

AN EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT

OF THE

MCI-CONCORD DAY WORK PROGRAM

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Joseph J. Higgins

Acting Commissioner

Researcher:

Daniel P. LeClair
Research Analyst

Second Printing
July 31, 1973

Acting Social Science Research Specialist

Carroll T. Miller

Publication #6906 (42-225-7-73-CR)

Approved by Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent

INTRODUCTION

On November 6, 1967, the Massachusetts State Legislature approved a law providing for the employment of certain inmates by the day outside the precincts of the institution.¹ The new Massachusetts law was based on a program first introduced in Wisconsin penal institutions in 1913² and the program's subsequent modifications as the plan gradually became adopted by other states and by the federal prison system. The plan has been variously referred to as "Work-Release", "Work-Furlough", and "Day Work".

In August 1968, the new Massachusetts law was put into effect by the establishment of the Day Work program at the Massachusetts Correctional Institution, Concord. The program participants were drawn from that institution (or from recent transfers to that institution for the purpose of entering the Day Work program) if they were eligible by offense,³ had volunteered for the program, and had been subsequently selected by the Day Work Board.

The purpose of the Day Work program is to allow inmates to experience a gradual reintroduction to society as opposed to an abrupt jump from prison to street. This process is accomplished in several ways. First, the selected inmates live in a reintegration residence located near, but outside of, the institution. Presumably, this separates him from what has been called "the anti-rehabilitative inmate social system" within the institution. Secondly, the inmates work at jobs in the community during the day and return to the residence to spend their non-working hours. This allows for interaction with

¹
Chapter 723--Day Work

²
The 1913 Huber Law of Wisconsin

³
See Appendix I for a list of such offenses

non-inmates at work as well as provides the opportunity for the offender to participate in major economic roles. In addition to accumulating savings from their wages, inmates in the program are participating in economic roles by paying state and federal taxes, by paying for social security benefits, and by paying for the costs of their room, board, and personal expenditures. Furthermore, a portion of their pay is often allocated to support dependents or to pay off debts or court costs accumulated before incarceration. When released from prison, the inmate receives his accumulated earnings less the deductions for room, board, taxes, personal expenditures, and outside allotments. The remaining accumulated earnings provide an additional resource for the inmates' reintegration into the community when released.

It can be said that the Day Work program aims at providing a viable alternative to traditional incarceration. The program provides needed institutional supervision but at the same time allows the offender to continue to perform major societal and economic roles. Hopefully, the program eases the often difficult transition from prison to community by providing an intermediary step.

It is the purpose of this study to test the assumption that the Day Work program at MCI-Concord provides a viable alternative to traditional incarceration through the reduction of further crime upon release. The vehicle for testing this assumption will be the comparison of recidivism rates between Day Work participants and two control groups of non-participants.

David Graves assisted in the Data Collection for this report.

RESEARCH DESIGN

In January 1972, the research staff of the Massachusetts Department of Corrections undertook a research evaluation of the Concord Day Work program. The basic questions the study sought to answer were: (1) Are Day Work program participants less likely to be reincarcerated in the first year after release than are comparable non-participants? and (2) Are certain types of program participants less likely (or more likely) to be reincarcerated in the first year after release than are the same types of non-participants? The general procedure followed in answering these questions was to use rates of recidivism. A recidivist was defined as a man returned to a state or federal prison or to a jail or house of correction for at least 30 days within 12 months of release from prison. Follow-up was over a 12 month period since all participants in the sample had been out of the Day Work program for at least that long.

A second area of concern included in this evaluation is the cost-benefit aspects of running the Day Work program as compared to cost-benefits of traditional incarceration. Part II of this report, therefore, concerns itself with such a breakdown.

Samples--For the purposes of this study, three samples were selected for use. The first or treatment sample consisted of inmates who had participated in the Day Work program. The second or control sample consisted of inmates who did not participate in the program. The third or "secondary control" sample consisted of inmates who did not participate in the program but who had applied for the program and were rejected by the selection board.

The treatment sample was drawn to consist of all offenders whose incarceration at MCI-Concord terminated successfully between August, 1968 and

December, 1970 and who had participated in the Day Work program prior to release.⁴ From this list, 94 members fit the criteria necessary for a recidivism follow-up period of one year (i.e., they were released to the community before December 31, 1970). Of the 94 participants thus selected, 16 had to be dropped from the sample as "in-program failures" or as part of an "other" category. The "in-program failures" category consisted of 11 participants who were dropped from the program for disciplinary problems such as failure to work, for being fired from their job, or for failure to adjust to the cooperative living arrangements at the reintegration residence. The "other" category consisted of 5 participants who had been removed from the program for reasons such as poor health or having newly arrived outstanding warrants lodged against them; or participants who had completed the program and were released to the community but died before the end of the one year follow-up period. Both categories were dropped from the analysis because it was judged inappropriate to evaluate participants in terms of program effects when they had not completed the program, or to include participants who could not meet the criterion of a one year follow-up period.

The second sample, the non-Day Work control sample, was obtained from the already collected MCI-Concord Base Expectancy Data. The decision to use this data for the control group was made in the interest of time and economy since it did not necessitate additional data collection. The Base Expectancy Data consists of collected material on 306 former inmates of MCI-Concord who were released to the community in 1966. This total sample of 306 former inmates was reduced to a sample of 152 by eliminating those offenders who would have been ineligible by law for entry into Day Work. (See Appendix I)

4

The Day Work program began in August, 1968 and thus we took as our sample all participants in the program until our cut-off date of December, 1970.

The third sample, the secondary control sample, consisted of all inmates who had been incarcerated at MCI-Concord between August, 1968 and December, 1970 who had applied for acceptance into the Day Work program but who had been rejected by the Day Work Board. This sample contained 68 former inmates. The secondary control group was included as a means of balancing any possible distortion in using 1966 releasee data as the non-Day Work control sample. Since inmates in the non-Day Work control group were released two years earlier than the participants in the Day Work program, some changes in the characteristics of the inmate population may have occurred through time. The secondary control group, however, was drawn from the same prison population as was the Day Work treatment sample.

Data Collection--One category of data, collected for each of the three samples, consisted of (1) social background variables, (2) criminal history variables, (3) history of present offense, (4) history of present incarceration, and (5) recidivism variables. This material was collected from the central office inmate folders and from records kept by the Parole Board and by the Board of Probation.

A second category of data consisted of program related material for those in the Day Work sample. This included factors such as: amount of weeks in the program; amount of money earned; amount of money allotted to dependents; and house, job, and attitude ratings. This material was collected from financial and program records kept at MCI-Concord.

The final category of data consisted of the material for a cost-benefit analysis for the Day Work program. This material was collected from financial records kept at Concord and from the 1969 Annual Statistical Report of the Commissioner.

