7-6-2005

Assessing the Impact of Prison Industries on Post-Release Employment and Recidivism of Florida Inmates

Robin Leigh Richardson
Florida State University

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF PRISON INDUSTRIES ON POST-RELEASE EMPLOYMENT AND RECIDIVISM OF FLORIDA INMATES

By

ROBIN L. RICHARDSON

A Thesis submitted to the
College of Criminology and Criminal Justice
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Degree Awarded:
Summer Semester, 2005

The members of the Committee approve the Thesis of Robin L. Richardson defended on July 6, 2005.

_____
Gordon Waldo
Professor Directing Thesis

_____
William Bales
Committee Member

_____
Marc Gertz
Committee Member

Approved:

_____
Thomas Blomberg, Dean, College of Criminology and Criminal Justice

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Kathy Padgett, thank you for your help during the data analysis and editorial process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The deskilling of labor and the loss of social networking has accounted for part of the crime problem in recent decades. Vocational training and other correctional programming is meant to reverse the effects of these problems by providing inmates with usable, legal, and employable skills. Over the last five to ten years, the role of rehabilitative services has become highly questionable. The lack of confidence in such services has led to a decline in the number and type of prison programming available to inmates. In addition, fiscal concerns on the part of privately owned correctional industries have sharpened this decline. This paper reports results of an evaluation performed on PRIDE Enterprises, one of the largest providers of privately operated inmate vocational training in Florida, in regards to its effect on inmates' post release employment and recidivism. This study found that working in the vocational program, PRIDE, significantly increases the likelihood of the participant being employed after release. This study also found that PRIDE has no direct effect on recidivism.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Rehabilitative correctional programming holds a tenuous position in criminal justice policy. Beginning in the 1970s, Martinson's investigation into the effectiveness of correctional programming brought a decline to the number and scope of various programs across the nation (Blomberg & Lucken 2000). The often-quoted "Nothing Works" became a symbol for decreases in funding and openings in prison programming. The "Nothing Works" rhetoric was not the whole picture of Martinson's argument. Martinson also found that programming ineffectiveness was the result of particular factors, such as inadequate application of the program, understaffing, and targeting the wrong prison populations to mention a few (Martinson 1974; Lipman et al. 1975; Lattimore et al. 1990). Afterward, rehabilitative programs were not cut completely from corrections but were subject to closer scrutiny than before.

However, the imprisonment binge of the last twenty years begs the corrections system to find alternatives to aiding the reentry of inmates. This has resulted in the continuation of counseling, drug therapy, and vocational training within the prison system but not in the unmitigated fashion prior to the Martinson's investigation. This scrutiny has been brought to bear on one of the leading vocational programs in the state of Florida.

PRIDE's Vocational Program

An investigation of Prison Rehabilitative Industries and Diversified Enterprises (PRIDE), a state authorized, non profit manufacturing and service corporation established in 1981, revealed several problems with the vocational program (OPPAGA 2003). PRIDE Enterprises had been established to meet several objectives at its inception:

-Provide education, training, and post-release job placement to inmates to help reduce recommitment;

-Enhance Security by reducing inmate idleness and providing an incentive for good behavior in prison;

-Reduce the cost of state government by operating enterprises primarily with inmate labor while not unreasonably competing with private enterprises; and

-Rehabilitate inmates by duplicating, as nearly as possible, the activities of a profit-making enterprise (OPPAGA 2003, p.1)

OPPAGA Report

In 2003, OPPAGA released a special report questioning the merits of continuing business with Prison Rehabilitative Industries and Diversified Enterprises (PRIDE) because of its declining sale records, questionable corporate restructuring, and decreasing number of inmates employed by the corporation. The report found that the number of PRIDE inmates had dropped 33% since 1994, despite an increasing prison population. OPPAGA had further difficulties confirming PRIDE's effect on inmate recidivism. PRIDE claimed that inmates employed by the corporation recidivated less than inmates not employed by PRIDE (approximately 18% to 38%), but this information appeared to be anecdotal and difficult to confirm (PRIDE, 2002; OPPAGA 2003).

OPPAGA recommended a separate agency to conduct a more in-depth analysis of the recidivism data. In 2004, the FSU College of Criminology and Criminal Justice's Center for Criminology and Public Policy Research evaluated PRIDE using data provided by the corporation. Due to certain limitations of that data, a second evaluation was conducted using data provided by the Florida Department of Corrections. This current evaluation examines post release employment and recidivism rates of inmates who were employed by PRIDE and released from prison during 2001 fiscal year. This evaluation compares inmates who participated in PRIDE industries during their current incarceration to non-PRIDE inmates released during the same fiscal year. Further, sub-group comparisons between participants in PRIDE and inmates who are incarcerated in facilities with PRIDE are performed to reduce environmental factors of the prison, which could deter or aggravate recommitment. Finally, a second sub group comparison was performed on PRIDE participants of greater than six months against PRIDE participants of less than six months to determine if there is a time factor in participation.

Theoretical Framework: The Life Course and Social Capital

An individual's life span is made of several trajectories or "pathway[s] or line[s] of development…, such as work life, marriage, parenthood, self-esteem, or criminal behaviors" (Cullen & Agnew 2003, p. 472). According to the life course perspective, it is the strength and quality of social bonds that influence delinquency across a person's life (Sampson & Laub 1993). These changes in a person's social control are clearly seen when looking at transitions and turning points in the individual's life. Transitions, unlike trajectories, are "changes in state that are more or less abrupt" (Cullen & Agnew 2003, p. 472). Two suggested transitions are obtaining a job and marriage (Cullen & Agnew 2003; Sampson & Laub 1993; Giordano et al. 2002). On the other hand, turning points are defined as a "change in the life course" (Cullen & Agnew 2003, p. 472). It is suggested that these short term changes [transitions and turning points] can actually "redirect" (p. 472) the individual's trajectory, because it's "crucial" (p. 472) for the individual to adapt to life events (Cullen & Agnew 2003).

It is suggested that the training and services provided to offenders who participated in PRIDE industries and programs are able to produce a turning point for inmates. Most vocational programs only emphasize skill development for the inmate, with the intention of providing inmates with viable working skills upon release. The problem with this perspective is that the skills and training offered are usually out of date or in a career field with little growth. This makes it difficult for ex-offenders to transition into similar positions upon release. PRIDE provides skill training to inmates participating in its programs, but it also provides placement and other job development courses. Further, the organization of the PRIDE Corporation provides trainees with a skeletal version of nonprison working habits and systems. Although, inmates may not be able to directly obtain jobs in the fields they were trained for in prison, their training may benefit them in alternative ways. Employment itself is not the key in reducing crime, but the "mutual ties of work" (1993, p. 140) from stable income and trust may reduce crime (Sampson & Laub 1993; Giordano et al. 2002). In other words, PRIDE may provide participating offenders with "social investment" (Sampson & Laub 1993, p. 140) or social capital.

In the past, "informal social networks" were the gateway for new generations to "enter the labor market by providing information and personal contacts for young women and men to take advantage of job openings" (Baskin & Sommers 1998, p.79). Unfortunately, most of these networks have been disrupted by inner city violence and the deterioration of neighborhoods. The violence and disinvestment in these communities has led to subsequent generations restricted to jobs that are low waged, low skilled, and limited mobility service careers (Baskin & Sommers 1998 ; Chiricos 2002). Most vocational training programs focus only on skill development to help inmates find a job upon release, but this leaves a gap that was once filled by informal networks. Coleman found that a "lack of social capital" is a primary feature in "weak social bonds" for adults (Sampson & Laub 1993, p.140).

Social capital is "embodied in the relations among persons" (Sampson & Laub 1993, p. 140) as an "obligation of reciprocity" (Herreros 2004, p. 7). It is an intangible resource that is unstable but necessary in order to effectively bind the person to the community and other social institutions (Sampson & Laub 1994; Herreros 2004; Krishna 2002; Allik & Realo 2004; Hooghe & Stolle 2003). Communities with high social capital are bound by social networks and norms that enable them to produce "superior outcomes in multiple domains" (Krishna 2002, p. IX; Hooghe & Stolle 2003; Herreros 2004). Further, Sampson and Laub (1993) argued that adult social bonds are more indirect than juvenile bonds; as such, social ties are more important in establishing "interdependent systems of obligation and restraint" (p. 140). These ties are fostered by social capital, and social capital mitigates the effects of delinquent propensities (Sampson & Laub 1993; Hooghe & Stolle 2003).

Thereby, the life course, as defined as a "sequence of culturally defined age graded roles and social transitions that are enacted over time" (Cullen & Agnew 2003, p. 476) could be altered or redirected by vocational training programs. As such, PRIDE's program helps to provide released offenders with employment and promote skills that would enable them to maintain and remain committed to a job and turn away from criminal behaviors after release. If the relationship between the ex-offender and other social institutions were characterized by "interdependence," then the ex-offender would have greater ties to the community to "draw on as they move through life transitions that

traverse larger trajectories" (Cullen & Agnew 2003, p. 476). "Voluntary participation" could effectively "foster instructor and employer contact and a commitment to conventional aspects of society" (Wilson et al. 2000, p. 349).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical Roots of Prison Labor

Rehabilitation of offenders was of little consequence for correctional systems in pre-colonial times. Early prison systems and labor camps were meant to punish the offender and to deter future criminal offending (Funke et al. 1982; Burger 1985). Prison administrators were more concerned with controlling the prison population and cared little if the prisoner returned to society as a reformed citizen. However, the goal of rehabilitation began to drift into penal policy around the mid nineteenth century, although, earlier forms of rehabilitative zeal were found in the construction of workhouses in the sixteenth century.

Workhouses were the first attempt to use labor to "behaviorally transform" (Blomberg & Lucken 2000, p. 19) the impoverished and transient population in a community. Workhouses were constructed with the belief that a "regimen of honest labor, discipline, and moral instruction" could transform offenders into "productive citizens" (Blomberg & Lucken 2000, p.19). The use of the workhouse quickly expanded, and these ideas were later included when constructing the innovative prison systems in Auburn and Pennsylvania.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Auburn and Pennsylvania prison systems both used a regimen of hard work and silence to rehabilitate offenders by allowing them to contemplate their transgressions and learn a work ethnic that was lacking before incarceration (Blomberg & Lucken 2000; Funke et al. 1982). There was a strong belief that hard work and contemplation could reform the offender's moral character. The Auburn system, which emphasized silence, but not solitary work like the Pennsylvania system, expanded greatly during the early nineteenth century in the northeast. Unfortunately, Auburn's reformist intentions were lost as fiscal and overcrowding concerns grew (Blomberg & Lucken 2000; Funke et al. 1982). Southern development of a prison system was severely neglected, but alternative punishment

flourished primarily in the form of leasing out of prisoners as laborers (Blomberg & Lucken 2000; Funke et al. 1982). The differences in penal practices between these two regions became noticeably different after the Civil War, with the rise of progressive reforms in the North and the exploitation of prison labor through the convict lease system in the South (Blomberg & Lucken 2000). The dichotomy of the two regions would shape America's viewpoint of prison labor and vocational programming in corrections until the present.

