

WORK AND EDUCATION RELEASE IN CONNECTICUT
AN ANALYSIS OF POST RELEASE EFFECTS ON INMATE PARTICIPANTS

BY
GERALD F. STOWELL

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

RESEARCH SECTION

AND

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS

CORRECTIONS PROGRAM

APRIL 15, 1974

CDC # 74-04

19605-C.5

LOAN

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the post release effects of the Connecticut Work and Education Release Program on participants in terms of (1) reducing the rate of return to the Connecticut Correctional System, (2) increasing the number of days free from arrest, (3) reducing the number of subsequent offenses, and (4) reducing the seriousness of subsequent offenses. The post release experience of a random sample of work release participants was compared to the post release experience of a random sample of non-participants. It was found that there was a slight, but non-significant advantage for work release in terms of reducing the rate of return to the Connecticut Correctional System, reducing the number of subsequent offenses, and reducing the seriousness of subsequent offenses. Work release was differentially effective in terms of increasing the number of days free from arrest. That is, there was a significant advantage for work release only for those individuals who prior to incarceration were unemployed, claimed no skill or trade, and were incarcerated for periods of six months or less. It was suggested that certain changes in selection policy of the work release program might improve the rehabilitative efficacy of the program.

INTRODUCTION

The Connecticut Department of Corrections initiated a work and education release program (hereafter referred to as work-release) on January 1, 1969 as a device to improve the prospects for the rehabilitation of offenders in the Connecticut Correctional System. The Connecticut Department of Corrections Annual Report for 1973 describes the typical work-release situation where

"...the participant is employed or attends school during the day and returns to the institution at night. He lives in a special unit at one of the community correctional centers designed both to segregate him from the non-participating inmates and to afford him a greater measure of freedom in the conduct of his non working hours. During hours in the work-release facility the participants are both supervised and counseled by specially trained community release counselors." ¹

Since its inception, the work-release program in Connecticut has expanded from 119 persons served in its first year of operation to the point where in fiscal year 1972-73, 429 individuals had an opportunity to participate in the program. The low percentage of participants removed from the program for "cause" during the 72-73 period (15%) and the very low escape rate (02%) gives some indication of operational success for the program and of the effectiveness of the program selection committee in accepting only the "good risks" into the program. ² The purpose of this study however, was to investigate beyond the operational success of work-release in Connecticut and examine the programs post release effects on participants in terms of; (1) reducing their rate of return to the Connecticut Corrections System, (2) increasing the number of days free from arrest, (3) reducing the percentage of time incarcerated following release, (4) reducing the number of subsequent offenses, and (5) reducing the seriousness of subsequent offenses following release. ³

DESIGN AND METHOD

The investigation was carried out through the use of a quasi-experimental design wherein the post release experience of 100 work-release participants was compared to the experience of a control group of 100 non-participants. The study was done ex post facto, using a post release follow up period of 15-24 months. ⁴ The work-release participants were randomly selected from the case records of 299 individuals who took part in the program in fiscal year 1971-72. The 100 non-participants or control group, were randomly selected by computer from all non work-release individuals released from Connecticut Corrections custody in fiscal year 1971-72.

For a comparison of post release performances of the work-release and non work-release samples to be appropriate, the work-release sample had to be generally similar to the non work-release sample. Work-release subjects were therefore compared with non work-release subjects across each of 18 separate variables.⁵ Sample comparability was tested by the computation of measures of central tendency for each of the 18 analytical variables across both samples.⁶

For half of the analytical variables (9), the measure of central tendency was very similar across both samples. However, the other half of the variables measured were found to differ between samples, and these differences were statistically significant. These differences may be explained at least in part by the selection criteria used to determine acceptance into the Connecticut work-release program (see appendix A). A listing of the nine variables where statistically significant differences were found follows.

1. Age: Work-release participants as a group were somewhat older than non participants. The mean age of the work-release sample was 28.4 years as opposed to 26.16 years for the non work-release sample ($p < .05$).

2. Race-Ethnicity: The work-release sample contained significantly more whites than did the non work-release sample ($p < .01$). The work-release sample was 66% white while the non work-release sample was only 43% white.

3. Marital Status: There were significantly more married men in the work-release sample than in the non work-release sample ($p < .01$). Forty-three percent of the work-release subjects were married compared to 23% for the non work-release sample.

