

# **A Twelve-Month Probation Outcome Study: Examining the Effects of Employment on Probationer Adjustment**

A Monograph in the Criminal Justice System Series

Number 34

BY  
**KIRK J. KAVANAUGH**

48434

THE  
OHIO  
STATE  
UNIVERSITY

— **PROGRAM FOR THE STUDY OF CRIME AND DELINQUENCY** —

DELINQUENCY  
CORRECTIONS  
POLICE  
COURTS

COLLEGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE  
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

A TWELVE-MONTH PROBATION OUTCOME STUDY:  
EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF EMPLOYMENT  
ON PROBATIONER ADJUSTMENT

NCJRS

JUN 19 1978

ACQUISITIONS

by

Kirk J. Kavanaugh

Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency  
School of Public Administration  
College of Administrative Science  
The Ohio State University  
1314 Kinnear Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43212

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements . . . . .	iii
CHAPTER 1 - BACKGROUND INFORMATION	
Introduction . . . . .	1
Description of Cincinnati-Hamilton County Area . . . . .	2
CHAPTER 2 - FRAMEWORK OF PROBATION STUDY	
Literature Review . . . . .	7
Purposes of Probation Study . . . . .	10
Methodology . . . . .	11
CHAPTER 3 - ANALYSIS OF DATA	
Analysis of All Probation Cases . . . . .	18
Analysis of Property Offenders . . . . .	31
Probationers' Questionnaire Results . . . . .	45
Testing the Hypotheses . . . . .	47
CHAPTER 4 - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Conclusions . . . . .	54
Recommendations . . . . .	56
Appendix . . . . .	61

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank the Honorable Gilbert Bettman, Judge of the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas, for his complete cooperation and important suggestions on the content and purposes of the research study. We wish also to express our deep gratitude to Mr. Ernest Taylor, Hamilton County's Chief Probation Officer, and to his entire staff for their complete cooperation during the entire study. Particularly, we wish to thank Mr. Earl Russell, Mr. William Dell, Mr. Edward Olsvig, Mr. William Thomas, Ms. Alice Bonvillain, and Mr. John Boster all of whom made the study proceed quite smoothly.

We also thank Mr. Richard Haller, whose assistance made the computer a valuable tool for analyzing the research study's data.

# CHAPTER I

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Introduction

This research project was completed in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of Masters of Social Work from the Ohio State University School of Social Work. The School enables students interested in research to undertake second-year research placements as a component of the social work curriculum. Cincinnati was chosen as the site of the research study because of the immense cooperation that was available.

Practitioners in the area of probation services have recognized the importance of employment on the overall adjustment of probationers. This research study measures the impact of employment on probationer adjustment. Policy decisions in probation should reflect the overwhelming significance of employment/vocational placements on the probationer. The administration of probation services must emphasize the development of and successful referrals to employment opportunities for probationers who are in desperate need of full-time employment.

Social work philosophy has advocated the right of the individual to self-determination and the attainment of basic human rights. Social work intervention is required when

impediments to the acquiring of those rights exist. The importance of employment on the total well-being of the individual is recognized by the social work profession. Probation and social work both have a mutual understanding and goal in that they both realize the significance of employment on an individual's adjustment and propose that efforts should be made to develop those opportunities which enhance the individual's well-being.

Before the research study is presented, the environment in which the social services operate must be understood; the characteristics of the Cincinnati-Hamilton County area will be examined. Knowledge of this area is an important prerequisite before which one can accurately generalize the study's findings to other areas.

#### Description of the Cincinnati-Hamilton County Area

Hamilton County is located in the southwest corner of the state of Ohio; it occupies an area of 414 square miles. According to the 1970 census, Hamilton County has a population of 924,018, of which 145,294 (15.7 percent) are Blacks. There are 37 incorporated areas in the county, with Cincinnati being the largest.

The city of Cincinnati occupies an area of 77.62 square miles. According to the 1970 census, Cincinnati per se has a population of 452,524, of which 125,070 (27.4 percent) are

Blacks. Cincinnati is located on the Ohio River. Major traffic between the northern central states and the southern states passes through Cincinnati because of easy availability to interstate highways, railroads, and freight cars, truck lines, airports, and water carriers. By a series of locks and dams, the Ohio River is navigable the year round; this places Cincinnati on the Mississippi River inland waterway system.

Cincinnati has a diverse economic base and leads the world in the production of playing cards and soap. Cincinnati is also a leader in the production of such items as building materials, cans, chemicals, clothing, coffins and burial cases, conveyors, cosmetics, electric motors and machinery, electronic equipment, food products, foundry and machine shop products, jet engines, malt and distilled liquors, mattresses, meat packing, motor vehicles and parts, paper, pianos and organs, plastics, printing inks, sheet metal products, shoes, sporting goods, steel mill products and valves. Handling more than 600,000 cars annually with a tonnage of 32,000,000 and over 3,000,000 tons additional on the Ohio River, Cincinnati is the world's largest inland coal port. Cincinnati is the bituminous coal sales center of the United States. According to figures available on Hamilton County's business operations in the 1967 census report, Hamilton County had 10,234 retail businesses and 2,283 wholesale businesses.

The consumer price index for the twelve months from

December, 1973 to December, 1974 rose 12.6 percent in Hamilton County. The United States consumer price index rose 12.2 percent during the same period. However, the cost of living in Cincinnati, according to Autumn, 1973 statistics compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor, was 4 percent below the National cost of living for intermediate budgets (\$12,137) and 7 percent below the national average for higher budgets (\$16,896).

The per capita income for Hamilton County in 1973 was \$5,066, with the state of Ohio's capita at \$5,012 and the United States at \$4,918. Per capita income is obtained by dividing total income by the number of people. Household income (total income divided by the number of households) figures were: Hamilton County, \$16,321; Cincinnati, \$16,425; State of Ohio, \$15,608, and the United States, \$15,685. Though inflation caused a higher-than-average rise in the consumer price index, Cincinnati's cost of living was from 4 to 7 percent below the national average. Also personal and household incomes were higher in Hamilton County than the national averages.

Data were obtained concerning the unemployment rate in the Hamilton County area from January of 1974 through March of 1975. The seasonally adjusted rates by month for Hamilton County are shown in Table 1.



TABLE 1  
SEASONALLY ADJUSTED UNEMPLOYMENT RATE FOR  
HAMILTON COUNTY, JANUARY 1974 TO MARCH 1975

Year		Unemployment Rate
1974	January	6.1%
	February	5.8
	March	5.3
	April	5.0
	May	4.0
	June	5.5
	July	5.4
	August	4.6
	September	4.6
	October	4.7
	November	6.4
	December	6.7
1975	January	8.2
	February	8.8
	March	8.5

Unemployment data were also obtained for the Black residents of Hamilton County, beginning with September of 1974. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rates by month for Hamilton County's Black residents are shown in Table 2.

This information indicates that the unemployment rate for blacks to be approximately two times the rate for Whites. After examining the unemployment rate for Blacks in 1973 (7.9 percent compared to 3.7 percent for Whites) and the rate for Blacks from January of 1974 to August of 1974 was at least two times higher than the rate for Whites. This

evidence clearly indicates that in this region unemployment has been considerably higher in the Black community.

