

New Public Management in the New Age of Rehabilitation: A Qualitative assessment of Faith-Based Prisoner Reentry Managers and Managerial Styles

Gautam Nayer, Ph.D.

Administration of Justice Department

Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland

School of Public Affairs

Texas Southern University

3100 Cleburne Avenue

Houston, TX, USA 77057

Email- NayerG@TSU.EDU

Phone- 713-313-4809¹

Abstract

Recently, policy, and budgetary concerns have coerced local and state criminal justice administrators to re-examine, and question prisoner reentry programs cost and usefulness. The idea of social value utilizes principles of New Public Management such as Client-Oriented Services. What decision-making process do managers in faith-based programs engage in when they evaluate and determine eligibility of individuals to their programs? Do faith-based supervisors and managers of such programs view participants as clients or family or are they considered in another type of category? Do faith-based managers engage in client-oriented services when managing their programs? In-depth qualitative interviews were conducted with four managers, in four separate faith-based reentry programs.

Keywords- prisoner reentry, faith-based, New Public Management, Client-Oriented Services

1. Introduction

Historically the prison system in the United States very rarely released an inmate back into the public without sufficient supervision (Listwan et al., 2006). Often, a primary reason for granting parole was being able to start working upon release. Denial of parole was clearly defined, because without strict policies geared towards government supervision, support, a meaningful, and worthwhile societal integration could not occur. It was thought that ex-inmates would be seduced into falling back to a deviant and potentially criminal lifestyle after returning to society without the support of a steady job. Ultimately, the offenders' lifestyle brought them to prison in the first place, and would return them, if adequate amounts of supervision were unavailable. Very often, prospective returning inmates were denied the opportunity of returning to society if they were unable to find employment (Listwan al., 2006).

New Public Management is a branch of public administration theories and a management philosophy used by the public sector since the mid 1980's with the idea to modernize governments (Hood, 1989). New Public Management is considered a broad and complex term used to describe the tsunami of

¹ Special thanks to Dr. Helen Greene and Ms. Racquel Jackson for their invaluable assistance in proof-reading, editing and online research.

public administration reforms, which occurred around the world during the 1980's. The primary idea behind NPM was of escalating laissez-faire competition in the public sector, thereby creating greater cost-efficiency for governments. This research is particularly important to the reentry movement and will supply further understanding how NPM could possibly benefit the reentry process. This research study will evaluate the utility and usage of Client-Oriented Services (COS) in faith-based prisoner reentry programs. Qualitative interviews were conducted with four faith-based reentry program managers to determine if NPM and COS could be successfully applied to a faith-based reentry program.

1.2 Prisoner Reentry Programs

The prison system became overburdened with the escalating war on drugs, mandatory minimum sentencing, recidivist statues, lack of alternatives to incarceration, and prisoners' difficulty of getting paroled (Martin, 2011). The policy shifted from meaningful reintegration of returning inmates back to their communities to one simply of "supervision" by parole officers (Simon, 1993). More often than not, supervision was not followed, rather a simplistic policy of monitoring was deemed sufficient. The former model of rehabilitation that allowed inmates to develop valuable job skills for their future usage was curtailed and largely forgotten. America's administration of justice system has become more focused on creating rational systems. Parole programs such as job training, anger management, GED attainment, and work furlough programs were deleted, and cut back due to a public outcry over a few highly publicized incidents in the 1970's and 1980's (Travis, 2005).

Inmates who formerly had been placed in highly restrictive and punitive prisons were abruptly returned back to society. Martin (2011) found that among African Americans and Hispanics disproportionately incarcerated, they returned back to poverty-stricken communities with the expectation of being suddenly able to rapidly adjust and become regular, working citizens. Quite simply, this was an unrealistic and impractical policy that resulted in many failures, i.e. recidivism (Travis, 2005).

The 20th century incarceration rates in America ranged from 110 per 100,000 in 1975 but by the end of 2008 the incarceration rates have steadily increased, to 504 per 100,000 (Arungwa & Osho, 2012). Contributing factors to the rising incarceration rates are: the politicization of crime, the misinformation of crime, and the fear of crime and/or the fear of victimization (Arungwa & Osho, 2012). Due to these factors communities are now plagued with the mass exodus of returning prisoners. The Bureau of Justice Statistics found that during 2006 about 750,000 inmates were being admitted into prison, while about 713,000 inmates were being released back (Martin, 2011).