In the post-Civil War era, the Northeast was the beginning of progressive penological change. The progressive movement ignited several policy changes, including the creation and administration of reformatories. Reformatories provided rehabilitation for delinquent and at risk youth, but it also provided "paid work, job training, physical exercise and well planned diet" (Blomberg & Lucken 2000:72) to persons who had little experience with any of these dimensions. Reformatories, much like the workhouses, embraced the idea that inmates could learn new social habits and industriousness through work (Blomberg & Lucken 2000). The 1870 Transactions of the National Congress on Penitentiary and Reformatory Discipline "urged prisons to concentrate less on profit and self-sufficiency and to use the labor of prisoners in a 'productive' manner" (Funke et al. 1982: 26). However, deficiency in administration and the money/merit system eventually caused reformatories to fail. Nevertheless, the progressive philosophy fed into the early nineteenth century rehabilitative ideal.

The rehabilitative ideal was less about the program and more about fostering of ideas concerning ways to "correct offenders." It was during this era that expansion of correctional treatments such as counseling, drug therapy, and vocational training began to expand. Policy makers of this era believed that inmates could be successfully "reintegrated" into society, primarily by "holding a job, paying taxes, and raising a family" (Blomberg & Lucken 2000: 101). The momentum to rehabilitate offenders and the ever increasing number of penal services eventually tapered off around the mid twentieth century. After several crushing evaluations of these rehabilitation programs, the rehabilitative ideal moved to the background as a harsher correctional policy was adopted.

On the other hand, the antebellum south found little usefulness for the rehabilitation of offenders, but contracted out inmates for cheap labor. This system was in affect well before the Civil War, but its rampant expansion and marked abuses were most apparent after the Civil War (Blomberg & Lucken 2000; Funke et al 1982). Several scholars have associated the growth of the contract-lease system after the civil war as a continuation of the slave model found throughout the south before the civil war (Adamson 1983; Myers & Massey 1991; Ward & Rogers 1987).

The South fostered a system of forced labor and in some cases depravity (Blomberg & Lucken 2000; Ward & Rogers 1987). It merely acted as a system to obtain cheap and expendable labor, as seen in cases such as the Banner Mine Explosion. The Banner Mines, employed the use of convicts, and due to faulty ventilation and general mismanagement eventually killed 128 workers, mostly black convicts (Ward & Rogers 1987). However, this system remained in full effect for several decades, before being temporarily abolished in the mid twentieth century.

The cyclical nature of correctional policy has brought into view once again other rehabilitative programming. However, the use of prison labor continues to bring up the question of whether it is a salvation or slavery?

Prison Labor: Salvation or Slavery

There are two conflicting views of prison labor in America. The first is of "sadistic profit-obsessed managers" (Jacobs 1999, p. 269) ensnaring prisoners into a life of forced labor and driving them "beyond human endurance" (Jacobs 1999, p. 269). The other is of idle prisoners, lazing their days away on taxpayer's money (Jacobs 1999). Although, both viewpoints provide an inaccurate view of most prison labor systems, examples of both extremes can probably be found. However, it is this duality of the prison labor system that causes it to promote and restrain vocational training programs at the same time.

There is also a larger question of how to provide meaningful employment and skills to inmates, without offending private enterprise. "Everyone has the right to work," (Hawkins 1983, p. 87) but this adage does not always seem to apply to offenders. Most offenders have little "productive work" to do in the prison systems, leaving them with a lot of time idle. Most blame this on the "inferiority" of the prison laborers but it has been

found that with "reasonable incentives" (Hawkins 1983, p. 103) the prison labor system is just as good as the free labor system. Hawkins (1983) found that "Free Venture prison industry program lend no support … [to] some intrinsic deficiency in the prison labor force" (p. 103). Prison laborers had comparable "productive abilities …to similarly skilled employees in the world outside prison" (p. 103). Further, productive labor experience for prisoners can also lead to increases in self esteem that would promote greater employment success upon release and less recidivism (Burger 1985).

However, many believe that prison labor would be an unreasonable competitive market against free laborers, despite little evidence to support that claim (Jacobs 1999; Hawkins 1983). Further, prison laborers are made out to be completely "unreliable and irresponsible" (Jacobs 1999, p.271), and lack motivation, which is not always the case. Nevertheless, there are still difficulties in establishing an effective prison labor system without criticizing the labor itself. First, prison industries lack officials with "expertise in and strong commitment to business" (Jacobs 1999, p. 278) causing "industry a lower priority than safety and security" (Jacobs 1999, p. 276). Secondly, prisons are unable to obtain the "substantial capital investment" (Hawkins 1983, p. 104) necessary to operate a reliable prison industry (Hawkins 1983; Jacobs 1999). Finally, political and legal issues prevent prison made goods from successfully competing with free trade institutions. Prison made goods are often banned from interstate commerce and substantial restrictions are placed on which industries are allowed to compete with free trade institutions (Jacobs 1999). The creation of an effective and productive labor system inside prison will continue to be a challenge as long as these issues are not handled. Unfortunately, the most common method to date to remedy this situation has been to favor free trade institutions by decreasing the number of prisoners effectively employed in prison, which has decreased from 44% in 1940, to less than 10% in today's prison (Funke et al. 1982).

Vocational Training and Work Release

A review of vocational training literature finds that while the findings are mixed, most studies support the idea that vocational training programs can improve the likelihood of employment upon release and reduce the likelihood of returning to prison (Johnson 1984; Wilson et al 2000; Gerber & Fritsch 1995; Seiter & Kadela 2003; Lattimore et al. 1990; Schumacker et al. 1990; Anderson 1982; Witte 1977; Saylor &

Gaes 1996; Motiuk & Belcourt 1996; Drake 2003; Anderson 1995a; Anderson 1995b). Further, participation in these programs often leads to better adjustment in prison, higher self esteem, and fewer disciplinary reports for the participating inmate (Witte 1972; Saylor & Gaes 1996; Motiuk & Belcourt 1996; Gerber & Fritsch 1995).

Research has found that the lack of education or a marketable skill often made it difficult for former inmates to find employment after release (Vernick & Reardon 2001; Gleason 1986; Simon 1999). Others have suggested that it the criminal label and not the lack of job training that could produce difficulties with obtaining employment, since most inmates were employed prior to incarceration (Wilson et al. 2000). However, the employment record of most inmates is sporadic, and aimed primarily at low mobility service sector jobs (Gillis et al. 1996).

Those programs that were found to be the most effective are typically multi-dimensional. They do not focus exclusively on skill development but also use follow up procedures and make sure that the skills taught are "relevant" to the current job market (Wilson et al. 2000; Gerber & Fritsch 1995; Kennedy 1997; Harrison & Schehr 2004). There is little overlap between the skills taught in prison and actual employment (Gerber & Fritsch 1995; Anderson 1982), but those inmates who did find jobs that matched their skills were more likely to be successful (Gillis et al. 1996; Johnson 1984). Some programs found that focusing on inmates with the most disadvantage, in terms of job skills, provide the best success (Adams et al. 1994), while others found those with the best skill succeeded (Anderson 1995b). In the meta-analysis performed by Gerber & Fritsch (1995) they found prison programs that were "separate" from the prison were more likely to succeed. Also, prison programs that were aimed at certain groups had better success than those aimed at the general population (Anderson 1995a, 1995b).

Unfortunately, most studies conducted on vocational training programs suffer from poor research methods, lack statistical controls, failed to eliminate selection bias and it was difficult to determine the cause of change for the inmate (Wilson et al. 2000). In some cases, the program was inadequately activated and there was "misconception" of the programs goals (Craig & Rogers 1993; Simon 1999; Lattimore et al. 1990). In some cases, the inmates took over the program and used it as a means of intimidation (Craig & Rogers 1993).

Most vocational studies used quasi-experimental designs (Wilson et al. 2000), because it was often difficult to randomly assign inmates to programs. When experimental designs were used, there was no statistical support for vocational programs reducing recidivism (Waldo & Chiricos 1977; Johnson 1984; Johnson & Goldberg 1983).

In several studies, initial support for vocational training effecting recidivism was found, but when more statistical rigor was applied, the reexamined relationship disappeared (Maguire et al. 1988; Sung 2001). Finally, Brewster and Sharp (2002) found a reverse effect, with both male and female participants in vocational training programs returning to prison sooner than non participants. Possible explanations for these findings is that the participants self selected themselves into the program, but another possibility is that the success rate was smaller due to the chronic facility changes occurring in the correctional system.

In summary, most of the research is supportive of the position that vocational training is rehabilitative, but this could be the result of weak statistical controls and selection bias. Further, most research does not provide an adequate causal pathway to understand how vocational training effects recidivism.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

The PRIDE evaluation analyzed offenders who had been released from the Florida Department of Corrections during the 2001 fiscal year. The study consisted of 20,441 inmates who were released that year, with 5,328 of the inmates having prior PRIDE experience. This is a Post-hoc quasi experimental, cross-sectional study using two comparison groups, inmates released who participated in the PRIDE programs and inmates released who did not participate in the PRIDE program.

Hypotheses

The study is testing four main hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: PRIDE participants will be more likely to be employed after release than non-participants within one year after prison release?

Hypothesis 2: PRIDE participants will be more likely to be employed after release than non-participants within two years after prison release?

Hypothesis 3: PRIDE participants will be less likely to be returned to prison than non participants within one year after prison release?

Hypothesis 4: PRIDE participants will be less likely to be returned to prison than non participants within two years after prison release?

This study examines recommitment data and employment data on these inmates for up to two years following his or her release from prison. In order to replicate the circumstances similar to those used by PRIDE in their evaluation of the program, this study examines recidivist behavior two years following prison release.

Selection Bias

The choice to participate or not to participate in the PRIDE programs is based on convenience and self-selection. The first limitation to the selection choice is that inmates can only participate in programs that are offered by his or her correctional facility. Although PRIDE is found in a large number of the correctional facilities and work camps throughout Florida, there is not a program in every facility. Secondly, inmate participation is based partially upon self-selection. Inmates are not randomly assigned to participate or not participate in this program or other programs offered in the correctional facility. These biases limit the ability to generalize the findings of this study to inmates in PRIDE and/or vocational training programs in other states. This also limits the ability to generalize to inmates in other years, too.

Participants

The study analyzes 5,328 inmates who actively participated in PRIDE during his or her current incarceration. The members of the PRIDE cohort (see Table 1) for the 2001 fiscal year are more likely to be older, male, white, and to have graduated high school than those inmates who had not participated in the program. Those participating in PRIDE are incarcerated 50-100% longer than non participating members. The PRIDE cohort was more likely to be a violent offender, habitual offender, to have a prior conviction, and to be under supervision upon release to the community. The PRIDE cohort was less likely to be a drug offender.

