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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, our penal institutions have operated on the assumption that each criminal offender must pay his debt to society. Accordingly, penology has been geared toward punishment and retribution rather than rehabilitation. In recent years however, many criminologists and penologists concluded that the punitive approach is ineffective as a method of rehabilitation, for studies revealed unmistakably that a large number of inmates were recidivists. Federal Bureau of Investigation Statistics substantiate the conclusion indicating that in 1965 seventy-five per cent of all felons were recidivists. Given the ineffectuality of the punitive approach, the State of North Carolina established a work release program for the rehabilitation of its prisoners.

The work release program allows the inmate to work at regular jobs during the day and requires him to return to the prison at night. As a result, the prisoner remains in contact with society, pays for his

---


room and board, and provides financial support for his family. Accordingly, the work release program is considered to have much value as a method of rehabilitating inmates. The program assumes that a prisoner with a steady job is a greater benefit to himself, to his family and to the state.

Review of the Literature

Although the work release program is a relatively new method in the rehabilitation of prisoners, the non-punitive approach is not a new idea. Hebrew prophets asked the question, "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die?" Plato also held that the proper end of punishment is not merely to render the guilty his due, but at the same time to make him better.¹

In New Horizons in Criminology, Elmer Barnes and Negley Teeters write that it should seem obvious to any intelligent citizen that sustained idleness is extremely detrimental to public policy. Yet legislatures during the past hundred years seemed impervious to appeals of penologists and administrators for developing more productive labor policy for our prisons. The authors assert that more tirades have been hurled at the apathetic public because of the chaotic and demoralizing conditions in our prisons due to the problem of idleness, than on any other problem in the correctional field. They contend that the public cannot be blamed for this condition, for it does not understand the problems of prison labor. Few citizens know that the prisoner is sitting

in his cell listening to the clock tick off the hours day after day. Because the individual citizen is unaware of the situation, he is also unaware of the price society pays for inadequate prison labor policy, through increased taxes or the release of embittered prisoners.

Barnes and Teeters have compiled the following list of reasons used at one time or another to justify working prisoners.¹

1. As punishment: it is assumed that if hard and onerous tasks are the lot of prisoners, they will serve as a deterrent to crime.

2. As a source of discipline: if all inmates have jobs to perform, greater discipline results and thus, it is easier to operate the institution.

3. To relieve the monotony of a prison term: it is axiomatic that time passes more quickly if men are busy.

4. To reduce operating cost: by working, the inmate is able to pay for his room and board as well as provide for his own personal needs.

5. To assist the inmate in supporting his family: by paying a slight wage for his work, the inmate maintains his self-respect and assumes his responsibility for supporting his dependents.

6. As a reformative device: work can be regarded as therapeutic and as an aid in restoring a man to society as a social asset.

In this country, the work release program originated in Wisconsin as early as 1913. State Senator Hubert Huber convinced fellow legislators that it would be wasteful for an able-bodied prisoner to be idle in jail and thereby deprive his family of necessary financial support. As a result the legislators enacted a law that permitted the use of

prisoners as paid farm laborers, with their wages applied to the cost of supporting themselves. The scope of the program expanded rapidly. From 1957 to 1961, work release prisoners in Wisconsin earned more than $2,800,000, of which $1,100,000 went to dependents. It is estimated that during that period the state saved $1,000,000 in welfare payments and $750,000 in room and board for the prisoners.

Since the beginning of the Huber Plan, sixteen other states have enacted work release laws: West Virginia (1917), Virginia (1956), California (1957), Idaho (1957), North Carolina (1957), Minnesota (1957), North Dakota (1957), Wyoming (1961), Montana (1959), Oregon (1959), Illinois (1959), Washington (1961), Missouri (1961), Michigan (1962), Maryland (1963), and Indiana (1963). The aim of the work release programs in these states is both economic and rehabilitative. Variously described as work furlough or "pay as you go penology," the approach taken in all the states is derived from the Huber Plan. Work release usually is limited to misdemeanants, but North Carolina has expanded the program to include felons with sentences up to five years. The State of Maryland recently approved a similar program.¹

In North Carolina, the work release plan began in 1957. Under State Prison Director George W. Randall, the program has evolved into what is reportedly one of the most liberal work plans in the nation. Administered solely by the State Prison Department, county sheriffs

are excluded. Exclusive state administration is possible because most misdemeanants in North Carolina are sentenced to the State Prison Department. In this program all inmates with sentences of five years or less are eligible for consideration, provided they are not sex offenders, confirmed alcoholics, or drug addicts. (Due to amendments to the work release law, length of sentence is no longer a limiting factor in work release participation). Each prisoner's wages are turned over to the North Carolina Prison Department which gives him $5.00 for personal expenses. The Prison Department keeps $1.00 for state furnished transportation and $2.25 for room and board. The balance of his earnings is sent to the inmate's family and/or placed in a trust fund. The Prison Department officials do not actively seek employment for the inmates; however, they permit many inmates who were employed prior to commitment to continue with their regular employment. All of the work release participants, prison officials, and employers have "high praise" for the program.

Since World War II, several English writers have recognized the need for penal reform in Western European countries.

Kathleen J. Smith, a former Birmingham, England prison official and author of A Cure for Crime, cites the rising crime rates in the United States and England and then criticizes outmoded retributive

1Ibid., p. 271.


3"Outside on the Job" Time (September 14, 1962), p. 33.

treatment of prisoners. She advocates the wider use of the Hostel Scheme, a plan used in many Western European countries, which affects prisoners serving sentences of at least four years.

When possible, these prisoners are accommodated in special hostels or buildings on the prison grounds. They are allowed to leave the hostels each day for employment in the communities. The inmates who participate in this plan receive union wages and after the deduction for the cost of their keep, their earnings are saved for them until they are discharged. The work is obtained for them by the Ministry of Labor.

Miss Smith writes that the retributive approach employed by penal systems is terrifying, cruel and immoral, for it is a system both of imposing outrageous restrictions on people and of feeling justified in one's opinion of those people when they fail to adjust to the community upon release. Her contention is that our present penal systems only supply the prisoner with enough vital incentive for normal citizenship such as purpose, prospect, responsibility, work and respect to get him to the end of his term without committing suicide. Such deprivation does not end after the prisoner is released for the inadequacies it causes hamper his cooperation, initiative, spontaneity, and encourage society's suspicion and contempt of him. Accordingly, the retributive approach is neither beneficial to the offender nor satisfactory to any affluent society.¹

J. L. Bevenisti, a British economist and writer, shares Miss Smith's advocacy of the Hostel System. He states that another objective of this

¹Ibid.
plan is to help the prisoner to adjust as early and as quickly as possible to a state of freedom and, particularly, to counteract the phenomenon known as "gate fever" or the panic many prisoners experience at the thought of re-entering the world of free men after a long stay in prison.  

