

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF VARIABLES AFFECTING  
THE DECISION TO APPLY FOR PAROLE

by

Douglas Matt Skoog

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

February 1971

© Douglas Matt Skoog 1972



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express special appreciation to Dr. Stuart D. Johnson, my thesis advisor. His guidance made the work both stimulating and rewarding. I am also indebted to Dr. George Kagiwada and Dr. Jack Stephens for their assistance and constructive criticism. I would also like to acknowledge the assistance provided by Dr. Ed Bolt and Dr. Thomas Duffy, both of whom served on my committee.

Appreciation is also expressed to the National Parole Service regional office in Winnipeg and the Manitoba Penitentiary. Without their assistance and co-operation the study could not have been completed.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to the inmates at the Manitoba Penitentiary who participated in the study.

A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF VARIABLES AFFECTING  
THE DECISION TO APPLY FOR PAROLE

Abstract

by

Douglas M. Skoog

All persons convicted of a crime under the Criminal Code of Canada are eligible for parole at some time during their prison internment. It is necessary, however, for the inmate to make application for parole. This research was concerned with a number of variables related to the decision to apply for parole.

A group of thirty-three inmates who had not applied for parole were compared to forty-three inmates who had applied for parole. Data was obtained from Parole Service records and a questionnaire administered to inmates at the Manitoba Penitentiary.

The independent variables were: (1) frequency of prior convictions, (2) acceptance of inmate norms, (3) attitude toward parole, (4) stable non-prison relationships, (5) length of sentence, (6) level of formal education, (7) possession of job skills, (8) age, and (9) factual knowledge of the parole system. The dependent

variable was the decision to apply for parole.

The results indicated that three of the independent variables were clearly related to the parole application decision. The first was the individual's acceptance of the inmate normative structure. Inmates who accepted the convict sub-culture typically did not apply for parole. The second finding was that individuals who do not apply for parole possess a markedly negative attitude toward the parole system. The third finding showed that inmates who do not maintain social bonds with the free community frequently do not make application for parole. The research also revealed a positive relationship between acceptance of the inmate normative structure and attitude toward parole.

It was concluded that the variables that affect the parole application decision have a symbolic interactionist interpretation. The parole application decision was affected not by the attributes of the individual, but by social system in which he interacts. This research indicated that the parole application decision was strongly affected by the interplay between the inmate's social relationships within the prison setting, and his maintenance of social bonds to the free community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Outline of the Thesis . . . . .	4
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. . . . .	5
The Hypothesis. . . . .	13
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	32
Research Design . . . . .	32
Research Setting. . . . .	34
Measurement of the Variables. . . . .	35
Pretest of the Data Collection Instruments. . . . .	40
Data Collection . . . . .	40
The Interview . . . . .	44
Analysis of the Data. . . . .	45
Likert Type Scales. . . . .	47
IV. THE RESPONDENTS . . . . .	50
Respondents Included in the Research. . . . .	50
Age . . . . .	51
Race. . . . .	51
Marital Status. . . . .	53
Length of Sentence. . . . .	54
Place of Residence Prior to Commitment . . . . .	55

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. THE PAROLE APPLICATION DECISION . . . . .	58
Prior Convictions . . . . .	58
Acceptance of Inmate Norms. . . . .	60
Attitude Toward Parole. . . . .	63
Stable Non-Prison Relationships . . . . .	65
Length of Sentence. . . . .	70
Education . . . . .	72
Job Skills. . . . .	74
Age . . . . .	76
Factual Knowledge of Parole . . . . .	78
VI. CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	81
Implications and Suggestions for	
Further Research. . . . .	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	86
APPENDIX A. The Questionnaire . . . . .	94
B. Coding Instructions . . . . .	107
C. Map Indicating Ecological Zones	
Utilized. . . . .	112

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Length of Sentence and Time of Parole Eligibility Under Conditions of the 1958 Parole Act, Canada . . . . .	23
II. Age of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary. . . . .	51
III. Race of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary. . . . .	53
IV. Marital Status of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	54
V. Length of Sentence of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	55
VI. Place of Residence Prior to Present Commitment of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	56

TABLE	PAGE
VII. Size of Community Inmate Resided in Prior to Present Commitment of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	57
VIII. Record of Prior Convictions of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	60
IX. Acceptance of Inmate Norms of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	63
X. Attitude Toward Parole of Seventy-six Inmates, by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	65
XI. Non-Prison Relationships Measured by Documentary Sources of Seventy-six Inmates, by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	68
XII. Non-Prison Relationships Measured by Questionnaire of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	70
XIII. Length of Sentence of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	72

TABLE	PAGE
XIV. Level of Formal Education of Seventy-six Inmates, by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	74
XV. Job Skills of Seventy-six Inmates, by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary . . . . .	76
XVI. Age of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary. . . . .	78
XVII. Factual Knowledge of Parole Test Score of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary. . . . .	80

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

Under Canadian law all individuals convicted of an offence punishable by the Criminal Code of Canada are eligible for parole at some time during their prison internment. Under the 1958 Parole Act certain points in time are delineated at which the convict may be eligible for parole; however, it is necessary for the individual to make application for consideration (Miller, 1965:326-81). A substantial number of these individuals do not make application for parole. The present research is concerned with those individuals who do not make such application.

Those who do not apply for parole are of interest to the sociologist for a number of reasons. Inasmuch as release from the physical environs of the prison is assumed to be of prime importance to the inmate, it seems illogical for an individual not to make every effort to remove himself from it (Clemmer, 1940:151). The isolation and discomfort of prison life is so extreme and demoralizing that the decision not to extricate oneself from it at the earliest possible opportunity is paradoxical at best.

Those who choose to remain in custody and to complete

the sentence passed down by the court would seem to be at odds with many of the most basic concepts of parole and correctional procedures. "Almost all contemporary penologists agree that if a person is to be released at all, he should be released on parole," (Sutherland, 1939:643). The prevailing school of thought is that all prisoners could benefit from the guidance and controls placed on them by parole systems (Sutherland, 1939:543).

Insightful criminologists have, for many years, held that the prison experience is of dubious value and may actually encourage criminal behavior rather than deter it (Barnes and Teeters, 1959:584-86; Johnson, 1964:409; Haskell and Yablonsky, 1970:393). Lengthy sentences do not make the individual any less criminal and may in fact do just the opposite (Johnson, 1964:409). Parole is a tool which can counteract many of the dysfunctional aspects of prison life and effectively reintegrate the individual into the community.

If we are to view parole as a rehabilitative tool, and if we view the entire concept of prison as a treatment-oriented device, rather than a simple punitive effort, then some concern for the non-applicant seems warranted.

The prisoner who does not apply is of further interest because of the lack of empirical research in this area. Generalizations regarding inmates who choose not to

apply for parole have been made largely without benefit of empirical research. It is therefore felt that the present study fills a definite research gap.

The sociological aspects of decision-making are well known. No decision is made without some influence from present environment and previous experience in a socio-cultural context (Thomas, 1967:315). Certain factors must be operating which affect the decision to apply or not to apply for parole.

Clemmer (1940:151) stated that the wish for freedom is universal and ranks first among inmates. Inmates typically spend great amounts of time counting the days remaining on their sentences. It would appear that, with most inmates, the norm is clearly to leave the institution at the earliest possible date. It would not, then, seem unreasonable to assume that certain differences exist between those inmates who apply for parole and those who do not.

In the present study several variables will be investigated that either affect the parole application decision, or are common to those who do not apply. Hopefully, some insight into this phenomenon will be gained that may fill a gap in the existing literature of criminology.

### Outline of the Thesis

Chapter II contains a review of the literature and the introduction of the hypotheses. Chapter III discusses the methodology used in the research, including the research setting, the measurement of variables, data collection and the statistical approach. Chapter IV contains a description of the social characteristics of the respondents and the criteria for their inclusion in the study. Chapter V presents the results of the research. In Chapter VI some conclusions are drawn from the preceding analysis, and suggestions about possible applications of the research are made.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Parole is a legal provision for the conditional liberation of a person under sentence so that he or she may continue to serve such sentence in the community subject to certain restrictions and nearly always under supervision as a required condition. (Remple, 1961:108)

Parole in Canada, as in most Western societies, finds its roots in the seventeenth and eighteenth century European practice of transporting criminals to the New World or Australia. Canada's first parole legislation was introduced in 1898 with the passing of the Ticket of Leave Act. Canada retained the terminology "Ticket of Leave" through 1958 at which time the Parole Act was enacted. The 1958 act grew largely out of the "Fauteux Report", a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Gerald Fauteux of the Supreme Court of Canada. The committee's express purpose was to investigate the Ticket of Leave Act and to make recommendations regarding the future of parole in Canada. Their report resulted in passage of the Parole Act which provided for the establishment of a five member National Parole Board (Remple, 1961). The Board has offices in Ottawa and has jurisdiction over all adult public

offenders who have been convicted under a federal statute whether they be in a federal or provincial institution. The duties of the National Board are essentially as follows:

1. Granting parole to inmates;
2. Revoking or suspending parole;
3. Revoking or suspending any sentence of whipping; and
4. Revoking or suspending any order under the Criminal Code prohibiting any person from operating a motor vehicle. (Miller, 1965:337)

The National Parole Service serves as an administrative arm of the National Parole Board. The duties of the Parole Service are twofold.

1. The investigation of cases and the preparation of material in relation to them for consideration by the National Parole Board.
2. The supervision of parolees. (Miller, 1965:337)

The Parole Service maintains twelve regional offices across Canada. These offices are responsible for providing inmates with information about the parole system, interviewing parole applicants and preparing case files for the boards consideration.

In the Canadian setting direct parole supervision is frequently provided for by private after-care agencies such as the Salvation Army and the John Howard Society. The Federal Government provides ex gratia grants to those private after-care societies which are active in prison release programs. Typically, the after-care agency is involved in pre-release planning with the inmate, and upon

his release, functions in a counselling and supervisory capacity. Although prisoners aid societies and other community resources are utilized to a great extent the ultimate responsibility and authority for the parolee rests with the National Parole Service.

The stipulations by which the parolee must abide are for the most part standard throughout Canada. These conditions appear on the back of a parole certificate which the inmate must sign to indicate that he understands the conditions and will abide by them during his period of parole.

The general conditions applicable to all parolees are as follows:

1. To remain, until the expiry of sentence under the authority of National Parole Service Regional Representative in the designated area.
2. To proceed directly to the area designated and, immediately upon arrival and at least once a month thereafter, to report faithfully to the police nearest place of residence.
3. To accept the supervision and assistance of his supervisor.
4. To remain in the immediate designated area or such area as designated by the Regional Representative and, if good cause exists to leave this area permission must be obtained beforehand through the supervisor.
5. To endeavour to maintain steady employment and to report at once to the Regional Representative through the supervisor, any change or termination of employment or any other changes of circumstances such as accident or illness.
6. To secure advance approval from the Regional Representative, through the supervisor, if at any

time he wishes to:

- (a) purchase a motor vehicle
  - (b) incur debts by borrowing money or instalment buying
  - (c) assume additional responsibilities, such as marrying
  - (d) own or carry firearms or other weapons
7. To abide by all instructions which may be given by the supervisor or by the Regional Representative through the supervisor, and especially with regard to employment, companions, hours, intoxicants, operation of motor vehicles, medical or psychiatric attention, family responsibilities, court obligations.
  8. To abide by special conditions (if applicable).
  9. To forthwith communicate with the Regional Representative, through the supervisor, if parolee is arrested or questioned by peace officers regarding any offence.
  10. To obey the law and fulfill all legal and social responsibilities. (Remple, 1961:114-15)

Failure to meet any one of the above conditions may result in the suspension of parole by the Regional Representative. Typically, the Regional Representative issues a Warrant of Suspension and a Warrant of Apprehension which are usually executed by the police. The parolee is placed in custody and held until the National Parole Board makes a decision on the case. They have the option of revoking the Parole Certificate or allowing the individual to remain at large. If the Regional Representative issues a Warrant of Suspension, he must provide the board with a detailed report indicating the circumstances surrounding the situation. Although he may make recommendations to the Parole Board, the final decision is made by the board itself.

If the suspension is upheld and the Certificate of Parole is revoked the person in question is deemed to be serving the original sentence being credited with time served in the institution. A revocation is considered a modification of the conditions of the sentence only and therefore the National Parole Board is not answerable to anyone for its decision nor is the decision subject to appeal. (Remple, 1961:116)

Individuals who are convicted of an indictable offence, whether before or after the expiry of the actual parole period, automatically forfeit the Parole Certificate and are required to serve the remainder of their sentence as well as any additional time that the judge may impose.

All inmates who are incarcerated for violation of any section of the Criminal Code of Canada come under the jurisdiction of the National Parole Board, and each has a legal right to apply for parole.

