

131
0784

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LAW AND SOCIETY

University of California

Berkeley

PAROLE ACTION STUDY

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT FOR LEAA

NCJ-00784

131

Elliot Studt
August 31, 1969

INDEX

Main Headings:

1. Goals of the Study	pp. 1 - 3
2. The Setting	pp. 3 - 12
3. Work Prior to LEAA Financing	pp. 12 - 14
4. Study Personnel	pp. 14 - 18
5. Work Accomplished	pp. 18 - 21
6. The Study of PCSD as the Organizational Context for Technology	pp. 21 - 25
7. The Parole Psychiatric Outpatient Clinic	pp. 25 - 26
8. The Parolees	pp. 26 - 28
9. The Agent-Parolee Interaction Study	pp. 28 - 40
10. The Schedules	pp. 40 - 54
11. Chief Problems of the Study	pp. 54 - 56
12. Next Steps	pp. 56 - 58

Attachments:

1. "Middle Management in Parole"
2. "A Study of Psychiatric Services in Parole"
3. Parolee Schedule
4. Agent Schedule

Appendices:

- I. The Reentry of the Offender into the Community
- II. "Parole Revocations: Sentencing without Trial"
- III. "Conceptual Framework for the Parole Action Study"
- IV. "Deviant Roles and Social Reconnection"
- V. The Felon (To be mailed Fall, 1969)

Goals of the Study

The Parole Action Study has explored two related areas in parole: 1) interaction between parole agents and parolees as it affects parolee experiences in the community; and 2) certain critical processes in the parole agency, the correctional system, and the community that affect what the agent and the parolee are able to do together. In short, the Parole Action Study is a first attempt to describe and conceptualize parole technology¹ as it is practiced and as it is influenced by the organizational and community context.

It may seem strange that this subject has been neglected for so long in the voluminous literature on parole. Much writing has been devoted to a) reports of individual cases or small programs; b) justification of laws and programs; c) promulgation of standards; d) formulae for prediction; and e) attempts at evaluation based on recidivism rates. But what agents actually

¹ The term "technology" is used here much as it is used in Charles Perrow, "A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Organizations," pp. 194-208, American Sociological Review, Vol. 32, No. 2, April, 1967. In his analysis he uses technology as an independent variable determining organizational structure and, in part, organizational goals.

He says, "By technology is meant the actions that an individual performs upon an object, with or without the aid of tools or mechanical devices, in order to make some change in that object. The object, or "raw material," may be a living being, human or otherwise, a symbol or an inanimate object. People are raw materials in people-changing or people-processing organizations; ---" (p. 195) We have chosen to use "technology" rather than "techniques" in order to refer to the body of principles and knowledge that states why certain actions should produce the desired changes, that is, to the conceptual framework for action, as well as to the tools and the skills by which the concepts are used.

do to help or control parolees--as opposed to what they are exhorted to do-- has remained ignored as a subject for systematic study. In fact, agent activities are still described in much the same terms as those used by the first private parole agency in 1860 England; and these terms still imply the assumptions about human beings and how they conform that governed the thinking of Brockway in the 1870's when he pioneered in spreading the ideas of reformatory, indeterminate sentence, and parole. The formulation of parole technology, therefore, still remains at the level of lore accumulated by generations of parole officials; and the language of parole suffers from a lack of commonly defined referents while carrying a heavy weight of implicit value assumptions. Such a language has limited usefulness for the kind of problem analysis, planning and program evaluation required of correctional agencies in today's high-powered organizational world.

Although parole administrators still lack systematic information about the nature of the primary parole processes, they are currently under much pressure to improve the basic technology and to expand the auxiliary services proposed for its support. The alternatives suggested for improvement are diverse although all involve heavy additional expenditures in parole. The agency should "do more of the same" by expanding staff and reducing caseloads. Agents should be trained in a variety of treatment techniques, e.g., behavioral conditioning, guided group interaction, I-level treatment theory, or reality therapy. Auxiliary programs should be provided, such as half-way houses, work furlough programs, and short-term return units in institutions. Or major attention should be invested in projects to influence community attitudes and to increase resources. Without a conceptual framework for, and systematic knowledge about, what goes on in the basic parole process as it occurs between agent and parolee, administrators are handicapped in assigning priorities as

they plan for organizational change; and the researchers who are asked to make the evaluative studies needed for program justification are equally disadvantaged.

The attempt to develop knowledge about the technology of parole has occupied the Parole Action Study since 1965. From March, 1967, through August, 1969, LEAA has financed additional intensive studies including a) the Agent-Parolee Interaction Study, b) an exploration of middle management in paroles as it has been affected by a major reorganization of the California Division of Parole and Community Services, and c) a study of outpatient psychiatric services provided for parolees in the same agency. These and other related studies will be reported in some detail in the following pages.

The Setting

The Parole Action Study has been conducted under the auspices of the California Department of Corrections Parole and Community Services Division, and has focused its attention on the activities of that agency.

Rationale for Selection

Two main considerations influenced the decision to examine parole technology as it is practiced in a single state organization.

1. The Nature of the Research Task. The Parole Action Study, as a first systematic attack on the problem of parole technology in its organizational environment, has necessarily been exploratory in nature. The primary task has been to identify the critical variables that make a difference for parolee experiences in the community, involving careful examination of a wide range of parole activities that might or might not ultimately prove to be significant for the core process. Partly because of the great complexity of any single parole system, but also because of the nature of discovery research,

such an exploratory study is best done in a sample universe whose parameters can be defined and held constant while hypotheses are formulated and methods of study are designed. Comparison within the study universe is a necessary part of such an exploratory phase. Comparison across universes, when they are quite different from each other in basic structure, can be most productive as a second phase in the research endeavor. Given the limits in time, staff and money entailed in a two-year grant, the Parole Action Study, with the firm support of its National Advisory Committee, chose to invest its efforts in the depth study of a single agency and to limit comparative work to differences occurring within that agency's jurisdiction. The findings of the Parole Action Study should make future comparative studies of different parole systems, in which there are basic structural variations in such matters as the role of the parole board in parole decisions and the criteria for selection of prisoners for parole, both more productive and relatively economical.

2. The Characteristics of the California Agency. The California Parole and Community Services Division was selected for intensive study in large measure because this is an agency in which there was high probability that the Study could observe the approved standards for parole technology in practice. California is one of the few parole jurisdictions in which both the actions of the administrators and the investment of State resources have, in recent years, been guided by nationally accepted principles. Accordingly, in this State the Study ran a minimal risk of having its findings nullified simply because excessive caseloads, lack of qualified personnel, reactionary administrators or bad institutional practices had defeated all attempts to put approved parole technology into practice. In addition the California Parole and Community Services Division has experimented widely with those auxiliary programs often proposed for improving parole outcomes, such as group

counseling, narcotic testing clinics, half-way houses, short term return units, and work furlough, thus providing the Study with an opportunity to observe what such programs mean for the work of agents with parolees. The fact that the California agency was already research-oriented and ready to invest generously in facilitating the Parole Action Study was an added factor supporting its selection as the base for the exploratory phase of this endeavor.

The California Parole and Community Services Division

The California Parole and Community Services Division is a major division in the California State Department of Corrections, paralleling that responsible for the institutional care of adult offenders. Its Chief is a Deputy Director of the Department. Within its jurisdiction there are currently 773 staff members and 14,956 parolees, located throughout the state. These figures include the staff and parolees in three basic programs with their auxiliary services: parole for male felons; the civil addict parole program; and women's parole.

The PCSD is organized with a central headquarters at the State capital in Sacramento and with five regional offices located throughout the State. One of the regions, Region V, is responsible for civil addicts, male and female, wherever they are located throughout the State. The other four regions¹ divide the State geographically each assuming responsibility for all male and female felon parolees from any institution who reside in the region. Many administrative functions that were reserved for the central office in previous years have been delegated in the past two years to the Regional Administrators, including various planning, budgeting, personnel and

¹ Only the four Regions dealing with felon parolees have been investigated by the Parole Action Study.

program planning responsibilities. As a result the PCSD regions have each developed characteristic administrative patterns. In addition the geographical division locates each region and its parolees in quite different social environments so that one, such as Region III with its headquarters in Los Angeles, must adapt to the conditions of an extensive modern metropolis, while another, such as Region I (headquartered in Sacramento) is more concerned with smaller communities and with wide ranging rural areas. In a limited way the PCSD can be seen as something like a federation of local parole agencies with matters of State-wide concern handled at the top.

Each region is further divided into districts, each composed of two to four supervisory units. There are 15 districts in the four regions under study. Each district is managed by a District Administrator who is responsible for the work of the supervisors, agents and secretaries assigned to his area. The DA acts as business manager for his district; represents his district at the regional level; presents the district calendar at the weekly Board Panel meetings; and is responsible for work with local community agencies and resources.

A supervisory unit is customarily staffed by a supervisor, a Grade II agent who is also an assistant supervisor, and six Grade I agents. Any unit could include a woman agent for work with female parolees, an agent from Region V whose caseload is composed of civil addicts, trainees or aides.

Supervisory units in the PCSD are of two kinds, work unit and conventional, and most districts have at least one conventional unit. This differentiation refers to the way cases are assigned to the unit and has consequences for the size of the caseloads carried by each agent. In the work unit program, cases are weighted for expected social danger and surveillance classification, and are assigned to agents according to the quota of points for his caseload.

Thus an agent in a work unit might have responsibility for 25 to 40 cases as they are usually counted (one per parolee). In the conventional units, cases are assigned to the agent as parolees move into his area of supervision, so a conventional agent's caseload might run from approximately 65 to 80 or more parolees. Standards for the frequency of supervisory conferences, recording, and agent contact with parolees, are higher for agents in the work unit program, and have included the requirement that the agent conduct at least one group counseling class. Standards for frequency of agent activities are less stringent for conventional agents and no group counseling requirement has been made for them.

