



National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

THE PAROLE BOARD AS AN ORGANIZATION:
ITS INFLUENCE ON BOARD MEMBERS'
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.

Marie-ève Marchand-Hart

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
University of Ottawa, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

* 1981 *

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Firstly, I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Justin Ciale, my advisor, for his guidance, his encouragement and his constant support during the redaction of my thesis. I am also very grateful to the Chairman of the Parole Board, Mr. W.R. Outerbridge, for allowing me to conduct a study on the decision-making process in the Parole Board. I was particularly touched by his trust and openness as I fully realize that such studies are seldom allowed in administrative tribunals.

Completion of my thesis would have been impossible without the support of the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Roger Labelle, who relieved me from many of my responsibilities and turned a blind eye to some missed deadlines...

I am also thankful to all the Board members who accepted to participate in this study and I sincerely hope that they will find its outcome worthwhile.

My good friend, Yvon Dandurand, deserves many thanks not only for helping me with the structure of the thesis but especially for giving me a sense of perspective: "don't forget that it won't change the world!" The assistance of Len Wevrick and M.A. Rahim of the Statistical Division of the Ministry of the Solicitor General was also very precious.

I owe the original idea for the design of this study to another friend, Dr. Jean Trepanier, who created the decision making-game that I used as a model, and took time to explain it to me.

I am also very grateful to my family for their patience and the moral support I received especially at the times I thought that I could not go a step further...

I

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
I THE PAROLE BOARD AND ITS DECISIONS: A CRISIS OF LEGITIMIZATION	11
A) The Present Situation	11
B) Historical Perspective on the Mandate of the Parole Board	16
C) Parole Decisions	25
a) The Nature of the Decisions	25
b) The Legal Framework and the Policies	30
c) Decisional Referents Other Than the Law, Regulations and Policies	32
d) The Board as an Organization	36
II THE STUDY	45
A) Hypotheses	45
B) Methodology	48
a) The Subjects	48
b) The Instruments	50
. A Questionnaire on Background Characteristics	50
. The Decision-Making Game	53
c) The Selection of Cases	60
. The First Case "COOK"	62
. The Second Case "MARTIN"	63
. Administration of the Instrument	65
d) Compilation and Analysis of the Data	66

III THE RESULTS	70
A) Number of Information Cards	70
B) Selection of Information	75
C) Order of Priority in Card Selection	86
D) The Decisions	96
IV DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS	105
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
APPENDICES	

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
I	Number of Cards Used (COOK)	71
II	Number of Cards Used in Cumulative Percentage (COOK)	71
III	Difference in Number of Cards Used (Chi-square Test)	72
IV	Number of Cards Used (MARTIN)	73
V	Number of Cards Used in Cumulative Percentage (MARTIN)	73
VI	Difference in Number of Cards Used (Chi-square test)	74
VII	Frequency of card Utilization in Any of the 15 Positions	76
VIII	Difference in the Weight Given to Cards (COOK)	77
IX	Frequency of Cards Utilization by Board Members (COOK)	79
X	Frequency of Card Utilization in Any of the 15 Positions (MARTIN)	81
XI	Difference in the Weight Given to Cards (MARTIN)	82
XII	Overall Frequency of Card Utilization (MARTIN)	83
XIII	Cards Selection by Category of Importance (COOK and MARTIN Together)	85
XIV	First Five Choices (COOK)	87
XV	Ranking of First Five Choices "COOK"	89
XVI	First Three Choices (COOK)	90
XVII	First Five Choices (MARTIN)	93
XVIII	Ranking of First Five Choices (MARTIN)	94
XIX	First Four Choices (MARTIN)	95
XX	Interim Versus Final Decisions (COOK)	97

XXI	Interim Versus Final Decisions (MARTIN)	97
XXII	Interim Decision (COOK)	100
XXIII	Final Decision (COOK)	102
XXIV	Interim Decision (MARTIN)	102
XXV	Final Decision (MARTIN)	102

INTRODUCTION

The last five years have been marked by a mounting criticism of parole. None of its facets has been spared from the attacks of researchers, philosophers, lawyers and managers.

The strict legal mandate of every Parole Board in North America may vary but, in essence, the work is similar: appointed Board members must decide whether an inmate should be returned to the community before the end of his sentence; they have the responsibility of granting, or refusing, release to a convicted offender after weighing the risk involved for the community. Some Parole Boards have explicit criteria set by statute to govern their decisions¹. Other Boards have developed detailed policies and procedures to narrow down the possible interpretations of the Act under which they operate².

Some Parole Boards, including the U.S. Board of Parole, have developed sophisticated guidelines that reduce considerably the discretionary power of their Board members and presumably render their decisions more uniform, equitable, and predictable.

Guidelines usually refer to two different types of scoring systems: a matrix or a sequential model. The systems consist of giving a

¹ e.g., The Nebraska Board of Parole

² e.g., The Parole Board of Canada

numerical value to pre-determined elements of the inmate's background; the decision to release or not is then based on the inmate's overall score. Criteria, on the other hand, are more general guides to decision-making, leaving the responsibility of weighing the factors with individual decision-makers.

With or without guidelines, Parole remains under continuous attack as one of the last symptoms of a dying rehabilitative ideology. Moreover, with the decline of that ideology has come the questioning of the moral appropriateness of parole. A new, and yet very old, concept of justice - an eye for an eye - is emerging. An offender should be punished for what he did by being accorded a flat sentence rather than being kept in prison for an indeterminate period of time with a promise of freedom if administrators and professionals of the system gain confidence that he will behave "properly" in the future. The proponents of this return to strict legality, often referred to as "modern classicists", claim that everyone should be punished according to explicit, well-established rules in order that justice be served (11). The enthusiasm generated by this simple, uncomplicated approach is already being criticized as carrying to an extreme the legal principle which argues that justice is intrinsically and necessarily a matter of rules (3, p. 2).

Board members, at this time, find it a difficult task indeed to decide whether the philosophical basis of parole -- linked with the

"individualized justice" approach of the post-classical school -- is still worthwhile. Should they not rather espouse the classical view, which categorizes offenders, offences and appropriate punishment without consideration of individual circumstances?

The rebirth of the classical approach has brought onto Parole Boards accusations that they do not respect the principles of natural justice and do not offer the guarantees of due process that the courts offer. They have also been accused of making their decisions on the basis of a large number of questionable criteria.

Paradoxically, they also have to respond to the opposite criticism, that only two criteria are considered by Board members when making decisions, namely the seriousness of the offence and the length of the criminal record (10). These latter critiques claim that, because Parole Boards use the same criteria as judges, they have become in fact re-sentencing Boards or, at best, sentence equalization Boards.

The climate of distrust towards "individualized justice", and the demand for explicit parole criteria, have forced the Canadian Parole Board in the last four years to enter a phase of intensive policy development coupled with the establishment of procedural safeguards, resulting mainly from the adoption by the Canadian Parliament of the "Human Rights Act". These policies and procedures do not appear to be enough to respond to all the objections, as indicated by the increasing

number of litigations against the Parole Board. Is the best way to respond to the objections a further narrowing of the discretion by way of guidelines? This has been a constant topic of discussion within the Canadian Parole Board in the last year.

Before narrowing further the discretionary power of Parole Board members, one would need to assess whether the presumed disparity in decisions and the decision-making process does in fact exist.

The moral concern is of importance. If, on the one hand, excessive discretion leads to arbitrariness and inequality, on the other hand, too many rules could lead to inflexibility and insensitivity to the differing needs and circumstances -- and consequently to impersonal treatment (3, p. 2). Asquith points out also that, by focusing on procedures and rules, more subtle forms of control are left unexamined:

"By introducing an ideological veneer of equality, equity, fairness and justice, attention may be deflected away from more basic social and structural inequalities" (1 p. 12).

One of these forces or controls that has been left totally unexamined is the organization itself: how the power of the Board affects its members. It is amazing that the immense body of research in social psychology related to the relationship between the individual and his organization has left criminologists so indifferent. The

individual's need for congruence, between his values and those of the organization, is demonstrated in numerous studies (6) (7). D.S. Pugh, in his 'Modern Organization Theory' (8) stresses the importance of the bureaucratic organization as one of the dominant institutions of our times. And organizations themselves do not exist in a vacuum: they respond to the societal pressures impinging upon them and interpret the social reality for the individuals operating within them.

One author, Daniel Gifford, has paid attention, at least theoretically, to the constraints of the administrative justice system on the individual decision-maker. His article "Decisions, Decisional Referents and Administrative Justice" is totally devoted to that theme:

"The official, however, is not free to decide any way he wishes. He is free only in case he decides to flaunt the imperatives of the systems in which he acts. So long as he identifies with that system, he internalizes the "obligation" which the system imposes upon him to decide in accordance with its mandate; he is in effect bound "by its rules." (4 p. 14).

When a system is under pressure, especially when its own survival is threatened, the informal constraints tend to increase. At the same time, usually, the system creates more norms and rules to govern itself. The pressures on the Parole Board and the massive policy.

development of the last few years may have created a situation where the presumed disparity in decisions has been replaced by an unexpected homogeneity and where the system has developed strong priorities which are not stated in the law, regulations, or policies.

If indeed a high level of homogeneity was found in the decisions, new questions would have to be addressed by the Parole Board.

"... if no differences are found among Board Members, the Board, as such, may not be needed at all, at least for individual case decision-making. If all tend to make the same decisions, then one decision maker will suffice" (5 p. 119).

It would also mean a departure from the original vision of the Parole Board as composed of strong, independent decision-makers.

This study will attempt to assess the impact of organizational priorities and internal constraints on the decisions and decision-making process of the Board members. In order to better understand the impact of the Board as an organization on its individual members, an analysis will first be made of the present socio-political and ideological context in which the Parole Board operates. And, because it appears that the context is so different than the one that existed when the Parole Board was instituted by law in Canada (in 1959), a short

historical perspective will be presented on the evolution of parole in Canada.

A review of the literature on parole decisions, their nature and the influencing factors will complete the framework in which the analysis of this particular decisional referent (or influencing factor) will be made: the Board as an organization.

The study itself will compare the decisions and decision-making process of two groups of Board members -- full-time Board members and Community Board members -- because these two groups differ radically in terms of their relationship to the Board as an organization.

In addition to full-time Board members who spend two-thirds of their time voting on conditional release cases, the Board counts nearly 80 Community Board members, whose services are required only two or three times a year. They vote only in cases of offenders serving life sentences (2, section 3.1). It is expected that full-time Board members are more likely to have "internalized the obligations of the systems"; and its informal constraints (4).

The priorities of the organization will play an influential role in their decision-making process and their decisions. Therefore full-time Board members would display more homogeneity in their decisions than

Community Board members who remain at the periphery of the organization. The latter are expected to identify less with the system and its priorities and consequently render conditional release decisions that are more individualized and, as a group, less homogeneous.

In order to study the decision-making process of these two groups of Board members, a method was selected that permitted the generation of the required data in a controlled setting: the decision-making game of Leslie Wilkins (12) as adapted by Trépanier (9). The collaboration of full-time and Community Board members was requested, and a most supportive response received.

References

- (1) ADLER, M. and ASQUIETH S: (1979), Discretion and Power, University of Edinburgh: Unpublished paper.
- (2) CANADA (1979), Parole Act and Regulations (Office Consolidation). Ottawa: Queen's printer.
- (3) DEMERS, D. (1980), Discretion: Underlying Principles and Current Issues, Ministry of the Solicitor General: unpublished paper.
- (4) GIFFORD, D. (1978), Decisions, Decisional Referents and Administrative Justice in B. ATKINS and M. POGREBIN, The Invisible Justice System Discretion and the Law, Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson publishing, 14-23.
- (5) GOTTFREDSON, D. and BALLARD K.B., Differences in Parole Decisions Associated with Decision-Makers, Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency 3, 112 - 119.
- (6) HOLLANDER, E.P. and WILLIS, R.H. (1969), Some Current Issues in the Psychology of Conformity and Non-Conformity in E.F. BORGATTA, Social Psychology U.S.A.: Rand McNally & Cie, 412 - 428.

- (7) KEMPER, T.D. (1969), Reference Groups: Socialization and Achievement in E.F. BORGATTA, Social Psychology U.S.A.: Rand McNally & Cie, 297 - 312.
- (8) PUGH, D.S. (1969), Modern Organization Theory: A Psychological and Sociological Study in BORGATTA, E.F., Social Psychology U.S.A.: Rand McNally & Cie 667-68.
- (9) TREPANIER, J. (1978), The Characteristics of Probation Officers in Relation to the Decision-Making Process in the Presentence Inquiry, University of London: unpublished doctoral thesis.
- (10) VON HIRSH, A. and HANRAHAN K.J. (1979), The Question of Parole Cambridge, Mass.: Balinger.
- (11) VON HIRSH, A. (1976), Doing Justice: The Choice of Punishment, New York: Hill and Wang.
- (12) WILKINS, L.T., GOTTFREDSON, D.M., (1973), Information Selection and Use in Parole Decision-Making, California: NCCD Publications.

CHAPTER IPAROLE BOARDS AND THEIR DECISIONS: A CRISIS OF LEGITIMIZATION.A) The Present Situation

In the difficult economic climate that prevails today, parole is often seen as an unjustifiable burden on the taxpayer. Why maintain humanitarian programs for those who have added to the high level of stress in our society by breaking its rules? Why increase the personal risk of "decent" citizens by releasing dangerous offenders?

The public is also far less accepting of programs that cannot clearly prove their effectiveness. The humanistic principles behind some correctional options are considered more as an abdication of the tough responsibility to manage a world in crisis than as a courageous step towards the creation a better society. It is difficult indeed, to imagine in 1981, a replay of 1967's endless philosophical debates in the House of Commons about the possibility of a judicial error as an argument against capital punishment.

In this era of management by objectives, cost-effectiveness and efficiency, the Parole Board is often short of arguments to convince pragmatists that parole might have other objectives than a cost-reduction in correctional administration. Because of the new belief in management by objectives and its accompanying technology, the Parole

Board found itself very much on the defensive when the Auditor General of Canada stated in 1978

"... The Parole Board was not in a position to evaluate its effectiveness since it has not specified criteria for assessing the quality and consistency of its decisions" (16, p. 95).

The public is also very intolerant of the Parole Board's failures. Sensational incidents reported in the media always raise the anger of citizens who write to their elected representative with essentially the same message: "Lock them up and throw away the key!".

While these criticisms flow from the general public, professionals and administrators discuss openly the failure of behavioral sciences in predicting human behaviour and submit to Martison's conclusion that "nothing works" (31). Civil libertarians proclaim, with creditable arguments, that if, on the one hand, the offenders are guilty of breaking the laws, on the other hand, those who make decisions about convicted offenders are guilty of disobeying all the principles of natural justice and the latter are accused of rendering, lightly and arbitrarily, decisions that could affect for years the lives of citizens. The Parole Board has been repeatedly attacked along these lines since the dissenting judgement of Judge Bora Laskin in Mitchell v. The Queen (24. C.C.C. (2d) 245).

"The plain fact is that the Board claims a tyrannical authority that I believe is without precedent among administrative agencies, empowered to deal with a person's liberty. It claims an unfettered power to deal with an inmate, almost as if he were a mere puppet on a string. What standards the statute indicates are, on the Board's contentions, for it to apply according to its appreciation and without accountability to the courts. Its word must be taken that it is acting fairly without it being obliged to give the slightest indication of why it was moved to suspend or revoke parole. All this is said to be expressed or found in the Parole Act".

The overall climate is one of distrust in the ability of human beings to seek the well-being of the majority at the expense of their own personal interest and ambitions.

In this view of man lies the foundation of Beccaria's classical school of criminology and his solutions. Beccaria (7) in his "Essay on Crimes and Punishment", devised a system of predetermined punishments for each crime without consideration for individual differences and circumstances. In his view, the human capacity of free will makes "all men equal before the law". But the free will of man is also an evil which the state should, and could, overcome since human beings express free will only through criminal actions (23 p. 246).

This ideology is resurfacing under the new name "just desserts", a model that also comes with a method to ensure "proportional justice" (6). The solution consists of guidelines that eliminate, or at least reduce considerably, the discretion of decision-makers in the criminal justice system. With the abolition of discretion, presumably everyone would be treated equally according to pre-determined criteria. This approach is essentially in opposition to the individualized justice model that gave birth to parole in North America (8 p. 194).

The proponents of the "just desserts" model have chosen parole as their first target, stating openly that the inequities of that system are easier to demonstrate than the inequities of court decisions (37). Also, the remedy is easier to develop.

With the availability of a computer technology, parole guidelines and their accompanying "scoring" systems are tempting. They seem to offer an immediate alternative to a professional diagnosis fallen in disrepute and at least a short-term answer to the civil libertarians -- who may be satisfied with the type of equality guaranteed by this approach in default of an assurance of substantial justice, a broader social problem.

According to Adler and Asquieth, an appeal for more rules and regulations is usually launched when there is a dissatisfaction with the exercise of discretion from those are the recipients of these decisions

(1 p. 4). The appeal is heard when the individuals or groups who voice their dissatisfaction have political support. Discretion, on the other hand, is favoured when decision makers have a high status and are not opposed by another powerful group dissatisfied with the way decision-makers operate.

If parole decisions became totally governed by guidelines or even more, if parole were abolished, it is not sure at all that we would have eliminated discretionary decisions about the release of offenders. According to Davis, discretion is never eliminated -- it is moved to another decision point and other decision-makers in the system (21).

This states briefly the climate in which Parole Boards operate at this time, caught between the requirements of the new, prevailing ideology and the nature of its mandate, itself embedded in a totally different vision of man and justice and a different school of thought in criminology. "The individualized justice" model which, without denying the fundamental principle that similar cases should be treated in a similar manner, claims that cases are never totally similar and attention should be paid to individual characteristics and circumstances.

In order to better understand the impact of this dichotomy on the Board as an organization, and consequently on the decision of Board

members, one must look back at the origin of parole and its evolution over the last 20 years.

B) Historical Perspective on the Mandate of the Parole Board

The Parole Board was established in Canada in 1959, following an investigation ordered five years before by the Hon. Stuart S. Carson, then Minister of Justice. The Committee's official mandate was to "inquire into the principles and procedures followed in the Remission Service of the Department of Justice of Canada" (14). The Report submitted by the Committee on April 30, 1956, became commonly known as the "Fauteux Report".

The Fauteux Report established the principles under which the future Parole Board was to operate, principles that have remained unamended in the last 22 years. The report stated that "Parole is designed to ensure, as far as possible, the safety of the community as well as the welfare of the individual prisoner" (14 p. 52). To reach this dual objective, the Committee rested its trust in findings on sociology, and psychology, in the experience of institutional officers (14 p. 52), and above all, in the quality of the persons selected to become Parole Board members (14 p. 81).

The Fauteux report established that sociologists, psychologists and experienced staff would have the responsibility to indicate to the Board

the optimum moment in the life of an offender when "he has had enough" and would, if released, become a law-abiding citizen. Members of that inquiry commission believed that the same prisoner kept in prison past that critical moment would become discouraged, bitter, cynical and probably even more anti-social than he was (14 p. 53).

This point of view, of course, reflects the social context of the late 50's and early 60's where "humanistic" theories were becoming popular and where the promise of sociology and psychology, in providing means of assessing and predicting human behaviour, was received enthusiastically in the correctional field.

For the supporters of parole at the time, there was no question of weighing factors or developing -- beyond a statement of principles -- specific criteria for granting or refusing parole. Each case was to be judged on its own merit and the true task of the Board member was to detect this intangible, unmeasurable change in the basic attitude of the inmate.

Questions that became very important later were never raised at that time. For instance, the intrusion of personal prejudices into decision-making was never considered. It was assumed that everyone acted in good faith and was objective. It was also assumed that if the Governor in Council chose educated and respected persons to become Board members, their decisions would be enlightened and well balanced.

The Fauteux Report was clear on that point:

"Generally speaking, it is important that members of the Board should have personal attributes in addition to qualifications by way of education and experience. A member should be of such integrity, intelligence and good judgement as to command the confidence of the public. Having regard to his quasi-judicial functions, he should possess the equivalent personal qualifications of a high judicial official. He should possess qualities of forthrightness and independence. It goes without saying that he should be appointed without regard to creed, colour or political affiliation" (14 p. 81).

The report also stated that the academic training that would qualify a person to become member of the Board would be professional experience in the field of law, psychiatry, social work and applied criminology. It was expected that no one would be appointed who did not have a previous work experience "that furnish him with intimate knowledge of situations and problems with which the offender is most confronted" (14 p. 80).

Trusting that a Board composed of such high-calibre persons would render the best possible decisions, the Committee recommended also that the decisions of the Board be final and conclusive, and not subject to appeal. The Board was to determine its own procedures and would not be

subject to any type of judicial, political or external pressure. In addition, the Committee recommended that the Board not be required to make public the reasons for its decisions.

In accordance with the spirit of the report and the trust in the concept of "individualized justice", there were no rigid rules for parole eligibility: each case was to be considered on its own merit. The Parole Board members were appointed to judge when a particular inmate had derived maximum benefit from incarceration and to ensure that his release did not create an undue risk to society. The first chairman adhered to and reinforced that position.

"The (first) Chairman of the Parole Board, George Street, believed strongly that each case should be judged according to its own merit. Thus flexibility not arbitrary rules and regulations, characterized the early mood of the 1960's and supported such an approach" (32 p. 46).

