Research Publication

Performance on work release & after

Joy Turnbull
Project Research Officer

Don Porritt
Chief Research Officer

George Cooney
Research Consultant

NSW Department of Corrective Services

Research Publication

PERFORMANCE ON WORK RELEASE & AFTER

Joy Turnbull   **Don Porritt**   George Cooney

Project Research Chief Research   Research Consultant
Officer   Officer

with assistance from

David Cairns
Statistical Consultant

Research and Statistics Division
N.S.W. Department of Corrective Services

SUMMARY

Work release in NSW allows selected prisoners to work in the community while residing in prison. Up to 2% of prisoners held are in the scheme. It is claimed to have advantages for the prisoner and his family, for the community and for the Department. The main disadvantage is that some prisoners abscond or re-offend in other ways while in the programme.

Selection procedures could be aimed at selecting those most likely to benefit, at selecting those least likely to fail (abscond or re-offend) or excluding those whose failure, if it occurred, would generate strong community objections.

Data on 296 work releasees are examined to determine whether selection to minimise failure is practicable. The data also give a profile of work releasees when the programme was at its numerical height (1977 and early 1978). Participants showed high rates of social, educational and occupational disadvantage, and many had long histories of convictions and penalties. In these ways they were not atypical of the prison population in general.

Two types of failure in the programme were identified: those removed for non-criminal breaches (16%); and those who committed criminal offences including escape (8%). Successes (75%) were released from the programme to the community.

It was possible to predict who would fail at a level better than chance but not sufficiently better to usefully select those with good prospects of successful completion. Measures of prior convictions and sentences were the best predictors. Other things being equal, property offenders were poorer risks than offenders against person, although on its own offence type did not predict programme outcome.

Those failing for technical breaches were similar to those re-convicted for offences committed in the programme, on the variables that discriminated successes from failures.

Further data showed that those successfuly completing the programme had lower recidivism over 15 months after release (33%) than those failing by technical breach (54%) or criminal breach (83%). This effect held when the common association of both programme outcome and post-release performance with previous convictions and sentences was allowed for. Nor could the effect be explained by the longer time spent in the programme by successes or by their greater savings accumulated on release.

It was concluded that available data could not be used to usefully increase the rate of programme success. However, those with more extensive histories of conviction and incarceration might need special forms of support early in their period of work release. It would be helpful if the objectives of selection were made more explicit. The stated criteria appear to be unrelated to either programme performance or recidivism. Violent offenders are not worse risks than others. The processes leading to failure or success, and which link programme performance to recidivism, are not yet clear and deserve further study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERFORMANCE ON WORK RELEASE AND AFTER: A PREDICTION STUDY

1. Introduction

Work Release in New South Wales

Work Release in New South Wales is a programme in which selected convicted prisoners are allowed to go to work in the community while residing in the prison. Participants receive normal pay and conditions at work, but pass their pay on to the Department. Agreed sums are allocated to board and lodgings (retained by the Department), travelling and other costs (returned immediately to the prisoner), payments to any dependents of the prisoner, and savings banked for the prisoner to collect on discharge.

The New South Wales scheme commenced in 1969. The numbers involved built up to around 100, then dropped to 40-50 and have since slowly increased to 60-70. At its height, the programme involved 2-3% of NSW prisoners.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Work Release

Numerous advantages have been claimed for such programmes. These can be grouped as advantages to the prisoner and his family, economic advantages to the community, and organisational advantages to the Department.

The suggested gains for the prisoner and family include:

* increased income during the pre-release period, and hence reduced economic hardship before release (for the family) and following release (for both prisoner and family),
* smoother transition to freedom following from being more accustomed to self-determination and having already established relationships at work when released,
* reinforcement of work habits under normal industrial conditions while in a situation which offers greater incentives and support than would be available after release,
* contacts with the prison community, which could discourage rehabilitation, are reduced at the key pre-release period.

The direct economic benefits to the community include:

* reduced costs of imprisonment (about half the costs of full-time imprisonment),
* in some cases, reduced social welfare payments to the prisoner's family,
* increased taxation revenue where the position taken would otherwise have remained vacant.

An indirect benefit would follow in reduced costs of crime if the programme does reduce re-offending. The organisational advantages include:

* easier management of prisoners resulting from the incentives for good conduct and industry implicit in selection for the programme and in the operation of the programme itself,
* reduced pressure on the already overloaded capacity of prison industries to provide employment,
* provision of greater work satisfaction and lowered tension levels for staff supervising work releasees compared to staff in more secure settings.

Braithwaite (1980) recently reviewed studies of the effects of work release. No study found recidivism to be increased by work release. Some programmes were more successful than others at delivering economic and social benefits to participants. Success in reducing recidivism was evident only in the programmes which did produce these benefits.

The main disadvantage of work release is the certainty that some prisoners will abscond or in some way re-offend while in the community. Action to reduce eligibility for work release following such an incident cut the numbers on the programme from 95-115 (achieved in January — September, 1979) to 40-50 (October, 1979). Return to around 60 has taken two years, with successive changes of selection criteria having at times quite unintended effects on the composition of the population.

Selection for Work Release

Selection for such a programme is a difficult matter, particularly when the objectives of selection are not clear. These could be:

1) to select those in greatest need,
2) to select those most likely to succeed,
3) to ensure that the chance of violent re-offences by prisoners with histories of violence are minimised, and so to minimise mass media and public objections to the programme.

Different objectives require incompatible policies. Offenders held for violent crimes tend to have lower overall recidivism rates than those held for non-violent property offences, but are slightly more likely to commit further violent offences (Ward and Porritt, 1982). When they do commit such offences while on work release, their history of such crimes results in strong mass media and public reaction. Thus, objective 2) would lead to a preference for such offenders while objective 3) would lead to their exclusion. Selection by 'need' (criterion 1), depending on how the need is defined, could well lead to inclusion of prisoners with a greater chance of failure, hence violating objective 2). These issues are considered again later in this report in the light of the results of this research.

The actual criteria used have been revised on a number of occasions. To reduce the chances of 'breakdown', criterion changes successively increased the length of time candidates must spend with a low security classification before entering the programme. As Table 1 shows, the effect was the reverse of that intended. The participants were increasingly drawn from long-stay prisoners who were serving terms for violent offences. The criteria have recently been revised again to ensure that short-term prisoners sentenced for less serious offences can gain entry.

This raises the question of what selection criteria (if any) can be used to minimise failure in the programme. The data collected and analysed here were designed to answer this question. One major finding identified an issue of special interest about the relationship between programme performance and recidivism following discharge. Some additional data were collected and analysed to explore the basis of the relationship found.

2. The Sample and Data

Information was collected from the records of 296 off-

enders, placed on the Work Release 1 programme in 1977 and early 1978, in order to answer several questions regarding programme participation:

1. Which attributes predict success within the programme?
2. What combination of such attributes best predict success on the programme?
3. Do removal from the programme for 'technical breach' and 'criminal breach' represent different degrees on one dimension of non-success or two different types of non-success?
4. Which attributes (including performance in the programme) predict subsequent re-offence?

Choice of Data Items

Previous prediction studies have found criminal history and certain personal and social offender attributes to be useful predictors of successful participation. Specific predictive attributes utilised have varied amongst these investigators as has the number of such attributes (Mannheim & Wilkins, 1955; Dean, 1968; Hood & Sparks, 1970; Simon, 1971; Hoffman, Gottfredson, Wilkins & Pasela, 1974; Brookhart, Ruark & Scoven, 1976).

