AN EVALUATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS FURLOUGH EXPERIENCE
NOVEMBER 1972 - AUGUST 1973

Frank A. Hall
Commissioner

Researcher: Joanne O'Malley
Research Analyst

Daniel P. LeClair
Social Science Research Specialist

A B S T R A C T

This study is a description and analysis of the Massachusetts furlough program. It was designed to determine the characteristics of the participants in the program, the characteristics of those participants for whom escape warrants were issued, and the characteristics of those participants who encountered difficulty in the program.

A statistical comparison of the resident population and the furlough population provides a profile of program participants. This comparison indicates that the furlough population reflects those characteristics of the population at those MCI's that granted the larger proportion of furloughs. Included in this comparison is a discussion of escapees, but because such a small proportion of furloughees (1.7%, N=74) failed to return, reliable risk categories could not be developed.

Additional analysis provides a profile of those furloughees who encountered some difficulty in conforming to the conditions of the furlough agreement (7.6%, N=429). The characteristics of this group is also a reflection of the populations at those MCI's that granted the larger proportion of furloughs. Five variables are found to be strongly associated with encountering difficulty. These are 1) offense, 2) sentence, 3) months to parole eligibility, 4) age at furlough, and 5) history of drug use. Analysis of these variables provides a profile of those furloughees having a high rate of difficulty and those having a low rate of difficulty.

Finally, statistical analysis provides expected difficulty rates for population subclassifications.

Four of the above variables are shown to be indicators of encountering difficulty on furlough. These are: 1) offense; 2) months to parole eligibility; 3) age at furlough and 4) history of drug use.

INTRODUCTION

"The basic obligation of the Massachusetts Department of
Correction is the protection of society. Part of this
duty is to provide for the humane care and custody of
those whom the courts have sentenced to the state
correctional system. A more challenging aspect of this
obligation is to provide a truly corrective experience
for sentenced offenders so that they will be better
equipped to lead productive and law-abiding lives. For,
if a man is returned to society more embittered, venge-
ful, demoralized, and incapable of social and economic
survival than when he first came to prison, then we cer-
tainly will have failed in our obligation to protect
society. Our goal is to return a man to society with
the knowledge and skills necessary to earn an honest
living, with a reasonable sense of social responsibility
and self-value, and with an increased capacity for self-
control, judgment, and realistic optimism. Thus, the
reintegration of the offender into community life is the
primary concern of the Department of Correction." **

Correctional admisistrators have recognized the serious limitations
of rehabilitative programs within the artificial structure of an institution,
and have begun to place emphasis on the development of programs which will
enable the offender to make a more satisfactory adjustment to life in the
community.

The protection of society, however, involves much more than the inmate's
isolation from the community as 98% of all offenders sentenced to state
correctional facilities eventually return to the community and 85% of these
offenders are released to the community within three years of the date of
their sentence. Therefore, the Department of Correction is also responsible
for providing the offender with a positive and corrective experience that
will encourage and facilitate the adoption of more productive and law-
abiding lives.

_____

**Taken from Department of Correction Philosophy, Department Order 1000.1

Community-based corrections provides a system of specific programs and
services in the community which are designed to prepare selected inmates,
prior to their parole eligibility, for their release from prison. This
system provides a series of transitional stages to facilitate the offender's
reintegration into the community.

These stages form a continuumof treatment programs from initial incar-
ceration to release from parole supervision. The continuumof treatment
includes: 1) assessment of individual needs at the Reception and Diagnostic
Center; 2) institutional counseling and training programs; 3) education
release, work release, and furloughs to the community on a temporary basis;
4) residence in a pre-release and/or post-release community-based facility
with specific house rules and regulations and counseling services; and
5) follow-up services such as parole advocacy (sponsored by the Special Impact
program at Concord) and general parole supervision.

The final component of this system of community-based corrections is
research and evaluation. The Research and Planning Division of the Department
of Correction will publish a series of statistical and evaluative reports on
each of these stages along the continum of community-based corrections. This
report on the furlough program is the first of that series.

Both components, treatment and research, combine to form a coordinated
system of correctional services which follows the incarcerated offender from
initial commitment to release and follow-up after release. This system is
designed to meet the correctional needs of both the individual offender
and the community.

It has been suggested that temporary release can be an effective tool
by which to bridge the gap that has generally existed between the offender's
treatment within an institution and his supervision within the community.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice recommended that:

> "Programs of graduated release suggest that crime control can be increased by making the transition from confinement in a correctional institution to freedom in the community a gradual, closely supervised process. This process of graduated release permits offenders to cope with their many post-release problems in manageable steps, rather than trying to develop satisfactory home relationships, employment, and leisure time activity all at once upon release. It also permits staff to initiate early and continuing assessment of progress under actual stresses of life."

Temporary release provides the opportunity to reintegrate the offender into the community through exposure to beneficial and rewarding experiences and programs which are not available in the institution. In addition, an environment of increasing responsibility and freedom provides a realistic rehabilitative experience for the individual offender.

The concept of reintegration requires that correctional administrators build a functional and coordinated system that provides a true correctional experience. A furlough program is an invaluable component of such a system.

Furlough programs are not new to corrections. In 1918, Mississippi introduced a program of ten day home leaves for minimum security inmates. Arkansas adopted a more limited program in 1922; Louisiana followed in 1964. When furloughs became authorized in Massachusetts, October, 1972, furlough programs already existed in twenty-seven states and in the Federal prison system. Twenty-two states did not have furlough programs at that time, but sixteen planned to implement a furlough program in the near future. (Smith and Milan)

The contribution of furlough programs to the achievement of reintegration cannot be ignored. Furloughs aid the offender's post-release adjustment by aiding him in (1) reinforcing family ties; (2) firming up parole plans, i.e., arranging a job, a home and other contacts necessary to adjust to re-entry into the community; and (3) testing newly learned social skills and insights that may have developed in institutional counseling experiences.

A study of California's furlough program found that program participants did better on parole than nonparticipants; i.e., 60% of participants compared with 42% of nonparticipants experienced no difficulty on parole. (Holt and Miller). Although these findings should be interpreted with caution, Markley found that officials at community treatment centers state that offenders who have had contact with the community prior to release, have lower rates of recidivism than those offenders not having such contact.

The preservation and reinforcement of family ties is an essential component of reintegration into normal community life. Studies have shown that those inmates having strong family ties, and who have been able to maintain those ties during their incarceration, are more successful on release than those offenders without such support. (Ohlin, Glaser, Holt and Miller) A study of Oregon's furlough program concluded that "leaves do have a very significant positive value to inmates in reestablishing and/or maintaining family relationships, tend to be correlated with advances in institutional programming, and will prove to be positively related to release adjustment." (Reed)

Recognition of the positive influence of community and family support on post-release adjustment, and of the need to build and rebuild solid ties between the offender and the community, with special emphasis on family ties, led to the development of a furlough program in Massachusetts.

