


2018

The Relationship between Alabama's Prison Reentry and Rehabilitative Programs and Recidivism

Kenneth Whitman
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Law Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Ken Whitman

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Anthony Fleming, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Timothy Bagwell, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. James Mosko, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2018

Abstract

The Relationship between Alabama's Prison Reentry and Rehabilitative Programs and
Recidivism

by

Kenneth James Whitman

MS, California State University Sacramento, 2004

MPA, California State University Hayward, 1987

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

February 2018

Abstract

Recidivism is a vital concern to the Alabama Department of Corrections (ADOC), Alabama Board of Pardons and Parole (ABPP), taxpayers, and family members affected by the revolving door of inmates in and out of the Alabama prison system. Little, however, is understood about the relationship between the effectiveness of prison programs and rates of recidivism. Using social learning theory as a theoretical framework, the purpose of this study for the ADOC was to explore the nature of the relationship between prison program efficacy and improvements on recidivism. Data were collected through a convenience sample of 17 ADOC and 1 ABPP staff members who were tasked with input to inmate programs including evidence based programs or risk assessments. Interview data were inductively coded then subjected to Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis procedure. In total, 43 inmate programs were analyzed from the 5 selected prisons in Alabama. Findings associated with this study indicated 3 key terms. First, despite resources dedicated to inmate programs, participants perceive that the programs do not meet the intended goal of recidivism reduction. Second, the ADOC does not effectively track recidivism, and there are opportunities to expand evidence based decision making related to recidivism programming. The positive social change implications stemming from this study of this study include recommendations to establish a validated risk assessment that will assist the correctional facility in tailoring evidence based programs to fit the needs of the inmate and create a mechanism for tracking recidivism. An effective risk assessment and prison programs will assist convicts in assimilating back into the community and reduce taxpayer costs of incarcerating inmates.

The Relationship between Alabama's Prison Reentry and Rehabilitative Programs and
Recidivism

by

Kenneth James Whitman

MS, California State University, Sacramento, 2004

MPA, California State University, Hayward, 1987

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

December 2017

Dedication

I dedicate this study to the men and women employed in law enforcement, who daily, place themselves in harm's way to protect and serve the community and to ensure inmates are rehabilitated. The job is frequently thankless with inordinate amount of stress. Yet, law enforcement brothers and sisters continue to perform their duties in a professional manner and strive to ensure public safety. Your dedication to service exemplifies a true professional and you have my gratitude and profound appreciation. Additionally, I would like to dedicate this study to Alabama Correctional Officer Kenneth Bettis, who gave his life in the line of duty on September 16, 2016.

Acknowledgments

There are several individuals who have assisted me in my endeavor to earn a Ph.D. I would like to thank my mother, Dr. Rosemary Lee, who obtained her Ph.D. in 1975, from U.C. Berkley. My mother has been an inspiration to complete the program. Secondly, I would to thank my wife, Kathleen Fodor, who is a surgical Registered Nurse and has patiently supported and encouraged me to complete the program. I would like to thank the Walden family, including staff and students, who debated, encouraged, corrected, and motivated me to complete the demanding Ph.D. Program. Social change is difficult, especially in law enforcement. However, under the expert tutelage of my committee chair, Dr. Anthony Fleming, and committee member Dr. Kirk Williams, Dr. Tim Bagwell, Dr. Jim Mosko as well as other Walden University professors, the completion of the Ph.D. program would not have been possible. Finally, I would like to thank the Alabama Department of Corrections and the Board of Pardons and Parole for assisting me by providing the necessary data to complete this study. The Alabama Department of Corrections provided me with not only the ability to speak to wardens and staff members of the prison, but allowed me to also tour facilities. Additionally, the Alabama Department of Corrections ensured there was complete transparency in providing this researcher with the data I requested. Thank you.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| List of Tables | vi |
| Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study | 1 |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Background of the Study..... | 3 |
| Problem Statement..... | 5 |
| Purpose of the Study..... | 8 |
| Research Questions..... | 9 |
| Theoretical Framework..... | 10 |
| Nature of the Study..... | 13 |
| Definitions..... | 15 |
| Assumptions..... | 18 |
| Scope and Delimitations..... | 19 |
| Limitations..... | 20 |
| Significance of the Study..... | 21 |
| Summary..... | 23 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review..... | 25 |
| Introduction..... | 25 |
| Synopsis of Current Literature..... | 27 |
| Major Chapter Sections..... | 29 |
| Literature Search Strategy..... | 30 |
| Theoretical Framework..... | 32 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Theory of Differential Association..... | 33 |
| Theory of Rational Choice..... | 37 |
| Theory of Strain..... | 41 |
| Theoretical Conclusion..... | 44 |
| Honor..... | 45 |
| Inmate Programs..... | 46 |
| Faith Based Inmate Programs..... | 47 |
| Prison Industry Programs..... | 51 |
| Prison Reentry Programs..... | 58 |
| Prison Vocational Programs..... | 61 |
| Risk Assessment..... | 62 |
| Ohio Risk Assessment..... | 63 |
| Level of Service Inventory-Revised..... | 66 |
| Summary and Conclusions..... | 66 |
| Chapter 3: Research Method..... | 69 |
| Introduction..... | 69 |
| Setting..... | 69 |
| Research Design and Rationale..... | 70 |
| Role of Researcher..... | 71 |
| Biases..... | 72 |
| Ethical Issues..... | 74 |