A review of these studies suggested that it would be worthwhile to include some 30 specific variables based on the data available about offenders. These are listed with brief descriptions in Appendix 1. Following the description of each variable is a list of the published work where a similar measure had been used. To ensure full coverage, data on a number of variables thought unlikely to be predictive was also obtained. These are denoted in Appendix 1 by an asterix.

Outcome Criterion

Prediction studies require a criterion to be defined. The most common criterion in corrections has been the binary measure of recidivism. However, more discriminating measures have also been utilised varying from success on the programme itself through number of arrests, reconvictions, type of follow-up offence and severity of offence to number of free days after release from custody (Simon, 1971; Rudoff & Esselstyn, 1973; Jeffery & Woolpert, 1974; Brookhart, Ruark & Scoven, 1976; Kellar & Carlson, 1977, Gendreau & Leipciger, 1978). The main concern in this study was to predict programme success. Thus a three level criterion was chosen.

1) Successful completion of the programme (ie. Released to Parole or License);
2) Removed for Technical Breach; or
3) Removed for Criminal Breach (including escape).

A pilot study was completed in 191 cases. This investigation was limited by a lack of data on a sufficient number of cases to complete a discriminant analysis. The present study increased the number of cases and so expanded the information available on variables to develop a predictive function.

The Sample

The data were obtained for 296 prisoners who commenced Work Release 1 from January 1977 to March 1978. A few other prisoners who commenced Work Release in this period were not included because crucial data (such as performance over 15 months after discharge) were not available (eg., still in prison or deported). The sample period ended at the time more restrictive selection criteria were applied and numbers entering the programme were sharply reduced. The sample was thus relatively diverse compared to those entering the programme since mid 1978. The period was chosen to allow time for all those included to be followed for 15 months after discharge, including those who re-offended while in the programme.

Sample Characteristics

1) ### Personal and Social

The vast majority of these work releasees were Australian born (84%) from low socio-economic backgrounds (69% classified D on the Congalton scale) and with average or below average performance on standard ability tests but showing no evidence of psychiatric disturbance. Most (92%) had commenced secondary schooling but relatively few (27%) had gained a secondary school certificate. In the two years prior to the current conviction 54% had held four or more jobs. At the time of the offence, 49% were unemployed, although the majority of these had not been receiving any social welfare benefits. Slightly over half (57%) were not in any permanent relationship (married or de facto) and only 40% had dependent children (see Table 2). These findings would be fairly typical of any unselected group of prisoners.

2) ### Criminal Record

Nearly half the sample (47%) had criminal convictions dating from their early teens but few (5%) had been charged with neglect. Of the 138 who had been convicted of juvenile offences other than neglect, 99 (72%) had been placed on probation at least once while 86 (62%) had been in an institution at least once (see Table 3).

Only one quarter (25%) had no previous adult criminal history; the remainder were evenly divided between those with 5 or less adult convictions (38%) and those with 6 or more (38%). About three quarters (73%) had previously spent at least one period in prison. Of the 66 (22% of the sample) previously placed on probation only 15 (23% of the 66) completed this successfully. The majority (78%) of the 51 who had been paroled following a previous imprisonment had had their parole revoked (Table 4).

3) ### Current Episode

In about half the cases (53%) where the trial judge made any remarks concerning the offender's attitudes to his offence, the remark was negative; only a quarter were positive. Psychologists who interviewed 60% of the work releasees as part of the classification procedures considered that nearly half (46%) had a positive attitude to putting their time in prison to good use, while one quarter (24%) of those seen were thought to have a negative attitude at this stage. The most recent recorded assessment by a Programme Review Committee before commencing Work Release rated two-thirds (67%) of those assessed as above average or better in attitudes to work, to staff and other prisoners and in general behaviour while in prison.

These ratings suggest a trend toward more favourable assessments as prisoners progressed through their sentences,

but could be a reflection of different assessment standards employed by the three different types of assessor (see Table 5).

The most common offences (see Table 7) for which these men had been imprisoned were property offences (41%, usually Break, enter and steal) and robbery or extortion (22%). Sentences (see Table 5) were mainly in the 3 – 5 year range (47%) with the typical non-parole period being around 1 year and very few exceeding five years (3%). Nearly two thirds (65%) of these men were 25 years of age or more when convicted for the current offence (Table 5). Most (81%) spent 1 year or less in custody prior to entry to the work release programme and about half (55%) left the programme within 3 months, nearly two thirds of these being released to parole. Overall, three quarters were released to parole, license or remission (thereby completing the programme successfully), 16% were withdrawn for technical breaches of the rules (including behaviour suggesting they were "bad risks" although not necessarily breaching formal rules) and the remainder (8%) were charged with criminal offences, including escape (see Table 6).

All 296 were followed until they had completed 15 months at large or had been re-imprisoned. Most (69%) had no offences in the 15 months after discharge, but two thirds of those who did re-offend (27% of the total sample) were re-imprisoned (Table 6). Comparison of the re-offences with the "current" offences (Tables 7 and 8) shows a drop in property offences and a rise in offences against order. This rise represents those who, while on parole, commit an offence less serious than the "current offence" and have their parole revoked, or commit drug offences. Table 8 shows that while some of those who were re-convicted committed more serious offences, most were re-convicted for offences similar to or less serious than their original offence.

Overview

This descriptive information suggests that in 1977 and early 1978, work releasees were not atypical of prisoners serving sentences long enough to qualify for the programme. Low education and restricted work skills were associated with low status occupations, frequent unemployment and criminal records running back for many to their teens.

It is not possible to say whether the re-conviction rate is above or below that which might be expected. Relatively few (13%) were reconvicted for offences accorded penalties short of imprisonment. Of 250 parolees followed by Gorta et al, (in press), 26% were convicted of an offence in their first year at large. In an unselected sample of sentenced prisoners released in 1974, 38% were reconvicted, with 22% re-imprisoned and 16% not re-imprisoned in their first year after release. Without allowing for the type of offence and prior convictions, such crude comparisons cannot show the effect of work release on recidivism. What is very clear is that those who successfully complete the programme are much less often reconvicted in the follow-up period (33%; 19% re-imprisoned and 14% not re-imprisoned) than those who failed (64% reconvicted; 53% re-imprisoned and 11% not re-imprisoned). It is important to realise that convictions and sentences for offences committed while in the programme were not included in the follow-up period.

This leads to the central issues of this report: what distinguishes work releasees who "fail" from those who 'succeed" and (a subsidiary but important question),

what explains the difference in recidivism found for those who succeed and those who fail.

3.   Performance in Work Release

Predictors of Performance

Of those studied, 75% successfully completed, 16% were withdrawn for technical breaches and 8% committed proven criminal offences while in the programme. How did these three groups differ?

Those variables (of the many examined in Table 2 to Table 6) which indicated some relationship to programme performance are listed in Table 9, together with the statistical level of significance. Four variables (having dependent children, performance on the PM 38 test of intellectual ability, the Psychologist's summary remarks, and education), are only just significant if the 5% level is taken. Two juvenile criminal record measures and two measures of adult criminal record are highly significant. Time on Work Release, reconviction after discharge and being sentenced to prison for an offence after discharge also were statistically significant.

Closer examination allowed some of these measures to be discarded as potential predictors of performance.

