

Ending a Cycle: Effects of a Pre-release Program on Recidivism

by

Deana Moore

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

Approved April 2019 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Jacob T.N. Young, Chair
Cody W. Telep
Kevin Wright

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2019

ABSTRACT

Recidivism occurs when an individual is released from prison and then, through a violation of parole or a new offense, ends up back in prison. Durose and colleagues (2014) cite that 55.4% of individuals go back to prison after a five-year post release. Considerable attention has been focused on reducing the cycle of these individuals going back to prison. One of the attempts to remedy this issue is through offering pre-release programs for prison inmates. These programs seek to provide individuals skills that will reduce their likelihood of reoffending. But existing research shows that the effectiveness of these programs is limited. Moreover, few attempts have been made to look at differences between individual's dosage of program participation. This thesis aims to determine if participation in a pre-release program reduces recidivism. Using data from the state's Department of Corrections, there is a comparison of previously imprisoned individuals who participated in a pre-release employment program and those who declined participation, to understand if participation influences recidivism. Additionally, dosage of the center will be analyzed to determine whether length of program participation influenced recidivism. Participating in the program and a longer dose of the program should allow more time for the individual to learn the material and fully absorb what the program is offering such as skills and training. The results show that participation in the pre-release employment program did not significantly affect recidivism as individuals who went through the program were no less likely to be reincarcerated. In addition, a longer dosage of the program did not significantly influence recidivism among those who went through the program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Pre-release Pograms	3
Participation	4
Employment Specific Programs	5
Current Study	7
METHODOLOGY	8
Research Design/ Procedure	8
Dependent Variables	9
Independent Variables	9
Control Variables	9
Analytic Approach	11
RESULTS	12
DISCUSSION	13
Limitation	14
Policy Implications	15
Future Research	16
Conclusion	17
REFERENCES	18

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary Statistics	21
2. Summary Statistics Comparison Across Groups.....	21
3. Crosstabulation Examining Participation in Pre-release Program.....	22
4. Logistic Regression of Readmission on Pre-release Employment Program Participation	22
5. Logistic Regression of Readmission on Dosage of Pre-release Employment Program	22

Introduction

Understanding problems that exist within the field of criminal justice is extremely important. One of those problems is that many previously incarcerated individuals end up returning to prison after they are released. This process is referred to as recidivism. Though recidivism can be getting rearrested, this study uses recidivism as going back to prison. Of a study that looked at recidivism from 23 states over five years, 55.4% individuals were convicted after being released (Durose et al., 2014). The best chance to reduce the rate of recidivism is to identify the programs that are truly effective in preventing re-incarceration.

Research is required to identify which programs are effective and why they are effective. In doing this, programs can adjust to what works and provide effective results. This research is intended to contribute to that body of research of pre-release program participation and dosage by evaluating individuals post release who participated or declined participation in a program. In order to reduce recidivism, pre-release programs have focused on implementing support programs including job assistance, drug rehabilitation, health, or housing (Jonson & Cullen, 2015). As the prisoner participates in the program, they learn skills before they are released; these should stay with them as they begin living outside prison walls. The biggest focus is to prevent future criminal behavior. However, past research has found mixed results of the effectiveness of these programs. Mixed findings consist of participation only working in some programs (Mellow & Barnes-Ceeney, 2017; Visher et al., 2017; Wikoff et al., 2012; Wilson et al., 2000).) In other research, it is discussed that the dosage of the program can be influential in some programs (Duwe, 2018; Nelson & Trone, 2016).

Though this thesis focuses on pre-release programs specifically, there is a body of research on post-release programs as well. These are administered once the individual is released and is typically community based. The results have also been mixed in this research (Moses, 2012; Nelson & Trone, 2016; Visher, 2006; Visher, Winterfield, & Coggeshall, 2005; Wikoff, Linhorst, & Morani, 2012).

This research will assess whether participation in a pre-release employment program influenced recidivism. Using a sample of 4,168 individuals, the research will compare those who participated in the program and those who declined participation. It will also look at dosage of the program to understand its effect. Other variables such as past offense, age, and risk will be assessed in order to identify additional factors that may have an effect on the rates of recidivism.