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| Methodology..... | 74 |
| Participant Selection Logic..... | 74 |
| Instrumentation..... | 76 |
| Data Collection..... | 78 |
| Data Analysis..... | 81 |
| Threats to Validity..... | 84 |
| Issues of Trustworthiness..... | 86 |
| Ethical considerations..... | 86 |
| Summary..... | 88 |
| Chapter 4: Data Analysis..... | 89 |
| Introduction..... | 91 |
| Setting..... | 93 |
| Demographics..... | 93 |
| Data Collection..... | 93 |
| Alcohol and Drug Programs..... | 95 |
| Educational Programs..... | 97 |
| Reentry Programs..... | 97 |
| Vocational Programs..... | 99 |
| Correctional Industries..... | 101 |
| Participant Interviews..... | 103 |
| Data Analysis..... | 104 |
| Results..... | 105 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Theme 1: Overcrowding and Space..... | 105 |
| Theme 2: Staffing Levels..... | 109 |
| Theme 3: Age of the Prison..... | 112 |
| Theme 4: Inmate Programs..... | 114 |
| Theme 5: Risk Assessments..... | 119 |
| Theme 6: Recidivism..... | 124 |
| Discrepant Cases..... | 127 |
| Evidence of Trustworthiness..... | 128 |
| Summary..... | 128 |
| Chapter 5: Interpretation of Findings..... | 131 |
| Introduction..... | 131 |
| Interpretation of Findings..... | 131 |
| Theoretical Framework..... | 137 |
| Limitations of the Study..... | 142 |
| Recommendations..... | 142 |
| Implications..... | 144 |
| Conclusion..... | 146 |
| References..... | 151 |
| Appendix A: ADOC Prison Program Survey..... | 168 |
| Appendix B: ABPP Interview Staff Questions..... | 168 |
| Appendix C: ADOC Interview Staff Questions..... | 171 |

Curriculum Vitae 174

List of Tables

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 1. Draper, Kilby, Limestone, St. Clair, Tutwiler Prison Programs..... | 96 |
| Table 2. Draper, Kilby, Limestone, St. Clair, Tutwiler, Vocational Programs..... | 100 |
| Table 3. Draper, Kilby, Limestone, St. Clair, Tutwiler, Correctional Industries... | 102 |
| Table 4. Initial Themes and Their Reduction..... | 106 |
| Table 5. Major Themes..... | 107 |

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

Historically, prison reform has been the main purpose of correctional institutions commencing with the Pennsylvania correctional system in the 1800s. Predicated upon the era, prisons have either attempted to punish or rehabilitate to reduce the number of inmates that will recidivate and to ensure public safety (Petersilia, 2003). To be clear, recidivism is defined as “The act of criminal offending despite having been punished. The prison recidivism rate is the proportion of persons released from prison, who are rearrested, reconvicted or returned to custody within a specified time period, typically three years” (The PEW Center, 2011, p. 7). The Alabama Department of Corrections (ADOC) defines recidivism as any felon, who has been released from the ADOC system and commits a criminal act within three years, and is subsequently returned to the ADOC jurisdiction. Unlike the definition presented by the PEW Center, where any violation of law resulting in incarceration within three years of release is defined as recidivism, the ADOC refers to recidivism as having to be incarcerated in an ADOC facility (ADOC, 2015). This will be discussed more in depth in Chapter 2.

The purpose of the criminal justice system, including the department of corrections is to incarcerate the guilty. Additionally, they are tasked with correcting deviant behavior while incarcerated and thus transform offenders into viable members of society. Finally, the department of corrections must punish offenders thereby dissuading would be criminals from pursuing and engaging in future criminal acts, and ensure public safety by effectively curtailing citizens from being victimized from offenders.

Prisons accomplish one or more of these tasks by placing the offender in a certain custody or security level prison. Minimum and medium custody in house (Level IV Security) prisons are the least restrictive and predicated upon the institution, afford the inmate with a variety of vocational and educational programs. Close custody (Level V, VI, and VII, Security) prisons become more restrictive and house more serious felons. Predicated upon the custody and security level of the prison, it will serve to punish, rehabilitate, treat, educate, and provide vocational training for the inmate. In doing so, the prison expects time served will rectify the inmate's propensity to commit further criminal acts and possibly prepare them for reentry into society. This is exemplified by the correctional facilities' mission statement, which is provided in most prison's annual report and available to the public. For example, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's (CDCR) mission statement reads in part: "We protect the public by safely, securing, and supervising adult and juvenile offenders, providing effective rehabilitation and treatment, and integrating offenders into the community" (CDCR, 2014 p. 3). However, some close custody or supermax prisons are devoid of rehabilitative programs to ensure the inmate is prepared to enter the community. The focus of a close security or supermax institution is to curtail behavior through lengths of strict confinement, which is proportional to the gravity of the crime. During this period of confinement, very few vocational, educational, or reentry programs are offered to the inmate primarily due to the focus of the prison to correct deviant criminal behavior.