4. Area of Residence: The work release sample had significantly fewer individuals who resided in Bridgeport, Danbury, or Hartford, and more who resided in New London and Torrington ($p < .05$).

5. Usual Occupation: There were more work-release participants who were employed as service workers prior to their current offense, and fewer as laborers ($p < .05$).

6. Offense: There were more burglary/B & E, and non support offenders in the work-release sample, and fewer cases of breach of peace, narcotics violations and sex offenders ($p < .05$).

7. Time Served: Individuals in the work-release sample had served more time on the average for their current offenses than non work-release subjects ($p < .05$). Time served was computed by subtracting the date of initial incarceration for the current offense from the date of discharge or release to parole. Work-release individuals served a mean average of 358 days while the mean time served for non work-release individuals was 272 days.⁷

8. Skill or Trade Claimed: More individuals in the work release sample claimed a skill or trade ($p < .01$). Forty-seven percent of the work-release sample claimed a skill or trade compared to 13% for the non work-release sample.

9. Drug History: Work-release individuals were less likely to have a history of drug use ($p < .05$). Sixty-six percent of the work release subjects had no history of drug use while 45% of non work-release subjects had no history of drug use.

In summary, participants in the work-release program when compared to non work-release subjects are older, more likely to be white, are more likely to be married, show some differences in area of residence and employment patterns, and tend to have committed different criminal offenses. In addition, the work-release individuals served more time, had more skills, and less incidence of drug use than did non work-release subjects. (See appendix B for a comparison of work-release to non work-release subjects on all 18 variables measured.)

Since the work-release sample differed significantly from the non work-release sample on fully half of the 18 variables measured, it was decided that a simple comparison of the two groups in terms of post release experience was not appropriate. Instead, it was necessary to use a multi-variate analysis technique where by each of the nine variables discussed were controlled in turn, while the post release performances of the two groups were analyzed.⁸

FINDINGS

The overall impact of the work-release program was as follows. The analysis showed no significant difference between work-release and non work-release participants under any conditions in terms of rate of return to the Connecticut Correctional System. Rate of return is based on all individuals who during the follow up period were incarcerated for one day or more in accused or sentenced status or who were lost to contact with the Department of Corrections, with resulting warrant for parole violation outstanding. A simple comparison of the work-release and non work-release groups with no controls for other possibly relevant variables showed that the work-release group did slightly better, (28% rate of return as opposed to 33%). However, this difference was not statistically significant, and even disappeared under certain control conditions. Similar results were obtained in the categories of percentage of time incarcerated following release, number of subsequent offenses, and the seriousness of subsequent offenses. In these categories, a slight but non significant advantage was found for work-release participants which disappeared under certain control conditions (see table I).

TABLE I

POST RELEASE PERFORMANCES OF WORK-RELEASE AND
NON WORK-RELEASE GROUPS OF FIVE VARIABLES

VARIABLE	WORK-RELEASE GROUP	NON WORK-RELEASE GROUP
RATE OF RETURN	28%	33%
% OF TIME INCARCERATED POST RELEASE (RECIDIVISTS ONLY).	$\bar{x} = 20.3\%$	$\bar{x} = 29.3\%$
# OF SUBSEQUENT OFFENSES	$\bar{x} = .41$	$\bar{x} = .49$
SERIOUSNESS OF SUBSEQUENT OFFENSES.	50% FELONIES 50% MISDEMEANORS OF PAROLE VIOLATIONS.	55.6% FELONIES 44.4% MISDEMEANORS OR PAROLE VIOLATIONS.
* # OF DAYS FREE FROM ARREST, POST-RELEASE (RECIDIVISTS ONLY)	$\bar{x} = 267.9$ DAYS	$\bar{x} = 132.1$ DAYS
* (t = 19.75, p .001)		

There remains one category of post release experience where a statistically significant advantage was found for the work-release participants. As previously mentioned, there was only a slight difference between work-release and non work-release subjects in the rate of return to the correctional system. However, an examination of the data of only those individuals who had returned to the system showed that work-release recidivists stayed free from arrest much longer than non work-release recidivists. The mean number of days that recidivists in the work-release group stayed free from arrest was 268 as compared to 132 days for non work-release recidivists (p<.01).⁸ This represents a difference of 4.5 months. There was a differential impact in this area however. That is, under certain conditions individuals were particularly helped by participation in the work-release program, while under other conditions they were not helped at all. Conditions under which subjects were helped were, where they had served six months or less for their last offense, had been unemployed prior to incarceration, and had claimed no skill or trade prior to incarceration.