Not all criminologists, of course, agree that the punitive approach is a complete failure nor do all agree that the work release program is the ultimate answer to our penal problems.

Ralph W. England asserts that the history of the use of prisoners by private interests involving as it does shameful memories of cruelty, exploitation, and unfair competition, has produced among many American prison administrators strong negative feelings against the use of prison labor by private industry.  

The American Correctional Association has long taken a stand against the private use of prison labor. Its position was reasserted by the United States delegation to the United Nations Congress at Geneva.

Arnold S. Kauffman, a writer in the field of criminology, challenges the assumption that in order to reform the criminal, new methods that do not rely on punishment are justified. He further argues that the reform theorists are unaware of the conflict that generally exists between their views concerning punishment and their views concerning other social

---


practices. Superficially, they fail to see that reform practices, as usually endorsed, involve coercion and manipulation pre-supposing moral inequality which is in general unjustified.1

Daniel Glaser and a group of sociologists at the University of Illinois conducted a study in 1958-1959 on prisoners in federal institutions—interviewing more than 1,000 inmates. Most of the inmates interviewed by Glaser and his associates said that "the unpleasantness of the confinement experience" greatly influenced their decision to go straight. Glaser's findings suggest that punishment does deter men from crime. In addition, his findings indicated that one-third of the men released from prison recidivate rather than the two-third as contended by other well known penologists and criminologists. Glaser states that released prisoners in the United States have not been regularly traced to adequately ascertain the incidence of recidivism among them.2

Another criminologist, George B. Vold, considers it a basic fallacy of the sentimental approach to rehabilitation to assume that every inmate committed to prison constitutes an equally good prospect for rehabilitation. Whether one views the apparent preponderance of recidivists in prison as an indication of failure of the punitive approach or places emphasis on the smaller segment of inmates successful rehabilitated seems to be largely a matter of temperament and/or point of view. The conclusion, according to Vold, is unescapable that some

reform or rehabilitation does take place in the course of present penal treatment procedures. Presumably no type of treatment would rehabilitate 100 per cent of prison inmates, but whether the proportion now being rehabilitated represents the maximum is another matter.

It should be rather obvious that the work release program is not a solution for crime, but it offers an acceptable solution for jail. This new approach is by no means the answer to all criticism of modern penology, nor does it guarantee a reduction in prison population in the future. But to the individual convicted on a relatively minor offense, it is one thing he badly needs, the one thing that can possibly determine whether he is to become an asset or liability to his family, his community and his state. Admittedly, the work release program in many states is currently in the experimental stage for which long term results are not apparent. Nevertheless, immediate results seemingly justify the use of the program.

Significance of the Study

The potential significance of this study is two-fold. First, it seeks to provide an index of the effectiveness of the work release program, particularly as it represents an innovation in the field of penology. If this and similar studies provide evidence that this approach is effective in the rehabilitation of inmates, they might well contribute

---


to a revolutionary overhauling of our current penal practices. Second, an analysis of such variables as age, previous prison records, race, and type of offense for which convicted, might enable prison officials to identify and predict those inmates most likely to benefit from participation in the work release program.

Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to provide an index of the effectiveness of the North Carolina work release program in rehabilitating prisoners. In the course of this study, emphasis is placed on the rehabilitative potential of the program as a new and innovative approach to corrections in the field of penology. It further seeks to delineate any factors from the case records which might aid prison administrators in selecting inmates who are most likely to succeed or benefit from the program.

The investigators have assumed that certain factors associated with success or failure in the work release program can be delineated. Predictive studies by E. W. Burgess, A. J. Harno, and A. A. Bruce;1 Lloyd E. Ohlin,2 and Shelton and Eleanor Glueck,3 have been used as a frame of reference for this study. By delineating characteristics of successful parolees that distinguished them from parolees who were

1Andrew A. Bruce, Earnest W. Burgess, and Albert J. Harno, Parole and the Indeterminate Sentence (Springfield: Illinois State Board of Parole, 1928).


3Sheldon Glueck and Eleanor T. Glueck, Criminal Careers in Retrospect (New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1943).
unsuccessful, the aforementioned social scientists accurately predicted, in many instances, the success or failure of inmates on parole from penal institutions.

If the aforementioned assumption is valid, the findings of this study could serve as a guideline for the selection of future work release participants.

Hypotheses to be Tested

The hypotheses to be tested in this study are the following:

(1) First offenders are better risks for work release participation than those with previous prison records.

(2) Inmates incarcerated for crimes against the person tend to be poorer program risks than those incarcerated for property crimes.

(3) Married inmates are more likely to evidence successful program participation than unmarried inmates.

(4) Inmates thirty years of age and older are more likely to successfully participate in the work release program than inmates under thirty years of age.

(5) Misdemeanants are more likely to succeed on the work release program than felons.

(6) Negro inmates are poorer risks for work release participation than white inmates.

(7) Catholic inmates are more successful work release participants than Protestant inmates.

(8) Inmates with a high level of occupational skill tend to be more successful work release participants than their less skilled counterparts.

(9) Inmates who resided in a rural area prior to incarceration are more successful work release participants than those inmates who resided in an urban area.

It is felt that the hypotheses enumerated above, whether validated or rejected, will give an indication of the effectiveness of the program as a new form of penal practices.
Scope and Limitations

To evaluate the effectiveness of the work release program as a new and innovative method of rehabilitation, the case records of 100 inmates were analyzed. As the case records were analyzed, efforts were made to delineate certain factors which were directly related to successful work release participation. It is to be noted that this study is based on the case records of former work release inmates, many of whom have been released from prison. Accordingly, it is quite possible that many former inmates who successfully terminated their participation in the program may have recidivated after release from the Prison Department.¹ For this reason, findings and conclusions in this study pertaining to the effectiveness of the work release program as a rehabilitative method do not apply to the after-conduct of released inmates.

Several other limitations should be noted. In the course of the study, it became apparent that the records were kept for administrative rather than research purposes. This imposed a limitation on the study due to a paucity of information in the records.