Prisons are highly complex organizations that must adhere to a myriad of federal and state laws. The laws ensure inmates are treated with dignity and respect as well as

afforded adequate medical care. To ensure prisons remain in compliance with federal and state laws regarding inmate treatment, the Bureau of Prisons, Board of Corrections, prisons as well as the Department of Justice if necessary inspect prisons.

Correctional facilities are tasked with providing inmates with rehabilitative treatment, and are therefore sent to a prison specifically designated by the ADOC. The inmates are sent to a prison that will best serve the needs of the inmate and is best suited for a particular correctional institution. To accomplish this, inmates are placed in a temporary facility in order to extrapolate information regarding the inmate's behavior and rehabilitative needs. In the State of Alabama, Kilby Correctional Facility is tasked with assessing the inmate's custody and security level. Once the inmate is processed, and a determination has been made as to what correctional facility is best suited to rectify criminal tendencies and assist the inmate in conforming to the standards of behavior expected of citizens in the community, the inmate is transferred to the correctional facility.

Chapter I provides information regarding the background of the study and an analysis of the research problem in conjunction with the nature of the study. Further, Chapter I presents the preliminary research questions utilized to guide the study, the purpose of the study, and the theoretical framework for the study. The assumptions, limitations, and the significance of the study conclude Chapter I.

Background

Voluminous research has been conducted focusing upon factors, which contribute significantly to the possibility the felon will recidivate once released from prison. Several

researchers have noted factors such as education, family, job skills, and drug dependency. Immarigeon (2003) argued once an inmate is released from prison, the ex-convict will either transform back into the culture from which they were once removed, or they will recidivate due to their lack of success in being able to gain employment and thus curtail their criminal activities. Morris and Rothman (1998) argued if a felon's punishment was not severe as to instill a sense of fear of returning to confinement, the individual faced with the uncertainties of economical support, but also of continuing to separate them from the criminal element, which may have been the very factor for existence, may be extremely difficult. Thus, it is a mathematical certainty the individual will recidivate if not properly prepared to reenter the community upon release from prison.

Petersilia (2003) studied recidivism extensively and provided several recommendations and strategies for prison officials and parole officers to follow regarding the reentry process for inmates. Peterson argued administrators should concentrate on the reentry and reintegration process, including rehabilitative and work programs that would provide the inmate with a useful skill. Additionally, Petersilia argued inmates should participate in prerelease programs to adequately prepare themselves for release into society (Petersilia, 2003, p. 176).

Although there has been a number of studies regarding recidivism, there exist a gap in the research pertaining to prison programs and the relationship between the effectiveness of inmate prison programs and rates of recidivism. Further, very little research has been conducted regarding the effectiveness of prison programs, within the ADOC, in reducing rates of recidivism among paroled or end of sentence (EOS) convicts.

The strategies provide a guideline for the ADOC officials to measure the effectiveness of prison programs and track rates of recidivism in each of the 16 major correctional facilities throughout the system. Further, adequately preparing inmates to reenter the community should assist in lowering rates of recidivism and provide the family and community with a productive member of society. Additionally, lower rates of recidivism will reduce prison population thereby reducing the cost of \$50.28 per inmate per day to Alabama taxpayers (ADOC, 2016).

Problem Statement

The ADOC has struggled to effectively rehabilitate inmates while incarcerated. The ADOC's 2016 Annual Report noted 31.9% of all inmates released, had recidivated and been remanded back into custody (ADOC, 2016). The problem of recidivism, which research has shown to be a contributing factor to prison overcrowding, has been one of major concerns of the Alabama Board of Pardons and Parole (ABPP) as well as the ADOC and the Governor of the state of Alabama. The in-house prison population for March 2016 showed close custody 154%, medium 200%, while minimum security was 270% capacity (ADOC, 2016). The Alabama correctional system is at a critical state and thus required action by the state senate to address the issue of overcrowding.

In 2003, the ABPP began examining the growing prison population more than the design capacity. According to the ADOC's March 2016 Monthly Statistical Report, the Alabama in-house prison population was 24,526, which is 11,208 over the designed capacity of 13,318. (ADOC, 2016) Further, the ADOC list the average cost to house an inmate per day is \$50.28, equating to \$18,352.20 per inmate per year (ADOC, 2016). The

staggering cost of housing inmates, in conjunction with the overcrowding of the 16 major correctional facilities located in Alabama, places the state of Alabama in a precarious situation similar to what the CDCR experienced in 2010 when the CDCR fell under the auspices of the Justice Department. The fiscal and legal ramifications to the state of Alabama, as noted earlier, as well as the loss of an incarcerated parents, children, uncles, aunts, and other members to the family places a strain on the family, community, and state.

Senate Joint Resolution 20 (SJR 20) was adopted and approved by Governor Bentley on February 18, 2014. The Alabama Prison Reform Task Force (APRTF), which was established under SJR 20, was tasked with studying a broad range of issues regarding prison overcrowding and to make recommendations to ensure inmate prison reduction (SJR 20, 2014). There has been little research regarding the measurement of prison programs as they relate to the reduction of recidivism. Additionally, the most recent formation of the APRTF, under the adoption of SJR 20, exemplifies the criticality of addressing the issues that plague the Alabama prison system.