Those inmates participating in PRIDE for less than six months were more likely to resemble the general prison population than those inmates participating for six months or more. Those inmates participating in the program for longer than six months appear to be inmates with longer and possibly more serious offenses.

Data

This study utilizes secondary data from the official records of the Florida's Department of Corrections. Florida's DOC uses an Offender Based Information System (OBIS) that keeps records of all felonious offenders who are either sent to a correctional institution or supervised by the state (Bales et al. 2003). OBIS maintains

records of all offender characteristics, movements, and sentences since 1980. The fact that this information is collected by outside parties makes it difficult to understand how their collection methods and instruments may affects these numbers.

The main independent variable in the first model is whether the inmate participated in PRIDE or did not participate in PRIDE. The main independent variable in the second model is whether the inmate participated in PRIDE or did not participate in PRIDE but was incarcerated in a facility with PRIDE. In the third model, the main independent variable is whether the inmate participated in a PRIDE for six months or longer or did they participate for less than six months. The first model has a separate variable to measure the effect of being housed in a facility with PRIDE. This controls for the environmental effects of facilities with PRIDE not found in the first model cohort.

Education after release and being employed for two years is found in the first recommitment model at two years. This model is limited to offenders that have been rearrested for a new crime, and not returned to prison for technical violations. The model is also limited to offenders with verifiable employment histories. The second recommitment model for two years is not limited to inmates with a reoffense in the last two years or a valid social security number. The recommitment model for one year does not include education after release, since this is a general variable looking at any education after release, as such it was only included in one model. Employment in one year is substituted accordingly in the recommitment within one-year model.

The other independent variables included in this study met "two criteria: 1) factors for which FDOC has reliable data, and 2) factors found to be significant recidivism predictors in prior studies" (Bales et al. 2003) [1]. The demographic variables found to predict recidivist behavior including age at release, being male (sex), being black (race), being hispanic (ethnicity), being married, and level of education (high school graduate (1=yes, 0=no)). Prior criminal history and institutional variables that are used to predict recidivist behavior are also included; such as, past criminal convictions (1=no, 0=yes), habitual offending (1=yes, 0=no), violent habitual offending (1=yes, 0=no), being a violent offender (1=yes, 0=no), prior offense (primary offense), length of time in prison (continuous, by number of months), most serious prior conviction and past

1 See Appendix B for more information on the variables used in this study.

prison behavior (disciplinary report during prison incarceration (1=no, 0=yes)). Significant findings should be found repeatedly for several of these variables, such as being a habitual offender or having a prior conviction, since they are high predictors of future criminal behavior. Gendreau et al. (1996) meta-analysis of offender recidivism found that certain demographic variables and criminal history are strong predictors of recidivism. They also found that substance abuse history is a strong predictor but this variable is not included in this study, because this data is confidential, and is not available from the DOC. Additional variables are included about residency such as being born in the US, being a Florida resident, and speaking English, in case these factors limited the offender's ability to find employment.

The dependent variable is being recommitted to prison, which is measured as being recommitted to prison after being released from prison within one year and within two years. Recommitment was used as the recidivism measure, rather than rearrest, because it was found to be a better predictor of program effectiveness (Brewster & Sharp 2002). The model was limited to only those inmates who remained in the state and could be tracked. However, the number of cases lost due to this restriction is negligible. On the other hand, the use of only verifiable employment data, while increasing accuracy of reporting, also limits the numbers of case in the study dramatically.

These variables were tested for multi-collinarity to establish if the variables had any potential interactive effects. If multi-collinarity is found these interactions could potentially inflate the results. After determining and potentially removing any variables that may unduly inflate the reported statistics of the study, a logistic regression is performed for all three main independent variable models and all recommitment /employment models. Afterward, a Cox's regression survival analysis is performed on the three main independent variables and being recommitted within two years. Being employed within two year is included in this model, so the model is limited to inmates with verifiable work histories.

Measures

PRIDE cohort. A direct measure of PRIDE participation was needed because this measure was lacking in the recidivism data. First, the 2001 recidivism cohort was merged with the DOC work assignment data, which includes each entry and exit date into

a PRIDE program. After merging the recidivism file with the work assignment file, inmates were identified whose release dates were between July 1, 2000 and June 30, 2001. The work assignment data was used to calculate the number of days spent working for PRIDE. The number of days working for PRIDE was calculated for both the primary (a.m.) and secondary (p.m.) work assignments of the inmate. The numbers of days working for PRIDE were calculated by subtracting the end date of the inmate's work assignments from the beginning date of the inmate's work assignments. Participants in PRIDE are put into three categories, based on the length of time in PRIDE: Inmates who were not PRIDE participants because they spent no time in PRIDE, inmates who were PRIDE participants and worked for less than six months, and inmates who were PRIDE participants and worked for six months or more. Six months is determined by PRIDE as a necessary length of time to be rehabilitated by the PRIDE program (PRIDE, 2002).

In facility offering PRIDE. A comparison measure of indirect PRIDE experience for inmates who did not participate in PRIDE, but were incarcerated in a facility that offered PRIDE programming was needed since none existed in the data. The recidivism cohort was merged with the inmate movement data, and retained inmates whose movement dates were between July 1, 2000 and June 30, 2001. The inmate's length of time in a facility was calculated by subtracting the date they moved out of a facility from date the inmate moved into a correctional facility. Inmates were placed in two categories: In a PRIDE facility or not in a PRIDE facility.

Education and employment. The Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), data is used to measure inmate employment and education after being released from prison. FETPIP, a division of the Florida Department of Education, collects data concerning "the educational histories, placement and employment, military enlistments, and other measures of success of former participants in Florida's educational and workforce development programs" (FETPIP 2005). Employment is determined by using the inmate's release date to divide the year(s) following release into work quarters . After, the work quarters was matched to the offender's wage earning. If the offender earned a wage during a work quarter, then he or she was considered employed. Work quarters were calculated for two years. Education

is measured by taking the year the offender was enrolled and matching it to any time after the year released. If the offender was enrolled in school after released, he or she was considered to be going to school.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Bivariate Analysis

The correlation matrix (not shown) performed for PRIDE participation is found to have a positive and significant association with having employment in one year (r=.06, p<.0001) and two years (r=.05, p<.0001). PRIDE participation is weakly, but significantly correlated with being recommitted within two years (r=-.02,p<.004), but not one year (r=-.01, p<.24) in comparison to all releases. PRIDE participation has a moderately weak relationship with age (r=.08, p<.0001), months in prison (r=.24, p<.0001) and being black (r=-.14, p<.0001).

PRIDE participation has a weak positive and significant relationship with having employment in year one (r=.06, p<.0001) and year two (r=.05, p<.0001) in comparison to those housed in facilities with PRIDE. PRIDE participation has no relationship with being recommitted in year two (r=-.02, p<.09) and year one (r= -.01, p<.36). PRIDE participation has a moderately weak relationship with age (r=.15, p<.0001), and months in prison (r=.35, p<.0001).

PRIDE participation of more than six months had a weak positive and significant relationship with employment in year one (r=.05, p<.0005) and year two (r=.05, p<.0003) in comparison to those with less than six months participation. PRIDE participation of more than six months had no relationship with being recommitted in year two (r=-.02, p<.27) and year one (r= -.01, p<.25). PRIDE participation of more than six months had a moderate weak relationship with age (r=.15, p<.0001), and months in prison (r=.20, p<.0001). PRIDE participation of more than six months had a moderate negative and significant relationship with being male (r=-.31, p<.0001). There are no issues with multi-collinarity in any of the models.

Multivariate Analysis

PRIDE Model 1 & Recidivism

Table 2 shows the Maximum Likelihood Estimates between PRIDE participation and being recommitted to prison. The first recidivism model includes two independent variables for education after release and being employed in two years. This model only includes ex-offenders living within Florida, with verifiable work histories, and that have re-offended. These restrictions reduce the sample from 20,441 inmates to 4,613 inmates.

The variables participating in PRIDE and being in a facility with PRIDE has no significant effect on the dependent variable, being recommitted within two years. Being employed within two years had a significant, negative relationship with being returned to prison ($p<.001$). Being employed within two years after release has an odds ratio equaling 0.48. Inmates employed within two years after release were 52% less likely to recidivate. Pursuing an education after release had no effect on the likelihood of recidivating.

Being male, a habitual offender, or being supervised after release are all positively associated with being returned to prison. Males were 95% more likely to recidivate than females, but habitual offenders were only 38% more likely to recidivate than non habitual offenders. Having a prior conviction and a disciplinary report were also positively related to recidivating. Being single had no effect on the likelihood of being returned to prison.

The second recidivism model measured recommitment to prison within two years but it does not include the employment or education variables. This model includes all inmates that recidivated after releases, even for technical violations, unless they move to another state and could no longer be tracked.

The main independent variable of participation in PRIDE has no significant relationship with the recommitment of an offender. Being a habitual offender, violent habitual offender, or violent offender are strongly, and positively associated with the dependent variable. Being a violent offender makes it 396% more likely that the offender will recidivate. Several variables associated with recidivating had a significant relationship, such as age at release, months in prison, and being male. Prior convictions

and having more disciplinary misconduct reports were significantly associated with higher recidivism.

The third model measuring recommitment after one year, finds no significant relationship between the main independent variable and dependent variable. However, being employed in the first year is significantly associated ($p<.001$) with being recommitted. Employed ex-offenders were 47% less likely to recidivate than ex-offenders who were not employed. Ex-offenders are more likely to recidivate if under supervision too ($p<.001$). Supervision increases the likelihood of recidivating, because there is a greater chance to observe criminal behavior for supervised ex-offenders than unsupervised ex-offenders.

Table 3 shows the results of a Cox's regression survival analysis conducted on the first PRIDE cohort and recommitment to prison within two years of release. There is not a significant association between being recommitted to prison and participating in PRIDE. There is not a significant association between recommitment and being in a PRIDE facility.

Being employed has a negative and significant relationship with being recommitted. Those inmates who were employed within two years after release were 42% less likely to return to prison. Education had no effect on recidivism. Significant findings for age, months in prison, being male, being black, being hispanic, being a (violent) habitual offender, prior conviction, disciplinary reports, and being supervised have been confirmed by the previous models as well.

PRIDE Model 2 & Recidivism

Table 4 shows the Maximum Likelihood Estimates of participating in PRIDE v being in a facility with PRIDE against recommitment. The relationship between being in PRIDE and recommitment is non-significant in determining the likelihood of an ex-offender returning to prison.

However, being employed has a very strong, negative significant ($p<.001$) effect on being recommitted to prison within both year one and year two. Employed offenders are 64-66% less likely to recidivate and return to prison. Education had no effect on being recommitted to prison within two years.