Literature Review

Pre-release Programs

The National Institute of Justice defines recidivism as “a person’s relapse into criminal behavior, often after the person receives sanctions or undergoes intervention for a previous crime” (National Institute of Justice, 2014). Recidivism has been an issue for many years. Since the 1970’s, the government has tried to implement programs to assist offenders before they leave prison (Jonson & Cullen, 2015). Seiter and Kadela identify that “the world to which [prisoners] return is drastically different from the one they left regarding availability of jobs, family support, community resources, and willingness to assist ex-offenders” (Seiter & Kadela, 2003, p.361). Pre-release programs aim to prepare a prisoner for their reintegration back into society.

Mellow and Barnes-Ceeney (2017) note that a successful pre-release program occurs “when the criminal justice system, stakeholders, and the community interconnect to supervise, intervene, advocate, and refer for all or nearly all of the needs of men and women returning to the community after a period of incarceration” (p.22). Though Mellow and Barnes-Ceeney focus on post-release, their key features are still relevant. They identify the crucial elements for a successful reentry program. These elements are setting visions and goals. These ensure that the individual is getting what they need. A program also follows up with the individual and gives them a sense of involvement (Mellow & Barnes-Ceeney, 2017). Though the current research focuses on pre-release programs, these factors are still applicable.

Overall, the literature identifies the need for pre-release programs and theorizes the definition of an effective pre-release program. However, there is still opportunity to conduct assessment of the actual effect pre-release programs have on recidivism rates.

Participation

An important aspect of pre-release programs is participation. The environment of the programs can be significant in their effect on recidivism. "... [pre-release programs] provide an opportunity to shape offender behavior while transitioning back to their natural environments, thereby reducing recidivism rates" (Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2005, p. 72). Allowing individuals to receive assistance while starting the reintegration process is a benefit of these programs. Through working with the staff and other inmates, the individual begins to modify their actions toward life outside of prison.

Wikoff et al. (2012) found that participation alone reduced new charge rates when compared to individuals who did not participate. Age, race, criminal past, and length of confinement the authors identified as risk factors of an individual committing a new crime. Because those risks cannot be changed through a program, other risks need to be addressed. Financial stress of employment, housing, and supporting others is a risk that a program can address. Providing employment services, education, and social services allows offenders to no longer have such high risk and not reoffend. When comparing participant and non-participant of the program, the authors found that recidivism was significantly reduced for participants (Wikoff et al., 2012). Seiter and Kadela (2003) found that offenders who participated in a program were rearrested at a lower rate, however the results were not significant. This was collection of three vocational training

and work release programs that were analyzed and found to not only reduce recidivism, but they prepared the individual with job related skills (Seiter & Kadela, 2003)

Visher et al. (2017) evaluated what the after-effect of pre-release programs looks like. An important study they mentioned was the U.S. Department of Justice Crime Solutions research which found that of the 27 programs, none yielded effective results, yet 22 were promising. The study that authors performed looked at 12 different pre-release programs in 12 different states. Their analysis addressed that programs should assist offenders in their post-release outcomes and lead to less reoffending. However, their analysis found less than reassuring results. The programs did not lead to recidivism being reduced in either arrest or reincarceration.

Mixed findings offer opportunity for further analysis. What factors lead to some of these programs being effective in reducing recidivism while others show no significant results? Although participation is a key factor, the *type* of pre-release program may also be a driving factor in effectiveness.

Employment Specific Programs

One of the primary types of pre-release programs is employment-based programs. This typically involves resume building, mock interviews, job networking, or skills training. Employment pre-release programs aim to reduce recidivism by increasing the chance of securing employment (Bushway, 2003). Theory backs up this argument through Social Learning Theory. When an individual is released, they experience a very different life style then when they were in prison. What these programs aim to do is educate the individual through several different training processes. Through this, they learn pro-social behavior and how to act outside prison walls. While doing this, their

chances of gaining employment are increased through the assistance of the employment-based program (Astray-Caneda, Busbee, & Fanning, 2013). Sampson and Laub reiterate this idea through their theory of aged-graded informal social control. Obtaining employment is one of the crucial factors that theory has explained. By spending more time within an employment center, the individual would have more time to develop key skills needed for later employment (Sampson & Laub, 1995). “Equally important [to supporting individuals in challenges of release] are efforts to prepare inmate for the challenges ahead: finding a job... and avoiding habits linked with previous criminal behavior” (Nelson & Trone, 2016, p. 1).