THE MASSACHUSETTS EXPERIENCE

Authorization for the furlough program in Massachusetts came into law October 16, 1972, under the Correction Reform Act. This legislation provides that the Commissioner of Correction may extend the limits of confinement; i.e., grant furloughs, for the following reasons:

    a) to attend the funeral of a relative;

    b) to visit a critically ill relative;

    c) to obtain medical, psychiatric, psychological or other social services when adequate services are not available at the facility and cannot be obtained by temporary placement in a hospital;

    d) to contact prospective employers;

    e) to secure a suitable residence for use upon release on parole or discharge;

    f) for any other reason consistent with reintegration of a committed offender into the community.

The first furloughs in Massachusetts were granted on November 6, 1972. From that date through August 30, 1973, 5645 furloughs had been granted. Of the 5645 furloughs, 94 residents failed to return to custody at termination of their furlough, and were declared escapees. These figures represent a success rate of 98.3% and a failure rate of 1.7%. (It is important to note than 78% of these escapees have returned to custody either voluntarily or through apprehension by authorities.)

Table I presents the number of furloughs granted each month, and the number of escapes each month from November, 1972 through August, 1973. This table shows that the rate of escape increased steadily from zero in November to a peak of 3.4% in March, 1973, but it decreased since that time to a low of 1.3 in August. This decrease may have been affected by a departmental modification of the screening procedure for furlough

applications which was introduced at the end of March, i.e., all applications from MCI Walpole and all applications from other institutions that required the Commissioner's approval underwent a thorough screening after the furlough board had made its recommendation.

TABLE I

THE FURLOUGH PROGRAM OUTCOME EXPERIENCE BY MONTH

	NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING FIRST FURLOUGH THAT MONTH		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
November 1972	397	(7.03)	218	(11.22)	0	(0.00)	(0.00)
December 1972	760	(13.46)	279	(14.36)	7	(7.45)	(0.92)
January 1973	452	(8.01)	106	(5.46)	3	(3.19)	(0.66)
February 1973	616	(10.91)	72	(3.71)	14	(14.89)	(2.27)
March 1973	590	(10.45)	114	(5.87)	20	(21.28)	(3.39)
April 1973	472	(8.36)	296	(15.23)	9	(9.57)	(1.91)
May 1973	580	(10.28)	305	(15.70)	9	(9.57)	(1.55)
June 1973	642	(11.37)	265	(13.64)	13	(13.83)	(2.02)
July 1973	675	(11.96)	161	(8.29)	13	(13.83)	(1.93)
August 1973	461	(8.17)	127	(6.54)	6	(6.38)	(1.30)
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	1943	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	(1.66)

Table II presents furlough data in regard to institutional security level, i.e., maximum security, medium security, and minimum security. The table reveals a definite relationship between security level and number of furloughs granted, with the minimum security facilities granting a preponderant number of the furloughs. For example, although the two maximum security facilities (MCI Walpole and Concord) represent close to half (46.7%) of the total resident population, the number of furloughs granted at these institutions constitute only 19.6% of the total number of furloughs. Conversely, the resident population at the minimum security institutions, i.e., MCI Framingham,Forestry, MCI Shirley, and Boston Pre-Release Center, represent only 14.3% of the total population, whereas these institutions have granted nearly half (48.3%) of the total number of furloughs. These figures are not surprising, however, because of the screening process involved in transfer to a medium or minimum facility. Each resident is classified before being transferred to medium or minimum security, and it has been determined that these residents are in a low risk category, a status more conducive to receiving furloughs.

The average number of furloughs granted each resident furloughed also provides an indicator of the screening process. Table II reflects the difference between this average and the security level of each institution. Combining the number of furloughs and the number of individuals furloughed from maximum security institutions yields an average of 2.0 furloughs per individual furloughed; the same combination for minimum security institutions yields an average of 4.4 furloughs per individual furloughed. This evidence supports the initial observation that participation in the program increases as the security level of the institution decreases.

TABLE II

FURLOUGH EXPERIENCE BY INSTITUTIONAL SECURITY LEVEL

	NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		AVERAGE POPULATION		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE	NO. INDIVIDUALS FURLOUGHED	AVERAGE NO. FURLOUGHS P INDIVIDUALS FURLOUGHED
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%		
Maximum Security (MCI Walpole, MCI Concord)	1107	(19.61)	976	(46.65)	33	(35.11)	2.98	567	1.95
Medium Security (MCI Norfolk, MCI Bridgewater)	1811	(32.08)	817	(39.05)	33	(35.11)	1.82	751	2.41
Minimum Security (MCI Framingham, Forestry, MCI Shirley, Boston Pre-Rel.)	2727	(48.31)	299	(14.29)	28	(29.79)	1.03	625	4.36
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	2092	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	1.67	1943	2.90

Table III presents furlough outcome data by each institution. These figures show that there is a large difference between MCI Concord and Boston Pre-Release Center with regard to the proportion of furloughs granted and the proportion of escapees from each institution. Whereas MCI Concord is over-represented in the escape category, Boston Pre-Release is under-represented in this category.*

_____

* This phenomena may also be a reflection of the selection process pre-requisite to acceptance in a pre-release center.

TABLE III

FURLOUGH OUTCOME EXPERIENCE BY INSTITUTION

	NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		AVERAGE POPULATION		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE	NO. OF INDIVIDUALS FURLOUGHED	AVERAGE NO. OF FURLOUGHS PER INDIVIDUAL FURLOUGHED
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
MCI Bridgewater ***	184	(3.26)	158	(7.55)	9	(9.57)	4.89	90	2.04
MCI Concord *	976	(17.29)	417	(19.93)	29	(30.85)	2.97	459	2.13
MCI Framingham **	382	(6.77)	94	(4.49)	8	(8.51)	2.09	142	2.69
MCI Norfolk ***	1627	(28.82)	659	(31.50)	24	(25.53)	1.48	661	2.46
MCI Walpole *	131	(2.32)	559	(26.72)	4	(4.26)	3.05	108	1.21
Forestry **	929	(16.46)	133	(6.36)	11	(11.70)	1.18	275	3.38
MCI Shirley **	505	(8.95)	38	(1.82)	4	(4.26)	.79	92	5.49
Boston Pre-Rel. **	911	(16.15)	34	(1.63)	5	(5.32)	.55	116	7.85
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	2092	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	1.67	1943	2.90

*   Maximum Security

**   Minimum Security

*** Medium Security

PART II

ANALYSIS OF FURLOUGH EXPERIENCE IN RELATION TO BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF FURLOUGHEE

Although participation in the furlough program seems to be related to the security level of each institution, additional analysis provided a profile of the background characteristics of a furloughee. A statistical comparison of the characteristics of the resident population and the furlough population determined whether any particular variables were related to participation in the furlough program. Six background characteristics were found to differ between the two populations and the difference proved to be statistically significant (significance levels ranged from .05 to .001). The statistical significance should be interpreted with caution in that it may very possibly reflect equally significant differences among the residents of the various MCI's. As previously indicated, certain institutions constitute the large bulk of furloughs granted although these institutions (specifically MCI-Concord, Framingham, Forestry, Shirley and Boston Pre-Release) comprise only a minor proportion of the total resident population, therefore, these statistically significant phenomena most likely are indicative of the background characteristics of the residents of those institutions which granted the largest number of furloughs.