Description of Day Work Sample-- The typical participant in the Day Work program had been sentenced to a 5 year indefinite term at MCI-Concord for burglary. His mean age at incarceration was 27.3 years with 50% of the sample under age 25. The participant was white, from the Boston area, and was more often Catholic. He was typically single, had not had previous military experience, and had left school after completing the 9th grade. The occupational status of the Day Work participant was typically characterized as unskilled; his work patterns very often were irregular--the longest period on one job being 7 months or less.

In terms of criminal history, the typical Day Work participant was first arrested at age 15; he had 9 prior arrests, predominately for property offenses. Very infrequently (often none but no more than once) had he been arrested for offenses against the person, for sex offenses, for narcotic offenses, or for drunkenness. The typical participant had not been incarcerated as a juvenile nor had he served time under juvenile probationary supervision. He had no previous state or federal incarcerations. Overall total time for previous incarcerations amounted to 19 months.

When considering institutional behavior, the typical Day Work participant had no disciplinary reports filed against him, had not had any good conduct days removed, and had not been screened or processed as a sexually dangerous person. He did not spend time in the departmental segregational unit while incarcerated.

The present offense usually involved an actual incarceration of 12 months after which time the participant was released on parole supervision.

Sample Comparability-- The study will compare the recidivism rates of the Day Work sample with the recidivism rates of the two control samples. For this comparison to be appropriate, the Day Work sample must be generally similar to the two control group samples. The Day Work sample was therefore compared

with the two control samples across each of 43 separate variables.

Sample comparability was determined by the computation of measures of central tendency for each of the 43 analytical variables across each of the three samples. One up to three measures of central tendency were used depending upon the appropriability for the particular variable in question.⁵

For most of the analytical variables (36), the measures of central tendency were astoundingly similar across each of the three samples. This substantiates a strong similarity between samples and to a degree justifies sample comparability. However, seven of the 43 variables were found to differ between samples and these differences were highly statistically significant (usually at the .001 significance level). A discussion of these seven variables follows:

Race: The Day Work sample contained significantly more (20%) non-whites than did the Base Expectancy control group and the secondary control group also contained significantly more (20%) non-whites than did the Base Expectancy control sample. However, there were no differences between the Day Work and the secondary control samples on this variable.

The 20% higher number of non-whites in the Day Work and secondary control samples can partly be explained in the increase rate of non-whites being admitted to MCI-Concord since 1966. It will be remembered that the Base Expectancy Data was comprised of 1966 MCI-Concord releasees, whereas the Day Work and Rejectee samples were drawn from releasees from MCI-Concord between August 1968 and December 31, 1970. The increase in the non-white population at MCI-Concord since 1966 is a little under 10% and therefore such a part of the difference between samples can be explained by this change. Beyond that, we would explain the remaining difference as due to the volunteer process.

These measures included the arithmetic mean, the median, and the mode. Differences between samples were determined to be statistically significant by comparing the measure of central tendency used through a difference-of-means test (t-test) when interval scale variables were involved, or chi square when nominal or ordinal scale variables were involved.

That is to say, non-whites apply for the Day Work program in disproportionately higher numbers (10% more applicants) than do their white counterparts. However, once they apply, their chances of acceptance are the same. This is borne out by the fact that no difference occurs between the proportion of non-white applicants accepted for Day Work and the proportion of the non-white applicants rejected.

In terms of the variable marital status, there were significantly more married people in the Day Work sample than in the two control samples. Since there were no differences between the two control samples on this variable, the higher number of married participants in the Day Work sample can be reasonably attributed to the selection process of the Day Work Board. That is, the Day Work Board is more apt to approve applicants who are married and thus allow inmates to support their dependents through wage contributions.

A third variable yielding a significant difference between samples, and closely related to the above variable marital status, was relationship of emergency addressee. A higher number of the Day Work participants give their wife as an emergency addressee than do those in the two control samples. Again, there were no differences between the two control groups. The interpretation for this finding is the same as for the variable marital status discussed above and, in fact, the two variables probably reflect the same phenomenon.

When the variable number of prior state or federal incarcerations was broken down into a some vs. none dichotomy, the following resulted: the rejectee sample had the highest number of men with no previous state or federal incarcerations; the Day Work sample had the second highest number of men with no previous state or federal incarcerations; and the Base Expectancy control group had the lowest number of men with no previous state or federal incarcerations. All three differences were statistically significant.

This finding was both unexpected and perplexing. The difference

between the Day Work and the Base Expectancy control group could partly be explained as a difference in the inmate population at MCI-Concord over time. That is, there has been recent evidence of an increase in inmates committed to MCI-Concord with no records of previous incarcerations. However, though such a change might account for the differences between the Day Work and the Base Expectancy samples, it can not explain the differences between the Day Work and the rejectee samples. One can only conclude that more inmates with no records of previous state or federal incarcerations are rejected by the Day Work selection process than are accepted. A possible reason for such a priority remains unknown.

In terms of the variable number of disciplinary reports , the Day Work sample contained more men with no disciplinary reports than did the Base Expectancy control sample and the rejectee secondary control sample. In that there were no differences between the two control samples, one can assume that the difference between the treatment and control samples is due to the Day Work Board selection process. That is, the board selects out those applicants with a high number of disciplinary reports as a high risk category for the Day Work program.

The sixth variable in which significant differences between samples occurred was Good Conduct Days Withheld. This variable is closely related to the above discussed variable, number of disciplinary reports, and the difference not surprisingly occurred in the same direction. More men in the Day Work sample had no good conduct days withheld than did the control groups. Again, the interpretation is that these results are due to the Day Work Board selection process.

The final variable in which a significant difference between samples occurred was Type of Release. The Day Work sample contained significantly fewer inmates who were eventually released on a discharge as opposed to a parole

than did the two control samples. Because there were no significant differences between the two control groups, we again conclude that the selection process accounted for the differences between the Day Work and control samples. Thus, the Day Work Board selects a disproportionately lower number of potential discharges and, by the same token, selects a disproportionately higher number of potential parolees for participation in the Day Work program.

In summary, participants in the Day Work program when compared to the control groups exhibit; a higher number of non-whites; a higher number of married inmates; fewer inmates with disciplinary reports and good conduct days withheld; and fewer inmates who were eventually discharged as opposed to paroled. In addition, the Day Work sample had more inmates with no prior state or federal incarcerations than did the Base Expectancy sample but a lower number than the rejectee control sample. For most of the 43 analytical variables, however, sample comparability was quite high.

FINDINGS

Overall Impact-- From the perspective of evaluating the overall impact of the Day Work program, the recidivist analysis for the twelve month follow-up period resulted in these rates of recidivism for the three samples:

DAY WORK PARTICIPANTS: 31%

CONTROL GROUP: 32%

SECONDARY CONTROL GROUP: 31%

As can be seen from the above, the Day Work participants did not have a significantly lower recidivism rate than the two control groups. Participants in the Day Work program had virtually the same recidivism rate as did MCI-Concord men released in 1966 (Control Group) and the recidivism rate as did men who had applied for the program but who had been rejected by the Board (Secondary Control Group). Therefore, in terms of the general overall impact of the program, we must conclude that the Day Work program did not result in any significant increase in recidivism.