Such parole application may emanate from the prisoner himself or from anyone else in his behalf. However, the National Parole Board expects a personal application from the prisoner as well as an indication that he is interested in parole. (Remple, 1963:117)

Criminological literature has had little to say specifically about persons eligible for parole who decide not to apply. Sutherland indicates that "Many criminals are opposed to this (parole) policy, and some of them, when the time between eligibility for parole and final discharge is not great, waive the parole hearing," (Sutherland, 1939: 643). He continues,

The criminal does not feel that he has been treated unjustly if he is forced to pay the penalty for his crime, but when he gets out of prison he wants to regard

it as finished. Parole means that the state still regards him with suspicion, keeps snooping around, and is unwilling to give him a fair chance to get along as an ordinary individual. Consequently, it has a bad effect psychologically upon the prisoner who is paroled. (Sutherland, 1939:643)

It would appear that the individual who regards himself as a professional criminal may be opposed to parole because it tends to place what he views as unnecessary restrictions upon his activities. Restrictive supervision does not enhance one's opportunities for profitable crime. Parole officers and agents more often emphasize supervision rather than guidance. Such supervision often takes the form of periodic inspection, and parole officers are often extremely skillful at detecting violations (Sutherland, 1939:647). Virtually every aspect of the Parole Agreement used in the Canadian setting is contrary to the pursuit of a successful criminal career (National Parole Board Brochure 1967; Sutherland, 1939:282-83).

A second aspect of the prisoner's occasional opposition to parole is the lingering stigma that it places on the individual in the community. Goffman (1963:3, 30) pointed out that the stigma of criminality can be particularly devastating to both the ex-convict and his family. The parolee often feels that he is "somehow different," (Sutherland, 1939:649). Or, as a respondent of Sutherland (1939:694) pointed out, "Although we walk the streets to all outward appearances free men, we wear invisible

numbers . . . ."

A great deal of work has been done on the nature of the parole system (Gluek, 1945; Dressler, 1959; Kay and Vedder, 1963; Glaser, 1964). Although they, for the most part, neglect the non-applicant, some insight into the nature of parole can be gleaned from them. There seems to be general agreement, both in the literature and in the eyes of the law, that parole is a conditional release of selected convicts prior to the completion of the court's sentence. It implies that the person continues in the custody of the state and that he may be reincarcerated in the event of misbehavior. Parole is to be distinguished from probation, clemency, or pardon. It allows a person to be moved from the highly institutionalized environment of the prison to a controlled state in the community (Kay and Vedder, 1963:43).

An underlying proposition of this project is that certain values, either learned or reinforced by prison interaction, may influence the decision to apply for parole. Cloward (1960:48) stated that, "We are led to the conclusion that the inmate elite constitutes the most important source of social control in the prison." He further indicated that recidivists found in most penal populations are convinced that it is extremely difficult to function legitimately on the outside, and thus these inmates provide a " . . . potent socializing agent, whose influence eliminates the legitimacy of institutional norms for many first offenders" (Cloward,

1960:31). The newly-initiated convict may well believe that the doors of opportunity on the outside are closed to the ex-convict and this belief may reduce his desire to leave the confines of the prison, at least while under the continued supervision of the state.

Inmates who are disinclined to resist official pressure due to strong ties to the outside world and hopes for freedom are held in low esteem by fellow prisoners. Those persons who are most likely to apply for parole are openly ostracized (Cloward, 1960:57-60). Such pressure from other inmates may contribute to an avoidance of the parole system by some individuals.

A further consideration revolves around inmates' assumptions about who will be granted and who will not be granted parole. If the nature of the convict sub-culture is as strong as the literature suggests, then the inmate who views himself as having little chance for parole may not go to the trouble to apply. This is not to say that inmate perceptions of parole criteria are correct. Ohlin points out that:

Although prisoners' views on parole selection vary according to their status as parole applicants, there is, however, a rather well defined body of beliefs in the prison community concerning the actual influences which bring about a favorable or unfavorable parole decision. It is frequently impossible to find any evidence to support these beliefs other than hearsay or the authority of constant repetition. But as long as they prevail they will be reflected in the offender's attitude toward parole selection and the parole situation. (Ohlin, 1961:24)

Rasmussen (1940), in one of the few empirical works done on prisoners' attitudes toward the parole system, points out that penal authorities, and the general public, commonly overlook inmates themselves as a source of information about parole. It is Rasmussen's contention that inmates, because of the nature of the situation in which society has placed them, have knowledge and insights of the system that no one else can obtain. He feels that no description of the parole system is complete without assessing prisoners' views on it.

#### The Hypotheses

Inasmuch as the problem explored in the present research has received little, if any, attention in the past, the following hypotheses are not closely tied to any single theoretical perspective. An attempt has been made, instead, to reach into a broad spectrum of existing literature, to formulate hypotheses and predict the direction of relationships between variables on the basis of many sources. The following portion of the chapter includes the hypotheses and the rationale for their inclusion in this study.

Hypothesis 1. There is a negative relationship between frequency of prior convictions and the decision to apply for parole

This hypothesis was selected for a number of reasons. Confirmed criminal behavior, as indicated by multiple convictions, should provide some indication that

the individual is a career criminal. Sutherland saw this first attribute of the professional criminal as being "regular work at theft." Wheeler's research (1961:710) indicates that offenders become more criminal with each offense and more criminal with each term of imprisonment.

If the idea that the confirmed criminal is likely to view parole as an unnecessary restriction has credence, this hypothesis may be fruitful in that context.

The second reason for selection of the variable, frequency of conviction, lies in the previous reference to the strength of the inmate value system and the effectiveness of the prison "grapevine". It is not difficult to believe that multiple offenders are viewed somewhat unfavorably by parole-granting authorities. Nearly all parole prediction tables use recidivism as a factor for granting parole (Ohlin, 1951). Hence, if the individual does not believe he will be granted parole, he may be less likely to apply.

The recidivist may have been, and very probably will have been, paroled at some time previously. If his parole experience was unfavorable then he may have negative attitudes toward it and hence attempt to avoid it.

Hypothesis 2. There is a negative relationship between acceptance of inmate norms and decision to apply for parole

The literature abounds with references to the

strength of the inmate social system and to certain tenets of it. Central to the rationale for inclusion of this hypothesis are two aspects of the inmate value system. First, an inmate value system does exist and it constitutes a powerful socializing influence on the individual during his prison career. Second, an integral part of this system is a universal dislike for prison authorities and, more specifically, parole boards and parole officials.

The idea of a prison sub-culture relies heavily on the concept of assimilation. Assimilation, as used here, refers to a relatively unconscious process during which a person learns enough of the culture of a social unit in which he is placed to make him characteristic of that unit (Clemmer, 1940:87).

Virtually every study of prison life makes reference to the strength and influence of inmate beliefs and controls. Clinard (1958:514) points out that the strongest influence on inmate beliefs is the convict sub-culture. He indicates that this influence is greater than that of the officials and professional persons on the prison staff. The inmate who attempts to get along with his fellow inmates and to benefit at the same time from the professional and administrative staff may find himself playing contradictory roles. Or, as Wheeler reported in his study of the inmate sub-culture:

The dominant normative order among inmates (at least in terms of power and visibility if not numbers) is strongly opposed to that of the staff. The inmate who values friendship among his peers and also desires to conform to the staff's norms faces a vivid and real role conflict. (Wheeler, 1961:704)

Sutherland (1939:668) pointed out that inmates who wish to reform are called "yellow", "rat", or "stool pigeon" by their prison peers. It is not at all unusual for inmate and official values to be at odds, with the end result that inmate values will take precedence (Clinard, 1958:513-14). The inmate value system, then, would appear to be a dynamic socializing force in prison life.

Several authors have made reference to inmate attitudes toward parole. Cloward (1960:31) and Miller (1965:345) both make reference to the incidence of ill feelings on the part of prisoners towards parole authorities. Ohlin (1951:24) contends that, although these feelings may not have any basis in fact, they profoundly affect the inmates' attitudes toward the parole situation.

Clemmer (1940:67), when speaking of inmate attitudes, comments on convicts' views of parole boards. Members of the parole board are openly slandered by prisoners. Slanted stories of isolated incidents involving parole officials are given great credence. Although the inmate may have had no significant attitudes toward parole prior to his confinement, he typically comes to accept the convict view early in his prison career.

It would seem to follow, then, that a relationship between acceptance of inmate norms and the decision to apply for parole may exist. Clemmer (1940:298-315), in his significant work on prisonization, (a neologism coined by Clemmer to refer to the assimilation of the inmate sub-culture) indicates that each inmate is more or less prisonized by the inmate sub-culture. Those persons who, for whatever reason, are less affected would be more likely to apply, and those who have accepted the inmate value system in large measure may be less likely to apply.

Hypothesis 3. There is a positive relationship between a favorable attitude toward parole and the decision to apply for parole.

Although this variable may seem somewhat self-explanatory, there are several factors which should be discussed concerning its inclusion in this research.

The inmates' attitudes toward parole, conditioned by past experience with parole, or anticipated experience in that context, may result in an unwillingness to seek parole.

There is a certain interrelationship between this hypothesis and the previous one concerning the acceptance of inmate norms. As previously suggested, the literature indicates that the parole system is often a much-despised institution. Obviously, any inmate who views the parole system as does this respondent of Rasmussen's may well be

reluctant to apply:

No group of individuals, regardless of who they be or how they are chosen, could possibly administer satisfactorily such a monstrosity as parole. The whole concept is a bizarre, distorted, legalistic aberration conceived by book-drunk freaks, administered by scoundrels, foisted upon fools, and manipulated by frauds in bishop's frocks and editorial visors. (Rasmussen, 1940:595)

If hostility toward parole is an integral part of the inmate sub-culture, then individuals who are substantially drawn into the inmate normative structure should exhibit negative feelings toward the parole system. Although no previous research has substantiated such a relationship the literature implies that attitude toward parole and the inmate normative system are related.

This hypothesis may measure several factors which the hypothesis concerning inmate norms will not measure. If the individual is extremely apprehensive about his chances for parole, he may wish to avoid failure by simply not applying. Richmond (1965:144-46) suggests that prisoners are often apprehensive about parole boards due to the structure of the boards themselves. A vast amount of decision making is necessarily done in a limited amount of time. To the prisoner, who may have spent months or even years awaiting his chance to be considered, the few minutes that the parole board spends on each case may seem hardly suited to the circumstance in which he finds himself. The inmate who knows that parole-granting authorities only act

favorably in what seems to him a small percentage of cases, may not wish to risk the pain of being turned down (Richmond, 1965:144-46).

Clemmer (1940:301) indicates that not all individuals are drawn into the inmate sub-culture to the same degree. The individual who has not been significantly affected by the inmate sub-culture may still choose not to apply due to apprehensions about life under the continuing control of the state.

Even if prisons were more successful at making significant changes in public offenders' attitudes, it would still be necessary to contend with the public's unfavorable view of "ex-cons". The public is not so opposed to the man's crime, but to the fact that he has been in prison. The paroled convict often finds it extremely difficult to cope with the stigma that society attaches to him. It is often impossible to lead any type of meaningful life with a prison record (Clinard, 1958:515-16).

The paroled individual is often easier to identify than the man who is released without supervision. When the inmate considers reporting to the parole officer, employer reports, and the other trappings of parole, he may decide it would be easier to reduce the stigma and serve out his time.

Among prison populations, the overwhelmingly common attitude among inmates is that supervision of parole is unnecessary and an obvious restraint. For many convicts

parole rules seem to be a definite hinderance to making successful adjustments in the free community (Rasmussen, 1940:588).

The rationale for inclusion of the variable attitude toward parole is thus twofold. First, attitude toward parole would appear to be a function of assimilation of inmate norms. Second, an unfavorable attitude toward parole may be related to the structure of the parole system itself, in that inmates view parole as an unwanted restriction upon release.

Hypothesis 4. There is a positive relationship between stable non-prison relationships and the decision to apply for parole.

There are several factors involved in the inclusion of non-prison relationships as a variable. Non-prison, as we use it here, includes wife, parents, siblings, girl friend, and an open category that allows for inclusion of other relatives, clergy, friends, or former employer that the inmate views as significant. Clemmer (1940:301) in his work on prisonization pointed out that the existence of positive relationships outside the walls resulted in a lower degree of assimilation of convict values. He also contended that those persons having a loved one in the free community are less likely to engage in abnormal sexual activity while incarcerated (Clemmer, 1940:257-58). Sutherland (1939:232) indicated that marital status is "important to criminality

and non-criminality because it determines the kinds of behavior patterns with which a person comes in contact." Furthermore, stable marriages and family ties are often used as a factor in predicting parole success (Sutherland, 1939: 232; Clemmer, 1940:257, 258).

This is a fairly common sense concept. The individual having positive relationships on the outside should be better motivated to seek parole than the inmate who does not. The inmate with stable contacts in the free community may also have greater opportunity for parole. The individual with a family and the opportunity for employment (which perhaps has been obtained by a family member) may be looked upon favorably by parole granting authorities. In the Canadian setting, parole authorities utilize family relationships as a consideration for the granting of parole (Miller, 1965:344).

Thus, three factors may be influenced by family relationships. First, the individual may have assimilated fewer convict norms by maintaining a frame of reference on the outside and may be better motivated to seek parole. Second, if the assumption that inmates have some knowledge of who is likely to be granted parole is correct, then the existence of stable family relationships may well influence these intuitive impressions. Third, the individual with family ties may be better able to meet the conditions of parole (i.e. employment, place to live) and therefore may be

more likely to apply.

