the institution is favorable to reformation or whether the youths who are more likely to reform are released on parole after eleven months commitment.

TABLE XIV
LENGTH OF TIME SERVED IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Length of Time Served</i>	<i>Record on Parole</i>								
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Dis-charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Viol-ation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
11 months	408	352	86.3	56	13.7	26	6.4	30	7.3
1-2 years	1103	864	78.3	239	21.7	97	8.8	142	12.9
2-3 years	925	681	73.6	244	26.4	80	8.6	164	17.8
3-4 years	367	231	62.9	136	37.1	39	10.6	97	26.5
4-5 years	116	75	64.7	41	35.3	10	8.6	31	26.7
5 years and over.....	81	55	67.9	26	32.1	6	7.4	20	24.7
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

For the individual who serves three years or over there is more than a thirty per cent chance that he will violate his parole agreement. Moreover, the longer he serves the more likely is his violation to be of a serious nature. The long period of incarceration hardens his attitude toward society.

Previous Criminal Record

From the records at Pontiac it is apparent that 1,864 of the 3,000 cases had had no earlier serious contact with the police, or at least no previous criminal record. Table XV indicates a significantly lower

violation rate among the members of this group who have served their first sentence.

TABLE XV
PREVIOUS CRIMINAL RECORD IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Previous Criminal Record</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Record on Parole</i>							
		<i>Dis- charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Vio- lation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Per Minor</i>	<i>cent</i>	<i>Per Major</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
1. None	1864	1499	80.4	365	19.6	154	8.3	211	11.3
2. Police Character									
Only	45	36	80.0	9	20.0	2	4.4	7	15.6
3. Fine or Probation									
Only	267	204	76.4	63	23.6	19	7.1	44	16.5
4. Industrial School									
Only	331	201	60.7	130	39.3	34	10.3	96	29.0
5. Jail Only	332	221	66.6	111	33.4	25	7.5	86	25.9
6. Reformatory	139	83	59.7	56	40.3	20	14.4	36	25.9
7. Penitentiary	22	14	63.6	8	36.4	4	18.2	4	18.2
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

The classification "police character" was added when the present study was undertaken in order to characterize those individuals who, according to the records of identification bureaus or state's attorneys, had had nothing proved against them or had managed to escape punishment. The relatively low violation rate, 20.0 per cent, suggests that these fellows are a wary group and are successful in evading detection in violation, or else that their acquaintanceships are of such a nature as to afford protection.

The youths were classified according to the most serious record so that a boy who falls under the "reformatory" grouping may have had an earlier probation, industrial school or jail record. So, also, many who would otherwise be known as police characters served a short jail sentence and therefore are said to have a "workhouse or jail record." Any previous record of incarceration seems to make for less likelihood of success on parole. Of course, it is the repeated offenders in the main who have these records against them.

Work Record, Work Assignment, and First Job

The record of whether the boy was working at the time he committed the crime was apparently of little significance.

TABLE XVI
WORKING WHEN ARRESTED IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Working When Arrested</i>	<i>Record on Parole</i>							
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Dis- charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Vio- lation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major cent</i>
0. No Record	107	77	72.0	30	28.0	10	9.3	20
1. Yes	1450	1119	77.2	331	22.8	108	7.4	223
2. No	1443	1062	73.6	381	26.4	140	9.7	241
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484

There were 1,450 cases where he was employed according to the records and 1,443 cases where he was not. The answer to this question seemed to be a difficult one to obtain for frequently the various records in the jacket were not in agreement.

The classification calling for a record of the youth's working habits and skill was according to Table XVII of much greater significance.

TABLE XVII
WORK RECORD IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Work Record</i>	<i>Record on Parole</i>							
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Dis- charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Vio- lation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major cent</i>
0. No Record	9	8	88.9	1	11.1	1	11.1	0
1. None	13	8	61.5	5	38.5	1	7.7	4
2. Casual	2134	1527	71.6	607	28.4	204	9.6	403
3. Irregular	790	664	84.1	126	15.9	51	6.5	75
4. Regular	54	51	94.4	3	5.6	1	1.9	2
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484

The gradation from 38.5 per cent failure among those whose records gave no evidence of the individual's ever having worked, through to those skilled laborers who were regularly employed and who showed a violation rate of only 5.6 per cent, is quite valuable for prediction purposes.

Since the Parole Board has the authority to inform itself of the work habits of the parolee both while he is in the institution and after he leaves, it was considered worthwhile to gather what information was available for this study. Accordingly two new items were added, the "last assignment in the institution" and the "first job on parole." Anything like exact information is difficult to secure par-

ticularly on the latter item, while with regard to the work assignment it would be far more valuable to have the expressions of the officers on the ability and work habits of the youth. Nevertheless, both factors disclosed several startling points as is seen in Tables XVIII and XIX.