Finally, this study focused specifically on the North Carolina work release program. The findings of this study may or may not be applicable to similar programs in other states. The findings may, however, be used as a guide to the selection of inmates who are to participate in

¹A fruitful line of departure for another investigation would be to conduct a follow-up study on inmates who had successfully participated in a work release program and have been released from prison. Here we would be interested in ascertaining the recidivist rate among such inmates.
work release programs in another institution.

Methodological Procedure

To collect the data for this study, the investigators designed a study of a longitudinal nature. Case records of 86 inmates who participated in the work release program from 1957-1967 were selected for analysis. To ensure that the case records selected for the study were representative of work release participants, every tenth case was chosen by drawing a systematic sample from the files at the State Prison Department at Raleigh, North Carolina.

The original sample totaled 100 but was reduced to 86 after it proved impossible to classify 14 of the inmates as either successful or unsuccessful work release program participants. These cases were subsequently deleted from the sample.

By way of explanation, inmate work release participation may be terminated in any of the following ways: (1) discharge, (2) parole, (3) infraction of rules or regulations, (4) escape, (5) loss of job, (6) inmate request, (7) detainer to another court, (8) transferral to another prison unit, (9) loss of housing (efforts are made to quarter work release inmates separately from other inmates), (10) illness, and (11) death.

The above eleven ways of terminating work release participation was reduced to three major categories. They are: successful, unsuccessful, and aborted. If an inmate's participation was terminated by release or parole, his participation was considered successful. If termination was due to escape or rule infractions, his participation was considered unsuccessful. The third category, "aborted," included detainer to another
court, transferral to another prison unit, loss of housing, illness, and death. The possible exception in the "aborted" category was where the inmate was considered a failure if loss of job was due to unsatisfactory work performance. It should suffice to say that work release participation was considered "aborted" if termination was due to circumstances not directly attributed to actions or behavior of the inmate. The exception to this rule is termination requested by the inmate because he considers the employment unsuitable for him.

In gathering the data, a schedule was also designed to record the information and to standardize the data collection process. All items were precoded in order to simplify the process of gathering data and to facilitate the final analysis. Finally, in analyzing and presenting the data, standard statistical tools such as the mean, median, percentages, and the chi-square test of significance were used.
CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF THE NORTH CAROLINA WORK RELEASE PROGRAM

In the United States we have concentrated primarily upon teaching our prisoners to be good inmates, and little else. In countless cases, rehabilitative efforts have been defeated by failing to give prisoners the type of responsibility which would better prepare them to return to a free community. Accordingly, penology has been geared toward punishment and retribution rather than rehabilitation. In recent years, however, penologists have been recognizing the importance of correctional treatment to gradually prepare inmates to return to the community and assume the responsibilities of free men. The aim of this type of correctional treatment is to bridge the gap between imprisonment and parole. North Carolina is beginning to utilize new innovative techniques in the correctional treatment of prisoners. The work release program is evidence of this new trend.

Work release is quite simple both in theory and practice. Under this plan, selected prisoners leave the institution to which they are committed and work on jobs in the community during the day-time and return to confinement after working hours. A prisoner's earnings are used to pay for his room and board expenses and for the support of any dependents during his incarceration. After taxes and other miscellaneous commitments are deducted from the prisoner's earnings, the balance of his money is placed in a trust fund until he is discharged. Thus,
instead of serving "dead time" behind bars, a prisoner in the work release program contributes to his maintenance by paying his way, and to the support of his dependents. It is hoped that through such a re-introduction to society a prisoner will develop, or regain, self-respect and a sense of responsible citizenry. Gertrude Samuels, writing in the New York Times Magazine, puts it quite succinctly when she states that "the basic objective of the work release is to build a bridge of self-respect and responsibility between abnormal prison life and normal community living."  

The 1957 General Assembly enacted North Carolina's original Work Release Law to permit selected offenders committed to the prison system to engage in work in the free community while continuing as inmates of the confinement facility to which they are assigned. This law limited the work release plan to misdemeanants who had not previously served sentences totaling more than six months. The law proved to be too restrictive. These restrictions resulted in only twenty-four inmates being recommended by the courts for work release during the first two years of the program.  

The original work release law of 1957 was criticized by judges and correctional experts as not sufficiently inclusive. The General Assembly enacted North Carolina's original Work Release Law to permit selected offenders committed to the prison system to engage in work in the free community while continuing as inmates of the confinement facility to which they are assigned. This law limited the work release plan to misdemeanants who had not previously served sentences totaling more than six months. The law proved to be too restrictive. These restrictions resulted in only twenty-four inmates being recommended by the courts for work release during the first two years of the program.

---


3 Ashman, op. cit.

Assembly in 1959 amended the original law of 1957 to include felons with sentences up to five years. The amended status permits the presiding judge of the sentencing court to recommend to the State Prison Department that a person "sentenced to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years ... to be granted the option of serving the sentence under the work release plan ..."1 Every regular session of the General Assembly since 1959 has produced further amendments to the work release law or related statutes. The 1961 amendment removed a requirement that prisoners with work release privileges be quartered apart from prisoners serving regular sentences. The 1963 amendment removed the five year restriction on cases where the authorization to grant the privileges is extended by the Board of Paroles. The 1965 General Assembly did not amend the work release statute, but enacted legislation authorizing the executive head of the State Prison System to grant home leaves, a measure which experience demonstrated is necessary to enable prisoners with work release privileges to avoid the temptation to slip away from work for unauthorized visits with his family or friends.2 With the support of Governor Terry Sanford and Governor Dan K. Moore, the North Carolina Prison Department has increasingly made use of work release as a parole preparation and pre-release program. Work release has also been utilized as a community based program between probation and conventional imprisonment. Also, many jurisdictions authorize work release at the discretion of the sentencing court. North Carolina provides that both the sentencing court

1Ashman, op. cit.

and the State Board of Parole may authorize work releases.

By reducing recidivism, work release has played an important role in reducing North Carolina's prison population. Today, although the State population is increasing rapidly, North Carolina's prison population has been reduced to 10,000. This figure is 3700 below a prediction made by University of North Carolina social scientists in 1956. The prison department, as a result, has closed 22 field units which were designed to house 100 inmates each.\(^1\)

Both the employment of inmates in the free community and the quality of their confinement are subjects which arise in most discussions of work release. In North Carolina, if an inmate is eligible for work release privileges he (or she) must, among other things, "have suitable employment in a locality where facilities for work release inmates have been provided." This regulation not only states that employment is a prerequisite for work release, but suggests that employment is contingent upon the existence or availability of prison facilities in a given locale.\(^2\) The prison department plans to expand its facilities for housing work release inmates locating the majority of work release inmates in or near the community in which they are to be released.