TABLE 2

SEASONALLY ADJUSTED UNEMPLOYMENT RATE FOR BLACKS  
IN HAMILTON COUNTY, SEPTEMBER 1974 TO MARCH 1975

Year		Unemployment Rate
1974	September	9.8%
	October	9.8
	November	14.7
	December	14.0
1975	January	16.4
	February	17.9
	March	17.3

## CHAPTER II

### FRAMEWORK OF PROBATION STUDY

#### Literature Review

Published research reports have generally centered on the effects of employment for parolees. Although parole and probation are two different systems, general characteristics and inferences can be offered when examining the importance of employment.

George A. Pownall's article, "Employment Problems of Released Prisoners" (Manpower, January 1971) discusses a study completed by the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration in which three surveys were made. The first was an analysis of the official records of a 10-percent sample (945) of all released male Federal Prisoners under parole on June 30, 1964. The second survey was based on a review of official records of, and interviews with, all Federal releases under supervision as of October 31, 1965, in Baltimore and Philadelphia, a total of 169 persons. In the last survey, all Federal prisoners released between October 1, 1965 and March 31, 1966 and under the jurisdiction of the Baltimore and Philadelphia probation offices--a total of 51--were interviewed upon release and once a month for three months thereafter.

The findings of this study suggested that the unemployment rate (17 percent) for the Federal releases was three times the United States' rate for males in June of 1964. Also, whites had lower unemployment rates than non-whites (15 percent to 22 percent, respectively). Married men had lower unemployment rates than non-married men (8.5 percent to 21 percent), and older releases (over 55) had lower rates than the younger releases (23 percent to 36 percent). The first six months after release were found to be the most difficult time for releases, and they had a significantly higher unemployment rate during this time.

Property crime offenders and drug offenders had higher rates of unemployment, lower rates of full-time employment, and higher recidivism rates than non-property and non-drug offenders. The study concluded that "unemployment was a major factor contributing to new violations of the law by former prisoners". All parolees who violated parole before being interviewed in the study were either unemployed or had unstable employment experiences. The federal releasee's job (if secured) was the result of his family, friends, or former employer's efforts 57 percent of the time, the releasee's own efforts 22 percent, and the parole officer or institution only 6 percent of the time. Finally, it was found that the lower the education of the individual, the higher the unemployment rate.

Daniel Glaser, in his The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, stated that of the 1,015 adult male federal prison releasees, only a quarter (25 percent) were employed during 75 percent or more of their last two years of their civilian life. Unskilled and semi-skilled jobs constituted 5/6 of the first jobs obtained by releases and 7/8 of all jobs obtained in the first 5 or 6 months out of prison. Only 1/6 of the jobs were either skilled labor or white-collar employment. Glaser asserted that if 25 percent to 33 percent of the men under correctional supervision in a community are unemployed, it is a major problem. Glaser argued that steady employment is usually a major factor in the life style of the nonrecidivist.

Sol Chaneles, a co-director of a New York State study of prisoner-rehabilitation programs and consultant to Project Second Chance, recently wrote an article entitled "A Job Program for Ex-Convicts That Works" (Psychology Today, March 1975). His article is a follow-up study on the effectiveness of New Yorks' prisoner-rehabilitation program, Project Second Chance. He asserted that only those programs combining realistic job training and placement in worthwhile jobs have any effect on the rate of recidivism. In 1972, New York had designed a small pilot program called Project Second Chance to place ex-offenders in jobs. In its first two years of operation, at a cost of \$400,000, Project

Second Chance placed about 450 ex-cons in jobs. More than half of those men are still at work, and only 7 men (1 percent of the entire group) have returned to prison. It must be remembered that the unemployment rate for New York at this time was 7 percent in general, and a depressing 22 percent for young blacks, the majority of the Project's clients. Under better conditions, more men would have been placed in good jobs.

Chaneles concluded that if an ex-offender can stick with a steady job for at least six months, the chances are better than 50-50 that he will "make it for life." Finally, the project clients over a period of two years worked a total of nearly 1 million person/hours, which at an average of \$2.25 an hour comes to more than two million dollars. Federal and state taxes on this income more than repaid the taxpayers for the \$400,000 they invested in the program.

#### Purposes of the Study

The research study will examine the effects of length of unemployment, wages earned, past and present work record, employment level, source of job, and referral result on the relative adjustment of probationers. The study is a twelve-month analysis of probation outcome; it examines the effect of employment of probation outcome. The degree of the probation officer's influence in effecting the probationer's

adjustment and outcome will also be explored in depth.

Finally, the study will test the following ten hypotheses:

### Hypotheses

1. Probationers receiving successful referrals by probation officers will have higher relative adjustment scores than will probationers not receiving successful referrals.
2. Probationers achieving employment through their own sources will have higher relative adjustment scores than those who received a successful referral by the probation officer.
3. Probationers whose offense was for violation of drug laws or who were under the influence of drugs during the commission of the offense will have lower relative adjustment scores than those who were not drug-related.
4. The greater the number of months unemployed, the lower the relative adjustment score.
5. The higher the weekly income, the higher the relative adjustment score.
6. Probationers who are skilled employees will have higher relative adjustment scores than those who are not skilled.
7. Probationers retaining their previous job will have higher relative adjustment scores than those who find other employment.
8. Black probationers will have a higher number of months unemployed than will whites.
9. Black probationers will receive lower relative adjustment scores than will whites.
10. Married probationers will have higher relative adjustment scores than those who are not married.

### Methodology

The case records for all offenders granted probation

during the months of February, March, and April of 1974 were examined. These three months were chosen because it was felt that during this time the cases granted probation would adequately and accurately reflect the sentencing practices of the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas' judges. This time period was sufficiently removed from the Christmas season and the summer months, the usual vacation times and a period of increased use of visiting judges. Also, an outcome period of twelve months was needed for the study design.

Initial examination of the records resulted in the decision to exclude women from the study. Forty-five women were granted probation during this time. In addition to the fact that this was a very small sample, roughly 70 percent of the women were either pregnant or receiving Aid for Dependent Children. Therefore, the study examined only male probationers.

Two hundred and ten males were granted probation during this time. Of these, 168 cases were found acceptable and were included in the study. Forty-two cases were rejected, with 90 percent of the rejected cases falling into the three categories of shock probation (31 percent), handicapped (26 percent), and transferred to another district (33 percent). A published report on shock probation by the Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency had shown that shock probation cases had specific characteristics which differentiated from



regular probation felony offenders. Therefore, shock probation cases were excluded from the study. Handicapped probationers were for the most part unable to work during probation and it would, therefore, be impossible to evaluate the effects of employment. Probationers transferred to another district were no longer in the Hamilton County area and information on their status was at best very limited, if available at all. The remaining 10 percent of excluded cases consisted of retired (old age) probationers and one probationer now in the armed services.

The research study embraced three stages. The first stage consisted of examining the case records after six months of probation supervision. This stage documented individual characteristics, examined employment data, and tried to ascertain the probationer's adjustment on probation. After examining the records, the investigator interviewed the probationer's probation officer to verify information or clarify any questions, and to provide a more complete information base.