TABLE XVIII

LAST ASSIGNMENT IN INSTITUTION IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

Last Assignment	Total	Record on Parole							Per cent
		Dis-charge	Per cent	Vio-lation	Per cent	Minor	Per cent	Major	
1. Clerks (Office Library), Drivers, Receiving and Discharge Boys ..	147	125	85.0	22	15.0	8	5.4	14	9.6
2. Cooks, Bakers (Hospital, Laundry) ..	335	255	76.1	80	23.9	22	6.6	58	17.3
3. Farmers, Gardeners, Greenhouse men	452	382	84.5	70	15.5	35	7.75	35	7.75
4. Barbers	116	100	86.2	16	13.8	8	6.9	8	6.9
5. Furniture Factories	558	377	67.6	181	32.4	67	12.0	114	20.4
6. Tailor Shop	173	116	67.1	57	32.9	22	12.7	35	20.2
7. Shoe Shop	47	33	70.2	14	29.8	4	8.5	10	21.3
8. Printers	161	111	68.9	50	31.1	18	11.2	32	19.9
9. Carpenters and All Gangs	634	490	77.3	144	22.7	41	6.5	103	16.2
10. Band	89	66	74.2	23	25.8	7	7.9	16	17.9
11. Cell House	237	170	71.7	67	28.3	21	8.9	46	19.4
12. Extra Detail	51	33	64.7	18	35.3	5	9.8	13	25.5
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

Since there are more than fifty possible assignments for any inmate of the reformatory it was necessary to combine most of them into groups according to similarity of responsibility, trust, honor, and required skill. It is noteworthy that boys in the barber shop, where greater skill is developed than in perhaps any other industry at Pontiac, showed the lowest violation rate, 13.8 per cent. The office clerks, drivers, library clerks, and receiving and discharge boys, were next lowest with 15.0 per cent. Their jobs are mainly positions of trust, and are eagerly sought as "politician jobs" by nearly all who enter. The farmers, gardeners, and greenhouse men all work outside the wall much of the time. The rate of failure among them was only 15.5 per cent, and theirs was a group numbering 452. Evidently confidence placed in the boys by the managing officers was a factor highly correlated with success on parole.

The "extra detail" composed of cripples, weaklings, and those unfit for regular assignment, showed the highest rate of violation, 35.3 per cent, while the furniture factory, the tailor shop, and the print shop were close with more than 30 per cent. It is significant that few boys are attracted by these assignments.

The training received in these better positions seems to carry over to the parole period. The point may be made, however, that the more reliable youths are selected for certain assignments, while more disagreeable tasks are given to the more hardened criminals.

TABLE XIX
FIRST JOB ON PAROLE IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>First Job on Parole</i>	<i>Record on Parole</i>							
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Dis-charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Violation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major</i>
0. No Record	279	197	70.6	82	29.4	39	14.0	43
1. Farm	486	403	82.9	83	17.1	40	8.2	43
2. Labor	619	459	74.2	160	25.8	55	8.9	105
3. Factory Labor ..	437	334	76.4	103	23.6	38	8.7	65
4. Skilled	232	174	75.0	58	25.0	13	5.6	45
5. Welfare Agencies.	245	165	67.3	80	32.7	28	11.4	52
6. Teaming	144	100	69.4	44	30.6	8	5.6	36
7. Mining	100	71	71.0	29	29.0	9	9.0	20
8. Clerk	223	178	79.8	45	20.2	11	4.9	34
9. Porter	87	59	67.8	28	32.2	8	9.2	20
10. Railroad, Road ..	42	36	85.7	6	14.3	2	4.8	4
11. Restaurant	61	44	72.1	17	27.9	6	9.8	11
12. Barber	45	38	84.4	7	15.6	1	2.2	6
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484

Those who on parole take jobs in barber shops and on farms continued to disclose low rates, 15.6 per cent and 17.1 per cent. Laborers on roads and on railroads are surprisingly low with only 14.3 per cent failure among them. Youths paroled to welfare agencies showed a violation rate of 32.7 per cent. It is noteworthy, however, that welfare agencies normally receive those who have no friends who will accept them. This group would doubtless show an even higher rate had they not gone to the welfare agency. Porters in hotels, barber shops, and confectionery stores gave the rate of 32.2 per cent. These are mainly colored boys and their rate of failure is consistent with that among the colored group as a whole. The only other group showing above 30 per cent failure on parole were the teamsters.