Hypothesis 5. There is a positive relationship between length of sentence and the decision to apply for parole

Sutherland (1939:643) points out that an expression of prisoners opposition to parole is often manifested in a decision not to apply for parole when the time between eligibility and final release is not too great. This hypothesis would seem to be related to both the acceptance of inmate norms (which tends to be generally opposed to the parole system) and attitude toward parole. It was hoped that correlating length of sentence with the decision to apply for parole would serve to add an important dimension to the research design. If, for example, we found inmates having generally unfavorable attitudes toward parole and parole authorities still applying for parole, some relationship between length of sentence and decision to apply might prove crucial. Under the Parole Act of 1958 provision for time eligibility is as follows:

1. One third of the sentence or four years, whichever is the lesser, in a sentence of a term of months or years.
2. Seven years in a life sentence imposed by the court as the maximum permitted by the Criminal Code; and
3. Ten years in a life sentence commuted from a sentence of death (Canada, 1960; Miller, 1965:340).

Thus, the individual with a relatively short sentence would invest less (in terms of time behind bars) by not

applying than would the individual with a longer sentence.

The following table may serve to illustrate this point.

TABLE I. Length of Sentence and Time of Parole Eligibility Under Condition of the 1958 Parole Act, Canada

Length of sentence	2 years	4 years	5 years	10 years	12 years
1/3 of sentence (time at which eligibility occurs)	9 mos.	16 mos.	20 mos.	40 mos.	
Time remaining if inmate does not apply	15 mos.	32 mos.	40 mos.	80 mos.	in sentences of 12 years or more eligibility occurs after 4 years

Thus the penalties (in terms of prison time remaining for not applying become more severe as length of sentence increases.

The individual with a shorter sentence may prefer to serve his time in the institution and be able to regard it as finished when he leaves the institution. He may wish to do this in order to continue a life of crime without the restraints of parole, or to avoid the stigma of the parolee, or simply to be independent and without restriction upon release. However, there would appear to be a point at which

these considerations may be outweighed by the desire for freedom.

Under the Criminal Code all offenders are eligible for parole at some time during their prison career. In theory, a person sentenced to one day would be eligible for parole some time during that day (Miller, 1965:339). If indeed those persons who have short sentences constitute a significant number of the non-applicants it would appear that those whom the courts and the lawmakers have seen as the least dangerous offenders are the very persons who do not utilize a system whose aim is the rehabilitation of the offender.

Inasmuch as this research relies to some extent on the concept of internalization of convict norms and the assimilation of the convict sub-culture, some construct regarding time should be introduced. Wheeler, when studying Clemmer's major work on assimilation of the convict sub-culture (Clemmer chose to call this process prisonization) found that the time variable is of prime importance (Clemmer, 1940:87, 171; Wheeler, 1961). Wheeler's data suggests that Clemmer's concept of prisonization is more complex than Clemmer indicated. Wheeler (1961:711) found that assimilated inmate values are largely extinguished as the time for release approaches.

Two purposes are served by the hypothesis relating length of sentence to parole application. First, the

individual with a shorter sentence does not make as large a personal investment by not applying for parole as does the individual with a longer sentence. Second, prior research indicates that assimilation of inmate norms is related to temporal considerations.

Hypothesis 6. There is a positive relationship between the amount of academic education possessed by the individual and the decision to apply for parole

Individuals in today's society find it increasingly difficult to compete economically without adequate education. Advancing technology demands increasing levels of education. Typically, it requires a good education to obtain employment above the level of unskilled labor (Kahl, 1965:95).

Sutherland (1939), Barnes and Teeters (1959) and Caldwell (1965) all indicate that incarcerated offenders generally have a lower level of formal education than that of the general public.

Education and parole application may be linked for several reasons. The better educated convict may be better equipped to meet informal parole requirements than the poorly educated individual. The inmate who has a job waiting for him on release stands a better chance of being paroled than the inmate who has not secured employment. Better educated persons often have avenues of employment open to them which are not open to persons with lower levels of education (Kahl, 1965:95). Employers often

utilize job specifications which exclude individuals who have dropped out of school early in their formal educational career. The relationship to the present research is that lesser educated inmates have fewer job opportunities, and knowing that parole granting authorities use employment as a criteria for granting parole, may be reluctant to apply.

A further consideration of education and parole application involves the differences in the socialization process that exist between the school dropout and the youth who remains in school. Sutherland (1939:250) felt that the school system provided children with "certain values of a law abiding society". The dropout, on the other hand, receives a large measure of his socialization on the streets. The situation there is commonly the antithesis of the classroom experience. Youths who have left the school system at an early age frequently exhibit delinquent behavior. These individuals often have assimilated the norms of the criminal sub-culture at an early age. The school dropout may be interested in pursuing a life centered around the successful commission of crime and not wish to be impeded by parole restrictions.

Hypothesis 7. There is a positive relationship between significant job skills possessed by the individual and the decision to apply for parole.

The use of significant job skills as an independent variable is intended to measure a dimension that is not

reached by the education variable. Although the individual may have completed high school (grade 12), this does not, in all cases, mean that he is ready to enter the competitive labor market. Conversely, the individual who has dropped out of the formal educational system at a relatively early age may possess significant job skills. He may have completed an apprenticeship program, have attended a trade school which would not be included in the academic educational variable, have been trained by the armed forces for some skilled task, or have worked for several years in an industry which resulted in some on-the-job training. Recognition of job skills and parole success is suggested by the ever increasing number of penal institutions which have instituted vocational training programs in recent years (Caldwell, 1965:618).

Thus the individual who possesses saleable job skills may envision life, upon release from prison, from the perspective of law abiding society. His intention may well be to return to his trade, avoid entanglements with the law and meet the expectations of non-criminal society. Parole regulations would not be viewed by such an individual as a hinderance or obstacle to making a satisfactory adjustment. Caldwell (1965:118) points out that individuals who possess job skills may be less likely to return to a life of crime than the individual who is unable to obtain steady employment upon release.

Conversely, the individual who lacks a legitimate trade may view life on the outside in terms of making a living by illegal means. The regulations that a parolee must follow are not conducive to such an enterprise.

A further consideration is that the individual who lacks significant job skills may feel he is unable to meet the requirements of the parole system (i.e. that the inmate have some prospect for employment) and hence believe that he will not be granted parole.

The hypothetical stance taken here is that individuals with significant job skills are more likely to apply for parole than those inmates who lack such skills.

Hypothesis 8. There is a positive relationship between age and the decision to apply for parole

Crime, or at least being apprehended is primarily a phenomenon peculiar to young men. Adult males from 20-30 years of age are arrested more frequently than any other age group (Roebuck, 1967:254). Crimes of violence appear to peak at age 19 to 20 and remain constant for 5 to 10 years at which time they typically change to crimes requiring less agility and daring, or crime is abandoned entirely (Sutherland, 1939:269).

Cantor (1939:325) when citing Glueck's work, reports that "only within the factor of aging [emphasis in the original] was there a significant trend away from criminal conduct . . . ."

The passage of time brings about an accumulation [emphasis in the original] of those inclined to reform at various spans, this accumulation reaching its peak at 31-35 years. . . . If reformation has not occurred by the thirty-sixth year, it is less likely to occur thereafter. (Cantor, 1939:325)

Several authors indicate that parole success is lower with younger offenders (Sutherland, 1939:655; Dressler, 1959:119). Although society has a tendency to be more inclined to help the younger offender, the reality of the matter is that he is more prone to recidivism than are older offenders. If a pattern exists, as the literature suggests, age may be a meaningful variable with respect to parole application.

If increasing age brings about a curtailment of criminal activities then it would not seem unreasonable to assume that the older inmate would be more likely to seek parole. Individuals who wish to reform are not substantially drawn into the inmate sub-culture (Clinard, 1958:514). They are more likely to conform to the staff normative structure and thus view parole favorably.

The younger offender, on the other hand, may have no intention of foresaking a criminal career and choose not to apply in order to avoid close supervision upon release.

Hypothesis 9. There is a positive relationship between factual knowledge about the parole system and the decision to apply for parole

Goffman (1961:210-16), when speaking of total institutions, indicates that individuals who have "an

intimate" knowledge of the formal system are better able to "work" the system. The point is that those inmates who have knowledge of the institution are in a better position to make the system work for them.

This would seem to lend credence to the idea that prisoners who have some knowledge of the factual workings of the parole system may be more likely to avail themselves of it. On the other hand, the individual who has little knowledge of the system may fear it or become insecure when involved in it.

It is important to point out here that the quality of "knowledge" that is relevant to this hypothesis is to be distinguished from the "knowledge" referred to when discussing inmate norms. Inmate's so-called "knowledge" of the parole system often has little relationship to reality and instead constitutes what might best be described as a negative mythology. This hypothesis deals instead with the inmates grasp of factual information about the parole system in Canada.

Although most prisoners have access to information about parole (a handbook published and circulated by the National Parole Board (1966) is theoretically available to all inmates), some may not seek such information, or, because of some personal deficiency such as illiteracy, may not comprehend the material presented.

It is hypothesised that individuals with low levels

of knowledge concerning the parole procedure will be less likely to apply.

These, then, are the hypotheses tested in the present study, along with a review of the relevant literature from which they were derived.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Research Design

There are a number of ways in which information concerning inmates who do not apply for parole might be gathered. Participant observation has been used in past criminological research. This approach was rejected due to time considerations and the limited number of inmates that the researcher could contact using such a technique. Festinger and Katz (1953:72) point out that participant observation often presents "practical difficulties" as it consumes great amounts of time.

Two other approaches seemed applicable. The first is the analysis of institutional records, and the second, the use of an interview schedule or a questionnaire (Festinger and Katz, 1953:15-56, 300-27; Phillips, 1966:77, 107-33; Young, 1966:12, 21, 214-73). There are several relevant considerations to be taken into account. One is the accuracy of information that inmates themselves will provide. Rasmussen (1940) indicates that research in penal institutions is unique in that the researcher is often dealing with an embittered, hostile population. The use of institutional records alone would provide more accurate data,

and thus minimize the possibility of obtaining erroneous information. Such an approach would not, however, provide attitudinal information which the literature indicated was crucial to the problem.

The approach that was chosen combined the use of institutional records and the administration of a questionnaire. Inmate records were utilized to identify individuals who met the criteria for inclusion in the study, and to provide background characteristics of those who became respondents. It was felt that the use of documentary sources served to minimize erroneous information regarding a number of variables. A questionnaire was constructed to measure variables dealing with attitudes and social perception.

The research is based on a cross sectional technique; that is, a "slice out of time" is taken and analyzed. This method allows the researcher to determine the characteristics of a population at a given point in time (Goode and Hatt, 1952:100; Festinger and Katz, 1953:22; Young, 1966:13-21, 131-33).

A control group was used in the present research to provide comparability. Inasmuch as a central concept of the research is that certain differences exist between those inmates who apply for parole and those who do not it is felt that inclusion of a control group was imperative (Festinger and Katz, 1953:84-115). The control group was composed

entirely of inmates who had applied for parole but had not been notified of the outcome of their application. The experimental group was composed entirely of inmates who had passed their date of eligibility and had chosen not to apply.

No sampling technique has been utilized in the present research. Initial meetings with the National Parole Service and Manitoba Penitentiary personnel revealed that the universe of non-applicants would probably not exceed fifty in number. Therefore, a decision was made to include all individuals who had passed their application date without giving any indication of intent to apply.

The control group similarly constitutes a universe. All individuals who had applied for parole but had not been notified of the outcome of their application were placed in the control group. Thus, the two populations were enumerated rather than sampled.

### Research Setting

The site of the study was the Manitoba Penitentiary located at Stony Mountain, Manitoba. The Manitoba Penitentiary is a Federal Institution administered by the Department of Justice through its Commissioner of Penitentiaries. It is one of nine medium security institutions in Canada. The grounds are divided into two major areas, one a walled complex and the other a farm annex. The farm annex represents a less security conscious area and is

utilized for housing offenders who are able to function in such a setting. Inmates are typically moved from the walled area to the annex and then released. Vocational training is offered for individuals housed in the walled complex. Work stations at Stony Mountain are similar to many northern United States and Canadian institutions. Inmates work in food preparation, a machine shop, shoe shop, sheet metal, tailor shop, change room, janitorial services, carpentry, steam engineering, electrical service, plumbing and masonry. Although the inmate population is subject to some fluctuation it remains around 450 in number.

Initial data concerning the inmates included in the project was obtained through the National Parole Service Office in Winnipeg, Manitoba. Permission was obtained from the Parole Service Regional Representative to research their records.

The records in the Parole Service office contained all pertinent information with regard to the inmates' criminal careers as well as social, educational, and employment histories. No pertinent case had to be excluded from the study due to a lack of information in the Parole Service files.

#### Measurement of the Variables

The dependent variable was parole application. This forms a natural dichotomy and was defined in the following

way for the present research. The "parole applicants" are those individuals who had made written application to the National Parole Board for consideration for parole, but who had not yet been notified of the outcome of their applications. The "non-applicants" are defined as those individuals who had passed the date of eligibility to apply for parole and had chosen not to apply.

The independent variables follow with an explanation of the instruments utilized for their measurement.

The form used for recording social background characteristics and the questionnaire employed in the study are presented in Appendix A.

Frequency of prior convictions. Parole Service Records which contain the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Fingerprint Section Arrest and Conviction Records were utilized for determining the number of prior convictions. Only convictions were counted. Arrests which did not result in a conviction were excluded.

Acceptance of inmate norms. The instrument used to measure the extent to which inmates accepted the norms of the inmate population was developed by Stanton Wheeler (1961) as a test of Clemmer's concept of prisonization. This instrument consists of scale items involving hypothetical conflict situations which are used as an index of conformity to staff role expectations. Wheeler felt that although

such an index may measure only a part of the complex phenomena referred to by Clemmer as prisonization, it "does seem to get at a central core: the acceptance or rejection of norms and role definitions applied to inmates by prison staff" (Clemmer, 1940; Wheeler, 1961:700). Wheeler also utilized two items to measure the extent of inmate involvement in the informal life of the prison community. These two items, one aimed at intensity and the other at extensity of involvement were utilized in the present study (Clemmer, 1940; Wheeler, 1961).