When individuals were incarcerated for a period of six months or less, only 20% of the work-release participants who committed new offenses or violated parole did so within six months after release. More than 80% of the non work-release recidivists committed new offenses or violated parole within six months after release (see table II).⁹

TABLE II

TIME FREE FROM ARREST FOR WORK-RELEASE AND
NON WORK-RELEASE RECIDIVISTS PREVIOUSLY INCARCERATED FOR SHORT TERMS¹⁰

TIME FREE FROM ARREST	WORK-RELEASE RECIDIVISTS	NON WORK-RELEASE RECIDIVISTS
6 Mo. or less	20% (n=2)	82.4% (n=14)
More than 6 mo.	80% (n=8)	17.6% (n=3)

($\chi^2 = 10.15, 2df, p=.006$)

Among those work-release participants who were unemployed prior to incarceration, 16 were rearrested or violated parole. Of this number, less than a third were rearrested or violated parole within six months of release. Of the 26 non work-release recidivists who were unemployed prior to incarceration, more than two thirds were rearrested or violated parole within six months after release (see table III).

TABLE III

TIME FREE FROM ARREST FOR PREVIOUSLY UNEMPLOYED WORK-RELEASE AND
NON WORK-RELEASE RECIDIVISTS

TIME FREE FROM ARREST	WORK-RELEASE RECIDIVISTS	NON WORK-RELEASE RECIDIVISTS
6 Mo. or less	31.3% (n=5)	69.2% (n=18)
More than 6 mo.	68.7% (n=11)	30.8% (n=8)

($\chi^2 = 5.89, 2df, p=.053$)

Of the work-release recidivists who had claimed no prior skill or trade, less than one third were rearrested or violated parole within six months after release. Of the non work-release recidivists who had claimed no prior skill or trade, more than two thirds were rearrested or violated parole within six months after release (see table IV).

TABLE IV

TIME FREE FROM ARREST FOR UNSKILLED WORK-RELEASE AND

NON WORK-RELEASE RECIDIVISTS

<u>TIME FREE FROM ARREST</u>	<u>WORK-RELEASE RECIDIVISTS</u>	<u>NON WORK-RELEASE RECIDIVISTS</u>
6 Mo. or less	31.3% (n=5)	70% (n=21)
More More than 6 mo.	68.7% (n=11)	30% (n=9)

$(x^2 = 6.47, 2df, p=.039)$

Work-release seemed to make no difference in time free from arrest when subjects were incarcerated for more than six months, had a record of full employment before incarceration, or had claimed some skill or trade prior to incarceration.

There were two conditions under which the work-release experience seemed to have a slightly negative impact. That is, the rate of return to the Connecticut Correctional System was greater for work-release participants. Where individuals had been employed full time prior to confinement, the rate of return for work-release participants was 12% greater than for non participants. Also, where an individuals current offense was burglary or B & E, the work-release rate of return was 19% greater than non participants. Neither of these differences was statistically significant however.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study may be questioned because of sampling technique, the ex post facto nature of the design, and the limited number of variables examined in determining sample comparability. It is doubtful however, that concern for public safety and possible adverse publicity would permit the ideal sampling condition where individuals would be randomly assigned to the work-release program and control groups.

Some of the problems encountered in gathering data on subjects who had been out of the Connecticut Correctional System for more than a year might have been avoided if subjects had been observed from the time of their release, and the results of this study would be more reliable. Time limitations however, precluded anything but an ex post facto design in this instance.

The small number of variables examined to determine sample comparability was a function again of time limitations, in addition to records keeping practices throughout the state. The variables measured represent those areas in which some effort has been made to record information in a uniform manner. It might have been better to look at other variables, but this would have meant extensive digging through various files in a number of institutions; a time consuming and costly affair. I am hopeful that information gathering for future research in the Connecticut Department of Correction will be aided by the greater use of computer assisted information retrieval systems, and by the project now underway ("Project Single File") whereby inmates will retain the same identifying number, irrespective of how many times they transfer from facility to facility and community programs or enter and leave the system.