From today's perspective, it may seem irresponsible to have given this immense discretionary power to the Parole Board. However, one has to remember the step forward represented by the creation of that independent decision-making body. Indeed, Parole Boards replaced a Remission system that had been severely criticized for its partial and political decisions. The criticisms have been summarized by Ciale:

"Consequently, granting pardons and tickets of leave was often a matter of political expediency or a response to public attitudes or the benevolent attitude of the current minister of justice. Further, information concerning ways and means of applying for a ticket of leave, eligibility rules and so on, was purely a matter of chance, good fortune, having money to hire a lawyer or having political connections... An inmate could be refused a ticket of leave on any grounds and he was never told why his ticket had been refused" (18 p. 51).

In addition to eliminating direct political interference in the process, the new parole Act instituted that every inmate would be considered for parole and his case reviewed by the Parole Board (18).

True to the philosophy of the Fauteux Report, the first appointees were educated, well-respected and knowledgeable about the criminal justice system. Four of the five original members were lawyers, thus reinforcing the quasi-judicial nature of this new body. The only member who was not a lawyer had extensive experience in the Correctional system working directly with inmates.

During the 60's, behavioural and social sciences were gaining even more than respect and attention from key decision makers. Some professionals of these disciplines were commanding as much respect as graduates of the traditional liberal professions. Consequently, the

Ouimet report in 1969, after restating that "Parole is a treatment-oriented correctional measure, not a sentence correcting method" (13, p. 339), recommended that "the Parole Board contain representatives from various disciplines such as the judiciary, the police, the correctional services, psychiatry, psychology and social work" (13 p. 339). In 1973 the Task Force on Release of Inmates reinforced this position (28 p. 51).

The Ouimet report also expressed much concern about the fact that the Parole Board appeared distant and invisible to the inmate who did not even know when his case was being reviewed. The Committee recommended, therefore, that: a) the law be amended to require that the Parole Board hold hearings in institutions, and b) that after hearing the inmate, the Board give orally its decision to the inmate and explain to him/her its reasons for arriving at that decision (13, p. 342).

But, most important of all, is the fact that the two fundamental beliefs of the Fauteux report were re-affirmed: 1) parole is not a way to correct harsh sentences, and 2) persons with appropriate knowledge and a good judgement will render good decisions.

Holding hearings in the institution was also a way of further ensuring that each case would be assessed on its own merits by giving an inmate an opportunity to state his case before those who make the

decisions. With all the elements of information to hand, it was genuinely expected that decision-makers would render wise decisions.

In the 70's, one can note the beginnings of distrust in the assumed wisdom of educated, experienced and respected Board members. While the Hugessen Report (28 p. 47) and the Goldenberg Report (12) were making criticisms that did not alter the original vision of parole, the Law Reform Commission was starting to question the unfettered discretion of the Parole Board.

A critical report published by that Commission in 1975 - "The Parole Process" - recommended that the Parole Board state officially its criteria for granting or refusing parole and that it establish an appeal system. As a result of this report, the criticisms coming directly from the judiciary and pressures from prisoner rights movements, the Board entered an era of policy development. Since then, the parole system has become increasingly complex and more concerned with the visibility of its decision-making process.

The original concern of the Fauteux Report to appoint educated, concerned, highly respected citizens who would be able to detect a fundamental change in the attitude of criminal has been gradually replaced by a concern for the establishment of policies and procedures that govern all aspects of the parole decision-making process.

If one adheres to Adler and Asquith's theory, this shift can be explained by the change in the power relationship between decision-makers -- the Parole Board members -- and the recipients of the decisions -- the inmates -- (1 p. 4) and by the dissatisfaction expressed by other powerful groups about the discretionary power of the Parole Board (1 p. 4). This shift could also be explained by a general change in the vision of man in our society and a change in values. One thing is certain in regard to Parole, the change in attitude is not due to a systematic analysis of the situation based on strong factual information. In fact, there has not been a single systematic analysis of the decisions rendered by the Parole Board since the 1976 Law Reform Commission report "Permission to be Slightly Free" (11).

That report was an attempt to determine why parole is granted, denied or withdrawn. A research team analyzed more than 400 files of male penitentiary inmates and tried to find out, in retrospect, which data, which combination of variables, had governed the granting, denial or withdrawal of parole. The author found that Parole Board members are more influenced by the source of an item than by the topic to which the item refers. McNaughton-Smith also found that the decision rests very heavily on the custodial authority's recommendation and that criteria for granting or refusing parole are irrelevant to the aims implied by such an activity -- if it has aims at all other than purely bureaucratic ones (11).

McNaughton Smith, despite his severe criticisms, did not question the usefulness of the Board. Parole, for him, was merely one example of the irrationality of all programs that try to reconcile self-contradictory pairs such as justice and rehabilitation (11 p. 32).

The authors of the other Law Reform Commission report "The Parole Process" found through their observations of hearings and interviews with Board members, seven criteria influencing the decisions of Board members (29). By order of importance, they were:

- 1) Release plans
- 2) Personality problems
- 3) Maturity of the inmate
- 4) Personal resources of the inmate
- 5) Established delinquency
- 6) Danger to society
- 7) Institutional performance

No further research in Canada has been done on parole decision-making criteria. One wonders if the findings of such a research would lead to the same conclusion that Von Hirsh arrived at: Board members make the decisions on two criteria, namely, the seriousness of the offence and the length and seriousness of the previous criminal record. These criteria are now the two most important factors weighed in the guideline systems and constitute for many Parole Boards their decision-making policy.

There is a tendency to accept as valid criticisms those that reinforce the "mood" or prevailing ideology of the time. In the case of parole, the "mood" has changed radically in less than ten years. It is, therefore, imperative, before reducing further the discretionary powers of Board members in order to accommodate the present ideology, that some studies be conducted to evaluate whether the presumed arbitrariness and disparity does exist and, if so, to what extent.

C) Parole Decisions

a) The Nature of the Decision

According to Hawkins (25), risk is the official acceptable basis for parole decisions. There are many facets to this idea of risk. Risk assessment does not consist only of evaluating the likelihood that a prisoner will recidivate or that he will violate the conditions of his parole. Parole Board members are concerned in their risk assessment with the character of a possible violation and this assessment, according to Hawkins is a question of values.

The United Nations report on Parole (1954), the Canadian report on the Remission Service of the Department of Justice (1956), and the British Government white paper on "The Adult Offender" (1965), all agreed that the task of the parole decision-maker is to find that particular moment when the offender has had enough and would, if

released, become a law-abiding citizen. As stated earlier, members of the Canadian inquiry commission also believed that a prisoner, if kept in prison past that critical moment of change, would become discouraged, bitter and cynical and even more anti-social than he was (14 p. 53).

The Fauteux Report was also of the opinion that a lengthy record was not in itself a sufficient reason to deny parole. Rather, Board Members were to focus their evaluation of the offender on his institutional progress, his change of attitude, his opportunities for readjustment in the community and his willingness to accept supervision (14 p. 53).

In this, the Fauteux Report was adopting the same position as the United Nations. The United Nations report on Parole had expressed the view that Parole was not a procedure to correct the gross injustice of an unduly severe sentence. Pardon was seen as a better suited means of correcting such an injustice:

"It is generally agreed (...) that Parole should be used exclusively as a social transitional measure and not to correct injustices, for which other measures should be applied" (35 p. 129).

Interestingly enough, the Hugessen Report that "the parole decision itself was primarily a decision as to whom to release rather than one as to when to release" (28 p. 31).

The moral appropriateness of making a decision based on a prediction of future behaviour has been seriously questioned in the last five years. Von Hirsh in "Doing Justice" (36) and "The Question of Parole" (37) criticizes the criminologists who have developed prediction tables on parole recidivism for not addressing that fundamental question.

"But predictive restraint poses special ethical problems. The fact that the person's liberty is at stake reduces the moral acceptability of mistakes of over-prediction. Moreover, one may question whether it is even just to punish someone more severely for what he is expected to do even if the prediction was accurate" (37 p. 26).

Parole Boards that have adopted the "just desserts" approach have developed guidelines for their decisions. The specific term that the prisoner will serve is set in advance without regard to the so-called magic moment when a prisoner is ready to re-enter the outside world. The factors considered in the parole decisions are the seriousness of the offence and a parole prognosis which itself is based almost completely on the inmate's prior criminal and work record.

This marks not only a change in the nature of the decision but also in the basic philosophy of parole. As Dr. Von Hirsh stated at a Conference on Parole Guidelines held in Washington in April, 1980:

"What would be the reason to abolish parole, now that Parole Boards are in fact using only two criteria for the decisions, namely seriousness of the offence and the extent of the criminal record? The role of Parole Boards is evolving in a way that makes them correctors of sentencing disparities. In that way parole guidelines replace sentencing guidelines and Parole Boards play a useful role until we have proper sentencing guidelines throughout the United States" (38).

This new basis for parole decisions is totally the opposite of what the Fauteux Report had envisaged when it stated that the Parole Board should have nothing to do with correcting sentence disparities.

This shift in the United States in regard to parole philosophy has had an impact on the Parole Board of Canada. Because the sentencing disparity problem in Canada does not compare in magnitude with the American situation, the possibility of becoming a sentence equalization Board does not immediately attract or recommend itself to the Canadian Parole Board. The "just desserts" model does not seem to raise as much enthusiasm in Canada as a guaranteed antidote to the arbitrariness and unfairness of discretionary decision-making at the sentencing stage. And yet, the Canadian Parole Board is constantly requested to state its position in relation to the American situation and its reasons for refusing guidelines and salient-factor scoring.

If one accepts Hawkins' view that the essence of the parole decision is a risk assessment, one should recognize another dimension to the risk taken by the Board members: that is, the possible damage that a "wrong" decision could do to the Parole Board as an organization.

Parole is certainly not a popular institution in this conservative era, and the public is not very forgiving of parole decisions that result in violent crimes. Therefore, Parole Board members have a responsibility of not contributing to the destruction of their own Board by rendering decisions that jeopardize the organization.

Of course, the Parole Board as an organization does its own evaluation of how much risk it can take without endangering its existence and translates that assessment into implicit and explicit policies that govern the decision-making behaviour of Board members. The higher his commitment to the organization, the more the decision-maker will be careful not to endanger the existence of the Parole Board by casual decisions. He will take into account implicit policies that would not be immediately available to persons not belonging to the organization.

This commitment may be strong enough to cancel out the influencing factors, other than legal and regulatory, that have traditionally been associated with the decision-making behaviour of decision-makers.

b) The Legal Framework and the Policies

It seems almost self-evident to say that Board members must render their decisions in accordance with the Parole Act and Regulations as well as other relevant Canadian legislations. However, no Act has ever been drafted in a way that dictates every future course of action in every possible circumstance.

"...legislatures often do not have the time and capacity (and — perhaps even the desire) to determine precisely what is meant by every nuance of a statute. Nor can they foresee the unintended consequences of their good intentions or anticipate the impact of social change" (22 p. 2).

The parole criteria as set in the law are a good example of the intention of the legislator being expressed, but in terms that leave room for the development of policies that are responsive to the social and legal needs of the time.

The three criteria set in the law for the granting of parole are that:

- 1) the inmate has derived maximum benefit from incarceration,
- 2) the reform or rehabilitation of the inmate will be aided by the grant of parole, and

- 3) the release of the inmate on parole would not constitute an undue risk to society.

The Parole Act states the types of conditional release that the Board can render and its power to revoke a conditional release. The Regulations cover mainly the procedural safeguards that the Board should provide to the inmate, such as assistance at hearings, the sharing of the information used to arrive at a decision, and the review of decisions.

Within that legal and regulatory framework, the Board has developed policies to set the eligibility date of inmates applying for conditional releases other than parole, eligibility for inmates with two or more instances of violent conduct and for inmates whose parole has been revoked. The Board has also developed policies regarding case preparations, review of cases, hearings, supervision, and parole violation. In addition, it has specific policies regarding temporary absences and day parole.

The Parole Act of 1959 contained only 10 sections; now it comprises 27 sections. The major amendments and additions took place in 1977. The Regulations were passed in 1978 following a movement of policy development started in 1974. The consolidation effort of the last few years coincided with the expansion and regionalization of the Board. From five Board members in 1959, the Board now counts 26 members, 14

temporary Board members and more than 80 Community members¹. The Board has become an organization with its established hierarchy, formal communications system, informal network, and its "personality". It would, therefore, be naive to believe that the legal framework is the only referent in the Board's decision-making process.

c) Decisional Referents Other Than the Law, Regulations and Policies

In the criminal justice system, empirical research on decision-makers in relation to their decisions has been overwhelmingly positivistic in its methodological orientation.

Hogarth (1971) studied the decision-making behaviour of 200 Ontario judges in relation to their attitude and background characteristics. He concluded that judges do interpret the defendant's situation according not only to the facts, but also according to their personalities and the social and legal environment in which they live. More precisely, Hogarth concludes that sentencing decisions are consistent with the magistrate's subjective definition of the situation facing him, not with an abstract objectivity (26).

¹ The idea of appointing Community members to the Parole Board was first expressed in the Hugesson Report (28 p. 8).

Manheim had arrived at a similar conclusion in 1957 when he studied 400 cases from eight juvenile courts in London. The cases involved were boys aged between 14 to 16 years convicted of larceny. Manheim concluded that the subjective or intuitive assessment of individuals played a key role in the decisions of judges (8 p. 134).

Trépanier (1978), in his study of London probation officers, confirmed the earlier finding of Hogarth (1971), Manheim (1957), Carter (1966) and Holland and Holt (1976): that decisions tend to vary from one decision-maker to another depending on individual personality.

Studies that have attempted to associate background characteristics with the decision-making behaviour of officials have been severely criticized by Asquith and Adler for their theoretical "sterility".

"Thus, attempts were made to explain apparent inconsistencies in sentencing by looking for associations between sentences and factors in the background of the offenders, the sentences or a combination of the two. There was no attempt to elicit the working ideologies employed in the course of sentencing or to appreciate the "logic in use" employed by key personnel such as judges and magistrates..." (8 p. 152).

Bottomly (1973) had remarked, in his study of decision in the penal process, that there is almost no limit to the number of different back-

ground characteristics which could be included for study under such broad headings as personality, or the human element, in sentencing. Bottomly remarked that researchers have not investigated enough the social and working context of the decision-makers as influencing factors.

"Additional factors which various research have found to be associated with sentencing decisions have included age, political sympathies, experience on the bench, judicial reference groups and role patterns" (8 p. 152).

An important study, reported by Bottomly, on the influence of reference groups on sentencing behaviour was conducted by Winick in 1961 (8 p. 152). Winick and his colleagues found that reference groups might increase or decrease the likelihood of sentencing disparities. Judges will tend to render sentences that confirm with their reference group's social and philosophical views. For instance, sentences will differ between judges who associate with leaders of the judiciary, colleagues in higher courts, and those who associate with defense lawyers expressing ideals of social amelioration.

Bottomly quotes Smith and Blumery on the role of the organization as a dynamic and powerful element in shaping decisions.

"The problems of objectivity, then, is one which is not dependent upon individual social biographies but also filtered through an ethos of efficiency and maximum production which overrides concerns for the ideal of objectivity and uniformity" (8 p- 153).

Gifford (1978) is the only author who gives a theoretical framework from which one could start to examine the role of administrative tribunals as entities that influence the decision-making behaviour of its members

"If the decision-maker feels a sense of obligation or duty to apply the rules which is strong enough to overcome his personal desires in individual instances, then could we not admit that his decisions are in fact constrained even in the absence of external constraints?" (24 p. 16).

The question is important on two grounds: first, on an ethical level: whether the control of decisions is exercised by the development of a sense of "corporatism" (39) or by the establishment of strict guidelines, the decision-maker is bound by an organizational ethos and there has to be means available to question the underlying values. (As Davis commented "Openness is the natural enemy of arbitrariness" (21))

The question is important philosophically. Bottomly, in his

introduction to "Decision in the Penal Process" advanced the idea that "all enlightened criminal justice systems should be striving towards individualized justice" (8 p. XVII). Therefore, one should question constantly whether the implicit policies and informal constraints, while reducing disparity in decisions, do not take away the flexibility necessary for an ideal of individualized justice.

d) The Board as an Organization

The latest findings in organizational development and social psychology have shown the important role that one's organization plays in shaping personal values. The literature also points at the individual's effort to be congruent with what he perceives to be the objectives of his organization. In fact, much of the work of Chris Argyris (2) (3) concerns the existing dichotomy and the need for coincidence of individual needs and organizational needs.

His work is, in fact, an extension and confirmation of the massive and extremely creative work of Festinger (29) and Aronson on dissonance (4):

"Although it (the concept of dissonance) has been applied primarily in social psychological settings, it is not limited to social psychological phenomena such as interpersonal

relations or feelings towards a communicator and his communication. Rather, its domain is in the widest of places: the skull of an individual organism" (4 p. 443).

Aronson defines dissonance as "a negative drive state which occurs whenever an individual simultaneously holds two cognitions (ideas, beliefs, opinions) which are psychologically inconsistent" (4 p. 443). Aronson explains further that dissonance is presumed to be unpleasant, therefore individuals strive to reduce it by changing one or both conjunctions in order to make them fit together better.

The work of Theodore D. Kemper on conformity and normative groups demonstrates the importance for the individual to be congruent with his normative groups. Kemper defines normative groups as those "groups, collectivities or persons that provide the actor with a guide to action by explicitly setting norms and espousing values" (30 p. 298). Normative groups may include one's family, one's religion, one's nation, one's parents, one's employer, one's God (30 p. 299). Chris Agyris has focused specifically on the relationship between the individual's need to hold opinions that are conformed to the opinions of the organization that he works for:

"Pressures to uniformity are seen as establishing a) a tendency on the part of each group member to change his own opinion to change the opinions of the other group members, b)

a tendency to try to change the opinions of others, and c) a tendency to redefine the boundaries of the group so as to exclude those holding deviate opinions" (3 p. 15).

Schachter (34) demonstrated that deviation on a given issue will result much more readily in rejection when that issue is relevant to the group's goals than when it is irrelevant. Ross (33), in his study of Group Standards concerning the admission of Jews, came to a similar conclusion.

It seems reasonable to assume that, like judges, Parole Board members are influenced in their decisions by their personality, the legal constraints, the facts of the cases and situational constraints. Like judges, they are directed by the ethos of their reference groups. However, unlike judges -- who by the nature of their position are not attached to a formal, structured organization -- Parole Board members operate from within a very structured group that has, in fact, an important normative function. This normative group is the Board itself. In addition to developing rules, regulations, policies, and procedures that govern closely the decision-making behaviour of its members, the Parole Board, like all small organizations, has its implicit policies, its formal and informal constraints, and its priorities, all of which play a powerful role in governing the decision-making behaviour of Board members.

References

- (1) ADLER, M. and ASQUIETH, S. (1979), Discretion and Power, University of Edinburgh: unpublished paper.
- (2) ARGYRIS, C. (1962), Social Science Approaches to Business Behaviour, Illinois: The Dorsey Press Inc.
- (3) ARGYRIS, C. (1967), Personality and Organization: The Conflict Between System and the Individual, New York: Harper.
- (4) ARONSON, E. (1969), Dissonance Theory: Progress and Problems in E.F. BORGATTA Social Psychology, U.S.A.: Rand McNally & Cie, 443-463.
- (5) ATKINS, B and POGREBIN, M. (1978), Introduction: Discretionary Decision-Making in the Administration of Justice in B. Atkins and M. Pogrebin The Invisible Justice System: Discretion and the Law, Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing, 1 - 13.
- (6) BANKOWSKI, Z. and NELKEN, D. (1979), The Problem with Discretion, University of Edinburgh: unpublished paper.
- (7) BECCARIA, C. (1964), Of Crimes and Punishments, England, Oxford University Press.

- (8) BOTTOMLY, A.K. (1973), Decisions in the Penal Process, London: Martin Robertson and Cie Ltd.
- (9) CANADA (1979), Parole Act and Regulations, Office Consolidation Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- (10) CANADA Law Reform Commission (1977), The Parole Process, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- (11) CANADA Law Reform Commission. (1976), "Permission to be Slightly Free", Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- (12) CANADA (1976) Report of the Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- (13) CANADA (1969), Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- (14) CANADA (1956), Report of a Committee Appointed to Inquire into the Principles and Procedures Followed in the Remission Service. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- (15) CANADA (1977), Report to Parliament by the Sub Committee on the Penitentiary System in Canada, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

- (16) CANADA (1978), Auditor General's Report, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- (17) CARTER, R.M. (1970), The Presentence Report and the Decision-Making Process in M. CARTER and L. T. WILKINS, Probation and Parole: Selected Readings, U.S.A.: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 203-210.
- (18) CIALE, J. (1980), The Birth of the Penal System in Canada: 1938 - 1970 in LAPLANTE, Proceedings of the Fourth Canadian Conference on Applied Criminology, University of Ottawa.
- (19) CLARK, K.B. (1969), Problems of Power and Social Change: Toward a Relevant Social Psychology in E.F. BORGOTTA Social Psychology, U.S.A.: Rand McNally and Cie, 511 - 539.
- (20) DAWSON, R. (1978), The Decision to Grant or Deny Parole B. Atkins and M. Pogrebin, The Invisible Justice System Discretion and the Law, Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing, 360 - 395.
- (21) DAVIS, K.P. (1969), Discretionary Justice: a Preliminary Inquiry, Baton Rouge: LSU Press.
- (22) DEMERS, D.J. (1980), Discretion: Underlying Principles and CURRENT ISSUES, Ministry of the Solicitor General: unpublished paper.