Although it is well known to parole officers that many first jobs last scarcely more than a week or a month, the figures in Table XIX

are of great importance in indicating that placement in a job that requires a certain amount of skill and where the parolee is able to meet that requirement seems to make for successful rehabilitation.

Punishment Record in the Reformatory

The punishment record in the institution not only influences the board in determining fitness for parole but also automatically increases the length of time spent in the institution. Entering in grade C the inmate advances through good behavior into grades B and A, and is entitled to a hearing before the Parole Board. Contrariwise, through infractions of the rules the inmate may be demoted to grades D and E, from which through extended good behavior he must work himself up in order to "see the board." What is the relationship of punishment in the reformatory to parole success?

The correlation coefficient between success or failure and no punishment or punishment was $+0.150$, a fairly high relationship for the r of this type. It is indicative of the wide difference in violation rates as is shown in Table XX.

TABLE XX
PUNISHMENT RECORD IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

<i>Record on Parole</i>										
<i>Punishment Record</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Dis- charge</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Vio- lation</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	
0. No Record	82	61	74.4	21	25.6	4	4.9	17	20.7	
1. None	1773	1430	80.7	343	19.3	138	7.8	205	11.5	
2. Demerit	2	2	100.0							
3. 1-2 Demotions	715	484	67.7	231	32.3	78	10.9	153	21.4	
4. More Than 2 Demotions	428	281	65.7	147	34.3	38	8.9	109	25.4	
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1	

Considerably more than one-half the cases, 1,773, had no punishment record, and their violation rate was low. Of the remainder, it mattered little how frequently they were demoted, their violation rate was 8 per cent higher than the average.

Age When Paroled

The younger the boy the more likely he is to succeed on parole.

TABLE XXI
AGE AT TIME OF PAROLE IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

Record on Parole									
Age	Total	Dis-charge	Per cent	Vio-lation	Per cent	Minor	Per cent	Major	Per cent
17 Years	68	58	85.3	10	14.7	3	4.4	7	10.3
18 Years	210	172	81.9	38	18.1	11	5.2	27	12.9
19 Years	383	288	75.2	95	24.8	34	8.9	61	15.9
20 Years	515	386	75.0	129	25.0	41	8.0	88	17.0
21 Years	523	399	76.3	125	23.7	53	10.1	71	13.6
22 Years	361	270	74.8	91	25.2	39	10.8	52	14.4
23 Years	305	224	73.4	81	26.6	20	6.6	61	20.0
24 Years	233	179	76.8	54	23.2	13	5.6	41	17.6
25 Years and Over...	402	282	70.1	120	29.9	44	10.9	76	18.9
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

The boys who left the institution at the age of seventeen or eighteen years were extremely unlikely to violate parole. They, in the main, were found to be amenable to supervision and served but eleven months.

Intelligence and Personality

From the report of the Committee on the Parole Study we learn that:

Illinois enjoys the honor of having been the first state in the Union to establish the position of state criminologist. Under his direction the mental health officer at Pontiac, Menard, and Joliet gives the mental and psychiatric examination of the inmates. A diagnostic summary of this examination together with a statement by the mental health officer of the probabilities of success or failure of the inmate upon a return to the community is entered in the material that comes to the Parole Board for consideration. From these records it was possible to correlate the findings on general intelligence, personality type, and the psychiatric prognosis with the rate of violation of parole.

It was through the work of Dr. Herman M. Adler, State Criminologist, in an examination of the population of Illinois penal and reformatory institutions, that the first conclusive demonstration was made that the proportion of those of inferior intelligence in the criminal and delinquent group is no larger than in the general population. Indeed the percentage of youth of inferior intelligence in Pontiac from Cook County was found to be lower than the percentage of inferior intelligence among men from Cook County examined in army camps during the World War.

So, while inferior mentality can no longer be given as one of the major causes of crime, it is of interest to determine how men of different intelligence levels react to supervision upon parole.²

Table XXII indicates that those of inferior and very inferior intelligence were most likely to violate their agreement while the very superior showed the least tendency.

TABLE XXII
MENTAL RATING IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

Record on Parole										
Mental Rating	Total	Dis-charge	Per cent	Vio-lation	Per cent	Minor	Per cent	Major	Per cent	
0. No Record	79	59	74.7	20	25.3	1	1.3	19	24.0	
1. E	134	91	67.9	43	32.1	16	11.9	27	20.2	
2. D	275	190	69.1	85	30.9	37	13.5	48	17.4	
3. C—	635	481	75.7	154	24.3	44	6.9	110	17.4	
4. C	972	752	77.4	220	22.6	73	7.5	147	15.1	
5. C+	557	413	74.1	144	25.9	60	10.8	84	15.1	
6. B	284	218	76.8	66	23.2	21	7.4	45	15.8	
7. A	64	54	84.4	10	15.6	6	9.4	4	6.2	
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.2	

The smoother gradation of the percentages in this table, compared with that in the earlier report, demonstrates once more the validity of collecting a larger number of cases as an assurance of greater accuracy.