Attitude toward parole. The data collection instrument utilized to measure attitude toward parole was designed by the researcher. The existing literature on inmates attitudes toward the parole system was examined and items constructed that would hopefully differentiate between the applicants and non-applicants (Young, 1966:358-66; Phillips, 1966:118-22).

The resulting scale contains twenty-three items. The concept of attitude in the present research is defined as the individuals inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, perceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specific topic (Thurstone, 1928: 529-31). The items utilized on the attitude toward parole scale represent a broad spectrum of concepts relating to parole as suggested by Likert (1937).

Stable non-prison relationships. Two sources of information were utilized to measure stable non-prison relationships. The first was information contained in the Parole Service case records. The second involved a series of items in the questionnaire. These questions provide a measure of the individuals intensity and extensity of relationships in the free community. A four category typology was developed which allowed combining the intensity and extensity factors for purposes of data analysis.

Length of sentence. The inmates length of sentence was obtained from Parole Service records. In cases where the individual had received several sentences (i.e. two years for theft and one year for forgery to be served consecutively) the total was recorded. If the sentences were concurrent the total time to be served was utilized.

Academic Education. The respondents level of academic education was obtained from Parole Service records. Many of the individuals had dropped out of school at some point during a particular school year. Only the last year completed was recorded since it was questionable how much actual learning had taken place during the uncompleted year. This is consistent with most public and private employment agencies who utilize last year completed.

Job Skills. Information regarding job skills was

also taken from Parole Service records. The inmates were placed into occupational types according to a method suggested by Roebuck. Roebuck's scheme utilizes four categories. They are as follows:

1. Skilled laborer - Inmate worked for at least 6 mos. as a skilled laborer, which is defined as a worker who used tools and processes which are usable only by one who has been trained for a period of time (over 6 mos.) in trade school or as an apprentice. He was familiar with the technical aspects of his skilled job.
2. Semi-skilled laborer - The semi-skilled worker used tools and processes requiring some training and he worked for at least 6 mos. as a semi-skilled laborer. He had experience under guidance or study at the trade. The processes, however, were not greatly complicated and the period of training was short (3 mos.).
3. Unskilled laborer - The inmate worked at any kind of rough task for which he had no training. Mere strength of hand or keenness of eye--untutored through any course of apprenticeship training--was the only requirement.
4. Clerical worker or other - self explanatory.  
(Roebuck, 1967:276-77)

The Dictionary of Occupational Titles (1965) was consulted to determine placement of specific jobs in the four categories. This dictionary provides a description of specific jobs, as well as the physical demands, working conditions and amount of training required in the occupation.

Age. Age was determined from Parole Service Records. In all cases age at last birthday was utilized.

Factual knowledge of parole. A thirteen item true-

false test was designed to measure factual knowledge of parole. The questions were constructed entirely from literature published by the National Parole Board. The major source was the Handbook on Parole (National Parole Board: 1966) which is a guide for inmates concerning parole.

#### Pretest of the Data Collection Instruments.

The questionnaire was pretested to provide a test of the clarity of questions and of the correctness of interpretation put upon the questions by respondents (Young, 1966:207). Residents of a National Penitentiary Service Community Release Center located in Winnipeg, Manitoba were utilized in the pretest. The pretest respondents had recently been provisionally released from the Manitoba Penitentiary. The individuals involved in the pretest were interviewed by the researcher after they completed the questionnaire. Their criticisms of the instrument resulted in several structural changes and the addition of one item on the attitude toward parole scale.

#### Data Collection

Initial data collection took place at the National Parole Service Offices in Winnipeg. There was some question in the mind of the researcher whether all of the inmates were fully informed regarding the date on which they could apply for parole. The application date is determined by the Parole Service by subtracting five months from the date

the individual is eligible for parole (i.e. five months before they are eligible to leave the institution on parole). Two methods were used to determine if each individual was cognizant of his application date. First, each inmate received written notice indicating his application date. Examination of the case files revealed that a carbon copy of this correspondence was kept in the inmate's file. Copies were found, without exception, in every file examined. A second check consisted of the inmate's knowledge of his application date as revealed by questionnaire responses. Two questions were asked concerning whether or not the individual was eligible and whether or not he had applied. All respondents provided the researcher with this information. It was therefore concluded that all informants possessed the knowledge necessary to make application for parole.

Compiling the list of non-applicants proved difficult. The Parole Service had no clear listing of inmates who were eligible but had not applied for release on parole. As a result it was necessary to examine a master index card for each individual who had been committed to the Manitoba Penitentiary. The procedure followed was to begin with the most recent admission and work backwards chronologically. The Manitoba Penitentiary is a medium security institution and few inmates are serving sentences of five years or more. As the researcher proceeded back in time,

fewer and fewer cases were found that were still in the institution. By the year 1960, a point of diminishing returns was reached. No usable records were found (applicants or non-applicants) among the 1960-1962 admissions. A check was made with prison officials who were unable to mention any inmates admitted prior to 1960 who had not applied for parole. It is therefore highly unlikely that any case was missed due to the selection of 1960 admissions as the cut off point for data collection.

The form entitled "Inventory of Social Characteristics" was filled out entirely from the records at the Parole Service Office. Documents utilized included the following:

1. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police Fingerprint Section report of prior arrests and convictions.
2. Police Reports.
3. Pre-sentence reports.
4. Institutional classification reports.
5. Newcomer's Questionnaire from penitentiaries and corresponding forms from Provincial prisons.

The form is presented in Appendix A.

The enumeration of inmates who comprise the control group was obtained by utilizing the list of recent applicants maintained by the Parole Service.

Festinger and Katz (1953:114-15) point out that control groups should be treated in the same manner as the

experimental group whenever possible. Following their suggestion the same documents were utilized for both groups when completing the Inventory of Social Characteristics.

With the exception of three items, collection of data concerning social characteristics of the informants was straightforward and uncomplicated.

Information on marital status occasionally proved somewhat contradictory at various points in the case file. Several cases were listed as married on one document and common-law on another (or similar combinations). In most cases the conflict was resolved by reading through the entire case file. In cases where this did not provide an explanation the most recent document was accepted.

Data collection concerning family interest was handled in the following manner. The researcher read each document in relevant case files that contained information about the inmate's family relationships. An overall impression was thus gained and notations made regarding which, if any, family members maintained an interest in the inmate. Relative strength of interest in the inmate was arranged in a three category scheme consisting of low, medium, and high interest. Placement of inmates into one of the three categories was not done on the basis of total numbers of persons who maintained an interest in the inmate but rather on the intensity of relations with any persons outside the institution. Thus, an individual whose parents

had no interest in the inmate but whose wife was clearly interested in continuing contact with the individual and maintaining the marital bond would be classified as "high". The approach here is one of qualitative analysis of written material (Festinger and Katz, 1953:421-22). Such an approach allows for systematic description of symbolic communication (Festinger and Katz, 1953:422-23; Phillips, 1966:221-22).

Prior Conviction data included only offenses for which the individual had been convicted. Dismissals, cases dropped and other outcomes short of conviction were not counted. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police Fingerprint Section record of arrests and convictions was the documentary source used for this purpose.

### The Interview

Respondents were divided into groups of ten for purposes of administering the questionnaires. The individual inmates included in the research received passes instructing them to report to the administration building of the prison at a specified time. Each group of ten inmates was seated in a conference room and the researcher introduced himself as a graduate student from the University of Manitoba. The project was described as a study of the parole system in Canada. The researcher explained that individual opinions were important as were the opinions of inmates in general.

The primary emphasis of the short introduction was a guarantee of anonymity to the inmates. Emphasis was placed on the fact that no official from the Penitentiary Service or the Parole Service would be allowed to see the questionnaires. Rasmussen (1940) points out that a convincing guarantee of anonymity is of vital importance in penal research.

Most individuals were able to complete the questionnaire in thirty minutes with some running as long as one hour. Respondents who were functionally illiterate were seen individually and the instrument was read to them.

#### Analysis of the Data

Goodman and Kruskal's tau-b ( $T_b$ ) was chosen to measure the degree of association between the dependent variable and the various independent variables throughout the project.  $T_b$  has several advantages in the context of the present research. As a measure of association  $T_b$  allows the researcher to summarize the strength of the relationship between two variables (Blalock, 1960:227). Measures of association further allow comparison of several relationships and reach a conclusion as to which is the strongest (Blalock, 1960:227). In the context of the present research such an approach is particularly applicable because nine independent variables are being related to a single dependent variable.

Tb is of further value as it meets the conditions of a "proportional reduction in error" measure as outlined by Costner (1965). All proportional reduction in error measures of association have a common logic.

Briefly stated, that common logic entails the determination of the prediction error expected from knowledge of the marginals and a specification of the degree to which that error may be reduced by a prediction rule utilizing knowledge of a second variable. (Mueller, 1970:247)

For purposes of sociological research, measures that represent the predictability of one variable from knowledge of another appear to provide the most useful measures. (Costner, 1965:342)

Goodman and Kruskals tau-b provides values between 0 and +1 inclusive; +1 is the case of "complete association", and 0 is the case of "independence" (Goodman and Kruskal, 1954:760). Blalock (1960:232) points out that the ability to interpret values between 0 and +1 has an "intuitive meaning" and would seem superior to measures based on chi square.

Tb is a measure of association for the investigation of the relationships between two nominal scales. Although a case could be made for treating all the independent variables in the present research as ordinal level data, no measure of association which has a proportional reduction in error interpretation has been devised which allows analysis of an independent ordinal variable and a nominal dependent variable. The arguments made in favor of the use of proportional reduction in error measures by the

preceeding authors (Goodman and Kruskal, 1954; Blalock, 1960; Costner, 1965) would appear to outweigh the losses made by reducing certain variables to nominal level data.

Recognizing that  $T_b$  is a measure of association the present research also utilizes a test of significance. Winch and Campbell (1969:140) point out that although tests of significance seldom "prove" a hypothesis "the social scientist is better off for using the significance test than for ignoring it". Blalock (1960) suggests four tests of significance that might be applicable in the present research; runs test, Mann-Whitney U test, Wilcoxon matched pairs signed ranks test and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Blalock, 1960:187-210). Of the four the Kolmogorov-Smirnov is the most useful in the context of the present research. The Smirnov (following Blalock it was decided to drop the first portion of the name) test is designed to allow the placing of data in ordered categories without being either "invalidated or made unusually cumbersome by the presence of large numbers of ties" (Blalock, 1960:203). "The test statistic used in the Smirnov test is the maximum difference between two distributions" (Blalock, 1960:203). It is a test of whether two independent samples have been drawn from the same population (Siegal, 1956:127). The Smirnov test is particularly useful in the present research as a relatively small number of cases and scales with few items tend to produce ties and the need for the ordering of

categories. The .05 level of significance is used to reject a hypothesis of no difference in the present research (Mueller, 1970:401).

### Likert Type Scales

Likert type scales were utilized on the section dealing with attitude toward parole and Wheeler's measure of prisonization. The Likert scale utilizes a series of statements which are expressive of a wide range of attitudes toward a particular question or object. The statements emphasize values rather than facts. A response continuum follows each statement which allows the subject to check or underline a response ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Response continuums typically range from three to six responses with occasional variation of the wording of responses to suit the needs of the researcher (Likert, 1937; Goode and Hatt, 1952:274-82; Phillips, 1966: 184-85; Young, 1966:358-59). In the five-point continuum, for example, weights of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 are assigned to the various responses, the direction of weighting being determined by the favorableness or unfavorableness of the item (Young, 1966:359). A total score for each respondent completing the scale is obtained by summing the value of each item that is checked.

The attitude toward parole section, which was designed for the present project, utilizes a five-point

response continuum as suggested by Likert (1937). The internalization of inmate norms scale, which was developed by Wheeler (1958, 1961), utilizes a four-point response scheme with the exception of one item which utilized two possible responses. This was a direct application of Wheeler's scale.

Both scales were subjected to the "criterion for internal consistency" method suggested by Likert (1967). The criterion for internal consistency method provides for the selection of items that will consistently separate those people who are "high" from those who are "low" on the attitude continuum (Goode and Hatt, 1952:275). Likert (1967) referred to statements that fail to measure what the rest of the statements in a scale measure as "undifferentiating" and commented that "the statement does not measure what the battery measures and hence to include it contributes nothing to the scale" (Likert: 1967). The criterion of internal consistency utilizes the responses of the group that constitutes one extreme on the attitude being measured and compares them with the responses of the group that constitutes the other extreme.

The difference of the means of the two groups (high and low scores) is computed to determine the discriminatory power of each item. Likert (1967:93) pointed out that the criterion for internal consistency yields essentially the same results as item analysis without the laborious

calculations necessary in item analysis.

Likert suggested utilizing the high and low deciles for purposes of comparison. The present research utilized the upper and lower quartile approach suggested by Goode and Hatt (1952:276) as it was felt that, in view of the relatively small number of cases, ten per cent might include only deviant cases. In instances where quartile distributions contained several tied scores, all cases on the particular cutoff point were included.