The LEAA arm of the U.S. Department of Justice has recently sponsored the publication of a work-release manual which points out that there is only a small amount of competent research and evaluation which has been completed on work-release programs.¹¹ These few reports do lend some support to the results of this study however, in that their results were similar. That is, little convincing evidence was produced to indicate that work-release as presently practiced, could guarantee most rehabilitation objectives. Reports from the District of Columbia Department of Correction,¹² Massachusetts corrections,¹³ and the Federal Bureau of Prisons¹⁴ show no advantage for work-release in terms of reducing recidivism.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons report is especially interesting to compare with this study. The federal report compared individuals who completed work-release successfully to an equivalent number of individuals who were admitted to the work-release program, but who were terminated as in program failures. It was found that the rearrest rates of successes and failures on work-release were not significantly different. It did show however that the work-release success group stayed free from arrest an average of six months longer than those who failed on work-release. The findings of this study, comparing work-release participants to non participants were almost identical, with the exception that Connecticut work-release individuals stayed free from arrest an average of 4.5 months longer than non work-release individuals, whereas the experience was six months in the federal study.¹⁵ This is a significant finding in a practical as well as a statistical sense. When an individual can remain free from arrest for an additional six months, or even 4.5 months as was the case in this study, there are human and financial benefits for both the ex-inmate and the public.

Perhaps it should be noted again at this point that work-release in Connecticut seemed to be differentially effective. That is, it helped only individuals with certain characteristics to remain free from arrest

longer. Two types that the Connecticut work-release experience seemed to help were those who had been unemployed prior to incarceration and who had claimed no skills prior to incarceration. Interestingly enough however, these two types were under represented in the work-release sample. The evidence in this study indicates that the program might do better to afford easier acceptance for those who have a history of unemployment and no marketable skills.

The other limitation that showed up was that work-release seemed to help only those who had been incarcerated for six months or less. There are at least two possible explanations for this. (1) There is the possibility, as many writers in criminology and corrections claim, that incarceration is an inherently destructive process. Perhaps work-release cannot help those who have been incarcerated for more than six months because the destruction beyond that point is too great for any program to be of real help. (2) An alternative explanation would be that those who are incarcerated for less than six months are "better risks" to begin with, and may naturally be expected to do better. This may be the more viable explanation in this case since work-release selection guidelines do tend to promote acceptance of only the "better risks". In any event, it would probably be helpful to continue to encourage easier acceptance into the program for those who have been incarcerated for six months or less.

Perhaps it is unfair to evaluate work-release solely on its rehabilitative merits, for although work-release is promoted as a rehabilitative program, Lawrence Root has pointed out that institutional concerns, not rehabilitative criteria usually determine eligibility for work-release.¹⁶ Consequently, some of the lack of rehabilitative success for work-release programs may be attributed to conflict between institutional and rehabilitative goals.

There is possible credit to be given to work-release programs for assisting in the accomplishment of goals other than rehabilitation. The response to questionnaires sent out as part of this investigation was small, but this small return did show that inmates were for the most part, very much in favor of maintaining or even expanding the work-release program. It could be surmised from this that the availability of programs such as work-release serve as an escape valve for tensions in institutional settings. Thus, the elimination of popular programs such as work-release simply because they do not reduce recidivism could be a mistake due to the possibility of increased institutional tension.

Another non-rehabilitative benefit of work-release is that it provides a more humane, and sometimes cheaper alternative to incarceration, regardless of its rehabilitative effects or lack of them. One of the major reasons for work-release's attractiveness is the financial benefits which it promises. The LEAA manual on work-release points out however, that many of the costs of work-release are indirect and difficult to isolate and describe. The manual shows that unless work-releasees are required to contribute to their own support while incarcerated, the additional facilities and personnel required for work-release may make the program more expensive than simple incarceration. In Connecticut, work-release probably does save money in that participants are required to contribute toward the cost of their confinement.

The results of this study constitute neither grounds for condemnation or unqualified support of work-release above other correctional programs intended to rehabilitate. Rather, these results would seem to indicate that work-release may be of some limited use to certain individuals who are confined in total institutions, but it is not a panacea for our correctional ills. Indeed, there is little evidence that any attempts at rehabilitation have had any far reaching effects on the reduction of crime. Work-release and programs like it are perhaps, from a humanitarian perspective at least, a step in the right direction, but there is little evidence to show that such programs provide an adequate response to most correctional problems.