Employment is seen as a crime reducing practice. Duwe and Clark (2017) evaluated 15,111 released prisoners and found mixed results when observing employment and recidivism. Overall, the study concluded that the best results were for young, white, married males who had spent longer times in prison. There were negative effects for those with more serious criminal histories, those with worse prison misconduct, and those with suicidal histories (Duwe and Clark, 2017).

Research on the effectiveness of employment pre-release programs commonly compares those who participated in a pre-release program versus those who did not participate. In these studies, recidivism rates between a group who participated and a group that did not participate were compared after a set period of time. The comparison did not show a significant relationship between participation and a reduction in recidivism (Wilson et al., 2000). The primary factor being observed in most of the research is participation.

A meta-analysis by Wilson, Gallagher, and MacKenzie found that “the evidence is currently insufficient to conclude that work programs reduce recidivism” (2000, p. 361). This analysis looked at 33 different correctional based programs that compared participant and nonparticipants. However, the results for educational programs were positive in reducing recidivism.

Current Study

Prior research on pre-release programs is limited in frequency as well as rigor. Some studies have focused on recidivism rates without a control group, which make the results hard to generalize. This research will examine two main factors: participation on its own and for those who do participate, if dosage of participation matters. This study will seek to overcome past limitations by having a comparison group of those who declined participation. Also, the study will go in depth in comparing days within the pre-release employment program with control variables that will help in understanding if length of stay is significant while accounting for other possible factors.

Time within the program is rarely looked at in past research, however this may be a critical factor that results in a lower rate of recidivism. By addressing offenders’ needs, a program can be altered to fit those needs. This includes more time to work on those needs (Duwe and Clark, 2017). More days within the center allows the opportunity to better learn the programs lessons and therefore getting better “treatment” from the program.

This thesis will aim at filling in the limitations of past research as mentioned above, while also examining other factors that may contribute to recidivism for those who participate in employment programs.

Hypothesis 1. individuals who participate in the employment centers are less likely to recidivate than those who chose not to participate in the employment center.

Hypothesis 2. among those who participate in the employment centers, individuals in the employment center longer are less likely to recidivate compared to those who spent less time in the employment centers.

Methodology

Research Design/Procedure

This study uses data of 15,897 offenders released from a Southwest state Department of Corrections from October 2017 to December 2018. In order to focus on just those who participated in the pre-release employment program and those who declined participation, only 4,168 are used for the analysis. These are individuals who were identified as high risk and high need, and were set to be released in 60 days. The individuals were offered to participate in a pre-release program. They either agreed to go through the program or declined participation. The pre-release program was offered at three locations; two of which were men's prisons and one women's prison. The centers offer "workforce readiness services" (Seamans, 2018). Included in these services are "hard and soft skills workforce training, resume and job search assistance, job interview preparation, participation in on-site job fairs, enrollment in healthcare, as well as connections to housing, clothing, and transportation" (Seamans, 2018). The program indicates that their full length is an eight-week duration (Seamans, 2018). By using offenders who either participated or declined participation, the study is able to determine if participation and time in the program is effective for reducing recidivism.

Unfortunately, more information on what the program offered or how it was administered

was not provided by the pre-release employment center, nor was it available under any public source.

Dependent Variables

The main concept being measured is *recidivism*. The dependent variable for this study is measured by determining whether an individual was readmitted back into the state's Department of Corrections (1=yes, 0=no) within the study period (i.e. October 2017 to December 2018). This includes both new offenses and technical violations of parole.

Independent Variables

There are three key independent variables in this analysis. The first two, *program participation* and *dosage of the program*, measure the individual's involvement in the employment center. *Program participation* is a binary variable measuring whether the individual participated in the employment center (1=yes, 0=no). The second variable, *dosage of the program*, is an integer measuring the number of days the individual was in the employment center. The third key independent variable, *time at risk of incarceration*, measures how long the individual was out of prison. For individuals who experienced readmittance to the state's Department of Corrections, the variable is a count of the number of days from release until being readmitted. For those who did not experience readmittance, the variable is a count of the number of days from release until the end of the study period (i.e. December 2018).