A different question which confronts most work release jurisdictions is whether work release should be only for inmates already employed at the time they are sentenced. It is argued, however, that while such a policy may "tend to include only the best risks, ease administration, and minimize cost..." it probably excludes those who have the most go

\(^1\)Randall, op. cit.

\(^2\)Ashman, op. cit.
gain from a well contrived and well implemented program. While the work release program in North Carolina might favor men who happen to be employed at the time of sentencing, it does not discount men who might receive offers of employment after commitment to prison. The criteria used by the department in placing inmates on jobs are:

(1) that the inmate attempts to select a job in an area closest to his home and

(2) that the job be suitable for the inmate.

It is not unusual for an inmate on work release to remain with his job after he is discharged from prison, unless he happens to be far from home.

When appropriately used, the advantages of the work release program over conventional imprisonment are immeasurable. According to George W. Randall, Director of Prisons in North Carolina, the advantages of the program are as follows:

First in public appeal is the program's relief to the taxpayer. In the North Carolina Prison System today, more than 1,000 work release inmates support themselves. These include 590 misdemeanants and 421 felons. Without work release privileges in North Carolina these approximately 1,000 offenders would be a tax burden on the State. The 5,425 participants approved for the program between its inception and March 1, 1965, earned a total of $3,844,706, and from this amount the Prison Department deducted $1,295,089 for their keep.

Second, the burden of supporting the inmate's dependents is removed from or reduced for the taxpayers, and the prisoner himself continues to pay taxes. Work release inmates in North Carolina had contributed over a million dollars ($1,046,287) to the support of their families as of
March 1, 1965. The amount of welfare payments made to inmates' dependents are determined by two factors: first, the amount of need established and reported to the Prison Department on Form DFW-NCPDI by the local Welfare Department; second, the net earnings of the inmate for support payments to his family.

Third, society continues to benefit from the productive labor of a work release inmate. When the offender's attitudes and his crime do not require complete removal from society, it is pointless to keep him from wholesome productivity that enables him to support his family.

Fourth, the work release inmate retains his trade skills and work habits by keeping a regular job.

Fifth, the nature of the work release program places emphasis on correction while remaining sufficiently punitive to retain effective deterrent values against crime.

Sixth, the stigma that falls on the inmate's family is reduced when he continues as their support and as a contributing member of society.

Seventh, a work release inmate is less likely to offend again. He has the advantages of his earnings, a steady job, a place in the community, and the personal knowledge that he paid cash for the punishment he suffered. This is a deterring but not embittering experience.¹

It is not to be assumed that the North Carolina work release program has been without problems. In fact, about nine per cent of these inmates have been removed from the program for violation of regulations.

¹Randall, op. cit.
Most violations fall into two categories -- drinking intoxicants or slipping off to see the wife or girl friend.

There is still much that can be done to improve the quality of work release. However, it is an alternative to the more conventional practices of confinement and retribution. It is a program which allows a correctional administrator to give variety and flexibility to a rehabilitation program.¹

¹Ashman, op. cit.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter will present an analysis and interpretation of the data collected from the case records of 86 former work release inmates chosen by systematic sample for this study.

(1) First offenders are better risks for work release participation than those with previous prison records.

(2) Inmates incarcerated for crimes against the person tend to be poorer program risks than those incarcerated for property crimes.

(3) Married inmates are more likely to evidence successful program participation than unmarried inmates.

(4) Inmates thirty years of age and older are more likely to successfully participate in the work release program than inmates under thirty years of age.

(5) Misdemeanants are more likely to succeed on the work release program than felons.

(6) Negro inmates are poorer risks for work release participation than white inmates.

(7) Catholic inmates are more successful work release participants than Protestant inmates.

(8) Inmates with a high level of occupational skill tend to be more successful work release participants than their less skilled counterparts.

(9) Inmates who resided in a rural area prior to incarceration are more successful work release participants than those inmates who resided in an urban area.

Under the liberal work release plan that evolved in North Carolina, felons as well as misdemeanants are allowed to participate. For this
reason, the type of offenses committed by the 86 former work release participants run the gamut from murder in the second degree to disorderly conduct and operating a motor vehicle after the revocation of license.

It should be noted that many of the inmates had committed more than one offense; however, this study includes only the offense for which the inmate was incarcerated. These offenses can be grouped into 13 broad categories. Table 1 depicts these categories, and definitions of the offenses can be found in Appendix I.

**TABLE 1**

**TYPE OF OFFENSES OF WORK RELEASE PARTICIPANTS**

**BY NUMBER AND PER CENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking and Entering</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Homicide</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk and Disorderly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement and Fraud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery and Counterfeiting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses Against the Family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Escape or Attempt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Violations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Violations of the laws are generally classified as misdemeanants or felonies, and of the 86 inmates chosen for this study, official records
show that 45 were listed as felons while 41 were listed as misdemeanants. It was hypothesized earlier that misdemeanants would be more likely to succeed on the work release program than felons. The success and failure rates of each class can be seen in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**

CLASSIFICATION OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE AS RELATED TO TYPE OF TERMINATION OR WORK RELEASE PARTICIPATION BY INMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Termination</th>
<th>Crime Classification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felonies</td>
<td>Misdemeanors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Felony and Misdemeanor, totals the chi-square value of .2277 is significant at the .05 level.

The figures indicate no significant difference between the success or failure rates of felons and misdemeanants. Of the 47 successful former work release inmates, 23 or 48.9 per cent had committed misdemeanors while 24 or 51.1 per cent committed felonies. The percentages vary only slightly between those felons and misdemeanants who were successful and those who were failures. Of the 39 inmates who were unsuccessful work release participants, 21 or 53.8 per cent had committed felonies while 18 or 46.2 per cent had committed misdemeanors.

Due to the fact that both felons and misdemeanants participate in North Carolina's Work Release Program, work release administrators have a greater degree of flexibility in the selection of inmates for the program. Accordingly, there is a wide range between the sentences of the
inmates who participated in the program. Sentences for the 86 inmates in the sample of this study ranged from 3 months to 28 years with an average sentence of 4.5 years. Because of the extremes, the median is perhaps more representative of average sentence. When the median is employed, the average sentence is reduced to 3.1 years.

