

Fall 1927

Some Factors in Success or Failure on Parole

Helen Leland Witmer

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

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

Recommended Citation

Helen Leland Witmer, Some Factors in Success or Failure on Parole, 18 *Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology* 384 (1927-1928)

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

SOME FACTORS IN SUCCESS OR FAILURE ON PAROLE

HELEN LELAND WITMER¹

This study was undertaken two years ago when, at the request of the Wisconsin State Board of Control, the Sociology Department of the University of Wisconsin began its investigation of the probation and parole systems of the state. The material for this part of the study was taken wholly from the records of the state prison and reformatory, a fact which makes the factors to be discussed only the most obvious ones, for prison records are notoriously inadequate, and these were no exception to that rule. A more fundamental limitation is the fact that this is a study of success and failure in abiding by the rules (or, more strictly speaking, in not being caught not abiding by the rules) laid down by the parole board for conduct while on parole. Nothing is known about success or failure, however they might be defined, after release from parole. Nevertheless, it was thought that some information might be secured from even so handicapped a study.

THE PAROLE SYSTEM IN WISCONSIN

Wisconsin's parole laws follow the accepted pattern for such laws in the United States, the most outstanding difference being in the lack of an indeterminate sentence law to bolster them up. The granting of parole is in the hands of the State Board of Control, a group of three persons appointed by the governor and having direction of all the state's charitable and correctional institutions. It sits as a parole board once every two months at each institution and hears recommendations for parole which the institution has to offer.

To be eligible for parole a man in the prison must have served at least half his sentence, less time deducted for good conduct, or thirty years, less the same good-conduct deduction, if he was given a life sentence. At the reformatory he must have served at least nine months, the exact time of release being determined by a system of marks and grades. Chief emphasis in both institutions seems to be placed on conduct in the institution as the criterion for deciding when to recommend a prisoner for parole. Theoretically the parole

¹University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

officer makes a study of the home background, for his duty is to advise the parole board as to the community's attitude toward the offender and as to advisability of his parole on the basis of the "causes" of his crime; but, in fact, this usually means nothing but a recital of the details of the offense, so far as one can judge from the available records. Letters from friends, petitions or protests from the community, the attitude of the trial judge (in the case of prison offenders) all help to determine the board's decision. Recently, since the time of this study, mental and physical examinations have been added.

In both institutions the man must have secured a job and a sponsor before he is paroled. At the prison he secures these through his own efforts or those of his friends, while at the reformatory it is the parole officer's duty to find one for him. While on parole he must stay at this job (or at another, if the warden approves the change), conduct himself honestly, "avoid evil companions, obey the laws, and abstain from the use of intoxicating liquors." He returns to the institution each month all money earned above actual expenses (this is returned to him at his final release), and his sponsor, usually his employer, certifies that the amount is correct and that he has not misbehaved during the month. This, in fact, is the supervision the prisoner receives while on parole, for, since there is but one parole officer connected with each institution, and he must act, at the reformatory at least, as the one who finds jobs and looks up past histories, it is evident that he can do little in the way of actual supervision.

The length of the parole period varies. Due to the definite sentence law the sentence of many of the parolees expires before much time has been spent on parole. It can continue until the sentence does expire, but it is the custom, especially at the reformatory, to dismiss at the end of twelve months.

THE RECORDS SELECTED FOR STUDY

For nearly thirty years Wisconsin has used parole to some extent. The Reformatory for Men, established in 1898, had parole as a part of its system from the beginning, and the State Prison adopted it in 1907. The new Reformatory for Women, which was too new for us to study, has parole also, as do the institutions for juveniles. Our study is confined, however, to the two first-mentioned institutions.

In selecting the records to be studied we used a mixture of the methods of sampling and complete count. By March, 1925, the time of our study, there had been about sixteen hundred persons paroled

from the prison and nineteen hundred from the reformatory. It was obviously unnecessary to study all these records in order to arrive at some conclusions regarding the groups. On the other hand, the number who "failed" on parole was small, 116 at the prison and 266 at the reformatory, and sampling seemed unjustified. Then, too, the percentage failing each year varied greatly at the reformatory, though it was quite steady from 1919 on, the time when a change of administration had been made.

What was wanted was a group from each institution of those "successful" on parole to compare with a group of "failures," success being measured by not being returned to the institution during the parole period. We finally decided to select the records for study thus. From the prison we took for our successful group the 214 who, paroled between June, 1918, and February, 1921, were not returned for violation of their parole agreement; for the failed group the whole 116 who had failed since the parole system was put into operation. From the reformatory we took as a sample of the successful men the 229 successes between June, 1921, and January, 1925, and of the failures the records of 48 men between 1917 and the time of our study, about March, 1925.