Items in which the difference between the means of the high quartile and the low quartile was less than 1.00 were excluded from the scales (Goode and Hatt, 1952:276).

When the criterion for internal consistency was applied, the results indicated that items 2, 3, and 20 in the attitude toward parole scale failed to differentiate between the upper and lower quartile and were excluded.

The results further indicated that items 6 and 7 should be excluded from Wheelers measure of staff-inmate role expectations.

A discussion of the items excluded from Wheeler's scale is contained in Chapter V. Appendix A may be consulted for identification of the excluded items.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE RESPONDENTS

#### Respondents Included in the Research

Of the list of potential candidates for inclusion in the study compiled from Parole Service records ninety-two individuals were in the institution at the time of the study. A total of seventy-six inmates were eventually included in the findings. The seventy-six respondents were comprised of forty-three applicants and thirty-three non-applicants.

Of the ninety-two individuals available to the researcher, three had recently been advised of the outcome of their parole applications and thus did not fit the criteria for inclusion in the study. Despite efforts to check each questionnaire as it was completed, one had to be excluded as it lacked both name and inmate number. One man read only Italian and spoke virtually no English. Another individual had visual problems and was not amenable to having the researcher read the questions to him. Ten inmates were outright refusals.

The refusal rate of 10.8 per cent is only slightly above the 10 per cent average suggested by Stephan and McCarthy (1958). Stephens and Reid (1970) report a 10 per

cent refusal rate in non-penal settings in Manitoba. In view of the unique research setting of the present research it is not felt that the refusal rate is unusually high.

### Age

The respondents ranged in age from seventeen to sixty. More than half (65 per cent) were under thirty. This is consistent with most penal populations (Sutherland, 1939:269).

A frequency distribution by age and parole application status is presented in Table II.

TABLE II. Age of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Age at last birthday	Both Groups		Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
0 - 19	5	7	5	12	0	0
20 - 29	44	58	23	53	21	64
30 - 39	19	25	11	26	8	24
40 - 49	7	9	3	7	4	12
50 and over	1	1	1	2	0	0
	76	100	43	100	33	100

### Race

The respondents were exclusively White, Indian or

Metis (i.e. descendents of unions between Native Indians and Whites, principally Europeans). It was difficult to accurately distinguish between the Indians and Metis in the institutional records, and hence, the two groups have been listed together in the present research. The number of Indians and Metis in the Manitoba Penitentiary is disproportionate to their frequency in the general population. Data gathered in 1965 showed 22.5 per cent of the institutional population to be Indian or Metis. Disproportionate representation of Indians and Metis in institutional populations is common in the Canadian setting (Canadian Corrections Association, 1967). The seemingly high percentage of Indians and Metis (21 per cent) in the present research does not reflect a bias in the selection of cases, rather it reflects the racial distribution in the institutional population.

A frequency distribution of the race of the respondents by parole application status is presented in the following table.

TABLE III. Race of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

	Both Groups		Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
White	60	79	37	86	23	70
Indian and Metis	16	21	6	14	10	30
	76	100	43	100	33	100

#### Marital Status

Roebuck (1967:253) reports that "studies show a higher proportion of criminals than of the general population to be unmarried or to have failed in marriage." The respondents in the present research reflect this. Sixty-four per cent were either single, divorced or separated.

The following table contains the data concerning the marital status of the respondents.

TABLE IV. Marital Status of Seventy-six Inmates  
by Parole Application Status, 1970,  
Manitoba Penitentiary

	Both Groups		Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Married	18	24	10	23	8	24
Single	40	53	23	53	17	52
Divorced or Separated	8	11	3	7	5	15
Common-Law	10	13	7	16	3	9
Widowed or other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	100	43	100	33	100

#### Length of Sentence

Because the Manitoba Penitentiary is a medium security institution most inmates have relatively short sentences. The respondents included in the present research reflect the nature of a medium security institution. Seventy-seven per cent had sentences of less than three years. Only 6 per cent had sentences of four or more years. Provincial institutions are normally charged with maintenance of all inmates with sentences of less than two years. The present research includes five cases with sentences of less than two years. These respondents are parole violators who were returned to the Federal Penitentiary system. All five of these cases met the criteria for inclusion in one of the

two populations and have therefore been included.

Table V describes length of sentence by parole application status for the seventy-six respondents.

TABLE V. Length of Sentence of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Length of sentence in years	Both Groups		Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
0 - 1.9	5	7	3	7	2	6
2.0 - 2.9	53	70	29	67	24	73
3.0 - 3.9	13	17	9	21	4	12
4.0 - 5.9	4	5	1	2	3	9
6 and over	1	1	1	2	0	0
	76	100	43	100	33	100

#### Place of Residence Prior to Commitment

More than half of the respondents were residing in greater Winnipeg at the time of their commitment. Inasmuch as the Manitoba Penitentiary is a federal institution, a substantial number of the respondents were committed from provinces other than Manitoba.

The ecological zones are based on the areas contained between concentric circles emanating from Winnipeg. Zone 1 is a 25 mile radius around Winnipeg and contains the area commonly referred to as metropolitan Winnipeg. Zone 2

was drawn at a distance of 200 miles. Zones 3 and 4 are drawn at 600, and 1,000 miles respectively.

A map is presented in Appendix C indicating the ecological zones utilized.

Table VI presents the respondents place of residence prior to present committment.

TABLE VI. Place of Residence Prior to Present Committment of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

	Both Groups		Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Zone 1	41	54	28	65	13	39
Zone 2	5	7	3	7	2	6
Zone 3	12	16	5	12	7	21
Zone 4	14	18	6	14	8	24
Zone 5	4	5	1	2	3	9
	76	100	43	100	33	100

The respondents were typically urban dwellers at the time of their committment. Seventy-two per cent were from cities of over 100,000. Haskell and Yablonsky (1970: 40) report that the crime rate per 100,000 inhabitants is almost twice as high in metropolitan areas as it is in smaller cities. Urban crime rates are more than three times higher than crime rates in rural areas. The respondents

in the present study are consistent with prior research relating crime to large urban population centers.

Table VII illustrates the size of the communities the respondents resided in prior to their present committment.

TABLE VII. Size of Community Inmate Resided in Prior to Present Committment of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Population of community	Both Groups		Applicant		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
0 - 2,500	10	13	5	12	5	15
2,501-10,000	6	8	3	7	3	9
10,001-50,000	3	4	1	2	2	6
50,000-100,000	2	3	0	0	2	6
100,001 and over	55	72	34	79	21	64
	76	100	43	100	33	100

In summary, the respondents were typically single males under the age of thirty. Most were serving sentences of under four years. The respondents were commonly urban dwellers prior to their committment and about half were from metropolitan Winnipeg. Slightly less than a quarter of the inmates included in the study were of Indian or Metis ancestry. This is representative of the racial distribution of the research setting.

## CHAPTER V

### THE PAROLE APPLICATION DECISION

The following chapter contains the results of the study. Here the nine hypotheses are tested and their ability to explain the parole application decision is discussed.

#### Prior Convictions

It was hypothesized that a negative relationship existed between the number of prior offenses and the decision to apply for parole. The data indicated that the relationship was not significant at the .05 level. There were, however, several considerations that should be discussed regarding this finding.

The first is that the data indicated a general trend in the direction hypothesized. The ability to predict 14 per cent of the variance, as measured by  $T_b$ , indicated that knowledge of the inmates record of prior convictions provides some indication that prior convictions and the decision to apply for parole are related. A second consideration was that the inmate's record of prior convictions may not be the only indicator of confirmed criminal behavior. This variable was chosen essentially as a result

of indications in the literature that the individual who views himself as a career criminal might avoid the restrictions that the parole system places on recently released offenders.

Sutherland, (1937) in his work on the "professional thief", indicated that the individual who organized his life around the successful commission of crime may not have a lengthy conviction record. He is apprehended less often, utilizes legal counsel to the best advantage and has greater knowledge of methods, such as "pay offs" to keep the case out of court.

The point is that the use of prior conviction records as a measure of confirmed criminal behavior may not have provided an adequate indicator of such a life pattern. It is difficult to suggest what might provide a better method for classifying inmates along this dimension. It is somewhat doubtful that individuals would divulge their criminal histories voluntarily.

In the context of the present research it can only be concluded that while the inmates record of prior convictions appeared to have some relationship to differential parole application it was not a crucial variable.

The relationship between the parole application decision and prior convictions is presented in table VIII.

TABLE VIII. Record of Prior Convictions of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Prior Convictions	Applicant		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
first offender	7	16	0	0
2-5 prior convictions	12	28	6	18
6-10 prior convictions	13	30	9	27
11-20 prior convictions	8	19	13	39
21 or more prior convictions	3	7	5	15
	43	100	33	100

$$T_b = .14$$

$$X^2 = 3.2264 \text{ (Smirnov test)}$$

$$P < .20$$

#### Acceptance of Inmate Norms

The present research shows a strong negative relationship between the acceptance of inmate norms and the decision to apply for parole. Individuals who do not apply for parole show a greater acceptance of the inmate normative structure than do those who chose to apply. The variable, acceptance of inmate norms, explains 48 per cent of the variance as measured by  $T_b$ . This would seem to substantiate the contention that an integral part of the inmate value system and normative structure is not only a dislike for

prison authorities but an apparent dislike of the parole system as well. Prior research in penal settings clearly indicated that the strongest influence on inmate beliefs is the convict sub-culture (Clinard, 1958:514). Inmates who are substantially drawn into the inmate sub-culture are typically non-applicants. If it can be assumed that a portion of the inmate sub-culture is the existence of ill feelings toward the parole system, then it would appear from these data that the aversion to parole is, in part, learned within the prison setting.

The scale utilized to measure acceptance of inmate norms was an adaptation of Stanton Wheeler's 1958 work in a western United States prison setting. He had utilized two items to measure the degree of inmate involvement in the informal life of the convict community. One item measured the extensivity of involvement by utilizing the number of close friends the individual had in the institution as an indicator. The second item reflected the intensity of involvement by asking the inmate if he spends his free time alone or with other inmates. Analysis of Wheeler's scale, utilizing the criteria for internal consistency, indicated that these two items failed to differentiate between respondents in the present research. As a result of this the scale scores reported below utilize only the first five items. Wheeler himself was unable to specify clearly the relationship between involvement and conformity to staff-

inmate role expectations, although he felt that a relationship existed. The failure of the present research to substantiate this relationship could be a function of two things. First, Wheeler controlled for the length of time served. The present research did not control for that variable. Second, some differences exist between Wheeler's research setting and the one used in the present research. The excluded items are presented in Appendix A.

The use of the first five items did, however, provide significant discrimination between the two groups and the conclusion that the non-applicants conform much more closely to inmate role expectations than do the applicants is therefore justified.

The following table presents the data concerning the relationship between acceptance of inmate norms and the parole application decision.

TABLE IX. Acceptance of Inmate Norms of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Scale Score *	Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
0 - 5	0	0	3	9
6 - 10	3	7	21	64
11 - 15	32	74	9	27
16 - 20	8	19	0	0
	43	100	33	100

$$T_b = .48$$

$$\chi^2 = 23.9736 \text{ (Smirnov test)}$$

$$P < .001$$

\*low scores indicate that respondents adhere closely to inmate role expectations; high scores indicate respondents adhere closely to staff role expectations.

#### Attitude Toward Parole

It was hypothesised that a positive relationship existed between a favorable attitude toward parole and the decision to apply for parole. The relationship was found to be significant at the .001 level as measured by the Smirnov test.

The value of  $T_b$ , the measure of association was found to be .52. This indicates that knowledge of an individual's attitude toward parole will reduce errors by

over 50 per cent in predicting whether or not that individual will apply for parole.

This finding provided further evidence for the view that the inmate social system includes a distain for parole and parole granting authorities. The researcher is not aware of any prior empirical test that clearly marked the relationship between assimilation of the inmate normative system and attitude toward parole. Prior work, such as that of Goffman, Clemmer and Wheeler, has focused on inmate attitudes toward factors within the institution and not on parole, which may be viewed as external.

There are several other considerations within the framework of inmates' attitudes toward parole. Rasmussen (1940) has pointed out that prison populations view parole as an obvious and unnecessary restraint. Those inmates who hold this attitude may do so for several reasons. The inmate may be concerned about his chances for parole, and hence, answer in a negative fashion. Similarly, he may be apprehensive about the stigma that society attaches to parolees and have concerns about what life will be like under the continued supervision of the correctional system.

The relationship between attitude toward parole and the parole application decision is presented in table X.

TABLE X. Attitude Toward Parole of Seventy-six Inmates, by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Scale Score*	Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
30 - 39	0	0	6	18
40 - 49	1	2	15	45
50 - 59	10	23	7	21
60 - 69	23	53	2	6
70 - 79	7	16	3	9
80 - 89	2	5	0	0
	43	100	33	100

Tb = .52

$X^2 = 11.8040$  (Smirnov test)

P < .001

\*low scores represent unfavorable attitude toward parole; high scores indicate favorable attitude toward parole.

#### Stable Non-Prison Relationships

It was hypothesized that individuals who maintain a frame of reference outside the institution are more likely to apply for parole than those who do not. Two measures of this relationship were utilized in the present research. The first measure was the use of case records as a source of information. The second was a series of items in the

questionnaire.

The data obtained utilizing case records is significant at the .001 level. The moderately strong  $T_b$  of .32 indicates that a reduction in errors of about one-third can be realized through knowledge of the independent variable.