As this study was formulated, one of the hypotheses to be tested stated briefly that first offenders would be better risks on the work release program than those with previous records. The records of the 86 inmates studied showed that 56 or 65.1 per cent were first offenders while 30 or 34.9 per cent had previous records. The relationship between previous record and success or failure in the work release program is indicated in Table 3.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF PREVIOUS RECORDS OF INMATES AS RELATED TO SUCCESS OR FAILURE IN THE WORK RELEASE PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Termination</th>
<th>Number of Previous Records</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 and Above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square value of 19.5663 for inmates with no previous record and those with previous records is significant at the .05 level.

Table 3 indicates that inmates with previous records are less likely to succeed than first offenders, for 21 of 30 inmates who had previous records were failures. On the other hand, only 18 of 56
inmates without previous records were failures.

This finding is consistent with that of E. W. Burgess and others in their predictive study of success or failure on parole. They found that the following factors were favorably related to success on parole:

1. Type of offense (robbery, sex offenses, murder, manslaughter).
2. Marital status (married).
3. Type of offender (no previous record).

It is noteworthy that all work release participants are honor inmates. There are, however, different grades or conduct ratings for honor inmates. These ratings are: "H," which indicates that minimum custody or surveillance is needed; "A," which means that a moderate amount of surveillance is required, and "B," which is indicative of maximum custody or surveillance of the inmate. The distribution of "H," "A," and "B" ratings is depicted in Table 4.

The second hypothesis tested in this study was that inmates who had been incarcerated for crimes against the person tend to be poorer risks for participation in the program than those who had committed property crimes.

As the records were scrutinized, it was found that 20 offenses could not be designated as either personal or property crimes. These offenses included such acts as driving with a revoked license, prison escape, disorderly conduct, and family offenses such as desertion and

---

1Bruce, Burgess and Harno, *Indeterminate Sentence*, pp. 221-234.
TABLE 4

CONDUCT RATING OF WORK RELEASE INMATES AS RELATED TO SUCCESSFUL OR UNSUCCESSFUL PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Termination</th>
<th>Conduct Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;H&quot; Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square for "H", "A", and "B" totals is 5.2489. This value is not significant at the .05 level.

non-support. Property crimes included larceny, arson, auto theft, forgery, counterfeiting, fraud, and breaking and entering. Listed as personal crimes were those offenses which would most likely involve personal injury or the threat of the same. Such offenses include robbery, aggravated assault, murder, and manslaughter. This finding of the hypothesis is depicted in Table 5.

There is no significant difference between success and failure of those inmates who committed personal as opposed to property crimes. Neither is there any significant difference when "other" totals are included. As shown in Table 5 the chi-square values for personal and property; and personal, property, and "other" totals are .2979 and .4899 respectively at the .05 level.

As one might suspect with a liberal work release program, participation is not restricted by sex or by race. However, there were no females in the sample. Negro and white inmates were distributed rather
TABLE 5

TYPE OF TERMINATION OF INMATES WORK RELEASE PARTICIPATION AS RELATED TO PERSONAL, PROPERTY AND OTHER CRIMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Termination</th>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = .4899 for Personal, Property and "Other" totals and .2979 when "Other" totals are selected. This value is not significant at the .05 level.

evenly throughout the sample. The third hypothesis tested in this study was that Negro inmates are poorer risks for work release participation than white inmates. Table 6 reflects the findings.

It can be readily seen in Table 6 that 39 or 45.3 per cent of the inmates were Negroes, and 46 or 54.7 per cent were Caucasians. The "Other" inmate listed was an American Indian. A chi-square value of 3.2040 is not significant at the .05 level, although the percentage of successful inmates was greater for Caucasians. The Indian inmate was excluded from the chi-square calculations.

Interestingly, a 1950 study showed that for the United States as a whole, Negroes accounted for 30 per cent of all inmates committed to state and Federal institutions. If the sample in this study can be

considered as representative of the total work release population in North Carolina, Negroes are seemingly being selected for work release participation at a rate much higher than their proportion to the general prison population.

**TABLE 6**

RACIAL STATUS OF 86 WORK RELEASE INMATES AS RELATED TO SUCCESS OR FAILURE ON THE WORK RELEASE PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Termination</th>
<th>Racial Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square value of 3.2040 for Negro and white totals is not significant at the .05 level.

A fourth hypothesis tested in this study stated that inmates who are married tend to be more successful on the program than those unmarried or single. Unmarried inmates are those who are no longer married due to death, divorce, or legal separation. The hypothesis is consistent with the findings of noted criminologists and sociologists.

William Healy and Augusta F. Bronner found that life histories of criminals leave a clear-cut impression of the absence of marriage and stability of family life. In a follow-up study of 420 Chicago male delinquents, they found that when the average age of the group was 25 years, only 9 per cent were married. In the general population, about 28 per cent of males between 20 and 24 years of age were married.\(^1\) This study

also revealed that of 250 recidivists studied, only 5 per cent were married.\(^1\) Their study gives some indication of the relationship between marriage and recidivism.

Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck also found that among 500 male criminals studied, 54.5 per cent were married at the time their average age was thirty. For the population as a whole in 1940, approximately 70 per cent of the males were married by age thirty.\(^2\)

In this study, it was found that 39 or 45.3 per cent of the inmates were married while 47 or 54.7 per cent were single or unmarried. Table 7 shows the relationship between marital status and success or failure on the work release program.

Just as marital status has been found to be a relevant factor in the rehabilitation of criminals, so has the factor of age. The Gluecks, in their study, *Criminal Careers in Retrospect*, found that a greater proportion of those inmates who responded well to each form of peno-correctional treatment were further along in years when they first became delinquent than those who did not respond satisfactorily to treatment.\(^3\)

In view of such findings as those of the Gluecks, it was hypothesized that inmates 30 years and older tend to be more successful participants in the work release program than those under 30 years of age.

Table 8 summarizes these findings.

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 268

\(^2\)Glueck and Glueck, *Criminal Careers in Retrospect*, p. 84.

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 211-212.
TABLE 7
MARITAL STATUS OF WORK RELEASE INMATES AS RELATED TO SUCCESS OR FAILURE ON THE WORK RELEASE PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Termination</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th></th>
<th>Single or Unmarried</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square value of .0927 for married and unmarried totals indicate that marital status is not a significant factor in successful or unsuccessful work release participation.