- (23) GALLIHER, J.F. (1978), The Life and Death of Liberal Criminology
Contemporary Crises 2, 245 - 263.
- (24) GIFFORD, D. (1978), Decisions, Decisional Referents and
Administrative Justice in B. ATKINS and M. POGREBIN The Invisible
Justice System: Discretion and the Law, 14 - 23.
- (25) HAWKINS, K.O. (1971), Parole Selection: The American Experience,
Cambridge University: unpublished Phd. Thesis.
- (26) HOGARTH, J. (1974), Sentencing as a Human Process, Toronto,
University of Toronto Press.
- (27) HOME OFFICE (1965), The Adult Offender, London: H.M.S.O.
- (28) HUGESSEN, J.K. (1973), Task Force on the Release of Inmates,
Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- (29) FESTINGER, L. (1957), A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, Evanston,
Ill.: Row Peterson.
- (30) KEMPER, T.D. (1969), Reference Groups: Socialization and
Achievement in E.F. BORGATTA Social Psychology, U.S.A., Rand
McNally & Cie, 297 - 312.

- (31) LIPTON, D. MARTINSON, M. and WILK J. (1975), The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluative Studies. -New York: Praeger.
- (32) LLOYD, SHEILA (1980), A History of the Development of Parole Administration in Canada, National Parole Board: unpublished report.
- (33) ROSS (1955), Group Standards Concerning the Admission of Jews, Human Relations 2, 133-140
- (34) SCHACHTER (1954), Cross Cultural Experiments on Threat of Rejection" Human Relations 7, 403 - 439.
- (35) UNITED NATIONS REPORT (1959), "Justification for Parole", in Report of a Committee Appointed to Inquire into the Principles and Procedures Followed by the Remission Service, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, p. 126 - 129.
- (36) VON HIRSH, A. (1976), Doing Justice, New York: Hill and Wang.
- (37) VON HIRSH, A. and HANRAHAN, K. (1979), The Question of Parole, Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Cie.

- (38) VON HIRSH, A. (1980), Symposium on Parole Guidelines, College Park, Maryland: unpublished transcripts..
- (39) WRIGHT, P. (1980), On a Clear Day You Can See General Motors, New York: Avon.

CHAPTER IITHE STUDYA) Hypotheses

The purpose of the study is to find whether the Parole Board as an organization, with its priorities and informal constraints, constitutes an influencing factor on the decision-making process of full-time Board members when they consider the release of an offender.

If Gifford is right in his observation that members of administrative tribunals "internalize the obligations of the system", this "internalization" is likely to be reflected in the decision-making process of full-time Board members who are truly part of the organization. On the other hand, Community Board members who remain at the periphery of the organization (they are called for duty only two or three times a year), are less likely to recognize and be influenced by the informal constraints of the organization.

In order to properly isolate our independent variable, "the influence of the organization", it had to be ensured that the two groups did not differ significantly on characteristics traditionally considered as influential in decision behaviour, such as age, sex, education, income, and related work experience.

It was also determined that, in order to measure the variable of "organization" as an influencing factor, the cases on which Board members would be required to vote had to be exactly the same. Therefore, the scalogram was discarded as a method in favour of the decision-making game of Wilkins.

It was also deemed important that all subjects in the study be fully aware of the formal constraints on the decisions: legal, regulatory, and policy constraints.

It was assumed that if the two groups were comparable in terms of personal characteristics, if the facts before them were the same as well as the formal constraints on their decisions, differences in the decision-making pattern of the two groups could be attributable to the influence of the organization on full-time Board members. It was anticipated that this influence, if it existed, would manifest itself by the emergence of more definite and identifiable trends in the decision-making process of full-time Board members, reflecting a higher consensus on the amount and type of information needed, the importance of that information and the appropriate decision for the particular case.

Therefore, the hypothesis was formulated as follows:

THERE WILL BE A DIFFERENT PATTERN IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS OF FULL-TIME BOARD MEMBERS THAN IN THAT OF COMMUNITY BOARD MEMBERS.

This pattern will be reflected in four specific constructs:

- 1) the amount of information used to reach a decision,
- 2) the type of information selected,
- 3) the order of priority in which the information is selected,
- 4) the decisions rendered.

Working Hypotheses

For the purpose of this study, the null hypothesis was used:

THERE WILL BE NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS OF FULL-TIME BOARD MEMBERS AND THAT OF COMMUNITY BOARD MEMBERS.

The null hypothesis was to be tested through four working hypotheses:

- a) there will be no difference in the number of information cards used to reach a decision,
- b) there will be no difference in the information cards selected to reach a decision,

- c) there will be no difference in the order of priority in which the information is selected,
- d) there will be no difference in the decisions rendered, including the interim decisions, the final decisions, and the relationship between them.

B) Methodology

To test the hypothesis that full-time Board members will show a different pattern than Community Board members in their decision-making process, the instrument -- the decision-making game -- was administered to as many volunteers as could be found among full-time Board members and Community Board members of the Prairies and British Columbia regions.

a) The Subjects

Ideally, the whole population of full-time Board members and Community Board members should have been used. It should be appreciated, however, that participation could only be requested on a voluntary basis and that the research had to be conducted within the constraints of the organization. Each of the 25 full-time Board members serving on the Parole Board at the time the study took place (July, 1980) was sent a letter asking for his/her collaboration in this study (see Appendix A). A similar letter was sent to the 45 Community Board

members who had been re-appointed to the Parole Board in June, 1980 (see Appendix B). Of the full-time Board members, 19 (76%) accepted to participate in the study and the decision-making game was given to them at the general Board meeting of July 1980. Initially, the plan was for this researcher to visit each of the regional and headquarter offices and administer the decision-making game to small groups of Board members. In order to avoid discussion of the content of the exercise between the subjects, it was finally decided to wait until the general Board meeting where all members of the Board could do the decision-making game together. The support given to this study by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the Board members themselves was remarkable especially when one considers the nature of the experiment.

All Community Board members who had been appointed or re-appointed to the Parole Board in June, 1980, (a total of 45) also received a letter asking for their collaboration. Their readiness to collaborate was also remarkable. All except four of the community members that were approached accepted readily to participate. However, because the Community Board members are dispersed throughout the country, it was decided that the decision-making game would be given to them at regional meetings in October and November, 1980. By that time, some new Community Board members had been appointed and their collaboration was requested orally at the meeting itself. Because of the time frame and other internal administrative constraints, the decision-making exercise was given only to Community Board members appointed in British Columbia

and the Prairies. Twenty-seven accepted to participate out a total of 32 appointees in those two regions (84.3%).

The Instruments

A Questionnaire on Background Characteristics

In order to ascertain that the variable "belonging to the organization" was the one being measured, this researcher had to be satisfied that the two groups of subjects were similar socio-demographic variables found in previous research to be influential in decision-making behaviour. Therefore the variables "sex, age, income, education, and experience" were measured. It was found that the two groups were similar enough on these variables to permit the testing of the hypothesis.

	EDUCATION		N=46	
	Full-time B.M.		Community B.M.	
no high school some high school vocational training	2/19	(10.5%)	3/27	(11.1%)
high school diploma college diploma some university	3/19	(15.8%)	10/27	(37.0%)
Bachelor's degree	3/19	(15.8%)	5/27	(18.5%)
Master's degree or Phd.	8/19	(42.1%)	9/27	(33.3%)
Unstated	3/19	(15.8%)	0/27	(0%)

		INCOME		N=46	
		Full-time B.M.		Community B.M.	
less than \$30,000		0/19	(0%)	6/27	(22.2%)
\$30,000-\$50,000	89.5%	12/19	(63.2%)	14/27	(51.9%)
more than \$50,000		5/19	(26.3%)	7/27	(25.9%)
unstated		2/19	(10.5%)	0/27	(0%)

		AGE		N=46	
		Full-time B.M.		Community B.M.	
less than 35 years old		2/19	(10.5%)	4/27	(14.8%)
35 to 50 years old		8/19	(42.1%)	12/27	(44.4%)
50 and above		7/19	(36.9%)	11/27	(40.7%)
unstated		2/19	(10.5%)	0/27	(0%)

		SEX		N=46	
		Full-time B.M.		Community B.M.	
male		15/19	(78.9%)	17/27	(62.9%)
female		4/19	(21.1%)	10/27	(37.1%)

EXPERIENCE IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PRIOR TO APPOINTMENT

N=46

		Full-time B.M.		Community B.M.	
no experience		6/19	(31.5%)	6/27	(22.2%)
some experience	68.4%	4/19	(21.1%)	15/27	(55.5%)
extensive experience		9/19	(47.3%)	6/27	(22.2%)

There is a slight difference in the percentage of women in each group, with somewhat more women representatives among full-time Board members. The age distribution follows exactly the same pattern in the two groups and the educational backgrounds are comparable. It should be noted, however, that 21.8% more Community Board members indicated that they did not complete graduate studies. However, 15.8% of full-time Board members did not answer that particular question, which could explain the difference. The income was comparable with a high majority of members in both groups - including virtually all of the full-time Board members - earning more than \$30,000. However, the only appreciable difference between the two groups was found in relation to that variable since 22.2% of Community members were in the category \$30,000 or less. One should take into consideration that the salary of full-time Board members put them automatically in the category of \$30,000 to \$50,000. If one compared the salaries of full-time Board members before their appointment to the Board with the salary of Community Board members, it would probably reveal a similar distribution.

The analysis of the variable "experience" revealed a similarity between the two groups when the categories "some experience" and "extensive experience" are combined.

On the whole the two groups were homogenous enough on the five background characteristics to enable the testing of the independent

variable "belonging to the organization" with a fair degree of confidence that it would be the influence factor in the decision-making process.

These findings on background characteristics support the observation of Adler and Asquith that the selection process ensures that lay people who are asked to join an official decision-making body subscribe to the official ideology (1). These lay people are likely to have background characteristics that are common indicators of adherence to the social values that the officials want embodied in the decision.

b) The decision-making game

There are two possible methods of comparing the decisions rendered by full-time Board members and Community Board members. One would be a scalogram of decisions rendered by full-time Board members over a period of years compared to decisions rendered by Community Board members. This would require an immense amount of work in reviewing files and decision sheets since the needed data are not yet computerized. Moreover, this way of analyzing decision patterns does not permit a control of the context in which the decisions are made. It was therefore deemed more appropriate to find a method that would generate data on the decision-making behaviour of both groups within a controlled or "laboratory" context. Wilkins' decision-making game seemed the most appropriate instrument (9). Carter (1), Sullivan and Seigel (6), and

Trépanier (7) conducted research studies based on the decision-making game of Wilkins and found that this instrument was helpful in identifying influencing factors in decisions.

In order to determine which factors about the offender are important in parole decisions, Wilkins made a narrative abstract of 26 cases. The abstract consisted of 50 items of information that were chosen among those most frequently appearing in case files and noted by Parole Board members as useful in the decision-making process (9 p. 26). The items fell into one of the following categories: offenders' general background, criminal history, present offence, institutional progress and parole plan. The decision-makers (at this point, research clerks, students and Parole Board staff) were asked to select information cards in their order of importance in the decision to grant or deny parole in a particular case. The decision-makers were asked to vote twice on some cases, once with the information coded where the information card entitled "age" would read 24, and once with the narrative format "Subject is 24 years old". It appeared that those who tend to grant parole in narrative cases have the greatest difficulty with coded data. In addition, these persons appeared to make more negative decisions with coded data (9 p. 40).

When, after this early experiment, a group of Parole Board members was asked to make decisions on cases based on short narrative statements, they expressed dissatisfaction with the "one piece at a time"

conditions of the experiment. Board members stated their preference for "a starting array of material, such as is found on case summary sheet, from which to initiate their review" (9 p. 61).

While this coding information on single factors is most useful in determining which of these elements of information are generally accepted as essential or important, it does not simulate the actual process that takes place when Board members make their decision. In the reality of the Board members' work, the raw facts, as well as interpreted facts, are presented in a written style that gives a "mood" to that information; and Board members take into consideration the dynamic aspect of data presentation as well as the dynamic aspect of the offender when making their decision. In that regard, one must give weight to Wilkins finding that decisions to grant parole increase when even a very limited narrative is used.

Two important contributions of Wilkins' study are the development of his decision-making game, and his attempt to establish an order of priority among the 50 elements of information. However, Wilkins makes the reader cautious about this order of priority. He points out that while there are trends in selecting or not various information elements, he found "no unanimity among decision-makers as to the relative importance of information available to the decision" (9 p. 74). He concluded that, before we can improve our information system, we should improve our understanding of different types of decision-making and

different types of decision-makers (9 p. 76).

Wilkins also made a number of interesting comments such as:

- 1) Different items of information were generally considered important for different cases;
- 2) The same decision often was made on an entirely different basis,
- 3) Different information was used by different people to arrive at the same conclusion (9 p. 45).

Wilkins found that there is no unanimity among decision-makers as to the relative importance of information available when making the decision, and he concluded that improvement of information as an aid to the decision may be based upon an improved understanding of decision-making styles (9 p. 74).

Wilkins also found that asking for an interim decision should give a measure of confidence in one's own decision. Some decision-makers will not want to risk an interim decision -- it is important for them to wait until they have sufficient information.

In 1970, Carter (1) used Wilkins' decision-making game with 14 probation officers. He selected five cases all previously referred for pre-sentence reports to the Northern District of the U.S. probation office in California. He analyzed the content of the file and

classified them under 24 subject headings, those commonly used in the probation office.

His study reflected an average of 4.7 items of information used prior to the decision, with a range of one to 13 items being employed. He found that some information was essential to all decision-makers, that decision-makers used a similar pattern in choosing information for the five cases before them, and that there was a considerable divergence in the recommendations.

Trépanier (1978) designed a modified version of Wilkins' decision-making game. A case history was summarized on 62 information cards and presented in a narrative way that recreated as much as possible the conditions of real-life decisions. The case was that of a juvenile offender and the decision-makers were probation officers. Direct quotes from the offender or his parents were used and, while avoiding overlapping information as much as possible, the cards were designed to make the case as dynamic as possible.

The narrative method as developed by Trépanier poses a problem in terms of neatness of the separation of information items on the cards. Carter had already noted that even with the limited narrative form he was using; information on one card sometimes implied another item (1). However, Wilkins had been criticized by his subjects for not presenting a real decision-making situation. As he commented himself,

the subjects were frustrated because they could not get a feeling that they understood who the person was, how he came to prison, and his probable behaviour on parole (9 p. 73).

Trépanier did not find that the narrative method he used hindered the research objectives.

A similar method was used in constructing the two cases for this research. Two cases were summarized on information cards under 30 different headings. The topics were determined from an analysis of the criteria found important in Carter's study and the ranking of Parole Criteria by Ottawa Board members as reported in Law Reform Commission report, and also on the experience of this researcher as a parole officer.

The way the information is presented in the parole files was also important in deciding upon the titles and content of information cards. The objective was to present the information in as familiar a way as possible, given the restrictions of this study. A pilot test with a professor of criminology who had been a Parole Board member confirmed that the information was pertinent and presented in a way that was congruent with the decision-making experience of Board members.

The content of the file was summarized and reported under the following headings:

1. behaviour in institution
2. social history
3. criminal record (including present offence)
4. use of alcohol and drugs
5. physical appearance
6. judge's report and recommendation to the Board
7. community response to a potential release
8. age/date of birth
9. institutional personnel recommendation
10. use of leisure time in penitentiary
11. police report of the offence
12. report on victim or victims
13. offender's previous experience on parole and/or probation
14. religious affiliation
15. court process (bail, plea and appeal if applicable)
16. academic and work history
17. parole officer recommendation
18. offender's version of his offence
19. release plans
20. psychological report
21. family ties (relationship with mother, father and siblings)
22. parole application as filled by offender
23. financial situation
24. juvenile record
25. relationship with women (wife and/or girl friend(s))

26. offender's understanding of his criminal behaviour
27. psychiatric report
28. physical health
29. friends and associates
30. temporary absences (requests and grants)

c) The Selection of Cases

In order to verify the hypotheses, it was decided to present the Board with two cases: one case where the crime committed was not commanding a high level of social reprobation but where the offender was a constant recidivist. The first case chosen was that of a petty house burglar. The other case involved a one-time offender having committed a crime that commands a high level of social reprobation - a child molestor - but who, in the view of many experts, was rehabilitated. It was expected that if full-time Board members as a group were to present a clearer pattern in their decision-making process than Community Board members, it would be more visible in the latter case because of the level of risk involved in potential relapse and the complexity of the case itself.

It was also expected that the analysis of risk would be more difficult in the second case. According to Dawson, Parole Boards consider offences against the person far more serious than offences against property:

"This judgement is reflected in the practice of readily releasing minor property offenders despite an estimated very high probability of recidivism, and the reluctance to release assaultive offenders despite an estimated low probability of recidivism" (2 p. 383).

If, indeed, a sense of "obligation" towards the system operates in the assessment of risk, it would manifest itself more clearly in the case that is the most ambiguous and where the potential risk is higher:

"The official is not free to decide in any way he wishes. He is free only in case he decides to flaunt the imperatives of the system in which he acts. So long as he identifies with the system, he internalizes the obligation which the system imposes upon him to decide in accordance with its mandates; he is in effect bound by its rule" (3-p. 16).

It was decided that the cases would be real cases presented with the minimal number of changes, and that they would be cases on which a post-decision history was available. It was also decided to transpose the cases in time in order to make the parole eligibility date coincide with the research project.

The First Case 'COOK' (see Appendix D)

The type of offence that commands the highest social reprobation is the molestation of a young child. According to MacNamara and Safarin (14) forcible rape and carnal abuse of children arouse such an emotional reaction that they are the only sex crimes about which social policy cannot be seriously debated (p. 57).

A most difficult case to decide upon would be one that involves such a crime but committed by an offender with no previous criminal record, extremely good community support, and all the external signs of being "rehabilitated". Such a case leaves the decision-maker at grips with his own philosophy of justice or his interpretation of the philosophy of his organization.

Such a case -- 'COOK' -- was found in the "special cases files" that a former executive director of the parole service was using for training purposes. 'COOK' was tried 10 years ago for sexual assault on a child and received a sentence of five years and five lashes; he successfully appealed the five lashes. The law has since changed in regard to corporal punishment, thus all references to the five lashes were omitted in transposing the case in time. No other important changes were made except for some reported statements that were put into the form of a direct quotation to make the case more realistic. "COOK" was granted a full parole at his parole eligibility date and finished

his parole without any further problems with the law.

The Second Case 'MARTIN' (see Appendix E)

One type of criminal seems to stir up relatively little anguish in our society: the petty house burglar. Compared to other crimes, the sentencing dispositions in these cases are considered lenient.

Philippe Robert, in his study of public opinion and criminal justice (5), found that the demand for repression and control of property offences was much lower than for offences against the person. Members of liberal professions, he argues, attach less importance to property crimes than do tradesmen or artisans who are, by definition, more vulnerable to this sort of crime.

It was therefore decided to present to Board members the case of a petty house burglar with an extensive record of minor offences against property. This property offender would have an acceptable release plan but no real support in the community. Such a case -- 'MARTIN' -- was found among those selected by the regional Parole Board offices two years ago as interesting for training purposes.

'MARTIN' was tried four years ago for 'Break and Enter with Intent', an offence for which he received two years in a penitentiary followed by one year on probation. One change has been made on the

transposition of this case. A judge's recommendation was created which did not exist on file. The recommendation was extrapolated from the pre-sentence report. It was felt important to include one in the study in order to assess later, in the analysis of the decision-making process, the bearing of the judge's view on the case.

When analyzing the content of the file, it appeared that this inmate had two possible release plans, one which involved the grant of a day parole and the other a full parole. For the simulation exercise, both options were presented, leaving it up to the Board to select the one that they preferred if they chose at all to grant him a release.

In reality, 'MARTIN' was granted "day parole in principle", subject to completion of Grade 12, but it was not possible to implement the day parole until four weeks before the Mandatory Supervision date. While on Mandatory Supervision, he was suspended and his release then revoked for failure to report to his parole officer. When released later on Mandatory Supervision, he committed a new offence of "Break and Enter".

In brief, the two cases used for the decision-making game were real cases that had come before the Parole Board some years before and for which post-decision histories were available. The cases were updated to make the parole eligibility dates coincide with the period the research was conducted. Other than elements that could give away the identity of the inmates, very few changes were made to the cases.

The content of the file was summarized under 30 headings corresponding with the various reports and categories used by Board members. In some instances, a report was rewritten using direct quotes rather than the narrative reporting form of the parole officer or other reporting agent. The use of direct quotes was meant to recreate the "mood" of the hearing recognized as an important factor in the decision-making process.

The Administration of the Instrument

The ~~two~~ cases were presented in a binder divided into two sections. The first section contained the 'COOK' case and the second, the 'MARTIN' case. The 30 information cards were placed on a graduated index showing the numbers 1 to 30 for each case. A list, in numerical order, was provided, showing the title and the number of each card. The numbers of the cards were allocated at random. Each subject had his own binder.