Many former inmates are returning to social and economic adversity, often without the necessary skills to lead a productive life (Marbley & Ferguson, 2005). The returning former inmates are at a high risk of recidivism due to their lack of higher education, low employment prospects, prison and/or jail stigma and lack of hireable skills. Finally, returning prisoners may have problems with substance abuse, drug addiction and health issues, creating more difficulties for favorable long-term employment and life-long stability.

Reentry programs were developed out of the remnants of the previous generation's knowledge of rehabilitative programs. Reentry programs borrowed from rehabilitation programs, but over time have made adjustments to their curriculum. Ultimately, reentry programs strive to make the former inmate's life more fulfilling, meaningful, and prevent the ex-offender from re-offending and returning back to prison. Prisoner reentry is the notion in criminal justice that involves former prison, jail, and juvenile inmates re-entering society after incarceration. The transition from incarceration to becoming an independent functioning member of a community after incarceration is extremely onerous.

In the last decade, over 700,000 prisoners have been released from federal, state, and local prisons annually (Kirk, 2009; Travis, 2005; Roman, Wolff, Correa, & Buck, 2007). The vast majority of ex-inmates

are granted little or no supervision/support once they return to society (Travis, 2005). The rationale for the dearth of supervision and support are due to several factors, but the primary culprits are attributable to states' slashing budgets, mandatory sentencing laws, a general lack of commitment and will in rehabilitation and insufficient interest in prisoner reentry programs (Travis, 2005).

President Obama spent \$25 million in 2009 on reentry programs (Arungwa & Osho, 2012). Reentry programs and laws have been set in place to support people who are providing programs for former inmates. The Second Chance Act signed into law by President Bush in 2008 supplies monetary help to state and local reentry programs (Arungwa & Osho, 2012), The Ready4Work initiative along with the Second Chance Act provides preliminary evidence that NPM partnerships are important to the prisoner reentry process (Martin, 2011). In a three-year study among fifteen states, 66% of prisoners released in 1994 were re-arrested (Hughes, Wilson, and Beck, 2001; Langan and Levin, 2002). Other research appears to show the inherent difficulties in re-entry for former inmates, as less than half of all parolees complete their parole supervision successfully, which is a 25% decrease from 20 years ago (Glaze, 2002). Another reason why reentry programs should be on the government's agenda is that when a person spends time behind bars they often become completely institutionalized. Reentry programs are important for the development of reversing the negative effects that incarceration has been proven to occur on released prisoners. "The muting power of the incarceration environment can become internalized by prisoners such that they can carry that system's social structures and values into their post released lives" (Hooper, 2010).

Haney (2002) found that numerous inmates return home from prison and suffer from psychological distress and maladaptive coping strategies. The offenders may have internalized and entrenched antisocial attitudes and values. These former inmates will need intensive reentry programs to combat and change self-destructive patterns of thinking in order to garner societal and individual success. Several research studies have argued that the characteristics of the client may have an impact or be a barrier to successful treatment (Andrews et al., 1990; Andrews and Bonta, 2003). As a group, returning inmates are considered an unstable and volatile cohort of individuals.

Research conducted among former jail and prison inmates appears to show that there is a need to identify the risk principle (Listwan et al., 2006). The risk principle refers to variables that may identify personal attributes or circumstances that could be predictive of future behavior (Andrews, Bonta, and Hoge, 1990). Often ignored in regard to this principle is the importance of risk to service delivery. In specific terms, the principle indicates that our most cohesive and intensive correctional treatment services should be put towards our critical risk population (Andrews and Bonta, 2003; Andrews et al., 2002; Bonta, 2002; Gendreau, 1996; Lowenkamp and Latessa, 2005).

Morani et. al (2011) examined 122 ex-offenders who participated in Project Re-Connect, a 6-month voluntary, prisoner reentry program for inmates who had finished serving their entire prison sentence. Social outcomes referred to employment, housing, and substance abuse assistance to returning inmates was analyzed. Not surprisingly many returning inmates sought assistance even when participation was not mandatory. The authors concluded that returning adult inmates are able to self-identify their service needs without requiring undue and costly assistance (Morani et. al, 2011).