The six background variables that were found to be related to receiving a furlough are: 1) offense, 2) minimum sentence, 3) age at furlough, 4) race, 5) marital status, and 6) number of remaining months to parole eligibility date. A discussion of these variables follows.

OFFENSE

A comparison of the resident population and the furlough population by offense (appendix i) indicates that the furlough population contained significantly more narcotic offenders (13.1%) than did the resident population, (10.6%) and significantly more property offenders (16.3%) than did the resident population (14.5%). Conversely, the furlough population contained significantly fewer (5.2%) sex offenders than did the resident population (8.4%). These discrepancies may be explained by the large proportion of property offenders (62.1%) and narcotic offenders (49.8%) at those institutions that represent the largest proportion of furloughs granted (65.6%), i.e., MCI Concord, MCI Framingham, Forestry, MCI Shirley, and Boston Pre-Release;[1] and the small proportion of sex offenders (12.7%) at these institutions.

MINIMUM SENTENCE

The second variable found to be related to program participation is minimum sentence (appendix ii). A comparison of the resident population and the furlough population on this variable indicates that significantly more furloughees were serving indeterminate sentences, (38.6)[2] than were in the population, (28.7) (P= < .001). In addition, while this category was overrepresented in the furlough population all other minimum sentence categories were significantly under represented in the furlough population. (Significance levels range from .05 to .001).

This discrepancy may be explained by the large proportion of residents,

1 See Patrician, Robert, "A Description of the Residents of Massachusetts Correctional Institutions on January 1, 1973". (Correction and Parole Information System Project: Massachusetts Department of Correction) August, 1973. 20 pages.

2 That is, no minimum sentence was set by the court.

who are serving indeterminate sentences, at MCI Framingham (86.9%), MCI Shirley (95.8%), Boston Pre-Release (92.0%), and MCI Concord (81.1%); and the fact that these institutions accounted for 49.2% of the total number of furloughs granted. Conversely, those institutions having a large proportion of residents serving determinate sentences, i.e., MCI Walpole (93.9%) and MCI Norfolk (96.2%), accounted for 31.1% of the total number of furloughs granted.

AGE

Age is the third variable which is related to program participation. (appendix iv). A statistical comparison between the furlough population and the resident population shows that the 16-19 age group is significantly over represented with respect to the total number of furloughs (P=$<$.05). Conversely, both the 25-29 and 30-34 age groups are significantly under represented with respect to this total (P=$<$.05).

These discrepancies may be explained by the age distribution of the resident population. Those institutions that account for the largest proportion of the resident population between the ages of 16 and 19 (77.4%) also account for a large proportion of the total number of furloughs, (49.2%), i.e., MCI Concord, MCI Shirley, Boston Pre-Release, and MCI Framingham. On the other hand, those institutions that account for a large proportion of the resident population in the 25-29 (71.5%) and 30-34 (81.8%) categories, i.e., MCI Walpole, MCI Norfolk and MCI Bridgewater, accounted for 34.3% of the total number of furloughs.

RACE

Race is another variable related to participation in the furlough program (see appendix v). Statistical comparison of the two populations indicates that the furlough population contained significantly fewer (3.6%) whites than did the resident population (P=$<$.01). This under-representation may be explained by the large proportion of non-whites in the populations of MCI Framingham (36.9%), MCI Shirley (33.3%), and Boston Pre-Release (48.0%). These institutions account for 31.9% of the total number of furloughs granted, but account for only 7.9% of the total resident population. It is likely therefore, that the racial composition of the furlough population would be a reflection of the racial composition of the populations at these institutions.

MARITAL STATUS

The fifth variable that is related to program participation is marital status. (appendix vi) Statistical comparisons between the resident population and the furlough population indicate that married residents are significantly over-represented in the furlough population (P=$<$.01 and P=$<$.05 respectively). These discrepancies may be related to an assumption that married residents are better risks for furlough than single or divorced residents. However, as will be shown later in this report, married inmates are not less inclined to escape.

MONTHS TO PAROLE ELIGIBILITY

The last variable that is related to program participation is months to parole eligibility. (appendix vii) A statistical comparison resident population and the furlough population indicates that the furlough population contained significantly more (59.5%) residents within eighteen

months of parole eligibility, (P= $<$.001) than did the resident population, (46.7%). This discrepancy may be explained by the large proportion of residents at MCI Concord (84.0%), MCI Shirley (95.8%), Boston Pre-Release (92.0%) and Forestry (70.1%) who are within eighteen months of parole eligibility and the fact that these institutions granted 58.85% of the total number of furloughs. In addition, furloughs have been used extensively at all institutions as an aid in preparation for parole. Because of the role of the furlough program in the reintegration process, an over-representation of furloughs in the eighteen month or less category is expected.

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF FURLOUGH ESCAPEES

Of the 5,645 furloughs that were granted from November, 1972 through August, 1973, only 94 or 1.7% resulted in an escape. An individual is declared an escapee if he fails to return within two hours of the designated return time. Because of the low incidence of escape, statistically significant relationships could not be determined, but certain interesting results were discovered which, while not statistically significant, may be cautiously viewed as possible interrelationships. Four variables in particular, offense, minimum sentence, age at furlough and marital status, were found to be somewhat related to escape.

OFFENSE

A comparison of the proportion of furloughs granted and the proportion of escapes in each offense category (see appendix i) indicates an over-representation of escapes in the offense against person (+5.2%) and the offense against property (+2.3%) categories. The same comparison shows a

slight under-representation with respect to the proportion of escapes in the narcotic offense (-5.7%) and the sex offenses (-1.9%) categories. However, a statistical analysis of these figures failed to show that these differences were significant.

Finally, a breakdown of the escape rates for each offense category shows a range from zero to 6.4%. These rates should be interpreted with caution, however, for these rates taken alone may prove misleading. For example, the highest rates of escape are found for those sentenced for larceny of a motor vehicle (6.4%) and for escape (3.6%), but each of these categories represent less than one percent of the total number of furloughs granted, and less than five percent of the total escapes. On the other hand, those sentenced for armed robbery represent the largest proportion of furloughs granted (23.9%), and also the largest proportion of escapees (34.0%), but this offense category shows an escape rate of 2.4%.

Because these proportions are so disparate, it may be more appropriate to compare the escape rates of the major offense categories. These rates range from a high of 2.0% in the offense against property category, to a low of .9% in the sex offense category, for an over-all escape rate of 1.7%.

MINIMUM SENTENCE

Escape rates for minimum sentence categories range from zero to 2.5. (see appendix ii) The highest rate of escape is found in the 15-19 year sentence category. However, this category represents only 2.8% of the total number of furloughs granted and less than 5% of the total escapees. The second highest rate (2.1) is found in the indeterminate sentence category. This rate may reflect the high escape rate from MCI Concord (2.1), since a large proportion of MCI Concord furloughs are in this category (80.%) (see appendix iii).

AGE

A breakdown of the escape rate by age (see appendix iv) suggests that as age increases, the rate of escape decreases. Although further analysis of the data is necessary to determine the significance of the relationship, the data indicates that some relationship exists.