There are several considerations that would appear to be relevant to this finding. The first concerns what is actually measured by utilization of case records as an indicator of the inmates maintainance of relationships in the free community. The reporting of such relationships by officials involved in the correctional process is of a subjective nature. It is possible that the officials who completed documents such as pre-sentence reports and case histories may be recording not only what relationships exist, but also their own perceptions of the individual, his offense, and other factors that are situational in nature. It would seem, therefore, that the offender who prompts negative responses from various people involved in the correctional process may be perceived and described in a negative manner. Becker's (1964) concept of "labeling theory" serves to illustrate the point being made here. The individual who is arrested, tried and convicted of a crime may have prompted some person in the correctional process to fail to make a substantial effort to determine what kinds of relationships exist between the offender and his family and

friends. The correctional official, instead, makes some negative comment about the individuals relationships. The offender is thus labelled as an individual without significant ties to the outside world. As the offender moves through the correctional process the label follows him. Labelling theory would indicate that the individual's behavior would, in turn, be conditioned by the responses of others to him. These responses may be largely a result of the label attached to the individual. Such a situation could have an effect on the parole application decision. Such an argument is, of course, highly speculative. The point is, however, that judgements about the offender and his social relationships are made by professionals in the penal career of the offender, are often of a subjective nature, and may reflect the bias of the recording official.

A more straightforward interpretation of the case record data on external relationships is simply that the information is accurate, and that, as Clemmer (1940:301) has pointed out, individuals who maintain a frame of reference outside the institution are less susceptible to becoming deeply involved in the convict sub-culture. They may also be better motivated to seek parole, better able to meet the conditions of parole such as employment and a place to live. They would, therefore, be more likely to be granted parole (Miller, 1965:343).

The relationship between information regarding

community relationships obtained through parole service files and the decision to apply for parole is presented in Table XI.

TABLE XI. Non-Prison Relationships Measured by Documentary Sources of Seventy-six Inmates, by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Relationships	Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
High interest	18	42	0	0
Medium interest	15	35	9	27
Low interest	10	23	24	73
	43	100	33	100

$$T_b = .32$$

$$X^2 = 18.2753 \text{ (Smirnov test)}$$

$$P < .001$$

The second measure of inmates relationships on the outside came from the respondents themselves. These data have been placed into a four category scheme which allows the combining of intensity and extensity scale scores. The scheme simply combines the number of individuals the respondent views as being meaningful to him with his perception of intensity of the relationship.

These data provided substantial evidence that a

relationship exists between the inmates perception of his linkages in the free community and the decision to apply for parole. Comparison of Tables XI and XII indicated that the inmate's own perception of his relationship to the outside world provided a much more adequate explanation of the linkage between positive external relationships and parole application than did utilization of case records. Although both were significant at the .001 level, comparison of the Tb's showed that inmates' perceptions explain 21 per cent more of the variability than was possible using case records. It would appear that the manner in which the inmate himself defined the situation provided a better tool for explaining the relationship between contacts in the free community and parole application than did the case record alone.

Roebuck suggests that an excellent indicator of offenders with extensive criminal histories is a tendency to sever ties with conventional social groups such as "the parental family group, church groups, law-abiding community groups and the conjugal groups" (Roebuck, 1967:253). Following this line of reasoning, it might be concluded that by using free community relationships as an indicator, the non-applicants would appear to be somewhat "more criminal" than the parole applicants.

Whatever the specific process or combination of relationships may be, the present research clearly indicated that external social relationships and parole application

were closely related.

The data concerning non-prison relationships, measured by the questionnaire, is presented in the following table.

TABLE XII. Non-Prison Relationships Measured by Questionnaire of Seventy-six Inmates, by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Relationships	Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Many strong	23	53	4	12
Few strong	12	28	0	0
Many weak	8	19	15	45
Few weak	0	0	14	42
	43	100	33	100

$$T_b = .53$$

$$X^2 = 35.8485 \text{ (Smirnov test)}$$

$$P < .001$$

### Length of Sentence

The data concerning length of sentence failed to substantiate the hypothesis that length of sentence and parole application are positively related. The rationale behind the hypothesis was essentially that those individuals with longer sentences would be more likely to apply as

failure to apply would require a much greater personal investment, in terms of time in the institution, than those who have shorter sentences. All sentences up to twelve years are eligible after serving one-third of the sentence (see Table I). The literature, particularly Sutherland (1939:643), indicated that inmates were prone to avoid parole when the time between eligibility and final release was not great. The difference for an inmate with a two year sentence could be as little as eight months whereas the inmate with a ten year sentence would invest an additional three and a half years (statutory remission and "good time" are figured on both).

Although the present data failed to uphold the hypothesis, it was felt that this failure was largely a product of the particular research setting. Seventy-seven per cent of all respondents had sentences under 2.9 years and 94 per cent had sentences of 3.9 years or less. The entire group contained only five individuals with sentences of four years or more. Manitoba Penitentiary is a medium security institution with few inmates having lengthy sentences. Of these, fewer still have characteristics that met the criteria for inclusion in the present research. It was felt that further research, perhaps at a maximum security institution, should be undertaken in order to fully explore the relationship between length of sentence and parole application.

Table XIII presents the relationship between length of sentence and parole application status.

TABLE XIII. Length of Sentence of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Length of Sentence	Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Less than 2 years	3	7	2	6
2.0 - 2.9 years	29	67	24	73
3.0 - 3.9 years	9	21	4	12
4.0 - 5.9 years	1	2	3	9
6 years or over	1	2	0	0
	43	100	33	100

$$T_b = .044$$

$$X^2 = .5825 \text{ (Smirnov test)}$$

$$P < .80$$

### Education

It was hypothesised that a positive relationship existed between the amount of education possessed by the individual and the decision to apply for parole.

The relationship found was in the direction predicted, but was not statistically significant at the .05 level; ( $P < .20$ ).  $T_b$  results indicated that 16 per cent of the variation could be explained with knowledge of the

respondent's level of formal education. As with the preceding variable, this might partially be explained by the overall (both groups) low level of education. Seventy-seven per cent of the respondents had not completed grade ten. Prison populations generally are less educated than the general public.

Sutherland (1939:250) stated that conventional crime appears to decrease with increased education. It was his feeling that crime is probably related to education through the effects which non-school activities have on behavior patterns. The present research provided a slight indication that the non-applicant is less well educated than the applicant. If Sutherland's contention that crime decreases as education increases is valid, we might conclude that the applicants are, in a small way, less criminal than the non-applicants. Whether or not education is an index of criminality, however, would appear to be somewhat questionable.

To a large extent this variable was chosen because it was felt that the better educated respondent would be better able to compete in the outside world and hence would be in a better position to meet the implicit requirements of the parole system. Although some indication was obtained that a linkage between application and education exists, it did not appear to be particularly relevant for explaining variance in the dependent variable, parole application.

The level of formal education of the respondents is related to parole application status in table XIV.

TABLE XIV. Level of Formal Education of Seventy-six Inmates, by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Highest Grade Completed	Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
0 - 5	4	9	11	33
6 - 9	24	56	19	58
10 - 11	23	30	2	6
12	1	2	1	3
Over 12	1	2	0	0
	43	100	33	100

$$T_b = .16$$

$$X^2 = 4.361 \text{ (Smirnov test)}$$

$$P < .20$$

### Job Skills

It was hypothesised that individuals possessing significant job skills would be more likely to apply for parole than those who lacked them. Results from the present research indicated a relationship between job skills and parole application. This relationship was, however, not particularly revealing.  $T_b$  results indicated that errors in placing individuals into "applicant" and "non-applicant"

categories could be reduced by only 16 per cent through knowledge of the independent variable, possession of job skills. Although some relationship did exist, the researcher did not feel that the hypothesis had actually been substantiated. Job skills were not seen as being an important variable in explaining the decision to apply. Once again, the results reflected the homogeneity of both groups along certain dimensions. Over four-fifths of the respondents fell into the unskilled or semi-skilled categories. This would appear to be typical of most prison populations. The reality of the situation may have been that skilled and professional workers are seldom found in penal institutions, and as a result, such a dimension may not prove valuable for analysing the institutional career of the offender. This is not to say that a lack of sufficient job skills had no effect on the pre-institutional history of the offender, or upon his post-institutional career. Rather, job skills were only slightly related to the parole application decision.

Table XV illustrates the relationship between parole application status and job skills.

TABLE XV. Job Skills of Seventy-six Inmates, by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Job Skills	Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Skilled labor	10	23	2	6
Semi-skilled labor	16	37	6	18
Unskilled labor	17	40	25	75
Clerical or other	0	0	0	0
	43	100	33	100

$$T_b = .14$$

$$X^2 = 9.8061 \text{ (Smirnov test)}$$

$$P < .01$$

### Age

It was hypothesised that a positive relationship existed between age and the decision to apply for parole.

Little relationship was found between age and parole application. The two populations were found to be virtually identical in this respect. Sixty-five per cent of applicants and 64 per cent of the non-applicants were under the age of thirty. Ninety per cent of the respondents were under forty. The literature had clearly indicated that prison populations tend to be under the age of thirty or thirty-five, (Sutherland, 1939:269; Cantor, 1939:325). It

was expected that sufficient variability would be present, however, to provide some base for analysis. This was not the case. Previous research has shown that around the age of thirty-one to thirty-five years, criminal behavior (or at least getting caught) typically ceases (Cantor, 1939: 325). It was felt that respondents who were older than the above mentioned figure would be more likely to be parole applicants because increasing age appears to bring about a decrease in criminal activity and a corresponding desire to "go straight".

The inmate population at the Manitoba Penitentiary is shaped to some degree by the nature of its medium security designation. Offenders who are committed to that institution are considered less dangerous and are typically younger than those found in maximum security settings. The findings of the present research were not contrary to the literature in this area. Instead, it did not provide an adequate test of the age dimension due to the absence of respondents falling in the upper age groups.

The data concerning age and parole application status is presented in Table XVI.

TABLE XVI. Age of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Age at last birthday	Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
0 - 19	5	12	0	0
20 - 29	23	53	21	64
30 - 39	11	26	8	24
40 - 49	3	7	4	12
50 and over	1	2	0	0
	43	100	33	100

$$T_b = .07$$

$$x^2 = 1.0082 \text{ (Smirnov test)}$$

$$P < .70$$

#### Factual Knowledge of Parole

It was hypothesised that individuals having greater factual knowledge of the parole system would be more likely to apply for parole. The rationale for the inclusion of this hypothesis was essentially that individuals with a greater knowledge of the formal system would be more likely to utilize the system (Goffman, 1961:210-16). A thirteen item true-false test was designed to measure inmates factual knowledge of the parole system.

The findings show little relationship between factual

knowledge of the parole system and parole application. The researcher feels that the test was simply not designed adequately. The respondents had much more knowledge about the parole system than had originally been anticipated. Seventy-two per cent of the respondents selected ten or more correct responses out of the 13 possible correct responses. It is clear that the sophistication of the respondents was underestimated. The test was not sufficiently difficult to discriminate among the inmates. The present results indicated that further research utilizing factual knowledge of the parole system as a variable should employ an instrument with a larger number of items and greater variation in the relative difficulty of the items. Due to the inability of the present instrument to measure the relationship between factual knowledge and the parole application decision little can be concluded with respect to this variable.

The results are contained in Table XVII.

TABLE XVII. Factual Knowledge of Parole Test Scores of Seventy-six Inmates by Parole Application Status, 1970, Manitoba Penitentiary

Number Correct	Applicants		Non-applicant	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
12 - 13	13	30	6	18
10 - 11	23	53	13	39
8 - 9	6	14	10	30
7 or less	1	2	4	12
	43	100	33	100

$$T_b = .09$$

$$X^2 = 1.9941 \text{ (Smirnov test)}$$

$$P < .50$$

In this chapter the hypotheses have been tested and the results reported. Of the nine hypotheses, three showed a clear relationship to the parole application decision. In the following chapter some conclusions are drawn from the analysis of the data.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS

The present research set out to answer the question: Why do some individuals choose to remain in prison until the expiration of their sentences rather than make application for parole. The existing literature was reviewed, and, on the basis of available information, nine hypotheses were cast. Of the nine, three provided considerable explanation for the phenomenon under study. Viewing the nine independent variables as a whole, one thing becomes quite clear. Those variables that have a clear relationship to parole application are of a unique and similar social nature. The emphasis is not so much upon the actor, but upon the social system in which he interacts. It is this relationship that appears to influence his behavior. The history of the inmate may condition, but does not seem to determine his behavior. Within the scope of this study, the respondents are influenced more by their experience in the penal setting than by their life history.

The data indicated that a continuum exists. The individuals on one end have maintained a frame of reference outside the prison setting. These individuals are not markedly drawn into the inmate sub-culture. They tended

to view the parole system in a favorable manner and typically applied for parole. The other end of the continuum was occupied by individuals who had few, if any, stable bonds to the free community. They had, in large measure, assimilated the inmate sub-culture. They had little use for the parole system and tended not to apply for parole.

There are two properties of the relationship between the prison setting and the decision to apply for parole that must be recognized. The first is the evident existence of an inmate normative structure. This is essentially a factor internal to the prison. The second is external, and involves the incarcerated individual's continuing reference to meaningful relationships outside the prison walls. An interplay exists between these two, in that one may thwart the other. Thus, the inmate who wants to return to his wife and family (external) is not substantially affected by the inmate value system (internal). For the respondents included in the present research, the type of socialization process that goes on within the institution provided the most adequate explanation for differential parole application.