Control Variables

The control variables that will be used are *age*, *gender*, *race*, *prior conviction*, *risk level*, and *custody level*. *Age* is measured by years that the individual has been alive

the data that is being utilized has the youngest individual at 18 and the oldest individual at 74. *Gender* is binary in which 0 equals female and 1 equals male. *Race* is listed as 1 being a minority and 0 being white. *Men's Site A* was used to look at the effects of the specific location. *Prior conviction* will be coded as binary where 1 means they had a prior conviction, 0 is they have no prior conviction. *Risk* is determined by a general risk score which is scaled on a level of 1 to 14 with higher values indicating greater risk. *Custody level* is measured by four levels of security at the prison: minimum, medium, maximum, and closed. In the analyses below, minimum custody is the referent category. Due to low number of individuals within max and closed security, the two variables were combined for the analysis.

Table 1 summarizes all the variables. 15% (SD= .36) of individuals were readmitted. The average days within the center (dosage) was 60 (SD=14.65). This result could be significant given that 60 days is not a lot of time within a program. Depending on how long the individual is in prison, 60 days could be a very short period of time. Given the two-week standard deviation, it is possible to conclude even more that the program is not long enough and shorting the 60 days could be harmful. The average days out was 171 (SD= 115.45). The average age was 38 (SD=10.38). The majority of the individuals were male (82%). About 55% (SD=.5) of the individuals were minorities. 83% (SD= .38) had a prior conviction. The average risk score was 7.75 (SD= 2.93). Minimum security was 79% (SD=.41) of the participants. 19% (SD= .39) individuals were medium security. Finally, 1% (SD=.12) of the individuals were in closed security.

Table 2 looks at a comparison of those who participated and those who declined participation. For those who participates, 16% were readmitted. The average days out

before readmission was 173 days (SD= 123.43). The average age was 38 years old (SD=9.86). 83% were males. 62% were minorities. 86% had a prior conviction. The average risk score was 8.49 (SD= 2.78). 81% were in minimum securing. 18% were in medium and less than 1% were in max or closed security.

For those who declined participation, 15% were readmitted. The average days out before readmission was 170 days (SD= 110.04). The average age was 39 years old (SD=10.69). 82% were male. 50% were minorities. 80% had a prior conviction. The average risk score was 7.27 (SD= 2.92). 78% were in minimum securing. 19% were in medium and 2% were in max or closed security.

A t-test was performed to see if there was any significant differences in the means between the groups. There was a significant difference in age with a t value of -2.336 ($p < .05$). Minority ($t=7.213$), prior convictions ($t=5.153$), risk level ($t=13.399$), closed security ($t=-4.184$), and the max/closed ($t=-5.520$) combined variable were all significantly different by $p < .001$. Minimum security ($t=2.885$) was significantly different by $p < .01$. Medium security ($t=-1.071$) was significant with a $p < .05$.

Analytic Approach

For the first hypothesis, the analysis will examine the relationship between whether the individual participated in the program and recidivism. This analysis will determine whether the recidivism significantly difference between the two groups. Then, logistic regression using odds ratios will be used to examine the effect of the program, controlling for other variables that may influence recidivism. Last, logistic regression using odds ratios will also be used to test the second hypothesis, whether higher dosage of the program significantly reduces recidivism.

Results

Table 3 shows the crosstabulation of program participation and recidivism. Out of the 2,539 individuals who declined participation, 377 (14.8%) were readmitted. Of the 1,629 individual who participated, 263 (16.1%) were readmitted. Although the percentages differ, a chi-squared test ($X^2 = 1.2834, p=0.257$) indicates that there is no association between being in the program and readmission.

Models 1, 2, and 3 of Table 4 look at the effects of the program on recidivism, net of time at risk and additional controls. Looking at model 3, we see that the longer an individual was out of prison, the lower the chance they had at being readmitted. This is more interpretable as a control for the more days out of prison will result in less of a chance of being in prison. Those who are younger were at lower risk of chance of readmission. Compared to someone similar in all other aspects, the odds of a younger individual being readmitted is 98.9% less than an older individual. Those who scored higher on risk level has a 10% greater chance of being readmitted. Finally, being in medium security within prison, relative to minimum security, decreased the odds of being readmitted by 29.8% with a $p \leq 0.05$. The remainder of the variables were not statistically significant. Overall, the results indicate that participation within the program does not reduce the chance of returning to prison.