The purpose of this research is to assist the ADOC in establishing a uniform reentry strategic plan. A section of the plan should consist of an assessment of the most effective and efficient rehabilitative programs. The assessment would identify the inmate prison programs that would aid the convicted felon in reentering the community and society and thereby possibly reducing the rate of recidivism.

Although there has been a voluminous amount of research regarding recidivism, there exists a gap in research regarding the effectiveness of prerelease reentry, vocational,

correctional industries, faith-based, and rehabilitative inmate programs excluding education and substance abuse programs, in Alabama. Cullen, Smith, Lowenkamp, and Latessa (2009) argued prison inmate rehabilitation programs have been ineffective in curtailing rates of recidivism. However, I was unable to locate any research or studies, which addressed the relationship of inmate prison programs to rates of recidivism specifically in Alabama. Further, Immarigeon (2003) extolled a sound reentry program, commencing with suitable counseling and training while the individual is incarcerated, will reduce the recidivism rate dramatically. Recidivism is an economic and social problem, which may be reduced by effective inmate rehabilitative, training, vocational, and reentry inmate programs.

Purpose of the Study

The use of a mixed methods research design was necessary in order to fully comprehend the specific complexities regarding prison programs. The quantitative data, derived from the ABPP and ADOC, provided information including but not limited to rates of recidivism, number of inmates paroled, pardoned, or reached the end of sentence, the number of inmates to staff ratio, beds available, programs offered, location of facilities, and inmate population demographics. Although the quantitative data provided useful information regarding the Alabama prison system, qualitative data regarding the effectiveness of prison programs in reducing rates of recidivism, availability of programs, metrics utilized to afford inmates access to prison programs, reentry procedures, statistical gathering procedures, and prison industries is necessary to comprehend what was not provided through statistical reports from the ADOC. Qualitative data obtained

from the ABPP include the explanation of a parole plan and metrics used for parole. This data is necessary to complement and triangulate the quantitative data extrapolated from the ABPP.

The intent of this study is two-fold. The first is to explore the relationship between certain prison programs in close and medium custody prisons and rates of recidivism. The second is to compare rates of recidivism between four close custody prisons. The four close custody prisons in the study were Kilby, St. Clair, Tutwiler, and Limestone correctional facilities. Draper was the only medium custody prison in the study. The St. Clair correctional facility is the site for four major prison industries, which provide inmates with vocational training. Limestone correctional facility has one similar prison program while Tutwiler is a female prison and Kilby is the reception and classification center for all male inmates entering the ADOC system (ADOC, 2015).

The nature of analyzing recidivism encompasses several independent variables, which frequently provide a causal relationship between factors such as age, type of crime, criminal history, and ethnicity to name a few. However, this study focused primarily upon prerelease prison programs and as such the independent variables are limited to: available vocational, correctional industry, faith-based prison programs, reentry and prerelease programs and, metrics for selection. Two control variables; the level of prison and the age of inmate were also considered and noted. The dependent variable is rate of recidivism.

Research Questions

This mixed methods case study involved identifying prison programs that may assist the inmate in assimilating back into the family, community, and society thus lessening the probability of recidivism among Alabama newly released inmates. The research questions are as follows:

RQ1: What is the relationship between ADOC correctional industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, and vocational programs, in close custody and medium custody prisons and rates of recidivism?

The hypothesis relating to RQ1 reads: Inmates who avail themselves of prison programs will experience lower rates of recidivism compared to those inmates who do not participate in any correctional industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based or vocational programs. The null hypothesis relating to RQ1 reads: There is no relationship between ADOC correctional industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, and vocational programs, in close custody and medium custody prisons and rates of recidivism?

RQ2: What is the criteria for inmates to be afforded the opportunity to participate in some type of prison program including prison industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, or vocational?

The hypothesis relating to RQ2 reads: Inmates who meet certain ADOC or collegiate requirements for study are afforded the opportunity to participate in prison program including prison industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, or vocational programs. The null hypothesis relating to RQ2 reads: There are no requirements for

inmates to participate in prison programs including prison industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, and vocational?

RQ3: What is the relationship between the presentence investigation report compiled by a court official and the internal risk assessment utilized by the ADOC and the Ohio Risk Assessment System utilized by the ABPP, as criteria for the Board's consideration for release and in predicting rates of recidivism.

The hypothesis relating to RQ3 reads: The presentence investigation report and the Ohio Risk Assessment System used by the ABPP are accurate assessments in evaluating an inmate for parole and in predicting rates of recidivism. The null hypothesis reads: The presentence investigation report and the Ohio Risk Assessment System used by the ABPP do not provide accurate assessments of an inmate's time while incarcerated nor is the presentence investigation report or the Ohio Risk Assessment System useful in predicting rates of recidivism.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework utilized for this study consisted of the Rational Choice Theory, Differential Association Theory, and the Strain Theory albeit researchers have espoused there are several other theories, which have been explored and used to explain deviant and criminal behavior. The three theories discussed in this study provide a rudimentary explanation for inmate behavior while incarcerated and once discharged from prison.