A further conclusion involves the relationship between the acceptance of inmate norms and the inmate attitudes toward the parole system. A number of authors, Sutherland (1939), Clemmer (1940), Cloward (1960) and Miller (1965) have stated that an integral part of the inmate

normative structure is a dislike for the parole system and for parole authorities. As far as is known, none of the above mentioned criminologists have ever put such a proposition to an empirical test. In the present research, the two were in fact shown to be related. As acceptance of the inmate normative structure increased, attitude toward parole became less favorable. This finding lends considerable support to the belief that much inmate hostility toward the parole system is learned within the prison setting.

The present research is consistent with the symbolic interactionist tradition as it applies to the field of deviant behavior. Criminologists from the symbolic interactionist school, including Clemmer, Sutherland, Cressey, Glaser, Wheeler and Becker have held that the behavior of inmates is determined in large measure by societal factors that are interactive in nature. The results of the present study tend to support this idea. It is not so much the attributes of the individual that are important, but the properties of the social structure and the individual's relationship to that structure that appear to influence the parole application decision.

A clear limitation of the present research was a failure to recognize the homogeneity of the two populations. The failure of variables such as prior offences, length of sentence, education, job skills and age to explain

differential parole application probably does not reflect inadequacies in the literature so much as a lack of variability among the cases.

A second limitation of the project is that the findings cannot be generalized to any other population. Given the financial and time limitations that were present, it was not possible to obtain any sort of random sample from a variety of penal settings across Canada, although it would have been valuable to have done so. The present results appear to be applicable only to inmates at the Manitoba Penitentiary who meet the criteria utilized for selection of the two populations.

#### Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

As far as is known, the present study was the first sociological investigation of the parole non-applicant. As such, it may have only scratched the surface in terms of fully understanding the interactive processes that prompt some inmates to avoid the parole system. Certainly, future research in the area should include respondents from a variety of penal settings. This would prove valuable for two reasons. First, the problems the present study experienced with homogeneity of the respondents could be counteracted by including cases from maximum and minimum security institutions. Second, the use of a number of penal institutions would provide a population sufficiently large

and varied to allow greater generalization than is possible in the present research.

If the prime factor in non-application is indeed the interplay between the inmates frame of reference on the outside and his interaction within the institution, some consideration might be given to penal programs that utilize this information as a rehabilitative tool. Liberal visiting privileges and increased use of day parole might serve to maintain outside contacts and tend to minimize inmate assimilation of the prison sub-culture.

The results raise a further question regarding priorities in penal institutions. If the prime determinant of inmate attitudes is the quality and type of interaction the individual experiences during his institutional career, then where should the emphasis be placed in rehabilitative programs? For example; given a choice between increased vocational training facilities and programs that maximize community involvement which would be the better choice? The present research would indicate the latter.

Research of a broader nature must be undertaken before firm conclusions can be made about the factors that affect the parole application decision. The present research does, however, suggest that a symbolic interactionist perspective that focuses on social relationships would provide the most useful starting point.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barnes, Harry Elmer and Negley K. Teeters. New Horizons in Criminology. Third edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1959.
- Becker, Howard S. (ed.). The Other Side: Perspectives of Deviance. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- Blummer, Herbert. Symbolic Interactionism. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1969.
- Caldwell, Robert G. Criminology. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1965.
- Canada. Regulations Made Under the Parole Act: 1960. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, 1960.
- Canadian Corrections Association. Indians and the Law. Ottawa: 1967.
- Cantor, Nathaniel F. Crime and Society. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1939.
- Cavan, Ruth S. Criminology. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1952.
- Clegg, Reed K. Probation and Parole; Principles and Practices. Springfield, Illinois: C. C. Thomas, 1964.
- Clemmer, Donald. The Prison Community. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1940.
- Clinard, Marshall B. Sociology of Deviant Behavior. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1958.
- Cloward, Richard A., and others. Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960.
- Cohen, Albert K. Deviance and Control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1966.

- Cressey, Donald R. (ed.). The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Deehy, P. "The Impact of Parole Upon the Family," Canadian Journal of Corrections, Vol. 3, 1961.
- Dinitz, Simon and Walter C. Reckless (eds.). Critical Issues in the Study Crime. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968.
- Downie, V. M. and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Dressler, David. Probation and Parole. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Dubin, R. Theory Building. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Edmison, J. Alex. "Some Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Canadian Prisons," in W. T. McGrath (ed.), Crime and Its Treatment in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965. Pp. 279-301.
- Edwards, Allen L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.
- Festinger, Leon and Daniel Katz (eds.). Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences. New York: The Dryden Press, 1953.
- Fishbein, Martin (ed.). Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. New York: John Wiley, 1967.
- Fornataro, John V. "Canadian Prisons Today," in W. T. McGrath (ed.), Crime and Its Treatment in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965. Pp. 302-25.
- Freeman, Linton C. Elementary Applied Statistics. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1965.
- Garrity, Donald L. "The Prison as a Rehabilitation Agency," in Donald R. Cressey (ed.), The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961. Pp. 358-80.
- Giardini, Giovanni. The Parole Process. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas, 1959.

Glaser, Daniel. "The Differential Association Theory of Crime," in Arnold Rose (ed.), Human Behavior and the Social Processes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1962. Pp. 425-42.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobs Merrill, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Criminality and Behavioral Images," American Sociological Review, 61:433-44, March, 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_ and Kent Rice. "Crime, Age and Employment," American Sociological Review, 24:679-86, October, 1959.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck. After-Conduct of Discharged Offenders. London: Macmillan and Company, 1945.

\_\_\_\_\_. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950.

Goffman, Erving. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and other Inmates. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. "On the Characteristics of Total Institutions: Staff-Inmate Relations," in Donald R. Cressey (ed.), The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961. Pp. 2-15.

\_\_\_\_\_. Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Goode, William J. and Paul K. Hatt. Methods in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1952.

Goodman, Leo and William H. Kruskal. "Measures of Association for Cross Classification," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 49:732-63, 1954.

Grygier, Tadeusz. "Crime and Society," in W. T. McGrath (ed.), Crime and Its Treatment in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965. Pp. 13-58.

Haskell, M. R. and L. Yablonsky. Crime and Delinquency. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1970.

- Hayner, Norman S. and Ellis Ash. "The Prison as a Community," American Sociological Review, 5:577-84, October, 1940.
- Johnson, E. H. Crime Correction and Society. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1964.
- Johnston, Norman, Leonard Savitz, and Marvin Wolfgang. The Sociology of Punishment and Correction. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- Kahl, Joseph A. The American Class Structure. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Kay, Barbara A. and Clyde B. Vedder. Probation and Parole. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1963.
- Kelley, W. H. "The Police," in W. T. McGrath (ed.), Crime and Its Treatment in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965. Pp. 109-35.
- Keve, Paul W. Imaginative Programming in Probation and Parole. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967.
- Kirkpatrick, A. M. "After-Care and the Prisoners Aid Societies," in W. T. McGrath (ed.), Crime and Its Treatment in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965. Pp. 384-411.
- Laune, Ferris F. Predicting Criminality. Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1936.
- Likert, Rensis. "The Method of Constructing an Attitude Scale," in Martin Fishbein (ed.), Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. New York: John Wiley, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and G. Murphy. Public Opinion and the Individual. New York: Harper and Row, 1937.
- Macleod, A. J. "Criminal Legislation," in W. T. McGrath (ed.), Crime and Its Treatment in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965. Pp. 91-108.
- Mann, W. E. (ed.). Deviant Behavior in Canada. Toronto: Social Science Publishers, 1968.
- McGrath, W. T. (ed.). Crime and Its Treatment in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965.
- Mead, G. H. Mind Self and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935.

- Miller, Frank P. "Parole," in W. T. McGrath (ed.), Crime and Its Treatment in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965. Pp. 326-83.
- Mueller, John H., Karl F. Schuessler and Herbert L. Costner. Statistical Reasoning in Sociology. Second edition, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- Nagel, Ernest. The Structure of Science. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1961.
- National Parole Board. Handbook on Parole. Ottawa: 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Brochure on Parole for Judges, Magistrates, Police and Parole Supervisors. Kingston Penitentiary Print Shop, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Report of the National Parole Board: 1969. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969.
- Nettler, Gwynn. "Antisocial Sentiment and Criminality," American Sociological Review, 24:202-08, August, 1959.
- Newman, Charles L. Sourcebook in Probation, Parole, and Pardons. Second edition. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas, 1964.
- Ohlin, Lloyd E. Selection for Parole. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1951.
- Phillips, Bernard S. Social Research, Strategy and Tactics. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Rasmussen, Donald. "Prisoner Opinions About Parole," American Sociological Review, 5:584-90, October, 1940.
- Remple, David. "Parole," Proceedings; Course in Corrections 1961. Sponsored by the Department of the Attorney General Province of Manitoba in co-operation with The Department of University Extension and Adult Education, The University of Manitoba. (Mimeographed).
- Richmond, Mark S. Prison Profiles. Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1965.
- Roebuck, Julian B. Criminal Typology. Springfield, Illinois: Charles G. Thomas, 1967.
- Rose, A. M. Human Behavior and Social Processes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1962.

- Ryan, Stuart. "The Adult Court," in W. T. McGrath (ed.), Crime and Its Treatment in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965. Pp. 109-35.
- Schrag, Clarence. "Leadership Among Prison Inmates," American Sociological Review, 19:37-42, February, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Foundations For a Theory of Correction," in Ronald R. Cressey (ed.), The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961. Pp. 309-57.
- Sexton, Patricia Cayo. Education and Income. New York: The Viking Press, 1961.
- Sheldon, William H. The Varieties of Delinquent Youth. New York: Harper, 1949.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., 1956.
- Stephan, F. F. and P. J. McCarthy. Sampling Opinions: An Analysis of Survey Procedure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Stephens, J. J. and A. E. Reid. Churchill: "A Socio-Economic Profile". Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Center for Settlement Studies, 1970. (Mimeographed).
- Sutherland, Edwin H. The Professional Thief. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and Donald R. Cressey. Principles of Criminology. Seventh edition. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1939.
- Thomas, William I. "The Definition of the Situation," in Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer (eds.), Symbolic Interaction, A Reader in Social Psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967. Pp. 315-21.
- Thurstone, L. L. "Attitudes Can Be Measured," American Journal of Sociology, 33:529-54, 1928.
- United Nations. Department of Social Affairs. Parole and After-Care. New York, 1954.
- United Nations. Secretariat. Department of Social Affairs. Probation and Related Measures. New York: 1951.

United States Employment Service. Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Third edition. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_. Selected Characteristics of Occupations. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1965.

Vold, George V. Theoretical Criminology. New York: New York University Press, 1958.

Wheeler, Stanton. "Social Organization in a Correctional Community." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Washington, 1958.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Role Conflict in Correctional Communities," in Donald R. Cressey (ed.), The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961. Pp. 229-59.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Socialization in Correctional Communities," American Sociological Review, 26:697-712, October, 1961.

Wiler, David. Scientific Sociology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Winch, Robert F. and Donald T. Campbell. "Proof? No. Evidence? Yes. The Significance of Tests of Significance," The American Sociologist 4:140-43, May, 1969.

Young, Pauline V. Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA PAROLE STUDY

In the following questionnaire we are trying to learn something about how you view the parole system in Canada. We feel that your opinions and information about you are important. This is a University study. We do not work for the Penitentiary Service or the National Parole Service. When the information you give us is analyzed you will be given a code number. The results will appear as patterns. Your name will not appear anywhere. Nothing you as an individual put down on paper will be shown to the officials at The Manitoba Penitentiary or to the National Parole Service. This will not, in any way, affect your chances for parole. This will not affect your stay at the Manitoba Penitentiary.

Please print your name here \_\_\_\_\_

FEELINGS ABOUT PAROLE

These questions deal with your feelings about parole. We are interested in what you personally think about the parole system. You have five choices for each question in this section. Please place a mark in the blank that best describes your feelings.

1. Parole board members are honest people who have a genuine concern for prisoners.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

2. Many prisoners who would succeed on parole are not granted parole.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

3. If a guy has the right political connections he stands a better chance of being paroled.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

4. Most of the rules that the parolee must follow are unnecessary.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

5. Parole officers are sincerely interested in helping the ex-con make good.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

6. The system of selecting people for parole should be changed.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

7. A person who is granted parole should be thankful to the authorities for giving him a chance.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

8. The parole board makes good decisions in the majority of cases.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

9. Most people who are returned to prison for parole violation deserve to be returned.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

10. Parole helps a person make good.  
Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_
11. The parole board has a pretty good understanding of each individual case.  
Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_
12. One of the big problems with parole is that police won't leave you alone.  
Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_
13. It is difficult to lead a normal life while on parole.  
Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_
14. The Parole Service is more interested in returning people to the institution than they are in helping a person make good.  
Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_
15. The fact that we have a parole system shows that the general public is willing to forgive and forget.  
Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_
16. If you make enemies among the staff, in the institution, you probably won't be paroled.  
Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_
17. Most of the guys I know in the institution don't like parole authorities.  
Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

18. One of the biggest problems with the parole system is all the restrictions it puts on a person once he gets out.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

19. In general, parole agents represent a second police force.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

20. The guys in the institution who are really interested in getting paroled are not the kind of guys I call my friends.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

21. I doubt I can meet all the requirements that are necessary to be paroled.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

22. The Parole Service lets so few people out on parole that I doubt it is worth the trouble of applying.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

23. It isn't fair that you lose your statutory remission and good time when you accept parole.

Strongly Agree \_\_\_ Agree \_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_

#### KNOWLEDGE ABOUT PAROLE

This section deals with your knowledge of the parole system as it exists in Canada. We are interested in how much information about the parole system inmates have. In this section you have two choices for each question. Please

place T if you think the question is true and F if you think the statement is false. Place your T or F in the space provided at the right of each question.