The units within a district vary markedly in the type of environments within which the parolees live; accordingly unit caseloads show quite different ethnic, economic, and social characteristics. For instance, the Study has been located during one period in a unit whose area of responsibility was primarily a large Mexican barrio; another unit might serve a largely rural area or the middle-class residential segment of a metropolis.

The PCSD works with three parole boards, one for male offenders, one for female felons and a third for civil addicts. For the purposes of the Parole Action Study the Board dealing with male felons, the Adult Authority, is of primary importance. The Adult Authority has state-wide jurisdiction and is responsible for most critical decisions affecting the careers of male offenders in institutions and on parole. The Authority is an independent body, coordinate with the PCSD rather than administratively responsible for it.

In connection with parole the Board sets and resets sentences, determines release dates, establishes the conditions of parole, restores selected civil rights, reviews cases in which serious misbehavior occurs, decides on

revocation or continuance in the community, approves assignment of parolees to short term institutional programs, and grants discharges. It also makes policy concerning case processing, and must approve appointments of parole personnel from Grade III (unit supervisor) up, as well as changes in parole programing and manual procedures. The present Board consists of 7 members; they are aided by 11 Hearing Representatives who team with Board members in panels of two for work on different calendars.

Primary channels for communication between the Adult Authority and the PCSD are provided at three points in the structure. There are liaison relationships between the Board and the PCSD at the central headquarters level. District Administrators present the calendars for their respective districts to the Board panel each week. Agents address case reports directly to the Board whenever a Board decision is required and are governed by Board policies concerning the circumstances that require reports. Agents make their own recommendations to the Board, although supervisors and District Administrators review Board reports and may register a difference of opinion if it is indicated. Recently occasional meetings have been held between Board members and members of a regional executive staff, or as training sessions for agents, in order to discuss the working relations of the Board and the PCSD.

The PCSD maintains three Community Correctional Centers including a half-way house for felon parolees, and two half-way houses for civil addicts. It shares responsibility with institutions, one in the North and one in the South, for two Narcotics Control and Treatment Units for the short term return of felon addicts, and for two additional Short Term Return Units for non-addict felons. Certain districts have units of trainees who are preparing themselves for work as parole agents; and a few districts have an aide program

for indigenous personnel who assist the agents. An extended Work Furlough program has been developed during the period of the Parole Action Study.

Study Focus within the Agency

The Parole Action Study has selected the male felon caseload of the PCSD for special attention and has concentrated on the processes affecting the work of Grade I agents as they deal with this caseload. Thus agents with civil addict parolees, Grade II agents, agents with special assignments such as NCTU, agents with female parolees, trainees and aides have not been included in the samples selected for special study.

The study of administrative processes has also focused on those activities that directly influence the work of the regular agent with the regular caseload. More attention has been given to agents in the work unit program than to those with conventional caseloads because the smaller caseloads in the work unit provide time for the more adequate performance of the approved parole technology.

At first, most of the work of the Parole Action Study was performed in the Oakland District because of its geographical closeness to the Study base at the University of California. The Oakland District was a useful study base in the initial stages because its staff represented a range of ideological approaches to parole, it supervised parolees in a variety of social environments, and it had a relatively stable staff including both old timers and more recently selected agents. The Oakland District also has had the advantage, for study purposes, of responsibility for several special programs, a narcotic testing clinic, a Community Correctional Center with its half-way house, a trainee program, an aide program and an NCTU program in a nearby institution.

From early on, however, Study activities have given attention to other districts and to the State agency as a whole. A period of three months was spent in a second district where agents were reputed to be strongly police-oriented. For over two years the Study director has been a regular observer with the State Executive Staff; she has also explored the various regional administrations. The study of the District Administrator's role has been conducted on a state-wide basis, as has the study of psychiatric services to parolees. As a final step in the Agent-Interaction Study there were three months of intensive study by a team of interviewers in the East-Los Angeles-Huntington Park District in Region III, a district selected by top administration as evidencing differences in caseload and in agent practices from those observed in the Oakland District.

As a result of the various studies, the Parole Action Study has been active in all those four regions with responsibility for male felon parolees, and has done some observation in most of the 15 Districts. Intensive study at the agent-parolee level has been conducted in two districts, reputed to vary over several key dimensions. A third district has been accorded less intensive study.

Recent Changes in the PCSD

It is particularly significant for the Study findings, that the period during which the Study has been conducted has coincided with major organizational innovations in the PCSD directed toward improving parole outcomes through maximizing the help provided for parolees. In 1957 the Division was removed from the administrative responsibility of the Adult Authority and made part of the Department of Corrections. By 1963 a new examination for the Chief of the Division resulted in the appointment of the present Chief, Milton Burdman. He was charged with the task of rationalizing and professionalizing the work of the Division.

The first major reform of the Division in that direction was the establishment of the Work Unit Program, in which a little less than half of the state-wide male felon parolee caseload was assigned to smaller caseloads. This innovation required the hiring of a number of new agents. The Parole Action Study was initiated close to the beginning of the Work Unit Program and so has been able to study the administrative processes used to translate this structural change into changed performance by agents. Soon after the Work Unit Program was established a new law was passed, requiring the Adult Authority to review for possible discharge all parolees who had spent two years on the streets. This legal change has resulted in regular yearly reviews for possible discharge of all cases with two or more years on parole.

A second major program change initiated by the PCSD occurred in 1967 when the administrative structure of the Division was reorganized through the redefinition of regions and the establishment of districts. A critical purpose of the reorganization was to locate a policy representative, the District Administrator, closer to the agents, and to free supervisors for more intensive case supervision. This change also signaled the increased importance assigned to parole in the planning of correctional services for California by elevating the position of Chief of the PCSD to that of a Deputy Director in the Department of Corrections coordinate with the Deputy who is responsible for institutions. The Parole Action Study was present to observe some of the planning for the reorganization, and has followed the processes by which it was established and ultimately consolidated in parole operations.

More recent program developments have included the aide program, the increased provision for and use of the work furlough program, the development of short term return units for non-addict felons, and other programs to

be mentioned as appropriate. Because the PCSD has been in a process of planned change the Study has been able to observe what the various administrative programs designed to help "keep parolees on the streets" have meant for the work of the agents and for the parolees whose adjustment they are expected to facilitate.

Work Prior to LEAA Financing

During three years prior to the receipt of LEAA funds, the director was financed by NIMH to make preliminary explorations in the parole field.¹ With the help of several student associates, who were financed from other sources, the following projects had been undertaken and completed:

- 1) An initial overview of the parole law and agency structure in California.
- 2) Field observation of primary parole activities such as pre-parole and group counseling classes, and of procedures in auxiliary programs such as narcotic testing clinics, half-way houses, and short term return programs for addicts.
- 3) An intensive study of sixteen newly released parolees from just before release through their first four months of parole, including interviews with family members, assigned agents, and representatives of related community agencies, as well as with parolees. (Reported in Studt, Reentry of the Offender into the Community--Appendix I)
- 4) A short study of revocation practices in the Oakland District, resulting in a paper presented to a Sociology and Law Seminar in January, 1967. (Copies of Michael Sanford's "Parole Revocations: Sentencing Without Trial"

¹ The director's salary has been financed throughout the Parole Action Study by NIMH grant # 1-K3-MA-22, 635-01.

are attached. See Appendix II.) This paper focused on the ambiguities and legal issues involved in technical violations of parole.

An additional study had been conducted during 1966 and was continued in 1967 with some financial assistance from LEAA, although the sociology doctoral student conducting it was supported by an independent fellowship. This study consisted of a year's follow-up of 116 parolees released to the Oakland and San Francisco Districts during a six-week period in the summer of 1967. Forty inmates to be released from northern institutions were interviewed prior to release; ten of these were interviewed intensively during their first weeks on parole, while a second interviewer talked with the families of parolees in the sub-sample of forty. This six month phase was concluded with a follow-up interview with all available respondents in the sub-sample, a total of 31.

A second phase of the study included a series of discussions with a seminar of convicts in prison, and interviews with fifteen ex-convicts who had been out of prison at least five years. The final phase consisted of administering a 180 item interview to the 70 parolees from the original sample of 116 who could be located at the end of a year on parole.

The document resulting from this study is John Irwin's The Career of the Felon; it constitutes his dissertation for his Ph.D. in Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley. It includes information about the parole period, as well as about other phases from pre-conviction through post-parole. The manuscript has been accepted for publication by Prentice-Hall, Inc. and is due in book form during the Fall of 1969 under the title The Felon. Ten copies of the book will be provided for LEAA files at the time of publication (constituting Appendix V).

By the time of funding by LEAA, the Parole Action Study had already identified through its initial exploratory work several key questions that

would guide efforts throughout the following two and a half years. The final book will address itself in some detail to the issues raised by these questions. They included:

- 1) What factor--or factors--are common to all parolees and are of such importance that all should be subject to the same conditions of parole?
- 2) What is the rationale for providing service to parolees through the parole organization; and to what extent might parolees be dealt with for service needs as members of other needy populations rather than as parolees?
- 3) What kinds of competence are implied in the definition of the agent's job and in the kinds of issues that come to him for action; and what are the probabilities that all such competences can be found in one person however well trained he may be?
- 4) What are the consequences of the fact that the agent has power to initiate a parolee's return to prison for the use made by parolees of agent help and for the kind of help the agents can give?
- 5) What organizational factors make a difference for the kind of help an agent can give?

With these questions and others already identified as of primary significance, in March, 1967, the Parole Action Study began a two and a half year period with sufficient funds for additional staff.