Four variables showed significant relationships only if the 5% level is set. Two of these (PM 38 and Psychologist's remarks) were not available for a large proportion of the sample. Education showed a non-linear pattern, although when all those not completing a secondary certificate are contrasted with those who had done so, a slightly stronger effect emerges (Chi square = 8.04, 2 d.f., p < .02).

The Programme Review Committee Assessment is only significant because of the very poor performance by the 7 rated below average (see note to Table 6). Indeed, those rated Excellent did not perform quite as well as those rated Average or Above Average, although this effect is not significant even at the 5% level. Again, the data are not available for many of the cases.

Time on Work Release was highly associated with performance in the programme. The bulk of the failures occurred during the first month. While an interesting result with some practical implications, this measure is more an effect of failure than a basis on which it can be predicted. The two measures of performance after discharge are also effects which cannot be used to predict programme performance. Of particular interest is the relatively strong association between performance in the programme and reconviction in the follow-up period. Both could be common effects of other causes but it is also possible that successful completion improved, and failure reduced, a prisoner's chance of remaining free of conviction after discharge. This issue is explored more thoroughly later in this report.

To summarise, the strongest candidates for use as selection criteria to minimise programme failure appear to be four measures of prior convictions and penalties, two covering juvenile convictions and two covering adult convictions.

Combination of predictors

The analyses reported here provide answers to the second and third questions raised in Chapter 2, viz, what is the best combination of predictors and whether 'technical breach' and 'criminal breach' are degrees of failure or different types of failure.

The analyses showed that criminal history measures combine to give the best prediction and that the two forms of failure represent degrees along the one dimension rather than different types of failure.

The method of analysis used was Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). This technique calculates functions of the dependent variables that give the maximum possible separation between the groups and also shows whether each variable on its own discriminates between the groups.

The method of analysis was particularly useful with the present problem. It is almost certain that, for example, juvenile convictions and times in juvenile institutions will be correlated with each other, ie., those low on one will usually be low on the other, while those high on one will tend to be high on the other.

The MANOVA technique takes this correlation into account and shows how each measure adds to the ability to predict the criterion over and above the information given by the other measure.

Also, some measures might appear to be unrelated to programme performance but make a useful contribution when other variables are taken into account. For example, older people have had more time in which to change jobs but might do better in the programme. Thus, any relationship between unstable employment and performance might emerge only if the effect of age is taken into account.

The first step was to decide which variables to include in the analysis. The four predictors identified in the previous section are all worthwhile candidates. Other variables that are related to these predictors can be worth including even if not directly related to programme success/failure. These can contribute in several ways, eg. by 'suppressing' portions of the differences between subjects that are measured by the outcome-related predictors but are irrelevant to outcome.

To be able to answer the question about type of failure, the subjects were placed in three groups: success, 'technical breach', and 'criminal breach'. A preliminary analysis using Psychologist's Remarks, Programme Review Committee rating, results of both intelligence measures and the Cornell Index scores showed that no combination of these variables discriminated significantly between the groups and no one of the five variables produced a significant F-ratio at the .01 level. As these variables were only available on some of the total group, their inclusion in further analyses would have seriously reduced the sample size. In the light of the results reported above it did not seem worthwhile to waste other data known to be related to outcome, so these variables were excluded from further analyses. To conserve space the detailed results of this analysis are not included here.

The next analysis used the criminal history and socio-demographic variables shown in Table 10.

Only one discriminant function was significant. Examination of mean scores of the three groups on this function showed that the 'technical breach' group (mean +0.135) lies between the 'success' group (mean -0.761) and the criminal breach' group (mean +0.626) but closer to the criminal breach' group. This shows that the two failure groups differ ir degree on the predictors but are similar in the kind of difference they display from the 'success' group.

Three aspects of the results can be considered in deciding and interpreting what predictors form the best combination to discriminate between the groups. These are: the level of significance of each variable considered individually; the discriminant function co-efficients; and the correlation between each variable and the discriminant function. All are shown in Table 11.

The univariate results confirm that number of previous offences, number of juvenile offences and number of incarcerations in juvenile institutions other than for neglect, each discriminates relatively strongly; number of adult sentences (to prison or other penalties) and number of adult prison sentences exceeding one week also discriminated but less strongly.

The discriminant function was mainly defined by number of previous adult offences, type of current offence and number of juvenile institutionalisations. The other variables that were significant taken singly did not add greatly to the ability of these three variables to discriminate between the groups. Number of juvenile offences drops out here because it correlates highly with number of juvenile institutions and so can add little more to separating the groups.

The correlations with the discriminant function suggest that high scorers have a long criminal history with many juvenile and adult convictions, a poor employment record, were less likely to have dependent children and were more likely to have offended against property than against person. They also, given the way this function is derived, have a high risk of failure.

To conclude, the overall discrimination is weak, accounting at best for about 18% of the variation between groups. The major contribution to discrimination is from measures of criminal history.

Implications

The results concerning offence type are of particular interest. Taken alone this measure is not related to performance even at the 5% level. When relationships among all the measures are taken into account, it adds a relatively substantial amount to the predictive power of the data. Not surprisingly, less serious offences (mostly property offences) are more typical of programme failures while more serious offences (robbery and assault) are associated with success once other things (ie., what is measured by other variables) are made equal. This is quite contrary to a policy of excluding prisoners convicted of serious violent offences. Such a policy can only be justified if the aim of selection is to re-assure the public, whether this improves the rate of programme success or not.

The level of prediction achieved was quite low. Thus, the results provide little assistance in selecting 'good' candidates for the programme. Two measures not included in the analysis did have rather stronger relationships to programme performance: time in the programme and reconviction within the follow-up period. The first finding suggests that particular care should be taken to supervise releasees in their first month. The second finding is explored further in the next chapter.

4. Performance in Work Release and After Discharge

Prediction of Criminal Convictions After Discharge

Three additional questions were dealt with initially. The results generated further questions which are explored later in the chapter.

The three questions considered in this section were:

1. Is failure in the programme a predictor of reconviction following release?
2. What background variables discriminate those reconvicted after release from those not reconvicted?
3. Are the relationships of predictors to failure in work release and to post-release reconviction independent of each other?

Programme Outcome was related to Post-release Reconviction, as already reported in Table 4. In the 15 months after release, the rate of re-conviction in the three outcome groups was: Success, 33.2%; Technical Breach, 54.2%; Criminal Breach, 83.3%.

It is interesting to consider whether the background predictors of these two variables are similar when examined independently.

To answer questions 2 and 3 a two-way MANOVA was conducted. Six groups were formed in a Work Release Performance (Success/ Technical Breach/ Criminal Breach) by Post-release Re-conviction (Reconvicted/ Not Reconvicted) design.

Any differences between those reconvicted and those not reconvicted were similar for each programme performance group. This was shown by the lack of significant interaction between Programme Performance and Follow-Up Outcome. Table 11 gives the results of significance tests for Programme Performance, Follow-Up Outcome and their interaction. It also shows the univariate significance, standardised discriminant function co-efficients and correlations of the measures with each of the two discriminant functions, one for Programme Performance, the other for Follow-Up Outcome.

Regardless of Follow-Up Outcome, Programme Performance is related to one function of the predictors. The variables that discriminate individually remain the same although there are shifts in the relative strength of each. The same three predictors as before largely define the discriminant function, and the correlations of the predictors with the discriminant function are very similar.