NOTES

1. Connecticut Department of Corrections. Annual Report (Hartford, 1973) p. 21.

2. Connecticut work-release failure rates compared favorably with rates in California, the District of Columbia, Florida, Massachusetts, Minnesota, South Dakota, Texas and Wisconsin. Some failure rates were as high as 39% for in program failures and 8% for absconders. This is by no means a comprehensive analysis of work-release failure rates, but it does indicate that Connecticut is not among those states that have the highest failure rates. Before we begin to celebrate the superiority of the Connecticut work-release program however, we should note that Connecticut is among those states that have the most stringent requirements for acceptance into the work-release program.

3. An attempt was also made to measure the effects of the program on post release employment. This was done simply by phoning some subjects and mailing out questionnaires to others wherein subjects were asked how many jobs they had since release, how long each job had lasted, and whether they had received any additional schooling or on the job training since release. Figures indicated that the work-release participants were employed a greater percentage of time than non work-release subjects, but the response rate to the phone calls and questionnaires was so low that it was not felt that these figures were reliable.

4. The length of the follow up period varied because individual subjects were released by parole or discharge on different dates during fiscal year 1971-72.

5. The eighteen variables observed were: (1) institution of incarceration, (2) age upon release, (3) race-ethnicity, (4) marital status, (5) number of dependents, (6) area of residence, (7) education claimed, (8) employment prior to confinement, (9) usual occupation prior to confinement, (10) offense, (11) time served for current offense, (12) previous jail terms in Connecticut, (13) skills or trades claimed, (14) institutional education or training, (15) history of drug use, (16) history of alcohol use, (17) psychiatric history, and (18) mode of release.

6. Differences between samples were determined to be statistically significant by comparing the measure of central tendency through the use of Z scores, a difference of means test (t-test), or chi square.

7. The figures given are somewhat deceiving. A close examination of the data showed that in spite of the higher average incarceration time for the work-release group, there were still more individuals in this group who were incarcerated for period of six months or less than there were in the non work-release group. It is apparent that a few individuals in the work-release program had especially long sentences, and this was inflating the mean time of incarceration for the entire work-release sample.

8. The data used to determine the rate of return to the Connecticut Correctional System, number of days free from arrest, percentage of time incarcerated following release, number of subsequent offenses, and seriousness of subsequent offenses were taken from computer files of the Connecticut Department of Corrections. Included in the computer file are all individuals who are incarcerated for one day or longer. Although some of the individuals may have been reconvicted; which individuals were reconvicted could not be determined by an examination of computer print outs. Time considerations did not allow for a follow up in corrections department hard files to determine which individuals were merely rearrested, and which were reconvicted.

9. The term recidivist in this study refers to any individual who is arrested and/or convicted for any new offense or parole violation or has been lost to contact with the department of corrections with a resulting warrant for parole violation outstanding.

10. Short terms refers to incarceration times of six months or less.

11. Walter H. Busher, Ordering Time to Serve Prisoners: A Manual for the Planning and Administration of Work-Release (U.S.G.P.O., 1973) p. Xll.

12. Stuart Adams and Joseph B. Dellinger, In-Program and Post-Release Performance of Work-Release Inmates: A Preliminary Assessment of the Work-Release Program (D.C. Department of Corrections, 1969) p. 16-18.

13. Daniel P. LeClair, An Evaluation of the Impact of the MCI-Concord Day Work Program (Massachusetts Department of Corrections, 1972) p. 11 and 15.

14. Kitchener and Lebowitz, Preliminary Highlights from Work-Release Follow-up Study (Bureau of Prisons, 1970) p.2-3.

15. Ibid.

16. Lawrence S. Root "State Work-Release Programs. An Analysis of Operational Policies" Federal Probation, v. 37 no. 4 Dec., 1973 p. 52.