Employment is a legitimate and foremost concern for inmates returning to society. Studies conducted among returning inmates show that securing employment can be a strong barrier to crime and delinquency (Sampson and Laub, 1993; Solomon, Johnson, Travis, and McBride, 2004). A number of reentry programs focus efforts on assisting with employment. Prisons and jails have established programs with local businesses that train inmates in the institution and provide them with employment once released (Listwan et al., 2006).

Paying careful attention to the sociological reentry needs of offenders is crucial to effective correctional reentry programs (Listwan et al., 2006). Reentry programs that subscribe to the empirical research model on effective interventions appear to be more successful than those that do not utilize empiricism in their evaluation. Programs that are not able to clearly define goals and objectives utilize inefficient classification systems and will most likely fail in the future (Roman, Wolff, Correa, & Buck, 2007).

Programs should be able to reassess offenders to help determine whether a program had an impact on an offender's risk of future criminal behavior (Listwan et al., 2006). This reassessment process should be initiated once the offender returns to the community and during the period the offender is under supervision. Based upon the reassessment, modifications should be made in the offender's treatment plan if needed. Reassessment can be used to inform key stakeholders and providers as to whether the treatment allowed for an impact on the offender's overall risk (Listwan et al., 2006).

1.3 New Public Management

Christopher Hood (1989) and Christopher Pollitt (1993) have written that New Public Management (NPM) allows for a strict managerial role of government. The managerial role of government is positioned to allow for governments to provide a higher level of quality and efficiency in public services, a focus on public accountability and core public service values (Hood, 1995). NPM is also more oriented towards outcomes through stronger management of municipal budgets. NPM doctrines tend to be opposed to egalitarian ideals of managing without managers, juridical doctrines of rigidly rule-bound administration and doctrines of self-government by public-service professionals (Hood, 1995).

NPM theorists advocate treating government citizens as beneficiaries of public services similar to customers and shareholders in the private sector (Pollitt, 1993). NPM is not concerned with the equitable distribution of social services as it is with the efficiency and quality of services (Pollitt, 1993).

New Public Management has had more than one type of definition depending on which author's view is examined (Lynn, 2006). Lynn (2001) created the analytical model of New Public Management consisting of several guiding principles:

- 1) A business-oriented approach to government
- 2) A quality and performance oriented approach to public management
- 3) An emphasis on improved public service delivery and functional responsiveness
- 4) An institutional separation of public demand functions (councils, citizens' charters), public provision (public management boards) and public service production functions (back offices, outsourcing, privatization)
- 5) A linkage of public demand, provision, and supply units by transactional devices (performance management, internal contract management, corporatization, intergovernmental covenanting and contracting, contracting out) and quality management

Critics of reentry programs contend that faith-based reentry programs fail because many of them do not adhere to business practices, responsible and transparent accountability and emphasis on improved public service delivery as a strict approach to their program. Lynn (2006) emphasized these salient points with regard to NPM and its applicability to prisoner reentry programs cannot be overstated. At the core, reentry programs provide an invaluable and pertinent service-oriented philosophy to a persistent problem occurring in the revolving door criminal justice system: "How do we make sure our returning inmates can effectively reconnect back to society?"

1.4 Client-Oriented Services

Osborne and Gaebler's (1992) Reinventing Government movement stressed the idea of Client-Oriented Services with the eternal quest to transform government into an efficient and effective machine. In the field of social services and healthcare this type of model is extremely relevant and useful. When analyzing the quality of nursing care, for example client satisfaction can serve as a successful outcome indicator using Likert surveys and questionnaires (Laferriere, 1993). Home health care providers have become more attentive to consumer concerns as competition to provide services increases (Laferriere, 1993). Unfortunately, reentry programs have not been as successful in designing programs, which push the message of client satisfaction for the recently released. Programs have operated on the basis of what constitutes completion rather than fixating on the measure of satisfaction. Reentry programs should follow the example provided by the healthcare field with regard to effective client delivered services.

Client satisfaction as an outcome variable has been studied in numerous healthcare settings such as hospitals, physician offices, clinics, and home-care nursing (Laferriere, 1993). In the area of home healthcare nursing, there has been a development of useful and valid client satisfaction survey instruments (Laferriere, 1993). These surveys assist administrators in critiquing the appropriateness and quality of home care services by identifying client concerns and integrating them into quality assurance activities (McNeese, 1988). Reentry programs must make headway in developing indicators and measure that capture client satisfaction. Once these programs accomplish this goal, proponents of new public management assert that then and only then will agencies tasked with delivering programs that reduce recidivism will actually accomplish these goals.