The emotionally unstable person seems to have the best chance of making good on parole. Perhaps his crime was committed during an unsettled period from which he readily recovered.

TABLE XXIII
PERSONALITY RATING IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

Record on Parole									
Personality Rating	Total	Dis-charge	Per cent	Vio-lation	Per cent	Minor	Per cent	Major	Per cent
0. No Record	397	339	85.4	58	14.6	23	5.8	35	8.8
1. Normal	14	12	85.7	2	14.3	1	7.14	1	7.14
2. Feebleminded	173	109	63.0	64	37.0	29	16.8	35	20.2
3. Ego	1122	805	71.7	317	28.3	90	8.0	227	20.3
4. Inadequate	996	757	76.0	239	24.0	89	8.9	150	15.1
5. Emotional	241	201	83.4	40	16.6	18	7.5	22	9.1
6. Sexual	15	9	60.0	6	40.0	2	13.3	4	26.7
7. Neuropathic and Psychotics	42	26	61.9	16	38.1	6	14.3	10	23.8
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484	16.1

²Bruce, Harno, Burgess, Landesco, *Parole and the Indeterminate Sentence*. Ernest W. Burgess, "Factors Determining Success or Failure on Parole," p. 231.

The feeble-minded; the sexual psychopaths, and the neuropathics and psychotics seemed to have the greatest difficulty during the period of rehabilitation.

When the psychiatrist at the reformatory had completed his examination of the individual he made a definite prognosis as to probable outcome on parole in 1,310 cases.

TABLE XXIV
PSYCHIATRIC PROGNOSIS IN RELATION TO RECORD ON PAROLE

Prognosis	Record on Parole							
	Total	Dis-charge	Per-cent	Vio-lation	Per-cent	Minor	Per-cent	Major Per-cent
0. No Examination ..	32	14	43.8	18	56.2	3	9.4	15 46.8
1. Favorable	744	618	83.1	126	16.9	55	7.4	71 9.5
2. Doubtful	266	198	74.4	68	25.6	32	12.0	36 13.6
3. Unfavorable	350	233	66.6	117	33.4	35	10.0	82 23.4
No Record	1608	1195	74.3	413	25.7	133	8.3	280 17.4
Total	3000	2258	75.3	742	24.7	258	8.6	484 16.1

In 1,608 cases the record of the psychiatrist's examination was not among the other records or the number of prognoses would doubtless have been greater.

Although we have noted great room for added information in the material collected from prisoners in the reformatory, we have before us a wealth of data covering the case of every individual. The examination of the percentages has shown that many factors disclose a rate of violation far below the rate for the entire group, while others are almost twice as great. Reference has been made throughout to the possible value of certain of these factors in predicting outcome on parole. Indeed, it has been suggested that the present study was undertaken upon the assumption that the record of the individual on parole could, to a certain extent, be predetermined.

An attempt is made to hit upon factors that may indicate outcome every time an individual appears before the Parole Board. Given a Board with extended experience, it may learn in a common-sense sort of way just what factors do seem to have a bearing. Yet such a Board can never be sure of the validity of the guide-posts it has selected, nor can anyone else until a thorough effort has been made to discover by a consideration of the material itself just which factors are significant. This has been the purpose of this study as well as of the preceding one.

The results of the investigation have just been presented. It is believed that three thousand cases are sufficient to make the figures fairly accurate. The group of cases includes all that left the reformatory over a seven-year period; it is not a sample taken from them or a selected group.

In the light of these things, factors are surely significant when they disclose extremely low rates like the farm boy with 15.1 per cent violation, the regular work record with 5.6 per cent, the barbers with 13.8 per cent, those who served only eleven months with 13.7 per cent, and the youths guilty of sex crimes only 8.0; and those with relatively high rates like the ne'er-do-well with 46.4 per cent, the underworld community with 55.6 per cent, and the habitual criminal with 58.8 per cent violation. While no one factor is itself a sufficient basis for prediction, some should undoubtedly be given more weight than others. Until we have many intimate and detailed accounts of the records of parolees who violate, we shall be unable to assign weight in the proper places. The following section gives in some detail our scheme for predicting whether the individual parolee will make good or fail on parole. It is not necessarily final but does represent the best expectancy rate that we have been able to develop.