1. The National Parole Board consists of seven members. \_\_\_\_\_
2. The National Parole Board is not required to grant a personal interview to the inmate or to any person on his behalf. \_\_\_\_\_
3. A parolee must obtain permission from the Regional Representative of the National Parole Service if he wants to buy a motor vehicle. \_\_\_\_\_
4. The sentence of a paroled inmate continues while he is on parole. \_\_\_\_\_
5. A parolee must report at least once a month to the person or agency designated as his supervisor. \_\_\_\_\_
6. It is required that the inmate have a lawyer write to the parole board on his behalf. \_\_\_\_\_
7. The National Parole Board has jurisdiction over every inmate in a federal prison who has been sentenced under an act of the Parliament of Canada. \_\_\_\_\_
8. Alcoholics and drug offenders can be granted parole. \_\_\_\_\_
9. Parole is the same as mercy or clemency. \_\_\_\_\_
10. An inmate with a two year sentence must serve 9 months before he is eligible for parole. \_\_\_\_\_
11. Parole is granted to about 1/3 of the inmates who apply. \_\_\_\_\_
12. A parole may be revoked for excessive use of liquor. \_\_\_\_\_
13. Parole may be revoked for leaving the area without permission. \_\_\_\_\_

We feel that the family and friends an inmate has on the outside are closely related to parole. In this section we would like to know something about your family and friends on the outside. We realize that some of you may not have any such contacts. If this is the case go on to the following section.

1. If you are married please answer this part (include common-law wife).

(1) Do you feel your wife has confidence in you?

A great deal of confidence \_\_\_\_, Some confidence \_\_\_\_,  
Very little confidence \_\_\_\_, No confidence at all \_\_\_\_.

(2) How often does your wife visit you?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(3) How often do you receive mail from your wife?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(4) Is your wife willing to help you when you're released?

A great deal of help \_\_\_\_, Some help \_\_\_\_,  
Very little help \_\_\_\_, No help at all \_\_\_\_.

2. If your mother is still living please answer this part.

(1) Do you feel your mother has confidence in you?

A great deal of confidence \_\_\_\_, Some confidence \_\_\_\_,  
Very little confidence \_\_\_\_, No confidence at all \_\_\_\_.

(2) How often does your mother visit you?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(Mother)

(3) How often do you receive mail from your mother?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(4) Is your mother willing to help you when you are released?

A great deal of help \_\_\_\_, Some help \_\_\_\_,  
Very little help \_\_\_\_, No help at all \_\_\_\_.

3. If your father is still living please answer this part.

(1) Do you feel your father has confidence in you?

A great deal of confidence \_\_\_\_, Some confidence \_\_\_\_,  
Very little confidence \_\_\_\_, No confidence at all \_\_\_\_.

(2) How often does your father visit you?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(3) How often do you receive mail from your father?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(4) Is your father willing to help you when you are released?

A great deal of help \_\_\_\_, Some help \_\_\_\_,  
Very little help \_\_\_\_, No help at all \_\_\_\_.

4. If you have a brother who you think is interested in you please answer this part. (If you have more than one brother who is interested in you please ask for another form).

(1) Do you feel your brother has confidence in you?

A great deal of confidence \_\_\_\_, Some confidence \_\_\_\_,  
Very little confidence \_\_\_\_, No confidence at all \_\_\_\_.

(2) How often does your brother visit you?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(Brother)

(3) How often do you receive mail from your brother?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(4) Is your brother willing to help you when you are released?

A great deal of help \_\_\_\_, Some help \_\_\_\_,  
Very little help \_\_\_\_, No help at all \_\_\_\_.

5. If you have a sister who you think is interested in you please answer this part. (If you have more than one sister who is interested in you please ask for another form).

(1) Do you feel your sister has confidence in you?

A great deal of confidence \_\_\_\_, Some confidence \_\_\_\_,  
Very little confidence \_\_\_\_, No confidence at all \_\_\_\_.

(2) How often does your sister visit you?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(3) How often do you receive mail from your sister?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(4) Is your sister willing to help you when you are released?

A great deal of help \_\_\_\_, Some help \_\_\_\_,  
Very little help \_\_\_\_, No help at all \_\_\_\_.

6. If you have a girl friend who you think is interested in how you are getting along please answer this part.

(1) Do you feel your girl friend has confidence in you?

A great deal of confidence \_\_\_\_, Some confidence \_\_\_\_,  
Very little confidence \_\_\_\_, No confidence at all \_\_\_\_.

(2) How often does your girl friend visit you?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

(Girl friend)

- (3) How often do you receive mail from your girl friend?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

- (4) Is your girl friend willing to help you when you get released?

A great deal of help \_\_\_\_, Some help \_\_\_\_,

Very little help \_\_\_\_, No help at all \_\_\_\_.

7. If there is some other person on the outside who is interested in how you are getting along please answer this part. Examples of this kind person might be; grandmother, grandfather, aunt, uncle, clergyman, former employer, etc. If you choose to answer this question, please answer the following part. You don't need to use the person's name.

Briefly explain what this person's relationship is to you: \_\_\_\_\_

- (1) Does this person have confidence in you?

A great deal of confidence \_\_\_\_, Some confidence \_\_\_\_,  
Very little confidence \_\_\_\_, No confidence at all \_\_\_\_.

- (2) How often does this person visit you?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

- (3) How often do you receive mail from this person?

Very often \_\_\_\_, Often \_\_\_\_, Seldom \_\_\_\_, Never \_\_\_\_.

- (4) Is this person willing to help you when you are released?

A great deal of help \_\_\_\_, Some help \_\_\_\_,

Very little help \_\_\_\_, No help at all \_\_\_\_.

This section deals with some situations that might occur in prison. We would like you to read each one and indicate how you feel about the inmates' actions.

1. An inmate, Owens, is assigned to a work crew. Some other inmates criticize him because he does more work than anybody else on the crew. He works as hard as he can. What do you think about Owens' actions?

Strongly Agree \_\_\_\_, Agree \_\_\_\_, Disagree \_\_\_\_,  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_\_.

2. Inmate Martin goes before a committee that makes job assignments. He is given a choice between two jobs. One job would call for hard work, but it would give Martin training that might be useful to him on the outside. The other job would allow Martin to do easier time in the institution. But it provides no training for a job on the outside. Martin decides to take the easier job. What do you think about Martin's actions?

Strongly Agree \_\_\_\_, Agree \_\_\_\_, Disagree \_\_\_\_,  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_\_.

3. An inmate, without thinking, commits a minor rule infraction. He is given a "write-up" by a correctional officer who saw the violation. Later three other inmates are talking to each other about it. Two of them criticize the officer. The third inmate, Sykes, defends the officer, saying the officer was only doing his duty. What do you think about Sykes actions?

Strongly Agree \_\_\_\_, Agree \_\_\_\_, Disagree \_\_\_\_,  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_\_.

4. Inmates Smith and Long are very good friends. Smith has a five dollar bill that was smuggled into the institution by a visitor. Smith tells Long he is thinking the officers are suspicious, and asks Long to hide the money for him for a few days. Long takes the money and carefully hides it. What do you think of Long's actions?

Strongly Agree \_\_\_\_, Agree \_\_\_\_, Disagree \_\_\_\_,  
Strongly Disagree \_\_\_\_.

5. Inmates Brown and Henry are planning an escape. They threaten inmate Smith with a beating unless he steals a crowbar for them from the tool shop where he works. He thinks they mean business. While he is trying to smuggle the crowbar into the cell house, he is caught by an officer, and Smith is charged with planning to escape.

If he doesn't describe the whole situation, he may lose up to a year of good time. He can avoid it by blaming Brown and Henry. What should inmate Smith do?

- (a) he should clear himself by telling about the escape plans of Brown and Henry. \_\_\_\_\_
- (b) he should keep quiet and take the punishment himself. \_\_\_\_\_

6. Have you developed any close friendships with other inmates since you have been in Stony Mountain?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, several, (more than 5)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, a few (3 to 5)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, one or two
- \_\_\_\_\_ No

7. Think back over the past month in Stony Mountain. How would you say you spent most of your free time?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Mostly with a group of inmates who are together quite a lot
- \_\_\_\_\_ With one or two inmates
- \_\_\_\_\_ With several inmates, but not in any one group
- \_\_\_\_\_ Mostly by myself

In this part we would like to know about your present and past parole status.

- (1) Have you ever been paroled in the past?  
If yes, how many times \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_
- (2) Have you ever been returned to an institution for breaking or violating parole? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_
- (3) Are you eligible to apply for parole at the present time? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_
- (4) Have you applied for parole for the sentence you are now serving? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

(5) Can you tell us in your own words why you (did; did not) apply for parole for the sentence you are now serving?

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA PAROLE APPLICATION STUDY  
SOCIAL BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

Parole Applicant \_\_\_\_\_ Non-Applicant \_\_\_\_\_

Date eligible for parole \_\_\_\_\_

Age at sentencing \_\_\_\_\_ Date of birth \_\_\_\_\_

Marital status \_\_\_\_\_

Family Interest \_\_\_\_\_

Convicted of (Present offense) 1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_  
4. \_\_\_\_\_

Length of sentence \_\_\_\_\_

Date sentenced \_\_\_\_\_

Time served to date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Total prior convictions \_\_\_\_\_

Education - Grade completed \_\_\_\_\_

Job skills \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Other vocational or education training \_\_\_\_\_

Ethnic group \_\_\_\_\_

Place of residence prior to present commitment  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Town or City                      Zone      Province

APPENDIX B  
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA PAROLE APPLICATION STUDY  
CODING INSTRUCTIONS

Col. No.

- 1-2 Case number
- 3
  - 1. Parole Applicant
  - 2. Non Applicant
- 4 Age at last birthday
  - 1. 0 - 19
  - 2. 20 - 29
  - 3. 30 - 39
  - 4. 40 - 49
  - 5. 50 and over
- 5 Marital Status
  - 1. Married
  - 2. Single
  - 3. Divorced or Legal Separation
  - 4. Common Law
  - 5. Widowed or other
- 6 Family Interest, Case Records
  - 1. High Interest
  - 2. Medium Interest
  - 3. Low Interest
- 7 Length of Sentence
  - 1. 2 years or less
  - 2. 2.0 - 2.9 years

Col. No.

- 7      3. 3.0 - 3.9 years  
       4. 4.0 - 4.9 years  
       5. 6.0 years and over
- 8      Prior Convictions
  1. First offender
  2. 2 - 5 prior convictions
  3. 6 - 10 prior convictions
  4. 11 - 20 prior convictions
  5. 21 or over prior convictions
- 9      Formal education; Highest Grade Completed
  1. 0 - 5
  2. 6 - 9
  3. 10 - 11
  4. 12
  5. Over 12
- 10     Job Skills
  1. Skilled Labor
  2. Semi-skilled Labor
  3. Unskilled Labor
  4. Clerical or other
- 11     Vocational Training
  1. Course experience and worked in occupation
  2. Course experience and never worked in occupation
  3. No vocational training

Col. No.

- 12 Race
1. White
  2. Indian Metis
  3. Negro
  4. Oriental
  5. Other
- 13 Place of residence prior to present commitment
1. Zone 1
  2. Zone 2
  3. Zone 3
  4. Zone 4
  5. Zone 5
- 14 Size of Community
1. 0 - 2,500
  2. 2,501 - 10,000
  3. 10,001 - 50,000
  4. 50,001 - 100,000
  5. 100,001 and over
- 15 Attitude toward parole section
1. 30 - 39
  2. 40 - 49
  3. 50 - 59
  4. 60 - 69
  5. 70 - 79
  6. 80 - 89

Col. No.

- 16-17 Attitude toward parole score (total)
- 18 True-False section scores
1. 12 or 13 correct
  2. 10 or 11 correct
  3. 8 or 9 correct
  4. 7 or less correct
- 19 Family relationship section
1. Many strong  
 (no. of relationships 7 6 5 4 )  
 (total scale score 42-48 36-72 30-60 24-48)
  2. Few strong  
 (no. of relationships 1 2 3 )  
 (total scale score 6-12 12-48 18-36)
  3. Many Weak  
 (no. of relationships 7 6 5 4 )  
 (total scale score 0-41 0-35 0-29 0-23)
  4. Few weak  
 (no. of relationships 0 1 2 3 )  
 (total scale score 0 1-5 0-11 0-17)
- 20 Total number perceived - Family Section
- 21-22 Total scale score - Family Section
- 23 Prisionization scale score (5 items)
1. 0 - 5
  2. 6 - 10
  3. 11 - 15
  4. 16 - 20

Col. No.

- 24-25 Total Prisonization scale (5 items)
- 26 Total items 6 and 7, Prisonization scale
- 27 Parolled in past
1. Never paroled
  2. Paroled 1-2 times
  3. Paroled 3-4 times
  4. Paroled 5 or more times
- 28 Revocation of parole
1. Yes
  2. No