The records, as we have said before, give a very inadequate picture of the men in question. The reformatory records are slightly better in that they show at what occupation the man was employed while on parole, but neither give any insight into the kind or degree of supervision that is exercised. Nothing can be gleaned as to the social background of the prisoner; there is seldom anything that tells what sort of a person his sponsor is; and the space on the monthly reports which is to be devoted to "conditions and prospects" of the prisoner is seldom filled in. Such are the limitations which are encountered in a study such as this. Our findings, however, outlined below, may be of some interest nevertheless.

"SUCCESSSES" AND "FAILURES" COMPARED

Age—The age of the parolee as a factor in accounting for failure on parole seems to be of more importance in the prison group than in the reformatory one. At the prison half the violators of parole were under thirty as compared with thirty-nine per cent of the successes, and a fourth of these were under twenty-two as compared with about one-seventh of the successes. At the reformatory nearly all the prisoners are by law under thirty, and age does not seem to be so important in determining success on parole. Twenty-one per

cent of the failures as compared with twelve per cent of the successes were between sixteen and eighteen, but, on the other hand, fifty-seven per cent of the successes were in the nineteen to twenty-two group as compared with forty-eight per cent of the failures. The percentage of failure in general is slightly higher at the reformatory than at the prison, and it may be that the difference in the ages of the men at the two institutions may be one of the reasons for this, though, on the other hand, the percentage at the reformatory has varied so greatly, running from four to twenty-seven per cent between 1908 and 1924, that the difference is probably largely administrative.

Marital Condition—Lack of family ties is, apparently, another slight influence in determining failure. Forty-nine per cent of the prison failures and thirty-eight per cent of the successes were single, while the reformatory figures were ninety-one per cent as compared with eighty-five. That this is not entirely a matter of age is shown by the fact that in the prison group, although men under twenty-six made up thirty per cent of those who violated parole, they made up thirty-nine per cent of the violators who were single. The conclusion to be drawn from this and the preceding discussion on age would seem to be, then, not necessarily that the younger and unmarried should not be paroled, but that they should, probably, be supervised more carefully. It may also have some bearing on the assumption that it is "safer" to release younger rather than older men.

Use of Alcohol—In this respect there appear at first sight to be really striking differences, both between the groups in the prison and between the prison and the reformatory. At the prison seventy per cent of the violators of parole are classed as intemperate as compared with thirty-nine per cent of the successes; and eight per cent of the violators are temperate (meaning, presumably, abstinent, for the classification is temperate, moderate, intemperate) as compared with thirteen per cent of the successes. At the reformatory this difference between the groups is not found, forty-six per cent of the successes and thirty-seven per cent of the failures being temperate. This apparently greater degree of temperance in the reformatory is probably not a real difference but one of classification, for only eight per cent of the successes in the reformatory group are classed as moderate users as compared with forty-three per cent in the prison.

These striking differences at the prison between the successes and failures disappear when the difference in time is taken into consideration. It will be remembered that the prison figures for failures

include all who broke parole from 1907 on, while the successes are for the period, 1918 to 1921. When comparison is made between successes and failures for the same time period (although such a procedure gives us only nineteen failures to compare with two hundred and fourteen successes) the differences are not so great. Forty-eight per cent of the failures are now classed as intemperate and thirty-nine per cent of the successes; and ten per cent of the failures and thirteen per cent of the successes are temperate, figures which are much more like those for the reformatory. On the other hand, only one man in the reformatory group was returned to the institution for being drunk, while this was the offense which constituted breaking parole in forty per cent of the prison cases. Since these prison offenders are older men, on the whole, it does look as though prohibition may be having some effect on the younger offenders, the reformatory group.

Previous record—The first difference of real importance becomes evident in this comparison. At the reformatory seventy per cent of the successes and forty-eight per cent of the failures had had no previous record. At the prison the figures were forty-eight per cent for the successes and twenty per cent for the failures. This might seem to constitute some justification for the laws in some states which limit parole to first offenders. When, however, several previous sentences have been served the difference between the two groups largely disappears.

At the reformatory out of the twenty-three failures who had already served some sort of sentence, nine were returned to the institution because they had committed some new crime, this being seventy per cent of the number who were returned for that reason. As they constituted only fifty-two per cent of all the failures, it is evident that this is more than their proper share. The records, meager as they are, seem to show that little care was used to prevent this. Six of them were paroled back to their home communities in spite of the fact that in the case of at least three of them the records definitely showed that their home conditions were very bad. All were paid quite poorly: one received nothing, one five, one ten, three twenty-five, and one fifty dollars a month. The other two worked so short a time that their records do not show how much they earned. Since all of them had previously been sentenced for stealing in one form or another, repetition of this offense under such conditions does not seem surprising.