MARITAL STATUS

In regard to marital status (see appendix vi), it is interesting to note than married furloughees have a higher rate (2.1) of escape from furlough than single (1.7) or divorced (1.3) furloughees. Most likely this reflects the aforementioned fact that married inmates are more often granted furloughs than non-married inmates. It does appear, however, to dispute somewhat the often-held assumption that married inmates are better risks for furlough.

PART III

DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED ON FURLOUGH

Data was also collected on difficulties encountered by furloughees. These difficulties were categorized as 1) returning late, 2) being arrested on furlough, and 3) other. Included in the other category are difficulties such as returning intoxicated, being involved in an accident, being injured, and attempting to introduce contraband into the institution. Difficulty rates were computed on the basis of the number of difficulties encountered and the number of furloughs granted in each category of the variable under analysis.

Table IV presents a breakdown of the furlough program and difficulty rates by each month from November, 1972 through August, 1973. The difficulty rates ranged from a low of 1.0 in November, to a high of 12.2 in May. The rate of difficulty encountered by furloughees seemed to be relatively stable from December through March, but this rate had been very sporadic from April through August, and its fluctuations do not seem to be related to either the proportion of furloughs granted, or to any administrative changes in the program.

Also presented in Table IV is a breakdown of the type of difficulty encountered by furloughees each month. These figures indicate that the "returned late" category accounts for the largest proportion (87.9%) of difficulties encountered. Conversely, the "new arrest" category accounts for only 3.5% of the total difficulties encountered and this category accounts for less than .3% of the total number of furloughs granted.

Table V presents a breakdown of difficulties encountered by furloughees at the institutional level. Rates of difficulty range from a low of 1.4 for MCI Norfolk, to a high of 14.3 for MCI Shirley. Further analysis

TABLE IV

	TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		TOTAL NUMBER OF DIFFICULTIES (NOT INCLUDING ESCAPE)		RETURNED LATE		NEW ARREST		OTHER		DIFFICULTY RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
November, 1972	397	(7.03)	4	(.93)	3	(.80)	0	(00.00)	1	(2.70)	(1.01)
December, 1972	760	(13.46)	45	(10.49)	36	(9.55)	1	(6.67)	8	(21.62)	(5.92)
January, 1973	452	(8.01)	27	(6.29)	23	(6.10)	1	(6.67)	3	(8.11)	(5.97)
February, 1973	616	(10.91)	31	(7.23)	27	(7.16)	1	(6.67)	3	(8.11)	(5.03)
March, 1973	590	(10.45)	33	(7.69)	30	(7.96)	1	(6.67)	2	(5.40)	(5.59)
April, 1973	472	(8.36)	42	(9.79)	42	(11.14)	1	(00.00)	0	(00.00)	(8.90)
May, 1973	580	(10.28)	71	(16.55)	61	(16.18)	3	(20.00)	7	(18.92)	(12.24)
June, 1973	642	(11.37)	57	(13.29)	50	(13.26)	2	(13.33)	5	(13.51)	(8.88)
July, 1973	675	(11.96)	81	(18.88)	72	(19.10)	4	(26.67)	5	(13.51)	(12.00)
August, 1973	461	(8.17)	38	(8.86)	33	(8.75)	2	(13.33)	3	(8.11)	(8.24)
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	429	(100.00)	377	(100.00)	15	(100.00)	37	(100.00)	(7.60)

indicates that MCI Concord, MCI Shirley, and Forestry are significantly
(P= $<$.001) over-represented in the difficulty category, while MCI Norfolk
is significantly (P= $<$.001) under-represented in this category. These
differences may very possibly reflect simply the varying background
characteristics of the resident population at each institution.

Analysis of the background characteristics of furloughees who encountered
no difficulty and those who encountered difficulty on furlough shows that
five variables are descriptive of the type of furloughee who has encountered
difficulty on furlough (all are at the .001 level of significance.) These
are: 1) offense, 2) minimum sentence, 3) months to parole eligibility,
4) age at furlough, and 5) drug use. A discussion of these follows:

OFFENSE CATEGORY

The first variable associated with outcome on furlough is offense
category (appendix viii). A comparison of the difficulty/no difficulty
dichotomy indicates that there are significantly fewer (11%) person offenders
in the difficulty category, and there are significantly more (5.9%) drug
offenders in the difficulty category.

A further breakdown by specific offense indicates that 17.8% of those
furloughees having no difficulty had been sentenced for first or second
degree murder, or manslaughter; and only 5.1 of those having difficulty had
been sentenced for these offenses. Conversely, only 4.9% of those having
no difficulty had been sentenced for drug offenses (other than sale), while
10.3 of those having difficulty had been sentenced for drug offenses.

Difficulty rates for offense categories range from a low of zero to a
high of 14.9. The highest rate of 14.9 is found in the larceny of a motor
vehicle category, but it should be noted that this category represents only
.8% of the total number of furloughs and less than 2% of the total difficulties
encountered. The next highest rate (14.3%) is found in the drug offense

TABLE V

	TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		TOTAL NUMBER OF DIFFICULTIES (NOT INCLUDING ESCAPE)		RETURNED LATE		NEW ARREST		OTHER		DIFFICULTY RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
MCI Bridgewater	184	(3.26)	5	(1.17)	4	(1.06)	0	(00.00)	1	(2.70)	(2.72)
MCI Concord	976	(17.29)	101	(23.54)	91	(24.14)	5	(33.33)	5	(13.51)	(10.35)
MCI Framingham	382	(6.77)	42	(9.79)	36	(9.55)	0	(00.00)	6	(16.22)	(11.00)
MCI Norfolk	1627	(28.82)	23	(5.36)	8	(2.12)	2	(13.33)	13	(35.14)	(1.41)
MCI Walpole	131	(2.32)	5	(1.17)	3	(.80)	0	(00.00)	2	(5.40)	(3.82)
Forestry	929	(16.46)	103	(24.01)	93	(24.67)	4	(26.67)	6	(16.22)	(11.09)
MCI Shirley	505	(8.95)	72	(16.78)	66	(17.51)	3	(20.00)	3	(8.11)	(14.26)
Boston Pre-Release	911	(16.15)	78	(18.18)	76	(20.16)	1	(6.67)	1	(2.70)	(8.56)
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	429	(100.00)	377	(100.00)	15	(100.00)	37	(100.00)	(7.60)

category. This category represents less than six percent of the total number of furloughs, but more than ten percent of the total difficulties encountered. These figures would seem to indicate that drug offenders have a disproportionate amount of difficulty conforming to the conditions of the furlough agreement.

MINIMUM SENTENCE

The second variable that is strongly related to furlough outcome is minimum sentence (appendix ix). A comparison of those serving definite and indeterminate sentences indicates that significantly more (16%) furloughees serving indeterminate sentences encountered difficulty on furlough. A comparison of those serving life or death, and those not serving life or death indicates that significantly fewer (8.3%) furloughees serving life or death sentences encountered difficulty on furlough.