The binder also contained three questionnaires, one on 'COOK', one on 'MARTIN', and one on the subject himself. The questionnaires on 'COOK' and 'MARTIN' give the instruction for each step of the decision-making process and served as a recording device for the process.¹ The questionnaire on the subject himself sought information about his/her background characteristics.

¹See Appendix F.

The subjects were given the instructions, which consisted basically of a presentation of the instrument and all its components, a statement of the time allocated for the exercise, with a few comments about the purpose of the study. The subjects were told only two things about the cases: that they were real cases about whom only the names, times and places had been changed; and that the facts were exactly the same as when these offenders had previously appeared in front of the Parole Board. They were also informed they should consider the cases according to present regulations and policies both cases before them being at their first parole eligibility date; they were instructed to start with 'COOK'. The Board members were reassured about the anonymity of the process, and that the results of the study would be discussed later with them. One hour was allocated to complete the decision-making game. In each of the three group sessions, the exercise was directed by this researcher.

d) Compilation and Analysis of the Data

Board members were asked to record each step in their decision-making process on two questionnaires: one relating to 'COOK', and the other to MARTIN. Both questionnaires were the same, except for the name of the offender (see Appendix 3).

The background characteristics of Board members were also recorded on a questionnaire (see Appendix 4). All questionnaires were pre-coded

for compilation of the data on a computer program, Statistical Program for the Social Sciences.)

It appeared, however, that computerization of the data in this small study was not practical. In fact, the global procedure, with the writing of the program, the transfer of data onto scan sheets and the correction of programming errors, took appreciably more time than a manual treatment of data would have taken.

A major advantage of relying on computer programs for data analysis is the possibility of building into the program the usual statistical measures of central tendency, dispersion, or correlation. However, such measures in a study that involves only a very small number of subjects - altogether 19 full-time Board members and 27 Community Board members - can have a seriously misleading effect.

A chi-squared test was used only for the first working hypothesis. A non-parametric test -- the Wilcoxon Test -- was used, along with a descriptive analysis of the data, in two other working hypotheses.

References

- (1) CARTER, R.M. (1970), The Presentence Report and The Decision-Making Processing R.M. CARTER and L.T. WILKINS, Probation and Parole: Selected Readings, U.S.A.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 203 - 210.
- (2) DAWSON, R. (1978), The Decision to Grant or Deny Parole in B. ATKINS and M. POGREBIN, The Invisible Justice System: Discretion and the Law, Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing, 360 - 395.
- (3) GIFFORD, D. (1978), Decisions, Decisional Referents and Administrative Justice in B. ATKINS and M. POGREBIN, The Invisible Justice System: Discretion and the Law, Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing, 14 - 23.
- (4) MACNAMARA, D.E.J. and SAGARIN, E. (1977), Sex Crime and the Law, New York: The Free Press.
- (5) ROBERT, P. (1979), La justice criminelle et l'opinion publique in J. LAPLANTE, La démonstration de la justice, Université d'Ottawa.
- (6) SULLIVAN, D.C., SEIGLE L.J. (1972), How Police Use Information to Make Decisions; An Application of Decision-Games, Crime and Delinquency 18, 253 - 262

- (7) TREPANIER, J. (1978), The Characteristics of Probation Officers in Relation to the Decision-Making Process in the Presentence Inquiry, University of London: unpublished doctoral thesis.
- (8) WILKINS, L.T. (1965), Social Deviance, New Jersey: Tavistock Publications.
- (9) WILKINS, L.T. GOTTFREDSON, D.M. ROBINSON, J.O. and SADOWSKI, C.A. (1973), Information Selection and Use in Parole Decision-Making, California: NCCD Publications.
- (10) WILKINS, L.T., and CHANDLER, A. (1965), Confidence and Competence in Decision-Making, British Journal of Criminology J, 22 - 35.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to find whether the independent variable "belonging to the organization" constitutes an influencing factor in the decision-making process of full-time board members. To facilitate the analysis, we used the null hypothesis that "there will be no difference in the decision-making process of full-time Board members and that of community Board members". From this null hypothesis, four working hypotheses were drawn and the following results refer to each of the working hypotheses.

A) Number of Information Cards Used

In order to test the hypothesis that there will be no difference in the number of information cards used by full-time Board members and community Board members, we first compared in actual numbers and percentages the number of cards utilized by members of each group in the Case of "COOK" (Table I and Table II) and in the case of "MARTIN" (Table IV and Table V). A chi-square was used to test the statistical significance of frequency distribution for both the case of COOK (Table III) and the case of MARTIN (Table VI).

TABLE I
Number of cards used (COOK)

N=46		5	7	8	9	11	12	13	14	15	Total No. of Cards
Full-time	n	3	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	5	205
B.M.											(average
N=19	(cum)	(3)	(4)	(6)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(13)	(14)	(19)	10.8)
<hr/>											
Community	n	2	2	1	3	1	3	1	2	12	327
B.M.											(average
N=27	(cum)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(8)	(9)	(12)	(13)	(15)	(27)	12.1)

TABLE II
Number of cards in cumulative percentage (COOK)

N=46		5	7	8	9	11	12	13	14	15
Full-time		.158	.217	.316	.421	.526	.579	.684	.736	1.0
B.M.										
N=19										
<hr/>										
Community	n	.074	.148	.185	.296	.383	.444	.481	.555	1.0
B.M.										
N=27										
<hr/>										
		.084	.063	.131	.125	.193	.135	.203	.181	

From these tables, one can note that the two major differences in the cumulative percentages occur at 11 cards and 15 cards. Ten out of 19 full-time Board members (52.6%) were

able to reach a final decision after reading 11 cards as opposed to nine out of 27 community members (33.3%), a difference of 19.3%. Another important difference from this descriptive analysis lies with the fact that 12 of the 27 community members (44.4%) read all 15 cards as opposed to 26.3% of the full-time Board members, a difference of 18.1%.

Because of the small number of subjects involved in the study, it was unlikely that these differences would be reflected using statistical tests. However, we compared the number of cards used by breaking the frequency cells at the natural steps of the decision-making process (Table III).

TABLE III
Difference in number of cards used (Chi-square test)

		5 cards or less	6 to 11 cards	12 to 15 cards	d^2/E
N=46	O(E)	3 (2.06)	7 (5.78)	9 (11.15)	19
	d	.94	1.22	2.15	
	d^2	.883	1.49	4.62	
	d^2/E	.428	.242	.414	1.084
Full-time B.M. N=19	O(E)	2 (2.93)	7 (2.21)	18 (15.8)	27
	d	.93	1.21	3.8	
	d^2	.865	1.46	14.4	
	d^2/E	.295	.177	.911	1.38
Community R.M. N=20	O	5	14	27	46
	(%)	(10.85%)	(30.43%)	(58.69%)	100%
	χ^2				2.46
	df				2

df=2

$\chi^2=2.46$

The working hypothesis that there will be no difference in the number of information cards used by the two groups is not disproved in the case of COOK, the sexual offender, since the X^2 at 2.46 is not significant.

TABLE IV
Number of cards used (MARTIN)

N=40

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	15	Total No. of Cards
Full-time B.M. N=18 (cum)	8 (8)	1 (9)	0	3 (12)	0	1 (13)	0	2 (15)	3 (13)	0	143 (average 7.9)
Communi- ty B.M. N=22 (cum)	2 (2)	1 (3)	3 (6)	1 (7)	2 (9)	1 (10)	2 (12)	1 (13)	1 (14)	8 (22)	240 average (10.9)

TABLE V
Number of cards in cumulative percentage (MARTIN)

N=40

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	15
Full-time B.M. N=18	.444	.500	.500	.666	.666	.722	.722	.833	1.0	1.0
Communi- ty B.M. N=22	.091	.136	.270	.318	.409	.455	.545	.591	.682	1.0
d	.353	.364	.310	.348	.257	.267	.177	.242	.318	0

Among full-time Board members, eight of the 18 subjects (44.4%) had reached a final decision after five cards as compared to two community Board members out of 22 (9.1%). Thirteen full-time Board members, (72.2%) used 10 cards or less as compared to 10 community members (45.5%). None of the full-time Board members used more than 13 cards. However, 36.4% of the community members needed all 15 cards.

The average number of cards used by full-time Board members was 7.9, three fewer cards than community members.

Table VI
Difference in number of
cards used (Chi-square test)

N=40

	5 cards or less	6 to 11 cards	12 to 15 cards		d ² /E
Full-time B.M. N=18	0(E) d 3.5 d ² 12.5	5 (5.85) 2.15 4.62	5 (7.65) 2.65 7.02	18	
	d ² /E 2.77	.789	-.917		4.47
Com- munity B.M. N=22	0(E) d 3.5 d ² 12.5	8 (7.15) .85 .72	12 (9.35) 2.65 7.02	22	
	d ² /E 2.22	.1	.750		3.07
				40	

$\chi^2=7.54$

df=2
 χ^2 is significant between
.02 and .05

In the case of MARTIN, the X^2 test showed a highly significant difference between full-time Board members and community Board members in the number of information cards selected. Therefore the null hypothesis is disproved.

B) Card Selection

In order to test the hypothesis that there will be no difference in the information cards selected by full-time Board members and community Board members, we compared the frequency of card utilization between the two groups, both in the case of COOK (Table VII) and MARTIN (Table XII).

In order to determine if the two groups tended to give different "weights" to cards, we used the Wilcoxon matched pairs signed-ranks test on the card selection process for both COOK (Table VIII) and MARTIN (Table XI).

From the results of the frequency count, we established five categories to describe, in a clearer manner, the nature of the difference in card selection between the two groups.

The five categories were:

ESSENTIAL:	85% - 100% (frequency of card utilization)
VERY IMPORTANT:	75% - 85%
FAIRLY IMPORTANT:	50% - 75%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT:	35% - 50%
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL:	Less than 35%

We analyzed the information in that manner for COOK (Table IX) and MARTIN (Table XII) and both cases together (table XIII).

TYPE OF INFORMATION USED

TABLE VII

Frequency of Card Utilization in any of the 15 Positions (COOK)

Cards	Full-time B.M.		Community B.M.	
	N	(%) N=19	N	(%) N=27
1. Behaviour in institution	6	(31.7)	13	(48.1)
2. Social history	11	(57.9)	16	(59.2)
3. Criminal record	19	(100.0)	20	(74.0)
4. Use of alcohol and drugs	8	(42.3)	19	(70.3)
5. Physical appearance	0	(0)	2	(7.4)
6. Judge's report and recommendation	9	(47.7)	7	(25.9)
7. Community response	8	(42.3)	21	(77.7)
8. Age/date of birth	4	(21.2)	4	(14.8)
9. Institutional personnel recommendation	12	(63.4)	15	(55.5)
10. Use of leisure time in penitentiary	1	(5.3)	3	(11.1)
11. Police report on the offence	19	(100.0)	19	(70.3)
12. Report on victim(s)	4	(21.2)	13	(48.1)
13. Offender's previous parole	1	(5.3)	7	(25.9)
14. Religious affiliation	0	(0)	0	(0)
15. Court process	0	(0)	1	(3.7)
16. Academic and work history	2	(10.6)	2	(7.4)
17. P.O. recommendation	10	(52.7)	22	(81.4)
18. Offender's version of his offence	13	(68.6)	15	(55.5)
19. Release plans	12	(63.4)	18	(66.6)
20. Psychological report	14	(73.9)	21	(77.9)
21. Family ties	8	(42.3)	7	(25.9)
22. Parole application	1	(5.3)	5	(18.5)
23. Financial situation	0	(0)	0	(0)
24. Juvenile record	0	(0)	1	(3.7)
25. Relationship with women	3	(15.8)	15	(55.5)
26. Offender's understanding of behaviour	14	(73.8)	11	(40.7)
27. Psychiatric report	18	(94.9)	24	(88.8)
28. Physical health	0	(0)	0	(0)
29. Friends and associates	0	(0)	5	(18.5)
30. T.A.'s (requests and granted)	4	(21.2)	14	(51.8)

TABLE VIII
Difference in the weight given to cards (COOK)*

Cards	W Weight of cards Full-time B.M.	W Weight of cards Community B.M.	d	Rank of d	Rank with t	t'
1	.317	.481	-.164	-14		-14
2	.579	.592	-.013	-27		-27
3	1.0	.740	+.260	+9	+9	
4	.423	.703	-.280	-7		-7
5	0	.074	-.074	-18		-18
6	.477	.259	+.218	+10	+10	
7	.423	.777	-.354	-2		-2
8	.212	.148	+.064	+19	+19	
9	.634	.555	+.079	+17	+17	
10	.053	.111	-.058	-21		-21
11	1.0	.703	+.297	+5	+5	
12	.212	.481	-.269	-8		-8
13	.053	.259	-.206	-11		-11
14	0	0	0	--		
15	0	.037	-.037	-23		-23
16	.106	.074	+.032	-25		-25
17	.527	.814	-.287	-1		-1
18	.686	.555	+.131	16	+16	
19	.634	.666	-.032	-26		-26
20	.739	.777	-.038	-22		-22
21	.423	.259	+.171	+13	+13	
22	.053	.185	-.132	-15		-15
23	0	0	0	--		
24	0	.037	-.037	-24		-24
25	.158	.555	-.397	-1		-1
26	.738	.407	+.334	+3	+3	
27	.949	.888	-.061	-20		-20
28	0	0	0	--		
29	0	.185	-.185	-12		-12
30	.212	.518	-.306	-4		-4

*Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Signed Rank Test

92

$$Z = \frac{t - Mt}{\sqrt{6t}} = 1.96$$

T=92

$p = 2(.025) = .05$
(p is doubled for a two-tailed test)
The test is significant at .05.

The Wilcoxon test revealed a significant difference (.05) in the overall selection of cards. It appears that the community Board members give more weight to a larger number of cards than full-time Board members whose choices are more concentrated. (It should be remembered that community Board members used slightly more cards in that case than full-time Board members (10.7% more).

In order to understand better the nature of this concentration, we have regrouped the data under the five categories mentioned earlier. This regrouping of cards is shown on Table IX in the case of COOK.

One can quickly notice that virtually all full-time Board members used the cards "Police Report", "Criminal Record" and "Psychiatric Report" in their assessment of the "COOK" case. For community Board members, only the card "Psychiatric Report" entered the category "essential": it was utilized by 88.8% of the group.

It is also worthy of attention that in the case of full-time Board members, the three cards considered "essential" do stand out in terms of importance. In fact, the next card in importance was utilized by only 73.8% of Board members, a drop of 21.1%. In the case of full-Board members, there is no card in the category "very important".

By contrast, community Board members do not appear to have reached such a high consensus on the importance to attach - or not to attach - to any information cards. The drop in importance is much more gradual, showing less differentiation between the value to be given to each area of information.

TABLE IX
 Frequency of Cards Utilization by Board Members (COOK)
 N=46

Category	Full time Board Members N=19	Community Board members N=27
ESSENTIAL 85-100%	11. police report 100.0 3. criminal record 100.0 27. psychiatric report 94.9	27. psychiatric report 88.8
VERY IMPORTANT 75-85%		17. parole officer recomm. 81.4 20. psychological report 77.7 7. community response to potential release 77.7
FAIRLY IMPORTANT 50-75%	26. offender's understanding his behaviour 73.8 20. psychological report 73.8 18. offender's version of his offence 68.6 9. Inst. personnel recomm. 63.4 19. release plans 63.1 2. social history 57.9 17. parole officer's recomm. 52.9	3. criminal record 74.0 4. use of alcohol & drugs 70.3 11. police report 70.3 19. release plans 59.2 2. social history 59.2 9. Inst. personnel recomm. 55.5 18. offender's version of offence 55.5 25. relationship with women 55.5 30. T.A.'s requests & grants 51.8
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 35-50%	6. Judge's report and recommendation 47.4 7. community response 42.3 21. family ties 42.3 4. use of alcohol & drugs 42.3	12. reports on victim(s) 48.1 1. behaviour in institution 48.1 26. offender's understanding of his behavior 40.7
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL less than 35%	1. behavior in inst. 31.7 8. age/date of birth 21.2 30. T.A.'s requests & grant 21.2 12. report on victim(s) 21.2 25. relationship with somen 15.8 16. academic & work history 10.6 10. use of leisure time 5.3 13. offender's previous experience on parole 5.3 22. parole application 5.3 14. religious affiliation 0 15. court process 0 23. financial situation 0 5. physical appearance 0 24. juvenile record 0 28. physical health 0 29. friends & associates 0	6. Judge's report & recs. 27.0 13. offender's previous experience on parole 25.9 21. family ties 25.9 29. friends & associates 18.5 22. parole applications 18.5 8. age/date of birth 14.8 16. academic/work history 7.4 10. use of leisure time 11.0 5. physical appearance 7.4 24. juvenile record 3.7 14. physical health 0 28. religious affiliation 0

The full-time Board members also seem more in agreement as a group in regard to useless information, since 16 cards fell into the category "not important at all". Community Board members considered only 12 cards "not important at all", two of which were not utilized by any member of this group -- as opposed to eight in the full-time group.

Full-time Board members differ from community Board members not only in their tendency to attribute a high level of importance to some cards and no importance to others, but also in which specific cards they consider most important in regard to COOK. For instance, the importance given to the "police report" and the "criminal record" varies between the two large groups, full-time Board members considering these cards "essential" while community Board members consider them only "fairly important". The "parole officer recommendation" was "important" and chosen by 81.4% of the community members as opposed to 52.9% of the full-time Board members. The card entitled "community response to a potential release" was considered as "very important" by community members while full-time Board members found it "somewhat important".

The selection pattern appears to be more diffuse among community Board members than full-time Board members.

TABLE X
FREQUENCY OF CARD UTILIZATION IN ANY OF THE 15 POSITIONS (MARTIN)

Cards	Full-time B.M.		Community B.M.	
	N	(%) N=18	N	(%) N=22
1. Behaviour in institution	5	(27.9)	7	(31.6)
2. Social history	10	(55.6)	13	(58.9)
3. Criminal record	16	(88.9)	19	(86.3)
4. Use of alcohol and drugs	8	(44.6)	12	(63.4)
5. Physical appearance	0	(0)	2	(9.0)
6. Judge's report and recommendation	5	(27.9)	10	(45.2)
7. Community response	2	(11.2)	3	(13.5)
8. Age/date of birth	5	(27.9)	4	(68.0)
9. Institutional personnel recommendation	9	(50.2)	14	(63.4)
10. Use of leisure time in penitentiary	2	(11.1)	3	(13.6)
11. Police report of the offence	13	(72.3)	14	(63.4)
12. Report on victim(s)	0	(0)	2	(9.0)
13. Offender's previous /parole	8	(44.8)	13	(58.9)
14. Religious affiliation	0	(0)	1	(4.5)
15. Court process	1	(5.6)	2	(9.0)
16. Academic and work history	3	(16.7)	7	(31.6)
17. P.O. recommendation	12	(66.7)	19	(86.4)
18. Offender's version of his offence	3	(16.8)	9	(40.8)
19. Release plans	12	(66.7)	15	(67.9)
20. Psychological report	4	(22.3)	11	(50.2)
21. Family ties	1	(5.6)	4	(18.0)
22. Parole application	5	(27.9)	9	(40.8)
23. Financial situation	0	(0)	4	(18.0)
24. Juvenile record	1	(5.6)	1	(4.5)
25. Relationship with women	1	(5.6)	3	(13.5)
26. Offender's understanding of behaviour	9	(50.2)	15	(67.9)
27. Psychiatric report	0	(0)	9	(40.8)
28. Physical health	1	(5.6)	0	(0)
29. Friends and associates	1	(5.6)	7	(31.6)
30. T.A.'s (requests and granted)	4	(22.3)	8	(36.2)

TABLE XI
Difference in the weight given to cards (MARTIN)*

Cards	W Weight of cards Full-time B.M.	W Weight of cards Community B.M.	d	Rank of d	Rank t	-
1	.279	.316	-.037	-23		-23
2	.556	.589	-.003	-30		-30
3	.889	.863	+.026	+25	+25	
4	.446	.634	-.188	-6		-6
5	.0	.09	-.09	-18		-18
6	.279	.452	-.173	-9		-9
7	.112	.135	-.023	-27		-27
8	.279	.180	+.090	+17	+17	
9	.502	.634	-.132	-12		-12
10	.111	.136	-.025	-26		-26
11	.723	.634	+.089	+19	+19	
12	0	.090	-.090	-16		-16
13	.448	.589	-.141	-11		-11
14	.0	.045	-.045	-22		-22
15	.056	.09	-.034	-24		-24
16	.167	.316	-.149	-10		-10
17	.667	.864	-.197	-5		-5
18	.168	.408	-.240	-4		-4
19	.667	.679	-.012	-28		-28
20	.223	.502	-.279	-2		-2
21	.056	.180	-.124	-14		-14
22	.279	.408	-.129	-13		-13
23	.0	.180	-.180	-7		-7
24	.056	.045	+.011	-29		-29
25	.056	.135	-.079	-20		-20
26	.502	.679	-.177	-8		-8
27	.0	.408	-.408	-1		-1
28	.056	.0	+.056	+21	+21	
29	.056	.316	-.260	-3		-3
30	.223	.362	-.113	-15		-15

82

*Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Signed Rank Test

T=82

$$2 = \frac{t - Mt}{.6t} = 3.09$$

$$p = 2(.001) = .002$$

(p is doubled for a two-tailed test)

TABLE XII
OVERALL FREQUENCY OF CARD UTILIZATION (MARTIN)
N=40

Category	Full time Board Members N=18	Community Board Members N=22
ESSENTIAL 85-100%	3. criminal record 88.9	3. criminal record 86.3 17. parole officer recom. 86.4
VERY IMPORTANT 75-85%		
FAIRLY IMPORTANT 50-75%	11. police report 72.3 17. parole officer recom. 66.7 19. release plans 67.7 2. social history 55.6 9. inst. personnel recom. 50.2 26. offender's understanding of his behaviour 50.1 13. offender previous experience on parole 44.8 4. use of alcohol & drugs 44.8	19. release plans 67.9 26. offender's understanding of his behaviour 67.9 4. use of alcohol & drugs 63.4 9. Inst. personnel recom. 63.4 11. police report 63.4 2. social history 58.9 13. previous experience on parole 58.9 20. psychological report 50.2 6. Judge's recommendation 45.2 18. offender's version of his offence 40.8 27. psychiatric report 40.8 22. parole applications 40.6
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 35-75%		30. T.A. granted & requests 36.2
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL less than 35%	6. Judge's report & recom. 28.0 1. behaviour in institution 27.9 8. age/date of birth 27.9 22. parole application) 27.8 30. T.A.'s requests & granted 22.4 22. psychological report 22.4 16. academic training & work history 16.7 18. offender's version of his offence 16.8 11. use of leisure time 11.2 7. community response to potential release 11.2 15. court process 5.6 21. family ties 5.6 24. juvenile record 5.6 25. relationship with women 5.6 28. physical health 5.6 27. friends & associates 5.6 5. physical appearance 0 12. report on victim(s) 0 14. religious affiliation 0 23. financial situation 0 27. psychiatric report 0	29. friends & associates 31.6 16. academic training & work history 31.6 8. behaviour in institution 31.6 21. family ties 18.0 8. age/date of birth 18.0 5. physical appearance 9.0 12. report on victims 9.0 15. court process 9.0 24. juvenile record 4.5 14. religious affiliation 4.5 28. physical health 0 7. community response 13.5 10. use of leisure time 10.6 23. financial situation 18.0 25. relationship with women 13.5

The Wilcoxon test reveals a highly significant difference in card selection between the two groups in the case of MARTIN. The nature of the difference lies with the fact that community Board members give more weight to more cards than full-time Board members. (It should be noted that community Board members used 27.5% more cards in this case).