Previous Occupation—To compare the groups for occupations involves the difficult question of how to classify occupations. When they are grouped according to a modification of the Barr Scale for Occupational Intelligence and the Taussig Industrial Classification² the following differences show up:

Occupational Groups	OCCUPATION BEFORE COMMITMENT							
	Prison				Reformatory			
	Successful Number	Percent	Failed Number	Percent	Successful Number	Percent	Failed Number	Percent
I	2	1	2	1
II	6	3	2	2
III	47	22	34	34	25	10	4	9
IV	54	26	23	23	57	25	22	51
V	18	9	5	5	4	2	2	5
VI	80	39	35	36	128	56	15	35
Student	13	6
Not stated..	7	...	17	5	...
Total .	214	100	116	100	229	100	48	10

According to this grouping there are no very significant differences except in the case of the fourth and sixth categories in the reformatory group. This would seem to mean that there was a larger percentage of successes comparatively in the unskilled group and of failures in the group of moderately skilled. If this is a real difference, the reason for it is not apparent.

At the prison farmers and farm laborers made up twenty-three per cent of the successful group and only five per cent of the unsuccessful. Only two farmers and four farm laborers broke parole. At the reformatory, however, this difference was not so marked, there being twenty-one per cent of the successful and sixteen per cent of the failures in the farmer-farm-laborer category. It is possible that these differences are due to the greater ease of abiding by the law that may exist in the country; or it may be merely that the chance of being detected not abiding is smaller there.

Offense Causing Commitment—At both institutions the chief difference between the groups is found in the category, offenses against property. Sixty-six per cent of the prison men who broke parole

²This particular classification was devised by the Institute of Child Welfare of the University of Minnesota. Descriptions of the scales on which it is based are to be found in *Genetic Studies of Genius*, by Terman et al., pages 66-72.

In general Group I includes the professions; II, officials, managers and the semi-professions; III, such categories as city and county officials, foremen, commercial travelers, clerical workers, real estate and insurance agents, the more skilled trades, machinists and mechanics; IV, such as salesmen in stores, policemen, farmers, the less skilled trades, most of the transportation occupations; V, such as semi-skilled operatives, teamsters, newsboys, elevator tenders, porters, servants; VI, laborers of all kinds.

and fifty per cent of those who did not had been sentenced originally for this class of offense, while at the reformatory the percentages were ninety-three as compared with eighty-four.

There has been a tendency in most states to limit parole to persons committing certain crimes. Especially has there been a feeling that persons committing murder or rape should not be paroled, and this, in some states has been extended to making parole difficult for any sex offenders or gunmen. The results in Wisconsin show that this feeling is unjustified in so far as it is based on a belief that these men are more likely to repeat their offenses. In contrast to the twenty-four men who were sentenced for adultery and were successful on parole, there were only two who broke parole, and only two others who were sentenced for rape in contrast to the ten successful parolees. The two men sentenced for rape were apparently subnormal and should not have been paroled. The one was sent to an insane hospital, where he committed rape again, and the other was returned to prison for another sexual offense. In the records of the two failures who were sentenced for adultery originally, there is nothing to show that they differed from the average parolee. The one was returned for being drunk and the other for leaving his place of employment, neither an offense at all peculiar to that class of men.

Those sentenced for burglary, forgery, and larceny make up fifty-six per cent of the men who broke parole. While thirty per cent of all the men returned to prison were convicted of a new offense, thirty-six per cent of this group were so accused. This is even more striking among those convicted in the first place of forgery. There were twenty-one such men among the parole violators. Eight of these broke parole by forging a second time, and three others, who had been convicted of burglary and larceny originally, forged while on parole. No other men committed forgery during their parole period. Forgery, also, makes up fifty per cent of the crimes for which the men who broke parole in this way were returned to prison. So, altogether, there seems to be some connection between this type of offense and failure to keep parole, a conclusion that is reinforced when we notice that only nine of the men successful on parole had forged. In general, then, it is the men who commit the lesser offenses who are likely to repeat them while on parole.

Length of Sentence—At the prison the percentage of failures whose sentence had been one year or less is higher than that of the successes, but the reverse is true at the reformatory. When to this one-year group at the prison is added those whose sentence was for

two years, the difference between the successes and failures disappears, and the percentages parallel each other for the longer sentences, as is the case also at the reformatory.