To test hypothesis 2, models 4, 5, and 6 in Table 5 restricts the analysis to only those who participated in the program. This leaves 1,628 observations. These models examine if dosage of the program influences recidivism. In these models, there were two significant results. Longer release decreases the odds of readmission by 99.5% with a $p \leq 0.001$. This however is better interpreted by understanding that if an individual is out

more days, they have more days that they are not back in prison. A higher risk score increases the odds of readmission by 7% and a $p < .05$. The remainder of the variables were not significant. Overall, the results indicate that for those who participated in the program, dosage of the program for a longer period does not reduce the chance of returning to prison.

Overall, the results from the analysis indicate that the pre-release program participation was not effective in reducing recidivism. Although research supports that the program should reduce recidivism by offering the offenders assistance in what they need before release, the results in the present study show that the pre-release employment center used in this study were not effective at reducing recidivism compared to those who were eligible to participate in the program but declined (Seiter & Kadela, 2003; Wikoff et al., 2012). The results within this study follow the findings of Visher et al. (2017) more closely. This program did not have significant results in reducing recidivism. As well, results do not indicate dosage of the center as a significant factor in recidivism.

Discussion

This study aimed to analyze whether a pre-release program participation reduced recidivism compared to those who declined participation. Along with that, the research looked at whether the dosage of a center made a difference in recidivism. The logic behind this research was that a longer amount of assistance through the program would have a greater effect of reducing recidivism. Theoretical perspectives such as social learning theory and life-course theory argue that being exposed to influences that are crime reducing, there should be a resulting effect that removes an individual from crime. This research used that perspective to anticipate that being within a center that created

goals and pro-social behavior of crime free life after release and obtaining employment, the individual would be less likely to recidivate. Unfortunately, the results do not follow this.

Due to limitations of the research, there may be an explanation of why this study had a null effect. Having a larger sample would have helped in being able to generalize the overall findings. Also, there was not a set amount of time after a person was released that data was collected. Because the individuals used in this research were released from October 2017 to December 2018, there are uneven amounts of time that data was recorded until potential readmission. The maximum time out was 457 days. This represents the individual released earliest who was never reincarcerated. This is a very short time frame compared to most research (Alper, Durose, & Markman, 2018; Durose, Cooper, & Snyder, 2014). It is interesting to look at the 15% recidivism rate of this study compared to Durose and colleagues finding reincarceration rates at 55.4%, however this could be explained by the time frame of the study. There is also very limited information of how the program was administered. Though the program stated different elements that it was offered, it is unclear if those were provided. All of these factors could have made a large impact on the results of the research.

Because recidivism rates are currently high in the United States, programs that aim to reduce recidivism are crucial (Durose, Cooper, & Snyder, 2014). Research to evaluate these programs is important to ensure they do what they are set out to achieve. Though the effects were null, it is important to continue research of pre-release programs to find an effective program and administer other programs in the same way.

Limitation

For this study, I would have liked to research the programs qualitatively. This would include surveys pre-release to address needs and obstacles the individuals have about being released. Having the ability to see how the program is being administered would also add a great amount of knowledge to the research. Then I would want in-depth interviews post-release that would identify what life is like adjusting to being out of prison, what thoughts of crime they may have, and why they would potentially commit a crime again. Though there is research that indicated that pre-release programs do not work, including this study, there is also research indicating that there are some successful programs. There are practices used in certain programs that work better than others, but the question remains what those are (Bloom, 2006). Because of this, the research is lacking in what the programs offer and how they are carried out. This information may help in the understanding of what works in reducing recidivism.

Post release data would have also been an extremely useful piece of information to analyze. This would have allowed for what job offenders had once they left incarceration as well as how long they were able to keep a job. This information would be significant in determining if the program helped offenders with obtaining a job. Also, it would help to understand if having and keeping a job affected recidivism in a way different than just participation in the program.

Policy Implications

This research allows for policy to be improved. The results indicate that participation alone did not have a significant effect on recidivism. From this policy must look at alternative solutions to ensure more successful results. Wright (2018) offers reasons behind why individuals recidivate, along with possible solutions. These include

when pre-release programs start, how they are administered, and understanding the individual. The way this would look is that individuals get assessed on what their needs are when they close to release. They would then get assistance such as resume assistance if the need was to find a job for the first time. If the need is just obtaining employment with a record, the program would connect the individual to employers willing to hire such individuals. If the need was more based in familial needs or education, the program would be adjusted to focus on that. Using data such as that in combination with the body of research could allow for more effective programs.