We investigated the possibility that the above results--similar recidivism rates for both the Day Work and control samples--could have been inaccurate. It was felt that there were two possible situations in which a distortion could have occurred: (1) high recidivism risk men could have been selected and had much lower recidivism rates because of the program, or (2) low recidivism risk men could have been selected and the program hurt them. Therefore, to determine whether or not either of these distortions might have occurred, an alternative, perhaps more sensitive, technique for

measuring the possible reduction of recidivism was utilized. More specifically, we constructed a base expectancy table--an instrument which aims at estimating, for a defined sample of inmates, the various degrees to which they are at risk of being reincarcerated within 12 months.

Our base expectancy table was developed from a sample of men released from MCI-Concord in 1966 but constructed so as to include only those men who would have been eligible for entry into the Day Work program. After constructing the table based on this data,⁶ the results were applied to the Day Work sample. In this way we arrived at the Expected Recidivism Rate for the Day Work sample--38%. We then compared this Expected Recidivism Rate with the Observed Recidivism Rate of the Day Work sample--31%. Although we can visually observe that the actual recidivism rate is lower than the expected, when we applied a test for statistical significance⁷ the difference was found to be not statistically significant. This gives additional support to our earlier conclusion that the Day Work program neither increased nor reduced recidivism for its participants.

A second use of the Expected Recidivism Rate derived from the base expectancy table was to compare the Expected Recidivism Rate for the Day Work sample (38%) to the observed recidivism rate of the control group (32%). This exercise is taken as an attempt to determine whether or not high or low risk categories were disproportionately accepted into the Day Work program. We determined that no statistically significant differences existed between the Day Work expected rate and the Control Group observed

6

See Appendix II

7 . 2

The X² one sample goodness of fit test was used;
(X²= 1.37, 1df, P>.05)

rate. Because there were no significant differences between these two rates, we are assured that a bias in terms of low / or high risk groups entering the Day Work program did not occur.

Differential Impact--Beyond the question of the overall impact of the Day Work program, we were also concerned with uncovering possible types of inmates particularly helped or adversely affected by program participation. Again, this was measured by rates of recidivism. Analysis of differential impact was undertaken in hopes that the results of the Day Work experience might contribute input for a differential treatment model to be used as an aid in the various junctures in the correctional decision-making process. If we are able to identify the inmate types which have high, moderate, or low success / failure outcomes as Day Work releasees, then we would have a valuable input for use in administrative decisions both in regard to the Day Work selection process and in terms of the needs of the inmate.

In terms of the differential impact of the Day Work program, our analysis clearly identified a negative impact group: inmates with either serious disciplinary records (some good conduct days withheld prior to entry into Day Work) or who were young with long records (25 years or younger at time of then present incarceration, with 13 or more prior arrests).

NEGATIVE IMPACT GROUP:

| Men with either of two characteristics: | <u>Day Work Sample</u> | <u>Control Sample</u> |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|
| (1) Serious Disciplinary Records | N= 10 | N= 47 |
| (2) Young with Long Records | Recidivism | Recidivism |
| | Rate = 80% | Rate =21% |

(note: these two categories are mutually exclusive)

$$(X^2 = 10.58, 1df, p<.01)$$

Note:From this point on in the analysis, comparisons will be made only between the Day Work sample and the control sample. The secondary control sample will not be referred to in that sample comparability has already been adequately established. Therefore, reference to the secondary control sample is made only if and when a discrepancy between the two control samples occurs.

The above differences between samples can be interpreted as indicating that not only are inmates with either of these characteristics not helped by Day Work, but that they are, in fact, actually hurt by program participation. Had inmates with either of these characteristics remained in the traditional institutional program their chances of not being reincarcerated would have been considerably improved.

An additional variable, total months previously incarcerated in a state or federal institution, revealed a strong negative impact in terms of recidivism reduction for the Day Work participants. Those Day Work releasees who had served from 1 to 17 months in a state or federal institution prior to their present entry to MCI-Concord had a statistically significant higher rate of recidivism than the control group for this category. The difference between the Day Work and Control sample in terms of inmates with no prior state or federal incarcerations or with more than 17 months was not significant. A summary of these relationships is presented below:

TABLE I

| <u>Total Time Previously Incarcerated: State or Federal</u> | <u>Day Work</u> | | <u>Control Group</u> | |
|---|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| | <u>N</u> | <u>RR</u> [*] | <u>N</u> | <u>RR</u> |
| None | 48 | 31% | 67 | 37% |
| 1-17 months** | 13 | 31% | 28 | 40% |
| 18 months or more | 17 | 29% | 57 | 42% |

**

(X² = 6.32, 1df, p < .02)

*RR refers to recidivist rate, and this abbreviated form (RR) will be used throughout the report.

While we can say that the above mentioned factors indicate categories of offenders who are not helped by the Day Work program, and who, in fact, are actually hurt by program participation; a positive impact group did not emerge in our analysis. No single variable or group of variables was found to indicate a statistically significant difference in favor of reduced recidivism for Day Work participants. That is to say, no type of inmate could be located where the Day Work recidivism rate was lower than the control group recidivism rate. Though not yielding statistically significant differences between samples, two variables were found to be at least approaching such a difference. These two differences approaching significance were: (1) inmates whose emergency addressee was their wife, and (2) inmates who had previously held a job for 12 months or more. These variables break down as follows:

TABLE II

| (1) <u>Relationship</u> <u>Emergency</u> <u>Addressee</u> | <u>Recidivism</u> <u>Day Work</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Recidivism</u> <u>Control</u> <u>Group</u> | <u>Number</u> |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|
| Parents | 35% | 37 | 29% | 114 |
| Wife* | 21% | 28 | 36% | 22 |
| Other | 39% | 13 | 50% | 16 |

$$*(X^2=1.36, 1df, p<.30)$$

(2) Longest Period
One Job

| | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|----|-----|-----|
| Under 12 Months | 39% | 51 | 32% | 113 |
| 12 Months or More* | 15% | 27 | 33% | 39 |

$$*(X^2= 2.86, 1df, p<.10)$$

Program Variables--Analysis of differential impact initially revealed that Day Work participants who were released with an accumulated savings of over \$400 were more likely to be recidivists than were participants who were released with under \$400. In this regard, the results break down as follows:

TABLE III

| <u>Men Released with \$400 or Less</u> | | <u>Men Released with More than \$400</u> | |
|--|------|--|------|
| N. | R.R. | N. | R.R. |
| 50 | 22% | 48 | 46% |

$$(X^2 = 5.03, 1df, p < .05)$$

A second variable, directly related to amount of money on release, was number of weeks spent in the program. This variable was also found to be related to recidivism as expected. Participants who spent 17 weeks or more in the Day Work program, had higher recidivism rates than those who spent under 17 weeks in the program. These results are provided in the breakdown below:

TABLE IV

| <u>Men Spending 1-17 Weeks in the Program</u> | | <u>Men Spending 17 or More Weeks in the Program</u> | |
|---|------|---|------|
| N. | R.R. | N. | R.R. |
| 45 | 20% | 33 | 45% |

$$(X^2 = 5.79, 1df, p < .05)$$

Amount of money on release is for the most part determined by the number of weeks in the program since salaries are generally quite similar. However, amount of money on release is affected by differential amounts of money allotted to dependents. Therefore, it becomes questionable whether it is the amount of money on release or the amount of weeks in the program or the interaction of both that is related to recidivism. To answer this question, a further test of the interrelationships was carried out through a correlation analysis. Both amount of money on release and number of weeks in the program were found to be significantly related to recidivism @.05 significance level. To determine whether it was time or money that was related to recidivism, each of the variables was recorrelated with the recidivism but holding the other variable constant. Thus, amount of money on release with the number of weeks held constant produced an $r=.18$ and the number of weeks in program with amount of money held constant produced an $r=.215$ when correlated with recidivism. These reduced correlations were no longer statistically significant @.05 significance level. We therefore interpret this to mean that it is the interaction of both phenomenon that accounts for the relationship with recidivism. That is to say, participants in the Day Work program who spend a longer period of time in the program (over 17 weeks) and who are released with a higher amount of money (\$400 or more) tend to be higher recidivist risks than those who leave either with less money or who have spent less time in the program.

8

Amount of money on release correlated with recidivism produced an $r=.254$; number of weeks in the program correlated with recidivism produced an $r=.272$; and amount of money on release correlated with number of weeks in the program produced an $r=.333$.

These findings merit careful consideration in terms of future policy formation. Several questions must be reviewed. To what extent is the releasee put in a situation of difficulty when given a large sum of accumulated earnings upon release? Do the accumulated earnings lessen the pressure to keep a steady job and therefore jeopardize his parole requirements? Does this extra money engender a temptation that might otherwise be avoided by returning the participants' earnings in a series of installments after release? In terms of amount of weeks spent in the program, is there an optimum period of time for program duration beyond which a point of diminishing returns occurs? Should the program be restricted to a period of no longer than 4 months? Consideration of these questions, with the above findings in mind, may have important input in strengthening the possibility of program success.

The last finding of our study was concerned with a subjective measurement of the participants' adjustment to the Day Work program. While in the Day Work program the correction officer in charge of the program rates each participant in terms of behavior in the Day Work residence, their behavior on the job, and their general overall attitude in the program. They are rated from poor to excellent. Though this particular rating is entirely subjective, it proved to be the most accurate predictive device in terms of subsequent recidivist behavior. Those participants who were rated Good to Excellent in these three areas consistently had low recidivist rates. By the same token, those participants who received Poor to Fair ratings consistently had high recidivist rates.

These findings are produced below:

TABLE V

| <u>POOR OR FAIR RATING</u> | | <u>GOOD, VERY GOOD, OR EXCELLENT</u> | |
|----------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| <u>RECIDIVIST RATE</u> | | <u>RECIDIVIST RATE</u> | |
| House Rating | 45% | 21% | ⁹ |
| Job Rating | 53% | 26% | ¹⁰ |
| Attitude Rating | 57% | 15% | ¹¹ |

The above results indicate that those participants in the Day Work program who are destined to be non-recidivists are the same participants who exhibit positive adjustment while in the Day Work program (at least positive adjustment as measured by the program director's subjective ratings). It would seem that these Adjustment and Attitude ratings could provide valuable input to the parole decision-making process, as well as to spotlight potential recidivists for more intensive counseling.

9 $\chi^2 = 5.00$, 1df, <.05
 10 $\chi^2 = 3.22$, 1df, <.10
 11 $\chi^2 = 15.35$, 1df, <.001

PART TWO

COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

The second part of this report is meant to provide data on the extent to which the Concord Day Work program was cost-beneficial. For this purpose, data was collected from the institution treasurer at MCI-Concord, from the Annual Statistical Report of the Commissioner of Corrections, and from a report prepared by two correction officers assigned to the Day Work program.

Table VI on the following page provides a summary breakdown of the distribution of wages earned by Day Work participants for the two periods specified. This breakdown provides information on the total amount of wages earned and the various categories to which they were disbursed. From the table it can be seen that Day Work participants are involved in economic roles in a variety of ways. They are involved through their contributions to tax obligations and F.I.C.A. payments; they are involved in the responsibility of paying for their food and lodgings and for their incidental personal expenses; and they are involved in accumulating savings to be received upon their discharge.

TABLE VI

FINANCIAL STATEMENT, MCI-CONCORD DAY WORK PROGRAM

August 1968 to June 1969 **

| | | |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Gross Earnings | | \$ 50,023.23 |
| Disbursements: | | |
| Federal Taxes | \$4,719.82 | |
| State Taxes | 602.82 | |
| F.I.C.A. | 2,349.09 | |
| Personal Expenses | 3,036.92 | |
| Food and Lodging | <u>14,341.00</u> | |
| Total Disbursements: | 25,049.65 | |
| Net Earnings | | 24,973.58 |

January 1, 1970 to December 31, 1971

| | | |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------|
| Gross Earnings | | 65,004.86 |
| Disbursements: | | |
| Federal Taxes | 4,719.82 | |
| State Taxes | 907.37 | |
| F.I.C.A. | 3,119.98 | |
| Personal Expenses | 4,115.11 | |
| Food and Lodging | <u>17,598.50</u> | |
| Total Disbursements | 30,460.78 | |
| Net Earnings | | 34,544.08 |

| | <u>1969</u> | <u>1970</u> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total Number of Men in the Program | 45 | 65 |
| Average Number of Men in the Program | 12 | 15 |

Salary Levels For Both Years:

Minimum Gross about 71.25 per week (@ Nursing Home)

Maximum Gross about \$150.00 per week (Foundry)

Average--\$120.00 per week

**Data for the period July 1969 and December 1969 was not available and thus could not be included.

The financial breakdown in Table VI does not provide information concerning an equally important economic responsibility taken by many of the Day Work participants: that is, the allotments made to dependents. This material should be added to the financial perspective. Of the 78 Day Work participants included in our analysis, 48 made contributions of varying amounts to their dependents. The total amount of these contributions for the 48 program participants who made such allotments was \$21,394.07. Table VII on the following page summarizes the distribution of these allotments.