Follow-Up Outcome is related to the predictors at a nearly significant level irrespective of programme performance. The pattern of the relationships is quite similar to that for Programme Performance. Taken alone, three variables are significantly related to both Programme Performance and Follow-Up Outcome (number of adult convictions, number of prison sentences exceeding 1 week and number of times in juvenile institutions). Some other measures (number of juvenile offences, number of adult penalties and three age measures) also show trends towards being related to Follow-Up Outcome when considered individually. Taken jointly, previous adult convictions, adult prison sentences, juvenile convictions and age of first criminal conviction all contribute uniquely to prediction. Inspection of correlations with this discriminant function suggest that, like the function associated with Programme

Performance, it measures level of detected criminal activity. The large weights for variables 13 and 14 can be neglected as an artificial effect of including three highly correlated variables. The contribution from variable 12 (age of first criminal conviction) can probably also be set aside as spurious, as it contributes a positive weight to the function but has a negative correlation with the function.

To sum up, similar background variables predict both failure in work release and reconviction on follow-up. The level of prediction is quite weak, especially for follow-up outcome.

Programme Performance and Follow-Up Outcome: Further Analysis

The strongest relationship found so far is that between Programme Performance and Follow-Up Outcome. Table 12 shows this relationship as well as the correlations of other measures with both these variables. Some measures already used were rescored into finer categories, and two measures of programme earnings were added to the list.

As expected, the two columns of correlations are similar in pattern but smaller for Follow-Up Outcome than for Programme Performance. This could reflect the use of a 3 point scale for Performance and a 2-point scale for Outcome.

The analyses reported suggested that criminal record does to some extent predict outcome even with the effect of Programme Performance controlled, but the effect is then at best marginal.

One of the major benefits from the programme is the savings accumulated and available at discharge. It seemed possible that one factor mediating the higher reconviction rate for programme failures would be the reduced level of savings available to them when they eventually were discharged. Table 12 shows correlations of both gross earnings and net earnings (after deductions for fares, board and expenses) with Programme Performance and Follow-Up Outcome. The relationships are negative because the programme failures tend to occur early and thus have less time to earn money.

To test the contribution of net and gross earnings further, several MANOVAs were carried out. The results showed that Programme Performance was the overwhelming influence on Follow-Up Outcome. When Programme Performance was included as a predictor, it was the strongest individual predictor and had the highest weight on the discriminant function. When data only from those succeeding in the programme was analysed, none of the other measures was associated with Follow-Up Outcome. Closer examination showed slight statistically non-significant trends among those who failed in the programme, for those re-convicted to have spent less time in the programme, to have earned less and earned at a lower daily rate than those not re-convicted.

This pattern was not evident among programme successes. Thus if earnings and duration of employment have an effect it is very small beside the effect of being in steady employment when released.

It appears that none of the criminal record variables analysed account for the relationship of Programme Performance to Follow-Up Outcome, nor does the amount or rate of net or gross earnings. Success on work release, or some-

thing not measured but closely associated with it, is a more powerful influence on recidivism than the best combination of criminal record variables. This finding deserves further study.

5. Reservations, Implications and Conclusions

Reservations

(1)   The Level of Prediction Achieved.

Although significant, the level of prediction achieved was not strong. Several explanations for this are logically possible, including:

1.   the wrong variables were chosen from the data available in the records;
2.   more powerful predictors exist but data on these were not available in the prisoner records;
3.   the participants are already pre-selected on the variables used; or
4.   breaches in the programme are largely the result of random, unpredictable, processes.

These are considered in order below.

(2)   Choice of Variables.

All variables which could be coded from any source were included. The purpose in extending the sample from that used in the pilot study was to obtain data on certain promising variables for a sufficient number of cases to allow meaningful analyses to be performed.

None of the variables excluded from the final discriminant function analyses showed any promise of substantially improving the level of prediction achieved. Thus the first possible explanation appears unlikely to apply.

(3)   Data unavailable.

It is of course possible that more powerful predictors could be found but that relevant data were not available in any of the data sources used. It is difficult to identify many additional variables that could be relevant and useable. Most self-report psychological measures, while obvious candidates, would be too open to deliberate distortion to use for selection in this context. In this study, psychologist's assessments and psychometric test results appeared unpromising. The finding by Brookhart et al (1976) that emotional maturity assessed by psychologists was one of the best predictors of work release outcome suggests that better use could be made of psychologists' assessments if these were specifically focussed on this particular variable. Greater detail about the assessment method employed in Brookhart's study would be helpful here. Brookhart et al also identified prior convictions as a significant predictor as it was in the present study. The time to discharge and the relationship of entry to work release to end of non-parole period also both added to prediction in their study. Their successful participants entered the programme earlier in relation to their non-parole date and had more time to serve to expiration of their sentence. These two variables were not measured directly in the present study. However, other measures were included that could have combined in the discriminant function to be equivalent to these two variables. The results for these measures did not suggest that re-analysis using the two measures identified by Brookhart's study would be fruitful.

In a study of 28 Work Releasees (15 failures, 13 successes) Kantola (1977) found two measures which offered promise as predictors of programme performance: a measure of the way decision conflicts were resolved; and a measure of willingness to wait to obtain a more valued reward. Whether these measures add to the predictive power of criminal record variables was not studied.

Thus, the only potentially useful additions to the predictors which can be identified from other research are: a more specific assessment by psychologists of the prisoner's emotional maturity; a measure of reaction to decision conflicts; and a measure of willingness to delay gratification to achieve greater rewards.

(4)   Effects of Preselection.

Participants are selected for entry to the programme. It could be that they are selected on valid predictors and that the reduction in variation caused by this selection prevents the selection variable from showing its capacity to predict outcome. For example, suppose having many prior convictions is considered a bad sign by those selecting among applicants, so that applicants with many convictions have less chance of being accepted. Within the selected group, the relationship between number of convictions and programme outcome will then be rather weaker than would emerge if selection was not based on number of prior convictions.

A similar effect could have hidden the predictive power (if any) of the psychologist's report and of the Programme Review Committee ratings.

To test this possibility it would be necessary to examine the distribution of relevant variables within a sample of applicants and within those accepted for the programme. If there is evidence that selection is based on certain variables and these same variables show some relationship to outcome within the selected group, then two conclusions could be drawn.

First, the variables are stronger predictors of outcome than the available data suggest; and second, selection for the programme is based on valid criteria for reducing failure. Further research on this issue appears warranted.

(5)   Outcome Unpredictable.

This possible 'explanation' for the results can only be dismissed if effective predictors are identified. The strong relationship with reconviction suggests that this explanation is not valid. If performance is truly random it could not show a strong relationship with Post Release Outcome.

(6)   Summary.

The main suggestions for approaches which might improve the level of prediction achieved are thus:
1.   to check the degree of preselection on the predictors, and
2.   to obtain data through psychologists on prisoner's emotional maturity, response to conflict and capacity to delay gratification.

It is possible that programme failure is not readily predictable from prisoner characteristics. The nature and suitability of the work, or accidental exposure to tempting opportunities to violate the rules or re-offend might be more important.

Implications for Programme Policy

(1) Selection of applicants.

Some reduction in programme failure rates could be achieved by excluding applicants with more than a specified number of juvenile offences, numbers of juvenile institutionalisations and numbers of previous adult offences. As the predictive power of these variables is limited, the result would be to reduce the numbers in the programme and the numbers succeeding in the programme in return for an at best modest reduction in the failure rate.