Study Personnel

Employed Staff

The persons who have been part of the Parole Action Study Staff since funds were granted from LEAA include:

Director - Elliot Studt

Temporary Senior Sociologist - Dr. John McNamara, sociologist, May, 1967 to September, 1967.

Doctoral Students Pursuing Dissertations:

1. John Irwin, Sociology, March, 1967 to September, 1968; dissertation completed.
2. Bernard Davitto, Social Welfare, September, 1967 to September, 1969.
3. Paul Raymer, Social Welfare, July, 1967 to September, 1969.
4. Forrest Dill, Sociology, June, 1967 to October, 1968.

Research Assistants:

1. Ruby Hertz, Criminology student, June, 1967 to September, 1967.
2. David Bentel, Criminology student, October, 1967 to October, 1968.
3. Katherine Johnson, Sociology student, July, 1967 to January, 1968.
4. Carlos Kruytbosch, Sociology student, May, 1968 to August, 1968.
5. Otto Broady, former parole agent, full-time from June, 1968 to September, 1969.
6. Daniel Beagle, former newspaper man and history instructor, full-time from June, 1968 to September, 1969.
7. Jacob Sperber, Sociology student, July, 1968 to October, 1968.
8. Robert Stratmore, Sociology student, July, 1968 to September, 1968.

Administrative Assistants:

1. Shirley Sanford, from June, 1967 to September, 1969.
2. Alice Lynn, Sociology, November, 1967 to February, 1968.

Secretaries:

1. Judy Dewing, March, 1967 to September, 1969.
2. Occasional part-time help as necessary.

Many of the staff members mentioned above alternated periods of part-time work with periods of full-time employment.

Consultants and Associates

The Parole Action Study has been particularly rich in the intellectual resources available in its environment. Based in the Center for the Study of

Law and Society, the Study has had the benefit of frequent consultation with Dr. Sheldon Messinger, the Vice Chairman of the Center; and has worked with Professor Caleb Foote of Law and Criminology during periods when he was in residence. Dr. Phillippe Nonet, Sociology, has also been helpful in the clarification of issues.

The administrators of the PCSD have provided valuable assistance in analysing issues as well as in facilitating research activities. Special help has been received from Mr. Milton Burdman, Chief; Ernest Reimer, Associate Chief; Walter R. Burkhardt and Victor Bluestein, members of the headquarters staff; James Robison, John Bull, Vita Ryan, Dorothy Jaman, and others in the Department of Corrections Research Division. The Regional Administrators have also contributed much to the Study's thinking, especially Bertram Griggs and Glynn Smith of Region III and J.H. Hubbell of Region II.

Two consultants from the University of California have worked closely with the director in the design and analysis of the field studies and the Interaction Survey. They are Dr. Anselm Strauss, Sociologist, University School of Nursing; and Dr. Gertrude Selznick, Research Sociologist, Survey Research Center.

The Parole Action Study has also been fortunate in the resource persons who have been associated with it at various times during the two and a half years. Dr. Howard Becker, Sociology, provided a training session for the staff in the techniques of field observation and interviewing. Christopher Nuttall, Research Officer in the Home office, United Kingdom, and United Nations Human Rights Fellow, used Study facilities and participated in staff discussions for a nine month period from December, 1967 through August, 1968. Mr. Keith Hawkins of Cambridge, England, consulted with the Study during the summer of 1968 while he was studying parole in the United States. Professor Arthur Rosett, UCLA Law School, made two visits to the Study for the discussion

of mutual interests in the legal meaning of wardship. Mr. Robert Montilla, Director of the Model Community Correctional Project (also financed by LEAA) was frequently in touch with the Parole Action Study. Professor E.K. Nelson of the University of Southern California Department of Public Administration acted as Chairman of the National Advisory Committee and has provided helpful consultation on a number of issues.

Advisory Committee

A National Advisory Committee consisting of nationally known correctional leaders met for two days in October, 1967. A second meeting was postponed because of the field work schedule and then was postponed again because of the director's illness. A final meeting for a review of findings will be scheduled during the Spring of 1970 prior to the preparation of the final book manuscript.

The members of the Advisory Committee include: Dr. E.K. Nelson, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California; Mr. John Wallace, Director of Probation for the Courts of New York City; Mr. Albert Wahl, Chief U.S. Probation Officer, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California; Dr. Norval Morris, Director, University of Chicago Center for Studies in Criminal Justice; Mr. Vincent O'Leary, School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York; and Professor Clarence Schrag of the Department of Sociology, University of Washington.

The first meeting of the Advisory Committee devoted itself to a discussion of Study plans, using the Conceptual Framework for the Parole Action Study, October 9, 1967, prepared by Studt as the base of the discussion. (See Appendix III) A number of recommendations to guide the Study were made, including 1) that the Study should concentrate its efforts on studying a single State parole system rather than attempting to spread its current

resources across several systems; and 2) that additional Advisory Committee meetings should not be held regularly throughout the life of the Study but should be devoted to consideration of Study findings prior to writing the final manuscript.

The California Department of Corrections has also provided an Advisory Committee which has met on call when significant issues concerning the direction of the Study have been under consideration. This Committee has included Milton Burdman, Chief, and Ernest Reimer, Deputy Chief, of the Parole and Community Services Division along with Victor Bluestein and Walter R. Burkhardt of the PCSD headquarters staff; Lawrence Bennett, Chief of the Department of Corrections Research Division, together with the research supervisor responsible for parole studies; and a representative from the Institutions Division. Members of the Department of Corrections Advisory Committee also participated in the meeting of the National Advisory Committee.

Work Accomplished

List of Studies

Without attempting to indicate how the various pieces of work were assigned, the small studies conducted under the auspices of the Parole Action Study during the period financed by LEAA are listed below by subject matter:

1. History

A survey of parole literature, including that from other countries as well as the United States.

A short history of California parole from 1887 to 1956 with a statistical analysis of flow of population between institutions and parole from 1893 to 1964.

An analysis of the 1917 Indeterminate Sentence Law in California.

An intensive history of the present administration of California paroles beginning in 1963, with particular attention to the rationales developed for major program innovations such as the Work Unit Program and the Reorganization.

Short histories of five programs for service to parolees developed in California, including narcotics treatment and control, group counseling, work furlough, short term return units, and half-way houses.

2. Administration

Observation by the director of PCSD Executive Staff meetings on a monthly basis from February, 1967, until July, 1969 (with an eight month break because of the director's absences on field work and because of illness).

Interviews with the Regional Administrators.

Observation of the Executive Staff meetings of Regions II and III during selected periods.

A study of the role of the District Administrator under the reorganization, with interviews and attendance at meetings in 13 of the 15 districts. (See attachment #1 prepared by Paul Raymer.)

Intensive study of two districts, including week-long observation of administrative processes in each.

3. Agents

A preliminary study in preparation for the Agent-Parolee Interaction Study, conducted in the Fall of 1967 by observers accompanying all Grade I agents in the Oakland District for one full work day each.

The Agent-Parolee Interaction Study (to be reported in detail in a following section).

4. Parolees

John Irwin's study of "The Career of the Felon" (See p. 13).

The Agent-Parolee Interaction Study.

A panel study of eleven families of parolees for twelve months after release.

5. Service Programs

A study of the Parole Outpatient Psychiatric Clinics. (See attachment #2 prepared by Bernard Davitto.)

A small observational study during one three-month period of all group counseling classes conducted by agents in the Oakland District.

6. Community

Three months observation of a police-oriented parole district with special attention to its relationships with community service agencies and with law enforcement.

A three-month study of 30 selected service agencies in the Oakland District with attention to intake policies and agency experiences with parolee clients.

Methods Used

Each of these small studies involved administrative preparation by the director and introduction of the researcher into the field. Preparation for field work in most studies has included a search of the literature and an accumulation of pertinent administrative memoranda and working papers. Wherever possible, researchers used observation as well as interviews. Except in the Agent-Parolee Interaction Study and John Irwin's final interviews with parolees, all the interviews have been open-ended, following general guides composed of selected topics to which questions were to be addressed. All interview reports were written soon after exposure to the field; followed the

actual process of the interview experience as closely as possible; and were prepared in duplicate. In order to protect the commitment of confidentiality to all respondents, both copies of the field reports were stored in locked files at the Center for the Study of Law and Society, and were to be used only in the Center's office. The only exception to this rule applied to dissertation students who were permitted to keep copies of their own reports at home provided they followed the same protocol for protecting confidentiality. Most studies resulted in short working papers which were presented to staff and consultants for discussion and criticism.

The Information File

The listing of the data sources on which Study findings will be based would not be complete without mentioning the large collection of documentary materials related to parole in California, in the United States, and elsewhere that has been accumulated during the life of the Parole Action Study. This file has been of use not only to Study staff but also to visitors interested in parole such as Christopher Nuttall and Keith Hawkins. The organization of this material together with the management of other forms of data has required a part-time administrative assistant during the last two and a half years.

The Study of PCSD as the Organizational Context for Technology

The Parole Action Study has made two approaches to understanding the PCSD as the organizational context for the interaction of the agent and the parolee. The two approaches have continued side by side.

1) One approach has been essentially programmatic and historical. Through the analysis of documents and interviews with administrative personnel, an outline of structural developments in the PCSD since 1963 with emphasis on

central policy concerns has been prepared. This survey has been elaborated through short histories of important sub-programs with which the PCSD has been concerned, also written with an emphasis on policy issues and their attempted resolutions. The Parole Psychiatric Outpatient Clinic, half-way houses, the narcotics control and treatment program, group counseling, short-term return units, and the work-furlough program are examples of the special service programs given attention. Observation of such programs in operation has supplemented and enriched with concrete details the Study's understanding of policy issues, as have discussions with agents and parolees about their experiences in relation to such programs.