Cornish and Clarke (1986) asserted an individual, who will engage in criminal activity, will do so after analyzing the cost and benefits of such activity verse the

repercussions. Thus, the individual will attempt to rationalize the behavior in terms of rewards versus punishment. Cornish and Clarke's rational choice theory is comprised of three aspects of criminal decision-making. First, the offender must decide whether to engage in criminal activity. Secondly, the offender decides a specific focus on the type of crime and the manner in which the crime is to be committed. Lastly, the criminal must decide the degree of involvement he/she is willing to engage. Once the inmate is released, he/she is faced with a dilemma in either conforming to the norms of society or revert back to the criminal behavior, which caused the inmate's original incarceration.

An inmate, who is rational, selfish, and pleasure seeking makes personal choices and decisions as to whether to become involved in deviant behavior while incarcerated, or to assimilate into the the expected norms of the prison community. The choice is made by weighing the consequences of punishment versus the benefits. Many variables exist, which may lead the inmate to recidivate. One of the most critical factors in determining the success or failure of the newly released inmate is whether the inmate has received some type of reentry, rehabilitative, vocational, educational, or prison industries training. However, other factors such as the social environment, family, and self worth of the inmate may also be major factors as to whether the felon elects to modify his/her criminal behavior. The choice rests solely upon the individual as to how they will enter the community.

Sutherland (1947) argued criminal behavior, as in the case of other behavioral attributes, is learned through associations. He argued a person becomes delinquent due to an excessive number of rules and regulations, which cause the individual to deviate from

acceptable norms and behaviors. One may conclude an inmate, confined to cell with another individual, will invariably adopt similar patterns of behavior as the cellmate or any other inmate who closely associates or may exert influence over the inmate. One may further conclude prison policy frequently dictates the segregation of inmates, by race and or gang affiliation, to alleviate tensions and maintain order. Prisons have established rules and regulations, which may or may not be codified and are the basis for curtailing behavior while the inmate is incarcerated.

Merton's strain theory focused upon the "imbalance between cultural goals and institutional means" (Merton, 1938). Merton argued society has established a set of goals and norms, which must be achieved. However, a problem exists in that society and or the community does not prescribe a manner in which the individual must achieve the goals but still insists they must be achieved. A felon, who has recently been paroled or discharged from prison, is expected to become a viable member of the community but is stifled due to lack of skill, prison record, or education. Thus, the felon is unable to firmly assimilate into the established cultural goals of society verse the institutional restrictions thrust upon him while incarcerated.

Featherstone and Deflem (2002) argued Merton's strain theory presents a scenario where an individual is faced with attempting to obtain goods and services through legitimate means, and due to circumstances that prohibit the successful legal obtainment of means, the subject then turns to deviant behavior as the alternative. Additionally, Featherstone and Deflem argued the illegitimate means of obtaining the goals are only done so because society has blocked the efforts to obtain the goals by legitimate means.

One may equate Merton's theory to a felon, who has been discharged from the penal system, and seeks to gain employment but his efforts are hampered due to a felony conviction. Thus, the felon precluded from obtaining goods legitimately and resorts to criminal deviant behavior. The theoretical framework presented provides a basis for comprehending the behavioral patterns of inmates while incarcerated and upon released from prison.

Nature of the Study

This mixed methods case study included quantitative data from various sources including the ADOC, ABPP, Bureau of Justice (BoJ), and Alabama Senate Bills and Resolutions to name a few. Qualitative data was obtained through one-on-one interviews with staff members of the five selected prisons of the ADOC. The Executive Assistant Director for the ABPP and members of the Research and Planning Division, who are in charge of the ADOC's statistical information were also interviewed. This was accomplished to gain a much better understanding of the revolving door of inmates that the ADOC and the ABPP are facing. Additionally, to determine the rates of recidivism (dependent variable) in the selected correctional facilities, and in addition to the case study design, it was necessary to obtain information from a variety of individuals who worked directly with either the ABPP or the ADOC.

The convenience sampling of ADOC and ABPP personnel was the result of the availability of individuals, who volunteered to be interviewed, and were approved by either ADOC or the ABPP regarding rates of recidivism in Alabama. Information provided by the selected participants during one-on-one conversations was collected with

the use of two digital recorders, in locations requested by the interviewee or by phone, and was semi structured. The focus of the interviews was on prison programs, the inmate reentry process, and the effectiveness of current programs. Additionally, the interviewees were requested to offer information as to which prison programs most assisted inmates in securing employment once released from prison. The interviewing of inmates was prohibited by the ADOC and access to former inmate information was restricted. The interviewing of parolees was prohibited by the ABPP.

The independent variables, availability of vocational prison programs, reentry and prerelease programs, and metrics for selection, were partially derived from the ADOC and ABPP Monthly Statistical and Annual Reports respectively. The substance of the information regarding prison programs and the metrics for selection, were obtained through qualitative interviews of individuals enumerated above.

Definitions

There are several words and acronyms used in the context of this study, which may be unfamiliar to the reader. Provided is a list of the more frequently used words and acronyms and their definitions.

ADOC Jurisdictional Population: Defines an inmate sentenced by the court to the ADOC. ADOC Jurisdictional Population includes all inmates serving time within ADOC facilities/programs as well as the custody of other correctional authorities such as county jails, other states DOCs, Community Corrections Programs, Federal Prisons, and Privately Leased Facilities (ADOC, 2015).