THE SCHEME FOR PREDICTING

The factors selected for use in determining outcome were the twenty-three factors listed in an earlier section which by reason of their showing in the correlation tables seemed valid.

The plan as outlined in the parent study was to consider every percentage lower than the rate for the entire group as a characteristic favorable to successful outcome, and every factor disclosing a rate higher than that for the entire group as unfavorable. A record of no work, then, which shows a violation rate of 38.5 per cent would be an unfavorable sign or what we have chosen to call "a black mark," while a good work record with only 5.6 per cent failure would be favorable or "a white mark." The rates of violation either above or below the average permit the factors to be listed in the following way according to whether they are favorable or unfavorable, "white" or "black."

TABLE XXV

THE FACTORS CORRELATED WITH RECORD ON PAROLE ARRANGED ACCORDING TO
THEIR FAVORABLE OR UNFAVORABLE BEARING ON PAROLE

<i>Favorable</i>			(Above or below the group rate)			<i>Unfavorable</i>		
LENGTH OF TIME SERVED								
11 Months	408	56	13.7	2-3 Years	925	244	26.4	
1-2 Years	1103	239	21.7	3-4 Years	367	136	37.1	
				4-5 Years	116	41	35.3	
	1511	295		5 Years and Over.....	81	26	32.1	
						1489	447	
SOCIAL TYPE								
Gangster	1427	277	19.4	No class	412	110	26.7	
Immigrant	28	6	21.4	Hobo	30	12	40.0	
Farm Boy	252	38	15.1	Ne'er-do-well	472	219	46.4	
Black Sheep	137	28	20.4	Drunkard	50	17	34.0	
Criminal by Accident..	186	33	17.7	Dope	6	2	33.0	
	2030	382				970	360	
TYPE OF CRIMINAL								
First Offender	1638	290	17.7	Occasional	1124	312	27.8	
	1638	290		Habitual and Profes- sional	238	140	58.8	
						1362	452	
WORKING WHEN ARRESTED								
Yes	1450	331	22.8	No Record	107	30	28.0	
				No	1443	381	26.4	
						1550	411	
PREVIOUS CRIMINAL RECORD								
None	1864	365	19.6	Industrial School	331	130	39.3	
Police Character	45	9	20.0	Jail	332	111	33.4	
Fine or Probation.....	267	63	23.6	Reformatory	139	56	40.3	
	2176	437		Penitentiary	22	8	36.4	
						824	305	
SENTENCE								
1-2 Years	4	0	0.0	1-3 Years	2	1	50.0	
1-14 Years	347	70	20.2	1-5 Years	49	16	32.7	
2-15 Years	8	0	0.0	1-10 Years	1006	259	25.7	
3-20 Years	307	56	18.2	1-20 Years	1040	288	27.7	
10 Years to Life.....	35	5	14.3	5-20 Years	5	3	60.0	
Two or More Years..	101	19	18.8	1 Year to Life.....	80	24	30.0	
Flat	16	1	6.2					
	818	151				2182	591	

MENTAL RATING									
Favorable					Unfavorable				
C—	635	154	24.3	E	134	43	32.1		
C	972	220	22.6	D	275	85	30.9		
B	284	66	23.2	C+	557	144	25.9		
A	64	10	15.6	No record	79	20	25.3		
	1955	450			1045	292			
PERSONALITY RATING									
No Record	397	58	14.6	Feebleminded	173	64	37.0		
Normal	14	2	14.3	Ego	1122	317	28.3		
Inadequate	996	239	24.0	Sexual	15	6	40.0		
Emotional	241	40	16.6	Neuropathic and Psychotic	42	16	38.1		
	1648	339			1352	403			
PSYCHIATRIC PROGNOSIS									
Favorable	744	126	16.9	No Record	32	18	56.2		
	744	126		Doubtful	266	68	25.6		
				Unfavorable	350	117	33.4		
				No Examination	1608	413	25.7		
					2256	616			
STATEMENT OF THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY									
Factual	2052	483	23.5	No Statement	416	172	41.3		
Recommends	387	50	12.9	Protests	134	34	25.4		
	2439	533		Withdraws	11	3	27.3		
					561	209			
SIZE OF RESIDENTIAL AREA									
Open Country	348	57	16.4	No Record	121	50	41.3		
Village	64	14	21.9	Small City	1120	286	25.5		
Town	158	28	17.7	Chicago	1189	307	25.8		
	570	99			2430	643			
MOBILITY									
Resident	2446	566	23.1	No Record	15	4	26.7		
	2446	566		Transient	539	172	31.9		
					554	176			
PAROLE COMMUNITY									
Apartment House	147	31	21.1	No-Record	1010	267	26.4		
Residential	404	70	17.3	Rooming House	74	40	54.0		
Farm	465	79	17.0	Immigrant	363	98	27.0		
	1016	180		Negro	219	76	34.7		
				Small City	318	81	25.5		
					1984	562			
PUNISHMENT RECORD									
None	1773	343	19.3	No Record	82	21	25.6		
Demerit	2	0	0.0	1-2 Demotions	715	231	32.3		
	1775	343		2+ Demotions	428	147	34.3		
					1225	399			