APPENDIX A

According to the latest Connecticut Department of Correction Directives, Connecticut work-release guidelines for selection are as follows:

1. Application: Any inmate wishing to be considered for any sub-division of the community release program must apply through his institutional counselor on the prescribed form. Inmates applying for the various sub-divisions of the program will be considered if they meet the following requirements:

- a. Must have a financial, vocational, or educational need.
- b. Must be considered to be normally qualified for minimum custody status.
- c. Must be within one year of parole eligibility or release date.
- d. Must not have a history of serious emotional or psychiatric disorder.
- *e. Must not have a serious background of violent or assaultive behavior.
- *f. Must not have been convicted of a sex crime involving minors or the use of force.
- *g. If involved in the use of hard narcotics, i.e. heroin, cocaine, and individual would only be accepted for a community release program if he is involved in a drug treatment modality while in community release.

*Inmates who have unquestionably demonstrated their trustworthiness by a long record of stability may be considered for community release in some of the above cases, but this must be approved directly by the deputy commissioner of community services.

The warden or superintendent will cause the application to be screened by the classification committee. If the applicant is not eligible under the criteria established above, the application will be returned to the inmate. When the applicant is approved by the classification committee, the warden or superintendent will sign two copies of the application and forward them to the chief of community release. If the application is approved, one signed copy will be returned to the institution from which it originated and the inmate may then be placed, or if necessary, transferred to the facility where he will be entered into the program.

2. Custody: Community release will not be authorized for offenders identified with large scale organized criminal activity, nor for others whose presence in the community is likely to evoke adverse public reaction toward the inmate or the State of Connecticut.

3. Physical Condition: The candidate for community release shall be in good health and be physically able to perform the proposed assignments. This requirement should not preclude the use of community release as a usual opportunity to aid a physically handicapped person in obtaining community employment consistent with his capabilities.

4. Emotional and Behavioral Factors: Candidates with serious emotional or personality defects and those with serious histories of violent or assaultive behavior will be excluded. However, community release may be considered, under limited circumstances, for others who are mentally or emotionally handicapped and who are not dangerous to others, when it is apparent that community employment will significantly aid their post-release adjustment.

5. Need: Community release is not intended as a program status to be made available automatically to all who may be technically "eligible". There must be indicated need for the opportunities and responsibilities which community release provides. This is a departmental screening committee judgement to be related to the pre-release family need or other individual circumstances for which community release is particularly appropriate. Further, it must be pre-supposed that the inmate will benefit from the experience. Decisions in cases of family need, restitution, and debt payment must be based on investigation so that official records will establish the inmates responsibility and verify that the claimed need exists.

6. Residence: Preference shall be given candidates who residence is in the vicinity of the institution or for whom release plans in this vicinity are reasonable and appropriate. Although this should not exclude others, a number of factors must be weighed carefully:

- a. It can be expected that many inmates and their employers will want to continue their employment after release from the institution.
- b. No community will tolerate its becoming a "haven" for felony offenders even though they may be under supervision.
- c. There are circumstances in which sound correctional treatment involves relocating an offender from a home or community situation that is untenable or lacking in opportunity. (In this respect, caution is recommended. Experience indicates some strong ties in the now community is needed. Relocating an offender solely because he thinks its a "good idea" rarely works out, especially in cases of younger offenders.)

7. Types of Work: There need be no general restrictions on the kinds of work-release jobs for which candidates may be considered. The expectation is that the job selected will be that which best fulfills the purpose of community release in each case consistent with the fact that the employed inmate is still in custody. Good employment placement will give preference to jobs that are related to prior training, work experience, or institutional training and may be suitable for continuing post-release employment. The "breakeven" point between wages and expenses will tend to eliminate temporary, part-time and intermittent employment.

8. Duration: Placements shall be limited ordinarily to a period of approximately six months immediately preceding the probably release or parole eligibility date. Exceptions can be made when fully justified.

9. Transfers: Inmates shall be recommended for transfer to a specific community release function or facility so long as all other eligibility requirements are met.