1.5 Prisoner Reentry Programs and a Client Oriented Service approach

Education plays an important role in offenders who may or may not return to a life of crime. Most research has found that many inmates lack basic educational skills. For example, in 1997, only 40% of adult inmates had high school degrees (Harlow, 2003). Only 11% of inmates have participated in college level or post-secondary vocational classes (Harlow, 2003).

Families are an integral part of the reentry support system for offenders both while in prison/jail and returning to the community. Social support allows for a reduction in stress as well as produce higher levels of self-control and predictability (Cullen, Wright, and Chamlin, 1999; Colvin Cullen, and Vander Ven, 2002). Some researchers believe that offenders who quit a life of crime are often successfully socially bonded to their family and maintain contact while incarcerated (Hairston et. al, 2003). Allowing for a reunification of offenders with their families requires attention to individual concerns and issues. In some circumstances, families are not equipped to handle the parolee and in several circumstances are considered high risk for criminal behavior themselves. The problem is further exacerbated when children are taken and then placed outside home care due to the parent's criminal activity. Furthermore, child welfare agencies may view the parent's criminal activity as a continued risk to the child (Maluccio and Ainsworth, 2003).

Community collaboration is another key component for many re-entry programs. Reentry involves the participation and collaboration of a number of community-based social service agencies (Listwan et al., 2006). These agencies are responsible for providing services for inmates as they transition back to society. These services may include the core components discussed above, such as education, employment, housing, counseling and mental health services. In addition, other services exist as well, such as medical, dental, clothing, and transportation services (Listwan et al., 2006). These services are labor and knowledge intensive and need a large amount of planning for re-entry and can be expensive.

Services need to be based on empirically validated treatment strategies if long-term change is expected (Listwan et al., 2006). Some research has suggested that cognitive behavioral programs may

possibly reduce recidivism (Andrews et al., 1990; Antonowicz and Ross, 1994; Garrett, 1985; Izzo and Ross, 1990; Lipsey, 1992; Losel, 1995). Cognitive theory suggests that offenders possess limited problem-solving skills (Ross and Fabiano, 1985), have antisocial values and attitudes (Jennings, Kilkenny, and Kohlberg, 1983), and display thinking errors (Yochelson and Samenow, 1976). Cognitive behavioral therapies improve problem-solving skills and target offenders' thinking and problem solving through a system of reinforcement, pro-social modeling, and role-playing (Michenbaum, 1977; Ross and Fabiano, 1985; Wilson, Bouffard, and MacKenzie, 2005).

Roman et. al (2007) examined intermediate outcomes of a faith-based residential program and assessed how client spirituality related to program completion and evaluation. The study measured religious preference and found that the choice of entering certain faith-based programs had a positive correlation with client progress and client satisfaction (Roman et.al, 2007). Daggett et. al (2008) found mixed results when examining faith-based programs in federal prisons. A faith-based correctional program known as the Life Connections Program is being utilized in five federal prisons. Program completion was positively correlated with scripture reading, perception of self-worth and the degree of desire for community integration (Daggett et. al, 2008).

Another main initiative for reentry programming is intensive aftercare and relapse prevention services (Listwan et al., 2006). Research on effective aftercare models indicates that aftercare should begin during the active treatment phase and should include frequent contacts and home visits (Altschuler and Armstrong, 1994). In addition, the offender's risk and needs should be reassessed to determine whether the, appropriate services have been provided. The intensity and duration of aftercare should not be fixed, but depend on the risk and needs of the offenders. As part of this spectrum of treatment, relapse prevention strategies offer invaluable potential. These strategies include teaching participants ways to anticipate and cope with high-risk situations. Programs that are based on cognitive or social learning strategies view relapse as a temporary setback that can be overcome through learning alternative responses (Listwan et al., 2006).

2. Faith-based Prisoner Reentry programs in Florida

In the United States, Florida has the fourth-largest prison system. There are a total of 144 state and community-based facilities holding an estimated total population over 102,000 inmates (FLDOC, 2013). In fiscal year 2009-2010 the Florida Department of Corrections yearly budget was listed as \$2.3 billion (FLDOC, 2013).