A breakdown into the five categories of importance, as was done in the case of MARTIN as was done in the case of "COOK", helps to understand the nature of the difference (see Table VII). For full-time Board members, only one card entered the category "essential" in this case, namely "Criminal Record". Community Board members considered two cards as essential: the "criminal record" and the "parole-officer recommendation". Neither of the two groups selected cards with the percentage of utilization needed for the category "very important". However the category "fairly important" regrouped eight cards for the full-time Board members and 12 cards for community Board members.

For full-time Board members, 21 cards were "not important at all", while community members considered 15 cards as "not important" (28.6% less).

It therefore appears that, in the case of "MARTIN" as in the case of "COOK", the selection pattern is more diffuse among community Board members than full-time Board members.

TABLE XIII

Cards Selection by Category of Importance (COOK and MARTIN together)

CATEGORY	FULL TIME	COMMUNITY
ESSENTIAL 85%-100%	3. criminal record 94.5	
	11. police report of offence 86.5	
VERY IMPORTANT 75%-85%		17. parole officer recommendation 83.7
		3. criminal record 80.2
FAIRLY IMPORTANT 50%-75%	19. release plans 65.1	19. release plans 67.3
	26. offender's understanding of offence 61.9	27. psychiatric report 65.0
	17. parole officer recommendation 59.8	4. use of alcohol 66.9
	9. Inst. personnel recommendation 59.8	11. police report 66.9
	2. social history 56.8	20. psychological report 61.3
		2. social history 61.3
		26. offender's understanding of his offence 54.0
	9. Inst. personnel recommendation 59.5	

When analyzing the card selection pattern for the cases of the sexual offender and the property offender together (Table XIII) it appeared that two cards were essential for full-time Board members, namely the "criminal record" and the "police report of the offence". Community Board members did not count any card in the category "essential" but two cards were "very important": the "parole officer recommendation" and the "criminal record".

One will notice, when considering the three categories "essential", "very important", and "fairly important" together, that many of the same cards appear to be important for both groups. The two exceptions are the "psychiatric report" and "psychological report" that did not get a high overall rating because these reports were of marginal interest to full-time Board members in the case of "MARTIN", the property offender.

In sum, the working hypothesis -- that there will be no difference in the selection of information between members -- is rejected. Full-time Board members are clearer about the information that they do want and information that they do not want.

C) Order of Priority in Information Selection

In order to test the hypothesis that there will be no difference between the two groups in the order of priority in which the information is selected, we first did a frequency count of each card selected in the first five positions for the two groups separately. The frequency count converted into percentages, appears on Table XIV. We then proceeded to determine, using the Wilcoxon test, whether the overall ranking of cards - or order of priority - differed between full-time Board members and community Board members.

This test was followed by an examination of the most important cards for the two groups in order to find out whether

full-time Board members present a more identifiable and definite pattern in the order in which they select the cards that they judge most important.

a) COOK

The results on Table XIV indicate that three cards have been considered important enough by a majority of members to be selected as one of their first five choices. The three most important cards were the same for the two groups. However, a higher percentage of full time Board members selected them in each case.

The three most important cards were: No. 3 -- Criminal Record, selected by 100% of the full-time Board members and 66.6% of the community members; 11 -- Police Report of the Offence, selected by 84.3% of full-time Board members and 48.1% of community members and 27 -- Psychiatric Report, 79% versus 59.2%.

In order to determine whether there was a significant difference in the overall order of priority in selection, we used the Wilcoxon test. The total percentage of ranks over the total percentage of members that have selected a particular card give us the ranking order of that cards. In the case of COOK, the test did not show a significant difference between the two groups (see Table XV).

TABLE XV
 Ranking of First Five Choices "COOK"
 Wilcoxon matched pairs signed ranks test

Cards	Full-time B.M. N=19 %rank/%members	Community B.M. N=27 %rank/%members	d	Rank of d	t	t'
1	2	1.33	+.66	+13	+13	
2	3	2.10	+.90	+11	+11	
3	1.5	1.55	-.05	-20		-20
4		3.5	+1.5	+7	+7	
5	0	5	-5	-1		-1
6	3	3.5	-.5	-15		-15
7	4	3	+1	+8	+8	
8	3	1.6	+2.4	+5	+5	
9	4	3	+1	+9	+9	
10						
11	2.06	1.85	+.21	+16	+16	
12	3.5	3.66	-.16	-18		-18
13	5	3	+2	+6	+6	
14						
15						
16	0	3	-3	-4		-4
17	3.56	3.54	+.02	+21	+21	
18	3.25	3.8	-.55	-14		-14
19	4	4.12	-.12	-19		-19
20	3.8	4	-.20	-17		-17
21	5	4	+1	+10	+10	
22						
23						
24						
25	0	4.5	-4.5	-3		-3
26	4.49	3.66	+.68	+12	+12	
27	3.66	3.81	-.15			
28						
29						
30	0	4.8	-4.8	-2		

T=103
 N=27

Z -0.43

p=.33 not significant

However, when examining closely the order of selection of the three most important cards in the COOK case, full-time Board members appear to have a higher consensus as a group about the specific order in which they select the information. The table below shows the more concentrated pattern of selection.

TABLE XVI
First Three Choices (COOK) N=46

Choice:	Full-time Board members N=19						Community Board members N=27					
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th		1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	
3. criminal record	63.2	26.3	5.3	5.3		100	40.7	18.5	3.7	3.7		66.6
11. police report	10.5	63.2	5.3	5.3		84.6	14.8	22.2	3.7	3.7	3.7	48.1
27. psychiatric report			42.2	21.1	15.8	79.0		7.4	14.8	18.5	18.5	59.2

Among full-time Board members, 89.5% selected the criminal record as one of their two first choices as opposed to 59.2% of the community Board members. This card was the preferred starting point for the two groups but the full-time Board members showed a higher consensus in selecting it as their first choice (63.2% as opposed to 40.7%).

The police report was selected in the second position by 63.2% of the full-time Board members as opposed to 22.2% of the community Board members. Twice as many full-time Board members as community members selected this card as one of their first two choices.

The psychiatric report fell in third position for the full-time Board members with a marked preference for this information in third and fourth position (63.3%). The community members selected the psychiatric report in second, third, fourth and fifth position, showing a more diffuse pattern of selection.

In sum, there was agreement between the groups on the priority of information selection for the COOK case, but the full-time Board members show a higher consensus on their importance indicated by the percentage of use and a more determined order of selection with a preferred position for criminal record first, police report second and psychiatric report third.

b) MARTIN

From Table XVIII, it appears that four cards were clearly more important than the others since they were selected by a majority of Board members as one of their first five choices. As in the case for COOK, the four most important cards were the same for full-time Board members and community Board members.

The four most important cards were No. 3 -- Criminal Record, (88.9% versus 81.8%), 11 -- Police Report (55.6% versus 59%),

2 -- Social History (50% versus 45.4%) and 17 -- Parole officer recommendation (44.4% versus 49.9%).

In order to determine whether there was a significant difference in the overall order of priority in selection, we used again the Wilcoxon test (see table XIX).

The test did not show a significant difference between the two groups in the overall ranking of cards.

TABLE XVII
First five choices (MARTIN)

Full-time Board Members
N=18

Community Board Members
N=22

Card	1st choice	2nd choice	3rd choice	4th choice	5th choice	Card	1st choice	2nd choice	3rd choice	4th choice	5th choice	
1.				11.1	11.1	1.		4.5			4.5	
2.	11.1	11.1	11.1	5.6	11.1	2.	18.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	45.4	
3.	61.1	22.2	5.6			3.	50.0	31.8			81.8	
4.		5.6	11.1		11.1	4.	4.5	9.1	9.1		22.7	
5.						5.			4.5		4.5	
6.	5.6	5.6		5.6	5.6	6.	4.5	4.5	4.5		4.5	
7.				5.6		7.					0	
8.			16.7			8.			4.5		4.5	
9.			11.1	5.6	16.7	9.		4.5		9.1	4.5	
10.						10.					0	
11.	16.7	33.3			5.6	11.	22.7	18.1	9.1	9.1	59.0	
12.						12.					4.5	
13.		5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	13.			13.6	4.5	9.1	
14.						14.					0	
15.					5.6	15.					0	
16.				5.6	5.6	16.			4.5	4.5	9.0	
17.		11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	17.		13.6	9.1	13.6	13.6	
18.			5.6			18.				9.1	9.1	
19.			5.6	16.7	16.7	19.		4.5	13.6	9.1	18.1	
20.			5.6			20.			9.1	9.1	9.1	
21.						21.				4.5	4.5	
22.	5.6		11.1			22.				13.6	13.6	
23.						23.					0	
24.						24.					4.5	
25.						25.					4.5	
26.				16.7	11.1	26.			4.5		13.6	
27.						27.			4.5		9.1	
28.						28.					0	
29.						29.					4.5	
30.		5.6		5.6		30.				4.5	4.5	
	5	8	11	11	10		5	9	13	12	12	51

TABLE XVIII
Ranking of First Five Choices (MARTIN)

Cards	Full-time B.M. N=18 %rank/%members	Community B.M. N=20 %rank/%members	d	Rank of d	t - t'
1	4	2	+2	+10	+10
2	2.55	2.20	+.35	+18	+18
3	1.38	1.38	--	--	
4	3.58	2.20	+1.18	+12	+12
5	0	3	-3	-8	-8
6	2.75	2.75	--	--	
7	3		+3	+7	+7
8	3	3	--	--	
9	4.13	3.75	+.65	+16	+16
10					
11	2	2.07	-.07	-20	
12	0	5	-5	-4	-4
13	3.5	3.83	-.33	-19	-19
14					
15	5	0	+5	+2	+2
16	5.6	3.5	+2.1	+9	+9
17	3.5	3.54	-.04	-21	-2
18	3	4	-1	-14	-1
19	4.29	3.9	+.39	+17	+17
20	3	4	-1	-15	-15
21	0	4	-4	-5	-5
22	2.32	4	-1.68	-11	-11
23					
24	0	5	-5	-3	-3
25					
26	4.39	4.41	-.02	-22	-21
27	0	4.33	-4.33	-6	-6
28					
29	0	5	-5	-1	-1
30	3	4	-1	-13	-13

T=91

N=22

$$Z = -1.15$$

$$p = .1251$$

The Wilcoxon test revealed that there is no difference in the overall order of priority given to the cards with a $p = 2(.1251) = (.2502)$.

Four cards in the case of MARTIN appeared to be clearly more important than the others, the significance being determined by the percentage of Board members who selected them.

TABLE XIX
First Four Choices (MARTIN) N = 40

Choice:	Full-time Board members N=18					Community Board members N=22						
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th		
3. criminal record	61.1	22.2	5.6			88.9	50.0	31.8			81.8	
11. police report	16.7	33.3			5.6	55.6	22.7	18.1	9.1	9.1	59.0	
2. social history	11.1	11.1	11.1	5.6	11.1	50.0	18.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	45.4	
17. parole officer's recomm.		11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	44.4		13.6	9.1	13.6	18.1	49.9

Both groups appear to follow a very similar selection pattern in the case of MARTIN. It is worth noting, however, that full-time Board members showed a preference for the selection of the card "Criminal Record" in the first place and "Police Report of the Offence" in the second place, a pattern not as clearly followed by the community Board members.

D) The Decisions

In order to test the hypothesis that there will be no difference in the decisions rendered, we compared the two groups in regard to COOK and MARTIN in terms of Board members' readiness to make, or not to make interim decisions and the nature of the interim decisions -- whether full parole, day parole or no release. We also compared the two groups on whether they upheld their interim decisions at the final decision stage and finally, we compared the nature of the final decisions. The procedure consisted simply of comparing percentages and determining, after calculating the probability (z), whether the differences were significant.

a) Relationship between interim and final decisions

An analysis of the relationship between the interim and final decisions -- as well as the willingness to make an interim and a final decision -- revealed some key differences between the two groups.

TABLE XX
Interim Versus Final Decisions (COOK)
N=46

	Full-time B.M. N=19	Community B.M. N=27
Made an interim decision	6/19 (31.5%)	12/22 (44.4%)
Did not make an interim decision	13/19 (68.4%)	15/27 (55.6%)
Interim same as final	3/6 (50%)	2/12 (16.7%)
Interim is final (no more cards)	3/19 (15.8%)	2/27 (7.4%)
Did not make a final decision	5/19 (26.3%)	1/27 (3.7%)

TABLE XXI
Interim Versus Final Decisions (MARTIN)
N=40

	Full-time B.M. N=19	Community B.M. N=22
Made an interim decision	10/18 (55.6%)	7/22 (31.8%)
Did not make an interim decision	8/18 (44.4%)	15/22 (68.2%)
Interim same as final	6/10 (60%)	2/7 (28.5%)
Interim is final (no more cards)	8/18 (44.4%)	2/22 (9.1%)
Did not make a final decision	2/18 (11.1%)	0/22 (0%)

In the case of COOK, a slightly larger number of community Board members were ready to make an interim decision, 12/27 (44.4%) as opposed to 6/19 (31.5%) of full-time Board members. The difference is significant at .09 ($z=1.34$). If this difference is not highly significant, on the other hand, 3/6 (50%) of the full-time Board members who did make an interim decision upheld it after reading more information. Community Board members by contrast, tended to reverse their initial decisions. In fact only 2 of the 12 (16.7%) community members who had made an interim decision upheld it after reading more information, a highly significant difference ($z=1.92$ significant at .0274).

In MARTIN's case, 55.6% of the full-time Board members made an interim decision, compared to 31.8% of the community members ($z=.78$ significant at .2177). This difference is not significant. However, as in the case for COOK, a much higher percentage of full-time Board members upheld their initial decision after reading more cards -- 6/10 (60%) as opposed to 2/7 (28.5%) ($z=4.4$ significant at .0003). There is a very significant difference between the two groups in regard to the upholding or rejecting of the interim decision for both cases. These results indicate that, when full-time Board members have chosen to make an interim decision, they tend to confirm it in a significantly higher proportion than community Board members who tend to change their initial decision in the light of more information.

In the case of COOK, the interim decision was the final decision for three full-time Board (15.8%) and for two community members (7.4%). These members were confident enough after five cards to make their final decision. There is no significant difference in this case. But in the case of MARTIN, the interim decision was final for 8/18 (44.4%) full-time Board members as compared to 2/22 community members (9.1%). This is a highly significant difference ($z=3.33$ significant at .005), which demonstrates that in the case of this property offender, the full-time Board members needed far less information than community members to make a decision.

One important difference in the decision-making process is that 26.3% of the full-time Board members were not able to reach a final decision after reading the 15 cards that were allowed. Only 3.8% of the community members could not reach a final decision after 15 cards. This indicates a more cautious attitude on the part of full-time Board members. Also full-time Board members may be more demanding in the type of information they need and it is possible that the way the information was presented on the cards was not acceptable to some of them.

b) Nature of the decisions

An analysis of the decisions made by full-time Board members and community Board members revealed a significant difference in the basic attitude towards the release of COOK, the sexual offender, and no significant difference in regard to MARTIN.

TABLE XXII
Interim Decision (COOK)
N=47

	Full Parole	Day Parole	No Release	Unable to make a decision	
Full Time	0	3	3	13	
	0	15.8	15.8	68.4	
	0	25.0	60.0	46.4	19
	0	6.5	6.5	28.3	
Community	1	9	2	15	
	3.7	33.3	7.4	55.5	
	100	75	40.0	53.5	27
	2.2	19.6	4.3	32.6	
<hr/>					
	1	12	5	28	46
	2.2	26.1	10.9	60.1	100

TABLE XXIII
Final Decision (COOK)
N=47

	Full Parole	Day Parole	No Release	Unable to make a decision	
Full Time	1	8	5	5	
	5.3	42.1	26.3	26.3	
	14.2	30.7	71.4	83.3	19
	2.2	17.4	10.9	10.9	
Community	6	18	2	1	
	22.2	66.6	7.4	3.7	
	85.7	69.2	28.5	16.7	27
	13.0	39.1	4.3	2.2	
<hr/>					
	7	26	7	6	46
	85.2	56.5	15.2	13.0	100

Only six (31.6%) full-time Board members ventured to make an interim decision in the case of COOK, three of them opting for day parole and three for "no release". Twelve community Board members made an interim decision, with 10 (83.3%) opting for a release -- one was ready to grant full parole and nine (75%) voting for "day parole".

The compilation of data on the final decisions on COOK shows that 47.4% of the full-time Board members were ready to grant COOK a release as opposed to 89% of the community members ($z=4.29$ significant at .00008). Among full-time Board members, 5.3% voted for full parole as compared to 22.2% of the community Board members ($z=2.47$ significant at .006) and 42.1% voted for day parole as compared to 66.6%.

Consequently, the full-time Board members show a clearly more conservative pattern in their decisions than community Board members in regard to this sex offender. It should be noted that the cautious attitude of full-time Board members is further demonstrated by the percentage of those who could not make a decision after 15 cards. Five full-time Board members (26.3%) were in this category as opposed to one (3.7%) community member.

In the case of MARTIN, there was no significant difference in the decisions rendered -- either interim or final -- as indicated by Tables XXIII and XXIV.

TABLE XXIV
Interim Decision (MARTIN)
N=40

	Full Parole	Day Parole	No Release	Unable to make a decision	
Full Time	0	9	1	8	
	0	50	5.6	44.4	
	0	56.3	100.0	34.8	18
	0	22.5	2.5	20.0	
Community	0	7	0	15	
	0	31.8	0	68.1	
	0	43.8	0	65.2	22
	0	17.5	0	37.5	
		16	1	23	40
		40.0	2.5	57.5	100

TABLE XXV
Final Decision (MARTIN)
N=40

	Full Parole	Day Parole	No Release	Unable to make a decision	
Full Time	2	14	.0	2	
	11.1	77.8		11.1	
	100.0	38.9		100.0	18
	5.0	35.0		5.0	
Community	0	22	0		
		100			
		61.1			22
		55			
		2	0	2	40
		36			

Virtually all members of both groups voted for day parole as their final decision in the case of MARTIN. The only two exceptions to that vote were two full-time Board members who opted for full parole; therefore all members of both groups were in favour of the release of that offender.

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The hypothesis of this study, that there will be a different pattern in the decision-making process of full-time Board members as compared to that of community members, is supported to a large extent by the results of this study. In one instance however - the decision on MARTIN - the results showed a remarkable similarity between the decision-making processes of the two groups.

In considering the results, it is important to remember that the study compared the decision-making process of the two groups on two cases only. The cases were selected, as explained in the chapter on Methodology because they represented the two extreme poles in the types of cases before the parole Board, with "COOK", being a one-time offender who committed a crime of violence that commands the highest social reprobation - sexual assault on a child - while the other case, "MARTIN", was a petty house burglar but a multi-time recidivist.