Being male and age at release were significantly related to recommitment within two years after release, but not within one year after release. Being on supervision was positively related to being recommitted in model one and three with the employment variables. However, in model two the relationship was significant in a negative direction. Prior convictions were positively and significantly related to recommitment in every model.

Table 5 shows a Cox's regression survival analysis conducted on PRIDE participation compared against inmates incarcerated in a facility with PRIDE, and finds a similar relationship to PRIDE participants when compared against all releases. Being in PRIDE had no significant relationship with being recommitted, but being employed was negatively and significantly associated with being returned to prison. Age, months in prison, being male, being a (violent) habitual offender, having prior convictions and having a disciplinary problems in prison were found to be significantly ($p<.001$) associated with being recommitted. Surprisingly, returning to school/college after release is significantly associated ($p = .05$) with being recommitted, in a positive direction

PRIDE Model 3 & Recidivism

Table 6 shows the Maximum Likelihood Estimates for being employed with PRIDE for six months or more against being employed for less than six months and recommitment. Being in PRIDE for more than six months has no significant relationship with being recommitted in any model. In the models where employment is tested, it is found to be very significant ($p<.001$) in a negative direction. Having employment made it 45-51% less likely that the ex-offender will be recommitted to prison.

Recommitment within two years, with no measure for employment, shows more varied explanation for being recommitted to the correctional facility. Age, months in prison, being a habitual offender, being a violent habitual offender, prior conviction, and disciplinary reports are all related to being recommitted within two years.

Table 7 shows the Cox's regression survival analysis for being in PRIDE for more than six months and being recommitted in two years. Being in PRIDE had no significant relationship effect with being recommitted, but being employed reduced the likelihood that an ex-offender would return to prison. The relationship between employment and the dependent variable was very significant ($p<.001$). Other variables associated with

recidivism are found to be significant such as age, months in prison, being a (violent) habitual offender, prior convictions, and prior disciplinary problems in prison.

PRIDE Model 1 & Employment

Table 8 shows the Maximum Likelihood Estimates for being in PRIDE and employment. Participants in PRIDE are positively and significantly associated with being employed in year one ($p<.001$) and year two ($p<.001$). PRIDE participant were 54-42% more likely to be employed than non-pride participants.

Being incarcerated in a PRIDE facility is also significantly associated with employment in a negative direction. Inmates in facilities with PRIDE were 13-16% less likely to be employed. Age and months in prison were very significantly associated with employment in year one ($p<.001$, $p<.001$) and year two ($p<.001$, $p<.001$). Having no disciplinary report ($p<.001$, $p<.001$) and having a high school degree or better ($p<.001$, $p<.001$) was positively and significantly associated with employment.

PRIDE Model 2 & Employment

Table 9 shows the Maximum Likelihood Estimates for being in PRIDE v PRIDE facility and employment. Participants in PRIDE are more likely to be employed in year one ($p<.001$) and year two ($p<.001$) than non participants incarcerated in facilities offering PRIDE. PRIDE participants were 57-66% more likely to be employed than the non-pride participants. Age and months in prison were very significantly associated with employment in year one ($p<.001$, $p<.001$) and year two ($p<.001$, $p<.001$). Having no disciplinary report ($p<.05$, $p<.01$) and having a high school ($p<.001$, $p<.001$) degree or better was positively and significantly associated with employment.

PRIDE Model 3 & Employment

Table 10 shows the Maximum Likelihood Estimates between being in PRIDE for more than six months and employment. In this model, being in PRIDE for more than six months has no significant relationship with employment in comparison with being in PRIDE less than six months. Age is very significantly associated with employment in year one ($p<.001$) and year two ($p<.001$). Months in prison is very significantly associated with employment in year one ($p<.001$) and year two ($p<.001$). Having a high school degree or better is positively and significantly associated with employment in year one ($p<.05$) and year two ($p<.01$). Having no disciplinary reports is positively and

significantly associated with employment in year one ($p<.01$) and year two ($p<.001$). Being single is negatively and significantly related to being employed in year one ($p<.05$) and year two ($p<.05$).

PRIDE Model 1 & Recidivism with Employment Constant

Table 11 shows the Maximum Likelihood Estimates between participation in PRIDE and recidivism when holding employment constant. Participation in PRIDE did not have significant relationship with being recommitted to prison after release, when employment was held constant. However, PRIDE participation increased the likelihood of returning to prison when the inmate was employed, in comparison to non-participants. Pride participation decreased the likelihood of returning to prison when the ex-offender was unemployed. As stated before, neither of these relationships were significant.

Male offenders were more likely to be recommitted to prison, if they were unemployed ($p<.001$) or employed ($p<.001$). However, being employed increased the likelihood of being recommitted to prison by about 15% (2.04 v. 1.90). Supervision after release increased the likelihood of the offender returning to prison, if the offender was employed ($p<.001$). This relationship was not present for those supervised after release and unemployed.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS & DISCUSSION

Summary

The data analysis found no direct relationship between participation in PRIDE, being in a facility that offered PRIDE, or length of participation in PRIDE and the likelihood that the participating inmate will return to prison within one to two years of release. Being employed is found to have a significant relationship ($p<.001$) with the inmate's likelihood of recidivating within one to two years. This relationship was consistently found in all models and with all statistical methods used. Being employed is found to decrease the likelihood of recidivating within one and two years of release for all inmates. Returning to get a college education had no significant relationship with the recidivism measures in all models, except for the survival analysis comparing PRIDE participant to inmates in facilities with PRIDE. However, the relationship is barely significant, and disappears after more controls are integrated into the model.

PRIDE participation in comparison to non-PRIDE participation is found to be significantly related to being employed within one to two years of release in all models. There is no significant difference in being employed or being recommitted to prison, between the PRIDE members who participated in the program for six months and over and those that participated less than six months. Participating in PRIDE has a significant relationship, but weak association with being employed in both year one and year two. Those who participated in PRIDE are 42 to 66% more likely to be employed in comparison to all inmates that year, and specifically, to inmates who did not participate in PRIDE but are incarcerated within a facility that offered PRIDE. The analysis found that being in a facility that offered PRIDE significantly reduced the non-participating inmate's chance for employment.

PRIDE participation in comparison to non-PRIDE participation had no relationship with being recommitted to prison within two years when employment is held constant. Although a significant relationship is not found between being in PRIDE and being recommitted to prison, PRIDE participants who are employed after release are

more likely to be returned to prison. PRIDE participants who are unemployed after release are less likely to be returned to prison.

Conclusion

The statistical analysis consistently showed that participation in PRIDE had no significant relationship with decreasing recidivism, but analysis did find participating in PRIDE to significantly increase the likelihood of having employment after release. Being employed is also inversely related to being recommitted to prison.

The findings support hypothesis one and two, which asks if PRIDE participation increases the likelihood of being employed after release within one year and two years. PRIDE participation has a weak association, but a significant relationship with being employed within one year and two years. In the maximum likelihood tests, PRIDE had a positive relationship with employment and increased PRIDE participants' likelihood of being employed by at least 42%. Although PRIDE participants' likelihood of being employed is significantly higher than non-PRIDE participants, the relationship as mentioned before is only weakly associated. Further, participation in other programs, such drug and alcohol rehabilitation, counseling, and/or other vocational programs, makes it difficult to determine the exact effect PRIDE has on post-release employment.

There is no statistical support for hypothesis three and four, PRIDE participants are not less likely to be returned to prison than non participants within one year and two years. The relationship between participating in PRIDE and being recommitted to prison is not statistically significant. Further, the relationship between PRIDE participation and being recommitted within one and two years is found to be a positive, not a negative relationship as predicted in the hypotheses. PRIDE participation increased the likelihood of returning to prison against all releases within one to two years, but it is not statistically significant. Further, PRIDE participants are less likely to be returned to prison than those inmates released from facilities with PRIDE within one to two years, but this relationship is not significant. Once again, the relationship is found to be non-significant. Further, the association between PRIDE and being recommitted to prison within one or two years is very weak.

Nevertheless, the relationship between being employed and being recommitted to prison may offer a better explanation about the relationship between PRIDE and being

recommitted to prison. Employment within either one year or two years reduced the likelihood of an ex-offender returning to prison by at least 45%. Employment had a significant influence on recommitment to prison, and PRIDE had a significant relationship with having employment. As such, being employed may act as an intervening variable between participating in PRIDE and returning to prison. When employment is held constant, no relationship is found between participating in PRIDE and being recommitted to prison.

There are several data limitations that may have restricted the data and explain, in part, the results found in this study. First, as mentioned before, there is no means to randomly assign inmates to different programs, which creates difficulties explaining what about the program and the inmates promotes or fails to make positive changes. Second, there is no control for participation in other prison programs, because this data was unavailable at this time due to confidentiality issues. Without this control, it is unclear if the PRIDE participants increased likelihood to find employment is the result of this specific program, another program, or the combination of several programs.

Finally, the FETPIP, employment and education, data caused several limitations to this study because of incomplete records. The FETPIP database can only track inmate employment and education records when it has confirmed and valid social security numbers. Additionally, employment in "cash-only" business such as migrant farming and day labor cannot be tracked. This severely decreased the number of participants in several of the models, but at the same time, provided the best model, since the inmate's employment and wage earning is verifiable. As such, the full sample could not be included in the model using FETPIP data. However, FETPIP is virtually the only database for employment data, so these problems will continue until data collection methods are improved.

Discussion

Sampson and Laub's (1993) theory on adult social bonds found that adults were "inhibited from committing crime to the extent that they have social capital invested in their work and family lives" (p. 140). As stated earlier, participation in PRIDE promoted social capital by job training, job placement and giving offenders a simulated real world work environment. Although the PRIDE participation had no support for influencing

recidivism, participation in this program increased the offender's likelihood of being employed. Employment promotes social capital, as employers and employees take a chance that "their investment will pay off' (Sampson & Laub 1993, p.141). This is supported in the finding that employed ex-offenders are less likely to return to prison than unemployed offenders. This finding was supported within one year and two years of employment.

PRIDE's questionable effects on offender's rehabilitation should be considered when evaluating its need in the correctional setting. PRIDE actively promoted post release employment, and it also met several of its other stated goals such as reducing inmate idleness and reducing the state operating costs. However, its exact effect on recidivism remains nebulous. The data would suggest that employment acts as an intervening variable, but further study is needed to support this idea.