The second stage involved interviewing the probationers with a structured questionnaire; 123 probationers were selected for this stage. These probationers were a representative sample of the 168 cases. The purposes of the interview stage were to obtain verifying information and to ask the probationers for their feelings and recommendations in the areas of probation supervision and employment/vocation development

and placement by the probation officer; 105 probationers were interviewed. (Their comments and the results of the questionnaire are presented in Chapter 3.)

The third stage consisted of examining the case records of each subject after 12 months of probation supervision. This was a follow-up on the six-month case examination stage and determined the progress of the probationer after approximately one year of probation. An emphasis was placed on updating all employment data for this period of time. Again, the probation officer was interviewed to provide a more complete information base. During this stage, final determination was made on the probationer's overall adjustment for this period of one year.

Five scales were used to measure the probationer's overall relative adjustment on probation. Misdemeanor arrests, misdemeanor convictions, felony arrests, felony convictions, and the relative adjustment scale determined the probationer's adjustment.<sup>1</sup> The criminal behavior indicators (misdemeanor/felony arrests/convictions) were obtained from the case records and interviews with the probation officer.

The relative adjustment scale was developed to measure eight positive factors of probationer adjustment (see scale).

---

<sup>1</sup>Seiter, Petersilia, and Allen. Evaluation of Adult Halfway Houses in Ohio, Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1975.

A value of +1 was assigned to each positive factor. The adjustment scale also measured negative factors, valued according to the severity and the occurrence of criminal activity (see scale). Each probationer was evaluated and assigned a numerical value obtained from adding the positive and subtracting negative factors scores. This numerical number represented the probationer's relative adjustment (RA) up to that point in time.

The "relative adjustment scale" is a new method for measuring overall behavioral adjustment of offenders. It assesses not only the negative factors of criminal activity but also the positive factors which reflect adequate social adjustment and allows for graduated outcome indicators other than the traditional two-valued indicator of "success" or "failure." The Ohio State University Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency in its study of Ohio's Halfway House utilized the relative adjustment scale as one method of measuring behavior adjustment. The positive factors for their scale were obtained from dialogue with and recommendations from correctional and halfway house administrators, probation and parole officers, sociologists, and criminologists. Their expert opinion provided both reliability and validity to the RA scale. The negative factors on the scale were obtained from Ohio's Criminal Code. The code provides a graduated scale which reflects criminal severity. Because

Ohio's Revised Criminal Code was passed by both houses and signed by the governor, it is felt that the code (the negative factors on the scale) was both valid and reliable as an indicator of the degree of negative adjustment. The relative adjustment scale utilized in this probation study is but a slight modification of the halfway house scale. This scale is assumed to have the same reliability and validity of the halfway house scale.

#### Relative Adjustment Scale

1. Attain vertical mobility in employment (raise in pay, promotion or better job).
2. Individual has become self-supporting, supports any immediate family, meets debt payments (to victim or restitution to the court), and has attained financial stability.
3. Individual shows stability in residency (same place for more than 6 months).
4. The individual has avoided any critical incidents that show instability, immaturity, or inability to solve problems acceptably.
5. Participation in self-improvement programs.
6. No arrests or charges on any available records during the probation period.
7. Reasonable progress through probation and/or recommendation or attainment of a final release from probation if present behavior continued.
8. The individual has no technical probation violations and reports as required to his probation officer.

Recidivism Outcome Index for Probation:

- 8 Imprisoned: (a) indicted or convicted of a felony.
- 7 Imprisoned: (a) charged with or convicted of a misdemeanor.  
(b) violation of rules of probation.
- 6 Abscond: (a) also wanted for and/or charged with, indicted for, or convicted of, a felony.
- 5 Abscond: (a) also wanted for or charged with a misdemeanor.
- 4 Consecutive Probation Sentence for Felony Offense:
  - (a) conviction of a felony and was either fined and/or consecutive probation sentence.
  - (b) conviction of a misdemeanor and served more than 90 days.
  - (c) abscond but not charged or wanted for any criminal offense.
- 3 Consecutive Probation Sentence for a Misdemeanor Offense:
  - (a) conviction of a misdemeanor and was either fined and/or given a consecutive probation sentence.
  - (b) conviction of a misdemeanor and served less than 90 days.
- 2 Arrested: (a) and temporarily jailed for felony offense but charges dropped or no charges filed.
- 1 Arrested: (a) and temporarily jailed for misdemeanor offense but charges dropped or no charges filed.

# CHAPTER 3

## ANALYSIS OF DATA

### Analysis of all Probation Cases

Data were analyzed at the Ohio State University Computer Center at the Systems Engineering Building. Frequency distributions for the 168 sample cases were obtained on important individual characteristics. Data for the sample cases will be divided into categories.

TABLE 3  
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROBATION SAMPLE: RACE AND AGE

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
<u>Race</u>		
White	53%	(89)
Black	4.7	(79)
Total	<u>100%</u>	<u>(168)</u>
<u>Age</u>		
18 years	.6%	(1)
19	13.1	(22)
20	14.9	(25)
21	10.7	(18)
22	7.7	(13)
23	7.7	(13)
24	7.1	(12)
25	4.2	(7)
26	1.8	(3)
27	6.5	(11)
28	4.2	(7)
29-34	12.0	(20)
35 and over	9.5	(16)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(168)</u>

Though Blacks represent 15.7 percent of Hamilton County's population, their percentage of the total probationer sample is 47 percent. Blacks are, therefore, over-represented in the probation sample. In the age categories 19-24, there are 103 cases (61.3%). The range within the age categories is 55 years, with the youngest probationer at 18 and the oldest at 73 years of age. The mean age is 25.5 years with the median age at 22.9 years. The data on age distribution are not surprising in view of the evidence which indicates that the highest concentration of individuals in the criminal justice system is under age 25. The largest group is in the age categories of 19-24 years.

TABLE 4.

MARITAL STATUS OF PROBATIONER SAMPLE

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Marital Status		
Single	59.5%	(100)
Married	26.3	(44)
Separated	7.1	(12)
Divorced	7.1	(12)
Total	100.0%	(168)

Almost 60 percent of the probation sample is single. Again, this is not surprising, as one would expect criminal offenders to have no substantial family ties of their own.

Previous research evidence shows that most offenders are single. In the testing of the hypotheses below, single, separated, and divorced probationers will be combined into the category of "not married."

TABLE 5  
EDUCATION LEVEL ATTAINED BY PROBATIONER SAMPLE

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Education		
< 6	4.2%	(7)
7	4.2	(7)
8	10.1	(17)
9	13.1	(22)
10	18.5	(31)
11	22.6	(38)
12	18.5	(31)
Some College	8.9	(15)
Total	100.1%	(168)

From Table 5, it will be noted that 46 cases (27.4%) finished their high school education; 91 cases or 54.2 percent had attained in the grade high school levels range. The mean educational grade was 10.2. This is a high educational level when compared to the mean educational level of Ohio prison inmates: 6.2 years of educational attainment. This is apparently one characteristic that judges take into account and finally consider when sentencing felons, and one would expect a higher educational level for probationers.