The transposition of the cases on cards might have been disconcerting to some full-time Board members, who are used to studying "real" files. For instance, it is noticeable that the very few cards in the decision game that did not carry the actual titles or sub-titles found in official reports did not raise much interest among full-time Board members. Thus, the cards "Relationship with Women" and "Community Response to a Potential Release" were rarely selected by full-time Board members, while community Board members gave them more importance.

A major strength of the study lies in the fact that the subjects who participated in the experiment were the Parole Board members themselves.

One must remember in considering the results of the study that the number of subjects was very small even though they represented a high proportion of total population of Board members. When the samples compared in a study include less than forty subjects, the traditional statistical tests tend to give conservative results, and sometimes some interesting trends remain undetected. In this study, strict statistical tests have been supplemented by a descriptive analysis. The reader should bear in mind also that all the community Board members who participated in the study were from either British Columbia or the Prairies. The similarities that were found in the background characteristics between the two groups, particularly in relation to previous experience in criminal justice, may not hold true for other regions in Canada. In Canada the appointment of Board members is a political process, therefore it is possible that the elected representatives of these two regions were particularly careful to recommend to the Solicitor General as potential community Board members, individuals whose backgrounds were immediately relevant to the position. (There is evidence in other internal Board documents that the same concern did not hold true for at least, one other region in Canada.)

The difference in the number of cards used by the community Board members and full-time Board members did not reach a significant level in the case of COOK but the difference was highly significant in the case of MARTIN. In both cases full-time Board members selected a smaller number of cards, but the difference was not statistically significant in the case of COOK, the sexual offender. One can conclude, therefore, that when a case is highly complex and risky, full-time Board members require almost as much information as community members but when a case is less complex and risky, there is a highly significant difference in the amount of information needed. In the case of the petty house burglar, 44.4% of the full-time Board members were ready to make a decision after five cards, as opposed to 9.1% of the community members.

The Wilcoxon test revealed a significant difference in the selection of cards between the two groups and that in relation to both cases. The nature of the difference lay basically in the distribution of "weight" or importance given to the cards. Full-time Board members gave much importance to three to four cards and far less to the others, while community Board members showed a far less concentrated pattern in their selection of information: the Wilcoxon test revealed that the weight was distributed much more equally between the cards.

In the case of "COOK", three cards were essential to virtually all full-time Board members: the "Police Report of the Offence", the "Criminal Record" and the "Psychiatric Report". Full-time Board members seemed to be seeking the "hard facts" of the case by selecting

the "Criminal Record" and "Police Report of the Offence": they gave credibility to one specialist, the psychiatrist, to help them make their decision. The community Board members displayed a more diffused selection pattern and seemed to be seeking primarily the opinion of experts, since the cards they selected the most were the "Psychiatric Report", the "Parole Officer Recommendation" and the "Psychological Report". However, one card, "Community Response to Potential Release", was given the same importance as the "Psychological Report". The most striking difference between the two groups was on the importance given to the parole officer recommendation, since in the case of "COOK", almost 30% more community members consulted it than did full-time Board members. The difference in the importance given to the parole officer recommendation appeared in both the "COOK" and "MARTIN" cases, where that card fell into the category "essential" for community Board members and was given the same weight as the criminal record. The card was selected by 20% less full-time Board members and fell into the category "fairly important".

In the cases of both COOK and MARTIN, the full-time Board members considered a much larger number of cards being "not important at all". One card in particular that addressed the core of COOK's problem, "Relationship with Women" - not a usual title or sub-title of a report on file - did not attract the interest of more than 15.8% of the full-time Board members, while 55.5% of the community members selected it.

When considering the selection of cards for the two cases together, two cards appeared to be essential for full-time Board members: the "Criminal Record" and the "Police Report of the Offence". For Community Board Members, no cards fell into the category "essential" the "Parole Officer Recommendation" was given the most importance, followed by the "Criminal Record", these two cards being in the category "very important".

From these results, it would appear that Krajick's and Von Hirsh's remarks that parole decisions are made basically on the nature of the offence and the criminal record, hold true for the full-time Board members, at least if one deducts the importance of these factors from the information selection process. One might also venture to say that this result reflects the existence of implicit guidelines governing the selection of information.

The Wilcoxon test did not give evidence of a significant difference in the over-all ranking of information cards, neither in COOK's case nor in MARTIN's case. However, a closer look at the selection of the three first cards in COOK's case indicates a clear preference for the selection of the "Criminal Record" in first position, the "Police Report" in second position, and the "Psychiatric Report" in third position. The community Board members also made the "criminal record" their first choice, but with less concentration: their second and third choices were far more diffuse. In the case of MARTIN, full-time Board members and community Board members chose the "Criminal Record" as their first choice, again with a higher percentage of full-time Board

members doing so. The "Police Report" of the Offence was the preferred second choice of full-time Board members, while there was no more significant order of priority after the first card for community members.

This ordering of information, while not giving statistical evidence of a different - and clearer - pattern in the decision-making process of full-time Board members, does however indicate in the descriptive analysis, a preferred order of selection for full-time Board members in the case of COOK.

The analysis of the relationship between interim and final decisions demonstrated that, when full-time Board members make an interim decision, they tend not to modify them as much as Community members in the light of additional information. There was a higher percentage of full-time Board members who changed their mind than could have been expected from the results of Carter (4) who found that additional data may result in some modifications in a few cases only. Wilkins on the other hand, found that only 21% of the decision-makers in his experiment had maintained their decision throughout the experiment after receiving additional information. In this particular experiment, Community members were remarkably prone to reverse their original decision, showing therefore a higher level of hesitancy in their decision-making process. This could be explained by the fact that they do not have the experience of full-time Board members. But this concept of experience is often considered as an isolated acquisition of techniques, skills, and knowledge by an individual. In

the perspective of this study, experience is seen as a process of reinforcement between the individual and the organization as to the appropriate steps to follow to reach the appropriate decision.

The analysis of the final decisions rendered on COOK demonstrated a difference between the two groups, with full-time Board members appearing much more conservative and cautious in their decisions than Community members.

Conversely, the decisions on MARTIN were remarkably similar between the two groups. This similarity raises another issue: if 100% of all decision-makers are in favour of the release of a particular offender, with 95% in favour of a day-parole, why could not the granting of a day-parole in such a case become an automatic decision? It appeared indeed that, in this case, the values of the Community members and the values of the Board as an organization as interpreted by its full-time members coincided.

However, the decisional attitude towards COOK, the sexual offender, revealed interesting differences between the two groups: these differences tend to confirm the initial assumption of this study that full-time Board members consider in their risk analysis, the potential impact of a wrong decision on the parole Board as an organization. Among Community Board members, 89% were ready to grant COOK a release, as compared to 47.4% of the full-time Board members. And only one full-time Board member was ready to grant him a full parole as compared to six Community members. The cautiousness of full-time Board members is further demonstrated by the fact that five

of them were not confident enough to make a decision after reading 15 cards, as opposed to only one Community member.

The decision rendered in the sexual offenders case showed indeed a change in the Parole Board's attitude towards the release of an offender having committed a crime of that nature. Eight years ago this man was paroled; consideration was even given then to granting him a parole by exception in order to reunite the family for Christmas. The decision was rendered based on exactly the same information available for the decision-making game. One may conclude that the Board as an organization, does indeed reflect the more conservative social climate of today. The Board's interpretation of what is an acceptable risk was revealed by the full-time Board members' decisions. In the case of "COOK", Community members obviously had a different sense of the risk involved, since their decision was much more liberal.

A final point that was striking to this researcher was the obvious general preference for day parole as a release decision. In the case of MARTIN, the parole preparation report indicated two possibilities for release: in one of the plans, MARTIN would stay with a friend being on full parole; according to the other plan, he would stay in a Community Correctional Center. Ninety-five per cent of all members found day parole in the Community Correctional Center to be the better alternative.

In the case of COOK, absolutely no reference was made in the parole preparation about the possibility of a stay in a Community Correctional Center or Community Residential Center. The release plan

was based on his return to his family in his community, where he had secured a job.

Yet eight of the nine full-time Board members who were ready to grant him a release, and 18 of the 24 Community members, opted for a day parole stating in comments on the questionnaire, that COOK needed the supervision and structure guaranteed by a Community Correction Center.

A further study may be needed to understand if the granting of day parole is not an adaptation by the Parole Board to the public intolerance towards parole and if day parole is not a way of protecting the organization against accusations of being too liberal rather than a way of testing the offender. Such a study could shed light on the fact that eight of the nine full-time Board members (88.8%) who were ready to grant "COOK" a release opted for day parole despite the absence of any day parole release plan.

In this study, we have attempted to open a new avenue towards the understanding of parole Board members and their decision-making process. Wilkins, in his initial efforts to develop guidelines (6), studied the factors considered by experienced Board members and weighed the importance of each of these factors. He and his followers then proceeded to crystalize these factors into decision guidelines. This process obviously presents the advantage of making parole decisions more visible and predictable. It could also render the parole decision-making process inflexible and unable to adapt to social changes and particular circumstances. Studying the dynamic

relationship between Board members and the Parole Board, which is a powerful interpreter of the current social values, can help to develop an openness in the discussion of the values underlying the decisions. Such a process can lead to a higher level of awareness of how and why decisions are rendered. As Bottomly stated:

"... all decisions in the penal process are both influenced by and reflect a variety of social and political values, although with varying degrees of awareness of this fact by those directly involved". (ep.XVII).

The results of this study support the concept that the Board as an organization interprets social and political values in a way that influences the decision-making behaviour of Board members. It influences the amount and type of information that Board members select and, to a certain extent, the order in which they select it, and decisions that they render, at least in difficult and risky cases.

The criticisms often heard about the decisional freedom of parole Board members does not seem to be justified seen from this dynamic point of view. As Gifford rightly pointed out:

"The observer will often rightly fail to perceive the 'obligation' felt by the decision maker to decide the way that he did. The result is an extremely perceived decisional freedom which is not at all perceived by the decision maker". (5 p. 18)

The correctional field has not yet paid much attention to the "personality" of its agencies or Boards as powerful influencing forces on decision makers. It would be worthwhile studying more deeply the

dynamic relationship between the correctional agencies or Boards and the people working in them as well as their interpretation of the social and political values that they represent.



References

- (1.) ADLER M. and Asquith, S. (1979) Discretion and Power, University of Edinburgh: unpublished paper.
- (2.) BANKOWSKI Z. and NELKEN D. (1979) The Problem with Discretion, University of Edinburgh: unpublished paper.
- (3.) BOTTOMLY A.K. (1973) Decisions in the Penal Process, London: Martin Robertson and Cie. Ltd.
- (4.) CARTER R.M. (1970) The Presentence Report and the Decision Making Process in M. CARTER and L.T. WILKINS, Probation and Parole: Selected Readings USA: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 203-210.
- (5.) GIFFORD D. (1979) Decisions, Decisional Referents and Administrative Justice in B. ATKINS and M. POGREBIN The Invisible Justice System: Discretion and the Law, 14-23.
- (6.) WILKINS L.T. (1972) Parole Decision Making Vol. I, The Utilization of Experience in Parole Decision Making, Springfield VA: NTIS publications.
- (7.) WILKINS L.T., GOTTFEDSON D.M., ROBINSON J.O. and SADOWSKI C.A. (1973), Information Selection and Use in parole Decision-Making, California: NCCD Publications.


BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADLER, M. and Asquieth, S. (1979) Discretion and Power, University of Edinburgh: unpublished paper.

ARGYRIS, C. (1962), Social Science Approaches to Business Behaviour, Illinois: The Dorsey Press Inc.

ARGYRIS, C. (1967), Personality and Organization: The Conflict Between System and the Individual, New York: Harper.

ARONSON, E. (1969), Dissonance Theory: Progress and Problems in E.F. BORGATTA Social Psychology, U.S.A.: Rand McNally & Cie, 443- 463.

ATKINS, B. and POGREBIN, M. (1978), Introduction: Discretionary Decision-Making in the Administration of Justice in B. Atkins and M. Pogrebin The Invisible Justice System: Discretion and the Law, Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing, 1 - 13.

BANKOWSKI, Z. and NELKEN, D. (1979), The Problem with Discretion, University of Edinburgh: unpublished paper.

BECCARIA, C. (1964), Of Crimes and Punishments, England, Oxford University Press.

BOTTOMLY, A.K. (1973), Decisions in the Penal Process, London: Martin Robertson and Cie Ltd.

CANADA (1979), Parole Act and Regulations, Office Consolidation Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

CANADA Law Reform Commission (1977), The Parole Process, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

CANADA Law Reform Commission (1976), "Permission to be Slightly Free", Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

CANADA (1976) Report of the Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

CANADA (1969), Report on the Canadian Committee on Corrections, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

CANADA (1956), Report of a Committee Appointed to Inquire into the Principles and Procedures Followed in the Remission Service. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

CANADA (1979) Parole Act and Regulations (Office Consolidation), Ottawa, Queen's Printer.

CANADA (1977), Report to Parliament by the Sub Committee on the Penitentiary System in Canada, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

CANADA (1978), Auditor General's Report, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

CARTER, R.M. (1970), The Presentence Report and the Decision-Making Process in M. CARTER and L. T. WILKINS, Probation and Parole: Selected Readings, U.S.A.: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 203-210.

CIALE, J. (1980), The Birth of the Penal System in Canada: 1938 - 1970 in LAPLANTE, Proceedings of the Fourth Canadian Conference on Applied Criminology, University of Ottawa.

CLARK, K.B. (1969), Problems of Power and Social Change: Toward a Relevant Social Psychology in E.F. BORGOTTA Social Psychology, U.S.A.: Rand McNally and Cie, 511 - 539.

CONRAD, J. (1980) News of the Future Research and Development in Corrections, Federal Probation 44, 65 - 72.

DAVIS, K.P. (1969), Discretionary Justice: a Preliminary Inquiry, Baton Route: LSU Press.

DAWSON, R. (1978), The Decision to Grant or Deny Parole in B. ARKINS and M. POGREBIN, The Invisible Justice System: Discretion and the Law, Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing, 360 - 395.

DEMERS, D.J. (1980), Discretion: Underlying Principles and CURRENT ISSUES, Ministry of the Solicitor General: unpublished paper.

GALLIHER, J.F. (1978), The Life and Death of Liberal Criminology Contemporary Crises 2, 245 - 263.

GIFFORD, D. (1978), Decisions, Decisional Referents and Administrative Justice in B. ATKINS and M. POGREBIN The Invisible Justice System: Discretion and the Law, 14 - 23.

GOTTFREDSON, D. and BALLARD K.B., Differenced in Parole Decisions Associated with Decision-Makers, Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency 3, 112 - 119.

HAWKINS, K.O. (1971), Parole Selection: The American Experience, Cambridge University: unpublished Phd. Thesis.

HOGARTH, J. (1974), Sentencing as a Human Process, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

HOLLANDER, E.P. and WILLIS, R.H. (1969), Some Current Issues in the Psychology of Conformity and Non-Conformity in E.F. BORGATTA, Social Psychology U.S.A.: Rand McNally & Cie, 412 - 428.

HOME OFFICE (1965), The Adult Offender, London: H.M.S.O.

HUGESSEN, J.K. (1973), Task Force on the Release of Inmates, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

KEMPER, T.D. (1969), Reference Groups: Socialization and Achievement in E.F. BORGATTA, Social Psychology U.S.A.: Rand McNally & Cie, 297 - 312.

LIPTON, D. MARTINSON, M. and WILK J. (1975), The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluative Studies. New York: Praeger.

LOYD, SHEILA (1980), A History of the Development of Parole Administration in Canada, National Parole Board: unpublished report.

MACNAMARA, D.E.U. and SAGARIN, E. (1977), Sex Crime and the Law, New York: The Free Press.

PUGH, D.S. (1969), Modern Organization Theory: A Psychological and Sociological Study in BORGATTA, E.F., Social Psychology U.S.A.: Rand McNally & Cie 667-68.

ROBERT, P. (1979), La justice criminelle et l'opinion publique in J. LAPLANTE, La démonstration de la justice, Université d'Ottawa.

ROSS (1955), Group Standards Concerning the Admission of Jews, Human Relations 2, 133-140

SCHACHTER (1954), Cross Cultural Experiments on Threat of Rejection". Human Relations 7, 403 - 439.

SULLIVAN, D.C., SEIGLE L.J. (1972), How Police Use Information to Make Decisions, An Application of Decision-Games, Crime and Delinquency 18, 253 - 262

TREPANIER, J. (1978), The Characteristics of Probation Officers in Relation to the Decision-Making Process in the Presentence Inquiry, University of London: unpublished doctoral thesis.

UNITED NATIONS REPORT, "Justification for Parole", in Report of a Committee Appointed to Inquire into the Principles and Procedures Followed by the Remission Service, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, p. 126 - 129.

VON HIRSH, A. (1976), Doing Justice, New York: Hill and Wang.

VON HIRSH, A. and HANRAHAN, K. (1979), The Question of Parole, Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Cie.

VON HIRSH, A. (1980), Symposium on Parole Guidelines, College Park, Maryland: unpublished transcripts.

WILKINS, L.T. (1965), Social Deviance, New Jersey: Tasvistock Publications.

WILKINS, L.T. GOTTFREDSON, D.M. ROBINSON, J.O. and SADOWSKI, C.A. (1973), Information Selection and Use in Parole Decision-Making, California: NCCO Publications.

WILKINS, L.T., and CHANDLER, A. (1965), Confidence and Competence in Decision-Making, British Journal of Criminology J, 22 - 35.

WRIGHT, P. (1980), On a Clear Day You Can See General Motors, New York: Avon.

Appendix A

Letter to request the collaboration
of full-time Board members
(English and French versions)

OTTAWA, KIA OR1
July 15, 1980

124

E

Dear G

This letter is to ask for your collaboration in a research project that I am undertaking in order to complete the requirements of my master's degree in criminology.

I have discussed with the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman the possibility of researching a topic that while being acceptable as a thesis, would be useful to the Board.

It is commonly agreed within the Board that at this time, a body of research on the Board's decision-making process is needed in order to develop and support any future position on the issue of guidelines.

Building on Marg Benson's suggestions at a recent Executive Committee meeting, the Chairman suggested that I adapt the decision-making game developed by Leslie Wilkins to the Parole Board situation. The method consists of doing a content analysis of several cases files and classifying the material under subject or factor headings that are familiar and logical to the users. Each different factor or group of factors used in making a decision is put on a card and the participants are asked to choose the factor cards in the order they wish to reach a decision on the case(s).

The process and the decision itself are then linked with background characteristics of the decision-makers and their opinions on a number of statements about crime and criminal justice.

The proposed study would involve RCBMs as well as full-time Board members. All the information received would be considered highly confidential and the results of the study written in a way that would not jeopardize the anonymity of each participant.

.../2

By undertaking such a study the Parole Board will be better equipped to respond to certain questionable assumptions underlying the guidelines concept—the major assumption being that biases and personal characteristics of decision-makers are "evils" that should be eliminated. Consequently, the decision makers are required to /make their decisions within very strict boundaries. If indeed all effort should be made to neutralize personal interpretation of cases, the question arises: Why have a Board and why pay attention to its composition?

In the last few years, the National Parole Board has always presented as one of its strengths the varied backgrounds of its full time and community Board members. Moreover, the voting system that has been established supports the philosophical option that Board decisions are more important than individual decisions and that justice is preserved when a number of decision makers are allowed to vote on a case, each from his different, personal viewpoint.

The proposed study will allow the Board to gather information about the nature and extent of the differences in the approaches of the decision makers.

I will conduct the research project during the summer and present a report on the findings at the next general Board meeting. The exercise and the questionnaire will take together about one hour of your time.

Please let me know as soon as possible if you accept to participate and we will arrange for a mutually convenient time.

I would greatly appreciate your support and cooperation in this study and again, I assure you that all data and information will be considered as highly confidential. More specifically, no one but myself will have access to the original data which will be destroyed as soon as the analysis is terminated.

Marie-ève Hart
Resource Development Officer

OTTAWA, K1A 0R1
le 15 juillet 1980

126

Q

Cher monsieur Q

Cette lettre est pour demander votre collaboration à un projet de recherche que j'ai entrepris afin de compléter les exigences de ma maîtrise en criminologie.

Après une rencontre avec le président et le vice-président à ce sujet, il a été convenu que je choisirais un sujet qui, tout en étant acceptable comme thèse, serait utile à la Commission. Après l'expérience des derniers mois, la plupart des commissaires et gestionnaires reconnaissent le besoin de recherche interne sur le processus de prise de décision afin d'appuyer toute position future de la Commission sur la question des lignes directrices.

A partir d'une suggestion de Marg Benson au dernier comité exécutif, le président a suggéré que j'adapte le jeu de décision de Leslie Wilkins pour la Commission. La méthode consiste à faire une analyse de contenu d'un ou plusieurs dossiers et de cataloguer l'information sous des titres ou sujets qui sont logiques et familiers aux usagers. Chaque renseignement ou groupe de renseignements utilisé dans la prise de décision est placé sur une carte et chaque décisionnaire choisit les cartes dans l'ordre qu'il le désire pour en arriver à une décision.

Le processus de prise de décision est alors analysé en fonction du profil des décisionnaires et de leur opinion sur un certain nombre d'énoncés sur la justice criminelle.