The other implication for selection concerns the criteria in use at present. These were made much more restrictive in March 1978. Most of the sample investigated here entered the programme before that date. The new selection criteria adopted after March 1978 were based on offence, prisoners convicted for violent offences or of serious drug or sexual offences being excluded. The present study showed no evidence that offenders with these types of convictions were more inclined to fail than others. Indeed, they were less likely to fail than property offenders.

The criteria were modified again in April 1979. Offenders against the person and drug offenders could be accepted if they had served a minimum proportion of their sentence. Other offenders had to have served six months outside maximum security.

The results of this study offered no evidence that would suggest these criteria are related to programme success or failure.

Matters considered in choosing candidates also include a preference for 'stable family men' with a wife and children to support, and for single men aged over twenty five. Applicants believed to suffer from serious psychological/emotional problems requiring intensive help were excluded since October 1976.

Having dependent children had only a very slight relationship, and age was found to be unrelated to programme outcome in this study. No evidence on emotional stability was available. In the light of the findings reported by Brookhart et al (1976), the exclusion of emotionally unstable prisoners appears reasonable, although Cornell Index score (a measure of emotional disturbance) was not related to Programme Performance.

The shifting selection policies also raise a caution in applying the results. Changes in the composition of the group accepted for the programme could reduce the validity of the predictors identified. Since the changes in selection criteria have, however, been based on variables unrelated to outcome, the changes are not likely to have altered the validity of the predictors identified here.

The existing psychologists' reports provided no data usefully related to outcome. Programme Review Committee ratings showed a weak curvilinear relationship, ie. prisoners rated 'above average' did slightly better than those rated 'excellent' or rated 'average' or below. As both these pieces of information are part of the selection process, some further examination of them might be advisable.

To sum up, selection using the variables identified by this study could only effect a modest reduction in failure rates at the cost of excluding many successful prisoners. The selection criteria stated in programme policy documents all appear to be irrelevant to programme failure except possibly for the exclusion of seriously disturbed prisoners.

(2) The Purpose of Selection and the Purpose of the Programme.

It is relevant here to consider what role selection can play in furthering the purposes of the programme.

This study did not evaluate the success of the programme. Crude comparison of reconviction rates with other samples are not valid, as differences, if any, could reflect selection of better-risk or poorer-risk prisoners or the impact of the programme. Further study would be required to determine whether the programme does reduce recidivism.

Work Release can be justified on other grounds than any possible effect on recidivism. These include reduced costs to the government; possible favourable effects on the family and family relationships of prisoners; and rendering imprisonment a less unpleasant and inhuman experience.

If these effects are the main purpose of Work Release, then selection to reduce offending while in the programme could be justified to increase the acceptability of the programme to the community. The cost in terms of exclusion of prisoners who would behave acceptably in the programme must be weighed against the gains.

If the programme aims at rehabilitation, then exclusion of prisoners with a higher chance of failure would be paradoxical. It is precisely these prisoners the programme should be designed to help, and it will naturally not succeed with all of them. The results of a prediction study such as that reported here are relevant in specifying sub-groups for whom special efforts might need to be made to bring their chance of success closer to that of other prisoners. The results obtained here suggest that offenders with long histories, especially of property offences, might repay special study and support in the early weeks of the programme.

It would be useful if the objectives of the programme, the objectives of selection and the priority of different objectives were made more explicit and consistent.

(3) Areas for Further Research.

Further research should be conducted on:—

1. The situations in which 'failures' occur (eg. suitability of and satisfaction with work assignment; exposure to 'temptation' to break rules or re-offend) and of how often 'success' cases face similar situations and how they deal with them.

2. The utility of psychological assessments of emotional stability, reactions to conflict and willingness to delay gratification as predictors of performance.

3. The processes linking programme failure to reconviction.

4. The reconviction rate of work releasees and of comparable prisoners not included in the programme.

5. The characteristics of eligible prisoners who do not apply, or apply and are not accepted.

Conclusions

1. Prediction of failure on Work Release using the variables included in this study cannot be used to select low risk candidates.

2. Variables not included might improve prediction.

3. The objectives and priorities of objectives for the programme and for selection of prisoners into the programme could usefully be clarified.

4. Programme successes have a markedly lower reconviction rate than programme failures and the process involved deserves further study. It cannot be explained by both programme performance and reconviction being effects of the past criminal record.

5. The stated criteria used to select prisoners for the programme are not related to performance in the programme.

6. The actual operation of the selection process deserves study.

7. The situations which prompt failure should be studied and methods to help vulnerable participants avoid or cope with such situations identified.

REFERENCES

Adams S., Evaluative Research in Corrections, *Federal Probation,* 1974, 38(2), 14-21.

Braithwaite, *Prisons, Education and Work,* St Lucia, UOP, 1980.

Brookhart D.E., Ruark J.B. & Scoven D.E., A strategy for the prediction of Work Release success, *Criminal Justice and Behaviour,* 1976, 3(4), 321-333.

Dean C.W., New directions for parole prediction research, *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science,* 1968, 59(2), 214-218.

Gendreau P. & Leipciger M., The development of a recidivism measure and its application in Ontario, *Canadian Journal of Criminology,* 1978, 20, 3-17.

Glaser D., Remedies for the key deficiency in criminal justice research, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 1974, 11(2), 144-154.

Hoffman P.B., Gottfredson D.M., Wilkins L.T. & Pasela G.E., The operational use of an experience table, *Criminology,* 1974, 12(2), 14-19.

Hood R. & Sparks R., *Key Issues in Criminology,* London World University Library, Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1970.

Jeffery R. & Woolpert S., Work furlough as an alternative to incarceration: an assessment of its effect on recidivism and social cost, *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology,* 1974, 65(3), 405-415.

Kantola S.J., Work Release: a series of pilot studies, *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology,* 1977, 10, 41-51.

Kellar S.L. & Carlson K.A., Developing an index to evaluate progress in a correctional setting, *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections,* 1977, 19(3), 273-277.

Mannheim H. & Wilkins L.T., *Prediction Methods in Relation to Borstal Training,* London, HMSO, 1955.

Rudoff A. & Esselstyn T.C., Evaluating work furlough: a follow-up, *Federal Probation,* 1973, 37(2), 48-53.

Simon F.H., *Prediction Methods in Criminology,* London, HMSO, 1971.

TABLE 1: CHARACTERISTICS OF PRISONERS PLACED ON WORK RELEASE OVER FIVE YEARS

This table shows the percentage distribution of male prisoners on Work Release 1 over a five year period according to offence category and length of sentence.