Corrections should continue to use PRIDE services or similar vocational programs. Further, PRIDE's process for selecting inmates to participate in its programs should be re-evaluated because they have increasingly limited the number of inmates permitted to participate in the program. If PRIDE is able to increase its inmate work force, positive outcomes of the program may be more visible.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

TABLE 1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF STUDY COHORT DIVIDE BY LENGTH OF TIME IN PRIDE

Characteristics	PRIDE Experience: No Experience (N=15,113)	Less Than 6 Months (N=2,978)	6 Months or More (N=2,350)	Total (N=20,441)
Demographic				
Mean Age at Release (Years)	33.0	33.7	36.3	33.5
% Male	89.3	93.9	96.0	90.7
%Female	11.7	6.1	4.0	9.3
% White	33.8	46.1	54.0	37.9
% African American	60.0	46.9	40.0	55.8
% Hispanic	6.0	7.0	6.0	6.3
% Never Married	40.3	39.7	41.7	40.4
%Never Grad High Sc	67.7	65.1	62.0	75.5
%Florida Resident	93.6	93.5	93.1	93.5
Criminal History				
% Prior Convictions	45.3	46.8	53.9	46.5
% Violent Offender	23.1	22.2	28.0	23.5
% Property Offender	30.8	35.5	35.9	32.0
% Drug Offender	32.0	26.7	22.2	30.1
% Other Offender	14.1	15.7	13.9	14.3
%Habitual Offender	13.5	15.9	21.4	14.8
%Violent Habitual Off	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.1
Incarceration History				
%Disciplinary Misconduct in Prison	49.0	55.7	57.0	50.9
Mean Time in Prison (Months)	23.6	33.0	47.4	21.7
%Supervised After Release	25.8	29.2	40.3	27.9
Post Release History				
%Employed w/in One Years After Release	38.6	43.7	48.5	40.5
%Employed w/in Two Years After Release	41.7	45.7	50.7	43.3
%Recommitted w/in One Year After Release	5.1	5.0	4.3	5.0
%Recommitted w/in Two Years After Release	14.7	13.5	12.5	14.3

TABLE 2 LOGISTIC REGRESSION FOR PRIDE PARTICIPATION & RECIDIVISM

	RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS[1]			RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS			RECOMMITTED ONE YEAR[1]		
Variable	N= 4,613			N= 20,441			N=3,235		
	Estimate	S.E	Odds Ratio	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio
Intercept	0.55	0.45		-1.35[C]	0.31		-2.39[C]	0.65	
PRIDE Participation	0.04	0.08	1.04	-0.06	0.05	0.94	0.10	0.10	1.10
In Facility w/ PRIDE	-0.12	0.08	0.89	0.01	0.05	1.01	-0.07	0.10	0.94
Educ after Release	-0.29	0.29	0.75						
Employ w/in Two Yr	-0.74[C]	0.08	0.48						
Employ w/in One Yr		0.005					-0.62[C]	0.09	0.53
Age at Release	-0.01[B]	0.002	0.99	-0.04[C]	0.003	0.97	0.01	0.01	1.01
Months in Prison	0.002	0.12	1.00	-0.01[C]	0.001	0.99	-0.002	0.002	1.00
Violent Primary Off.	0.14	0.10	1.15	-0.15	0.08	0.86	0.28	0.16	1.33
Property Primary Off.	0.13	0.10	1.14	0.19[B]	0.07	1.21	0.31[A]	0.13	1.37
Drug Primary Offense	-0.12	0.45	0.89	-0.06	0.07	0.95	0.03	0.14	1.03
Male	0.67[C]	0.13	1.95	0.42[C]	0.10	1.53	0.39[A]	0.19	1.48
Black	0.01	0.08	1.01	0.16[B]	0.05	1.17	-0.12	0.10	0.89
Hispanic	-0.53[B]	0.18	0.59	-0.36[B]	0.12	0.70	-0.31	0.26	0.74
High School Graduate	0.06	0.08	1.06	-0.08	0.05	0.92	-0.07	0.10	0.94
Doesn't Speak English	-0.62	0.42	0.54	-1.05[C]	0.27	0.35	-0.16	0.58	0.85
Born in US	-0.15	0.23	0.86	0.18	0.14	1.20	0.40	0.34	1.49
Habitual Offender	0.33[C]	0.08	1.38	1.01[C]	0.06	2.75	0.32[A]	0.10	1.37
Florida Resident	0.22	0.30	1.24	0.73[C]	0.22	2.07	0.62	0.45	1.87
Violent Habitual	0.06	0.26	1.07	1.12[C]	0.17	3.07	0.15	0.32	1.17
Supervised Release	0.39[C]	0.09	1.47	-0.13[A]	0.06	0.88	0.39[C]	0.11	1.48
Burglary Conviction[2]	0.11	0.10	1.12	-0.01	0.07	0.99	0.12	0.13	1.13
Homicide Conviction[2]	-0.33	0.24	0.72	-0.61[A]	0.16	0.54	-0.38	0.35	0.69
Other Violent Conv.[2]	0.01	0.09	1.01	-0.10	0.07	0.91	0.11	0.13	1.11
Robbery Conviction[2]	-0.11	0.11	0.90	-0.18[A]	0.07	0.84	-0.05	0.14	0.96
Sexual Assault Conv[2]	-0.19	0.19	0.83	-0.47[C]	0.13	0.63	-0.23	0.27	0.80
No Prior Convictions	-0.47[C]	0.08	0.62	-0.70[C]	0.05	0.50	-0.23[B]	0.11	0.79
No Prison Misconduct	-0.21[B]	0.07	0.81	-0.38[C]	0.05	0.68	-0.05	0.10	0.95
Single	0.06	0.07	1.06	0.05	0.05	1.06	0.17	0.09	1.18

[1]These recommitment models include variables for employment, so only inmates with verifiable work histories are included in the models. Further, only inmates recommitted for a new crime and not a technical violation are included in these models as well. These restrictions decrease the overall sample, but improve the accuracy of the model.

[2]Conviction variables are for the most serious offense the offender has ever been convicted of in the criminal justice system. May or may not match primary offense.

A=p<.05,B=p<.01,C=p<.001

TABLE 3 SURVIVAL ANALYSIS FOR PRIDE PARTICIPATION AND RECOMMITMENT TO PRISON W/IN TWO YEARS

Variable	RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS[1] N= 10,807		
	Parameter Estimate	S.E.	Hazard Ratio
PRIDE Participation	0.01	0.05	1.01
In Facility w/ PRIDE	-0.09	0.05	0.92
Educ After Release	0.27	0.18	1.31
Employ w/in Two Yrs	-0.54[C]	0.04	0.58
Age at Release	-0.03[C]	0.003	0.97
Months in Prison	-0.01[C]	0.001	0.99
Violent Primary Offense	-0.14	0.08	0.87
Property Primary Off.	0.14[B]	0.07	1.15
Drug Primary Offense	-0.08	0.07	0.92
Male	0.67[C]	0.10	1.96
Black	0.12[A]	0.04	1.12
Hispanic	-0.37[B]	0.12	0.69
High School Graduate	-0.001	0.05	1.00
Doesn't Speak English	-0.96	0.32	0.38
Born in US	0.02	0.13	1.02
Habitual Offender	0.61[C]	0.05	1.84
Florida Resident	0.64[B]	0.21	1.89
Violent Habitual	0.73[C]	0.15	2.08
Supervised Release	-0.18[C]	0.05	0.84
Burglary Conviction[2]	0.002	0.07	1.00
Homicide Conviction[2]	-0.57[C]	0.16	0.57
Other Violent Conv.[2]	-0.07	0.06	0.93
Robbery Conviction[2]	-0.11	0.07	0.89
Sexual Assault Conv[2]	-0.50[C]	0.13	0.60
No Prior Convictions	-0.50[C]	0.05	0.60
No Prison Misconduct	-0.26[C]	0.05	0.77
Single	0.06	0.04	1.07

[1]These recommitment models include variables for employment, so only inmates with verifiable work histories are included in the models. Further, only inmates recommitted for a new crime and not a technical violation are included in these models as well. These restrictions decrease the overall sample, but improve the accuracy of the model.

[2]Conviction variables are for the most serious offense the offender has ever been convicted of in the criminal justice system. May or may not match primary offense.

A=p<.05,B=p<.01,C=p<.001

TABLE 4 LOGISTIC REGRESSION FOR PRIDE PARTICIPATION V. BEING IN A FACILITY WITH PRIDE AND RECIDIVISM

	RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS[1]			RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS			RECOMMITTED ONE YEAR[1]		
Variable	N=1,513			N=6,471			N=1,053		
	Estimate	S.E	Odds Ratio	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio
Intercept	1.20	0.73		-0.92	0.48		-0.98	1.02	
PRIDE Participation (In Facility)	-0.02	0.14	0.98	-0.10	0.09	0.90	0.12	0.18	1.13
Educ after Release	-0.05	0.44	0.95						
Employ w/in Two Yr	-0.77[C]	0.13	0.46						
Employ w/in One Yr							-0.81[C]	0.15	0.44
Age at Release	-0.02[A]	0.008	0.98	-0.04[C]	0.005	0.96	-0.01	0.01	0.99
Months in Prison	0.004	0.003	1.00	-0.01[C]	0.002	0.99	-0.01	0.004	0.99
Violent Primary Off.	0.09	0.21	1.09	-0.14	0.14	0.87	0.17	0.28	1.18
Property Primary Off.	-0.04	0.17	0.96	0.14	0.12	1.15	0.19	0.23	1.21
Drug Primary Offense	-0.08	0.18	0.92	-0.01	0.12	0.99	-0.30	0.24	0.74
Male	0.59[C]	0.16	1.81	0.40[C]	0.12	1.49	0.36	0.23	1.43
Black	-0.11	0.12	0.90	0.12	0.09	1.12	-0.13	0.16	0.88
Hispanic	-0.78[A]	0.32	0.46	-0.40	0.21	0.67	-1.18[A]	0.55	0.31
High School Graduate	0.30[A]	0.14	1.35	-0.09	0.09	0.92	0.28	0.18	1.32
Doesn't Speak English	-0.72	0.87	0.49	-1.13[A]	0.52	0.32	-13.16	617.7	<0.001
Born in US	-0.43	0.39	0.65	-0.04	0.23	0.96	-0.04	0.58	0.96
Habitual Offender	0.30[A]	0.13	1.34	0.96[C]	0.10	2.61	0.11	0.17	1.12
Florida Resident	-0.03	0.50	0.97	0.63	0.34	1.88	0.51	0.68	1.66
Violent Habitual	0.77	0.49	2.16	1.56[C]	0.28	4.77	0.01	0.56	1.01
Supervised Release	0.36[A]	0.15	1.44	-0.19[A]	0.10	0.82	0.56[B]	0.19	1.75
Burglary Conviction[2]	0.13	0.17	1.14	0.10	0.12	1.11	0.27	0.23	1.30
Homicide Conviction[2]	0.06	0.41	1.07	-0.63[A]	0.278	0.53	0.37	0.60	1.45
Other Violent Conv.[2]	0.16	0.16	1.18	0.01	0.12	1.01	0.02	0.23	1.02
Robbery Conviction[2]	0.001	0.18	1.00	-0.08	0.13	0.92	0.15	0.25	1.17
Sexual Assault Conv[2]	0.31	0.36	1.37	-0.24	0.22	0.79	-0.02	0.50	0.99
No Prior Convictions	-0.62[C]	0.14	0.54	-0.77[C]	0.09	0.47	-0.39[A]	0.19	0.68
No Prison Misconduct	-0.30[A]	0.13	0.74	-0.33[C]	0.09	0.72	-0.25	0.17	0.78
Single	0.20	0.11	1.22	0.17[A]	0.08	1.18	0.08	0.15	1.09

[1]These recommitment models include variables for employment, so only inmates with verifiable work histories are included in the models. Further, only inmates recommitted for a new crime and not a technical violation are included in these models as well. These restrictions decrease the overall sample, but improve the accuracy of the model.