APPENDIX B

COMPARISON OF WORK-RELEASE AND NON WORK-RELEASE GROUPSON 18 VARIABLES

1. <u>INSTITUTION OF INCARCERATION</u>	<u># FROM W-R GRP.</u>	<u># FROM NON W-R GRP.</u>
CHESHIRE	22	28
ENFIELD	23	13
SOMERS	2	6
HARTFORD	16	26
NEW HAVEN	12	9
BRIDGEPORT	5	11
MONTVILLE	10	4
LITCHFIELD	8	1
BROOKLYN	2	2
2. <u>AGE UPON RELEASE</u>	<u># FROM W-R GRP.</u>	<u># FROM NON W-R GRP.</u>
16-24 yrs.	46	58
25-34 yrs.	33	31
35 + yrs.	21	11
W-R Grp \bar{x} Age=28.4		Non W-R Grp. \bar{x} Age. = 26.16
3. <u>RACE-ETHNICITY</u>	<u># FROM W-R GRP.</u>	<u># FROM NON W-R GRP.</u>
WHITE	66	43
BLACK	27	44
PUERTO RICAN	6	13
AMER. INDIAN	1	0
4. <u>MARITAL STATUS</u>	<u># FROM W-R GRP.</u>	<u># FROM NON W-R GRP.</u>
SINGLE	43	62
MARRIED	42	23
SEPARATED	6	7
DIVORCED	7	8
WIDOWED	2	0
5. <u># OF DEPENDENTS</u>	<u>W-R GRP.</u>	<u>NON W-R GRP.</u>
	$\bar{x} = 2.4$	$\bar{x} = 1.79$

6. AREA OF RESIDENCE	# FROM W-R GRP.	# FROM NON W-R GRP.
BLOOMFIELD	0	1
BRANFORD	1	0
BRIDGEPORT	6	10
CHESHIRE	0	1
COLUMBIA	1	0
DANBURY	1	5
DAYVILLE	1	0
DERBY	1	0
EAST HTFD.	1	4
ENFIELD	0	1
GRISWOLD	0	1
HAMDEN	2	0
HARTFORD	19	31
KILLINGLY	1	0
MANCHESTER	1	1
MERIDAN	1	0
MIDDLETOWN	1	0
MILFORD	2	4
NAUGATUCK	0	1
NEW BRITAIN	2	2
NEW HAVEN	13	10
NEW LONDON	7	1
NEWTOWN	1	0
NORWALK	1	3
NORWICH	3	1
OLD SAYBROOK	2	1
PORTLAND	1	0
PUTNAM	0	1
ROCKVILLE	1	0
SEYMOUR	0	1
SOMERS	0	1
SOUTHINGTON	0	1
STAMFORD	3	5
STONINGTON	1	0
STRATFORD	0	1
TORRINGTON	6	0
TRUMBULL	2	0
WATERBURY	8	6
WATERTOWN	1	0
W. HAVEN	1	1
WETHERSFIELD	1	1
WINCHESTER	0	1
WINDSOR	1	1
WOLCOTT	1	0
NOT IN CT.	3	3

7. EDUCATION CLAIMED	W-R GRP.	NON W-R GRP.
	$\bar{x} = 9.85$ yrs.	$\bar{x} = 9.78$ yrs.

8. EMPL. PR. TO CONFINEMENT	# FROM W-R GRP.	# FROM NON W-R GRP.
EMPLOYED FULL TIME	40	31
IRREGULAR (ODD JOBS)	6	4
UNEMPLOYED	52	57
UNKNOWN	2	8

9. USUAL OCCUPATION	# FROM W-R GRP.	# FROM NON W-R GRP.
PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD WK.	3	1
SERVICE WORK	7	3
MGR., PROPRIETOR, ETC.	1	2
OPERATIVES & KINDRED	1	1
CLERICAL WORKER	3	0
LABORER	20	35
SALES WORKER	0	1
STUDENT	0	1
UNKNOWN	65	56

10. OFFENSE	# FROM W-R GRP.	# FROM NON W-R GRP.
ASSAULT	4	5
ATTEMPTED ARSON	0	1
BREACH OF PEACE	2	6
BURG. OR B & E	23	13
CARRYING DANG. WEAP.	0	1
ESCAPE	2	2
FRAUD & FORGERY	5	6
LOITERING & CRIM. TRESPASS	0	2
MANSLAUGHTER	1	0
MOTOR VEH. VIOLATIONS	4	3
NARC. OFFENSES	28	35
NON SUPPORT	13	6
RCV. STOLEN GOODS	0	1
RESISTING OFFICER	1	0
ROBBERY	6	4
ROBBERY W/VIOLENCE	2	1
SALE TO MINORS	1	0
SEX OFFENSES	2	7