TABLE 6  
INSTANT OFFENSE OF PROBATIONER SAMPLE

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Offense		
Property	57.7%	(97)
Personal	10.7	(18)
Drug	21.5	(36)
Other	10.1	(17)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(168)</u>

From the data in Table 6, it can be seen that property offenders account for some 57.7 percent of the instant offenses. Judges have traditionally tended to more frequently grant probation to property offenders, and to sentence personal or violent offenders to prison. The dramatic increase in property crimes with the worsening economic situation in Hamilton County has resulted in a high number of property offenders being granted probation. The majority of offenses falling into the category "other" are the offense of carrying a concealed weapon.

During the commission of the instant offense, there was evidence of drug usage in 55 cases or 32.7 percent. Alcohol accounted for 41.8 percent of the drug usage cases. There were 36 drug-law offenders and an additional 55 cases where there was evidence of drug usage. However, 20 cases were classified as both a drug offense and evidence of drug usage.

TABLE 7  
DRUG USAGE BY PROBATIONER SAMPLE

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Drug Usage		
None	67.3%	(113)
Opiates	8.3	(14)
Alcohol	13.7	(23)
Barbiturate/ Amphetamines	3.0	(5)
Hallucinogens	7.7	(13)
Total	100.0%	(168)

TABLE 8  
WORK RECORD BEFORE OFFENSE FOR PROBATIONER SAMPLE

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Work Record		
Poor	41.7%	(70)
Satisfactory	40.5	(68)
Good	17.8	(30)
Total	100.0%	(168)

As a result, 71 probationers or 42.6 percent had either a drug offense or evidence of drug usage in the instant offense. The incidence of drug usage in Hamilton County probationers is at too high a level to go unnoticed.

Determination of work record before offense was made by examining the pre-sentence investigation report. Emphasis was placed on prior work record, length of employment/

unemployment, and the number of previously held jobs. "Poor" work record indicated very little or no prior work record, long length of unemployment, and many previous jobs held for a very short length of time. "Satisfactory" work record indicated seasonal or periodic periods of employment/unemployment and several previous jobs that were retained for long lengths of time. "Good" work record indicated no periods of unemployment and previous jobs that were each held for longer lengths of time. As the data in Table 8 show, only 17.8 percent of the probationer sample had good work records. Poor or satisfactory work records are characteristic of most criminal offenders in this sample.

TABLE 9

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROBATIONER SAMPLE: EMPLOYED AT TIME OF OFFENSE, EMPLOYMENT LEVEL, AND WAGES EARNED WEEKLY

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Employed at Time of Offense		
No	38.7%	(65)
Part-time	5.3	(9)
Full-time	56.0	(94)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(168)</u>
Employment Level		
Operative	89.9%	(151)
Skilled	10.1	(17)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(168)</u>

Characteristic	Percentage	Total
Wages Earned Weekly		
Less than \$50	5.4%	(9)
50-75	7.7	(13)
75-100	28.6	(48)
100-125	22.0	(37)
125-150	10.7	(18)
150-200	14.3	(24)
Greater than \$200	5.4	(9)
NA	6.0	(10)
Total	100.0%	(168)

Examination of the data in Table 9 reveals both a high rate of full-time employment (56 percent) and a high rate of unemployment (38.7 percent). Remembering Glaser's warning, this high rate of unemployment can be considered to be a major problem. Approximately 90 percent of the probationers are in the employment level category "operative." Operative refers to semi-skilled and unskilled levels. With the high educational-level average (10.2 years), it would appear that many probationers are under-employed.

Wages earned refers to weekly salary while on probation. The category designation of NA means the data were missing. All cases within this category were either unemployed the entire time of the study, had absconded from supervision, or had been arrested immediately following the granting of probation. The median weekly salary of the probationers was \$100-\$125. With the high cost of living and the higher-than-average rise in consumer price index in the Cincinnati-Hamilton

County area, a weekly salary of \$100-\$125 must be considered marginally poor income. Considering the costs of having a family and children, this income from legitimate sources would create great hardships. A strong tendency to find illegitimate sources of income could very well exist with such a low income and low standard of living.

TABLE 10  
PROBATIONER'S RETENTION OF PREVIOUS EMPLOYMENT

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Retained Job Held Before Offense		
Yes	62.1%	(64)
No	37.9	(39)
Total	100.0%	(103)

From the data in Table 10, it can be seen that 103 probationers (61.4 percent) were employed at the time of the offense (94 full-time, 9 part-time); 64 (62.1 percent) retained this same job once probation began and 39 (37.9 percent) lost the job they held at the time of the offense. Questioning of probationers revealed that 25 lost the job they held before the offense. (All probationers were not interviewed). Seventeen (68 percent) said they lost this job because of the instant offense.

TABLE 11

## EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PROBATIONERS ONCE PROBATION BEGAN

Characteristic	Percentage	Total
Employed once Probation Began		
Yes	61.9%	(104)
No	38.1	(64)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(168)</u>

Once probation was granted, 64 cases (38.1 percent) were unemployed. At the time of the offense, 65 cases (38.7 percent) were unemployed. Again, one is reminded of Glaser's warnings and the serious problem these figures indicate.

It should be remembered that the length of time between the offense and the granting of probation can vary from 5 to 14 months. Therefore, a probationer unemployed at the time of the offense might be employed once probation has begun. Also, a probationer who was employed at the time of the offense and lost this particular job could become employed by the time probation was granted.

From the data in Table 12, it can be seen that 52 cases (32 percent) were unemployed at least four months of the twelve month follow-up period. The average length of unemployment while on probation was four months (33 percent). This rate is very high and is relatively the same as the

TABLE 12

## NUMBER OF MONTHS UNEMPLOYED WHILE ON PROBATION

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals	Cumulative Percentage
Number of Months Unemployed			
0	29.8%	(50)	29.8%
1	4.2	(7)	34.0
2	7.7	(13)	41.7
3	13.1	(22)	54.8
4	7.1	(12)	61.9
5	5.4	(9)	67.3
6	6.5	(11)	73.8
7	4.8	(8)	78.6
8	4.2	(7)	82.8
9	4.2	(7)	87.0
10	6.5	(11)	93.5
11	1.8	(3)	95.3
12	4.8	(8)	100.1
Total	100.0%	(168)	100.1%

unemployment rate for probationers at the time of the offense (38.7 percent) and once probation began (38.1 percent).

This high unemployment rate will result both in lower relative adjustment scores and in a greater likelihood to engage in criminal activity.

Data for Table 13 were obtained from the interviews with the probationers and the probation officer. The category "own efforts" refers not only to the probationer's efforts but also to that of friends, family, and relatives. "NA" means data are missing; both absconders and unemployed probationers fall into this category. In 141 cases (83.9 percent),

TABLE 13  
SOURCE OF EMPLOYMENT FOR PROBATIONERS

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Source of Job		
Own efforts	83.9%	(141)
Probation Officer	9.5	(16)
NA	6.6	(11)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(168)</u>

employment was secured by the probationer's own efforts. Sixteen cases (9.5%) had the probation officer providing the source of the job.

TABLE 14  
REFERRAL SERVICES AND OUTCOMES FOR PROBATIONER SAMPLE

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Referral and Result		
None	37.5%	(39)
Unsuccessful	39.2	(41)
Successful	23.3	(24)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(104)</u>

The 64 cases (38.1 percent) that retained the job they held before the offense (Table 10) were excluded from this table which examines retention of previous employment; because they retained their previous employment, they were not in need of an employment/vocational referral. Successful referral



resulted in either an educational, vocational, or employment placement or opportunity. There were 65 cases (62.5 percent) that were referred to other agencies or employers by the probation officer. Of these referrals, 24 cases (37 percent) were successful. Data for this table were also obtained from the interviews with the probationers and the probation officer.