2.1. Florida Department of Corrections: Prisoner Facilities in Florida

The Florida Department of Corrections (FLDOC) divides the 144 facilities into major institutions, road prisons, boot and work camps, work release centers and annexes (FLDOC, 2011). 84.4% of prison inmates are incarcerated in the primary correctional facilities. The Florida Department of Corrections incarcerates only inmates who have been convicted and sentenced to more than a year. Inmates are classified into various facilities with regard to the seriousness of their offenses, length of sentence, time remaining to serve, prior criminal record, escape history and prison adjustment.

3. Methodology

This study was designed to analyze and examine faith-based reentry program managers' perceptions of New Public Management and Client-Oriented Services principles. Qualitative interviews with four faith-based reentry program managers were individually conducted at program offices on four separate occasions. Extensive notes were written while the interview was being conducted. Managers were advised and

cautioned against answering any questions they felt were too intrusive or which made them uncomfortable. Anonymity and confidentiality was preserved as was the identity of the managers. In order to assure their privacy, quotes were sometimes paraphrased and contextualized in order to maintain anonymity.

Managers were questioned if they had heard of New Public Management (NPM). Managers at all four programs had never heard of this theory. A brief explanation of NPM was discussed and explained. Managers were then asked if they had heard of Client Oriented Services (COS) philosophy. Managers had also never heard of this theory. An overview of COS was discussed and explained. After verbally agreeing that they understood the definitions of both NPM and COS, interviews were begun. Due to anonymity and privacy concerns, answers for all questions were coded as “Program #1, #2, #3, and #4” without divulging the identities of the individual programs in order to protect the identities of the managers.

Research Question #1- this question was chosen to understand the managers’ involvement in the success rate of the individuals in the program. Managers were asked their concerns regarding the likelihood of success for the individuals in the program. The question followed as “What are your greatest concerns with the men’s success rate during the course of the program?”

Program manager #1 answered: My greatest concern (is that) the men will not be able to fully adapt to our program and lack focus”; comment from program manager #2, “Providing enough support”; comment from Program Manager #3, “The men communicating effectively with me as to what their individual needs are”; comment from program manager #4 “The men will not be serious enough (to be successful)”.

Research Question #2- this question was designed to measure and analyze if program managers were utilizing a business-oriented budgeting tool or some other type of business-friendly budgeting system. Q2) “Is there a formal budgeting process you use in order to more effectively manage your expenses during the course of the program or on a year-by-year basis?”

Program manager #1 answered “We use Quicken for our financial management”; comment from program manager # 2, “No, (nothing specific). Excel provides us a good basis for financial management”; comment from program manager #3, “I manage the program’s budget on my computer. Our expenses are not complicated enough to require (sophisticated) software”; comment from program manager #4, “Once every six months, we have a volunteer (who comes to our program and) who examines our financial receipts and manages them.”

Research Question #3- this question was asked in order to find out whether or not managers gauge the effectiveness of their programs, and how exactly do they decide to measure effectiveness of the program. Q3 “How do you measure the effectiveness of your program?” Alternatively, the question was framed in another manner: “Do you know if the program *appears* to be working and is successful?”

Program manager #1 answered, “We do not have an official measurement tool. We rely on word of mouth from the men”; comment from program manager, #2, “We do not have any measurement tool for effectiveness”; comment from program manager, #3 “Our effectiveness relies on communication with the men”; comment from program manager, #4 “We do not have a process to measure effectiveness.”

Research Question #4- this question was asked in order to assess what managers think of the individuals in their programs- as clients, family members or some other type of relationship?

Q4) “Do you consider the men in the program as family members, clients or some other type of relationship?” Program manager #1 answered, “I consider the men in the program to be family members”; comment from program manager #2 answered in a similar way as program manager #1, “The men in the program are treated as a family”; comment from program manager #3, “Family is very important (to us); comment from program manager #4, “We would only consider the men in the program as members of our extended family.”

Research Question#5- this question was posed to assess whether or not managers made any type of changes to the content, format or style of the program.

Q5) “Since you have been working in this program, how much has changed in terms of content, format or style?”

Program Manager #1 answered “I have made some minor changes but overall very little have changed”; comment from program manager #2, “Some changes have been made as the program (has grown)”; comment from program manager #3,“(Ideally) we have tried not to make large changes but small changes have been made”; comment from program manager #4,“I have made an effort to keep the program as simple as possible.”