At the latter institution, however, parole can be granted any time after nine months have been served, so that a more accurate picture of the differences is secured by noting the time actually served rather than the length of sentence. A slightly larger per cent of those who failed were released at the minimum time (twenty-eight per cent as compared with twenty-four), but when those released within a year are included, the percentage becomes higher for those who were successful; and there are more who failed after being in the reformatory more than eighteen months than were successful. On the whole, then, it would seem that increasing the time spent in the institution is not any guarantee of greater success on parole. This conclusion would seem to raise grave doubts as to the effectiveness of the whole penal system, especially as it has already been shown that what are generally considered the more serious offenders do not break parole as readily as do the less serious ones.

Length of Parole Period—The men who broke parole, of course, did not serve out their full parole period, but the comparison is interesting in order to see how long it was before they did break parole. At the prison eighty-eight per cent of the failures broke parole within six months, and sixty per cent within three. That would look as though there were some justification for the short parole period, for none were held more than fourteen months and fifty-eight per cent were held less than six. On the other hand, half the men who violated parole after six months did so by committing some new crime, which makes it appear that the period of supervision should not be shortened too much. The fourteen per cent who broke parole within a week were returned to the institution either for drunkenness or for leaving their work.

At the reformatory the defects of the definite sentence system are to be seen in the fact that practically half the successful men were on parole seven months or less, due to their having to be released when their short sentence of one to two years were up.

As at the prison, a large per cent who do fail do so within a rather short time, eighty per cent within five months and nearly fifty per cent within three. But again, as at the prison, seven out of the nine who failed after six months did so by committing new offenses. It seems, then, a fair conclusion that those who are going to fail by breaking some minor rule do so within a rather short period, less than

six months on the whole, while those who commit new offenses on parole usually do so late in their parole periods; and this would seem to be a sufficient justification for longer supervision on parole.

The records at the reformatory were slightly more complete than those at the prison, so that for the next few topics we have information for only the reformatory groups. In some of the cases this is due to the fact that the system there was different from that at the prison.

Marks Received in the Reformatory—Progress in the reformatory is shown by the grade a man is in, and this is based on the number of marks he fails to receive. If he spends six months without receiving more than four marks he is advanced to the first grade, and he must remain there for three months without receiving more than three marks before he is eligible for parole. It was found in a study at the Massachusetts Reformatory that the parole violators received newer marks than did the parole successes.³ While this is not true in the Wisconsin institution, still the differences are not great. Twenty-four per cent of the successes and sixteen per cent of the failures received no marks against them; but, on the other hand, five successful men had from twenty-five to thirty-nine marks while none of the failures had more than twenty-three. The number of marks, then, does not seem to be a good criterion of success or failure. But if progress in reformation is measured by marks, and marks have little to do with success in the life outside, might it not be questioned whether what is called reformation inside is any real indication of preparation for life outside?

Grades in the Reformatory School—Only those attend the school who have not already completed the sixth grade outside. Of those who did attend there were more successful men with high grade in their studies and more with very low than was the case with the failures. The fact, however, that there were thirty per cent of the successes with grades above ninety as compared with the eleven per cent of the failures, and that there was a larger proportion of the successes who did not have to attend at all (fifty-one per cent as compared with forty-one) suggests that the successes may be of greater intelligence or more persistent in their efforts, or that their greater previous schooling was a factor in their success.

Superintendent's Recommendations as to Parole—The impression the man makes on the institutional authorities is doubtless summed

³Warner, Sam, *Factors Determining Parole from the Massachusetts Reformatory*, Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 14:193.

up in the superintendent's recommendations. The high correlation of this with success on parole may have some bearing on the moot question as to whether parole should be granted by the institution authorities or by some outside board. In eighty-seven per cent of the cases which later proved to be successful he recommended that parole should be granted in contrast to the fifty-five per cent who failed. He recommended that nine per cent of the successes should have their parole deferred and that four per cent should not be granted parole. The corresponding percentages for those who later failed were twenty-four and twenty-one.

Place of Residence before Commitment—Places of residence were classified as follows: Milwaukee, towns over 1,500, those under 1,500, out of the state. Eighteen per cent of the failures came from Milwaukee and thirteen per cent of the successes, a difference which is probably not significant. Forty-six per cent of the successes came from the towns of over 1,500 as compared with thirty-four per cent of the failures, while the difference was also slightly in favor of the successes in the villages and open country. Twice as many of the failures, twenty-five as compared with twelve per cent, came from out of the state as did the successes, which may mean that this was a group with a more roving disposition and that this disposition is not so likely to prove successful under the supervised parole conditions!