TABLE 15  
EVALUATION OF WORK HISTORY OF PROBATIONER

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Probation Work Record		
Poor	38.1%	(64)
Satisfactory	28.0	(47)
Good	33.9	(57)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(168)</u>

The following criteria were used to evaluate the probation work record. Five or more months unemployed = poor; 2-4 months unemployed = satisfactory; and 0-1 month = good. The probation work record has a higher percentage of cases in the category of "good" and lower percentage of cases in the category of "satisfactory" when compared to the probationers' work record before the offense (Table 8). Still, 64 cases (38.1 percent) in the "poor" category represents a very high number of months unemployed while on probation.

Through the use of the "relative adjustment scale," nu-

merical scores were assigned to each probationer, which defined the overall behavioral adjustment. The highest "relative adjustment" score obtained in the study was +8, which indicated successful attainment of all 8 adjustment criteria (the positive factors). The lowest "relative adjustment" score for the probation study was -12, even though technically there was no lowest score limit possible on the recidivism outcome index (the negative factors). The negative score was obtained by adding together each incidence of criminal activity and its corresponding criminal severity for each probationer during the twelve-month follow-up period. Therefore, there could be no limit on the incidence of criminal activity and severity possible for a given probationer.

The average relative adjustment score was 2.8. This score would be considered low when compared to the average relative adjustment score of 3.4 for paroled halfway house residents. This score was determined from the analysis and evaluation of Ohio's eight halfway houses by the Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency.

#### Arrest Record

Data were obtained on the arrest record for each probationer while on probation during the time of the research study; these data were discovered through examination of each probationer's file and interviews with the probation officer.

Four categories were developed for detailed analyses (misdemeanor arrests and convictions, and felony arrests and convictions). Traffic violations were excluded.

Of the 168 probationers, 37 (22 percent) were arrested for misdemeanor offenses; 27 were arrested once, eight were arrested twice, and two were arrested three times. Seventeen probationers (10.1 percent) were convicted of misdemeanor offenses; of these, 13 probationers were convicted of one misdemeanor offense and 4 were convicted of two misdemeanor offenses.

A total of 17 probationers (10 percent) were arrested for felony offenses; 15 probationers were arrested once, one probationer twice, and one probationer three times. Of these, 11 probationers (6.5 percent) were convicted of felony offenses; all 11 were convicted of one felony offense.

#### Analysis of Property Offenders

The dramatic increase in property crimes during 1974 was almost epidemic in proportions and presently shows no signs of lessening in intensity. As the economic situation worsens, the incidence of property crime will undoubtedly continue to increase. With this anticipated increase, more offenders will be granted probation. The administration of probation services and policies concerning those services must adequately and realistically provide alternatives to the illegitimate

TABLE 16  
RELATIVE ADJUSTMENT SCORE FOR PROBATIONER SAMPLE

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Relative Adjustment Score		
-12	.6%	(1)
-11	.6	(1)
-10	.6	(1)
- 9	1.2	(2)
- 7	.6	(1)
- 6	3.0	(5)
- 5	.6	(1)
- 4	.6	(1)
- 3	5.4	(9)
- 2	3.0	(5)
- 1	3.0	(5)
0	3.0	(5)
1	4.8	(8)
2	7.1	(12)
3	6.5	(11)
4	11.3	(19)
5	20.8	(35)
6	22.0	(37)
7	4.8	(8)
8	.6	(1)
Total	100.0%	(168)

income of the property offender. The development of and the successful referral to employment/vocational opportunities and placements would be a step in the right direction.

A detailed analysis of the property offender's individual characteristics and relative adjustment was made. Perhaps information and knowledge of the property offender could be valuable and result in more adequate handling of this offender within the criminal justice system. Data on the

property offenders are divided into categories by characteristics.

TABLE 17

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROPERTY OFFENDERS: RACE AND AGE

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Race		
Black	50.5%	(49)
White	49.5	(48)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>
Age		
18 years	1.0%	(1)
19	18.6	(18)
20	18.6	(18)
21	13.4	(13)
22	5.2	(5)
23	5.2	(5)
24	8.2	(8)
25	3.1	(3)
26	0.0	(0)
27	8.2	(8)
28	3.1	(3)
29-34	9.2	(9)
35 and over	6.1	(6)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>

These characteristics of the property offenders will be compared with those of the total sample. See Tables 17-29.

There were 97 probationers (58 percent of the total) who were property crime offenders. Within the property crime category, 49 probationers (50.5 percent) were Black. This high rate indicates that Blacks are over-represented, as they

comprise only 15.7 percent of Hamilton County's population.

The average age was 24.0 years and the median age was 21.4 years. Both these figures are lower than the total sample's mean and median ages of 25.5 and 22.9 years, respectively. Property offenders tend to be younger than other criminal offenders. The very high rate of property crime increase has witnessed a similar high rate of increase in property offenses among younger age groups.

TABLE 18  
MARITAL STATUS OF PROPERTY OFFENDERS

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Marital Status		
Single	70.1%	(68)
Married	20.6	(20)
Separated	6.2	(6)
Divorced	3.1	(3)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>

Sixty-eight of the property offender cases (70.1 percent) were single. When compared to the total sample's single category rate of 59.5 percent, the rate of the property offender can be considered very high. Property offenders tend to be single, with very few having married and established a family.

The average educational achievement level of the property

offenders was the 10.1 grade, with the median at 10.4. This is very similar to the total sample's mean and median of 10.2 and 10.5 respectively. An average grade level attainment of 10.1 is high when compared to the average educational level of prison inmates of 6.2.

TABLE 19  
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ATTAINED BY PROPERTY OFFENDERS

Education (in years)	Percentage	Totals
4	1.0%	(1)
5	1.0	(1)
6	1.0	(1)
7	4.1	(4)
8	10.3	(10)
9	17.5	(17)
10	17.5	(17)
11	25.8	(25)
12	15.5	(15)
Some College	6.2	(6)
Total	100.0%	(97)

In 22 cases (22.7 percent), evidence of drug usage by property offenders was discovered in records. Although the total sample's incidence of drug usage was 32.7 percent, the property crime offender's rate is still very high, for it excludes drug law offenders who have a 45-percent rate of evidence of drug usage. Alcohol had the highest rate of usage among all drug types for both the total probationer and property offender samples.