L'étude proposée impliquera des commissaires communautaires et des commissaires à temps plein. Toute l'information reçue sera considérée comme hautement confidentielle et les résultats seront publiés de façon à ne révéler d'aucune façon l'identité des participants.

.../2

Grâce à une telle étude, la Commission sera mieux préparée pour répondre à certains postulats tout à fait discutables qui sont sous-jacents au concept des lignes directrices. Le plus important de ces postulats est que les traits et préjugés personnels des décisionnaires sont des "maux" qu'il faut absolument éliminer. Par conséquent, l'on force les décisionnaires à prendre des décisions à l'intérieur de frontières très étroites. Si, de fait, tout doit être mis en oeuvre afin de neutraliser l'interprétation personnelle des cas, la question suivante s'impose: Pourquoi une commission et pourquoi s'attarder à sa composition?

Durant les dernières années, la Commission a toujours présenté comme étant une de ses forces, la diversité d'expérience de ses commissaires à temps plein et de ses commissaires communautaires. De plus, le système de vote de la Commission appuie l'option philosophique que les décisions de la Commission prévalent sur les décisions individuelles et que l'on préserve le sens de justice lorsque plusieurs décisionnaires sont appelés à voter sur un cas, chacun d'après son point de vue personnel.

Je compte faire cette recherche pendant l'été et présenter un rapport à la prochaine réunion générale. L'exercice et le questionnaire prendront à peu près une heure de votre temps.

Veuillez me laisser savoir le plus tôt possible si vous acceptez de participer et nous prendrons un rendez-vous. Votre appui et votre collaboration seraient grandement appréciés et, de nouveau, je vous assure que toutes les données et l'information seront considérées comme strictement confidentielles. Plus précisément, aucune personne, sauf moi, n'aura accès aux données originales et celles-ci seront détruites aussitôt que l'analyse sera terminée.

Marie-ève Hart
Agent de développement des ressources

Monsieur Gaston Gauvreau
4,000, rue de Maisonneuve
App. #1010

Montréal, Québec
H3Z 1J9

Monsieur Alonzo Malouin
714, rue St-Omer

Drummondville, Québec

Monsieur Mozart Carrière
650, rue Sydney

Lachute, Québec

J8H 1L8

Monsieur Gaston Clermont
Commissaire

Commission nationale des
libérations conditionnelles

340, avenue Laurier ouest

Ottawa, Ontario

K1A 0R1

128

POOR COPY
COPIE DE QUALITEE INFERIEURE

ONLY COPY AVAILABLE
SEULE COPIE DISPONIBLE

Appendix B

Letter to request the
collaboration of Community
Board members

OTTAWA, KIA 0R1
August 27, 1980

130

Dear

Thank you very much for accepting to participate in my research project on the "Selection of information for conditional release decisions". My original plan was to go on a tour of the regions and administer the questionnaire and the simulation exercise to individuals or small groups of regular Board Members and community Board Members.

However, at the beginning of August, I have been asked to assume temporarily the responsibilities of Secretary to the Board which rendered the trip to the regions impossible. In addition, since many regular Board Members and Community Board Members are on holidays in August, it would have been very difficult to meet with every one. A more practical approach would be to give the simulation exercise to regular Board Members during the General Board meeting, and to Community Board Members during the orientation and feedback session that will take place in each region next October. There are also many methodological advantages in administering the simulation exercise to all Board Members together and to all Community Board Members of a given regional together.

I hope this new plan will be acceptable to you. Thank you again for your collaboration.

Marie-ève Hart
Resource Development Officer

OTTAWA, KIA OR1
le 26 août 1980

131

8

Cher α

Tous mes remerciements d'avoir accepté de participer à mon projet de recherche sur "la sélection des renseignements dans le processus décisionnel des libérations conditionnelles". Mon plan initial était de visiter chaque région et d'administrer le questionnaire et le jeu de décision aux commissaires réguliers et communautaires, soit individuellement soit en petits groupes.

Cependant, au début du mois d'août, on m'a demandé de remplacer temporairement le Secrétaire de la Commission, rendant ainsi impossible ma tournée des régions. De plus, étant donné que plusieurs commissaires prennent leur vacances en août, il aurait été très difficile de rencontrer tout le monde. Il semblerait donc plus pratique de donner l'exercice de simulation aux commissaires réguliers lors de la réunion générale et aux commissaires communautaires pendant les sessions d'orientation et "feed-back" qui auront lieu dans les régions au mois d'octobre. Il y a aussi des avantages méthodologiques certains à ce que les commissaires réguliers fassent l'exercice de simulation ensemble et les commissaires communautaires par groupe régional.

J'espère que ce nouveau plan vous sera acceptable. Merci encore de votre collaboration.

Marie-ève Hart
Agent de développement des ressources

Appendix C

Questionnaire on background
characteristics

7

SECTION B

133

ID

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

1. Sex Male _____
Female _____

2. Age 25 and under _____ 46 - 50 _____
26 - 30 _____ 51 - 55 _____
31 - 35 _____ 56 - 60 _____
36 - 40 _____ 61 and over _____
41 - 45 _____

3. Religious affiliation Yes _____
No (Please specify denomination) _____
No _____

If you answered yes to the previous question

4. Are you active in religious activities of your denomination?

very active _____
somewhat active _____
not active at all _____

5. Status

single _____
married _____
widowed _____
separated or divorced _____

6. Children (own and/or adopted). Please insert no for each age group.

11 and under _____
12 - 17 _____
18 and over _____

7. Are you a home-owner?

134

Yes _____

No _____

8. Do you own a car?

Yes _____

No _____

9. Total annual family income.

15,000. or less _____

15,000. - 24,000. _____

25,000. - 30,000. _____

30,000. - 35,000. _____

35,000. - 40,000. _____

45,000. - 50,000. _____

50,000. - 60,000. _____

60,000. and over _____

10. In which of these five major disciplines did you receive most of your formal education.

Law _____

Behaviorial sciences (social work, psychology, political sciences, social sciences) _____

Pure or applied sciences _____

Police sciences _____

Business _____

Humanities (literature/philosophy/journalism) _____

Other (please specify) _____

11. What level of formal education have you received?

- primary school _____
- some high school _____
- high school completed _____
- some university _____
- college _____
- college diploma _____
- B.A. _____
- M.A. _____
- Ph D. _____
- Vocational training diploma _____
- other (please specify) _____

--	--

12. What is your position with the Board.

- full time Board Member _____
- Regional Community Board Member _____

--

13. Did you have a working experience in the Criminal Justice field before your appointment to the Board?

- extensive experience (career already in that field) _____
- some experience (part-time or volunteer work or full time for less than 2 years) _____
- no experience _____

--

14. Have you spent most of your life in a rural or urban area.

- rural _____
- urban _____
- both equally _____

--

15. How many years together have you been part of the work force? _____

--	--

If applicable, indicate separately here no. of years as housewife or homehusband.

--	--

16. For how long have you been with the Parole Board? _____

--	--

Appendix D
Cards on COOK

CARDS ON COOK1. Behaviour in Institution

Cook was very anxious and even frightened on admission to this penitentiary, knowing the treatment that sex offenders are subjected to by other inmates. He avoided trouble by stating that he was in prison for assault. He was bewildered by his behaviour in this offence and although unable to discuss his feelings with his classification officer, he asked that he be seen by a psychiatrist. He asked for the auto mechanics course but, as there was no vacancy, he was placed in the machine shop due to his several years of experience as a parts man. He has acquired the basic knowledge of precision tools and benchwork, is a grade 3 inmate and all conduct reports are above average. He gets along well with his fellow inmates although he prefers to keep to himself. He asked to stay a B.C. Pen in order to get psychiatric treatment from Dr. Price. He would normally be recommended for medium security.

2. Social History

Cook was born in Kamloops, B.C. He completed his grade 12 in Kamloops and his training as a fireman. He actually started to work as a fireman two years ago; prior to that, he worked for 6 years with an auto parts firm in Burnaby.

He has always played an active role in sports and social activities in the community. He has never been in trouble at school and has been brought up in a stable home where he was the only child. He came to the attention of the police twice - once when he was 19 and once at 21 for being drunk in a public place but no charges were laid.

He got married at the age of 25 with Anita Davis and the marriage has been marked by serious communications problems. His wife is very dependant and unable to assert herself. As a result, Cook spent more and more time in sports activities and in the last couple of years, increased his drinking continuously.

3. Criminal Record

1978 - October 30
Kamloops

Indecent Assault on Female
Sec. 141 (1) CC
5 Years

Arnold Manes COOK
#SRY 1162
BC Pen # 7619

(1st offence no previous criminal record)

4. Use of alcohol and drugs

"As a teenager, I used to drink hard sometimes at parties but until a couple of years ago, I did not drink regularly. When I became a fireman, I had more leisure time and I started to drink a lot. It was also a way to escape the problems in my marriage. On the day I invited the girl in my car, I was totally plastered. I have never used soft or hard drugs, just booze."

5. Physical appearance

Height:	5'11" (1 metre 78)
Weight:	180 pounds (85 kilos)
Hair:	brown
Eyes:	brown
Built:	strong
Special marks or tatoos:	none

6. Judge's Report & Recommendation to the Board

"Despite your Counsel's eloquent appeal for leniency and your previous good record, I propose to impose the maximum sentence permitted by law.

I do so for a number of reasons:

First, to punish you for a most reprehensible assault on a seven year old girl.

Second, as a deterrent to others who, in spite of sexual depravity urging them to do what you did, might think twice about it if they knew the consequences.

Third, because I do not believe that Parliament in fixing the maximum punishment could have envisaged anything more savage and brutal than what you did.

I sentence you to 'five years' imprisonment and also hope that the National parole Board realizing the horror of your crime, won't interfere with this sentence."

Judge
Kamloops, B.C.

7. Community response to potential release

a) from police report

While Mr. Cook had never been in trouble with the law before this offence and enjoyed a good reputation, I hope that the Parole Board will realize that the case got much publicity a

the time the offence was committed. The Community would certainly not be reassured to know that this man is coming back. This office will certainly receive numerous phone calls from worried parents. Our recommendation is that if he is to be released at all, he moves to another community.

Kamloops Police Chief

b) from parole officer report

The neighbours in his immediate community have generally been very understanding although with some inevitable exceptions..

8. Age

Cook is 33 years old. He was born September 10, 1946.

9. Institutional personnel recommendation

COOK has been eligible for day parole for over a year; he is making his first application for release to the Parole Board. He is applying for full parole to stay with his at 113 North Street, Kamloops.

In recent interviews with classification officer, Cook displayed more confidence, optimism and determination. The tearful and anxious man who was admitted in Oct. 79 now appears to have his problems in perspective. I feel that further incarceration would serve no purpose. Psychiatric treatment in which he willingly will be involved under parole supervision and a reunion with his family would be more beneficial. I recommend full parole.

D. Reid
Supervisor of Classification

10. Use of Leisure time in penitentiary

"In the institution, I lift weights and I am part of a volley ball team. I watch T.V. and read in my cell a lot."

11. Police report of the offence

At 4:05 p.m. July 3, 1977, Sergeant Burns was called to the house of Mrs. Alice Becker o 8223 10th Street, Kamloops, who reported that her 7 year old daughter Carol had been raped. The attending member ascertained that the little girl had been criminally assaulted. The mother's observations were later confirmed by medical examination: the little girl was

suffering from a swollen face and was discharging blood from her vagina. When interviewed the child advised that on her way home she had been stopped by a man who asked her directions to a local store. She got into his car to show him directions at which time the man drove to a secluded wooded area approximately 3 blocks from her home. The man then got out and went to the bathroom, after which he got into the car with his pants down. He laid the child out on the seat, removed her pants and then wet his finger and inserted it into her vagina. The girl began to scream, so he slapped her on the face. He then tried to insert his penis into the child's vagina, causing the girl to scream from pain. The suspect slapped the child constantly on the face when she was screaming. Failing to gain entry, he sat up and began to masturbate, then took the girl's head and forced his penis into her mouth so that the child choked and started to vomit. After stopping this, the accused then forced the child to stroke his penis until ejaculation took place. He then drove to a location about a block from the Burns residence where he let the child out of the car. Subsequent investigation resulted in the suspect being identified as Cook, who later admitted to assaulting the child. Cook was by himself during the commission of this offence.

12. Report on victim(s)

The victim is 7 years old and appears to be above average intelligence. She is a grade student and has been progressing very well at school. It has been a terrifying experience for the child and although her physical injuries may have healed, it is felt the girl will be haunted by the traumatic impact of the assault on her. Her family doctor, three months after the offence, found no indications of permanent mental damage and find that the girl is making remarkable progress. However, he feels that only time will heal the memory of pain which was inflicted on her.

Police report

13. Offender previous experience or parole or probation

The subject has never been on parole or probation before.

14. Religious affiliation

Member of United Church but not actively involved in religious activities.

15. Court process (bail, plea and appeal)

Cook was on bail on his own recognizance when awaiting trial.

He pleaded guilty. His lawyer appealed the 5 year sentence; the appeal judge retained the original sentence.

16. Academic and work history

"I graduated from grade 12 at the age of 17. I had no particular problem at school with any of the topics. I liked maths better. I got my first job just two or three months after I left school. It was in the parts department of E.I. Johnson Co. Then I left this job and took the training to become a fireman, but I did not work right away as a fireman. I moved to Burnaby where I also worked in the parts department of Mr. Bain's firm.

17. Parole officer recommendation

Mrs. Cook is certainly a much more mature and communicative person than she was a couple of years ago. She is supportive of her husband and looks forward to a renewed relationship Mr. Cook is willing to see Dr. McDonald following his release until it is no longer necessary in the doctor's opinion. He also demonstrated his ability to abstain from alcohol during his period on bail. I recommend full parole effective on his eligibility date, June 30th.

18. Offender's version of his offence

"I often think about that little girl. I hope that she will forget and forgive me. I hope she won't be marked for life. It hurts me even more now that my wife and I want children together. I would not want anything like that to happen to my children. Her parents must hate me.

You know, I was drunk when it happened and for a while I could not remember most of it. Dr. McDonald forced me to remember everything. It was so hard to face all that.

I don't want to go again through the details of what happened. You can read it in the court report. I don't deny what the report says.

19. Release plans

Cook intends to return to live with his wife Jane at their home at 1136 North Street, Kamloops, (tel 251-2200). Mrs. Cook has been working as a secretary with Anthes Service Ltd. for 7 years. She is most supportive of her husband and anxious that he be paroled. She has been under psychiatric treatment with Dr. McDonald for over a year and a half and feels that she has much more insight into herself. She now would like to have children. She considers that the best part of her marriage was the six months her husband was on bail. Mrs. Cook states that the second mortgage on their house is almost paid and that they have savings of about \$2,000. She has recently bought a car and considers their financial situation stable.

Cook's parents and parents in law, have visited him regularly at the penitentiary. Their support is certain. Cook has definite work available with Bain's Service Ltd. 1851 Broo Rd. (Tel 655-3833) as a sales manager in auto parts. He will be paid minimum salary plus commission based on the total of his monthly sales.

Parole Service
Assistant District Director

20. Psychological report.

1. Revised Beta I.Q. score of 121, of Superior intelligence.

2. M.M.P.I.: 9 45872 - 1 (44) 1:11:12

3. Scale: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

T-Score: 44 58 48 69 67 53 60 65 75

3. Interpretation & Interview

An anxious and highly agitated inmate during the interview. Depressive features also stand out. Cook is cautious and does not seem to want to "give away" too much of himself. Cook states that he was seen by a psychiatrist, Dr. D.W. McDonald, in Kamloops. Test results suggest over-activeness and agitation when excited. This man will tend to be hyperactive and flare up, or become hostile when frustrated. Secondary factors are the endorsement of di-social items and questions reflecting sexual problems. Though depressive features are not preminent in the results, cyclothymic mood swings are common. These types of individuals want to be mobile. Their drive seems to be sparked by an inner excitability that results in lack of social control.

This man has been referred to psychiatry. He is under the care of Dr. Price.

W. Owen
Psychologist. Aug. 14/78

21. Family ties (relationship with mother, father and siblings)

Mother (during community investigation):

"Arnold has always been a reliable boy. He was part of all kinds of organizations, hockey teams, soccer teams. He had many friends and they were always doing lots of sports. He was good at school too. I did not have any reasons to worry about him. Sometimes after he turned twenty, I thought that he did not go out with girls enough. He told me one day that he was too shy to ask girls out. Just like your father! I said, I nearly had to propose to him; I knew he wanted to ask me to marry him but everytime he was about to, he blushed and became mute."

Father (during community investigation):

"I don't understand what went through his head. I think he did that because his wife was so cold and distant at that time. He could have told me that he was unhappy but we never talked much; we sort of understood each other without words."

Inmate:

"My folks are good to me. They visit regularly. They were really shocked when they found out what I did but they did not reject me. When I was arrested I really thought that they would never want to see me again. Maybe we never knew each other very well."

22. Parole application as filled by offenderGive reasons for making this application

I have now served nearly two years at the B.C. Penitentiary where I have seen a psychiatrist, Dr. Price, regularly. I feel that I now understand my problem well. My wife has also seen a psychiatrist for two years and we are both ready to develop good relationship.

Give your plans for the future

I will live with my wife at 1136 North Street, Kamloops, (Tel 251-2200).

I will work with Bain's Service Ltd., 1851 Brook Rd. (Tel 655-3833).

What is your trade or occupation. State briefly your experience and give names of previous employers.

I am a fireman and a specialist in auto parts.
Mr. Brown, Chief Kamloops Fire Dept. (2 years)
Mr. Bain, 1100 4th Street, Burnaby, B.C.

Give name and address of anyone willing to employ you

Mr. Bain 1100 4th Street, Burnaby, B.C. He will employ me at his Kamloops branch.

Give names & addresses of relatives, friends who are willing and able to assist you

Mr. & Mrs. P. Cook, 1322 Church Street, Kamloops (parents)
Anita Cook 1136 North Street, Kamloops (wife)

23. Financial situation

House \$30,000.00 bought in 1974

1st mortgage \$25,000.00 10%
2nd mortgage \$ 5,000.00

\$880.00 left to pay on 2nd mortgage

Monthly payments: \$300.00 including taxes

Savings: \$2,000.00

Salary at Bain's Service Ltd. - \$3.25 per hour + commission

Wife salary - \$10,500.00

24. Juvenile record

Cook never had trouble with the law as a juvenile.

25. Relationship with women (wife and/or girl friend)

"I never had many girl friends. I felt better going with the boys. Actually, I did not go out with any girl before Anita. I went to high school with her but we did not notice each other much then. She was a very quiet girl, a "plain Jane". I was a friend of her brother who used to make fun of her; he called her "the shrinking violet". Many years later, when I came back from Burnaby, I went drinking with her brother. I asked him how was his sister and he told me that for sure she will remain an old maid. With the booze helping, I said: "Tell her I would be glad to take her out". He phoned me the day after and said that his sister would be glad to go out with me. I took her out to a drive-in and tried to kiss her. She said it was too early. We went out after; she was always very reserved and she told me that she would not sleep with me before we are married. So I married her but she did not like me touching her. I started to go out with the boys drink, make dirty jokes and read a lot of pornography. I did not go out with other women.

26. Offender's understanding of his criminal behaviour

"I was plastered when I did this. I had been drinking all afternoon thinking that if my wife did not want to have sex with me nobody would want to. For a while I had been having all kinds of strange fantasies. I was buying Playboys and magazines like that. I often thought of going to see prostitutes but I was afraid they would laugh at me. I think I have never been very good at sex. I thought sometimes about little girls because they would not laugh at me; they would be too scared. I never thought I would go as far as doing it.

Sometimes I tried to talk with my wife and tell her I needed her help but she would just say that I scare her when we sleep together and she prefers not to have sex at all.

Now that my wife and I have both had psychiatric treatment we understand ourselves better and are going to relate better too. We talk a lot about our relationship now. I am sure that I will never do again what I did."

27. Psychiatric report

This man has been in therapy for one year and a half with me and for a period also of about three months, between the offence and incarceration, with another physician.

When I first saw him he was tense, tearful, agitated and extremely anxious. He has now settled, though there is still a tendency to develop pains in association with acute panic attacks, and there is a suspicion of a gastric ulcer.

It is my opinion that this man has made progress toward a more realistic appraisal of himself in relation to society, but he is not in a fit state yet to be able to adjust completely without support. It is my further opinion that incarceration could not and has not been able to benefit a sick man, but that the state of the laws are such that it was necessary to imprison him in order to satisfy the demands of society. Provided that he remains in psychotherapy while on parole, I can see nothing but good to be achieved by his release, whilst continued incarceration carries with it the very serious danger of causing considerably more harm than good.

J.C. Price, M.C.
Psychiatrist.

11 March 1979

28. Physical health

Cook is in good health now but prior to and throughout the trial and initial months in prison, he was nervous and extremely tense and he suffered from stomach troubles.

Classification officer

29. Friends & associates

Cook makes friends easily. He says that he is reluctant to talk about himself to his friends. He prefers to do sports with them. He is well liked by the other inmates in the machine shop and is admired for his endurance with hard physical work.

30. Previous escorted and unescorted T.A.s

COOK was given permission to spend three days at Christmas with his wife and his parents and his parents in law. There is obviously a climate of concern and support in the family. Cook's wife who has been under psychiatric treatment seems to relate to him in a much more mature way. The parole officer visited the family during the T.A. period and was impressed by the relaxed, loving atmosphere.