[2]Conviction variables are for the most serious offense the offender has ever been convicted of in the criminal justice system. May or may not match primary offense.

A=p<.05,B=p<.01,C=p<.001

TABLE 5 SURVIVAL ANALYSIS FOR PRIDE PARTICIPATION V. BEING IN FACILITIY WITH PRIDE AND RECOMMITMENT TO PRISON W/IN TWO YEARS

	RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS[1] N= 4,125		
Variable	Parameter Estimate	S.E.	Hazard Ratio
PRIDE Part. (In Facility)	-0.02	0.09	0.98
Educ After Release	0.52 [A]	0.27	1.69
Employ w/in Two Yrs	-0.53 [C]	0.08	0.59
Age at Release	-0.04 [C]	0.01	0.96
Months in Prison	-0.01 [C]	0.002	0.99
Violent Primary Offense	-0.19	0.13	0.82
Property Primary Off.	0.01	0.11	1.01
Drug Primary Offense	-0.06	0.12	0.94
Male	0.65 [C]	0.12	1.92
Black	0.03	0.08	1.03
Hispanic	-0.43	0.23	0.65
High School Graduate	0.09	0.09	1.09
Doesn't Speak English	-1.48 [A]	0.71	0.23
Born in US	-0.07	0.25	0.94
Habitual Offender	0.66 [C]	0.08	1.93
Florida Resident	0.42	0.32	1.52
Violent Habitual	1.10 [C]	0.24	3.02
Supervised Release	-0.22 [A]	0.09	0.81
Burglary Conviction[2]	0.06	0.12	1.07
Homicide Conviction[2]	-0.47	0.27	0.63
Other Violent Conv.[2]	-0.001	0.11	1.00
Robbery Conviction[2]	-0.02	0.12	0.98
Sexual Assault Conv[2]	-0.33	0.22	0.72
No Prior Convictions	-0.60 [C]	0.09	0.55
No Prison Misconduct	-0.28 [C]	0.08	0.76
Single	0.16 [A]	0.08	1.18

[1]These recommitment models include variables for employment, so only inmates with verifiable work histories are included in the models. These restrictions decrease the overall sample, but improve the accuracy of the model.

[2]Conviction variables are for the most serious offense the offender has ever been convicted of in the criminal justice system. May or may not match primary offense.

A=p<.05,B=p<.01,C=p<.001

TABLE 6 LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF BEING IN PRIDE FOR SIX MONTHS OR MORE V. LESS THAN SIX MONTHS AND RECIDIVISM

	RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS[1]			RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS			RECOMMITTED ONE YEAR[1]		
Variable	N=1,050			N=4,792			N= 733		
	Estimate	S.E	Odds Ratio	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio
Intercept	0.52	0.88		-0.86	0.54		-16.21	660.4	
PRIDE Participation (Six Month or Longer)	-0.13	0.14	0.88	-0.08	0.10	0.925	-0.16	0.18	0.86
Educ after Release	0.28	0.70	1.31						
Employ w/in Two Yr	-0.59[C]	0.17	0.55						
Employ w/in One Yr							-0.72[C]	0.19	0.49
Age at Release	0.003	0.01	1.00	-0.02[C]	0.006	0.98	0.01	0.01	1.01
Months in Prison	0.001	0.003	1.00	-0.01[C]	0.002	0.99	-0.004	0.004	1.00
Violent Primary Off.	-0.04	0.25	0.95	-0.43[B]	0.16	0.65	0.39	0.33	1.47
Property Primary Off.	-0.02	0.19	0.99	-0.01	0.13	0.99	0.20	0.26	1.22
Drug Primary Offense	-0.28	0.21	0.76	-0.24	0.14	0.78	-0.30	0.28	0.74
Male	0.52	0.31	1.70	0.02	0.22	1.02	0.35	0.44	1.42
Black	0.21	0.15	1.22	0.21[A]	0.10	1.24	0.12	0.19	1.12
Hispanic	-0.89[A]	0.37	0.41	-0.50	0.24	0.61	-0.50	0.53	0.61
High School Graduate	0.16	0.16	1.17	-0.06	0.10	0.94	-0.02	0.20	0.98
Doesn't Speak English	-0.61	1.24	0.54	-1.87	1.01	0.15	0.68	1.25	1.97
Born in US	-0.50	0.44	0.61	-0.20	0.26	0.82	0.37	0.67	1.44
Habitual Offender	0.17	0.16	1.18	0.95[C]	0.11	2.57	0.52[B]	0.20	1.69
Florida Resident	0.46	0.56	1.60	0.79	0.43	2.20	14.48	660.4	>999.9
Violent Habitual	0.73	0.55	2.04	1.59[C]	0.32	4.91	0.73	0.60	2.08
Supervised Release	0.31	0.17	1.37	-0.18	0.11	0.83	0.51[A]	0.22	1.67
Burglary Conviction[2]	-0.03	0.20	0.98	-0.01	0.14	0.99	0.41	0.27	1.51
Homicide Conviction[2]	-0.53	0.47	0.59	-0.77[A]	0.31	0.47	-0.03	0.66	0.97
Other Violent Conv.[2]	-0.15	0.20	0.86	-0.08	0.14	0.92	0.33	0.27	1.39
Robbery Conviction[2]	-0.27	0.23	0.77	-0.25	0.16	0.76	-0.04	0.31	0.97
Sexual Assault Conv[2]	0.15	0.42	1.16	-0.07	0.27	0.93	0.33	0.54	1.39
No Prior Convictions	-0.57[C]	0.16	0.56	-0.74[C]	0.11	0.48	-0.15	0.21	0.86
No Prison Misconduct	-0.20	0.15	0.82	-0.34[C]	0.10	0.71	0.22	0.20	1.25
Single	-0.11	0.14	0.90	0.10	0.09	1.10	-0.14	0.18	0.87

[1]These recommitment models include variables for employment, so only inmates with verifiable work histories are included in the models. Further, only inmates recommitted for a new crime and not a technical violation are included in these models as well. These restrictions decrease the overall sample, but improve the accuracy of the model.

[2]Conviction variables are for the most serious offense the offender has ever been convicted of in the criminal justice system. May or may not match primary offense.

A=p<.05,B=p<.01,C=p<.001

TABLE 7 SURVIVAL ANALYSIS FOR BEING IN PRIDE SIX MONTHS OR MORE V. LESS THAN SIX MONTHS AND RECOMMITMENT TO PRISON W/IN TWO YEARS

	RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS[1]		
Variable	N= 2,848		
	Parameter Estimate	S.E.	Hazard Ratio
PRIDE Participation (Six Month or Longer)	-0.12	0.09	0.89
Educ After Release	0.64	0.35	1.90
Employ w/in Two Yrs	-0.38[C]	0.10	0.69
Age at Release	-0.02[C]	0.01	0.98
Months in Prison	-0.01[C]	0.002	0.99
Violent Primary Offense	-0.35[B]	0.16	0.70
Property Primary Off.	-0.04	0.12	0.96
Drug Primary Offense	-0.28[B]	0.13	0.76
Male	0.33	0.22	1.39
Black	0.20[B]	0.09	1.22
Hispanic	-0.54[B]	0.25	0.58
High School Graduate	0.05	0.10	1.05
Doesn't Speak English	-1.33	1.00	0.27
Born in US	-0.07	0.26	0.93
Habitual Offender	0.63[C]	0.10	1.87
Florida Resident	0.73	0.41	2.07
Violent Habitual	1.22[C]	0.28	3.40
Supervised Release	-0.26[A]	0.10	0.77
Burglary Conviction[2]	-0.10	0.13	0.91
Homicide Conviction[2]	-0.72[A]	0.32	0.49
Other Violent Conv.[2]	-0.13	0.13	0.88
Robbery Conviction[2]	-0.28	0.15	0.76
Sexual Assault Conv[2]	-0.22	0.25	0.80
No Prior Convictions	-0.55[C]	0.11	0.58
No Prison Misconduct	-0.25[B]	0.09	0.78
Single	-0.01	0.09	0.99

[1]These recommitment models include variables for employment, so only inmates with verifiable work histories are included in the models. These restrictions decrease the overall sample, but improve the accuracy of the model.

[2]Conviction variables are for the most serious offense the offender has ever been convicted of in the criminal justice system. May or may not match primary offense.

A=p<.05,B=p<.01,C=p<.001

TABLE 8 LOGISTIC REGRESSION PRIDE PARTICIPATION AND EMPLOYMENT

Variable	EMPLOYED ONE YEAR[1] N= 3,235			EMPLOYED TWO YEARS[1] N=4,615		
	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio
Intercept	0.37	0.25		0.77	0.26	
PRIDE Participation	0.43[C]	0.05	1.54	0.35[C]	0.06	1.42
In Facility w/ PRIDE	-0.18[C]	0.05	0.84	-0.14[B]	0.05	0.87
Age at Release	-0.04[C]	0.003	0.96	-0.04[C]	0.003	0.96
Months in Prison	0.01[C]	0.001	1.01	0.01[C]	0.001	1.01
Violent Primary Offense	0.01	0.08	1.01	0.03	0.08	1.03
Property Primary Off.	0.22[B]	0.07	1.25	0.21[B]	0.07	1.24
Drug Primary Offense	0.02	0.07	1.02	0.03	0.07	1.03
Male	0.02	0.08	1.02	0.05	0.08	1.05
Black	-0.10	0.05	0.91	-0.16[B]	0.05	0.85
Hispanic	-0.11	0.11	0.90	-0.16	0.12	0.85
High School Graduate	0.33[C]	0.05	1.40	0.34[C]	0.05	1.41
Doesn't Speak English	-0.33	0.19	0.72	-0.39[A]	0.20	0.68
Born in US	0.23	0.14	1.26	0.27	0.14	1.31
Habitual Offender	-0.25[C]	0.06	0.78	-0.30[C]	0.06	0.74
Florida Resident	0.90[C]	0.14	2.46	0.91[C]	0.15	2.49
Violent Habitual	-0.26	0.21	0.77	-0.41	0.22	0.67
Supervised Release	0.15[B]	0.05	1.16	0.10	0.06	1.10
Burglary Conviction[2]	0.08	0.07	1.09	0.08	0.07	1.08
Homicide Conviction[2]	-0.07	0.13	0.94	-0.14	0.14	0.87
Other Violent Conv.[2]	0.02	0.07	1.02	0.05	0.07	1.05
Robbery Conviction[2]	0.08	0.08	1.09	0.09	0.08	1.09
Sexual Assault Conv[2]	-0.03	0.11	0.97	0.01	0.11	1.01
No Prior Convictions	0.09	0.05	1.09	0.09	0.06	1.09
No Prison Misconduct	0.32[C]	0.05	1.37	0.34[C]	0.05	1.41
Single	-0.02	0.05	0.98	-0.03	0.05	0.97

[1]These employment models include only inmates with verifiable work histories. These restrictions decrease the overall sample, but improve the accuracy of the model

[2]Conviction variables are for the most serious offense the offender has ever been convicted of in the criminal justice system. May or may not match primary offense.