Descriptive questions: Briefly, managers were asked short, descriptive questions regarding:

- a) Program manager’s length of time working in program
- b) Manager’s decision as to how to admit individual into program
- c) Program managers view of men as clients/family or some other category
- d) Acceptance of government assistance
- e) Dependence on donations for the program
- f) Tracking former program participants after they leave the program
- g) Recruitment or incentive to attract individuals
- h) Bible study/G.E.D./college classes/anger management classes offered

(See Tables at end of document)

4. Future Recommendations

Potential future research among reentry programs should analyze and examine the effects of non-faith (secular) prisoner reentry program management’s utilization of Client-Oriented Services. Principles of New Public Management (NPM) could be theorized and expounded upon in future research. While this study was small, a comparative study could examine the effects of ex-inmates and their attitudes towards Client-Oriented Services being administered on them. Additionally, a future study should take into account a larger cohort of program managers and their attitudes towards business oriented practices in a non-profit.

5. Limitations of this research study

Unfortunately this study while noteworthy in its desire to analyze and understand the usefulness of NPM-COS in faith-based reentry programs was difficult to assess conclusively. One problem was that the sample size was smaller than anticipated and future research studies should improve on this study by gathering a larger data sample.

Finally, the questions should re-designed and re-developed with increased effort to understand the practical implications of NPM-COS policies on reentry efforts. Doing so, could create and enhance our knowledge of what works to assist returning inmates make a successful transition to society.

6. References

- Antonowicz, D.H. & Ross, R. R. 1994. “Essential components of successful rehabilitation programs for offenders.” *International Journal of Offender and Comparative Criminology*, 38(2), 97-104.
- Arungwa, S. C., & Osho, G. S. (2012). Policy Implications and Assessments of Inmate Education and Reentry: Empirical Evidence from Harris County Texas. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 360-373.
- Austin, James and Anthony Fabelo. 2004. “The Diminishing Returns of Increased Incarceration: A Blueprint to Improve Public Safety and Reduce Costs.” Washington, D.C.: JFA Institute.
- Austin, James and John Irwin. 2000. “Its About Time: America’s Imprisonment Binge.” Belmont, Calif.:

Wadsworth.

Basch, C.E. 1987. "Focus Group Interviews: An underutilized research technique for improving theory and practice in health education." *Health Education Quarterly*. 14: 411-448.

Bastow Simon, Dunleavy Patrick, Margetts Helen, Tinkler, Jane. 2006. 'New public management is dead: Long live digital era governance', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. July

Barzelay M and Armajani B J. 1992 *Breaking Through Bureaucracy*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA

Bauer, Lynn. 2004. "Justice Expenditures and Employment Extracts, 2001." *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin*. NCJ 190641. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Beauchamp, D. E. 1985. *Community: The neglected tradition of public health*. *Hustings Center Report*, pp. 28-36.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., and Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart*. New York: Harper and Row. Bowen, O. R. (1988). In pursuit of the number one public health problem. *Public Health Reports*, 103(3), 211-212.

Beck, A., and B. Shipley. 1989. *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1983*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Berg, Bruce L. 2004. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. 5th ed, New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Beck, Allen J and Maruscak, Laura M. 2001. "Mental Health Treatment in State Prisons, 2000." NCJ 188207. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Beck, Allen J and Shipley, Beranrd, E. 1989. "Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1983." NCJ 116261. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Blumstein, Alfred and Allen Beck. 2005. "Prisoner reentry as a transient state between release and recommitment." In Jeremy Travis and Christy Visser (eds.), *Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Daggett, Dawn. M, Camp, Scott. D., Okyun, Kwon, Rosenmerkel, Sean P., and Saffran-Klein, Jody. 2008. *Faith-Based Correctional Programming in Federal Prisons: Factors Affecting Program Completion*. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. Vol. 35. No.7. 848-862.

Florida Department of Corrections (FLDOC). (2013, March 30). *Quick Facts About the Florida Department of Corrections*. Retrieved from <http://www.dc.state.fl.us/oth/Quickfacts.html>

Hairston, Creasie Finney and Rollin, James. 2003. "Social Capital and Family Connections." *Women, Girls and Criminal Justice* 4 (5): 67-69

Henggeler, S.W., and Borduin, C.M. 1990. "Family Therapy and Beyond: A Multisystemic Approach to Treating the Behavior Problems of Children and Adolescents." Pacific Grove CA: Brooks/Cole.