TABLE 8
TYPE OF TERMINATION OF WORK RELEASE PARTICIPATION OF INMATES UNDER 30 YEARS OF AGE AND THOSE OVER 30 YEARS OF AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Termination</th>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Under 30 Years of Age</th>
<th>Over 30 Years of Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = 1.9476 for totals of inmates under 30 years of age and those over 30 years of age. This value is not significant at the .05 level.

Table 8 shows that 38 or 44.2 per cent of the inmates were under 30 years of age while 48 or 55.8 per cent were over 30 years of age. Again no significant difference exists as a chi-square value of 1.9476
for both categories is not significant at the .05 per cent level.

A close analysis of the age factor revealed that the mean age for the inmates was 32.5 years. When the ages of successful inmates were compared with those who were failures the mean age was 31.6 years for the former and 33.5 years for the latter. Thus, the successful inmate was on the average 1.9 years younger than his unsuccessful counterpart.

Another factor thought to be directly related to criminality and frequently used in predictive studies is that of educational achievement.

In their book, 500 Criminal Careers, the Gluecks assert that the level of educational attainment and success on parole are directly related. Also, Richard Korn and Lloyd McCorkle state:

Inferior educational achievement— one of the concomitants of low socioeconomic status is highly correlated with crime. Though recent over-all statistics on the educational level of prisoners are lacking, individual studies indicate that prisoners have generally completed fewer years of schooling than non-prisoners.

The educational level of the 86 inmates selected for this study ranged from 0 to 16 years of schooling. The mean number of years was 9.0 and the median was 9.1 years.

While there seems to be general consensus as to the relationship of marital status, previous record, and educational achievement on criminality and the predicting of behavior of inmates during parole, the same

---


consensus is lacking with regards to the significance of intelligence quotients.

Studies by Carl Hurchinson and Simon H. Tulchin found that the range of intelligence of prisoners closely approximated that for non-criminal Army draftees. On the other hand, the Gluecks use intelligence as a factor for predicting parole behavior. Later, however, they state that extreme claims of a high incidence of feeblemindedness among delinquents and criminals made during the first two or three decades of the present century are today recognized as exaggerations.

Since there is no consensus as to the importance of intelligence in the correctional process, it was included in this study.

Because only a small number of the 76 prison units administer psychological tests, intelligence quotient scores for 45 of the inmates were not available. The inmates are usually given the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, and Table 9 depicts the level of intellectual functioning of the inmates according to Wechsler's scale.

The intelligence quotients of the inmates ranged from 64 to 120. For all 41 cases, the mean was 93.2 and the median exactly 93. A chi-square value of .1970 for the totals of those inmates whose scores were below the lower limit of the average category and those whose scores

---

1 See Carl Murchinson, Criminal Intelligence (Worchester Mass.: Clark University, 1962) and Simon H. Tulchin, Intelligence and Crime (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939).

2 Glueck and Glueck, Criminal Careers in Retrospect, p. 244.

were above 90 is not significant. Accordingly, inmates whose level of intellectual functioning was below average were as likely to be successful work release participants as those whose level of intellectual functioning was above average.

**TABLE 9**

**LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL FUNCTIONING OF WORK RELEASE INMATES BY NUMBER AND PER CENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intelligence Quotients by Categories and Scores</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defective: 65 and below</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline: 66-79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull Normal: 80-90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average: 91-110</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Normal: 111-119</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 120-127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available:</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = .1970\) for inmates with intelligence quotients above 90 and those below 90. This value is not significant at the .05 level.

Although religion is thought to play an important role in the lives of many people and is often considered to be a stabilizing influence, the predictive studies earlier cited made no mention of religion as an important factor in prison rehabilitation.

Donald Taft and Ralph England, Jr. state that studies by students trying to show differences in the influence of various denominations have proved nothing. They argue that when considerable differences have been found in criminal records of persons of one denomination, as compared with others, the contrast in class membership, degree of urbanization,
and exposure to other causes of crime have been found almost certainly to be the real explanations of such denominational differences. They cite, for example, the fact that the Baptist denomination includes a large number of Negroes, it naturally reflects the high crime rate of Negroes.

For this study, religious affiliation was divided into five groups. It was hypothesized that inmates of the Catholic faith would be more successful work release participants than those of the Protestant faith. Table 10 portrays the five groupings and their relationship to the types of termination of work release participation.

### TABLE 10

RELIGIOUS STATUS OF WORK RELEASE INMATES AS RELATED TO SUCCESS OR FAILURE ON THE PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Termination</th>
<th>Religious Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 6.9283$ for Protestant, Catholic and "None" totals and $6.5256$ for Protestant and Catholic totals. Both values are significant at the .05 level.

---

A chi-square value of 6.9283 for Protestant, Catholic, and "None" totals is significant at the .05 level. When those who listed no religious affiliation are excluded, the chi-square value is 6.5256 which is also significant at the .05 level.

In the predictive studies of E. W. Burgess, the Gluecks, and Lloyd Ohlin previously cited, little credence is given to the level of occupational skill of the inmate as a factor related to success or failure on parole; rather, the emphasis is on the prior work record of the offender. This study, however, has included level of occupational skill as a factor for analysis due to a paucity of information pertaining to work records of the inmates prior to incarceration.

For this factor, it was hypothesized that inmates with a high level of occupational skill tend to be more successful work release participants than their less skilled counterparts.

There were no professional individuals among the 86 inmates whose records were studied, and as can be seen in Table 11, the majority of the inmates were in the semiskilled category.

For the purpose of this study, semiskilled persons are those who use tools or machinery after a period of experience under guidance or study. The skilled individuals are those who have had considerable training in the use of tools and processes such as electricians, plumbers, and machinists. The unskilled persons are those who do any type of menial work which does not require any training such as laborers, domestic workers, and carpenter helpers. "Unknown" and "Student" categories are self-explanatory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Termination</th>
<th>Level of Occupational Skill</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square for skilled total and totals of semiskilled, unskilled, and "unknown" categories is 12.5969. When the "unknown" category is deleted, the value is 11.8676. Both values are significant at the .05 level.
Table 11 shows that those inmates who were listed as skilled were much more successful than those listed as semiskilled or unskilled. As indicated at the bottom of Table 11, chi-square values are significant at the .05 level.

The last factor analyzed in this study was that of place of residence. This factor was chosen because most of the records recorded county of birth rather than the specific city or town in which the individual was born. It was hypothesized that inmates who resided in a rural area prior to incarceration are more successful work release participants than those inmates who resided in an urban area.