2) The second approach has involved observation of the agency in action at various levels in the administrative hierarchy, e.g., the Executive Staff for the State; The Regional Administrator and his staff at the regional level; the District Administrator as he operates within the district; supervisors operating within the Unit; agents and their activities in the community and with parolees. Observation of meetings and of daily operations has been supplemented by lengthy semi-structured interviews with many individuals at each level, in which special attention has been given to the individual's perception of his functions, his major problems, and his methods for managing as they have been experienced in each of his various role relationships.

Two major studies, focused on administration in action, have continued over the last two and a half years, although all studies have contributed in some way to the information gathered about parole programs and administrative behavior.

1) During this period the director has been present at most of the Executive Staff meetings which are convened on a monthly or bi-monthly basis. The Executive Staff of the PCSD is composed of the headquarters staff, including

persons with both line and staff functions, together with the Regional Administrators. Frequently administrators from other related bodies are also present, such as Department of Corrections officials or representatives of the Adult Authority; and other persons with special assignments in the PCSD are also often in attendance to make presentations. The opportunity to observe these meetings in sequence has enabled the Study to follow policy issues and decisions as they developed over time, as well as to accumulate information about the various administrative approaches used in the several regions. It has also provided valuable background for observing with understanding the ways in which policy becomes translated into action at the level of dealing with parolees.

2) A second study has focused on the District Administrator as a key position created by the reorganization to improve agent operation with parolees. This study has been conducted in large part by Paul Raymer, a Social Welfare doctoral student. The methods he has used are given in detail in the attached statement, "Middle Management in Parole". (See attachment #1.)

Several organizational themes have emerged as of particular importance in the studies of the different levels of administration in the PCSD. Of these, three will be mentioned.

1) The management of relationships with its own organizational environment is a necessarily central and abiding concern of PCSD administration. This environment at the State level includes not only the Department of Corrections, the institutions, and the Adult Authority, but also the Legislature, various other bureaucracies in the state government, and national funding agencies. At the regional and district levels, the same phenomenon occurs with the relationships with police, jails, courts, probation, welfare, indigenous organizations, federal programs, and the employment services

providing the problems and requiring the compromises that make up the ultimate context of the agent-parolee interaction. The herculean investment of time, energy and inventiveness in managing these outside-the-agency relationships required to accomplish any organizational change in paroles is impressive; but the fact that the agency is seldom able to move directly and swiftly from idea to implementation in significant matters relates to certain difficulties in agent response to changes in policy and program.

2) One of the major means used by recent PCSD administration to communicate policy intent in a meaningful fashion to the officials who deal directly with the parolees has been the strategy of encouraging "participative management". This strategy has involved progressive and continuing delegation of responsibilities for planning, program development, and evaluation from the State headquarters to the Regional administrations; from the Regional office to the District Administrators; and from the DA's to the supervisors and agents. It has also called for increasing participation of lower echelons in the planning processes of upper policy levels. One of the interesting aspects of this strategy is the demand it makes on upper level administrators to facilitate the assumption of responsibility by lower echelon groups and to respond effectively to innovative proposals coming up from below; and such processes require highly sophisticated management skills. The efforts to move the PCSD from the semi-military organization of the 1950's when obedience to orders was assumed to accomplish the goal while personal relations determined individual success, to an organization capable of both discipline according to policy and innovation will comprise an important case history of an attempt to put the principles of participative management into practice in a large correctional bureaucracy.

3) A third theme, among the several organizational issues on which we have accumulated data, will be mentioned here. The administrative problems

at all levels of the PCSD operation that arise from the fact that the Adult Authority controls policy about and makes critical decisions concerning the delivery of agency service to individual parolees has much to do with apparent problems in agent operation. What the parolee ultimately gets from the agency through the agent is often a compromise between Adult Authority policy with its primary emphasis on "protection of the community" and PCSD policy focused on increasing service in order to "keep parolees on the street safely". These two formulations of the goals guiding policy involve complicated differences between the Adult Authority and the PCSD in the definition of what constitutes social danger and in the prescriptions for dealing with possible social danger. The dilemmas of attempting to fulfill the intended mandates of both sets of policy in a responsible fashion appear in the operation of officials at all levels in the PCSD; and the Study's report of the various means individuals in different positions use to resolve these dilemmas in the direction of service to parolees should illuminate those aspects of technology that are primarily responsive to a difficult goal structure.

The Parole Psychiatric Outpatient Clinic

The POC, as it is known, has been studied as an example of combining two different technologies, the agent's and the therapist's, in direct action toward the parolee. The POC in California is organized into two Clinics, one operating in the north and the other in the south. The Clinics act as relatively independent units within the PCSD, with administrative responsibility for both Clinics and agents merged at the headquarters level. Certain of the organizational dilemmas suggested in the previous section as significant for the PCSD as a whole have appeared in even more intensive form in the study of the POC operation.

The study of POC, conducted by Bernard Davitto, Social Welfare doctoral student, has combined attention to organizational problems with an in-depth examination of the perceptions and activities of the agents and therapists as well as of parolee perceptions and reactions. The methods used in this study along with initial findings are reported in Mr. Davitto's statement, "Psychiatric Services in Parole". (See attachment #2.)

The Parolees

Much of the Parole Action Study's initial exploration of parolee experiences had already been concluded by the time funds were received from LEAA. Elliot Studt, Reentry of the Offender into the Community, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, #9002, 1967 (Appendix I) was published just as the LEAA phase of the Study's work was beginning. John Irwin's study, resulting in the book The Felon (Appendix V), had been operating for a year and only the administration of the final structured interview to the complete sample remained to be done. The final step in studying parolees and their experiences in the community occurred in the Agent-Parolee Interaction Study, and it constitutes a major portion of the work financed by LEAA.

The rationale for focusing the Parole Action Study's initial explorations on an examination of the parolee's situation and task is found in a guiding premise of all the Study's work: that the basic work of parole--the reincorporation of the parolee into his personal community in a set of viable working relationships--is, in the nature of reality, done only by the parolee and his significant others. In this special kind of relationship with the "raw material" of the organization, the parole agency is like other organizations whose products inhere in what non-agency-employed persons do in their own lives. When this kind of agency-raw material relationship is found, in

what is usually called "an organization with clients," the basic technology of those employees who work directly with the "raw material" persons--called agents in parole--needs to be structured as a facilitating or servicing task, one of encouraging the presence of conditions that support the client and his significant others in establishing the desired relationships among themselves. Accordingly, it was essential for the Parole Action Study to conceptualize and analyze the task facing the parolee before it could conceptualize and analyze the technology used by agents to support work done on that task.

The parolee's task, as it is revealed in all the work of the Parole Action Study, can be described in over-simplified form as:

- 1) Performing the normal roles of any self-sufficient individual in the community;
- 2) as a "stranger," or "returnee";
- 3) from a background experience, the patterns of which are inappropriate for present tasks and whose existence imputes stigma;
- 4) while usually lacking the normal resources in money, possessions, memberships, and intimate ties on which most persons rely when making critical life changes;
- 5) and while adapting to a dependent, supervised role in an agency that represents jeopardy of freedom together with an offer of help.

To oversimplify again, what the parolees most consistently express in describing the problems of return to the community, is not the hostility toward agents that was widely expected when the Parole Action Study began, but rather the human difficulty they experience in attempting to combine the role of "a man," as it is implied in point #1, and the role of "parolee" as it is implied in point #5.

We began to understand in more detail the dilemmas agents experience, as well as the conceptual problems in parole technology, when we made our

intensive study of agents attempting to use the parolee-agency relationship of point #5 in helping parolees with the tasks implied in points #1 through #4. That Study--the Agent-Parolee Interaction Study--will be described in detail in the next section.

The Agent-Parolee Interaction Study

The Agent-Parolee Interaction Study has been the focus for major attention in the Parole Action Study since April, 1968. It has examined that point of service delivery where the entire system, as implemented by the agent, impinges on the tasks of the individual parolee. The Study includes intensive exploration of both parole technology as it is practiced by selected agents and the consequences of the use of technology for parolee perceptions, attitudes and behavior. Because the findings of this study are expected to give significance to all other segments of the Parole Action Study, the methods used will be described in detail in this report. In fact, the "invention" and refinement of this method for exploring the interaction between an organization and its clients might be considered one of the Parole Action Study's major contributions to the field.

Method of Study

The Agent-Parolee Interaction Study was the final unit in the series of studies conducted over a four-year period by the Parole Action Study. It was based on earlier studies, each focussed on a different horizontal grouping in the parole system, e.g., upper administration, middle management, agents, parolees, through which general information had been collected about the problems and attitudes characteristic of persons in different positions in the system. Now information was needed about what happened when agents and parolees interacted, since it is at this point that official policies are implemented in the lives of parolees, and the goals of the entire organization

are either accomplished or not.

It took three years to design a method for "catching" the specifics of interaction between agents and parolees, because parole activity at the agent-parolee level tends to be unscheduled and dispersed geographically. The parole process at the client level operates throughout the community and around the clock rather than within the four walls and known schedule of an institution. Critical parts of an important event in the person's career as a parolee might take place on the street at 2:00 a.m., at the parolee's home or work, in an unscheduled administrative conference in the parole office, at an Adult Authority hearing, at the jail, the welfare office, or a corner bar. In consequence we found it difficult to follow any given event throughout its sequence; it was easier to identify general attitudes than to discover the responses of various actors to specific shared events; and we lacked information about how different kinds of agents responded to different parolees around similar events.