NEIGHBORHOOD

<i>Favorable</i>			<i>Unfavorable</i>		
No Record	1290	292 22.6	Underworld	18	10 55.6
Apartment House	159	35 22.0	Hobohemia	32	10 31.2
Immigrant	384	94 24.5	Rooming House	185	78 42.2
Residential	373	66 17.7	Negro	231	80 34.6
Small City, etc.....	328	77 23.5		466	178
	2534	564			

NUMBER OF ASSOCIATES

One	1092	243 22.3	None	1005	333 33.1
Two	588	104 17.7		1005	333
Three	232	47 20.3			
Four or More.....	83	15 18.1			
	1995	409			

OFFENSE

Robbery	776	137 17.7	Larceny	646	173 26.8
Sex	50	4 8.0	Burglary	1233	349 28.3
	826	141	Fraud	235	61 26.0
			Homicide	47	14 29.8
			Other	13	4 30.8
				2174	601

NATIONALITY

American (White) ...	1672	388 23.2	American (Colored) ..	460	164 35.7
British	57	10 17.5	Austrian	38	12 31.6
Czech	21	3 14.3	French-Canadian	3	2 66.7
German	119	25 21.0	Hungarian	2	1 50.0
Greek	11	1 9.1	Irish	100	31 31.0
Italian	110	19 17.3	Russian	37	11 29.7
Jewish	57	9 15.8	Slovak	4	4 100.0
Jugo-Slav	9	1 11.1		644	225
Mexican	25	4 16.0			
Lithuanian	11	1 9.1			
Polish	186	46 24.7			
Scandinavian	53	7 13.2			
Others	25	3 12.0			
	2356	517			

LESSER PLEA

One	501	109 21.8	No Plea	2309	608 26.3
Two	190	25 13.2		2309	608
	691	134			

AGE

17 Years	68	10 14.7	22 Years	361	91 25.2
18 Years	210	38 18.1	23 Years	305	81 26.6
19 Years	383	95 24.8	24 Years	233	54 23.2
20 Years	515	129 25.0	25 Years and Over....	402	120 29.9
21 Years	523	124 23.7		1301	346
	1699	396			

FIRST JOB ON PAROLE

<i>Favorable</i>			<i>Unfavorable</i>		
Farm	486	83 17.1	No Record	279	82 29.4
Factory Labor	437	103 23.6	Labor	619	160 25.8
Clerk	223	45 20.2	Skilled Labor	232	58 25.0
Railroad and Road....	42	6 14.3	Welfare Agency	245	80 32.7
Barber	45	7 15.6	Teaming	144	44 30.6
			Mining	100	29 29.0
			Porter	87	28 32.2
			Restaurant	61	17 27.9
	1233	244			
				1767	498

LAST ASSIGNMENT IN INSTITUTION

Clerks	147	22 15.0	Furniture Factory	558	181 32.4
Officers' Kitchen	335	80 23.9	Tailor Shop	173	57 32.9
Farm	452	70 15.5	Shoe Shop	47	14 29.8
Barbers	116	16 13.8	Print Shop	161	50 31.1
Carpenter Gang, etc...	634	144 22.7	Band	89	23 25.8
			Cell-house	237	67 28.3
	1684	332	Extra Detail	51	18 35.3
				1316	410

WORK RECORD

No Record	9	1 11.1	None	13	5 38.5
Irregular	790	126 15.9	Casual	2134	607 28.4
Regular	54	3 5.6			
				2147	612
	863	130			

It is readily seen that the rates secured for many of the points hover close to the average rate of 24.7 per cent, leading us to assume that they are not particularly significant in characterizing outcome. There is no absolute way to determine just where the line should be drawn between factors which are and those which are not valuable. Nevertheless, although it would have to be arbitrarily placed, experiment proved that the scheme would be more successful if the factors which by their rates were not significant, were ruled out. Hence the line was placed in such a way as to omit any factor not showing a rate below 20.0 per cent or 30.0 per cent or over: Any factor which was not 5.0 per cent better or 5.0 per cent worse than the group rate would not be considered. This refinement revised the list so that it leaves the following points:

TABLE XXVI

THE FACTORS WHICH SHOW A RATE OF VIOLATION LESS THAN 20.0 PER CENT
OR MORE THAN 30.0 PER CENT

1 OFFENSE			
<i>Less than 20.0 per cent</i>		<i>30.0 per cent or more</i>	
<i>Factor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Factor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
Sex Crime	8.0	Other Offenses	30.8
Robbery	17.7		
2. NUMBER OF ASSOCIATES			
More Than One.....	18.4	None	33.1
3. SENTENCE			
2-15 Years	0.0	1 Year to Life.....	30.0
All Flat Sentences.....	6.2	1-5 Years	32.7
10 Years to Life.....	14.3	1-3 Years	50.0
3-20 Years	18.2	5-20 Years	60.0
Two or More Sentences.....	18.8		
4. LENGTH OF TIME SERVED			
11 Months	13.7	5 Years and Over.....	32.1
		4-5 Years	35.3
		3-4 Years	37.1
5. ACCEPTANCE OF LESSER PLEA			
Two Counts Waived.....	13.2		
6. STATEMENT OF PROSECUTING ATTORNEY			
Recommends	12.9	No Statement	41.3
7. PREVIOUS CRIMINAL RECORD			
None	19.6	Jail	33.4
		Penitentiary	36.4
		Industrial School	39.3
		Reformatory	40.3
8. PUNISHMENT RECORD			
None	19.3	1-2 Demotions	32.3
		2 or More Demotions.....	34.3
9. PREVIOUS WORK RECORD			
Regular	5.6	None	38.5
Irregular	15.9		
10. TYPE OF CRIMINAL			
First Offender	17.7	Habitual or Professional.....	58.8
11. AGE AT TIME OF PAROLE			
17 Years	14.7		
18 Years	18.1		

12. SOCIAL TYPE

<i>Less than 20.0 per cent</i>		<i>30.0 per cent or more</i>	
<i>Factor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Factor</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
Farm Boy	15.1	Drug Addict	33.0
Criminal by Accident.....	17.7	Drunkard	34.0
Gangster	19.4	Hobo	40.0
		Ne'er-do-well	46.4

13. NATIONALITY

Greek	9.1	Irish	31.0
Lithuanian	9.1	Austrian	31.6
Jugo-Slav	11.1	Negro	35.7
All Other	12.0		
Scandinavian	13.2		
Czech	14.3		
Jewish	15.8		
Mexican	16.0		
Italian	17.3		
British	17.5		

14. SIZE OF RESIDENTIAL AREA

Open Country	16.4	No Record	41.3
Town	17.7		

15. MOBILITY

Transient	31.9
-----------------	------

16. NEIGHBORHOOD

Residential	17.7	Hobohemia	31.2
		Negro	34.6
		Rooming House	42.2
		Underworld	55.6

17. PAROLE COMMUNITY

Farm	17.0	Negro	34.7
Residential	17.3	Rooming House	54.0

18. FIRST JOB ON PAROLE

Railroad Labor	14.3	Teaming	30.6
Barber	15.6	Porter	32.2
Farm	17.1	Welfare Agency	32.7

19. LAST ASSIGNMENT IN THE REFORMATORY

Barber Shop	13.8	Print Shop	31.1
Clerks	15.0	Furniture Factory	32.4
Farm	15.5	Tailor Shop	32.9
		Extra Detail	35.3

20. MENTAL AGE

Very Superior	15.6	Very Inferior	32.1
---------------------	------	---------------------	------

21. PERSONALITY RATING

Normal	14.3	Feeble-minded	37.0
No Record	14.6	Neuropathic and Psychotic.....	38.1
Emotional Unstable	16.6	Sexual	40.0

22. PSYCHIATRIC PROGNOSIS

Favorable	16.9	Unfavorable	33.4
		No Record	56.2

One additional factor, Working When Arrested, has been omitted because the percentages for working and not working both fell between 20.0 per cent and 30.0 per cent. There remain, then, twenty-two factors with a violation rate either 5 per cent lower or 5 per cent higher than the average rate. Theoretically, any individual case could fall entirely on one side or entirely on the other; he could have every point in his favor or none, or any number between 0 and 22 favorable, and the difference between that and 22 unfavorable.

Let us compare two cases by means of the following summary and determine which shows the greater likelihood of making good. Case X is at once seen to have many factors with violation rates considerably above the average, while those surrounding Case Y are below the average. Obviously we should attach our hopes for success to Y.