Close Custody: Close custody is the most restrictive custody level and generally indicates that an inmate may be prone to violent behavior, is an escape risk or refuses to follow the rules and regulations. Close custody inmates are housed in a single cell and are allowed to leave the cell only for exercise and showering (ADOC, 2015).

COMPSTAT: Computer Statistics or Comparative Statistics, used by some correctional institutions as a means of reporting daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly inmate statistics (CDCR, 2014).

Custody Designation: A term used to determine the level of supervision an inmate receives once incarcerated (ADOC, 2015).

Evidence-Based Practices: Policies, programs, and procedures that have been researched and tested by a peer review process to show reductions in rates of recidivism. (SB 67, 2015, p. 6).

Inmate Classification Score System (ICS): System which is used by the CDCR to properly categorize inmates and to ensure inmates are housed accordingly. It is used as a standard inmate classification system throughout the CDCR and will be used by the ADOC (CDCR, 2014; ADOC, 2015).

Inmate Vocational Training: Training provided by the correctional facility to assist the inmate in obtaining skills that will be useful once the inmate is released. This term is frequently interchanged with the term Prison Industries such as the Alabama Correctional Industries.

Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R): An assessment used by the department of corrections to determine the probability of recidivism among high risk offenders (Manchak, 2008).

Maximum Security/Level IV: Maximum-security confinement for individuals who have committed serious offenses such as murder and armed robbery, and are high-risk offenders. This type of prison is categorized by housing units or cells that do not face exterior walls and are guarded by armed correctional officers inside and outside of the perimeter. These inmates are generally confined to their cells 23 hours a day and are afforded few amenities and programs (CDCR, 2014).

Medium Custody: Medium custody is for inmates who are considered appropriate for placement in general population. These inmates need additional observation but are suitable for dormitory living and participation in treatment programs and work assignments

Minimum Security Work Centers/Level I: Low security confinement for low risk offenders and those inmates who have not committed violent crimes. Open dormitories and a low security perimeter categorize this type of prison. Confinement includes work farms, boot camps, and forestry camps (CDCR, 2014).

Minimum Security/Level II: Minimum-security confinement for inmates who have committed less severe crimes. Open dormitories, a secure perimeter and a possibility of armed guards categorize this type of a prison. (ADOC, 2015, CDCR, 2014).

Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS): A classification system used as a prison screening, intake, and reentry tool (ORAS, 2010).

Reentry Program: This program offers information to inmates about life enrichment classes and valuable resources provided by the state. Additionally, the program affords the inmate the opportunity to obtain basic living skills to assist the inmate in transitioning from prison to civilian life (ADOC, 2015).

Rehabilitation Program: Programs designed to provide the inmate with useful skills in order to assist the inmate in reentering society (CDCR, 2014)

Secure Housing Unit (SHU): A unit comprised of cells, which house inmates that have been deemed the worst of the worst. Inmates are isolated from the general population and confined to their cells for approximately 23 hours a day (CDCR, 2014).

Supermax Prison: A prison designed to house inmates that are incorrigible, possess strong gang affiliation, or unable to adhere to the rules and policies of other prisons. Inmates sentenced to a Supermax prison are considered the worst of the worst. The former Alcatraz and the current Pelican Bay, located in California, are examples of Supermax prisons.

Validated Risk and Needs Assessment: “An instrument designed to assess an offender's relative risk for reoffending actuarial tool that has been validated and established by administrative rule in Alabama to determine the likelihood of an offender engaging in future criminal behavior . The ABPP, the ADOC, and the Sentencing Commission shall adopt compatible tools to conduct a validated risk and needs assessment upon offenders within the jurisdiction of the state. A validated risk and needs assessment shall include, but not be limited to, an offender's prior criminal history, the nature and severity of the present offense, and potential for future violence” (SB 67, 2015, p.7).

Assumptions

The mixed methods design of this study assumed the qualitative data assisted in explaining the quantitative data. Additionally, all interviews conducted with prison officials and staff knowledgeable regarding the criminal justice system would be accurate and reliable. However, due to the variety of interviews conducted from a diverse background of interviewees, and the databases from various governmental and private sources, several other assumptions were noted.

The very fundamental assumption, which is the basis for this study, is that all prisons, within the ADOC, offer some type of educational, vocational, rehabilitative, correctional industry, faith-based, or reentry program, to inmates under their jurisdiction. The second assumption is that inmates, predicated on their status, are allowed to participate in inmate programs. The third assumption is that each prison receives funding to support vocational, educational, rehabilitative, correctional industry, faith-based, and reentry programs.

The fourth assumption is that each individual prison reports statistics regarding all aspects of inmates including, but not limited to releases, inmates in specific programs, disciplinary actions, and escapes, to the ADOC's Research and Planning Division (RPD), in order to publish the ADOC's Monthly Statistical Report. The information derived from each prison provides quantitative data regarding inmate entries, releases, population, as well as a myriad of other information regarding inmates assigned to the prison.

The fifth assumption is regarding the validity of the information, which each prison sends to the RPD. It is assumed the curator of the statistics, extrapolated from each

prison, provides accurate information to the RPD. It is assumed the statistical information from the RPD is accurate and current. Further, it is assumed the qualitative interview, with the RPD staff, would provide information pertaining to prison statistics, and would be able to validate the information received from each prison. The sixth assumption is that there is a standardized checklist, which is used by the ABPP, to determine the eligibility of inmates to be paroled. It is further assumed that inmate participation in reentry, vocational, or other prison programs will be looked upon favorably by the ABPP.