Type of Community to Which They Were Paroled—The open country is the favorite place to which to send any defective or delinquent group in the eyes of most social theorists. It appears, however, that with this reformatory group it was not very conducive to good conduct on parole, for forty-one per cent of the failures were sent there or to villages under 1,500 population and but twenty-two per cent of the successes. Milwaukee too had a higher share of failures, forty-four per cent as compared with thirty-seven, while the towns of 1,500 and over seemed most conducive to success. Many who failed in the country did so by leaving their place of employment, a fact which will be discussed at greater length under that topic.

Occupation on Parole—The record for this also was to be found only at the reformatory. The principal trades taught there are stone-cutting and tailoring, though many men are employed in the machine, blacksmith, and plumbing shops, and in the bakery, laundry, and on the farm. The trades, however, are taught definitely with the idea of preparing the men for jobs after being released, and it would seem

reasonable to expect that a certain proportion of the men would be placed in these trades while on parole. As a matter of fact of the two hundred and seventy-seven records studied, one shows the man placed as a stone-cutter and one as a tailor. He had been a tailor before commitment to the reformatory. The training in the blacksmith shop was made use of in the case of two men. The plumbing shop yielded one plumber's assistant, and the bakery one cook.

If they are not placed in the trades for which they have been trained while in the institution, it might be expected that they would be placed at those at which they worked before commitment. This is apparently done to a much larger extent than is true of the trades for which they were trained while in the reformatory, forty-three per cent of the successful and thirty-three per cent of the failures being so placed. Nevertheless, there is much of what appears to be mere putting of men in any job that is available. Placing a book-keeper as a saw mill operative, a florist as an auto mechanic, a farmer as a store clerk, and a moulder's helper at housework seems somewhat peculiar on the surface, although, of course, there may have been reasons for this that the records do not reveal.

The fact that so many fail when placed on a farm may perhaps be accounted for on this basis of lack of relationship between former job and the one they have on parole. Only five of the seventeen failures who were placed on farms had been farmers or farm laborers previous to commitment, and fourteen out of the seventeen violated parole by absconding. On the other hand, of the fifty-seven successes who were placed on farms thirty had been farmers or farm laborers previously. Thirty-eight per cent of the failures were placed on farms during their parole period and but twenty-five per cent of the successes. It is evident that the country by itself is no guarantee of success on parole.

The other surprising fact which is disclosed by a comparison between jobs before commitment and those on parole is the small percentage of failures who were paroled as unskilled laborers, only two per cent as compared with the nineteen per cent of the successes. It would look as though men were more successful when placed in jobs that are simpler rather than more complicated than those they held previously. Examining the large group of successful laborers more carefully, we find that practically sixty per cent of them had been laborers before, which is in line with our theory that men do better in jobs for which they have been fitted either by training in the institution or, as in this case, by previous experience. Then,

too, there are only two men, bookkeepers, who appear to be definitely out of place in their parole job of laborer. The one laborer who did fail on parole was returned for forgery. He had been earning twenty-nine dollars a month on parole!

Amount of Monthly Earnings—The group of failures at the prison extend over such a long period of time as compared to the successes that it is impossible to compare their earnings without making careful allowance for changes in the value of the dollar. This is not true to the same extent in the reformatory group, and comparison there seems justified without any refined corrections, though there is the difficulty that men paroled to farms receive little in addition to their board and room. However, taking the raw figures, we find that fifty-seven per cent of the failures were paid less than thirty dollars a month as compared with only twenty-one per cent of the successes. The percentage of the failures paroled to farms was considerably lower than this, so low farm wages cannot account for all this difference. With forty-six per cent of the successful earning more than seventy dollars a month and only sixteen per cent of the failures, it may well be suspected that this is one cause of failure on parole.

Offenses Constituting Failure on Parole—We have tried to get at some of the possible factors which may lie back of failure on parole and have found slight differences between the groups compared in age, marital condition, use of alcohol, previous record, type of offense, grades in the reformatory school, and type of community to which they were paroled. Larger differences were found in regard to the superintendent's recommendations as to parole, the occupation at which they were placed on parole, and the amount of money they earned. Previous occupation, time served in the institution, marks received in the reformatory seem to have little relationship to success of failure. Although few of the differences are very large, the fact that they run in the same direction in almost every case in both the prison and the reformatory seems to indicate that they are real differences nevertheless.

Now, of those who do break parole, what are the offenses which constitute that breaking? Are they such as to endanger the community and thus constitute a challenge to the whole parole system? At the prison about twelve per cent of all the men paroled from 1907 on violated the terms of their agreement. At the reformatory the percentages fluctuated greatly, but for the period covered by this study the percentages of violation averaged about thirteen. In the

table below we have the percentages of these who broke parole by committing some new offense, the only type of breaking that is of real importance to society. And we find that these make up but two to three per cent of all the men paroled! With such a record the present outcry against parole seems quite unwarranted.