TABLE XXVII

X—FAILED ON PAROLE		Y—SUCCEEDED ON PAROLE	
<i>Factor</i>	<i>Violation Rate</i>	<i>Factor</i>	<i>Violation Rate</i>
Nationality		Nationality	
Colored	35.7	British	17.5
Previous Criminal Record		Previous Criminal Record	
Industrial School	39.3	None	19.6
Type of Criminal		Offense	
Habitual Offender	58.8	Robbery	17.7
Social Type		Lesser Plea	
Ne'er-do-well	46.4	Two	13.2
Number of Associates		Statement of Pros. Atty.	
None	33.1	Recommends	12.9
Work Record		Type of Criminal	
None	38.5	First Offender	17.7
Punishment Record		Length of Time Served	
Two Demotions	34.3	11 Months	13.7
Length of Time Served		Social Type	
39 Months	37.1	Gangster	19.4
Neighborhood		Work Record	
Negro Area	34.6	Irregular	15.9
Parole Community		Mental Rating	
Negro Area	34.7	Very Superior	15.6
Institution Assignment		Punishment Record	
Furniture Factory	32.4	No Punishment	19.3
		Neighborhood	
		Residential Community	17.7
		Parole Community	
		Residential	17.3

Each of the 3,000 cases was graded in similar fashion to determine in what group it would fall with respect to the average. Using the refined list of factors no case was found with more than fifteen favorable or white factors and no unfavorable, and there were no cases

with no favorable factors and more than eleven unfavorable or black. Of course, the group with the large number of favorable factors would be expected to succeed on parole, while that with no favorable points would be expected to disclose a very high violation rate. Table XXVIII gives the expectancy rate for twelve different groups of youths paroled from the reformatory at Pontiac.

TABLE XXVIII
EXPECTANCY RATES OF PAROLE VIOLATION AND NON-VIOLATION

<i>Groups of Factors Accord- ing to Num- ber of Points</i>	<i>Number of Cases</i>	<i>Expectancy Rates for Success or Failure Per Cent of Parole Violators</i>			
		<i>Minor</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Per Cent Successful</i>
15-0					
12-0	37	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
12-1					
10-0	144	2.1	2.8	4.9	95.1
10-1					
9-2	236	4.7	2.5	7.2	92.8
9-3					
7-2	485	5.8	5.3	11.1	88.9
7-3					
6-2	331	6.3	9.4	15.7	84.3
6-3					
5-2	227	6.2	11.9	18.1	81.9
5-3					
4-2	434	8.3	16.4	24.7	75.3
4-3					
3-3	409	11.5	19.1	30.6	69.4
3-4					
2-3	283	14.5	28.3	42.8	57.2
2-4					
1-4	234	12.8	36.8	49.6	50.4
1-5					
0-9	172	15.7	38.9	54.6	45.4
0-10					
0-11	8	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
All Cases	3000	8.6	16.1	24.7	75.3

The group with twelve or more favorable and no unfavorable factors represents those who have the greatest number of points conducive to success on parole, as the group with no favorable factors represents those who have the greatest number of unfavorable points. In the highest group all succeeded on parole, while in the lowest group everyone failed.

The practical value of an expectancy rate should be as useful in parole administration as similar rates have proved to be in insurance and in other fields where forecasting the future is necessary. Not only will these rates be valuable to the Parole Board, but they will be equally valuable in organizing the work of supervision. For if the probabilities of violation are even it does not necessarily mean that the prisoner would be confined to the penitentiary until his maximum was served, but that unusual precautions would be taken in placing him and in supervising his conduct. Less of the attention of the parole officers need in the future be directed toward those who will succeed without attention and more may be given to those in need of assistance.³

The table of expectancy based on the study of 3,000 cases seems statistically adequate. There is sufficient foundation for testing it in actual practice. All of the factors considered by the Parole Board have been included, as well as many others. Yet there is great room for improvement.

Individual case studies should supplement this plan. Aside from helping to understand the development of a criminal career, they will lead to a better knowledge of which of the factors like those in this study are more important in determining outcome. They will provide a basis for weighing certain factors and for gathering more detailed information on those to be employed in any scheme for predicting.

The statistical method of prediction employed in this study appears to be an improvement over the method used in the earlier report. It is the conviction of the writer that the statistical method as applied to combining factors favorable and unfavorable to parole may be still further developed and refined. The two methods already formulated are, however, quite adequate for purposes of practical use. Their employment should enable the work of parole administration to be placed on a scientific basis.

The present study provides the statistical basis, with an adequate number of cases examined, to introduce the proposed method of predicting success or failure on parole in all cases from Illinois Reforma-

³Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 248.

tory at Pontiac, now coming up for parole. If this were now introduced it would be possible within a period of two years to give the final check of actual experience to this method. With this complete demonstration the introduction of the method of parole prediction would doubtless become general in parole administration.