A breakdown of difficulty rates suggests that the difficulty rate decreases as minimum sentence increases. These rates range from zero for both those serving a death sentence and those serving thirty to forty years to 10.5 for those serving indeterminate sentences. It should be noted, however, that minimum sentence is strongly related to the characteristics of the resident populations at each institution. For example, a large proportion of the resident populations of MCI Concord (81.1%), MCI Shirley (95.8%), MCI Framingham (86.9%) and Boston Pre-Release (92.0%), are serving indeterminate sentences, and these institutions account for 78.3% of the total number of difficulties encountered on furlough (see Table V). Additional analysis is necessary, therefore, to determine the strength of the relationship between minimum sentence and outcome on furlough.

PAROLE ELIGIBILITY

The third variable that is related to outcome on furlough is months to parole eligibility, (appendix x). A comparison of those furloughees who were beyond their original parole eligibility date and those who were not beyond their date indicates that significantly more (9.9%) of those beyond their date encountered difficulty on furlough. An additional comparison of those within twenty-four months of parole eligibility (excluding those who were beyond their date) and those who were not within twenty-four months indicates that significantly more (6.8%) of those within twenty-four months encountered difficulty on furlough.

A breakdown of difficulty rates by months to parole eligibility acts to clarify the categories having the most difficulty. Difficulty rates for these categories range from zero to 11.4. The highest rates are found in those categories having twelve or fewer months to parole eligibility (including those who were beyond their original date). It should be noted, however, that parole eligibility is also related to minimum sentence, i.e., indeterminate sentences of 2½ or 5 years have a maximum of twelve months to parole eligibility, and that the twelve months or less categories also have the higher difficulty rates. Further analysis will determine the strength of the relationship between parole eligibility date and furlough outcome.

AGE

Another variable that is related to outcome on furlough is age at the time of furlough. (appendix xi). A statistical comparison of those furloughees who were twenty-four years of age or younger, and those who were older than twenty-four, indicates that significantly more (16.4%) of the younger furloughees encountered some difficulty on furlough. Further analysis of difficulty

rates by age indicates that there is a highly significant (P= .01) inverse correlation between the two variables, i.e., as age increases, difficulty rate decreases.

DRUG HISTORY

Finally, drug use is strongly related to furlough outcome (appendix xii). The furlough population was divided on the basis of whether or not any drug involvement was mentioned in the furloughee's probation summary. Analysis of this variable indicates that significantly more (10.8%) of those furloughees who have a history of drug use encountered difficulty on furlough. Further analysis, however, failed to specify the type of drug use that is most strongly associated with difficulty. In addition, because information regarding drug use was not available for more than twenty-two percent of the furlough population, the strength of the relationship between drug use and outcome on furlough may not be reliable.

Table VI illustrates the categories of each of the above variables that are associated with high and low difficulty rates.

TABLE VI

	HIGH DIFFICULTY		LOW DIFFICULTY	
VARIABLE		RATE (%)		RATE (%)
AGE:	24 years or age or younger	10.65	Over 24 years of age	5.54
OFFENSE:	Narcotics (other than sale)	14.72	Murder, first degree Murder, second degree Manslaughter	1.71 1.45 3.36
SENTENCE:	Indeterminate	10.48	Life Death	1.56 0

MONTHS TO PAROLE ELIGIBILITY DATE:	1) Beyond Original Date
	2) Within 18 months of
	    original date
	    (not beyond)
		11.40
		
		8.78
			Not within 18 months
			  or original date
				3.64

DRUG USE:	Mention of drug use in probation
	  summary
		10.09	No mention of drug use
			  in probation summary
				5.29

PART IV

PREDICTIVE ATTRIBUTE ANALYSIS

The analysis in part III provided a profile of those variables that differentiate high and low difficulty clusters. The following analysis will provide a further breakdown of these clusters and will determine the strength of the relationship between difficulty/no difficulty and the aforementioned variables.

In order to determine the effects each of the variables in the analysis upon the difficulty/no difficulty criterion, it is necessary to hold constant the effects of all other variables. This may be done statistically with predictive attribute analysis.[1]

The furlough population was dichotomized according to the difficulty/no difficulty criterion. Escapees were excluded from the analysis, because preliminary analysis determined that there is no significant relationship between escape and having difficulty.

The first division was made on the basis of the institution from which furloughed. This is not unexpected because of the difference in both difficulty rates and population characteristics at each institution. No further division could be made on either the Bridgewater or Walpole furlough subsets.

---

[1] Predictive attribute analysis is a divisive hierarchial method of clustering individuals based on prediction of the difficulty/no difficulty criterion. All variables are dichotomized according to presence or absence of a given attribute. Analysis proceeds by repeatedly dividing groups in two. The attribute chosen for splitting is then the one which is most strongly related to the dependent variable (difficulty). The process then begins again, each subgroup being dealt with separately, until a pre-specified stopping point is reached. The stopping point of this analysis was determined by one of two conditions, a) if chi square was not significant or b) if less than two percent of the population (N=112) remained in the subset.

The MCI Norfolk and Boston Pre-Release subsets were divided on the basis of the offense for which the furloughee had been sentenced. Difficulty rates for Boston Pre-Release range from zero to 18.9%. The lowest rates are found in the "other" and manslaughter categories, the highest rate (18.9%) is found for the drug category. The latter finding is consistent with the analysis in Part III.

Difficulty rates for the MCI Norfolk furlough subset are consistently low. These rates range from zero for first degree murder and "other" offenses, to 4.9% for property offenses. It should be noted that difficulty rates for the first and second degree murder, and manslaughter categories are much lower than those for the total furlough population, and all rates are much lower than the over-all rate of difficulty (7.7%). It is not clear, however, if these rates are a function of the screening process at the institution, or a function of its resident population.

The most discriminating variable with regard to difficulty rates for the MCI Framingham subset was months to parole eligibility. In order to maximize the differentiation between categories of this variable, the subset was trichotomized; i.e., a) beyond parole eligibility; b) within twelve months of parole eligibility and c) more than twelve months to parole eligibility. The findings were consistent with those in part III. The lowest rate (2.7%) was found for those having more than twelve months to parole eligibility; the highest rate was for those who were beyond the their date (15.4%).

The MCI Shirley subset was divided on the basis of "mention of drug use in probation summary." Those with no mention of drug use had a significantly lower rate of difficulty, than those having mention of drug use. This is also consistent with the analysis of drug use for the total furlough population.

Both MCI Concord and Forestry were split on the basis of age. In the

case of both of these subsets (institution), those older than twenty-four

encountered less difficulty on furlough than those who were twenty-four or

younger. This finding coincides with the findings in the previous analysis.

In no case did minimum sentence determine the division of a subset.

This analysis indicates that minimum sentence is more strongly related to

another   independent variable rather than outcome; i.e., institution and/or

offense.

These findings are summarized in Table VII, which appears on the following

page.

TABLE VII

29.