TABLE 20  
DRUG USAGE BY PROPERTY OFFENDERS

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Drug Usage		
None	77.3%	(75)
Opiates	8.2	(8)
Alcohol	10.3	(10)
Barbiturate/ Amphetamines	2.1	(2)
Hallucinogen	2.1	(2)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>

TABLE 21  
WORK RECORD BEFORE OFFENSE OF PROPERTY OFFENDERS

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Work Record		
Poor	51.5%	(50)
Satisfactory	40.3	(39)
Good	8.2	(8)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>

Property crime offenders had a higher percentage of poorer prior work records (51.5 to 41.7 percent) and a lower percentage of good prior work records (8.2 to 17.8 percent) than did the total sample. The criteria used in Table 8 to evaluate prior work records also applies to property offenders. The data indicate that property offenders have poorer work records when compared to other types of offenders. The



TABLE 22

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROPERTY OFFENDERS: EMPLOYED AT TIME  
OF OFFENSE, EMPLOYMENT LEVEL, AND WAGES EARNED WEEKLY

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Employed at Time of Offense		
No	47.4%	(46)
Part-time	4.1	(4)
Full-time	48.5	(47)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>
Employment Level		
Operative	93.8%	(91)
Skilled	6.2	(6)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>
Wages Earned Weekly		
Less than \$50	6.2%	(6)
50-75	8.2	(8)
75-100	26.8	(26)
100-125	25.8	(25)
125-150	9.3	(9)
150-200	12.4	(12)
Greater than \$200	3.1	(3)
NA	8.2	(8)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>

inability to obtain economic security in the market place may contribute to or result in the pursuit of illegitimate means of income.

From the data in Table 22, it can be seen that property offenders have a higher percentage of unemployment at the time

of the offense (47.4 to 38.7 percent) and a lower percentage of full-time employment at the time of the offense (48.5 to 56.0 percent) than the total probationer sample. With the correlates of this high rate of unemployment for property offenders, it is not surprising to find that illegal alternative means of support in the form of property crimes resulted.

Property offenders had a higher percentage of cases in the operative level (93.8 to 89.9 percent) and a lower percentage in the skilled level (6.2 to 10.1 percent) than the total sample. Property offenders tended to be unemployed and, if employed, underemployed at the time of the offense.

The median weekly salary for property offenders was slightly lower than the total sample's (\$100-\$125). The difference was too small to have any significance. This weekly income must, as before, be considered a marginally poor income.

Fifty-one of the property offenders (47 full-time and 4 part-time) or 52.7 percent were employed at the time of the offense. (Of the total probation sample, 61.4 percent were employed at the time of the offense). Twenty-two property offenders (43.1 percent) lost their job which they held before the offense; of the total probationer sample, 37.9 percent lost their jobs. Property offenders were unemployed to a greater extent than the total sample and lost the jobs that they held before the offense at a higher percentage rate than

TABLE 23

## PROPERTY OFFENDERS' RETENTION OF PREVIOUS EMPLOYMENT

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Retain Job Held Before Offense		
Yes	56.9%	(29)
No	43.1	(22)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(51)</u>

the total sample. The old phrase "Last hired, first fired" could well apply to the economic plight of property offenders.

TABLE 24

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PROPERTY OFFENDERS  
ONCE PROBATION BEGAN

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Employed once Probation Began		
Yes	51.5%	(50)
No	48.5	(47)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>

Property offenders had a higher percentage of unemployment than the total probationer sample once probation began (48.5 to 38.1 percent). An unemployment rate of 48.5 percent is a very serious problem. With such a high rate of unemployment, probation services should concentrate in this area of

need.

The average length of unemployment for property offenders while on probation was 4.8 months. The total probationer sample's average length of unemployment was 4.0 months. For a twelve-month period, the property offender's average percentage of unemployment was 40 percent. This 40-percent rate is somewhat lower than percentage rate of unemployment once probation began (48.5 percent) and the percentage rate of unemployment at the time of the offense (47.4 percent). All three figures identify and represent a serious problem of unemployment for property offenders. These high unemployment rates will with high probability result in lower relative adjustment scores and a greater likelihood to engage in criminal activity.

A higher percentage of jobs were secured by the probation officer (13.4 to 9.5 percent) and a lower percentage of jobs were secured by the probationer's own efforts (78.4 to 83.9 percent) for property crime offenders when compared to the total probationer sample (see Table 26). (NA means data are missing. Both absconders and unemployed probationers fall into this category.)

The 29 property offender cases (30 percent) that retained the job they held before the offense (Table 23) were excluded from this table. Because they retained their previous employment, they were not in need of an employment/vocational

TABLE 25  
NUMBER OF MONTHS UNEMPLOYED

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals	Cumulative Percentage
Number of Months Unemployed			
0	20.6%	(20)	20.6%
1	6.2	(6)	26.8
2	3.1	(3)	29.9
3	18.6	(18)	48.5
4	8.2	(8)	56.7
5	5.2	(5)	61.9
6	5.2	(5)	67.1
7	5.2	(5)	72.3
8	5.2	(5)	77.5
9	5.2	(5)	82.7
10	8.2	(8)	90.9
11	3.1	(3)	94.0
12	6.2	(6)	100.0
Total	100.0%	(97)	100.0%

TABLE 26  
SOURCE OF EMPLOYMENT FOR PROPERTY OFFENDERS

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Source of Job		
Own efforts	78.4%	(76)
Probation Officer	13.4	(13)
NA	8.2	(8)
Total	100.0%	(97)

TABLE 27  
REFERRAL SERVICES AND OUTCOMES FOR PROPERTY OFFENDERS

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Referral and Result		
None	36.8%	(25)
Unsuccessful	41.2	(28)
Successful	22.0	(15)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(68)</u>

referral. Successful referral resulted in either an educational, vocational, or employment placement or opportunity. Forty-three cases (63.2 percent) were referred to other agencies or employers by the probation officer. Of these referrals, 15 cases (22 percent) were successful. The percentage of referrals and successful referrals for property offenders was almost identical to the total probation sample's percentages.

TABLE 28  
EVALUATION OF WORK HISTORY OF PROPERTY OFFENDERS

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Probation Work Record		
Poor	43.3%	(42)
Satisfactory	30.9	(30)
Good	25.8	(25)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>

A smaller percentage of property offenders had good probation work records (25.8 to 33.9 percent) and a higher percentage had poorer work records (43.3 to 38.1 percent) when compared to the total probationer sample. Property offenders have poorer probation work records than other types of offenders. The poor work records are reflected in a higher number of months unemployed and a lower relative adjustment score. The same criteria that were used for the total probationer sample to evaluate probation work will be used for property offenders.

The average relative adjustment score for property offenders was 2.6. The total probationer sample's average score was 2.8. The property offender's average relative adjustment score is considered low when compared to the average relative adjustment score of 5.4 for halfway house residents. This score was determined from the analysis and evaluation of Ohio's eight halfway houses by the Ohio State University Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency.

#### Arrest Record

Four categories were developed for detailed analysis (misdemeanor arrests and convictions, and felony arrests and convictions). Traffic violations were excluded.

Of the 97 property offenders, 21 (21.6 percent) were arrested for misdemeanor offenses. Seventeen property

TABLE 29  
RELATIVE ADJUSTMENT SCORE FOR PROPERTY OFFENDERS

Characteristic	Percentage	Totals
Relative Adjustment Score		
-12	1.0%	(1)
-9	2.1	(2)
-7	1.0	(1)
-6	2.1	(2)
-5	1.0	(1)
-4	1.0	(1)
-3	6.2	(6)
-2	1.0	(1)
-1	3.1	(3)
0	4.1	(4)
1	6.2	(6)
2	8.2	(8)
3	6.2	(6)
4	11.3	(11)
5	20.6	(20)
6	19.6	(19)
7	4.1	(4)
8	1.0	(1)
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>(97)</u>

offenders were arrested once, three were arrested twice, and one was arrested three times. Ten property offenders (10.3 percent) were convicted of misdemeanor offenses; 9 property offenders were convicted once and one was convicted twice.