Offence	1976-77 N = 263 %	1977-78 N = 205 %	1978-79 N = 156 %	1979 80 N = 161 %	1980 81 N = 160 %
Property	43.0	45.8	53.8	25.5	21.9
Robbery and extortion	17.5	18.4	4.5	16.1	23.1
Homicide, assault, sexual	12.2	8.5	7.7	25.5	28.8
Drug	5.7	4.3	4.5	14.9	13.1
Fraud	3.8	12.0	14.7	8.7	9.4
Driving/Traffic	3.0	1.9	2.6	1.9	0.6
Other	14.8	9.1	12.2	7.4	3.1

Sentence	1976-77 %	1977-78 %	1978-79 %	1979 80 %	1980 81 %
Less than 12 months	1.5	1.4	3.2	—	0.6
1 year & less than 2 years	13.7	9.1	14.1	3.1	1.3
2 years & less than 3 years	18.3	13.9	21.2	14.9	8.2
3 years & less than 4 years	18.6	23.1	16.0	6.8	4.7
4 years & less than 5 years	10.6	9.6	12.8	16.8	20.9
5 years & less than 6 years	11.8	14.4	9.6	13.7	13.5
6 years & less than 10 years	20.2	20.7	16.7	29.8	33.3
10 years and over	5.3	7.8	6.4	14.9	17.5

TABLE 2: PERSONAL AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PERFORMANCE ON WORK RELEASE (N=296)

Variable	No of cases	Percent of available cases	Successful	Technical breaches	Criminal breaches	Chi square (d.f.)	p
COUNTRY OF BIRTH							
Australia	247	83.4	75.3	16.6	8.1	0.35	
Other countries	49	16.6	75.5	14.3	10.2	(2)	.8394
MARITAL STATUS							
Not married	168	57.7	72.0	17.9	10.1	3.55	
Married/De facto	123	42.3	81.3	13.0	5.7	(2)	.1696
N/A	5						
NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN							
None	164	58.2	71.3	19.5	9.1		
Some	118	41.8	83.9	10.2	5.9	6.16	
N/A	14					(2)	.0460
EDUCATION							
Primary only	21	7.6	85.7	4.8	9.5		
Some secondary	177	63.7	70.6	19.2	10.2		
Secondary (gained certificate)	52	18.7	92.3	7.7	0.0	12.80	
HSC/LC/UNI/CAE	28	10.0	78.6	14.3	7.1	(6)	.0500
N/A	18						
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT CURRENT OFFENCE							
Unemployed	145	49.0	70.3	18.6	11.0	12.58	
Employed/Pensioner	151	51.0	80.1	13.9	6.0	(10)	.2479
OCCUPATIONAL STATUS Congalton							
A/B	8	2.8	87.5	12.5	0.0		
C	76	26.3	78.9	15.8	5.3	3.46	
D	205	70.9	72.7	17.1	10.2	(6)	.7489
N/A	7						
NO. OF JOBS HELD PREVIOUS TWO YEARS							
0–3	101	38.8	85.1	10.8	3.9	10.21	
4+	159	61.2	69.2	20.1	10.7	(8)	.2501
N/A	36						
INTELLECTUAL ABILITY ACER ML + MQ:							
Below average	19	11.7	68.4	21.1	10.5	1.16	
Average	94	57.7	74.5	18.1	7.4	(4)	.8840
Above average	50	30.7	80.0	14.0	6.0		
N/A	133						
PM 38							
Below average	42	22.3	66.7	16.7	16.7	9.98	
Average	94	50.0	68.1	20.2	11.7	(4)	.0408
Above average	52	27.7	88.5	9.6	1.9		
N/A	108						
CORNELL INDEX							
1–12	93	63.7	78.5	17.2	4.3	4.40	
13+ (Unfavourable)	53	36.3	73.6	13.2	13.2	(4)	.3545
N/A	150						

TABLE 3: JUVENILE CRIMINAL RECORD BY PERFORMANCE ON WORK RELEASE

Variable	No of cases	Percent of available cases	Percent in category who were: Successful	Technical breaches	Criminal breaches	Chi square (d.f.)	p
JUVENILE RECORD							
Has record	143	49.0	72.0	17.5	10.5		
No record	149	51.0	77.9	15.4	6.4	1.73	
N/A	4					(2)	.4205
NEGLECT							
Yes	16	5.4	62.5	18.8	18.8	2.56	
No	280	94.6	76.1	16.1	7.9	(2)	.2776
OTHER JUVENILE OFFENCES							
None	158	53.4	79.1	14.6	6.3	28.33	
1 or more	138	46.6	71.0	18.1	10.9	(6)	.0001
PENALTIES AS JUVENILE: PROBATION							
Yes	99	33.4	71.7	18.2	10.1	1.09	
No	197	66.6	77.2	15.2	7.6	(2)	.5782
NO. OF TIMES IN INSTITUTION							
None	215	72.6	79.5	13.5	7.0		
1–2	53	17.9	73.6	20.8	5.7	18.04	
3–6	28	9.5	46.4	28.6	25.0	(4)	.0012
AGE OF FIRST CRIMINAL CONVICTION							
0–17	148	50.0	71.6	18.2	10.1		
18–24	89	30.1	77.5	14.6	7.9	3.67	
25+	59	19.9	81.3	13.6	5.1	(6)	.7207

TABLE 4: ADULT CRIMINAL RECORD BY PERFORMANCE ON WORK RELEASE

Variable	No of cases	Percent of available cases	Percent in category who were: Successful	Technical breaches	Criminal breaches	Chi square (d.f.)	p
NUMBER OF PREVIOUS ADULT OFFENCES							
None	73	24.7	86.3	9.6	4.1		
1–5	111	37.5	76.6	17.1	6.3	15.55	
6 or more	112	37.8	67.0	19.6	13.4	(6)	.0163
NUMBER OF PREVIOUS SENTENCES							
None	81	27.4	84.0	11.1	4.9	6.37	
1 or more	215	72.6	72.1	18.1	9.8	(4)	.1732
NUMBER OF PREVIOUS PRISON SENTENCES SERVED > ONE WEEK							
None	128	43.2	83.6	9.4	7.0	11.96	
1 or more	168	56.8	69.0	21.4	9.5	(4)	.0176
PREVIOUS PROBATION OUTCOME:							
Successful	15	22.7	86.7	13.3	0.0	4.04	
Not successful	51	77.3	62.7	17.6	19.6	(2)	.1324
N/A	230						
PREVIOUS PAROLE OUTCOME:							
Successful	11	21.6	54.5	36.4	9.1		
Not successful	40	78.4	50.0	35.0	15.0	0.25	
N/A	245					(2)	.8785

TABLE 5: DETAILS OF CURRENT EPISODE BY PERFORMANCE ON WORK RELEASE

Variable	No of cases	Percent of available cases	Percent in category who were: Successful	Technical breaches	Criminal breaches	Chi square (d.f.)	p
AGE AT CURRENT CONVICTION							
Below 25	128	54.7	77.3	14.1	8.6	1.38	
25+	168	65.7	73.8	17.9	8.3	(4)	.8479
REMARKS OF TRIAL JUDGE							
No remarks	31	22.0	87.1	12.9	0.0		
Positive	35	24.8	80.0	14.3	5.7	2.23	
Negative	75	53.2	81.3	12.0	6.7	(4)	.6931
N/A	155						
TOTAL SENTENCE (Years)							
0–2	69	23.3	69.6	14.5	16.0		
3–5	138	46.6	76.8	19.6	3.6		
6–9	70	23.7	80.0	10.0	8.6	47.71	
10+	19	6.4	68.4	15.8	15.8	(36)	.0917
NON–PAROLE PERIOD (Years)							
0–1	190	64.2	78.4	13.2	8.4		
2–4	96	32.4	68.8	22.9	8.3	4.84	
5+	10	3.41	80.0	10.0	10.0	(4)	.3037
PSYCHOLOGIST'S SUMMARY REMARKS							
Positive	82	45.8	82.9	14.6	2.4		
Neutral	54	30.2	70.4	20.4	9.3		
Negative	43	24.0	62.8	20.9	16.3	9.70	
N/A	117					(4)	.0457
PROGRAMME REVIEW COMMITTEE RATING							
Excellent	23	13.7	65.2	21.7	13.0		
Above average	90	53.6	74.4	15.6	10.0		
Average	48	28.6	75.0	12.5	12.5		
Below average	7	4.2	14.3	85.7	0.0	23.22*	
N/A	128					(6)	.0007

* Inflated by the results for the small number rated "Below average" when "Average" and "Below average" combined, Chi square = 0.76 (4 d.f.), p $\leqslant$ 0.90, n.s.