Future Research

There is almost no research of interviews with offenders who are participating in these programs. This leaves a huge gap in research for these programs. Having interviews could allow individuals to explain their experience in the center and identify what was effective and what was not. Also following up with individuals to see why they felt they needed to commit a crime if they recidivated. Knowing the mindset of those who did not recidivate would also be useful in the determination of what was effective in these programs.

Gathering more on what life is like post release is important. This includes housing, personal factors, job data, and education. All these could potentially be aspects of why someone would recidivate. Identifying possible risk factors that the programs could then assist with. Overall, identifying the probable risk factors is key in an effective program.

Finally, a personalized approach to pre-release programs may have significant findings. One approach to all offenders may be missing risk factors that are greatly

affecting others. Identifying risk could allow for a program to be geared toward what predisposes an offender to recidivate. Also, the needs of the offender can be identified to see what areas the program should focus on for each offender (Duwe and Clark, 2017). This personalized approach could be a key factor in reducing recidivism.

Conclusion

This research identified whether the program offered a reduction in recidivism through looking at participation and days within a center. The comparison group allows an accurate observation of recidivism. The logistic models also help to identify whether the number of days in a center help to reduce recidivism. The ideology behind this question was that longer time in the center meant that the individual could spend more time absorbing the material taught in the program. Although the results did not indicate this, there may be an answer if the program was analyzed for what it offered and how it carried it out.

REFERENCES

- Alper, M., Durose, M. R., & Markman, J. (2018). *2018 Update on Prisoner Recidivism: A 9-Year Follow-up Period (2005-2014)*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Astray-Caneda, V., Busbee, M., & Fanning, M. (2013). Social learning theory and prison work release programs.
- Bloom, D. (2006). Employment-Focused Programs for Ex-Prisoners: What Have We Learned, What Are We Learning, and Where Should We Go from Here?. *MDRC*.
- Bushway, S. (2003). Employment dimensions of reentry. Urban institute reentry roundtable discussion paper: Reentry and prison work programs (pp. 1-17).
- Bushway, S. D., & Apel, R. (2012). A signaling perspective on employment-based reentry programming: Training completion as a desistance signal. *Criminology & public policy, 11*(1), 21-50.
- Bushway, S., & Reuter, P. (2002). Labor markets and crime risk factors. *Evidence-based crime prevention, 198*.
- Durose, M. R., Cooper, A. D., & Snyder, H. N. (2014). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Duwe, G. (2018). The effects of the timing and dosage of correctional programming on recidivism. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 57*(3-4), 256-271.
- Duwe, G., & Clark, V. A. (2017). Nothing will work unless you did: The predictors of postprison employment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 44*(5), 657-677.
- Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1983). Age and the explanation of crime. *American journal of sociology, 89*(3), 552-584.
- Jonson, C. L., & Cullen, F. T. (2015). Prisoner pre-release programs. *Crime and justice, 44*(1), 517-575.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2005). Developing successful reentry programs: Lessons learned from the “what works” research. *Corrections Today, 67*(2), 72-77.
- Mellow, J., & Barnes-Ceeney, K. (2017). Key Factors to Promote Successful Comprehensive Pre-release Initiatives. *Fed. Probation, 81*, 22-31.

Moses, M. C. (2012). Ex-offender job placement programs do not reduce recidivism. *Corrections Today*, 74(4), 106-108.

National Institute of Justice. (2014). Recidivism, Retrieved from <https://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/recidivism/Pages/welcome.aspx#statistics>

Nelson, M., & Trone, J. (2016). Why planning for release matters. New York: Vera Institute of Justice, 2000.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1997). A life-course theory of cumulative disadvantage and the stability of delinquency. *Developmental theories of crime and delinquency*, 7, 133-161.

Schnepel, K. T. (2017). Good jobs and recidivism. *The Economic Journal*, 128(608), 447-469.

Seamans, J. (2018). Second chance centers 1-year anniversary. Arizona Department of Economic Security. Retrieved from <https://des.az.gov/featured-story/second-chance-centers-1-year-anniversary>

Seiter, R. P., & Kadela, K. R. (2003). Prisoner reentry: What works, what does not, and what is promising. *Crime & Delinquency*, 49(3), 360-388.

Taxman, F. S. (2004). The offender and pre-release: Supporting active participation in reintegration. *Fed. Probation*, 68, 31-35.

Visher, C. A. (2006). Effective pre-release programs. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5(2), 299-302.