A total of 11 property offenders (11.3 percent) were arrested for felony offenses. Ten property offenders were arrested once and one was arrested twice. Of these, 7 property offenders (7.2 percent) were convicted of felony offenses.



All 7 were convicted once. In this study, failures on probation in forms of conviction for a felony are markedly concentrated in the property offender category.

### Probationer Questionnaire Results

As mentioned earlier, the second stage of the research study involved interviewing the probationers with a questionnaire (see attached questionnaire). Of the total, 123 cases (representative of the total sample) were selected for this stage; 105 cases were eventually interviewed. The remaining 18 cases could not be located by either the probationer's probation officer or the probation department.

The answers to the question, "What, in your opinion, could the probation officer or the probation department do to help their probationers secure employment/vocational placements or opportunities?" were classified into three categories. It was found that 64.8 percent (63 probationers) believed the probation officer and/or the probation department should take an active role in this area. 21.9 percent (23 probationers) had no comment and 13.3 percent (14 probationers) believed it was up to the individual.

A major purpose of this interviewing stage was to ask the probationer for both his recommendations and suggestions regarding the probation officer and the probation department's providing employment/vocational opportunities and placements

for probationers. The probationers suggestions were recorded and combined with other similar suggestions to provide the following list of recommendations from offenders for the probation officer and the probation department:

1. Know the existing resources in the community (vocational and educational programs).
2. Establish a public service job opportunities program with the city and state to hire probationers.
3. Provide good recommendations to employers.
4. Have a daily job listing service.
5. Establish a program of job referrals with follow-up for probationers.
6. Find the probationer's interest through the use of mechanical ability and aptitude tests, and search for jobs that might exist within those areas of interest.
7. Establish a working agreement with the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services to hire probationers.
8. Utilize private, fee employment service agencies.
9. Make probation the period in which the probationer must obtain a skill or trade, otherwise the final release will not be given.
11. Establish a public relations program with the business community to hire probationers.
12. Personally take the probationer to employment interviews.

13. Provide financial assistance for transportation to and from work.

14. Utilize probationers who are currently working to inform probation officer and/or probation department of possible employment opportunities.

### Testing the Hypotheses

Ten hypotheses were tested for significance. Two statistical tests were utilized to analyze the data. The Gossett t-test was used for the nominal level independent variables. Regression analysis was performed on the ordinal level variables. Analyses of the data through the use of these statistical tests addressed the following null hypotheses.

1. There will be no difference in relative adjustment scores for probationers receiving successful referrals by probation officers and probationers not receiving successful referrals. This hypothesis could not be rejected.

2. There will be no difference in relative adjustment scores for probationer achieving employment through their own sources and probationer who received successful referrals by the probation officer. This hypothesis could not be rejected.

3. There will be no difference in relative adjustment scores for probationer whose offense was for violation of drug laws or who were under the influence of drugs during the commission of the offense, and probationers whose offense

was not drug related. This hypothesis could not be rejected.

4. The greater the number of months unemployed, the lower the relative adjustment score. This was found significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 30

COMBINED RELATIVE ADJUSTMENT SCORE  
AND NUMBER OF MONTHS UNEMPLOYED

Variable	B	F	Level of Significance
Number of Months Unemployed	-.51596	48.463	.01
Combined RA Score	4.94264		

It was determined that there exists a strong correlation, significant at the .01 level, between the number of misdemeanor and felony arrests and the number of months unemployed.

TABLE 31

NUMBER OF MISDEMEANOR ARRESTS AND NUMBER OF MONTHS UNEMPLOYED

Variable	B	F	Level of Significance
Number of Months Unemployed	.03792	8.767	.01
Number of Misdemeanor Arrests	.13143		

TABLE 32

## NUMBER OF FELONY ARRESTS AND NUMBER OF MONTHS UNEMPLOYED

Variables	B	F	Level of Significance
Number of Months Unemployed	.0227	13.371	.01
Number of Felony Arrests	.00816		

A positive correlation significant at the .05 level exists between the number of felony convictions and the number of months unemployed.

TABLE 33

## NUMBER OF FELONY CONVICTIONS AND NUMBER OF MONTHS UNEMPLOYED

Variable	B	F	Level of Significance
Number of Months Unemployed	.01182	5.184	.05
Number of Felony Convictions	.01508		

5. The higher the weekly income, the higher the relative adjustment score. A strong positive correlation was found that was significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 34  
COMBINED RELATIVE ADJUSTMENT SCORE AND WAGES EARNED

Variable	B	F	Level of Significance
Wages Earned	.55621	8.716	.01
Combined RA Score	.91723		

6. Probationers who are skilled employees will have higher relative adjustment scores than those who are not skilled. This was found significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 35  
COMBINED RELATIVE ADJUSTMENT SCORE AND EMPLOYMENT LEVEL

Employment Level	Sample Size	Mean RA Score	Level of Significance
Operative	151	2.464	.01
Skilled	17	5.353	

7. There will be no difference in relative adjustment scores for probationers retaining their previous job and probationers who find other employment. This hypothesis could not be rejected.

8. Black probationers will have a higher number of months unemployed than will whites. This was found significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 36

## RACE AND NUMBER OF MONTHS UNEMPLOYED

Race	Sample Size	Mean Number of Months Unemployed	Level of Significance
White	89	3.191	.01
Black	79	4.924	

9. There will be no difference in relative adjustment scores for black probationers and white probationers. This hypothesis could not be rejected.

10. There will be no difference in relative adjustment scores for married probationers and probationers who are not married. This hypothesis could not be rejected.

Analysis of the property crime offender resulted in the following statements:

1. Black property offenders will have a higher number of misdemeanor arrests than will whites. This was found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 37

## NUMBER OF MISDEMEANOR ARRESTS AND RACE

Race	Sample Size	Mean Number of Misdemeanor Arrests	Level of Significance
White	48	.125	.05
Black	49	.408	

2. The greater the number of months unemployed for property offenders, the lower the relative adjustment score. This was found significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 38  
COMBINED RELATIVE ADJUSTMENT SCORE  
AND NUMBER OF MONTHS UNEMPLOYED

Variables	B	F	Level of Significance
Number of Months Unemployed	-.59527	43.199	.01
Combined RA Score	5.5127		

A strong positive correlation significant at the .01 level was found between the number of misdemeanor and felony arrests and the number of months unemployed.