The Agent-Parolee Interaction Study did not produce the complete documentation we would have liked. It did, however, provide us with much fuller information about how parole policy affects the behavior of different kinds of agents, how agents vary their use of policy in response to different kinds of parolees, and how agent behaviors are perceived and reacted to by different kinds of parolees.

Basic Design and Variations

The basic design of the Interaction Study called for: 1) observation of each of a selected sample of agents during four to five (preferably continuous) working days, involving both office and field activities; 2) concurrent, open-ended interviews with a third to a half of the parolees on each such agent's caseload, selected to show a range of parolee situations; 3) observation of interaction between each agent and as many as possible of the parolees

under study from his caseload; 4) administration to each parolee in the sample of a schedule of critical questions about his relationship to his agent and his experiences in the parole system; 5) administration of a similar schedule to each agent about each sample parolee from his caseload; 6) implementation of this study in two parole districts, each of which had been studied in terms of the organizational factors affecting the agent's work.

This design had several elements intended to increase the probability that the desired information would be obtained. The sample of agents was selected to give us the widest possible range of styles of management within a known organizational framework. The specification that observation would continue through a sequence of working days reduced the possibility that the agent would be able to screen his activities in order to present an artificial impression; it also increased the chances that the details of certain decision-making sequences would be available for observation and inquiry. The number of parolees from each caseload was large to assure observation of the agent's reactions to a range of parole situations. The fact that the parolees were being interviewed close to the period of agent observations facilitated the interviewers in evoking from both sides specific reactions to identified events. The use of similar schedules administered to both parolees and agents on each case obtained systematic answers to critical questions as checks to the open-ended interviewing, and permitted examination of the differences between agent and parolee perspectives on similarly stated issues. The administration of the study in two different districts helped to clarify how the organizational framework for agent work introduced differences in practice, and permitted certain generalizations about the problems and adaptations that appear across the board.

Not all the studies in which interaction schedules were administered to both agents and parolees followed the basic design of the Interaction Study. As a result, there are two samples, in one of which all major aspects of the Interaction Study design were followed, in the other only that part which combined open-ended interviewing of both parties with the administration of the schedules.

Sample I: In the major Interaction Study the sample included eleven agents and 152 parolees from two different parole districts in California. 100% of the sample agents were studied; approximately 83% of the parolees in the sample were located and were willing to participate. This group of agents and parolees has been called Sample I.

Within Sample I there were minor methodological differences between the studies of the two districts. In the Oakland District, which was studied first, there was a period of four months for field work. The staff included two observers for the agents and six interviewers for the parolees. Accordingly it was possible to interview most parolees twice and a few from three to seven times. In the East Los Angeles-Huntington Park District the study had to be completed in two and a half months and the staff consisted of one observer for agents and two parolee interviewers. In this district most parolees could be interviewed only once and the schedule was administered at that interview. This reduction in number of interviews resulted in somewhat less rich data from the parolees, since the second interview usually found the parolee more relaxed and often he had remembered new details or had recent experiences to relate. The schedules administered in the southern district were both slightly revised from the version used in the Oakland District on the basis of experience in the northern study.

Sample II: During the period of the Interaction Study three related studies with somewhat different designs were conducted. In each of these it

seemed useful to administer the agent and parolee schedules developed for the Interaction Study. At present, this sample includes 16 agents and 53 parolees, none of whom were studied in Sample I. In Sample II there was a 100% return from the agents, and an approximately 73% return from parolees.

Sample I and Sample II differ in significant ways which affect the use of each for analysis, although they can be used together for certain purposes.

1) In Sample I the agents were selected according to a rationale (to be described) and the parolees were selected in order to exemplify the range of parolee situations found in each selected agent's caseload. In Sample II most of the cases were selected because we wished to study parolees in certain situations, such as patients of the Outpatient Psychiatric Clinic or newly released parolees; the agents involved in the study simply happened to be assigned to those parolees. Furthermore in Sample I all but one of the agent's caseloads are represented by 12-19 parolees;¹ in Sample II many of the agents are represented in the parolee sample by one individual and the maximum number of parolees from any one caseload is seven.

2) In Sample I both agents and parolees were interviewed extensively about the way parole conditions were implemented in the individual case. In Sample II, the interviews with agents and parolees tended to be much less detailed about the use and impact of parole regulations, focussing on other aspects of the parolee's experience.

3) In Sample I all cases were drawn from the two districts in which the organizational framework had been studied in detail. Most of the Sample II cases were drawn from one of these districts; however, a number of cases were

¹ One agent in Sample I was represented by only 8 parolees because he was initially resistant to having his parolees interviewed. He is included in Sample I because the rest of the study of him and his caseload fulfills all other Sample I requirements.

scattered throughout the State in areas about which the Study has little specific information.

The Selection of Sample I in the Agent-Parolee Interaction Study

The Districts: The two districts were selected in consultation with State level personnel and with the administrators of the two Regions (II and III), to which the Parole Action Study was giving special attention.

The Oakland District in Region II had been chosen for special study four years earlier at the beginning of the Parole Action Study, chiefly because it was geographically accessible to the Center for the Study of Law and Society. The district was large in area, covering most of two counties in which a wide variety of environments could be found, e.g., ghettos, well-to-do urban areas, industrialized, suburban and rural areas. 800 plus parolees lived throughout the district. The district parole agency was housed in the office section of a Community Correctional Center and consisted of three supervisory units, two work units and one conventional unit. Each unit had a supervisor, a Grade II parole agent who acted as an assistant supervisor, and six Grade I agents. Also housed in the Center building was the District Administrator, the clerical staff and several auxiliary service staffs, including the personnel managing the halfway house, a small trainee program, and a program of training for several indigenous personnel known as aides. The office was within driving distance of two major correctional institutions for the inmates of which the agents provided certain services.

The East Los Angeles-Huntington Park District in Region III was chosen on the recommendation of upper administrative officials as a comparison district for the Interaction Study. This district was quite different from the Oakland District although it was responsible for approximately the same number of parolees, a little over 800. It covered two deteriorated areas within Los Angeles proper, one a Mexican barrio and the other on the edge of the Negro

ghetto in Watts. It was located in two offices, each primarily related to a different ethnic group. The East Los Angeles office had a supervisor, a Grade II agent and nine Grade I agents. A high proportion of the parolees on its caseload were Mexican addicts. The only auxiliary staff were two aides, both of whom were parolees. The Huntington Park office was located in a conservative, small business community on the edge of the Negro ghetto and most of the parolees were blacks. This office contained two supervisory units, one with an unfilled Grade II position and one with an unfilled Grade I position. A recent redeployment of staff within the district had grouped agents in units according to perceived orientations to parole work. All three units in this district were work units. The District Administrator was located in the building housing the East Los Angeles Unit and each office had its own clerical staff. Both units served inmates in a nearby correctional institution.

The Agents: The population from which the Sample I agents were selected included all male Grade I agents in each of the districts. Three kinds of information were considered in selecting the agents for the sample: 1) information already gathered by the Parole Action Study about agents in the Oakland District; 2) rough statistical information gathered in each of the two regions about the frequency with which individual agents returned men to prison on technical violation charges; and 3) information about agent reputations gathered in a series of rating interviews conducted by the Study director with administrative personnel. These sources of information were unequally useful.

1) Previously gathered information: Information about agents in the Oakland District had been gathered in various small studies during the previous three years. Of these, the most systematic for sampling purposes consisted of observations of one day's tour of duty with each Grade I agent in that

district. In addition the Study had observed all the group counseling sessions conducted by Oakland agents during one three month period; had records of many meetings and small informal gatherings in which agents had expressed their ideas about parole; and had reports of discussions with individual agents about those parolees on their caseloads who had been included in two studies of parolees. The Study had originally hoped to develop a typology of agents, but had given up this attempt as the range of behavior each agent evidenced in response to different kinds of parolee situations was discovered. However, at the start of the Interaction Study the Study did have already formulated impressions about the various styles of management represented by most of the agents in the Oakland District.

2) Statistical information: Statistical information about the rates of revocation actions by agents proved difficult to obtain and not very satisfactory for Study purposes. At the State level such information had been kept by caseload rather than by agents; it was not easily available for analysis; and, since both parolees and agents move from time to time from one caseload to another, the usefulness of caseload rates would have been minimal, at best. Three additional sources of information about agent Board report performances were discovered. Region II had kept a record of agent recommendations to the Board for the period June-November, 1967; the Oakland District had a record of Board actions by agent for the period January-August, 1967; and Region III had information from February 1 to July 31, 1968 on agent recommendations and Board actions on all cases in which revocation was considered. These records provided rough indices for considering agents as possible high or low revokers. As the Study continued, however, it was discovered that such indices might reflect more about the caseload than about the agent's orientations; for instance, a caseload with a high proportion of addicts would usually show a high rate of parole interruptions, regardless of the agent's disposition to act, because of specific narcotic detection techniques,

continuous police activity in relation to addicts, and the high probability that the Board would institutionalize a known addict who had been discovered using or in possession of drugs.

3) Agent reputations with administrators: Agent reputations were assessed through a series of rating interviews with administrators. The respondents included four administrative staff members at the State headquarters; the Regional Administrators in Regions II and III; both District Administrators; and the three Unit Supervisors in each of the two districts. Each respondent was requested to 1) describe his own job as a base for observation and evaluation of subordinates; 2) state his criteria for performance in each subordinate position; 3) rate his subordinates at various levels, stating his reasons for such evaluations; and 4) state his goals for the improvement of parole, in order of priority. In this process the Study gained information about administrative expectations for different positions and about the range of performances perceived at different positional levels. Information about specific agents became more detailed as the interviews moved down through the echelons to the district level where agent styles of management had been observed on a daily basis. All administrators, however, seemed to use three general dimensions for evaluating agent work: 1) attitude toward parolees, from punitive to helpful; 2) organization of work, from very well organized to disorganized; and 3) type of commitment to the agency and its service function, i.e., committed, bureaucratic, or routine. The sample of selected agents includes agents who were reputed to evidence each of the recognized adaptations along these dimensions except that of serious disorganization.