TABLE VII

DISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNT OF WAGES ALLOCATED TO DEPENDENTS
OF DAY WORK MEN

| TOTAL INDIVIDUAL ALLOTMENTS | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|
| None | 30 | 38.46% |
| UP TO \$100 | 10 | 12.82 |
| \$100 up to \$300 | 17 | 21.79 |
| \$300 up to \$500 | 7 | 8.97 |
| \$500 up to \$700 | 5 | 6.41 |
| \$700 up to \$900 | 5 | 6.41 |
| \$900 up to \$1,100 | 0 | 0 |
| \$1,100 up to \$1,500 | 1 | 1.28 |
| \$1,500 up to \$2,000 | 2 | 2.56 |
| \$2,000 or more | 1 | 1.28 |
| TOTAL | 78 | 100.00% |

Table VIII presents the results of an examination of both the net financial gain of the program and the savings achieved when the Day Work program is compared to the official cost of holding the same inmate in the traditional institutional program at MCI-Concord. The first savings category--State Net Gain--was determined by calculating the amount of money paid by the Day Work releasees towards the cost of their room and board. Added to this figure are the wages no longer paid by the state to the Day Work participants (which would have had to have been paid had the inmate remained in the traditional program). Such income no longer paid represents monies already allocated to the institution by the State Legislature as part of the institutional budget. The Day Work program frees such money for other purposes.

After combining the contributions received for room and board and the savings in wages no longer paid to these participants, the actual weekly cost of feeding the Day Work participants, and the differential codes for program supervision are subtracted from the figure. The results are then multiplied by the average number of people in the Day Work program at any one time and then by the number of weeks in a year. The resulting figure gives us the financial gain of the Day Work program.

To get a more realistic appraisal of this financial gain, however, an incidental expense account-based on 6 months of miscellaneous operational expenditures and doubled to represent a yearly estimate--is subtracted from the financial gain. This final resulting figure of \$11,883.10 represents the Net Day Work Program Yearly Gain. Thus, not only does the program cost less to run but there is actually a financial gain from the program. The Net Gain is turned over to the general fund and is used for other state financial needs.

To establish the savings achieved by the Concord Day Work program in comparison to the actual cost of holding the same participant in the traditional institutional program, the figure for the standard "wall cost" per man per year for MCI-Concord (\$5,800.00) is multiplied by the number of Day Work releasees in the program at any one time (15). This represents the yearly cost for incarcerating Day Work participants had they remained in MCI-Concord. The result of this calculation represents a savings of \$87,000.00) in that no actual money is allocated for running the Day Work program and, as seen above in the calculations for program costs vs. program gains, there is actually a financial gain. Therefore, when the Day Work Program Net Gain is added to this comparison gain, the Total results in the figure of \$98,883.10. Again, in order to get a more realistic appraisal of the actual savings obtained, a figure representing yearly employee non-accounted for costs in the Day Work operations (\$33,343.96) is subtracted from the total. This results with a Total State Net Gain from the Day Work Program equaling \$65,539.14. Table VIII is produced below summarizing these cost-benefit calculations:

TABLE VIII

A COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF THE MCI-CONCORD DAY WORK PROGRAM

| ITEM | COSTS | BENEFITS | BALANCE |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <u>Inmate Payments for Rent:</u> | | | |
| Weekly per Individual \$ 24.50 | | | |
| Yearly per Individual 1,274.00 | | | |
| Total: Yearly per 15 Individuals: | | \$19,110.00 | |
| <u>Wages No Longer Paid by State:</u> | | | |
| Weekly per Individual 3.50 | | | |
| Yearly per Individual 182.00 | | | |
| Total: Yearly per 15 Individuals: | | 2,730.00 | |
| <u>Costs for Meals:</u> | | | |
| Weekly per Individual 4.42 | | | |
| Yearly per Individual 229.84 | | | |
| Total: Yearly per 15 Individuals: | \$3,447.60 | | |
| <u>Miscellaneous Expenses:</u> | 74.30 | | |
| <u>Differential for Supervision:</u> | | | |
| Weekly per Individual 8.25 | | | |
| Yearly per Individual 429.00 | | | |
| Total: Yearly per 15 Individuals: | 6,435.00 | | |
| TOTALS: | 9,956.90 | 21,840.00 | |
| DAY WORK PROGRAM NET GAIN (BALANCE) | | | \$11,883.10 |
| <u>Wall Cost per Man per Year:</u> \$5,800.00 | | | |
| Times number of participants in the program (15) | | \$87,000.00 | |
| Employee Non-Accounted for Costs: | \$33,343.96 | | |
| GRAND TOTAL: STATE NET GAIN FROM THE DAY WORK PROGRAM | | | \$65,539.14 |

In terms of the basic material relating to the cost-benefit analysis here presented, several important points should be stressed in summary fashion. First, from the taxpayers' point of view, the cost of retaining in detention favors the Day Work program approach. Although no specific funds are allocated to run the Day Work program, the facilities at MCI-Concord, including officers and other personnel, are used. However, as Table VIII clearly shows, when various assets and liabilities are weighed a State Net Gain results. Secondly, as seen in Table VI, the Day Work participants in 1970, for example, contributed \$4,719.98 in F.I.C.A. payments. As seen in Table VII money is often sent home to the inmates' dependents. Finally, the inmates have received a cash reserve to be used as a resource when they are released to the community. In sum, the data presented here clearly indicates a financial gain for the state, for the inmate, and for his family.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Drawing together the results of the recidivism analysis (Part I) and the cost-benefit analysis (part II), a framework for the evaluation of the Day Work program is presented as a conclusion of this report.

A first result of the analysis was the discovery that the Day Work program did not result with a significant impact on the reduction of recidivism within the 12 month follow-up period. Furthermore, an analysis of differential impact did not uncover any category of inmates that was particularly helped by the program in terms of the reduction of recidivism. To be sure, recidivism did not increase as a result of program participation, but neither was it reduced.

Inmates, in terms of negative differential impact, with certain characteristics were found to be hurt by their participation in the program (i.e., they were found to have disproportionately higher recidivism rates than their non-treatment counterparts). Specifically, inmates with either serious disciplinary records (some good conduct days withheld prior to entry into Day Work) or inmates who were young with long records (25 years or younger at time of the then present incarceration with 13 or more prior arrests) were found to have been hurt by their participation in the Day Work program. Had these types of inmates not entered the program and remained instead in the traditional institutional program, their chances of being reincarcerated within the 12 month follow-up period would have been considerably lessened.

In view of this finding, it is recommended that applicants for the Day Work program in the future who exhibit either of the above characteristics either not be accepted in the program or, that they

be accepted but receive more intensive attention as a potential high risk category.

In addition to the previously mentioned negative impact group, analysis of differential impact revealed that those Day Work releasees who had served from 1 to 17 months in a state or federal institution prior to their present entry to MCI-Concord had a statistically significant higher rate of recidivism than the control group for this category. Again, this represents a negative impact group and should be considered in future selection process decision-making.

Though categories of offenders who were not helped, but in fact actually hurt, by Day Work participation were determined; a positive impact group did not emerge in our analysis. No inmate characteristic could be determined where the Day Work recidivism rate was significantly lower than the control group recidivism rate. There was a suggestion that inmates who were married and inmates who had previously held a job for 12 months or more were more likely to be helped by Day Work participation. However, the direction of these relationships was not strong enough to reveal statistically significant differences at the .05 significance level.