Scope of Delimitations

The main focus of the study was to ascertain and analyze prison programs, within the ADOC, to determine if a relationship exists between prison programs and rates of recidivism. Since prison programs vary from rehabilitative for drug dependencies to correctional industries, it is imperative to comprehend the effectiveness of the program. Therefore, with the scarcity of prison funding in conjunction with the availability of prison reentry, vocational, or prison industry programs to prepare the inmate to reenter society is of paramount importance to ensure the individual does not recidivate. Additionally, the manner in which inmates are selected to participate in prison programs is not only crucial to the success of the program, but to the inmate. Therefore, this study focused primarily on inmate programs while incarcerated rather than post release activities.

The ADOC precludes the interviewing of current inmates. Originally, it was thought to draft a questionnaire, which would be administered by the parole office to parolees who had been released from the Draper, Kilby, Limestone, St. Clair, and

Tutwiler correctional institutions. The questionnaire would be administered to parolees and end of sentence convicts to ascertain their sentiments towards prison programs. However, this required special approval from the ABPP and as such, convicts were excluded from the case study. The wardens of the Draper, Kilby, Limestone, St. Clair, and Tutwiler correctional facilities and the classification and reentry coordinators, Public Information Manager, ABPP staff were interviewed.

Limitations

There were two limitations in this study. The first was the use of qualitative convenience sampling data collection. Participants were chosen due to their expertise in the field of corrections, statistics, and criminal justice. The participants were all employed by either the ADOC or the ABPP and therefore required to adhere to specific guidelines before speaking to the public. Each ADOC interview regarding correctional facility personnel required the approval of the ADOC's Public Information Officer (PIO) after securing permission from the warden of each of the prisons in the study. Additionally, since the prisons were located throughout the state, coordination with the ADOC's prison staff via the PIO to conduct the interviews was problematic in ensuring the interviewees would all be present at the time of the interview.

The second limitation was the denial of the researcher to interview parole officers assigned to each of the prisons in the study. A parole officer, employed by the ABPP, interviews the inmate and prepares a file to present to the ABPP's parole board. The file list programs that the inmate participated in, disciplinary actions, and a risk assessment. A survey instrument was constructed to address the content of the inmate file, interview

process, risk assessment, and parole board procedures. Additionally, each parole officer may have compiled the data in a different manner utilizing the ADOC risk assessment in conjunction with the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS) to determine the suitability of the inmate for parole. The ABPP would not grant me permission to speak to the parole officers but instead allowed me to interview one of their executive directors who had knowledge of the parole officer's duties while assigned to the prison. This limited my ability to compare and contrast interview data from the parole officers regarding ABPP policy and procedures and reduced the interview from 5 parole officers to one executive director.

One may deduce the ADOC and ABPP, during the interview process, may have exhibited a certain amount of reluctance to discuss the effectiveness of prison programs in relationship to reducing rates of recidivism. The triangulation method was used to ensure information obtained by sources, both civilian and law enforcement, was valid and accurate. Further, quantitative data compiled from ADOC, ABPP, Bureau of Justice (BoJ), Department of Justice (DoJ), and the Pew Center databases, provided information regarding rates of recidivism.

Significance of the Study

Recidivism has placed an economical strain on the state of Alabama in part due to the overcrowding of inmates in the prisons. The average cost to house an inmate is \$50.28 per day per inmate (ADOC, 2016). As noted earlier, the ADOC in-house custody levels of the close, medium, and minimum security prisons was 154%, 200%, and 270% capacity causing more funds to be expended to either erect new prisons and or reduce the

inmate population significantly (ADOC, 2016). With the present inmate population, it is extremely difficult for the ADOC to fulfill their mission, which in part is to provide rehabilitative programs for inmates that fall within the auspices of the facility's jurisdiction. The ADOC is also charged with providing an environment that is safe and secure where the inmate is afforded the opportunity to be rehabilitated and eventually reenter society and the community. This study seeks to assist in analyzing and measuring the effectiveness of the ADOCs' reentry, correctional industry, faith-based, rehabilitative, and vocational programs offered to inmates prior to release in relationship to rates of recidivism in the selected prisons. The results of the study may provide information to the ADOC regarding the viability of certain inmate programs. The study may pose a paradigm shift in the manner the ADOC collects data regarding rates of recidivism. It is important to once again highlight the ADOC's definition of recidivism, which excludes any offense that does not remand an individual back into the jurisdiction of the department of corrections. Developing a policy where the effectiveness of reentry, vocational, faith-based, and correctional industry programs can be measured in terms of reducing rates of recidivism, may assist the ADOC in choosing inmate prison programs, which are best suited in aiding the inmate in returning to the community and his/her family. Effective and efficient inmate prison programs may reduce rates of recidivism and the financial cost of housing inmates due to a decline in inmate population. The shift from expending funds to rehabilitate and train inmates, rather than merely housing them, may affect social change throughout the community and state by instilling a sense of

pride and accomplishment in the inmate. Therefore, the inmate may aspire to become a viable member of the community and society.