FURLOUGH POPULATION (EXCLUDING ESCAPEES)   N=5551   DIFFICULTY RATE=7.7%

MCI Bridgewater
N=175
Difficulty Rate=2.86%

MCI Norfolk N=1603 Difficulty Rate=1.4%	Murder 1st degree	N=139	Difficulty Rate=0
	Murder 2nd degree	N=235	Difficulty Rate=.9%
	Manslaughter	N=193	Difficulty Rate=1.6%
	Armed Robbery	N=388	Difficulty Rate=3.6%
	Other Person Offenses	N=190	Difficulty Rate=4.7%
	Sex Offenses	N=149	Difficulty Rate=2.7%
	Property Offenses	N=122	Difficulty Rate=4.9%
	Drug Offenses	N=152	Difficulty Rate=3.4%
	Other Offenses	N=23	Difficulty Rate=0%

MCI Framingham N=374 Difficulty Rate=11.2%	Beyond Original Parole Eligibility	N=227	Difficulty Rate=15.4%
	Within 12 months to Parole Eligibility	N=111	Difficulty Rate=5.4%
	Greater than 12 months to Parole Eligibility	N=36	Difficulty Rate=2.7%

Boston Pre-Release Center N=906 Difficulty Rate=8.6%	Murder 2nd degree	N=9	Difficulty Rate=11.1%
	Manslaughter	N=106	Difficulty Rate=4.7%
	Armed Robbery	N=212	Difficulty Rate=10.4%
	Other Person Offenses	N=166	Difficulty Rate=7.9%
	Sex Offenses	N=38	Difficulty Rate=13.2%
	Property Offenses	N=226	Difficulty Rate=4.2%
	Drug Offenses	N=122	Difficulty Rate=16.9%
	Other Offenses	N=8	Difficulty Rate=0
	Not Available	N=19	

| MCI Shirley
N=500
Difficulty Rate=14.4% | No Drug Use * | N=329 | Difficulty Rate=11.2% |
| | Drug Use * | N=171 | Difficulty Rate=20.5% |

| MCI Concord
N=947
Difficulty Rate=10.7% | 24 or Younger | N=640 | Difficulty Rate=12.2% |
| | Older than 24 | N=307 | Difficulty Rate=7.4% |

MCI Walpole
N=131
Difficulty Rate=3.8%

| Forestry
N=918
Difficulty Rate=11.2% | 24 or Younger | N=673 | Difficulty Rate=15.9% |
| | Older than 24 | N=245 | Difficulty Rate=9.5% |

S U M M A R Y

Although the influence of furloughs on post-release adjustment cannot
be measured at this time, the Massachusetts furlough experience has been a
positive one.

From November 6, 1972 through August 31, 1973, 5645 furloughs were
granted in Massachusetts. The program has provided 1943 individuals with an
average of 2.9 furloughs. Only 94 furloughees failed to return and were
declared escapees, and those furloughees who encountered difficulty accounted
for less than eight percent of the total furloughs granted.

A thorough analysis of the characteristics of escapees could not be
completed because of the exceedingly small proportion of furloughees in this
category (1.7%) and initial analysis failed to yield any significant associa-
tion between escape and any background characteristics, or program variables.

Initial analysis of the difficulty/no difficulty dichotomy indicates
that five variables are predictive of furlough outcome. These are: 1) offense,
2) minimum sentence, 3)months to parole eligibility, 4) age at furlough, and
5) drug use. Further analysis, however, indicates that the effect of minimum
sentence on outcome "washed out" when controlling for the effect of offense.

Finally, a predictive attribute analysis provides an expected difficulty
rate for the furlough population by institution. This analysis may be help-
ful as an aid in decision-making, but it should be noted that 87.9% of the
total number of difficulties encountered were "returning late from furlough."

The trend toward community-based corrections requires a system of programs
of graduated release. A furlough program is an indispensable component of
such a system. This analysis has described the Massachusetts furlough experience
in the first ten months of the program. The trend during this period has been

toward a highly successful program, i.e., a success rate of 98.3%, but further
analysis is necessary to assess the effects of furloughs on post-release
adjustment. The data presented here suggests that the furloughs can become
an integral part of the Massachusetts Community Rehabilitation System with-
out major problems or tragedy, and that furloughs may provide an important
tool for the reintegration of the offender into the communtiy.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX 1

FURLOUGH PROGRAM EXPERIENCE BY OFFENSE

	RESIDENT POPULATION (JANUARY 1, 1973		INDIVIDUALS FURLOUGHED		TOTAL FURLOUGHS GRANTED		NO. OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
OFFENSES VS PERSON									
Murder 1	110	(5.6)	47	(2.7)	175	(3.1)	1	(1.1)	(.6)
Murder 2	146	(7.4)	106	(6.1)	345	(6.1)	1	(1.1)	(.3)
Manslaughter	137	(7.0)	113	(6.5)	416	(7.4)	3	(3.2)	(.7)
Armed Robbery	442	(22.4)	392	(22.5)	1347	(23.9)	32	(34.0)	(2.4)
Other	273	(13.9)	242	(13.8)	786	(13.9)	19	(20.2)	(2.3)
TOTAL	1108	(56.2)	900	(51.5)	3069	(54.4)	56	(59.6)	(1.8)
SEX OFFENSES									
Rape	83	(4.2)	59	(3.4)	157	(2.8)	1	(1.1)	(.6)
Assualt to Rape	31	(1.6)	25	(1.4)	52	(.9)	1	(1.1)	(1.9)
Other	51	(2.6)	6	(.3)	15	(.3)	0	(00.0)	(0.0)
TOTAL	165	(8.4)	90	(5.2)	224	(4.0)	2	(2.1)	(.9)
PROPERTY OFFENSES									
Burglary	140	(7.1)	146	(8.4)	520	(9.2)	7	(7.4)	(1.3)
Larceny of M.V.	20	(1.0)	19	(1.1)	47	(.8)	3	(3.2)	(6.4)
Other	125	(6.3)	120	(6.9)	448	(7.9)	10	(10.6)	(2.2)
TOTAL	285	(14.5)	285	(16.3)	1015	(18.0)	20	(21.3)	(2.0)
NARCOTIC OFFENSES									
Drugs	84	(4.3)	89	(5.1)	299	(5.3)	5	(5.3)	(1.7)
Sale of Heroin	105	(5.3)	109	(6.2)	452	(8.0)	4	(4.3)	(.9)
Sale of Narcotic Drug	20	(1.0)	31	(1.8)	114	(2.0)	0	(00.0)	(0.0)
TOTAL	209	(10.6)	229	(13.1)	865	(15.3)	9	(9.6)	(1.0)
OTHER OFFENSES									
Escape	18	(.9)	12	(.7)	28	(.5)	1	(1.0)	(3.6)
Weapons	21	(1.1)	17	(1.0)	40	(.7)	0	(00.0)	(0.0)
Other	17	(.9)	16	(.9)	37	(.7)	1	(1.0)	(2.7)
TOTAL	56	(2.8)	45	(2.6)	105	(1.9)	2	(2.1)	(1.9)
Not Available	147	(7.5)	198	(11.3)	367	(6.5)	5	(5.3)	(1.4)
TOTALS	1970	(100.0)	1747	(100.0)	5645	(100.0)	94	(100.0)	(1.7)