Program variables associated with the differential impact analysis revealed that participants in the Day Work program who spend a longer period of time in the program (over 17 weeks) and who are released with a higher amount of money (\$400 or more) tend to be higher recidivist risks than those who leave either with less money or who have less time spent in the program.

The last finding of the differential impact analysis was concerned with the subjective assessment of the Day Work participant's adjustment to the program. Those participants who were found to have

low recidivism rates are the same participants who exhibit positive adjustment while in the program. We therefore stressed the possible future utility of such measures as inputs to the parole decision making process as well as to spotlight potential recidivists for more intensive counseling.

The cost-benefit analysis impressively revealed that not only is the Day Work program less costly to run than traditional incarceration, but that there is actually a net gain from the program. Added to this fact, taxes were paid on wage earnings contributed to State and Federal revenues. Cash payments were also provided for inmate dependents. Clearly, the results of the cost-benefit analysis demonstrated the value of the Day Work program when compared to traditional incarceration.

From a security point of view, there have been no disturbances in the Day Work residence, and there has been only one runaway in the four year history of the program. Clearly, problems inherent to a minimum security set-up have been successfully met.

This summary picture provides a basic framework for our concluding that certain aspects of the Day Work program need to be strengthened. Although impressive financial savings and even gains were shown to have been dramatically achieved, and although the security problems were so adequately met, the rehabilitative potential of the work release concept remained untapped. This point is essential. If rehabilitation is the genuine objective of the program, measurement of program success must ultimately be concerned with reduced recidivism. The critical issue, then, is not whether the taxpayer benefited in the short run by reduced costs, but rather whether he benefited in the long run through a reduction in the extent of repeated crimes. Therefore,

the results of the Concord Day Work program evaluation should be read as underscoring the fact that the rehabilitative potential of the program was not achieved. Now that the problems of reduced security and financial feasibility have been so successfully met, an ideal situation exists for tapping the rehabilitative potential of the program.

As the Concord Day Work program presently exists there is little, if any, treatment involved. Other than the physical structure which serves as the reintegration residence and the job placements for participants, no actual program exists. Furthermore, when an inmate is assigned to Day Work and is removed from the traditional institution, he is cut off from all programs and services carried within that institution.

Following below is a series of recommendations offered as suggestions for bringing the MCI-Concord Day Work program more within the treatment perspective. It should be stressed that these recommendations are proffered on the basis of information concerning work release programs currently in operation in various other states which have reported significant rehabilitative success. Whether or not the implementation of these recommendations will actually tap the rehabilitative potential of the MCI-Concord Day Work program would be revealed by subsequent research.

The five recommendations are as follows:

- I. To a far greater extent than is presently the case, the Day Work program should be structured as a treatment linked process of graduated release. Specifically, individual counseling and group discussion sessions dealing with the various critical junctures in the transition from the institution to the Day Work program setting, and from the Day Work program setting to parole status, should be included as an integral part of the

program. What is important here is that the inmates be psychologically prepared for the various changes in behavioral expectations as they move along through the stages of graduated release. Behavior appropriate while in the prison community cannot be transferred as behavior appropriate for the free community. A counseling program could be instituted within the Day Work reintegration residence to meet such needs. Under the present system, not only is such a program not in existence, but also, the Day Work participants are cut off from the various counseling programs that exist inside the wall.¹²

II. To all possible degrees, Day Work participants should be allowed to maintain their links with the larger institutional programs and services.

To some extent this need is currently being partially met, but it is only being met in terms of recreational needs. (Day Work participants are allowed use of the recreational facilities of the Farm on weekends for a limited amount of time.) However, more serious are the presently unmet needs for links to programs such as those dealing with problems due to alcohol and drug abuse. When it is deemed unfeasible for security reasons to allow the Day Work participant's movement in and out of the walls, similar programs could be instituted within the Day Work reintegration residence.

12

For an excellent discussion of counseling programs applicable to the Day Work setting see Murray Cohen et. al's A Study of Community-Based Correctional Needs in Massachusetts, Massachusetts Department of Correction publication, No. 6216, June 1972

III. Specific training needs should be met through work release as compliments to education and training at the institution. Good employment placement should give preference to jobs that are related to prior work experience and institutional training and that are suitable for continuing in post-release employment.

IV. The inmate should be prepared within the institution, before entry into Day Work, through special vocational training and counseling geared specifically to the Day Work assignment. Such an innovation would not only strengthen Day Work but also vocational programs within the institution.

V. To all possible extent, jobs chosen for Day Work Assignment should be jobs that are available upon release. This would complete the transitional process from vocational training within the institution to Day Work assignment to job assignment upon release.

APPENDIX I

CHAPTER 723-DAY WORK

The above law, which was approved November 6, 1967, and becomes effective February 4, 1968, provides for the employment of certain inmates by the day outside the precincts of the institution. Before implementation of this law the Commissioner will establish rules and regulations to govern its administration. The law provides that those serving a life sentence or a sentence for violation of the following sections, or attempt to commit any crime referred to in these sections, shall not be eligible for Day Work:

| | | |
|--------------------|------------|---|
| <u>Chapter 265</u> | Section 13 | Manslaughter |
| | 13B | Indecent assault and battery on child under 14 |
| | 14 | Mayhem |
| | 15 | Assault with intent to murder, maim, etc. |
| | 15A | Assault and battery with dangerous weapon |
| | 15B | Assault with dangerous weapon |
| | 16 | Attempt to murder by poisoning, etc. |
| | 17 | Robbery |
| | 18 | Assault with intent to rob, being armed |
| | 18A | Armed assault in dwelling house |
| | 19 | Robbery, not being armed |
| | 20 | Assault with intent to rob, not armed |
| | 21 | Confining or putting in fear a person for the purpose of stealing |
| | 22 | Rape |
| | 22A | Rape of female under 16 |
| | 23 | Rape of child |
| | 24 | Assault with intent to commit rape |
| | 24B | Assault on female under 16 with intent to commit rape |
| | 25 | Attempt to extort money by threat |
| | 26 | Kidnapping |
| <u>Chapter 272</u> | Section 17 | Incest |
| | 34 | Sodomy and Buggery |
| | 35 | Unnatural and lascivious acts |
| | 35A | Unnatural and lascivious acts with child under 16 or attempt to commit any of the above |

When this law becomes operative arrangements will be made to select eligible candidates from this institution who have demonstrated by their conduct and interest a sincere willingness to assume their rightful return to community living. Any inmate interested in being considered for Day Work should apply in writing to his social worker. The following regulations apply to the eligibility for Day Work:

1. Only inmates who consent thereto and who are not serving life sentence or are otherwise excluded by Section 86-D of Chapter 723 Acts of 1967.
2. No inmate will be considered if he has a warrant or detainer filed against him.
3. No inmate shall be considered for Day Work sooner than six (6) months prior to his parole eligibility or discharge.
4. No inmate will be approved for participation in the Day Work program until he has been certified by the physician of the institution as free from disease or other condition which would menace himself or others.