Visher, C. A., Lattimore, P. K., Barrick, K., & Tueller, S. (2017). Evaluating the long-term effects of prisoner reentry services on recidivism: What types of services matter?. *Justice Quarterly*, 34(1), 136-165.

Visher, C. A., Winterfield, L., & Coggeshall, M. B. (2005). Ex-offender employment programs and recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1(3), 295-316.

Wikoff, N., Linhorst, D. M., & Morani, N. (2012). Recidivism among participants of a reentry program for prisoners released without supervision. *Social Work Research*, 36(4), 289-299.

Wilson, D. B., Gallagher, C. A., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 37(4), 347-368.

Wright, K. (2018). Re-entry and recidivism. In b. Hart & D. Hunting (Eds.), *Criminal Justice in Arizona* (50-59). Arizona: Arizona Town Hall.

**Table 1:
Summary Statistics**

	Mean	SD
Readmission	0.15	0.36
Dosage of Program	60.80	14.65
Time at risk of Incarceration	171.87	115.46
Age	38.78	10.38
Male	0.82	0.38
Minority	0.55	0.50
Prior Conviction	0.83	0.38
Risk Level	7.75	2.93
Minimum	0.79	0.41
Medium	0.19	0.40
Max	0.01	0.07
Closed	0.01	0.12

**Table 2:
Summary Statistics Comparison Across Groups**

	Participated in Pre-release Program		Declined Participation in Pre-release Program		T-Test
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Readmission	0.16	0.37	0.15	0.35	1.133
Time at risk of Incarceration	173.95	123.43	170.53	110.04	0.932
Age	38.31	9.86	39.08	10.69	-2.336 *
Male	0.83	0.38	0.82	0.38	0.479
Minority	0.62	0.49	0.50	0.50	7.213 ***
Prior Conviction	0.86	0.34	0.80	0.40	5.153 ***
Risk Level	8.49	2.78	7.27	2.92	13.399 ***
Minimum	0.81	0.39	0.78	0.42	2.885 **
Medium	0.18	0.38	0.19	0.40	-1.071 *
Max	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.09	-3.685 **
Closed	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.14	-4.184 ***
Max/Closed	0.004	0.065	0.028	0.165	-5.520 ***

$p \leq 0.001$ ***, $p \leq 0.01$ ** , $p \leq 0.05$ * (two-tailed tests).

Table 3:
Crosstabulation Examining Participation in Pre-release Program

	Declined Participation		Participated	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
Not Readmitted	2,162	85.15%	1,366	83.86%
Readmitted	377	14.85%	263	16.14%
Total	2,539	100%	1,629	100%

Pearsons Chi = 1.2834 Pr = .257

Table 4:
Logistic Regression of Readmission on Pre-release Employment Program Participation

n=4,168

Readmission	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Program Participation	1.104	.097	1.100	.099	.988	.141
Time at Risk of Incarceration	----	----	.994 ***	.000	.994 ***	.000
Age	----	----	----	----	.989 *	.005
Male	----	----	----	----	.812	.109
Minority	----	----	----	----	1.020	.093
Men's Pre-release Employment Program Site A	----	----	----	----	1.027	.183
Prior Conviction	----	----	----	----	1.044	.149
Risk Level	----	----	----	----	1.100 ***	.020
Medium	----	----	----	----	1.298 *	.166
Maximum/Closed	----	----	----	----	1.562	.446

$p \leq 0.001$ ***, $p \leq 0.01$ ** , $p \leq 0.05$ * (two-tailed tests).

Table 5:
Logistic Regression of Readmission on Dosage of Pre-release Employment Program

n= 1,628

Readmission	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Dosage of the Program	.995	.004	.995	.005	.996	.005
Time at Risk of Incarceration	----	----	.995 ***	.001	.995 ***	.001
Age	----	----	----	----	.998	.008
Male	----	----	----	----	.876	.366
Minority	----	----	----	----	1.115	.161
Men's Pre-release Employment Program Site A	----	----	----	----	.915	.382
Prior Conviction	----	----	----	----	1.266	.313
Risk Level	----	----	----	----	1.070 *	.031
Medium	----	----	----	----	.969	.406
Maximum/Closed	----	----	----	----	1.605	.1452

$p \leq 0.001$ ***, $p \leq 0.01$ ** , $p \leq 0.05$ * (two-tailed tests).