The basis for selection of agents varied in the two districts, although in both checks with administrators confirmed that the chosen agents evidenced

a variety of styles of management. In the Oakland District seven agents could be studied so names were drawn from the entire rating range, ending with four agents who were evaluated highly and three who were rated less favorably. One was a conventional unit agent; two were located in one work unit and four in the other. In the East Los Angeles-Huntington Park District four agents were uniformly rated as top performers, although each was reputed to evidence a quite different pattern of operation. These agents were selected for study, first, because time limited the Study to four agent respondents, and second, because at this point the Study desired to explore the degree to which the problems evidenced in the work of the Oakland agents also concerned agents who were reported to be outstandingly capable and sensitive. Two of the selected agents were located in the East Los Angeles Unit; one in each of the two Huntington Park Units.

Although the Study had official permission to study the work of agents, each agent was asked if he was willing to participate and given a chance to refuse. Each was promised that information about him as an individual would be kept confidential, and he was assured that he would not be asked to change his regular plan for work during the observation period. At first, two of the eleven agents were hesitant about participating, one because he objected to a woman observer, the other because of uncertainty in his personal schedule at the time of the Study. When the Study adapted its arrangements to these conditions both agreed to participate.

The Parolees: The parolees in Sample I were selected by agent nomination and by request to the parolee from the researcher during observation trips with the agent. The first step in securing sample parolees occurred when the agent was asked to be part of the Study. After he agreed, he was asked to name five parolees with whom we might begin interviewing. One parolee was to

be a relatively new releasee; one was to be close to discharge; a third was to be a parolee for whom revocation might be considered in the near future; and two more were to represent either problem situations in which the agent was particularly interested at that time or the extremes of cooperativeness and resistance to parole. These nominations insured that the sample would include parolees at the various stages of parole, and of varying degrees of success. The arrangement also permitted the interviewers to begin contacting parolees prior to the week of agent observation.

The second step in building the parolee sample occurred during the week of agent observation. The interviewer accompanying the agent requested parolees observed in interaction with the agent to participate in the Study, selecting those who seemed to the observer to represent variations in situations and in relationship with the agent. The number of parolees secured during the observation week varied according to the productivity of the agent's work during that period. When the agent experienced many "no calls", the number of interactions observed was reduced; almost every contacted parolee had to be asked to participate; and in some cases names were added to the list because of information from the agent even if the parolee had not been reached during the agent's tour of duty.

The final step in selecting parolees occurred on the last day of the observation week when the researcher asked the agent to check over the parolee sample from his caseload to see if, in his judgment, a representative range of cases had been selected. On occasion the researcher had to probe for additional nominations that would represent "parole successes" or parolees who might be expected to be bitter about the agent when such types had not yet appeared on the list.

All parolees were assured that their participation was completely voluntary and that no information of any sort would be communicated about them to

the parole agent. Some parolees checked with their agents about the Study and most agents were helpful in encouraging uncertain parolees to participate, affirming the confidentiality of information and the agent's desire that the Study would secure full and accurate information from all participants. The agents often emphasized that they too were being studied and that they expected changes of value to parolees to result from the Study. At no time did any agent attempt to pressure the interviewers for information about their parolees. The only real difficulty in maintaining the promised confidentiality of parolee information occurred when interviewers needed to return to the agent for help in locating a parolee who could not be found otherwise. On these occasions the interviewer said that he might have copied the address incorrectly or asked for additional addresses of relatives or friends with whom he might check, in order to avoid suggesting that changes had occurred in the parolee's situation that were not already known to the agent.

Only three parolees in Sample I refused to participate in the first interview. One was "not interested"; one resented the Study because it was not sponsored and administered by his ethnic organization; the third was a mentally disturbed individual who said he would talk with us after discharge from parole and who has since been committed to a mental hospital. An additional four parolees were unwilling to talk with us a second time for the purpose of completing the schedule. Three of these did not want to have anything to do with parole that they were not required to do; one was obviously "on the nod" from drugs.

Ten parolees in Sample I were never located for the first interview. Of these, two were officially designated Parolees at Large during the time of the Study; another had been discharged and had moved out of the State shortly after the interviewer started looking for him; and two more had been

inaccessible to the agent for some time. The others might be classified as "latent refusals", as evidenced by such avoidance techniques as broken appointments or repeated reports from family members that the man was not at home although all signs indicated that he was.

Nine additional parolees participated for a first interview and then could not be located for the second interview to complete the schedule. One of these men had died in the interim; two had been discharged and their whereabouts were unknown; and the others were as difficult for the agent to locate as for the interviewers.

The Schedules

When most of the parolee sample in the Oakland District had been interviewed once, the need for a more systematic method for getting comparable answers to key questions from all respondents was recognized. Although most content areas, such as parolee experiences just before and just after release or in connection with specific rules, were covered by each interviewer, the interviewers differed in the skill with which they could elicit more abstract information such as a description of the strategies a parolee used in dealing with his agent. Accordingly, a schedule of critical questions was prepared to be administered to each parolee; and a complementary schedule, with questions appropriate for agents, was prepared for each agent to complete on each of the sample parolees in his caseload.

The schedules in themselves constituted a beginning analysis of the data obtained in the open-ended interviews. For the parolees, the schedule fell into two parts: information about the way the parolee and the agent interacted; and information about the parolee's experiences within the parole system. For the agent the emphasis in the schedule was on his perception

of the parolee's situation, the ways in which he and the parolee interacted, and the influence of administrative decisions on his own strategies for dealing with the parolee. Both parolees and agents were asked a set of questions about changes in parole that had been proposed by parolees. Each schedule took approximately twenty minutes to administer, although this time per schedule was reduced for the agents, each of whom was completing a number of schedules at one sitting. The questions were read to the respondents; the answers to questions and additional comments were recorded by the interviewer.

Three versions of the schedule for parolees were used. The first version was administered to a few parolees as a pre-test; the second was used for the rest of the Oakland sample; and the third, containing small revisions made on the basis of the Oakland experience, was used with the Los Angeles sample. There were two versions of the agent schedule, one used in the north and a slightly revised version in the south. Because many of the questions on the pretest schedule for the parolees and on the later version were similar, and because the number of parolees representing any agent's caseload was small, we have included answers to all pertinent questions on the pretest schedule in the analysis of the total sample in order not to lose cases from agent sub-samples.

Methods of Interviewing

The Agents: Interviewing with the agents involved almost unlimited availability on the part of the observer during the designated work week. The work day might begin anywhere from eight in the morning until shortly after noon, and might end anywhere from three in the afternoon until nine-thirty or ten in the evening. The observer asked the agent not to vary his week's plan in any way because of the researcher's presence. Accordingly the observer was present during arrests and the transportation of revoked

parolees from jail to prison as well as at interviews with parolees conducted in the parole office, in parolee homes, at the parolee's place of employment, in jails, prisons, Service Centers, or coffee shops. The observer also was present during office hours when the agent made telephone calls, assumed OD duties, attended meetings, recorded activities, wrote Board reports, conferred with supervisors, or participated in bull sessions with fellow agents. Additional settings for observation included group counseling classes involving several parolees, and agent interviews with various service agency personnel, police officials, probation officers, or potential employers of parolees.

In all cases where other persons besides the agent were involved the agent was requested to introduce the observer as "from the University" and to give the individual a chance to object to the observer's presence. In most cases the agents complied with this request. If the agent neglected to mention the voluntary aspect of the situation, it was usually possible for the observer to insert this information. In no case was the presence of the observer openly objected to, although there were occasions in which the observer noticed discomfort, and was able to clarify matters so that it was possible to remain.

During the first few hours of observation, some agents evidenced a pressure to talk to the observer continuously or expressed uncertainty about the kind of information desired. The sense of discomfort tended to disappear almost immediately; the observer acted as an interested participant who could sit quietly through periods of dictation or ask questions when a decision was being made. Most interviewing of the agent was conducted during periods of driving from one spot to another, sometimes involving as much as an hour of travel, especially when parolees were to be interviewed at outlying jails or institutions. When starting on the way to a visit, the observer asked about the reason for the visit and was usually given a "run down" of the agent's

experience with the pertinent case. On leaving a visit the observer asked for the agent's evaluation of what had happened or for clarification of a point that had not been clear during the interview. In addition the observer had a list of general topics which were worked into free periods during the week, such as "How do you define parole to your parolees?" "What do you like about parole work" "What types of parolees do you recognize?" as well as questions about the agent's evaluation of and experience with various correctional programs.

The observer's role was exceptionally wearing in many ways. It involved adapting a large portion of one's own life style to the work style of another for many of the waking hours during a week. This meant starting and ending work when another was ready, eating when another person chose to eat and at whatever spot was available (many meals were skipped), and submitting oneself as a passenger to various driving styles. The task required focussed concentration over long periods of time and a continuous pressure to empathize with persons whose perspectives might not be compatible to oneself in the effort to assure ease of communication and adequate understanding of what was being communicated. The observer's memory was heavily taxed because notes could not be taken in many interview situations or during the dark hours of evening driving, yet the work hours were so long it was seldom possible to take time between days to write reports about what had happened on the previous day. In order to keep recording close to the actual experience it was necessary to schedule observation tours on alternate weeks, leaving one week between free for recording. In spite of these problems, a good many verbatim quotes were captured; and the patterns that emerged in the kind of intensive exposure afforded by four or five days of continuous observation are solidly documented by specific data.