TABLE 6: PERFORMANCE ON WORK RELEASE AND AFTER

Variable	No of cases	Percent of available cases	Percent in category who were: Successful	Technical breaches	Criminal breaches	Chi square (d.f.)	p
PERIOD IN PRISON PRIOR TO W/R (Years)							
0—1	240	81.1	75.8	16.3	7.9		
2—4	46	15.1	71.5	15.2	13.0	27.55	
5+	10	3.4	80.0	20.0	0.0	(20)	.1205
PERIOD OF TIME ON W/R (Months)							
0—3	163	55.1	64.4	22.1	13.5		
4—6	90	30.4	88.9	11.1	0.0	26.83	
7+	43	14.5	88.4	4.7	7.0	(4)	.0000
MODE OF RELEASE							
Parole/License/Remission	223	75.3	100.0	0.0	0.0		
Technical breach	48	16.2	0.0	100.0	0.0		
Criminal breach (including escape)	25	8.4	0.0	0.0	100.0		
15 MONTH FOLLOW—UP AFTER RELEASE: RECONVICTED							
Yes	119	40.8	61.3	21.8	16.8		
No	173	69.2	85.0	12.7	2.3	29.39	
N/A	4					(4)	.0000
OUTCOME OF SENTENCE							
Return to prison Technical breach	4	3.3	25.0	50.0	25.0		
Return to prison Criminal breach	76	63.9	53.9	23.6	22.3		
Fine	20	16.8	85.0	15.0	0.0		
Recognizance	5	4.2	80.0	20.0	0.0		
Other	14	11.8	71.4	14.2	14.2	17.51*	
N/A	173					(10)	.0637

* When Returned to Prison is contrasted with Non-Custodial Penalty, Chi Square = 9.01, (2 d.f.), $p < .01$. When all those who "failed" in the programme are contrasted with "successes", Chi Square = 8.11 (1 d.f.), $p < .01$. Thus, those who complete the programme and are reconvicted are dealt with less severely than those who "failed" in the programme and are reconvicted after release.

TABLE 7: FREQUENCIES OF OFFENCES COMMITTED FOR A. CURRENT OFFENCE AND B. 15 MONTH RECONVICTION OFFENCE

Offence (A.B.S. Modified)	A. Current Offence		B. 15 month Follow-up Reconviction Offence	
	Number of cases	% Sample	Number of cases	% Sample
Offences Against the Person	22	7.4	12	10.1
Sexual and Related Offences	5	1.7	3	2.5
Robbery and Extortion	65	22.0	6	5.0
Offences Against Property	122	41.2	35	29.4
Fraud	24	8.1	8	6.7
Driving, Traffic and Related Offences	7	2.4	9	7.6
Offences Against Enforcement of Order	24	8.1	27	22.7
Offensive Behaviour and Related Offences	27	9.1	19	16.0
TOTAL	296	100	119	100

TABLE 8: CROSS—TABULATIONS: CURRENT OFFENCE WITH FOLLOW—UP RECONVICTION OFFENCE (15 MONTH)

Offence (A.B.S. Modified)	15 MONTH OFFENCE								
	Offence against the person	Sexual and related offences	Robbery & extortion	Offence against property	Fraud	Driving, traffic &related offences	Offence against enforce-ment of order	Offensive behaviour & related offences	TOTAL (%)
CURRENT									
Offences Against the Person	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	3	8 (6.7)
Sexual & Related Offences	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2 (1.6)
Robbery & Extortion	3	1	3	3	1	4	7	1	23 (19.3)
Offences Against Property	6	2	2	23	3	3	7	8	54 (45.3)
Fraud	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	5 (4.2)
Driving, Traffic & Related Offences	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2 (1.6)
Offences Against Enforcement of Order	1	0	1	4	0	1	7	3	17 (14.2)
Offensive Behaviour & Related Offences	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	3	8 (6.7)
TOTAL	12	3	6	35	8	9	27	19	119
%	10.8	2.5	5.0	29.4	6.7	7.6	22.7	16.0	100.0

TABLE 9: VARIABLES WITH APPARENTLY SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS WITH SUCCESS ON WORK RELEASE

VARIABLE	p
Has dependent children	.0460
Intellectual ability on PM38 test	.0408
Education	.0500
Psychologist's Summary Remarks	.0457
Programme Review Committee Assessment	.0007
Juvenile Offences: None/Some	.0001
Times in Juvenile Institutions (Exclude Neglect)	.0012
Number Previous Adult Offences	.0163
Number Previous Adult Prison Sentences	.0176
Time on Work Release	.0000
Reconviction During 15 month Follow-Up: Yes/No	.0000
Prison Sentence for Reconviction	.0200

TABLE 10: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: PROGRAMME OUTCOME

Tests of Significance	df	F	df	p	R
Programme Performance	2	1.922	38,438	.001	.422

Variable	p	S.D.F.C.[1]	$r_{v, DF}$[2]
Non-parole period	.500	.081	.162
Juvenile Record (Yes/No)	.182	.136	—.187
No. of Juvenile Convictions	.001	.282	.478
No. of Juvenile Probations	.672	—.132	.108
No. of Times in Juvenile Institution	.001	.378	.504
No. of Previous Offences (Adult)	.001	.739	.530
No. of Sentences (Previous Adult)	.014	—.253	.370
No. of Prison Sentences 1 week	.021	—.271	.383
Total Sentence (Current Offence)	.726	—.046	.059
Current Offence	.061	.459	.301
Time in Prison Prior to W/R	.451	.325	.165
Age First Criminal Conviction	.186	.291	—.148
Age Current Conviction	.087	—.098	.118
Age Entry to W/R	.101	.359	.146
No. of Dependent Children	.109	—.354	—.255
Employment Stability	.074	.181	.318
Employment Status (Current Offence)	.049	—.368	—.333
Occupational Status	.179	.220	.220
Education	.638	—.020	—.130

(1) Standardised Discriminant Function Co-efficients.
(2) Correlation between Variables and Composite Scores.