OFFENSES CONSTITUTING FAILURE ON PAROLE

Offense	Prison		Reformatory	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Committed new crime.....	19	20	13	28
Assault	1
Burglary	3	...
Forgery	9	...	5	...
Indecent exposure.....	1
Having burglar tools.....	1
Larceny	4	...	3	...
Non-support	1
Operating auto without consent of owner.....	1	...
Rape	1
Embezzlement	1	...
Drunkenness	34	35	1	2
Lazy and indifferent.....	1	2
Left employment.....	34	35	32	68
Returned of own accord.....	1	1
Unsatisfactory work.....	6	7
Died	1	1
Insane	1	1
Not stated.....	23	...	1	...
Total	118	100	48	100

When we look at the type of offense by which they broke parole, the situation is seen to be even less serious. In the whole history of parole at the prison, nearly a twenty year period, one man broke parole by committing rape and one by assault; the other seventeen, as well as all those at the reformatory, committed offenses which were not such as to warrant the cartoons and articles which have been circulated against the parole system. The large percentage who violated by leaving their work may be a reflection on the system of placing, while drunkenness is again seen to be an offense of the older, possibly pre-prohibition, type of man.

Conduct after Release from Parole—Any real estimate of success must be based on conduct after final release; but this, as was stated at the outset, is beyond the scope of this study and is probably beyond any study in the present state of penal statistics. However, a

partial record of recidivists is to be found by means of the Bureau of Criminal Identification, to which all federal and many state prisons send finger prints of all their prisoners. The Reformatory is one of the institutions which registers with this Bureau, and records of its men can thus be traced in so far as they are subsequently committed to some of the larger institutions. The inadequacy of this check-up is evident, but as a comparison between successes and failures it is interesting.

Of the two hundred and twenty-nine successful men, five were subsequently committed to one of the institutions listed with the Bureau. They were as follows: one to the Wisconsin State Prison for burglary and one for forgery; one to the Indiana State Prison for passing a fraudulent check; one to Kansas for desertion; one to Ohio for rape; making about two per cent in all. Of the forty-eight who failed, four were subsequently committed to these institutions, nine per cent of the total failures. Three were sent to the Wisconsin State Prison for burglary, larceny, and forgery, respectively, and one to Illinois for robbery. Three of these had broken parole by leaving their place of employment and one by committing burglary.

It may be objected, quite validly, that these percentages of two and three, which are the percentages of those breaking parole by committing a new offense, give but one part of the picture and that many more than those shown above commit offenses after their parole period is over or even commit them, undetected, during the period itself. In answer to the latter argument we may say that legally and for all statistical purposes a crime becomes a crime only when it is detected—at least it is only such as are detected that enter into the problem that we are now discussing; and there seems to be no reason for supposing that the surveillance by the police is less strict in the case of men on parole than it is of the ordinary citizen.

As to those who commit new offenses after they are released from parole, they constitute no argument against the parole system unless it can be shown that a larger proportion of paroled men become recidivists than of those who served out their full term in prison. If this is not the case—and no adequate study has been made to show whether it is or not—then the fact that so few men violate parole by committing new offenses would seem to constitute a serious argument in favor of retaining and improving the parole system, for it is manifestly a more economical and humane system than is that of long sentences in prison.

AGE OF PRISONERS AT TIME OF PAROLE

Age Groups	Prison				Reformatory			
	Success No.	%	Failure No.	%	Success No.	%	Failure No.	%
16-18	28	12	9	21
19-22	12	6	13	12	129	57	20	48
23-26	29	14	20	18	51	22	11	26
27-30	40	19	19	18	21	9	2	5
31-34	34	16	25	22
35-38	30	14	8	7
39-42	22	10	12	11
43-46	11	5	3	2
47-50	9	4	2	2
51-54	8	4	1	1
55-58	7	3	4	3
59-62	5	2	1	2
Over 62	6	3	3	2
Not stated	1	...	5	6	...
Total	214	100	116	100	229	100	48	100

MARITAL CONDITION OF PAROLEES

Marital Condition	Prison				Reformatory			
	Success No.	%	Failure No.	%	Success No.	%	Failure No.	%
Single	82	38	48	49	196	85	40	91
Married	86	40	36	35	32	11	3	7
Divorced	29	14	11	11	1	4	1	2
Widower	16	8	5	5
Not stated	1	...	16
Total	214	100	116	100	229	100	44	100