Initially it was anticipated that the use of a woman observer for the agents would present certain methodological difficulties. It was only when no man with sufficient theoretical sophistication about parole technology could be recruited for the job that the Study director assumed this critical task in the field work. Fortunately, the director was already well known in the field and had worked with male parolees along with several of the sample agents in a demonstration project some years earlier. Accordingly most of the agents were already accustomed to her presence in the field and were used to talking frankly with her about their parole experience. During the observation periods the director kept watch for shifts in plan or manner that might suggest modifications due to the fact that she was a woman, and usually at some time asked the agent what changes he thought had occurred because a woman was present.

Only minor shifts were reported. Once the agent under observation was asked to help another agent in transporting from the jail to the county hospital a parolee who was in a convulsive state from an overdose of pills, and the supervisor decided to get help from someone else rather than involve the observer. Since this was not a case belonging to one of the sample agents, there was no loss of information for the more specific research purposes. One agent said he found he would hesitate to give an angry bawling out to a parolee in the observer's presence, feeling that it would be humiliating to a man to have a woman observe the dressing-down. In the one case observed where he felt such a rebuke was needed, he made an appointment in his office with the parolee for the following week. Another agent attempted to draw the observer into expressions of approval or disagreement in a way that he had not done with two previous male observers; and this shift seemed related to the somewhat gallant manner he used toward the observer throughout the week.

One agent reported he was more relaxed about driving up to a parolee's home with a woman than he would have been with a man because he felt the parolees might fear an imminent arrest if two men, one a stranger, appeared at the same time. Most agents quickly relaxed and treated the observer as another colleague involved in common work. Most of them expressed appreciation at the end of the week for the opportunity to share their thoughts about issues of concern to themselves.

The schedules were administered to the agents, one for each parolee in his caseload, at some period after the observation week. Because the agents in Sample I were almost all represented by 12 to 19 parolees, extensive periods of uninterrupted time (from three and a half to seven hours in length) were required to complete the schedules. The agents were recompensed for the time required outside their normal work obligation at the rate of \$4 per case.

The Parolees: The parolees were interviewed wherever they could be found and at whatever time of the day or evening they were available. In most cases interviewers eliminated the parolee's place of work as a source of information or location of interview, although occasionally a parolee chose to be interviewed during his lunch period or could be reached by meeting him as he left work. Most parolees were interviewed in their homes, occasionally with family members present and participating. Many interviews occurred sitting in a car or while transporting the respondent to his destination. Bars and coffee shops were frequent interview locations, as were jails and prisons. Some parolees who could never be found at home and who had no telephones were reached through letters which included a dime for a return phone call. In the "difficult to locate" cases, in which no definite refusal had been received, many miles were driven by the interviewer in repeated efforts to find the parolee at home. Most parolees, once found, were eager to talk

and seemed to welcome the opportunity to express their thoughts on parole to a neutral person. The interviews usually lasted between an hour and two hours; and second or third interviews were even more productive when we were able to arrange for them.

The open-ended interviews were based on an interview guide developed during training sessions with the interviewers.¹ In the actual interview the topics could be ordered as seemed appropriate to the particular respondent, but most interviews followed a general chronological pattern beginning with questions about the parolee's experiences in prison and going on to his preparation for release, the events occurring immediately after release, and episodes of particular significance occurring in the following period. Interviewers were instructed to probe for the way the agent interpreted and enforced the various regulations of parole; the parolees' experiences of disorientation on moving into the community from the prison; the effect of parole on family members, friendships and employment; the comparison of this parole experience with others the parolee may have had; and the experiences surrounding any interruption of parole, such as an arrest or a period in jail. In all cases the interviewers were to push for the specification of parolee and agent behaviors, seeking to learn "what exactly happened" as well as the feelings of the parolee about what happened. Obtaining specifics rather than generalizations was not always easy to accomplish. There were parolees who had much they wanted to say about "the system"; others found that parole had made little impression on their lives and that they had few details to report except routine visits from the agents; and an occasional parolee was so occupied with

¹ The interviewer was expected to have read the parolee's official record and any available notes from the observer with the agents before each initial interview in order to alert him to special events or problems concerning which he should ask questions.

feelings it was difficult to follow a connected story. From most respondents, however, we have sufficient illustrative material to know to what behaviors they referred when reporting their feelings about the system; and there were many respondents whose reports were highly detailed.

All interviews with parolees were recorded soon after the interview, with the report following the actual interview process as closely as possible. The interviewer was expected to record what he said to stimulate discussion as well as what the parolee said. In consequence the interview records are lengthy. Some interviewers had a fine ear for dialogue and in their reports we find frequent actual quotes capturing the flavor of the individual respondent's personality as well as his meaning. During the first three months of the study each interviewer had weekly conferences with the director based on the interview reports. In this manner continuing training on interviewing and recording techniques was provided; at the same time the interview guide was elaborated to cover previously unincorporated subject matter.

At no time did the interviewers receive information from parolees that would have required them, as citizens, to report the matter to law enforcement officials, although they did hear of many violations of particular parole regulations. In only one case did the study communicate information about a parolee to the concerned agent. This case involved a parolee in jail who was in extremely bad physical condition and who had not been able to get word to his agent. Because of this report the agent was able to remedy the situation, although the parolee did not know the interviewer had intervened. A few parolees asked the interviewer to intervene in their behalf; in such cases he might make a suggestion about action the respondent could take for himself, but throughout the Study staff maintained the research position that they were unable to take action in the individual case.

Among the six interviewers with parolees, those persons who already had a wide and varied personal experience proved most effective in securing the desired information. They tended to be sophisticated in handling the occasionally resistant officials in a jail or prison, and inventive in discovering how to reach "difficult to locate" parolees or in persuading a suspicious parolee to participate. Such interviewers often gained valuable background material by involving the parolee in discussions of general matters; and they were comfortable in maintaining themselves as a certain kind of friend who at the same time would not get involved in providing personal services such as making loans. The adventures of the interviewers were various, including conducting an interview on the side of the bed in which the parolee and his girlfriend were reclining, becoming the captive audience for a hill-billy music session that lasted until 3:00 a.m., and wandering through what appeared to be a white brothel for Negroes in search of the parolee respondent. At the other extreme our interviewers were introduced into the homes of well-to-do or well-educated respondents. A sense of humour, a wide tolerance for the range of human conditions, and a genuine enjoyment of human interchange about many subjects, seemed required for successful interviewing with parolees.

At first the interviewers, who had enjoyed the freedom of the open-ended interviews, resisted administering a schedule to persons with whom they were accustomed to talking spontaneously. In actual experience they found the parolees greatly interested in the schedule and usually approving of its content. The schedule seemed to evoke additional thoughts from the parolees, leading them to recount experiences which they had previously forgotten to mention. Because the parolees tended to dislike the passive role of being read to, extra pages were provided for them to read along with the interviewer while they directed the checking of their answers or devised their own answers

in correction of those provided by the schedule itself. The interviewers were encouraged to elicit such elaborating comments and were expected to record all such contributions from the parolee.

Analysis

The details of the statistical analysis of the schedule data cannot be reported at this time. Computer processing has been used to record all the schedule data on a magnetic tape, including background information on both parolees and agents as well as the data from the schedules.

The interview reports have been coded for 83 topics for the agents and for a comparable number of items for the parolees.

Analysis of both forms of data will proceed during the coming year.

Impressions from the Agent-Parolee Interaction Study

Since both the survey materials and the interview reports are now in preparation for analysis, no systematic findings can be reported for the Interaction Study. Certain impressions, however, have been gathered during the months of reading interview reports and schedules, and these can be mentioned as indicating certain general aspects of the agent-parolee relationship that will be useful in making the analysis:

- 1) Agents seem relatively unaware of the difficulties in being a parolee that are reported extensively by the parolees themselves. Certain items in the agent schedule discriminate strongly between the agent who assumes that parolees are better off than most disadvantaged people because they have an agency to serve them, and those few agents who are sensitive to the psychic instabilities that the parolees report as arising out of their status. Parolees seem somewhat more aware of the constraints experienced by the agent because of his role; for instance, they often excuse an agent whose behaviors they do not like by saying, "Well, he has a job to do."

2) Both agents and parolees tend to value highly a long-term relationship. It apparently takes a period of several months to gather sufficient information about each other for both to feel some assurance that he knows what the other person means by what he says and to develop mutually understood ground rules. Both agents and parolees go to considerable lengths to avoid a transfer--the agent because he does not trust another agent to be as understanding or as strict as he is and so fears the parolee will foul up if he is transferred; the parolee because the agent he already knows, whether he likes him or not, is better than facing an unknown quantity.

3) There do not appear to be large differences between the gross behaviors of "policing agents" and of "helping agents", although an agent who is strongly concerned about his control function may spend more time covering all points of possible contact when faced with a "no-call", and tends to use orders more frequently. But the activities of both include making frequent contact when a problem is perceived, continuous attention to shifts over time in situations and relationships, etc. In fact, even the agents who pride themselves on surveillance activities seem to find it very difficult to specify just what concrete operations go into surveillance. The difference between the two kinds of orientations to parole work seems to lie primarily in the perceptual structure used by each in evaluating and responding to what is going on. The "helping" agent tends to accept problems as common to human experience, is secure that he will get additional information in the normal course of events if real danger is in the picture, takes action to help with the presenting problem, and is considerably less suspicious of parolee motivations. The "policing" agent, when faced with a problematic situation, is apt to become more active in checking on the parolee's weak areas, and tends to reject neutral alternative explanations of ambiguous

behavior in favor of explanations that infer bad motivation on the part of the parolee. There appear to be sub-type patterns of agent behavior along these dimensions: for instance, an agent can relate strongly as a helping person to most of his parolees, yet turn extremely suspicious and investigatory when he feels the parolee "has let him down" or "is playing games with him"; and another agent who emphasizes his policeman role may have such low expectations of all parolees that he remains relaxed with everyone except when gross misbehavior appears. Types, or styles, of parole agent adaptations along these dimensions should emerge more clearly with the analysis.