11. TIME SERVED/CURRENT OFF.	W-R GRP.	NON W-R GRP.
	$\bar{x} = 357.8$ Days	$\bar{x} = 271.9$ Days

12. PRIOR JAIL TERMS IN CT.	W-R GRP.	NON W-R GRP.
	$\bar{x} = 1.6$	$\bar{x} = 2.6$

13. SKILL OR TRADE CLAIMED	# FROM W-R GRP.	# FROM NON W-R GRP.
YES	47	13
NO	45	79
UNKNOWN	8	8

14. <u>INST. EDUC. OR TRAINING</u>	<u># FROM W-R GRP.</u>	<u># FROM NON W-R GRP.</u>
YES	10	16
NO	70	72
UNKNOWN	20	12
15. <u>DRUG USE HISTORY</u>	<u># FROM W-R GRP.</u>	<u># FROM NON W-R GRP.</u>
NON USER	66	45
FORMER USER	7	7
RECENT USER	5	6
USER (IMMEDIATE PAST)	9	8
USER (NOT WITHDRAWN)	13	30
UNKNOWN	0	4
16. <u>ALCOHOL USE HISTORY</u>	<u># FROM W-R GRP.</u>	<u># FROM NON W-R GRP.</u>
NON SIGNIFICANT USER	89	85
EXCESSIVE USER	11	12
UNKNOWN	0	3
17. <u>PSYCHIATRIC HISTORY</u>	<u># FROM W-R GRP.</u>	<u># FROM NON W-R GRP.</u>
YES	2	10
NO	83	71
UNKNOWN	15	19
18. <u>MODE OF RELEASE</u>	<u># FROM W-R GRP.</u>	<u># FROM NON W-R GRP.</u>
PAROLE	52	51
DISCHARGE	48	49

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Stuart and Dellinger, Joseph B. In-Program and Post-Release Performance of Work-Release Inmates: A Preliminary Assessment of the Work-Release Program D.C. Department of Corrections, 1969.
- Ayer, William A. "Work-Release Programs in the United States: Some Difficulties Encountered" Federal Probation, 34, no. 1 (1970), 53-56.
- Bartoo, Chester H. "How Measurable is Success?" Crime and Delinquency, 15, no. 4 (1969), 519-524.
- Busher, Walter H. Ordering Time to Serve Prisoners: A Manual for the Planning and Administering of Work-Release Washington, D.C. U.S.G.P.O. 1973.
- Connecticut Department of Correction Annual Report 1973 Hartford, 1973.
- Kitchener and Lebowitz Preliminary Highlights From Work-Release Follow-Up Study Washington, D.C. U.S. Bureau of Prisons, 1970.
- LeClair, Daniel P. An Evaluation of the Impact of the MCI-Concord Day Work Program Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1972.
- Logan, Charles H. "Evaluation Research in Crime and Delinquency: A Reappraisal" Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 63, no. 3 (1972), 378-387.
- Maltz, Michael D. Evaluation of Crime Control Programs Washington, D.C. U.S.G.P.O., 1972.
- Minnesota State Department of Corrections Analysis of Work-Release for Felons in Minnesota, 1971.
- Minnesota State Department of Corrections Work-Release for Misdemeanants in Minnesota, 1970.
- Ohlin, Lloyd E. Prisoners in America Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Root, Lawrence S. "State Work-Release Programs: An Analysis of Operational Policies" Federal Probation, 34, no. 4 (1973), 52-58.
- Rudoff, Alvin et al. "Evaluating Work Furlough" Federal Probation, 35, no. 1 (1971), 34-38.
- Rudoff, Alvin and Esselstyn, T.C. "Evaluating Work Furlough: A Followup" Federal Probation, 37, no.2 (1973), 48-53.
- South Dakota's Work-Release Program: A Progress Report Board of Charities and Corrections, South Dakota, 1968.
- Vold, George B. Theoretical Criminology N.Y., Oxford University Press, 1958.

Waters, John P. Annual Report of Community Release Programs for the Period
Ending June 30, 1972, Connecticut Department of Correction, 1972.

Wilkins, Leslie T. Evaluation of Penal Measures N.Y. Random House, 1969.

Wisconsin Division of Corrections "Work Release Program," Statistical
Bulletin C/63, 1968.

END

7. 10. 1972