Horney, Julie, D. Osgood, Wane and Marshall, Haen, Ineke. 1995. "Criminal Careers in the Short-Term: Intra-Individual Variability in Crime and Its Relation to Local Life Circumstances." *American Sociological Review* 60 (5): 655-73.

Hood, Christopher. 1991. "A Public Management for All Seasons." *Public Administration*. Vol. 69. 3-19

Hood, Christopher. 1995. *The New Public Management in the 1980's: Variations on a theme*. *Accounting, Organization and Society*. Vol. 20. Iss. 2/3. 93-109

Hood, Christopher. 1995. *Contemporary Public Management: A New Global Paradigm?*

Public Policy and Administration. 10(2): 104-117. Reprinted in Michael Hill, ed. *The Modern Policy Process: A Reader*. London: Prentice Hall, 1993; 1997 (2nd ed.): 404-417

Hoffman, L. 1981. *Foundations of Family Therapy*. New York: Basic Books.

- Jennings, W., Kilkenny, R., and Kohlberg, L. 1983. "Moral development theory and practice for youthful and adult offenders." In W. Laufer and J. Day (eds.), "Personality Theory, Moral Development and Criminal Behavior." Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Johnston, Denise. 1991. *Jailed Mothers*. Pasadena, CA: Pacific Oaks Center for Children of Incarcerated Parents.
- Klein, N., Alexander, J., & Parsons, B. 1977. Impact of family systems intervention recidivism and sibling delinquency: A model of primary prevention and pro- gram evaluation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 45. 469-474.
- Lawrence, K and Rita Laferriere. 1993. Client Satisfaction With Home Health Care Nursing. *Journal of Community Health Nursing*. Vol. 10, Iss. 2. Pp 67-76.
- Listwan, Johnson Shelley, Cullen T. Francis and Latessa, J. Edward. 2006. "How to Prevent Prisoner Re-entry Programs From Failing: Insights From Evidence-Based Corrections." *Federal Probation*. 70:3.
- Lynn, L. E., Jr. 2006. "Public Management: Old and New." New York: Routledge.
- Lynch, P. James. 2006. "Prisoner Reentry: Beyond Program Evaluation." *Reaction Essay*. 5:2. PP 401-412.
- Loeber, Rolf, and Farrington, David, eds. 1998. *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Loeber, Rolf, and Farrington, David, eds. 2001. *Child Delinquents: Development, Intervention, and Service Needs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Maluccio, A. & Ainsworth, F. (2003). Drug use by parents: A challenge for family reunification practice. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 25, 511-533.
- Martin, L. L. 2011. Debt to Society: Asset Poverty and Prisoner Reentry. *The Review of Black Political Economy*, 38(2), pp. 131-143.
- Marbley, A. F., & Ferguson, R. 2005. Responding to Prisoner Reentry, Recidivism, and Incarceration of Inmates of Color: A Call to the Communities. *Journal of Black Studies*, 633-649.
- McNeese, B. L. 1988. Patient satisfaction: How is it being addressed? *Home Healthcare Nurse*. Vol. 6. Pp 13-15.
- Metraux, Stephen, and Culhane, Dennis P. 2004. "Homeless Shelter Use and Reincarceration Following Prison Release: Assessing the Risk." *Criminology and Public Policy* 3(2): 201-22.
- Morani, Nicole M., Wikoff, Nora, Linhorst, Donald M., Bratton, Sheila. (2011). A Description of the Self-Identified Needs, Service Expenditures, and the Social Outcomes of Participants of a Prisoner-Reentry Program. *The Prison Journal*. 91(3). 347-365.
- Mumola, Christopher. J. 1999. "Substance Abuse and Treatment, State and Federal Prisoners, 1997." NCJ 172871. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Mumola, Christopher J. 2000. "Incarcerated Parents and Their Children." NCJ 182335. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Mumola, Christopher J. 2002. "Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2001 Annual Survey of Jails, and the 2001 National Prisoners Statistics Program." Paper presented at the National Center for Children and Families, Washington, DC, October 31.
- Mumola, Christopher J. 2004. "Incarcerated Parents and Their Children." Presented at the annual Administration for Children and Families Welfare Research and Evaluation Conference, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington DC, May 28.
- Nelson, Martha, Dees, Perry and Allen, Charlotte. 1999. *The First Month Out: Post-Incarceration Experiences in New York City*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.