4) Two dimensions of agent behavior seem particularly important to parolees: "Does he tell it like it is out in front"; and "is he--or is he not--a bookman". Parolees seem to make a comfortable adaptation to any agent who "tells it out in front" because in either case the parolee has some certainty about what is expected of him. The difference seems to be that parolees seldom become spontaneously open with the "bookman", who is perceived as ignoring reasonable human contingencies when technicalities are in question. Another agent dimension of importance to parolees is that of high or low intervener, and the agent they are most uneasy with is the high intervener who leaves them uncertain about the rules that guide his actions. High interveners, who seem to have no explicit rationale for frequent contact, tend to arouse anxiety. The agent to whom the parolees respond most warmly seems to be the man "who tells it like it is", who can be reasonably flexible about technical requirements, and who intervenes in a way that seems rational--parolees tend to say of such an agent, "he treats me like a man".

5) For most agents, deciding what to do about ambiguous situations in which the agent's decision not to act could be seen as a deviation from Board policy is a continuous strain. Is this a case to be reported of violent behavior, of violation of 5b, of common-law, of violation of drug use rules,

etc? are repeated questions arising in daily work. When an agent wishes to avoid jeopardizing a generally satisfactory parole, he often decides to avoid reporting the situation even to the supervisor, unless other law enforcement officials are active in the situation, or until further events help him to make up his mind. There is also frequent use of the "not-seeing unless law enforcement moves in" adaptation. There are two polar adaptations that appear with some frequency among "high-rated" agents and warrant mention: the tacit or explicit agreement that the agent will not report if the parolee keeps him informed and works with the agent to correct whatever problem is in the picture; and the scrupulous reporting of every incident, no matter how benign or explainable, because "the parolee knows I have to report and if I don't he will think there is something personal--a kind of collusion". The more unjust or unreasonable a law, a rule, or a probable punishment appears to the agent, the more apt he is to entertain the idea that deviation by not reporting is acceptable.

6) When asked what the agent has contributed to a successful parole, most agents disclaim responsibility for having taken any effective action. They express a similar sense of ineffectiveness when asked how they control a parolee who is seen as seriously out of line or capable of becoming so. In fact, the feeling of having inadequate tools when the parolee is strongly bent on doing whatever he intends to do is pervasive among agents. Nevertheless, when asked for each parolee whether or not he has needed parole, most agents say "yes" for almost all parolees, usually giving as a reason that the parolee is "inadequate", "disorganized", or "needs guidance"; they seldom say it is because the parolee has "criminal tendencies". When asked why a man who "needs guidance" should need to be on parole to get counsel, the answer tends to be, "Well, someone has to do it". The suggestion is that the

parolees with whom agents feel the clearest function are those dependent persons who go through life needing to lean on a parental figure of some kind.

7) Agents define parole to the parolees in widely different ways, across a range from "you are still in custody" to "you are to all intents and purposes a free man with the same obligations that pertain to any citizen." They define their own functions across a similar range from "I am here to see to it that you fulfill your obligations as a prisoner in the community" to "I am the parolee's advocate in a hostile world".

8) Parolees also vary widely in their definitions of parole as an experience. More parolees than one would expect, including those making apparently good adjustments, speak of parole as being a certain kind of "harder time" than being in prison. In this they refer to the uncertainties engendered by being supervised by a remote official and the pervasive sense of what can be lost by a misstep or by some involvement in "trouble". For many, the world while one is a parolee is full of lurking "trouble spots", requiring constant vigilance. For a few parolees, "parole makes no difference"; these tend to be men whose way of life is so conventional and limited in change that few permissions or special arrangements are required.

9) As could be expected, parolees show most bitterness about parole when they have been through a critical period of arrest and possible revocation. However, they are much more factual than might be expected about what they themselves did to cause the difficulty. Bitterness and resentment toward the agent seems to appear primarily when the parolee suffers from a lack of information, believes his side of the issue has not been looked into sufficiently, or experiences a sense of betrayal because the agent apparently acted other than he had said he would. General lack of understanding of the complicated processes determining critical matters in their lives, especially

among minority parolees, seems to be responsible for a great deal of the frustrated hostility that builds up in parolees on such occasions. The fantasies some of them develop to explain what happens as information moves from police to court to agent to the Board are often both completely remote from reality and devastatingly effective in engendering a sense that the total world is malign in its intentions toward them.

* * * * *

Only after analysis of the data can the relationships among the various types of agent adaptations and parolee adaptations be reported. The impressions noted above, however, suggest some of the perceptions and attitudes that will be taken into account in a more systematic and complex formulation of agent-parolee interaction.

Chief Problems of the Study

The chief problem of the Parole Action Study has concerned staffing a short term project of this complexity. The difficulties will be outlined in some detail both in order to explain some of the changes in the Study plan since the original proposal, and in order to communicate information that should be useful to others who are planning projects of this type.

The original plan called for three relatively senior positions, each supplemented by the work of part-time research assistants or doctoral students. This plan was expected to allow for the simultaneous exploration of different segments of the parole system such as law, community relations, administration and agent technology; and to permit spreading of administrative and training duties among several persons. Several factors contributed to the fact that no senior personnel were secured to aid the director, with the result that one person has had to perform all the senior duties in sequence. The chief factors interfering with the successful recruitment of senior staff

members were two:

1) A staff position with a two-year project that does not also assure a firm academic position in the University can attract only a limited group of applicants. By the time the Parole Action Study was funded in March, 1967, the occasional person who might have been interested in joining the staff had made plans for the coming year. Senior researchers tend to schedule moves for at least a year ahead. By the time in 1968 when a senior person could have been secured, only one year of the Project's work life would have remained. No senior researcher could be expected to commit himself to one year with a project in which the theoretical focus and research design had already been completely determined by others.

2) The pool of applicants from which the Parole Action Study might have drawn under more attractive circumstances would have been small. For a senior staff member to have been useful he needed qualifications in sociological theory and method as well as correctional sophistication. Relatively few sociologists have an intimate knowledge of correctional organizations; and most of these have already designed for themselves a major research program which they are pursuing independently. Furthermore, although one or two qualified women applied, men were needed to share responsibilities for field work with the director who was a woman and therefore somewhat handicapped for certain tasks in a field like parole in which both the clients and the staff are men.

Given the fact that extensive recruiting efforts produced no results, the Parole Action Study designed its work so that much of it could be done by research assistants, doctoral students, and an occasional senior person available for a temporary assignment, under the guidance of the director. There have been several consequences for the Study's product.

1) Three areas that have seemed most important for extended study have received only limited attention: the law of paroles, the operations of the Adult Authority, and the relationships between the local community and the parole agency with its parolees.

2) The various small studies have had to be designed so they could be conducted by temporarily employed or part-time students and adapted to the qualifications of the available individuals. In consequence some beginning studies have been dropped or redesigned because no second person with the requisite skills or time could be located.

3) The variety of duties to be performed in sequence, rather than simultaneously, because there was only one senior person to provide administrative and theoretical supervision, has lengthened the period required to complete the Study. At the same time the content focus of the Study has been limited to areas in which this one person, with specific areas of competence, could offer guidance to research assistants.

Our experience has suggested that, unless two or more senior persons make a joint study proposal, the most practical plan for staffing a research project involving the study of interaction among various positions within an organization or among various organizational complexes would call for one senior position, a full-time administrative assistant, several doctoral or post-doctoral fellowships, and provision for temporary research assistants as they are needed at the different stages of research development.

Next Steps

The extension of funds to the Parole Action Study for the year through August 31, 1970 will permit the preparation of a book length manuscript on parole technology, in which the findings of the entire study will be presented

systematically. The tentative outline of the book is as follows:

THE PAROLEE'S TASK AND PAROLE TECHNOLOGY

Chapters

- I. Historical and Conceptual Perspectives
- II. The Organizational Environment
- III. The Parolee's Task
- IV. The Agent's Task and Practice
- V. Agent-Parolee Interaction
- VI. Reorganization to Improve Parole Services
- VII. The Community as Context and Actor
- VIII. Future Directions for Parole

Plan for Work

The director will be responsible for analysis of the data and for writing the manuscript. Since she is starting a new assignment at the School of Social Welfare, University of California at Los Angeles, she will be able to work only part-time on the Parole Action Study report until June, 1970. The three months of the summer period in 1970 will be devoted full-time to the manuscript.

The director will be assisted by secretary (part-time during the academic year and full-time during the summer); and by two half-time research assistants. The first of these will be located in Los Angeles and will perform library and data summarization activities. The second, who has already been trained in the Study, will remain at the Center for the Study of Law and Society in Berkeley in order to complete the coding of interview data as well as to maintain liaison relationships with the Department of Corrections statistical division and with the Survey Research Center where the machine processing will

continue. This second assistant will require some help from typists in preparing the code books.

A meeting of the National Advisory Committee will be called sometime during April or May, 1970 for a review of findings and draft chapters of the book. In addition the director plans to make occasional trips to Sacramento to confer with PCSD administrators during the writing of initial versions of the manuscript, and to Berkeley for consultation with Sheldon Messinger, Anselm Strauss and Gertrude Selznick concerning data analysis. Bernard Davitto will continue field work for a possible three months during the early fall in order to complete data collection in the POC study in the Los Angeles area.