APPENDIX II
BASE EXPECTANCY TABLE

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| APPENDIX II | | | | |
| BASE EXPECTANCY TABLE | | | | |
| TOTAL GROUP N = 152 Recidivism Rate = 32.0% (RR) | TYPE OF RELEASE: PAROLE N = 94 RR = 42.6% | LONGEST PERIOD ONE | | |
| | | JOB: LESS THAN 3 MOS N = 27 RR = 66.7% | | |
| | | BIRTHPLACE: OTHER THAN BOSTON N = 14 RR = 92.9% | | |
| | | BIRTHPLACE: BOSTON N = 13 RR = 38.5% | | |
| | TYPE OF RELEASE: DISCHARGE N = 58 RR = 15.5% | LONGEST PERIOD ONE | LONGEST PERIOD ONE | NO ADULT PROBATION N = 14 RR = 42.9% |
| | | JOB: 3 MOS. OR MORE N = 67 RR = 32.8% | JOB: 9 MOS. OR MORE N = 31 RR = 45.2% | ADULT PROBATION N = 10 RR = 9.1% |
| | | | LONGEST PERIOD ONE | EDUCATION: GRADE 11 OR ABOVE N = 10 RR = 80.0% |
| | | | JOB: LESS THAN 9 MOS. N = 36 RR = 22.2% | EDUCATION: GRADE 10 OR BELOW N = 21 RR = 28.6% |
| | | NUMBER OF PRIOR HOUSE OF CORRECTIONS OR JAIL INCARCERATIONS: THREE OR MORE N = 19 RR = 31.6% | | |
| | | NUMBER OF PRIOR HOUSE OF CORRECTIONS OR JAIL INCARCERATIONS: TWO OR LESS N = 39 RR = 7.7% | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

36.

DATA FOR RECIDIVIST ANALYSIS AND ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENTIAL IMPACT

APPENDIX III

| VARIABLE | CONCORD DAY WORK SAMPLE | | CONTROL GROUP | | STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN RECIDIVIST RATE | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | CHI SQUARE | IF SIGNIFICANT, LEVEL |
| A. BACKGROUND FACTORS | | | | | | |
| 1. Age at Commitment | | | | | | |
| 17-25 | 40 | .33 | 115 | .35 | .0687 | |
| 26-35 | 25 | .36 | 30 | .30 | .2230 | |
| 36 or more | 13 | .15 | 7 | .00 | .0977* | |
| 2. Race | | | | | | |
| White | 55 | .26 | 138 | .33 | .9483 | |
| Black | 22 | .46 | 14 | .29 | 1.0261 | |
| 3. Religion | | | | | | |
| Catholic | 51 | .28 | 107 | .35 | .8029 | |
| Protestant | 26 | .39 | 43 | .26 | 1.2696 | |
| 4. Marital Status | | | | | | |
| Single | 35 | .40 | 104 | .32 | .8001 | |
| Married | 29 | .28 | 31 | .32 | .1557 | |
| Other | 14 | .14 | 17 | .35 | .8426* | |
| 5. Military Service | | | | | | |
| None | 59 | .32 | 109 | .35 | .1207 | |
| Some | 19 | .26 | 43 | .26 | .0644* | |
| 6. Emergency Address | | | | | | |
| Parents | 37 | .35 | 114 | .29 | .5048 | |
| Wife | 28 | .21 | 22 | .36 | 1.3631 | |
| Other | 13 | .39 | 16 | .50 | .3861 | |
| 7. Education | | | | | | |
| 0-7 years | 19 | .37 | 45 | .31 | .1990 | |
| 8 years or more | 59 | .29 | 107 | .33 | .2684 | |
| 8. Occupational Status | | | | | | |
| a. Unskilled | 48 | .38 | 112 | .30 | .9992 | |
| b. Semi-skilled | 19 | .16 | 8 | .13 | .1395* | |
| c. Other than a or b | 11 | .27 | 32 | .47 | .6125* | |

* Yates correction applied

APPENDIX III

| VARIABLE | CONCORD DAY WORK SAMPLE | | CONTROL GROUP | | STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN RECIDIVIST RATE | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------|
| | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | CHI SQUARE | IF SIGNIFICANT, LEVEL |
| A. BACKGROUND FACTORS CONT. | | | | | | |
| 9. Stability of Employment | | | | | | |
| Regular | 17 | .18 | 8 | .00 | .3683* | |
| Irregular | 32 | .41 | 28 | .39 | .0112 | |
| Casual | 29 | .28 | 114 | .32 | .2542 | |
| 10. Longest Period 1 Job | | | | | | |
| 0-5 months | 31 | .29 | 74 | .35 | .3662 | |
| 6-8 months | 15 | .53 | 23 | .21 | 4.0266 | < .05 |
| 9 months or more | 32 | .22 | 55 | .32 | 1.1634 | |
| 11. Birthplace | | | | | | |
| Over 100,000 population | 36 | .19 | 87 | .18 | 1.6819 | |
| Under 100,000 population | 23 | .44 | 61 | .41 | 1.7591 | |
| 12. Last Civilian Address | | | | | | |
| Over 75,000 population | 53 | .28 | 87 | .39 | 1.6819 | |
| Under 75,000 population | 20 | .40 | 61 | .25 | 1.7590 | |

* Yates correction
applied

APPENDIX III

| VARIABLE | CONCORD DAY WORK SAMPLE | | CONTROL GROUP | | STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN RECIDIVIST RATE | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------|
| B. CRIMINAL HISTORY | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | CHI SQUARE | IF SIGNIFICANT, LEVEL |
| 1. Age First Arrest | | | | | | |
| 8-14 | 35 | .26 | 67 | .28 | .0807 | |
| 15-18 | 26 | .35 | 65 | .40 | .2275 | |
| 19 or more | 17 | .35 | 20 | .20 | .4523* | |
| 2. Number of Prior Arrests | | | | | | |
| 0-5 | 11 | .24 | 37 | .32 | .4428 | |
| 6-10 | 32 | .28 | 65 | .31 | .0715 | |
| 11-20 | 21 | .43 | 45 | .36 | .3244 | |
| 21 or more | 8 | .25 | 5 | .20 | .2194* | |
| 3. Number of Prior Arrests: Property | | | | | | |
| 0-2 | 25 | .28 | 30 | .37 | .4652 | |
| 3-5 | 30 | .27 | 67 | .30 | .1023 | |
| 6-9 | 15 | .27 | 39 | .39 | .6609 | |
| 10 or more | 8 | .63 | 16 | .18 | 2.8359 | |
| 4. Number of Prior Arrests: Person | | | | | | |
| None | 40 | .35 | 93 | .31 | .1863 | |
| Some | 38 | .26 | 59 | .34 | .6221 | |
| 5. Number of Prior Arrests: Sex | | | | | | |
| None | 71 | .31 | 132 | .33 | .1159 | |
| Some | 7 | .29 | 20 | .25 | .0995* | |
| 6. Number of Prior Arrests: Narcotics | | | | | | |
| None | 74 | .31 | 146 | .33 | .0724 | |
| Some | 4 | .25 | 6 | .17 | .2344* | |
| 7. Number of Prior Arrests: Drunk | | | | | | |
| None | 44 | .36 | 70 | .34 | .0512 | |
| Some | 34 | .24 | 82 | .31 | .5717 | *Yates correction applied |