Appendix E

Cards on MARTIN

CARDS ON MARTIN

1. Behaviour in Institution.

MARTIN since his arrival at this institution has been enrolled in the school program, completing his grade 12. The school staff finds MARTIN to be of above average intelligence and thinks that he should have no academic problem even at university level.

In the Unit MARTIN is always quiet and well behaved. He keeps excellent relationships with other inmates and staff. He has neither unit or disciplinary charges. He attends range and unit meetings regularly. His personal hygiene and room cleanliness is above average.

Living Unit officer

When on remand, subject was involved with a group of inmates in the setting of a fire in his wing. Consequently, he spent the rest of his remand in the hole.

from pre-sentence report

2. Social History

(from pre sentence report)

MARTIN was born in Toronto and was surrendered to the care and custody of the Children's Aid Society 12 days later. He was made a permanent ward and was placed initially in various foster homes. When he was still very young, he was adopted by the Roy family with whom he lived for 13 years. When Mr. & Mrs. Roy retired to Victoria, B.C., in 1972, he remained in Thunder Bay with his married foster sister. MARTIN was disowned by his sister following a theft he committed at her home. Following that event, he was placed in various foster homes by his social worker but got repeatedly in trouble. After his first arrest for Break and Enter, he lived with his school counsellor Mr. McPherson. In 1976, he moved in with his girl friend Linda Wilson with whom he lived for nearly two years. During this period of time he did not come to the attention of the police.

Throughout the past five years, subject has been in and out of school. He never maintained steady employment.

3. Criminal Record

1974 Feb. Thunder Bay, Ontario	Possession of stolen property 296 CC	2 years probation
1974 June Thunder Bay, Ontario	Break & Enter with Intent 292 1(A) CC	12 months - 12 months probation
1974 June Thunder Bay, Ontario	(1) Robbery 2-289 CC (2) Break & Enter & Theft 292 (1) (B) CC	18 months concurrent with sent. Jne 25 12 months concurrent

1978 November Sault Ste Marie, Ontario	Possession of stolen property 312 (1) (A) CC	8 months
1979 November Thunder Bay, Ontario	Break & Enter with Intent 306 (1) (A) CC	2 years & probation for year upon release

Charges withdrawn or dismissed

1974 June Thunder Bay	Break & Enter & Theft	withdrawn
1979 March Don Mills	Wilful damage	dismissed
1979 March Don Mills	Obstruct peace officer Fail to appear Break & Enter with Intent	all withdrawn

4. Use of alcohol and drugs

Subject admits that he was intoxicated at the time he committed his last offence. He indicated that he has used LSD in the past but mainly his drug use is centered around soft drugs. He does not consider that he has a drug or alcohol problem. He blames his drinking binge at the time of the offence, on the fact that he had shortly before broken up with his girlfriend.

Parole officer

5. Physical appearance

Height:	5'11"
Weight:	150 pounds
Hair:	Black
Eyes:	Brown
Built:	Medium
Special marks or tattoos:	Appendix Scar

6. Judge's report and recommendation to the Board

"I sentenced this young man to a term of 2 years in a federal penitentiary and I consider this sentence to be relatively light if one considers that Mr. MARTIN is now on his sixth offence despite the fact that he has been given repeated opportunities not normally made available to offenders. For instance, he was placed at his school counsellor's home; at one time, he had a volunteer probation officer. However, he seems to revert to antisocial

behaviour every time supportive ties are severed. When I sentenced him, I recommended that he be placed in an institution where he can pursue educational courses since he appears to be a bright young man. I hope that the Parole Board will not release him until he has proven that he will make constructive use of his talents."

Judge

7. Community response to potential release

Subject has just recently been sentenced and a very early release would no doubt cause concern to members of the public who are aware of the circumstances.

(from police report)

8. Identification and sentence computation data

Age: 22
Date of birth: October 26, 1957

9. Institutional personnel recommendation

Andrew strikes me as being a very sincere and honest individual who is concerned about his future. He is registered at Queens University in Computing Sciences and I am confident that he will complete his degree. I doubt that we will ever see him in prison again.

Andrew plans to live with a friend who owns a taxi-cab and has offered to let him drive the cab at night between 12 a.m. and 6 a.m. This would not conflict with his courses and would assure him an income. I also understand that he could easily stay at the CCC should he be granted only a day parole.

I strongly recommend that the Board grants him at least a day parole to start his course in September.

Living Unit officer

10. Use of leisure time in Penitentiary

In his leisure hours, Andrew lifts weights in the gym, watches an occasional T.V. program and spends considerable time on his school courses. He is involved in the Jay-Cee club and sports activities.

11. Police Report of the Offence

Subject unlawfully entered the premises of the downtown medical clinic at approximately 4:00 a.m. by way of a basement window. Once inside, he entered various doctors' offices, broke holes in the walls to enter other rooms, etc... During this time an alarm sounded in the premises and subject fled. The area was searched and the subject was found pretending to be asleep behind a garbage container nearby. His clothing bore traces of plaster and he was arrested.

No property was stolen. Damages estimated at \$500.00. Evidence at scene indicates another person was involved; however no other arrest was made.

There are no known convictions other than those on FPS report.

Subject was drunk at the time of arrest but he offered no resistance and was cooperative.

12. Report on victims

The offence caused some inconvenience to members and patients of the medical clinic.

From police report

13. Offender previous experience on parole and/or probation (from pre-sentence report)

I have known Andrew MARTIN for many years. He first came to my attention in February 1974 on a charge of possession of stolen property (a social insurance card). At the time he had problems with foster homes, school and drugs. He re-offended while on probation, committing Break & Enter & Theft and then Robbery. When after incarceration, he came back under my care, I arranged for a volunteer probation officer to spend considerable time with him; the relationship was constructive and positive but ended on a bad note with the volunteer's divorce from her husband.

Last time his probation period terminated with no problem. He was involved with a girlfriend who had a very positive influence on him.

Probation officer

14. Religious affiliation

NONE

15. Court process

MARTIN was put on remand in custody following the present offence. He pleaded guilty. he was represented by a lawyer and did not appeal the sentence which was 2 years and 1 year probation upon release.

16. Academic and Work history

(1) Education

He did part of his grade 10 at St. Joseph's high school and terminated it by correspondence while in prison. He started grade 11 at St. Joseph's high school and terminated again by correspondence.

Presently terminating grade 12 by correspondence at Collin's Bay.

(2) Employment

Coached midget hockey for community league while attending school (winter of .77).

Local pipefitter's Union May 1977.

The Canadian Messenger summer of 1978.

Riverview Hotel: waiter, bouncer, September-October 1979.

17. Parole officer recommendation

While I could ascertain during the community investigation that MARTIN's friend, John Smith (#253-5114) was ready to give him a room and help him earn money by sharing time on the cab, I am not convinced that it would be the best setting for him. The house appeared to me to be a commune-like arrangement and I suspect that the lifestyle is too "unstructured" for Martin at this time.

On the other hand he would be welcome at at the CCC and I would be ready to recommend day parole at the beginning of the September semester at Queen's university.

Parole officer

18. Offender's version of the offence

"I was doing very well on the street. I had not had any problem with the Police since I started to go out with Linda but she broke our relationship. I became depressed and angry and I started to drink. I don't even fully remember what I did that night that I broke into the medical clinic. I thought that I would find all kinds of drugs that I could sell. But

I did not find anything. " I got very scared when the alarm started to ring. I rushed out but then I felt sick to my stomach and could not run further. My buddy got away but the police found me. I did not care. Maybe I wanted to be caught. I had no job, nobody who cared about me.

I was really stupid to do that. I know better now, even depressed, I would not do something so stupid. I was really shocked, you know, when the judge sentenced me to the pen."

19. Release plans

"I have been accepted in first year computing sciences, at Queen's and I would like to stay with my friend John who owns a taxi. John rents a house with two other friends and I would be the fourth one living there. It's a big house; there is room for four of us. John owns a cab and he will let me drive it between midnight and 6 a.m.; that way, I will be able to earn some money and pay for my courses at Queen. The rent is \$400.00 a month split 4 ways. I figure I need about \$400.00 a month to pay for my school fees, my food and my part of the rent.

I also met the director of the CCC who told me that there are already three students at the Centre and I could stay there. The P.O. who interviewed me seemed to think it was better idea. I would rather take a day parole than stay inside but I am sure I could handle it on full parole.

Linda and I are good friends now; I don't think we will ever live together again but she said many times that I could count on her and her parents when I get released."

From Parole Officer C.I.

The subject has no support in Kingston except for a friend by the name of John Smith who would be ready to give him a room and share time on his cab. Mr. Smith has never been in trouble with the law but his lifestyle appears to be very unstructured. I doubt that he would be able to control Martin, should he need it.

I also interviewed Linda Wilson and her parents (both of her parents are professional social workers). They are ready to give support to Martin but they will remain in the background mainly because the subject's release plans are not in the same city.

20. Psychological report

I.Q. 119 (above average)

Reading level T.A.B.E. 9.9

Although his Beta places him well above average on the B. scale of the 16, PF places him below average in his ability to think abstractly or relate ideas. He would probably prefer working with his hands.

MMPL L F K Hs D HY Pd Mf Pa PE Sc Ma
8 8 11 49 68 65 60 63 64 4a 40 45

154

His profile is that of an extremely sensitive and dependant individual. He would be considered unconventional, imaginative and would be subject to episodes of relatively immature, demanding and overwrought behaviour. He is probably rather clinging and insecure being indulgent to himself and others.

Psychologist

21. Family ties (Relationship with mother, father and siblings)

"I consider that I have no family ties. My foster parents live in Victoria and we have not kept in touch; my foster sisters don't want to know anything about me. The closest thing I have to a family is Linda and her parents".

from Pre sentence report:

Mother: Ethel Roy

Father: Philip Roy

"Siblings: Mike Martin (A true brother also brought up by Mr. & Mrs. Roy. Subject has not seen his brother for 7 years)
2 foster sisters: Helen and Louise Roy

Subject was born on the 26th of October 1957, and was surrendered to the Children's Aid Society twelve days later. He was made a permanent ward and placed in various foster homes. He stayed with the Roy for 13 years and moved to his married foster sister's home when Mr. and Mrs. Roy retired to Victoria, B.C. He stole a lawnmower from her and consequently she and his other sister disowned him.

22. Parole application as filled by offender

Give reasons for making this application

By August I will have completed my high school and received my Diploma as according to my original plan I now wish to study at Queen's in computing sciences. I have been accepted at the University provided I get my Diploma. I know that I will get it because so far my marks have been very good.

Give your plans for the future, stating where and with whom you will live

I wish to live with my friend John Smith at 4120 First Avenue, Kingston. He will let me drive his cab between midnight and six a.m., and I will attend University during the day. I have also a place at the CCC if I am granted only a day parole.

What is your trade or occupation? State briefly your experience and give names of previous employers.

I do not have a special trade or occupation at this time.

Give name and address of any one able and willing to employ you.
John Smith 4120 First Avenue, Kingston.

Give names and addresses of any relatives, friends or organizations willing and able to assist you following release.

Linda Wilson, Vanier Residence, York University.
Mr. & Mrs. Wilson 503 Church Street, Thunder Bay.

Andrew Martin

23. Financial situation

Subject has no debts and no assets.

24. Juvenile record

No juvenile record.

25. Relationship with women (wife and/or girl friend)

MARTIN has had only one lasting relationship with a girl friend, Linda Wilson. They met when they were in high school together but the relationship started to deteriorate when Linda started University. She resented the fact that he was very dependant on her and did not pursue any goal for himself. Linda's parents who are both professional social workers "adopted" MARTIN but realized soon that Linda would outgrow that relationship. Linda has remained a friend of the subject and is willing to give him support but in a platonic way.

(Parole office report)

26. Offender's understanding of his criminal behaviour

"I started to get in trouble when my foster parents moved to B.C. I was 14 then and I moved with my sister who did not really want me. She wanted the money that the government was paying for me.

I started to have problems at school. Also, I would not come back home after school because I could not face her. One day, I took the new electric lawnmower in the garage and I sold it. I figured that I deserved some of the money she was getting because of me, especially that she would not buy me the clothes I needed and never gave me pocket money. When she

found out, she phoned the police and the social worker to get rid of me. I was put in other foster homes. I continued drinking and stealing. I got arrested and I was put on probation. One of my sentence was for robbery; I got eighteen months for it; that was tough because the only thing I did to get that charge was to show my knife to the owner of the store and tell him that he'd better give me the cash. Honestly, I was at least as scared as he was and I never intended to use the knife. I didn't either.

I started to go straight when going out with Linda but when she left me, I became very depressed and I got in trouble again.

27. Psychiatric report

No psychiatric report available on this case.

28. Physical Health

Very good.

29. Friends and associates

Martin has two friends in the range. Both of them are young inmates who try to make a constructive use of their time. He is liked by other inmates and by staff.

Living Unit Officer

Martin has two straight friends, Linda Wilson and John Smith. However when he starts drinking, he seems to avoid his true friends and moves towards the criminal element.

Probation officer in
pre-sentence report

30. Previous escorted and unescorted temporary absences

Andrew has had a one day escorted T.A. with Linda Wilson and her mother on December 28, 1979.

He also had a three day T.A. at Easter to visit Linda and her family. There is a close friendship between Linda and Andrew. Andrew has handled these T.A.'s very well.

Head of living unit.

Appendix F

Questionnaires on COOK and MARTIN

COOK

No. of card

158

ID

2

3

1. Read the list of information cards available.
2. In this part, you will select five cards successively. Select a first card. Write the number of the card beside the line 1st card. Read the card. Then select a second card. Write the number beside the line 2nd card. Read the card. Continue this process until you have read five cards.

1st card _____

4-5

2nd card _____

6-7

3rd card _____

8-9

4th card _____

10-11

5th card _____

12-13

3. In the light of the information that you now possess, make an interim decision about this case. Put an "X" beside the right statement.

I am ready to grant him full parole _____

I am ready to grant him day parole _____

I am not ready to grant him any of these two types of release _____

14 15

I am unable with so little information to make even an interim decision *if you select this skip 4 & 5* _____

4. If you are not ready to grant him a release, when do you think the case should be reviewed? State in months.

16 17

5. If you are ready to grant him parole or day parole, do you wish to impose special conditions? YES _____

NO _____

18

If yes, please state them:

19 20 21

6. If you feel that you did not have enough information to make a decision that you can feel comfortable with, select up to ten more cards following the same process as in N° 2. (You select a card, write the number, read it and select another one until you have enough information to render a decision you feel comfortable with.)

1st card _____
2nd card _____
3rd card _____
4th card _____
5th card _____
6th card _____
7th card _____
8th card _____
9th card _____
10th card _____

22-23
 24-25
 26-27
 28-29
 30-31
 32-33
 34-35
 36-37
 38-39
 40-41

7. At the light of this additional information, do you wish to maintain your original decision? YES _____

NO _____

42

If your answer is yes, skip to (10)

8. If no, what is your decision now?

I am ready to grant him full parole _____

I am ready to grant him day parole _____

I am not ready to grant him any of these two types of release _____

I am unable with so little information to make a decision
(if you mark this statement skip the rest of the questionnaire)

43

9. If you are not ready to grant him a release, in how long do you think the case should be reviewed?

44 45

10. If you are ready to grant him a parole or day parole, do you wish to impose special conditions?

YES _____

NO _____

46

11. Please state any condition that is new or different from those stated in N° 5.

47 48 49

12. If you wish to remove one or more conditions stated in N° 5. Please indicate which one(s).

50 51 52

13. Please state briefly the reasons supporting your final decision.

53	54	55
----	----	----

14. How confident did you feel about the decision you made after reading 5 cards?

VERY CONFIDENT _____

FAIRLY CONFIDENT _____

LITTLE CONFIDENT _____

NOT CONFIDENT AT ALL _____

DID NOT MAKE AN INTERIM DECISION _____
(if you mark this statement skip N° 15.)

56

15. How easy or difficult was it to make a decision after 5 cards?

VERY EASY _____

FAIRLY EASY _____

RATHER DIFFICULT _____

VERY DIFFICULT _____

DID NOT MAKE AN INTERIM DECISION _____

57

16. How confident did you feel about the decision you made after reading the additional information cards?

VERY CONFIDENT _____

FAIRLY CONFIDENT _____

LITTLE CONFIDENT _____

NOT CONFIDENT AT ALL _____

DID NOT MAKE A FINAL DECISION _____

58

17. How easy was it to make a decision after reading the additional cards?

VERY EASY

FAIRLY EASY

RATHER DIFFICULT

VERY DIFFICULT

DID NOT MAKE AN INTERIM DECISION

59

MARTIN

163

1. Read the list of information cards available.

60 61

2. In this part, you will select five cards successively.
Select a first card. Write the number of the card beside the line
1st card.
Read the card.
Then select a second card. Write the number beside the line 2nd
card.
Read the card.
Continue this process until you have read five cards.

1st card _____

62-63

2nd card _____

64-65

3rd card _____

66-67

4th card _____

68-69

5th card _____

70-71

3. In the light of the information that you now possess, make an interim decision about this case. Put an "X" beside the right statement.

I am ready to grant him full parole _____

I am ready to grant him day parole _____

I am not ready to grant him any of these two types of release _____

72

I am unable with so little information to make even an interim decision _____

4. If you are not ready to grant him a release, when do you think the case should be reviewed? State in months.

73 74

5. If you are ready to grant him parole or day parole, do you wish to impose special conditions?

YES _____

NO _____

75

If yes, please state them:

76 77 78

79

6. If you feel that you did not have enough information to make a decision that you can feel comfortable with, select up to ten more cards following the same process as in N° 2. (You select a card, write the number, read it and select another one until you have enough information to render a decision you feel comfortable with.

No card
1

2 3 10

1st card _____

4-5

2nd card _____

6-7

3rd card _____

8-9

4th card _____

10-11

5th card _____

12-13

6th card _____

14-15

7th card _____

16-17

8th card _____

18-19

9th card _____

20-21

10th card _____

22-23

7. At the light of this additional information, do you wish to maintain your original decision?.

YES _____

NO _____

24

If your answer is yes, skip to (10)

8. If no, what is your decision now?

I am ready to grant him full parole _____

I am ready to grant him day parole _____

I am not ready to grant him any of these two types of release _____

I am unable with so little information to make a decision
(if you mark this statement skip the rest of the questionnaire)

25

9. If you are not ready to grant him a release, in how long do you think the case should be reviewed?

26 27

10. If you are ready to grant him a parole or day parole, do you wish to impose special conditions?

YES _____

NO _____

28

11. Please state any condition that is new or different from those stated in N° 5.

29 30 31

12. If you wish to remove one or more conditions stated in N° 5. Please indicate which one(s).

32 33 34

13. Please state briefly the reasons supporting your final decision.

35	36	37

14. How confident did you feel about the decision you made after reading 5 cards?

VERY CONFIDENT

FAIRLY CONFIDENT

LITTLE CONFIDENT

NOT CONFIDENT AT ALL

DID NOT MAKE AN INTERIM DECISION

(if you mark this statement skip N° 15.

38

15. How easy or difficult was it to make a decision after 5 cards?

VERY EASY

FAIRLY EASY

RATHER DIFFICULT

VERY DIFFICULT

DID NOT MAKE AN INTERIM DECISION

39

16. How confident did you feel about the decision you made after reading the additional information cards?

VERY CONFIDENT

FAIRLY CONFIDENT

LITTLE CONFIDENT

NOT CONFIDENT AL ALL

DID NOT MAKE A FINAL DECISION

40

17. How easy was it to make a decision after reading the additional cards?

VERY EASY

FAIRLY EASY

RATHER DIFFICULT

VERY DIFFICULT

DID NOT MAKE AN INTERIM DECISION

41

7. Are you a home-owner?

Yes _____

No _____

169

52

8. Do you own a car?

Yes _____

No _____

53

9. Total annual family income.

15,000. or less _____

15,000. - 24,000. _____

25,000. - 30,000. _____

30,000. - 35,000. _____

35,000. - 45,000. _____

45,000. - 50,000. _____

50,000. - 60,000. _____

60,000. and over _____

54

10. In which of these five major disciplines did you receive most of your formal education.

Law _____

Behaviorial sciences (social work, psychology, political sciences, social sciences) _____

Pure or applied sciences _____

Police sciences _____

Business _____

Humanities (literature/philosophy/journalism) _____

Other (please specify) _____

55

11. What level of formal education have you received?

- primary school _____
- some high school _____
- high school completed _____
- some university _____
- college _____
- college diploma _____
- B.A. _____
- M.A. _____
- Ph D. _____
- Vocational training diploma _____
- other (please specify) _____

56	57

12. What is your position with the Board.

- full time Board Member _____
- Regional Community Board Member _____

58

13. Did you have a working experience in the Criminal Justice field before your appointment to the Board?

- extensive experience (career already in that field) _____
- some experience (part-time or volunteer work or full time for less than 2 years) _____
- no experience _____

59

14. Have you spent most of your life in a rural or urban area.

- rural _____
- urban _____
- both equally _____

60

15. How many years together have you been part of the work force? _____

If applicable, indicate separately here no. of years as housewife or homehusband.

61	62
63	64

16. For how long have you been with the Parole Board? _____

65	66