HABITS IN REGARD TO USE OF LIQUOR

Use of Liquor	Prison						Reformatory			
	Success No.	%	Failure No.	%	Failed Since 1918 No.	%	Success No.	%	Failure No.	%
Temperate	27	13	7	8	2	10	105	46	18	37
Moderate	104	48	21	22	8	42	19	8	5	10
Intemperate	73	39	69	70	9	48	105	46	25	53
Not stated	16	...	19
Total	214	100	116	100	19	100	229	100	48	100

NUMBER OF PREVIOUS COMMITMENTS

Previous Commitments	Prison				Reformatory			
	Success No.	%	Failure No.	%	Success No.	%	Failure No.	%
None	104	48	34	20	165	72	21	48
One	51	24	29	25	53	23	15	34
Two	27	13	23	20	7	3	4	9
Three	19	9	18	15	1	.5	3	7
Four	6	3	3	2	1	2
Five	3	1	4	3	3	1.5
Six	1	1
Seven	1	.5	1	1
Eight	2	1
Nine	1	.5
Over 20	3	3
Not stated	4	...
Total	214	100	116	100	229	100	48	100

OCCUPATION BEFORE IMPRISONMENT

Occupations	Prison				Reformatory			
	Success		Failure		Success		Failure	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Professions	3	1.5	2	2	10	4.5
Public official.....	1	.5
Business or trade.....	21	10	17	16	3	1.5	2	4
Clerical	13	6	4	3	13	6	3	7
Skilled trades.....	45	22.5	30	28	29	12.5	15	36
Personal service.....	9	3.5	7	7	7	3.5	1	2
Unskilled labor.....	65	33	40	39	104	45	15	35
Farmers	23	11	2	2	23	10	6	14
Farm labor.....	25	12	4	3	27	11	1	2
Student	13	6
Not stated.....	9	...	10	5	...
Total	214	100	116	100	229	100	48	100

OFFENSES FOR WHICH PAROLEES HAD BEEN COMMITTED

Offenses	Prison				Reformatory			
	Success		Failure		Success		Failure	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Offenses against persons	48	22.5	18	16	13	5.4
Offenses against property	109	50	72	66	191	83.8	42	93.5
Offenses against public justice	2	1	2	1.5	2	.8
Offenses against chastity.	54	26	15	14	22	9.6	2	4
Unclassified offenses.....	1	.5	3	2.5	1	.4	1	2.5
Not stated.....	6	3	...
Total	214	100	116	100	229	100	48	100

LENGTH OF SENTENCE IMPOSED

Sentence	Prison				Reformatory			
	Success		Failure		Success		Failure	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One year.....	51	24	41	39	68	30	9	20.5
Two	55	27	19	17	65	29	12	27
Three	36	17	16	15	54	23.5	14	32
Four	13	6	5	5	14	6	5	11
Five	27	13	12	11	20	8	3	7
Six	3	1	1	1	3	1.5
Seven	5	2	2	2
Eight	4	2	1	1	2	1
Ten	6	3	3	3	2	1	1	2.5
Over ten.....	14	5	6	6
Not stated.....	10	...	1	...	4	...
Total	214	100	116	100	229	100	48	100

TIME SPENT IN REFORMATORY BEFORE PAROLE

Months	Success		Failure	
	No.	%	No.	%
9	55	24	12	28
10-12	64	28	7	16
13-18	64	28	12	28
19-24	31	13	7	16
Over 24.....	15	7	5	12
Not stated.....	5	...
Total	229	100	48	100

NUMBER OF MARKS RECEIVED IN REFORMATORY

Marks	Success		Failure	
	No.	%	No.	%
None	55	24	7	16
1- 4	102	45	18	42
5- 9	33	13	9	22
10-12	17	8	2	4
13-17	9	4	3	7
18-22	6	3	3	7
Over 22	7	3	1	2
Not stated	5	...
Total	229	100	48	100

GRADES RECEIVED IN THE REFORMATORY SCHOOL

Grades	Success		Failure	
	No.	%	No.	%
90-100	30	30	3	11
80- 89	53	52	16	62
70- 79	12	12	5	19
60- 69	3	3	2	8
50- 59	2	2
40- 49	1	1
Total	101	100	26	100
Did not attend	128	51	18	41
Not stated	4	...
Total	229	...	48	...

SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS IN REGARD TO PAROLE

(Reformatory Groups)

Recommendations	Success		Failure	
	No.	%	No.	%
Should be granted	198	87	23	55
Should be deferred	21	9	10	24
Should not be granted	8	4	9	21
Not stated	2	...	6	...
Total	229	100	48	100

PLACE OF RESIDENCE BEFORE COMMITMENT

(Reformatory Groups)

Residence	Success		Failure	
	No.	%	No.	%
Milwaukee	30	13	8	18
Towns, 1500 and over	105	46	15	34
Villages, less than 1500	65	29	10	23
Out of state	28	12	11	25
Not stated	1	...	4	...
Total	229	100	48	100

TYPE OF COMMUNITY TO WHICH PAROLED

(Reformatory Groups)

Type of Community	Success		Failure	
	No.	%	No.	%
Milwaukee	85	37	21	44
Towns, 1500 or more	89	30	6	13
Villages, less than 1500	37	16	13	26
Country	14	6	7	15
Out of state	3	1	1	2
Not stated	1
Total	229	100	48	100

MONTHLY WAGES WHILE ON PAROLE
(Reformatory Groups)

Wages in Dollars	Success		Failure	
	No.	%	No.	%
0- 10	7	3	5	13
11- 20	16	7	1	3
21- 30	25	11	15	41
31- 40	18	8	3	8
41- 50	14	6.5	2	6
51- 60	12	5.5
61- 70	24	11	5	13
71- 80	29	13
81- 90	32	14	2	6
91-100	24	11
Over 100	21	10	4	10
Worked too short a time to receive pay	7	...	11	...
Total	229	100	48	100

OCCUPATIONS OF MEN BEFORE COMMITMENT AND WHILE ON PAROLE
(Reformatory Groups)

<i>On Parole</i>	<i>Successful</i>	<i>Before Commitment</i>	
Advertising	1	Salesman	1
Auto factory	12	Auto mechanic	1
		Fireman	1
		Florist	1
		Laborer	6
		Salesman	1
		Woodworker	1
Barber	3	Barber	2
		Laborer	1
Blacksmith helper	2	Auto mechanic	1
		Laborer	1
Butcher's helper	1	Laborer	1
Carpenter	3	Clerk	1
		Bookkeeper	1
		Laborer	1
Candy factory	1	Stock clerk	1
		Bookkeeper	1
Clerical worker	1	Laborer	1
Cook	2	Cook	1
		Laborer	1
Contractor	1	Civil engineer	1
Farm work (25%)	57	Auto salesman	1
		Carpenter	1
		Civil engineer	1
		Cook	1
		Farmer or farm laborer	30
		Laborer	19
		Polisher	1
		Porter	1
		Store keeper	1
		Student	1
Fireman	1	Laborer	1
Housework	1	Molder's helper	1
Linotype	1	Printer	1
Labor (19%)	44	Auto mechanic	1
		Blacksmith	1
		Bookkeeper	2

<i>On Parole</i>	<i>Before Commitment</i>
	Farmer 8
	Fireman 2
	Gardener 1
	Laborer 26
	Plumber 1
	Student 2
Lumbering 4	Farmer 2
	Laborer 2
Manufacturing 40	Auto mechanic..... 1
	Chauffeur 1
	Clerical work..... 3
	Cook 2
	Farm work..... 5
	Fireman 1
	Laborer 21
	Manufacturing 4
	Radio operator..... 1
	Student 1
Mason 2	Carpet weaver..... 1
	Lineman 1
Painter 3	Painter 1
	Draftsman 1
	Student 1
Saw mill..... 17	Bookkeeper 1
	Farmer 1
	Laborer 12
	Store clerk..... 1
	Student 1
School 4	Laborer 1
	Student 3
Shipping clerk..... 8	Clerk 1
	Farm labor..... 1
	Labor 3
	Student 2
	Truck driver..... 1
Shoe repairer..... 1	Switch tender..... 1
Stone cutter..... 1	Laborer 1
Store clerk..... 6	Farmer 1
	Laborer 1
	Salesman 2
	Shoemaker 1
	Student 1
Truck driver..... 12	Auto mechanic..... 2
	Chauffeur 1
	Clerk 2
	Farm labor..... 1
	Fireman 1
	Laborer 3
	Painter 1
	Student 1

Failed

<i>On Parole</i>	<i>Before Commitment</i>
Auto mechanic 2	Auto mechanic..... 1
	Not stated..... 1
Call boy 1	Laborer 1
Farm work (38%)..... 17	Farmer or farm laborer..... 5
	Laborer 4
	Laundry 1

<i>On Parole</i>	<i>Before Commitment</i>
	Mechanic3
	Printer1
	Not stated.....3
Janitor 1	Laborer1
Labor 1	Labor (2%).....1
Manufacturing16	Farmer2
	Fireman2
	Laborer4
	Machinist2
	Newsboy1
	Plumber1
	Printer1
	Reedworker1
	Not stated.....2
Mason 1	Auto mechanic.....1
Restaurant 1	Auto mechanic.....1
Stock room..... 2	Chauffeur1
	Laborer1
Tailor 1	Tailor1
Truck driver..... 3	Clerk2
	Laborer1
Not stated..... 2	