APPENDIX ii

FURLOUGH PROGRAM EXPERIENCE BY MINIMUM SENTENCE

	RESIDENT POPULATION		TOTAL FURLOUGHS GRANTED		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Indeterminate	566	(28.73)	2176	(38.55)	46	(48.94)	(2.11)
1-5 Years	540	(27.41)	1368	(24.23)	17	(18.08)	(1.24)
6-10 Years	382	(19.40)	819	(14.51)	16	(17.02)	(1.95)
11-14 Years	77	(3.91)	166	(2.94)	2	(2.13)	(1.20)
15-19 Years	86	(4.36)	158	(2.80)	4	(4.26)	(2.53)
20-29 Years	31	(1.57)	59	(1.04)	1	(1.06)	(1.70)
30-40 Years	8	(.41)	6	(.11)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
LIFE	248	(12.59)	513	(9.09)	2	(2.13)	(.39)
DEATH	32	(1.62)	17	(.30)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
Not Available	0	(00.00)	363	(6.43)	6	(6.38)	(1.65)
TOTAL	1970	(100.00)	5645	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	(1.66)

APPENDIX 111

INSTITUTIONAL FURLOUGH EXPERIENCE BY MINIMUM SENTENCE

SENTENCE	WALPOLE N	%	NORFOLK N	%	FORESTRY N	%	CONCORD N	%	SHIRLEY N	%	BOSTON PRE-RELEASE N	%	FRAMINGHAM N	%	BRIDGEWATER N	%	TOTAL N	%
Indeterminate	6	(4.58)	76	(4.67)	131	(14.10)	705	(72.23)	473	(93.66)	521	(57.19)	230	(60.21)	34	(18.48)	2176	(38.55
1-5 Years	36	(27.48)	465	(28.58)	475	(51.13)	79	(8.09)	6	(1.19)	237	(26.02)	39	(10.21)	30	(16.30)	1367	(24.22
6-10 Years	34	(25.95)	407	(25.02)	236	(25.40)	23	(2.36)	0	(00.00)	86	(9.44)	17	(4.45)	15	(8.15)	818	(14.49
11-14 Years	10	(7.63)	112	(6.88)	10	(1.08)	12	(1.23)	0	(00.00)	7	(.77)	12	(3.14)	3	(1.63)	166	(2.94
15-19 Years	10	(7.63)	105	(6.45)	11	(1.18)	2	(.20)	0	(00.00)	27	(2.96)	0	(00.00)	3	(1.63)	158	(2.80
20-29 Years	4	(3.05)	47	(2.89)	6	(.65)	1	(.10)	0	(00.00)	0	(00.00)	0	(00.00)	1	(.54)	59	(1.04
30-40 Years	0	(00.00)	5	(.31)	0	(00.00)	1	(.10)	0	(00.00)	0	(00.00)	0	(00.00)	0	(00.00)	6	(.11
LIFE	31	(23.67)	360	(22.13)	26	(2.80)	48	(4.92)	4	(.79)	9	(.98)	34	(8.90)	1	(.54)	513	(9.09
DEATH	0	(00.00)	15	(.92)	2	(.22)	0	(00.00)	0	(00.00)	0	(00.00)	0	(00.00)	0	(00.00)	17	(.30
Not Available	0	(00.00)	35	(2.15)	32	(3.44)	105	(10.76)	22	(4.36)	24	(2.63)	50	(13.09)	97	(52.72)	365	(6.47)
TOTAL	131	(100.00)	1627	(100.00)	929	(100.00)	976	(100.00)	505	(100.00)	911	(100.00)	382	(100.00)	184	(100.00)	5645	(100.00)

APPENDIX iv

FURLOUGH PROGRAM EXPERIENCE BY AGE AT FURLOUGH

AGE AT FURLOUGH	RESIDENT POPULATION		TOTAL FURLOUGHS GRANTED		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
16-19 Years	106	(5.38)	371	(6.57)	9	(9.57)	(2.43)
20-24 Years	564	(28.63)	1732	(30.68)	34	(36.17)	(1.96)
25-29 Years	485	(24.62)	1234	(21.86)	22	(23.40)	(1.78)
30-34 Years	351	(17.82)	890	(15.77)	12	(12.77)	(1.35)
35-39 Years	142	(7.21)	365	(6.47)	5	(5.32)	(1.37)
40-44 Years	108	(5.48)	306	(5.42)	4	(4.26)	(1.31)
45-49 Years	70	(3.55)	194	(3.44)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
50 or Older	80	(4.06)	187	(3.31)	3	(3.19)	(1.60)
Not Available	64	(3.25)	366	(6.48)	5	(5.32)	(1.37)
TOTAL	1970	(100.00)	5645	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	(1.67)

APPENDIX v

FURLOUGH PROGRAM EXPERIENCE BY RACE

RACE	RESIDENT POPULATION		TOTAL FURLOUGHS GRANTED		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
White	1263	(64.11)	3418	(60.54)	57	(60.64)	(1.67)
Black	639	(32.44)	1847	(32.72)	30	(31.92)	(1.62)
Other	1	(.05)	1	(.02)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
Not Available	67	(3.40)	379	(6.71)	7	(7.45)	(1.85)
TOTAL	1970	(100.00)	5645	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	(1.66)

APPENDIX vi

FURLOUGH PROGRAM EXPERIENCE BY MARITAL STATUS

	RESIDENT POPULATION		TOTAL FURLOUGHS GRANTED		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
MARITAL STATUS							
Married	490	(24.87)	1544	(27.35)	33	(35.10)	(2.14)
Single	995	(50.51)	2612	(46.27)	44	(46.81)	(1.68)
Divorced	248	(12.59)	606	(10.74)	8	(8.51)	(1.32)
Widowed	45	(2.28)	121	(2.14)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
Separated	112	(5.68)	335	(5.93)	3	(3.19)	(.90)
Not Available	80	(4.06)	427	(7.56)	6	(6.38)	(1.40)
TOTALS	1970	(100.00)	5645	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	(1.66)

APPENDIX vii

FURLOUGH PROGRAM EXPEREINCE BY MONTHS TO PAROLE ELIGIBILITY

	RESIDENT POPULATION		TOTAL FURLOUGHS GRANTED		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
MONTHS TO PAROLE ELIGIBILITY							
Beyond	346	(17.5)	1026	(18.17)	20	(21.27)	(1.94)
0-6 Months	275	(14.0)	1487	(26.34)	20	(21.27)	(1.34)
7-12 Months	167	(8.5)	549	(9.72)	9	(9.57)	(1.64)
13-18 Months	132	(6.7)	322	(5.70)	3	(3.19)	(.93)
19-24 Months	87	(4.4)	165	(2.92)	4	(4.26)	(2.42)
25-48 Months	208	(10.8)	471	(8.34)	5	(5.32)	(1.06)
49-72 Months	150	(7.6)	233	(4.13)	3	(3.19)	(1.29)
Greater than 72 Mos.	239	(12.2)	147	(2.60)	3	(3.19)	(2.04)
LIFE	67	(3.4)	513	(9.09)	2	(2.13)	(.39)
DEATH	20	(1.0)	17	(.30)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
Not Available	279	(14.2)	715	(12.67)	25	(26.59)	(3.50)
TOTAL	1970	(100.00)	5645	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	(1.67)

