

1950

Addendum to Problems of Parole: A Minor Contributing Factor to Parole Adjustment

Robert M. Allen

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

Robert M. Allen, Addendum to Problems of Parole: A Minor Contributing Factor to Parole Adjustment, 41 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 55 (1950-1951)

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.

ADDENDUM TO "PROBLEMS OF PAROLE": A MINOR CONTRIBUTING FACTOR TO PAROLE ADJUSTMENT

Robert M. Allen

The author is Professor of Psychology at the University of Miami. He has been in the active practice of clinical psychology since 1934 and has hitherto taught in New York University and in Rutgers University. The "Problems of Parole" referred to in this article was published in this JOURNAL, Vol. xxxviii, Pages 7 and following. Other publications by Dr. Allen in this JOURNAL are, "A Review of Prediction Literature," Vol. xxxii, pages 548 to 554, and "A Note on the Relationship between Intelligence Level and Psychiatric Classification in Parole Risk," Vol. xxxviii, 636 to 638.—EDITOR.

A further analysis of the data previously published by the author¹ has yielded an additional minor factor that may have cumulative significance for parole adjustment and supervision.

Among the factors associated with the trial and commitment of the 200 reformatory parolees comprising the study groups was the distribution of types of crimes committed prior to incarceration.² This distribution for the successful parolee (N) group and the group of parole failures (V) may be seen in Table I.⁵

Table I
TYPES OF CRIMES³ FOR WHICH THE 200 PAROLEES
HAD BEEN ARRESTED⁴

	No. of Parolees		N	V
	N	V		
Juvenile Delinquency	66	68	17.6	17.8
Assault	11	12	2.9	3.7
Property Crimes	250	267	66.7	54.4
Sex Offenses	5	6	1.3	1.6
Drug Offenses	3	—	0.8	—
Others	40	88	10.7	23.1
	375	381	100.0	100.0

It would appear from these data that the parolees in both groups, N and V, did not differ significantly in the types of offenses committed prior to being sentenced to the state institution. The percentage of arrests for Juvenile Delinquency, Assault, Sex and Drug offenses are similar for

1. See "A Note on the Relationship between Intelligence Level and Classification in Parole Risk." This JOURNAL, Vol. 38, 1948, 636-638. "Problems of Parole." This JOURNAL, Vol. 38, 1947, 7-13.

2. "Factors in Success and Failure on Parole." Unpublished manuscript by the author, New York University.

3. Classification from Glueck & Glueck (Five Hundred Criminal Careers, 1930).

4. Including offenses for which committed to the reformatory.

5. The successful parolee (N group) completed the maximum sentence while under the extra-mural supervision of the parole case worker. The parole failure or violator (V group) was returned to the reformatory for breaking parole conditions prior to expiration of maximum sentence. (See also Note No. 1, "Problems of Parole," pp. 7-8.)

both groups. The differences worthy of note are the crimes against Property and the classification of "other crimes" which includes: disturbing the peace, vagrancy, intoxication, and petty gambling. The statistics for these indicate that as a group the successful parolees have committed many more crimes against property and fewer misdemeanors. The latter may indicate that the non-successful parolee is much more unstable emotionally and so was wont to repeat petty offenses until he "hit the big time" with a felony conviction.

The relationship between type of offense and parole outcome is small, the coefficient of contingency is .058⁶. This factor has little statistical value *per se*, but when brought into the proper context with other early life factors such as the number of arrests prior to commitment and the age of first arrest, the chances for extra-mural adjustment become qualitatively less. The same reasoning found acceptable for the relationship between the psychiatric classification and intelligence level of the parolees may well apply here. One cannot escape the implications of seemingly unmeasurable aspects of personality and adjustment.⁷

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, R. M. A review of parole prediction literature. J. CRIM. LAW CRIMINOL., 1942, 32, 548-554.
2. Lanzer, I. Forensic social case work: an analytical survey. J. CRIM. LAW CRIMINOL., 1948, 39, 34-48.

6. The maximum C value for a six-fold classification of offenses with a two-fold description of parole outcome (N and V) is .80. This highlights the statistical insignificance of the factor under discussion.

"Problems of Parole," this JOURNAL, Vol. 38, page 11.