TABLE 11: MANOVA WITH PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE & FOLLOW–UP OUTCOME

Summary

Criterion	df	F	df	p	R
Follow-Up Outcome	1	1.72	14,261	.051	.291
Performance	2	1.68	28,522	.017	.314
Interaction	2	1.72	28,522	.581	.274

	Variable	(a) Outcome			(b) Re-Conviction		
		p	SDFC[1]	$r_{V,DF}$[2]	p	SDFC[1]	$r_{V,DF}$[2]
V1	N.P.P.	.519	.251	.208	.775	.045	−.057
V2	Juvenile Record (Yes/No)	.716	.341	−.138	.197	.375	−.257
V3	No. of Juvenile Convictions	.005	.600	.555	.026	.367	.445
V4	No. of Juvenile Probations	.753	−.209	.028	.078	.252	.351
V5	No. of Times in Juvenile Institution	.003	.351	.609	.058	−.020	.378
V6	No. of Previous Convictions (Adult)	.011	.498	.543	.004	.514	.577
V7	No. of Penalties (previous Adult)	.075	−.030	.412	.028	.028	.440
V8	No. of Prison Sentences > 1 week	.003	.052	.486	.021	.453	.461
V9	Total Sentence (Current Offence)	.994	−.388	−.009	.363	−.154	−.181
V10	Current Offence	.218	.398	.259	.656	.007	.089
V11	Time in Prison Prior to Work Release	.510	.481	.212	.383	−.463	−.174
V12	Age First Criminal Conviction	.806	.289	−.084	.014	.484	−.491
V13	Age Current Conviction	.035	−.019	.246	.042	−2.973	−.406
V14	Age Entry to Work Release	.032	−.032	.278	.039	1.983	−.412

(1) Standardised Discriminant Function Co-efficient
(2) Correlation of Variable V with Discriminant Function

18

TABLE 12: CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED MEASURES WITH PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE AND FOLLOW—UP OUTCOME

Measure		Programme Performance (1)	Follow—Up Outcome (2)
Marital Status		−.09	−.02
Dependent Children	— Number	−.10	−.12*
	— Yes/No	−.12*	−.06
Juvenile Record		−.08	−.06
Juvenile Convictions		+.24***	+.14**
Juvenile Probations		+.08	+.13*
Times in Juvenile Institutions		+.24***	+.11*
Adult Convictions		+.24***	+.10*
Adult Sentences		+.15**	+.12**
Adult Prison Sentences		+.17**	+.12*
Current Offence		+.09	+.01
Non-parole Period		−.02	−.08
Total Sentence		−.03	−.05
Time Served Prior to Work Release		+.05	−.06
Age Entry to Work Release		+.05	−.12*
Age First Criminal Conviction		−.10*	−.14*
Age Current Conviction		+.04	−.11*
Days on Work Release		−.30***	−.15**
Net Earnings on Work Release		−.27***	−.12*
Gross Earnings on Work Release		−.32***	−.15**
Education		+.11*	+.17**
Programme Performance		−	+.29***

(1) Programme Performance scored: 1 = Success; 2 = Technical Breach; 3 = Criminal Breach
(2) Follow—Up Outcome scored: 1 = No reconvictions during follow-up; 2 = At least one reconviction during follow-up.

*p < .05   **p < .01   ***p < .001

APPENDIX 1

Description of Variables Used in Analysis

Variable   Age at:
First Recorded Conviction
First Criminal Conviction
Current Offence (Hood & Sparkes, 1970)

Variable*   Country of Birth: Australia/Other

Variable   Marital Status (Directory of Corrective Services: NSW Department of Corrective Services, 1977)

Variable   Having/Not having dependent children in nuclear family (Directory of Corrective Services: NSW Department of Corrective Services, 1977)

Variable   Education: Highest level of schooling gained (Glaser, 1974)

Variable*   Employment Status at time of Current Offence: Employed, pensioner/unemployed — obtained from Police Department records when this information was not on file with the Department of Corrective Services.

Variable   Occupational Status: Congalton Index A, B, C, D (Modified) 1962. (Simon, 1971; Brookhart, Ruark & Scoven, 1976)

Variable*   Employment Stability Score: No. of jobs held during 2 years prior to Current Offence.

Variable   IQ rating: ACER ML + MQ Higher Test: Form M — Section L (ML), containing 36 items, and Form M — Section Q (MQ), containing 36 items. These are pencil and paper intelligence tests containing a very high verbal ability loading.

IQ Rating Standard Progression Matrices (1938) PM 38 is a 36 item test of the individual's capacity to systematically apprehend the relationship amongst a set of figures. This non-verbal test is used by the Psychology Unit in order to identify prisoners for whom remedial education courses may be beneficial (Simon, 1971)

Variable   Personality Rating (Cornell Index). This Index
            is currently used by psychologists at the Metro-
            politan Reception Prison to classify convicted
            prisoners who have an N.P.P. of at least 12
            months. Form N2 (Index) consists of 101
            items which refer to neuropsychiatric and
            psychosomatic symptoms relevant to males
            only. The Index has three cut-off levels, Meth-
            od A, Method B and Method C. The Psych-
            ology Unit of the MRP uses Form N2 and
            Method C. It is claimed (Weider et al, 1948)
            that Method C identifies a large majority of
            neuropsychiatrically unfit individuals together
            with a moderate proportion of 'healthy' pris-
            oners. (Adams, 1974; Brookhart et al, 1976)

Juvenile Criminal History

Variable   Juvenile Record: Number of convictions
            other than for neglect before the age of 18
            years (Mannheim & Wilkins, 1955).

Variable   Type of Juvenile Offence was examined by
            coding number of Juvenile offence into each
            of 24 categories. No one category was related
            to outcome and no useful way of summarising
            the data in one variable was found, so it was
            dropped from the analysis. (Brookhart et al,
            1976)

Variable   Placed on Probation: Yes/No and No. of
            Instances (Mannheim & Wilkins, 1955).

Variable   Placed in an Institution: Yes/No and No. of
            Instances (Mannheim & Wilkins, 1955).

Adult Record

Variable   No. of Previous Offences post 18 years and
            prior to 'current' offence (Mannheim & Wil-
            kins, 1955; Brookhart et al, 1976).

Variable*   Sentences for Previous Offences: No. of Inst-
            ances.

Variable   Previous Prison Sentences Served — No. of
            Instances $>$ 1 week (Ohlin, 1951 — cited in
            Simon, 1971).

Variable   Previous Probation Outcome (Mannheim &
            Wilkins, 1955; Simon, 1971).

Variable   Previous Parole Outcome (Mannheim & Wil-
            kins, 1955; Simon, 1971).

prisoner and make a written report on the
prisoner's behaviour during the interview,
his reaction to his sentence and the probability
of his using his prison term advantageously
or otherwise. In the present study the remarks
in these reports were rated on a 3-point criter-
ion scale. (Brookhart et al, 1976)

Variable   Prisoners Programme Review Committee: This
            is a standard 5-point scale used in reports
            classifying prisoners' overall behaviour while
            incarcerated in an institution. Such reports
            cover the prisoners' attitudes to work, prison
            custody and prison staff, and his interaction
            with other prisoners. Although some files
            contained a number of these reports, only the
            most recent one prior to W/R entry was used.
            It was considered this report would be the most
            relevant for the administrative purposes of
            Programme participation. (Hoffman, Gottfred-
            son, Wilkins & Pasela, 1974).

Variable   Period in Prison prior to W/R (Brookhart et
            al, 1976).

Variable   Period of Time on W/R in months (Brook-
            hart et al, 1976).

Variable   Mode of Release from W/R: Success measured
            by Parole/License/Remission; Non-success mea-
            sured by Technical Breach or Criminal Breach
            including Escape (Brookhart et al, 1976).

15 Month Follow-Up After Release from W/R

Variable   Reconvicted/Not Reconvicted (Jeffery & Wool-
            pert, 1974; Rudoff & Esselstyn, 1973).

Variable   Outcome of Sentence (Jeffery & Woolpert,
            1974; Rudoff & Esselstyn, 1973).