- Osborne, David, and Ted Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Patterson, G.R., Chamberlain P & Reid, J. B. 1982. "A comparative evaluation of a parent-training program." *Behavior Therapy*. 13; 638-650.
- Petersilia, J. 2001. Prisoner reentry: Public safety and reintegration challenges. *The Prison Journal*. 81; 360-375.
- Petersilia, J. 2003. *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Re-Entry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rhine, Edward E., Smith, William R, and Jackson, Ronald W. 1991. *Paroling Authorities: Recent History and Current Practice*. Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Ripley, Amanda. 2002. "This Year the Nation's Prisons Will Release More Than 630,000 People-A New Record. Amanda Ripley Follows One Man's Struggle to Stay Outside the Gates." *Time*, January 21, 56-62.
- Roman, Caterina G., Wolff, Ashley, Correa, Vanessa and Buck, Janeen. (2007). *Assessing Intermediate Outcomes of a Faith-Based Residential Prisoner Reentry Program*. *Research on Social Work Practice*. Vol. 17. No.2. 199-215.
- Ross, R. and Fabiano, E. A. 1985. "Time to Think." Johnson City: Institute of Social Science and Arts, Inc.
- Sampson, Robert J and Laub, John H. 1993. *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Simon, J. 1993. *Poor discipline: Parole and the social control of the underclass, 1890*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Solomon, Amy L., Waul Michelle, Ness Van Asheley, Travis, Jeremy. 2004. *Outside the Walls: A National Snapshot of Community-Based Prisoner Reentry Programs*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Travis, Jeremy and Visser, Christy. 2003. "Transitions from Prison to Community: Understanding Individual Pathways." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 89-113.
- Travis, Jeremy. 2005. "But They All Come Back: Facing the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry." Urban Institute Press. Washington D.C.
- Wilson, D. B., Bouffard, L. A., & Mackenzie, D. L. 2005. "Quantitative review of structured, group-oriented, cognitive-behavioral programs for offenders." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32,172-204.
- Yochelson, S. & Samenow, S.E. 1976. "The Criminal Personality Volume 1: A Profile for Change." New York: Jason Aronson.

Table 1: Program#1*Results: Qualitative Questions*

Length of time as manager of program	More than 20 years
Most common method for decision to admit to program	Referral
Most common view of men in program	Family
Acceptance of government assistance	Yes
Acceptance of donations	Yes
Tracking of participants after leaving program	No
Recruitment or incentive to attract individuals into program	No
G.E.D./college classes offered to program participants	Yes
Anger management classes offered to program participants	Yes
Bible study classes offered to program participants	Yes

Table 2: Program#2*Results:**Qualitative**Questions*

Length of time as manager of program	More than 40 years
Most common method for decision to admit to program	Referral
Most common view of men in program	Family
Acceptance of government assistance	Yes
Acceptance of donations	Yes
Tracking of participants after leaving program	No
Recruitment or incentive to attract individuals into program	No

G.E.D./college classes offered to program participants	Yes
Anger management classes offered to program participants	Yes
Bible study classes offered to program participants	Yes

Table 3: Program#3

Results: Qualitative Questions

Length of time as manager of program	More than 10 years
Most common method for decision to admit to program	Referral
Most common view of men in program	Family
Acceptance of government assistance	Yes
Acceptance of donations	Yes
Tracking of participants after leaving program	No
Recruitment or incentive to attract individuals into program	No
G.E.D./college classes offered to program participants	Yes
Anger management classes offered to program participants	Yes
Bible study classes offered to program participants	Yes

Table 4: Program#4*Results: Qualitative Questions*

Length of time as manager of program	More than 20 years
Most common method for decision to admit to program	Referral
Most common view of men in program	Family
Acceptance of government assistance	Yes
Acceptance of donations	Yes
Tracking of participants after leaving program	No
Recruitment or incentive to attract individuals into program	No
G.E.D./college classes offered to program participants	Yes
Anger management classes offered to program participants	Yes
Bible study classes offered to program participants	Yes