APPENDIX viii

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY OFFENSE

	TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		TOTAL NUMBER OF NON DIFFICULTIES		DIFFICULTIES (OTHER THAN ESCAPE)		DIFFICULTY RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
OFFENSES VS PERSON							
Murder 1	175	(3.1)	171	(3.34)	3	(.70)	(1.71)
Murder 2	345	(6.1)	339	(6.62)	5	(1.17)	(1.45)
Manslaughter	416	(7.4)	399	(7.79)	14	(3.26)	(3.36)
Armed Robbery	1347	(23.9)	1212	(23.66)	103	(24.01)	(7.65)
Other	786	(13.9)	703	(13.72)	64	(14.92)	(8.14)
TOTAL	3069	(54.4)	2824	(55.14)	189	(44.06)	(6.16)
SEX OFFENSES							
Rape	157	(2.8)	148	(2.89)	8	(1.86)	(5.10)
Assault to Rape	52	(.9)	49	(.96)	2	(.47)	(3.85)
Other	15	(.3)	15	(.29)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
TOTAL	224	(4.0)	212	(4.14)	10	(2.33)	(4.46)
PROPERTY OFFENSES							
Burglary	520	(9.2)	472	(9.22)	41	(9.56)	(7.88)
Larceny of M.V.	47	(.8)	37	(.72)	7	(1.63)	(14.89)
Other	448	(7.9)	394	(7.69)	44	(10.26)	(9.82)
TOTAL	1015	(18.0)	903	(17.63)	92	(21.46)	(9.06)
NARCOTIC OFFENSES							
Drugs	299	(5.3)	250	(4.88)	44	(10.26)	(14.72)
Sale of Heroin	452	(8.0)	404	(7.89)	44	(10.26)	(9.73)
Sale of Narcotic Drugs	114	(2.0)	100	(1.95)	14	(3.26)	(12.28)
TOTAL	865	(15.3)	754	(14.72)	102	(23.78)	(11.79)
OTHER OFFENSES							
Escape	28	(.5)	26	(.51)	1	(.23)	(3.57)
Weapons	40	(.7)	36	(.70)	4	(.93)	(10.00)
Other	37	(.7)	33	(.64)	3	(.70)	(8.11)
TOTAL	105	(1.9)	95	(1.85)	8	(1.86)	(7.62)
Not Available	367	(6.5)	334	(6.52)	28	(6.53)	(7.62)
TOTAL	5645	(100.0)	5122	(100.00)	429	(100.00)	(7.60)

APPENDIX ix

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY MINIMUM SENTENCE

	TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		TOTAL NUMBER OF NON DIFFICULTIES		DIFFICULTY		DIFFICULTY RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Indeterminate	2176	(38.55)	1902	(37.13)	228	(53.15)	(10.48)
1-5 Years	1368	(24.23)	1238	(24.17)	113	(26.34)	(8.26)
6-10 Years	819	(14.51)	761	(14.86)	42	(9.79)	(5.13)
11-14 Years	166	(2.94)	160	(3.12)	4	(.93)	(2.41)
15-19 Years	158	(2.80)	150	(2.93)	4	(.93)	(2.53)
20-29 Years	59	(1.04)	56	(1.09)	2	(.47)	(3.39)
30-40 Years	6	(.11)	6	(.12)	0	(00.00)	(00.00)
LIFE	513	(9.09)	503	(9.82)	8	(1.86)	(1.56)
DEATH	17	(.30)	17	(.33)	0	(00.00)	(00.00)
Not Available	363	(6.43)	329	(6.42)	28	(6.53)	(7.71)
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	5122	(100.00)	429	(100.00)	(7.60)

APPENDIX x

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY MONTHS TO PAROLE ELIGIBILITY

MONTHS TO PAROLE ELIGIBILITY	TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		TOTAL NUMBER OF NON DIFFICULTIES		DIFFICULTY		DIFFICULTY RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Beyond	1026	(18.17)	889	(17.36)	117	(27.27)	(11.40)
0-6 Months	1487	(26.34)	1324	(25.85)	143	(33.33)	(9.62)
7-12 Months	549	(9.72)	494	(9.64)	46	(10.72)	(8.38)
13-18 Months	322	(5.70)	301	(5.88)	18	(4.20)	(5.59)
19-24 Months	165	(2.92)	149	(2.91)	12	(2.80)	(7.27)
25-48 Months	471	(8.34)	452	(8.82)	14	(3.26)	(2.97)
49-72 Months	233	(4.13)	224	(4.37)	6	(1.40)	(2.58)
Greater than 72	147	(2.60)	138	(2.69)	5	(1.17)	(3.40)
LIFE	513	(9.09)	503	(9.82)	8	(1.86)	(1.56)
DEATH	17	(.30)	17	(.33)	0	(00.00)	(00.00)
Not Available	715	(12.67)	631	(12.32)	60	(13.99)	(8.39)
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	5122	(100.00)	429	(100.00)	(7.60)

APPENDIX xi

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY AGE AT FURLOUGH

AGE AT FURLOUGH	TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		TOTAL NUMBER OF NON DIFFICULTIES		DIFFICULTY		DIFFICULTY RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
16-19 Years	371	(6.57)	313	(6.11)	49	(11.42)	(13.21)
20-24 Years	1732	(30.68)	1523	(29.73)	175	(40.79)	(10.10)
25-29 Years	1234	(21.86)	1126	(21.98)	86	(20.05)	(6.97)
30-34 Years	890	(15.77)	820	(16.01)	58	(13.52)	(6.52)
35-39 Years	365	(6.47)	348	(6.79)	12	(2.80)	(3.29)
40-44 Years	306	(5.42)	289	(5.64)	13	(3.03)	(4.25)
45-49 Years	194	(3.44)	191	(3.73)	3	(.70)	(1.55)
50 or Older	187	(3.31)	180	(3.51)	4	(.93)	(2.14)
Not Available	366	(6.48)	332	(6.48)	29	(6.76)	(7.92)
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	5122	(100.00)	429	(100.00)	(7.60)

APPENDIX xii

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY DRUG USE *

	TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		TOTAL NUMBER OF NON DIFFICULTIES		DIFFICULTY		DIFFICULTY RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
No Mention of Drug Use	2645	(46.86)	2469	(48.20)	140	(32.63)	(5.29)
Mention of Drug Use	1704	(30.19)	1499	(29.27)	172	(40.09)	(10.09)
Not Available	1296	(22.96)	1154	(22.53)	117	(27.27)	(9.03)
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	5122	(100.00)	429	(100.00)	(7.60)

* Mention of drug use in probation summary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Glaser, Daniel, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Inc., 1964)

2. Holt, Norman and Donald Miller. "Explorations in Inmate-Family Relationships." Research Report No. 46. Sacramento, California, January 1972.

3. Markley, Carson W., "Furlough Programs and Conjugal Visiting in Adult Correctional Institutions." Federal Probation, March, 1973. pp 19-26.

4. Ohlin, Lloyd E., "The Stability and Validity of Parole Experience Tables" University of Chicago, 1954.

5. Reed, Amos E., Administrator, "Temporary Leaves for Felony Inmates: Oregon's Experience." February 1, 1972. Salem, Oregon. p. 6.

6. Smith, Robert R. and Michael A. Milan. "A Survey of the Home Furlough Policies of American Correctional Agencies." (Elmore, Alabama: Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections, Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1972) 12 pp.

END