APPENDIX III

| VARIABLE | CONCORD DAY WORK SAMPLE | | CONTROL GROUP | | STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN RECIDIVIST RATE | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | CHI SQUARE | IF SIGNIFICANT, LEVEL |
| B. CRIMINAL HISTORY CONT. | | | | | | |
| 8. Prior State or Federal Incarcerations | | | | | | |
| 0 | 47 | .32 | 67 | .37 | .3535 | |
| 1-2 | 20 | .40 | 71 | .27 | 1.3107 | |
| 3 or more | 11 | .09 | 14 | .35 | 1.1567* | |
| 9. Total Time Incarcerated State or Federal (months) | | | | | | |
| 0 | 48 | .31 | 67 | .37 | .4532 | |
| 1-17 | 13 | .31 | 28 | .00 | 6.3718* | <.02 |
| 10. Number of Prior House of Correction Incarcerations | | | | | | |
| 0 | 31 | .23 | 46 | .24 | .0184 | |
| 1-3 | 35 | .37 | 85 | .34 | .0997 | |
| 4 or more | 12 | .33 | 21 | .43 | .0283* | |
| 11. Total Time Incarcerated House of Correction or Jail | | | | | | |
| None | 31 | .23 | 46 | .24 | .0184 | |
| 1-11 months | 22 | .27 | 57 | .37 | .6461 | |
| 12-23 months | 17 | .53 | 30 | .30 | 2.4167 | |
| 24 months or more | 8 | .25 | 19 | .42 | .1633* | |
| 12. Number of Juvenile Incarcerations | | | | | | |
| None | 43 | .30 | 73 | .29 | .0280 | |
| 1-2 | 9 | .22 | 50 | .34 | .0953 | |
| 3-4 | 15 | .46 | 17 | .41 | .0976 | |
| 5 or more | 11 | .18 | 12 | .33 | .1234 | |

*Yates correction applied

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX III

| VARIABLE | | CONCORD DAY WORK SAMPLE | | CONTROL GROUP | | STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN RECIDIVIST RATE | |
|--|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|------------|---|--|
| B. CRIMINAL HISTORY CONT. | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | CHI SQUARE | IF SIGNIFICANT, LEVEL | |
| 13. Total Time Incarcerated Juvenile | | | | | | | |
| None | 43 | .30 | 73 | .29 | .0280 | | |
| 1-11 months | 9 | .22 | 29 | .38 | .2168 | | |
| 12-23 months | 15 | .47 | 27 | .41 | .1383 | | |
| 24 or more | 11 | .18 | 23 | .26 | .0058 | | |
| 14. Overall Time incarcerated | | | | | | | |
| None | 18 | .11 | 10 | .30 | .5411 | | |
| 1-15 months | 18 | .39 | 34 | .41 | .0256 | | |
| 16-30 months | 14 | .43 | 37 | .16 | 2.6626 | | |
| 31-45 months | 10 | .30 | 32 | .44 | .1634 | | |
| 46 or more | 18 | .33 | 39 | .31 | .0375 | | |
| 15. Juvenile or Adult Probation | | | | | | | |
| None | 17 | .23 | 32 | .28 | .0000 | | |
| Juvenile only | 8 | .37 | 24 | .38 | .1778 | | |
| Adult only | 32 | .31 | 66 | .33 | .0245 | | |
| Both | 21 | .33 | 29 | .31 | .0296 | | |

APPENDIX III

| VARIABLE | CONCORD DAY WORK SAMPLE | | CONTROL GROUP | | STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN RECIDIVIST RATE | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | CHI SQUARE | IF SIGNIFICANT, LEVEL |
| C. INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY | | | | | | |
| 1. Number of Disciplinary Reports | | | | | | |
| None | 57 | .21 | 79 | .32 | 1.8760 | |
| Some | 21 | .57 | 73 | .33 | 4.0639 | <.05 |
| 2. Sexually Dangerous Person Data | | | | | | |
| Not Screened | 74 | .30 | 133 | .32 | .1493 | |
| Screened | 4 | .50 | 19 | .32 | .0158 | |
| 3. In Departmental Segregation Unit | | | | | | |
| No | 78 | .31 | 151 | .33 | .0669 | |
| Yes | 0 | .00 | 1 | .00 | .0000 | |
| 4. Good Conduct Days Withheld | | | | | | |
| None | 74 | .28 | 116 | .35 | .8806 | |
| Some | 4 | 1.00 | 36 | .25 | 4.2155* | <.05 |
| 5. Type of Release | | | | | | |
| Paroled | 69 | .32 | 94 | .43 | 1.9218 | |
| Discharged (including mandatory parole and sentence vacated) | 9 | .22 | 58 | .16 | .0005* | |

*Yates correction applied

APPENDIX III

| VARIABLE | CONCORD DAY WORK SAMPLE | | CONTROL GROUP | | STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN RECIDIVIST RATE | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | NUMBER | RECIDIVIST RATE | CHI SQUARE | IF SIGNIFICANT, LEVEL |
| D. HISTORY OF PRESENT OFFENSE | | | | | | |
| 1. Type of Offense | | | | | | |
| Property | 67 | .31 | 105 | .29 | .1507 | |
| Other | 9 | .22 | 47 | .40 | .4325* | |
| 2. Number of Co-defendant | | | | | | |
| None | 33 | .36 | 69 | .30 | .3585 | |
| One | 20 | .15 | 43 | .35 | 2.6445 | |
| 2 or more | 25 | .36 | 40 | .33 | .0842 | |
| 3. Inmate's Version | | | | | | |
| Agrees | 47 | .34 | 124 | .34 | .0004 | |
| Agrees with qualifications | 5 | .00 | 7 | .43 | 1.0286 | |
| Disagrees | 25 | .32 | 11 | .18 | .2014 | |
| 4. Is present Offense result of Parole Violation | | | | | | |
| Yes | 22 | .32 | 64 | .28 | .1083 | |
| No | 56 | .30 | 88 | .35 | .3653 | |
| 5. Institution Committed to | | | | | | |
| Walpole | 25 | .20 | 18 | .27 | .0528 | |
| Concord | 53 | .36 | 110 | .37 | .0312 | |
| 6. Length of Present Incarceration | | | | | | |
| Under 1 Year | 31 | .26 | 67 | .33 | .4930 | |
| 1-2 years | 39 | .33 | 64 | .33 | .0030 | |
| 2 years and over | 8 | .38 | 21 | .29 | .0002 | |

*Yates correction applied