To determine if a place of residence was urban or rural, Lloyd Ohlin's criterion was employed. Ohlin designated as urban "... a city or town of more than 2,500 population." Conversely, a rural place of residence was one with a population of less than 2,500.

Table 12 depicts the relationship between place of residence prior to incarceration and type of termination of work release participation. Table 12 shows that the inmate whose listed place of residence is in an urban area is more likely to be a failure on the work release program than his rural counterpart. The chi-square value of 4.3704 is significant at the .05 level.

Conclusions relative to the findings in this study are presented in the following chapter.

---

1Ohlin, Selection for Parole, p. 128.
### TABLE 12

RESIDENCE OF EIGHTY-SIX WORK RELEASE INMATES AS RELATED TO SUCCESS OR FAILURE IN THE PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Termination</th>
<th>Classification of Residential Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square value of 4.370 for urban and rural totals is significant at the .05 level.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings, as discussed in Chapter III, suggest that the work release program is an effective innovation in the rehabilitation of prison inmates. Of the total 86 inmates chosen for this study, 54.7 per cent were successful work release participants. It is not known whether the post release conduct of these inmates will be successful; however, the fact that over one-half of the sample were successful participants in the program indicates the effectiveness of the work release program as a method of rehabilitation.

The sample indicated that work release participants were not chosen on the basis of race or the nature of the offense. Rather, it revealed that Negro and white participants, as well as felons and misdemeanants, were evenly distributed in the program. It also revealed that a majority of those selected for work release participation were first offenders. This does not indicate, however, that first offenders are given first consideration for work release participation.

In the course of the study, nine hypotheses were tested in an effort to determine if certain variables or factors were directly related to successful work release participation. The null hypothesis and chi-square were used in testing the hypotheses. The following findings were obtained with reference to the hypotheses enumerated in Chapter III.¹

¹See Chapter III, p. 22.
(1) First offenders are better risks for work release participation than inmates with previous criminal records. A chi-square value of 19.5663 was significant at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis one was supported by the findings.

(2) Work release participants who committed crimes against the person are as successful as inmates who committed property crimes. Hypothesis two, therefore, was not supported by the findings.

(3) Marital status is not directly related to successful work release participation. There was no significant difference between success and failure rates for married inmates and single or unmarried inmates. Hypothesis three, therefore, was rejected.

(4) Age is not an important factor in successful work release participation. It was found that inmates under 30 years of age were as likely to successfully terminate their work release participation as those inmates over 30 years of age. For this reason, hypothesis four was rejected.

(5) Felons are as successful in the work release program as misdemeanants. Accordingly, the hypothesis that misdemeanants would be more likely to succeed on the program than would felons was rejected.

(6) Racial status does not appear to be related to successful work release participation, although proportionately more white inmates than Negro inmates were successful. A chi-square value of 3.2040 was not significant at the .05 level, and the sixth hypothesis was rejected.

(7) Those inmates whose religious affiliation was listed as Protestant were more successful work release participants than those whose religious affiliation was listed as Catholic. The findings do not support the hypothesis that Catholic inmates would be more successful. In fact, the results are just the opposite of those predicted and expected, and significantly so. A chi-square value of 6.5256 was significant at the .05 level.

(8) A high level of occupational skill seems to be related to successful work release participation. Hypothesis eight was, therefore, supported by the findings.

(9) Inmates from rural areas were more successful work release participants than were their urban counterparts. A chi-square value of 4.3704 was significant; therefore hypothesis nine was supported by the findings.
To summarize, with reference to the nine hypotheses tested in this study, only four factors appeared related to successful or unsuccessful work release participation. They were: (1) previous record, (2) religious affiliation, (3) level of occupational skill, and (4) urban versus rural place of residence. Because chi-square value for these factors was significant at the .05 level, each was further analyzed.

The study indicated rather clearly that the first offender was a better risk for work release participation than the inmate with previous prison records, for 38 or 67.9 per cent of the 56 inmates with no previous record were successful work release participants, compared with only 9 or 30.0 per cent of those inmates who were recidivists. The question must arise as to why 9 inmates with previous records were successful while 21 others were not?

In an effort to answer this question, several factors were cross tabulated with previous record. Percentagewise, the cross tabulation revealed that the two factors, place of residence and racial status, appeared related to the high failure rate of inmates with past records. It revealed that of the 21 unsuccessful inmates who were recidivists 17 or 80.6 per cent were urban dwellers. As for racial status, 13 or 61.9 per cent of the 21 unsuccessful recidivists were Negroes.

It was noted, by way of contrast, that these factors were not nearly as pronounced among the 9 successful inmates who had previous records. In both instances the figures were identical as 5 or 55.6 per cent were urban dwellers while 4 or 44.4 per cent were Caucasians. These findings seemingly indicate that a cluster of factors, rather than recidivism per se, is responsible for the unsuccessful work release participation of those inmates with previous records.
When religious affiliation was cross tabulated with other factors, it was found that racial status, place of residence, and previous records were related to the failure rates of the participants.

It was hypothesized that Catholic inmates would be more successful in the program than Protestant inmates. Conversely, it was found that Catholic inmates were more likely to be unsuccessful. This finding, however, was viewed with reservations because of the small number of Catholics in the sample—11 Catholics compared with 63 Protestants. It was assumed that had the Catholic sample been larger, the 81.8 per cent failure rate of the Catholic inmates might have been significantly reduced.

Because of the small number of Catholics in the sample, it was decided to further analyze the 63 Protestants in an effort to determine why 25 or 36.8 per cent of the total Protestants were failures.

The analysis revealed that of the 38 successful Protestant participants, 14 or 36.8 per cent were Negroes while 24 or 63.2 per cent were white. Of the 25 who were unsuccessful, 16 or 64.0 per cent were Negroes and 9 or 36.0 per cent were white. Regarding place of residence, 21 or 55.3 per cent of the 38 successful Protestant inmates were urban dwellers and 17 or 44.7 per cent were from rural areas. Of the 25 who were failures, 20 or 80.0 per cent were urban dwellers and 5 or 20.0 per cent were rural dwellers. When the past record variable was considered, 31 or 81.6 per cent of the 38 successful Protestants were found to be first offenders while 7 or 18.4 per cent were recidivists. Of the 25 who were failures, 10 or 40.0 per cent were first offenders, and 15 or 60.0 per cent were recidivists. These findings seem to indicate that
when religious affiliation is held constant, Negroes, urban dwellers, and recidivists tend to be less successful work release participants. Another variable which had a significant chi-square value was occupational skill. Table 11 shows that skilled inmates are more successful work release participants than those who are semi-skilled or unskilled. Nevertheless, 33 of the 69 inmates in the semiskilled and unskilled categories were successful work release participants.¹

A cross tabulation again proved useful as it was found that 16 or 49.5 per cent of the 33 successful semiskilled and unskilled inmates were from urban areas. In comparison, of the 36 who were failures, 28 or 77.7 per cent were urban dwellers and 8 or 32.3 per cent were rural dwellers.