A=p<.05,B=p<.01,C=p<.001

TABLE 9 LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF PRIDE PARTICIPATION V. BEING IN FACILITIY WITH PRIDE AND EMPLOYMENT

	EMPLOYED ONE YEAR[1]			EMPLOYED TWO YEARS[1]		
Variable	N=1,053			N=1,513		
	Estimate	S.E	Odds Ratio	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-0.25	0.39		0.25	0.40	
PRIDE Part. (In Facility)	0.56[C]	0.090	1.66	0.45[C]	0.09	1.57
Age at Release	-0.04[C]	0.004	0.96	-0.05[C]	0.005	0.95
Months in Prison	0.01[C]	0.002	1.01	0.01[C]	0.002	1.01
Violent Primary Offense	0.11	0.13	1.12	0.19	0.13	1.21
Property Primary Off.	0.31[B]	0.11	1.37	0.33[B]	0.12	1.38
Drug Primary Offense	0.01	0.12	1.01	0.11	0.12	1.12
Male	0.12	0.09	1.13	0.14	0.10	1.14
Black	-0.06	0.08	0.94	-0.11	0.08	0.89
Hispanic	-0.12	0.19	0.89	-0.01	0.21	0.99
High School Graduate	0.37[C]	0.08	1.45	0.40[C]	0.09	1.48
Doesn't Speak English	-0.60[A]	0.30	0.55	-0.67[A]	0.30	0.51
Born in US	0.26	0.22	1.30	0.30	0.23	1.35
Habitual Offender	-0.07	0.10	0.94	-0.07	0.10	0.93
Florida Resident	1.46[C]	0.24	4.28	1.33[C]	0.24	3.79
Violent Habitual	-0.06	0.38	0.94	0.002	0.41	1.00
Supervised Release	0.03	0.09	1.04	-0.05	0.09	0.95
Burglary Conviction[2]	-0.004	0.11	1.00	0.04	0.12	1.04
Homicide Conviction[2]	0.09	0.22	1.09	0.06	0.23	1.06
Other Violent Conv.[2]	-0.02	0.11	0.98	0.02	0.11	1.01
Robbery Conviction[2]	0.008	0.12	1.01	-0.003	0.13	1.00
Sexual Assault Conv[2]	-0.10	0.18	0.90	-0.008	0.19	0.99
No Prior Convictions	0.13	0.08	1.13	0.16	0.09	1.18
No Prison Misconduct	0.19[A]	0.08	1.21	0.23[B]	0.08	1.26
Single	-0.10	0.08	0.91	-0.10	0.08	0.90

[1]These employment models include only inmates with verifiable work histories. These restrictions decrease the overall sample, but improve the accuracy of the model.

[2]Conviction variables are for the most serious offense the offender has ever been convicted of in the criminal justice system. May or may not match primary offense.

A=p<.05,B=p<.01,C=p<.001

TABLE 10 LOGISTIC REGRESSION BEING IN PRIDE SIX MONTHS OR MORE V. LESS THAN SIX MONTHS AND EMPLOYMENT

	EMPLOYED ONE YEAR[1]			EMPLOYED TWO YEARS[1]		
Variable	N=733			N=1,050		
	Estimate	S.E	Odds Ratio	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio
Intercept	0.73	0.52		1.03	0.54	1.07
PRIDE Participation (Six Month or Longer)	0.06	0.10	1.07	0.07	0.10	0.96
Age at Release	-0.04[C]	0.006	0.96	-0.05[C]	0.006	1.01
Months in Prison	0.01[C]	0.002	1.01	0.01[C]	0.002	0.96
Violent Primary Offense	-0.01	0.16	0.99	-0.04	0.17	1.30
Property Primary Off.	0.35[A]	0.14	1.42	0.26	0.15	1.17
Drug Primary Offense	0.17	0.15	1.18	0.15	0.16	0.95
Male	0.11	0.20	1.12	-0.05	0.22	0.92
Black	0.01	0.10	1.01	-0.08	0.11	0.77
Hispanic	-0.32	0.22	0.73	-0.26	0.24	1.31
High School Graduate	0.32[B]	0.11	1.37	0.27[A]	0.11	1.03
Doesn't Speak English	0.22	0.53	1.24	0.03	0.53	1.78
Born in US	0.35	0.26	1.41	0.57[A]	0.27	0.85
Habitual Offender	-0.16	0.12	0.85	-0.16	0.13	2.13
Florida Resident	0.69[A]	0.28	1.99	0.76[B]	0.28	0.83
Violent Habitual	-0.29	0.40	0.75	-0.18	0.43	0.31
Supervised Release	0.07	0.11	1.07	0.04	0.12	1.23
Burglary Conviction[2]	0.19	0.16	1.21	0.21	0.16	1.06
Homicide Conviction[2]	0.16	0.26	1.17	0.05	0.27	1.07
Other Violent Conv.[2]	-0.03	0.15	0.97	0.06	0.16	1.08
Robbery Conviction[2]	0.05	0.17	1.05	0.07	0.18	0.98
Sexual Assault Conv[2]	-0.14	0.25	0.87	-0.02	0.26	1.25
No Prior Convictions	0.28[A]	0.11	1.33	0.22	0.12	1.46
No Prison Misconduct	0.32[B]	0.10	1.37	0.38[C]	0.11	0.78
Single	-0.20[A]	0.10	0.82	-0.24[A]	0.11	1.07

[1]These employment models include only inmates with verifiable work histories. These restrictions decrease the overall sample, but improve the accuracy of the model.

[2]Conviction variables are for the most serious offense the offender has ever been convicted of in the criminal justice system. May or may not match primary offense.

A=p<.05,B=p<.01,C=p<.001

TABLE 11 LOGISTIC REGRESSION BETWEEN PRIDE PARTICIPATION AND RECIDIVISM WHEN HOLDING EMPLOYMENT CONSTANT

	RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS [1]			RECOMMITTED TWO YEARS [1]		
Variable	Employed N=3,269			Unemployed N=1,254		
	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio	Estimate	S.E.	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-0.59	0.52		1.66	0.98	
PRIDE Participation	0.04	0.09	1.05	-0.03	0.17	0.97
In Facility w/ PRIDE	-0.10	0.09	0.91	-0.16	0.15	0.85
Age at Release	-0.01	0.001	1.00	-0.03[B]	0.01	0.97
Months in Prison	0.001	0.002	1.00	0.004	0.004	1.00
Violent Primary Off.	0.13	0.14	1.14	0.15	0.25	1.16
Property Primary Off.	0.09	0.12	1.10	0.29	0.20	1.33
Drug Primary Offense	-0.10	0.12	0.91	-0.16	0.20	0.85
Male	0.71[C]	0.16	2.04	0.64[B]	0.23	1.90
Black	0.08	0.09	1.08	-0.18	0.16	0.84
Hispanic	-0.54[B]	0.21	0.58	-0.43	0.39	0.65
High School Graduate	0.01	0.09	1.01	0.13	0.16	1.14
Doesn't Speak English	-0.77	0.60	0.46	-0.54	0.64	0.58
Born in US	-0.25	0.27	0.78	0.10	0.48	1.10
Habitual Offender	0.27[B]	0.10	1.31	0.45[B]	0.15	1.57
Florida Resident	0.41	0.35	1.50	-0.60	0.76	0.55
Violent Habitual	0.20	0.32	1.23	-0.23	0.44	0.80
Supervised Release	0.43[C]	0.10	1.54	0.24	0.18	1.26
Burglary Conviction[2]	0.18	0.11	1.20	-0.11	0.19	0.90
Homicide Conviction[2]	-0.24	0.28	0.79	-0.53	0.44	0.59
Other Violent Conv.[2]	-0.06	0.11	0.94	0.21	0.18	1.24
Robbery Conviction[2]	-0.22	0.13	0.80	0.22	0.21	1.25
Sexual Assault Conv[2]	-0.15	0.22	0.86	-0.37	0.40	0.69
No Prior Convictions	-0.45[C]	0.09	0.64	-0.53[B]	0.16	0.59
No Prison Misconduct	-0.22[B]	0.09	0.80	-0.19	0.15	0.83
Single	0.11	0.08	1.12	-0.07	0.13	0.93

[1]These recommitment models include variables for employment, so only inmates with verifiable work histories are included in the models. These restrictions decrease the overall sample, but improve the accuracy of the model.

[2]Conviction variables are for the most serious offense the offender has ever been convicted of in the criminal justice system. May or may not match primary offense.