TABLE 39  
NUMBER OF MISDEMEANOR ARRESTS AND NUMBER OF MONTHS UNEMPLOYED

Variables	B	F	Level of Significance
Number of Months Unemployed	.06031	15.484	.01
Number of Misdemeanor Arrests	-.00625		



TABLE 40

## NUMBER OF FELONY ARRESTS AND NUMBER OF MONTHS UNEMPLOYED

Variable	B	F	Level of Significance
Number of Months Unemployed	.02544	9.122	.01
Number of Misdemeanor Arrests	-.00578		

3. The higher the weekly income for property offenders, the higher the relative adjustment score. This was found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 41

## COMBINED RELATIVE ADJUSTMENT SCORE AND WAGES EARNED

Variable	B	F	Level of Significance
Wages Earned	.55621	8.716	.01
Combined RA Score	.91723		

CHAPTER 4  
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

After detailed analysis of case records and probation officer and probationer interviews, the study has found the following:

1. An over-representation of blacks in the research time period (47%),
2. A young average age of probationer (25.5 years),
3. A high percentage rate of single probationers (59.5% for total sample and 70.1% for property offenders),
4. A high educational level of the 10.2 grade,
5. A high incidence of drug usage among probationers (42.6%),
6. Poor prior work records (41.7% for total sample and 51.5% for property offenders),
7. High unemployment rate at the time of the offense (38.7% for total sample and 47.7% for property offenders),
8. A high percentage rate of probationers who are semi or unskilled (89.9% for total sample and 93.8% for property offenders),
9. A marginally poor economic weekly income (\$100-\$125),
10. A poor retention of previous jobs held before the offense (62% for total sample and 57.7% for property offenders),
11. A high unemployment rate once probation began (38.1% for total sample and 48.5% for property offenders),
12. A high average length of unemployment during

the twelve-month research study (4.0 months for total sample, 4.8 months for property offenders and 4.9 months for blacks),

13. A heavy reliance on the probationer's own efforts for sources of employment (83.9% for total sample),
14. A low percentage rate of successful referrals (23.3% for total sample),
15. Poor probation work records (38.1% for total sample and 43.3% for property offenders),
16. A low comparative relative adjustment score (2.8 for total sample), and
17. A high incidence of misdemeanor arrests (22.1% for total sample) and felony arrests (10.1% for total sample).

Examination of the data from the probationer questionnaire stage indicates that a very high percentage of the probationers lost their previously held jobs because of the instant offense (68%). Also, approximately 65% of the interviewed probationers feel strongly that the probation officer and/or probation department should take a more active role in the development of employment/vocational placements and opportunities. A summary of the probationers' recommendations was presented in the previous section "Results of Probationer Questionnaire."

Testing the hypotheses resulted in the following significant conclusions:

1. The higher the number of months unemployed, the lower the relative adjustment score, and the higher the number of misdemeanor arrests, felony arrests, and felony convictions.

2. The higher the wages earned, the higher the relative adjustment score.
3. Skilled probationers had higher relative adjustment scores than unskilled probationers.
4. Blacks had a higher number of months unemployed than did whites.

Analysis of the characteristics of the property offenders resulted in the following significant conclusions:

1. Black property offenders had a higher number of misdemeanor arrests than whites.
2. The higher the number of months unemployed, the lower the relative adjustment score, and the higher the number of misdemeanor arrests and felony arrests.
3. The higher the wages earned, the higher the relative adjustment score.

#### Recommendations

While it is relatively easy to conduct evaluative studies of outcomes of treatment modalities, such as probation services, it is much more difficult to formulate reasonable and feasible recommendations for consideration by responsible decision makers and policy-setting administrators. This is even more problematic, even in economically stable periods, when resource allocations and alignments are not directly under the aegis of criminal justice administrators. It is, therefore, imperative that recommendations be offered in terms of the objectives and mandates of each agency.

With these externalities in mind, the first recommendation is that consideration be given to utilization of court costs payments in individual cases to provide financial incentives to employers, particularly in the private sector, to hire and/or train probationers and to provide minimum wages to probationers attending a non-paying vocational or education program. While this may appear to be an unusual recommendation, the policy choices and alternative dispositions available to the courts as well as to probation services are limited, and this approach holds considerable promise to reduce further criminal behavior (thus protecting the local citizenry) as well as increase the speed of reintegrating offenders both into approximate pursuits of a non-criminal nature.

A second and related recommendation, not dependent on local resource availability, is to consider the development of a team approach for probation services, which would focus on the higher risk multiple-problem offenders on probation. If conceived as a demonstration project, it would be appropriate to request Federal funds from an agency such as the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, or the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. If this approach were selected (as perhaps part of a national basis), funds should be requested to cover such basic costs as a probation officer salary, services for the five (or so) most problematic cases in the probation department,

and at least funds for the immediate housing, medical, psychiatric, transportation, clothing, and related needs of the high-risk offenders selected for such a demonstration project.

A third recommendation would be to establish a centralized referral service within the probation department for probationers in need of employment, with follow-up to evaluate the referral source and its result. Before such a program could be instituted, a comprehensive public relations effort to enlist the support of the private, public, and the voluntary sectors in providing employment opportunities and placements for probationers is needed. Once such a public relations campaign is begun, a centralized referral service will be able to have an impact on the high unemployment rate among the probationers. Also, the referral service should establish a strong network for referral to vocational placements to make probation a time to acquire a skill or trade.

The research study stated that there exists a very high unemployment rate among black probationers. With this evidence, a greater concentration of the probation officer's and probation department's efforts is needed to reduce this alarming rate. The probation officer must be acutely aware of and utilize the existing programs and resources that provide employment, vocational, and educational assistance to probationers before any effective reduction in the black probationer unemployment rate is made.

The final recommendation is for the probation officer and the probation department to utilize private employment referral agencies. These agencies are supported solely by their "success rate" in placing people in meaningful employment. Their income is a fee paid by the client in return for successful placement in an employment opportunity. Private employment referral agencies would have a more vested interest in placing probationers in employment opportunities/placements than would public employment agencies. This avenue for possible employment development and placement would be excellent for referring semi-skilled and skilled probationers to job opportunities.

When an individual is granted probation by the court, it is felt that enabling the person to remain in the community will have a far more constructive influence on society and on that individual's future behavior than would removal from society to a prison. If, however, conditions exist within that community that are conducive to further criminal behavior, the effect of probation on the individual and society is minimal, at best, and possibly destructive. High rates of unemployment among probationers is such a condition.

The research study has examined the personal adjustment of male Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas probationers over a twelve-month period. It has concluded that the higher the number of months unemployed, the lower the probationer's

relative adjustment and the greater the likelihood to engage in criminal activity. The condition of high rates of probationer unemployment, particularly among blacks, cannot be overlooked. The administration of the probation delivery system and policy decisions pertaining to probation must begin to deal with this alarming rate of unemployment among probationers and start to effectively address itself to this crucial concern; for the effectiveness of probation and the protection of society are at stake.



Questionnaire to Probationer

1. Were you employed at the time of the offense? Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, (a) Was it full-time \_\_\_\_\_ or part-time \_\_\_\_\_ and  
how much did you earn weekly? \_\_\_\_\_

- (b) Did you keep this job once probation began?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If no, what was the reason for losing the  
job? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. If you were unemployed at the time of the offense or lost  
your job because of the offense, how long did it take you  
to find your next job? \_\_\_\_\_

- (a) Did anyone assist you? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, who? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Once probation began, were you employed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_

4. While on probation, how many months were you unemployed?  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. While on probation, how many different jobs did you hold?  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. When you secured a job, who was the source of this job?  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Did your probation officer or the probation department, at  
any time, assist you in obtaining an employment/vocational  
placement or opportunity? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, where were you referred and what was the result?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 
- 
8. What, in your opinion, could the probation officer or the probation department do to help their probationers secure employment/vocational placements or opportunities?
- 
- 
- 
- 

9. What person or agency has been of most assistance to you while on probation?
- 
- 
-



**END**