The previous record factor also appeared to be significant as 25 or 75.8 per cent of the 33 successful inmates noted above were first offenders, whereas only 8 or 24.2 per cent were recidivists. Among the failures, 16 or 44.5 per cent were first offenders, compared with 20 or 55.5 per cent who were recidivists.

Finally, the study revealed that rural dwellers are better risks for work release participation than those who reside in urban areas.² Again, cross tabulation was used in order to determine what other factors were related to the failure of the 9 rural dwelling inmates. For the first time, the marital status factor appeared significant, for

¹See Table 11, Chapter III, p. 37.

²See Table 12, Chapter III, p. 39.
7 or 77.8 per cent of the 9 unsuccessful inmates were single or unmarried. On the other hand, only 10 or 47.6 per cent of the 21 successful rural dwellers were single or unmarried.

In conclusion, there is ample evidence to indicate that factors such as previous record (first offender), level of industrial skill (skilled), and place of residence (rural) are favorably related to successful work release participation. However, it is possible that other hidden factors are involved in success or failure rates. It is also probable that such factors cluster together more frequently under certain conditions than others.

If other as yet unidentified factors are involved, further research and study are needed to delineate them and to determine their correlation with other factors which are related to successful or unsuccessful work release participation.
APPENDIX I

DEFINITION OF OFFENSES

Arson.— The malicious burning of another's property or burning of one's own home.

Aggravated Assault.— Includes assault with intent to kill; assault by shooting, cutting, stabbing, maiming, poisoning, scalding, or by the use of acids. Does not include simple assault but will include assault on female for this study.

Breaking and Entering.— Includes burglary, housebreaking, safecracking, or any unlawful entry to commit a felony or a theft, even though no force was used to gain entrance. Includes attempts. Burglary followed by larceny is included in this classification and is not counted again as larceny.

Criminal Homicide.— Murder and non-negligent manslaughter includes all willful felonious homicides as distinguished from deaths caused by negligence. Does not include attempts to kill, assaults to kill, suicides, accidental deaths, or justifiable homicides.

Drunk and Disorderly.— Includes all offenses of drunkenness or intoxication and all charges of committing a breach of the peace.

Embezzlement and Fraud.— Includes all offenses of fraudulent conversion, embezzlement, and obtaining money or property by false pretenses.

Felony.— An act or omission forbidden by law and punishable upon conviction by death or imprisonment in a state or federal penitentiary.

Forgery and Counterfeiting.— Includes all offenses dealing with the making, altering, uttering, or possessing, with intent to defraud, anything false which is made to appear true. Includes attempts.

Larceny.— Theft (except auto theft). (a) fifty dollars and over in value; (b) under $50 in value--includes in one of the above sub-classifications, depending upon the value of the property stolen, thefts of bicycles, automobiles accessories, shoplifting, pocket-picking, or any stealing of property or article of value which is not taken by force and violence or by fraud. Does not include embezzlement, "con" games, forgery, or worthless checks.

Offenses against the Family and Children.— Includes offenses of non-support, neglect, desertion, or abuse of family or children. Will also include for this study bigamy and attempt to commit common law.
Prison Escape.-- Self-explanatory. Includes attempts.

Robbery.-- Includes stealing or taking anything of value from the person by force or violence or by instilling fear, such as strong-arm robbery, stickups, robbery, armed. Includes assault to rob and attempt to rob.

Traffic Violations.-- Includes driving while intoxicated, while licenses are revoked, and other chronic violations of regulations with respect to the proper handling of a motor vehicle to prevent accidents.

Auto Theft.-- Includes all cases where a motor vehicle is stolen or driven away and abandoned, including the so-called joy riding thefts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Intelligence Quotient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (As Listed)</td>
<td>Place of Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>Length of Sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Record (Recidivism)</td>
<td>Honor Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition (How off work release)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX III

**CODES FOR TABULATION SHEET**

| Column 1. Crime Classification | (1) Felony | (2) Misdemeanor |
| Column 2. Race of Offender     | (1) Caucasian | (2) Negro | (3) American Indian | (4) Other |
| Column 3. Sex                  | (1) Male | (2) Female |
| Column 4. Age Group of Offender| (1) 16-21 | (2) 22-27 | (3) 28-33 | (4) 34-39 | (5) 40-45 | (6) 46-51 | (7) 51 and above |
| Column 5. Marital Status       | (1) Single (never married) | (2) Married | (3) Unmarried (Widowed, Divorced, Separated) |
| Column 6. Type of Occupation   | (1) Skilled | (2) Semi-skilled | (3) Unskilled | (4) Unknown | (5) Student |
| Column 7. Religious Affiliation| (1) Protestant |
(2) Catholic
(3) Jewish
(4) Other
(5) None

Column 8. Place of Residence
(1) Urban (2,500-up)
(2) Rural (Under 2,500)

Column 9. Type of Crime
(1) Personal
(2) Property

Column 10. Previous Record (Recidivism)
(1) (Self-Explanatory)
(2)
(3)
(4) 4 and above

Column 11. Disposition (How off work release program)
(1) Success
(2) Failure
(3) Aborted

Column 12. Educational Achievement
(1) None
(2) Grades 1-6
(3) Grades 7-9
(4) Grades 10-12
(5) 13 and above

Column 13. Length of Sentence
(1) Less than 1 year
(2) 1 to 2 years
(3) 2 to 3 years
(4) 3 to 4 years
(5) 5 years or more

Column 14. Intelligence Quotient (WAIS)
(1) 65 and below (Defective)
(2) 66-79 (Borderline)
(3) 80-90 (Dull Normal)
(4) 91-110 (Average)
(5) 111-119 (Bright Normal)
(6) 120-127 (Superior)
Column 15. **Honor Condition**

(1) "H" (Minimum Custody)
(2) "A" (Medium Custody)
(3) "B" (Maximum Custody)
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