A=p<.05,B=p<.01,C=p<.001

APPENDIX B

DEFINITION OF KEY VARIABLES

PRIDE PARTICIPATION
1=Entire PRIDE Cohort/participants in FDOC Recidivism File
0=All Inmates in Recidivism File who did not participate in PRIDE program

PRIDE PARTICIPATION (IN FACILITY)
1=PRIDE Participants who worked for PRIDE for six months or longer
0=Non-PRIDE participants, but released inmates that were incarcerated in facilities that offered PRIDE

PRIDE PARTICIPATION (SIX MONTH OR LONGER)
1= PRIDE Participants who worked for PRIDE for 6 months or longer
0= PRIDE Participants who worked for PRIDE for less than 6 months

IN FACLITY W/ PRIDE	1=Incarcerated in a facility offering PRIDE 0=Not Incarcerated in a facility offering PRIDE
EDUC AFTER RELEASE	1=Not employed, but returned or started college 0=Did not return or start college
EMPLOYED TWOYEAR	1=Employed two years after release 0=Not employed two years after release
EMPLOYED ONEYEAR	1=Employed one year after release 0=Not employed one year after release
AGE AT RELEASE	Continuous variable, Age of inmate upon his or her release from prison (in Years)
MONTHS IN PRISON	Continuous variable, Length of time the offender spent incarcerated (Months)
VIOLENT PRIMARY OFF	1=Prior Offense was violent (murder, robbery, assault, sexual assault, other assault) 0=Prior Offense was non-violent
PROPERTY PRIMARY OFF	1=Prior Offense was a property crime (Burglary, theft, other property) 0=Prior Offense was a non-property crime
DRUG PRIMARY OFF DUM	1=Prior Offense was drug related 0=Prior Offense was non-drug related
MALE	1=Male 0=Female
BLACK	1=Black 0=Non-Black
HISPANIC	1=Hispanic 0=Non Hispanic
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD.	1=High School Graduate or above 0=Non High School Graduate

DOESN'T SPEAK ENGL.	1=Doesn't Speak English 0=Does Speak English
BORN IN US	1=Born In the US 0=Not Born in the US
HABITUAL OFFENDER	1=Defined By DOC as Habitual Offender 0=Not Defined as Habitual Offender
FLORIDA RESIDENT	1=Florida Resident 0=Non-Florida Resident
VIOLENT HABITUAL	1=Defined by DOC as Violent Habitual Offender 0=Not Defined by DOC as Violent Habitual Offender
SUPERVISE RELEASE	1=Receives supervision while released 0=Does not receive any supervision during release
BURGLARY CONVICTION	1=Most Serious Conviction ever committed Burglary 0=Most Serious Conviction ever committed not Burglary
HOMICIDE CONVICTION	1=Most Serious Conviction ever committed Homicide 0=Most Serious Conviction ever committed not Homicide
OTHER VIOLENT CONVICTION	1=Most Serious Conviction ever committed Other Type of Violent Crime 0=Most Serious Conviction ever committed not Other Types of Violent Crime
ROBBERY CONVICTION	1=Most Serious Conviction ever committed Robbery 0=Most Serious Conviction ever committed not Robbery
SEXUAL ASSUALT CONVICTION	1=Most Serious Conviction ever committed Sexual Assault 0=Most Serious Conviction ever committed not Sexual Assault
NO PRIOR CONVICTION	1=No Prior Convictions 0=Prior Convictions
NO PRISON MISCONDUCT	1=No Disciplinary Misconduct Report 0=Disciplinary Misconduct reports
SINGLE	1=Never Married, Divorced, or Widowed 0=Married, Divorced or Widowed

RECOMMIT24	1=Recommitted to Prison within two years of releases 0=Not Recommitted to Prison within two years of release
RECOMMIT12	1=Recommitted to Prison within one year of releases 0=Not Recommitted to Prison within one year of release

REFERENCES

Adams, K., Bennett, K. J., Flanagan, T. J., Marquart, J. W., Cuvelier, S. J., & Fritsch, E. (1994). A large scale multi-dimensional test of the effect of prison education programs on offenders; behavior. The Prison Journal, *74*: 433-449.

Adamson, C. (1983). Punishment after slavery: Southern state penal systems, 1865-1890. Social Problems 30(5): 555-569.

Allik, J., & Realo, A. (2004). Individualism-collectivism and social capital. Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology 35(1): 29-49.

Anderson, D. B. (1982). The relationship between correctional education and parole success. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, *5*: 13-25.

Anderson, S. V. (1995a). *Evaluation of the impact of correctional education programs on recidivism.* Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Bureau of Planning and Evaluation.

Anderson, S. V. (1995b). *Evaluation of the impact of participation in Ohio penal industries on recidivism.* Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Bureau of Planning and Evaluation.

Bales, W., Bedard, L.E. & Quinn, S.T. (2003). *Recidivism: An analysis of public and private state prison release in Florida.* Tallahassee, Fl: Florida Department of Corrections.

Baskin, D.R., & Sommers, I.B. (1998). Causality of community disorder: Women's careers in violent crimes. Boulder: Westview.

Blomberg, T.G., & Lucken, K. (2000). American penology: A history of control. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Brewster, D. R., & Sharp, S. F. (2002). Educational programs and recidivism in Oklahoma: Another look. The Prison Journal, 82(3), 314-334.

Burger, W.E. (1985). Prison industries: Turning warehouses into fences. Public Administration Review 45: 754-757.

Chiricos, T. (2002). The media, moral panics and the politics of crime control. In G.F. Cole, M.G.Gertz, & A. Bunger (Eds), The Criminal Justice System: Politics and Policies (p. 59-79). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Craig, D., & Robert, R. (1993). Vocational Training in Prison: A Case of study of maximum feasible misunderstanding. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation 20 (1/2): 1-20.

Cullen, F.T. & Agnew, R. (2003). Criminological theory: Past to present. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Drake, E.K. (2003). *Class I impacts: Work during incarceration and its effect on post prison employment patterns and recidivism*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Corrections.

FETPIP. (July 5 2005). FETPIP: General overview. [Online]. Available: http://www.firn.edu/doe/fetpip/general.htm.

Funke, G.S.,Wayson, B.L. & N. Miller. (1982). Assets and liabilities of correctional industries. Toronto: Lexington.

Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works! Criminology 34(4): 575-607.

Gerber, J., & Fritsch, E.J. (1995). Adult academic and vocational correctional education programs: A review of recent research. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation 22(1/2): 119-142.

Gillis, C., Robinson, D., & Porporino, F. (1996). Inmate employment: The increasingly influential role of generic work skills. Forums on Corrections Research 8(1): 18.

Gleason, S. E. Inmates attitudes toward vocational training: A case study of vocational training students in the state prison of southern michigan. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, & Rehabilitation 10(4): 49-60 (1986).

Giordano, P.C., Cernkovich, S.A., & Rudolph, J.L. (2002). Gender, crime, and desistence: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. American Journal of Sociology 107(4): 990-1064.

Hawkins, G. (1983). Prison labor and prison industries. Crime and Justice 5: 85-127.

Harrison, B., & Schehr, R.C. (2004). Offenders and post-release jobs: Variables influencing success and failure. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation 39(3): 35-68.

Henderson, M.L. (2001). Employment and crime: What is the problem and what can be done about it from the inmate's perspective. Corrections Management Quarterly 5(4): 46-52.

Herreros, F. (2004). The problem of forming social capital: Why trust? New York: Palgrave.

Hooghe, M., & D. Stolle. (2003). Generating social capital: civil society and institutions in comparative perspective. New York: Palgrave.

Jacobs, J.B. (1999). United states of America; Prisoner labour: A tale of two penologies. In D. van Zyl Smit & F. Dunkel (Eds.), Prisoner Labour: Salvation or Slavery? International Perspectives (p. 281-296). Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.

Johnson, B. D., & Goldberg, R. T. (1983). Vocational and social rehabilitation of delinquents: A study of experimentals and controls. Journal of Offender Counseling Services and Rehabilitation, *6*(3), 43-60

Johnson, C.M. (1984). The effect of prison labor programs on post-release employment and recidivism (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1984).

Kennedy, S.M. (1997). Treating responsivity: Reducing recidivism by enhancing treatment effectiveness. Forum of Corrections Research 9(3): 19-23.

Krienert, J.L., & Fleisher, M.S. (2001).Economic rehabilitation: A reassessment of the link between employment and crime. Corrections Management Quarterly 5(4): 53-64.

Krishna, A. (2002). Active social capital: tracing roots of development and democracy. New York: Columbia University.

Lattimore, P. K., Witte, A.D., & Baker, J.R. (1990). Experimental assessment of the effect of vocational training on youthful property offenders. Evaluation Review 14(2): 115-133.

Lipman, D, Martinson, R. & Wilkes, J. (1975). The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies. New York: Praeger.

Maguire, K., Flanagan, T., & Thornberry, T. (1988). Prison labor and recidivism. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, *4*(1), 3-18.

Maguire, K. (1996). Prison industry programs and inmate institutional behavior. Forum on Corrections Research, 8(1): 39.

Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Question and answers about prison reform. The Public Interest 35: 22-54.

Myers, M.A., & Massey, J.L. (1991). Race, labor, and punishment in postbellum Georgia. Social Problems 38(2): 267-286.

Motiuk, L., & Belcourt, R. (1996). CORCAN participation and post-release recidivism. Forum on Corrections Research, *8*(1), 15.

OPPAGA. (2003). *Special report: PRIDE benefits the state but needs to improve transparency in operations*. Tallahassee, FL: Author.

PRIDE. (2002). *PRIDE enterprise: 2001 annual report.* St. Petersburg, FL: Author.

Robinson, L.N. (1939). Should Prisoners Work? A study of the prison labor problem in the United States. Philadelphia: Winston Company.

Ryan, T., & Desuta, J. (2000). Comparison of recidivism rates for operation outward reach (OOR) participants and control groups of non-participants for the years 1990 through 1994. Journal of Correctional Education, *51*(4), 316.

Sampson, R.J. & Laub, J.H. (1993). Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life. Cambridge: Harvard University.

Saylor, W., & Gaes, G. (1996). Effect of prison employment and vocational/apprenticeship training on long-term recidivism. Forum on Corrections Research, *8*(1), 12.

Saylor, W.G.,&. Gaes, G.G. (2001). "The differential effect of industries and vocational training on post-release outcomes for ethnic and racial groups: Research note." Corrections Management Quarterly 5(4): 17-24.

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

Schumacker, R.E., Anderson, D.B., &. Anderson, S.L. (1990). Vocational and academic indicators of parole success. Journal of Correctional Education, *41*(1), 8-13.

Simon, F.H. (1999). Prisoners' work and vocational training. London: Routtledge.

Sung, Hung-En. Rehabilitating Felony Drug Offenders through Job Development: A look into a Prosecutor-Led Diversion Program. The Prison Journal 81(2): 271-286 (2001).

Uggen, Christopher. (2001).Working as a turning point for criminal offenders. Corrections Management Quarterly 5(4): 1-16.

Visher, Christy A. & Jeremy Travis. (2003). Transitions from prison to community: Understanding individual pathways. Annual Review of Sociology 29: 89-113

Waldo, G. P., & Chiricos, T.G. (1977). Work Releases and Recidivism: An Empirical Evaluation of a Social Policy. Evaluation Quarterly 1(1): 87-108.

Ward, R.D., & Rogers, W.W. (1987). Convicts, coal and the banner mine tragedy. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama.

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.

Witte, A. (1977). Work release in north carolina-A program that works. Law and Contemporary Problems 41: 230-251.

Vernick, S.H., & Reardon, R.C. (2001), Career development programs in corrections. Journal of Career Development 27(4): 265-277.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Robin L. Richardson was born in Dothan, Alabama. Her father was in the military, so her family moved frequently during her youth. After her father's retirement, her family settled in Dallas, TX, where she attended high school. As an undergraduate, she attended Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, TX. In 2003, she graduated cum laude with a Bachelor in Science in Criminal Justice and a Bachelor of Science in Psychology. In 2003, she relocated to Florida to pursue her Masters in Criminology at FSU. Robin plans to stay at FSU to earn her PhD in Criminology. Her research interests include victimology, domestic violence, correctional programming, juvenile justice, attachment, and social psychology.