Summary

Chapter 1 provided an introduction to the study focusing upon the recidivism dilemma facing the ADOC, the ABPP, and the state of Alabama. The primary focus of the study involved analyzing current inmate prison, reentry, vocational, correctional industry, faith-based, and rehabilitative programs, excluding drug treatment, alcohol, mental treatment and general education programs, to ascertain their effectiveness and relationship in reducing rates of recidivism. To affect social change in the Alabama prison system, there must be several mechanisms to assist the inmate in curtailing their criminal activity once released from incarceration. This study may assist the ADOC and ABPP in reducing rates of recidivism.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature regarding rates of recidivism including facets of the theoretical framework for the study. Discussions regarding the rational choice, differential association, and the strain theories are integrated into the literature review. Additionally, Chapter 2 provides a review of inmate prison programs including reentry, vocational, and correctional industries.

Chapter 3 outlines and discusses the methodology for the study including the rationale for selecting a mixed methods case study, and the quantitative data used in conjunction with the qualitative interviews. The questions posed to the ADOC, ABPP, prison officials, and the Research and Planning Division of the ADOC, to name a few,

are presented including the method of collection. The setting for the study and the role of the researcher are also presented in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4 presents a detailed description and analysis of the data collection process for this study. The demographics of the participants is also presented. The techniques used to analyze the data are incorporated in Chapter 4.

Chapter 5 provides a thorough review of both the qualitative and quantitative data including, but not limited to, themes and the theoretical framework. The review will serve to answer the research questions posed in the Introduction Chapter of this study. Recommendations for further research and implications for social change are presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Recidivism has been a critical issue for law enforcement, prison systems, family, and community for decades. The Alabama correctional system has experienced a rapid growth in prison population due to a combination of factors including determinate sentencing regarding strict drug laws and repeat offenders who are unable to secure employment once released from custody (ADOC, 2015). Further, according to the March 2016 ADOC Monthly Statistical Report, the population in the close custody prisons (Level IV), is an average of 54.2% over design capacity. Additionally, the medium custody and minimum custody populations, as of March 2016, were 200% and 270.6% of design capacity (ADOC, 2016). The prison population, which vastly supersedes the design capacity, places staff members, correctional officers, and inmates in a precarious situation in that inmate and correctional officer safety is compromised. The ability of inmates to participate in vocational, educational, and industrial programs is greatly diminished due to the excess number of incarcerated inmates housed in the ADOC facilities.

Three compelling reasons for Alabama's current inmate situation have been noted. Stein and Stephens (2014) argued the first may be attributed to the Habitual Offender laws adopted in the 1980s. Stein and Stephens posited Alabama's Habitual Offender laws mandated lengthy prison sentences for low level repeat offenders, which contributed significantly to overcrowding but did not deter convicts from continued criminal activity.

The second is Alabama has the third highest incarceration rate, per capita, in the United States primarily due to the pro law enforcement culture that exists throughout the state (ADOC, 2014). Finally, the Alabama correctional system does not possess the staffing to adequately provide prison vocational, educational, and industrial training to all inmates that wish to avail themselves of said training, which precludes the inmate from acquiring basic skills to minimize the probability of recidivism (ADOC, 2014). The ADOC does not possess a means of measuring the effectiveness of inmate programs as they relate to rates of recidivism. The ADOC prison population has increased 840% since 1977 while the state's population has increased by a mere 23% (Stein and Stephens 2014).

Recidivism poses an economic and social impact to the family, community, and citizens of the State of Alabama. The average current cost to incarcerate an inmate is \$47.69 per day per inmate (ADOC, 2016). However, the cost to house an inmate in one of the 16 ADOC's major facilities is \$50.28 per inmate per day (ADOC, 2016). Funds that can be expended to further other needed social and assistance programs are being expended on housing inmates. Inmates, who are released to the community with no appreciable skills and with minimal education, are more apt to recidivate than those who have received reentry training to include some type of vocational, industrial, or educational training.

The purpose of my research is to assist the ADOC in identifying which inmate prison programs will be the most effective in reducing rates of recidivism among released inmates. Establishing a systematic process of measuring the viability of inmate programs,

which currently does not exist, will aid the ADOC in determining which programs should be continued or eliminated. A correctional facility system wide inmate prison program report will also assist the ADOC in preparing inmates to effectively reenter society, interact more easily with members of their family and community, and invariably lessen the probability the inmate will recidivate. Lower rates of recidivism assist the ADOC, and the state, in meeting the stated objective of reducing prison overcrowding.

Synopsis of Current Literature

Researchers have conducted studies regarding recidivism including but not limited to theories, causes, social factors, and methods to possibly curtail convicts from returning to a life of crime or engaging in deviant behavior not consistent with the norms of society. Researchers such as Bahr, Gibbs, Armstrong, Harris, and Fisher, who wrote “The Reentry Process: How Parolees Adjust to Release from Prison” (2005), or Petersilia’s work entitled “When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry” (2003), have conducted research regarding prisoner reentry and recidivism. Very little research has been conducted regarding the viability and effectiveness of inmate prison programs other than educational and substance abuse as they relate to reducing rates of recidivism. I have not discovered any research conducted regarding the relationship between Alabama’s prison programs and rates of recidivism. Additionally, the ADOC has not been able to measure the effectiveness of current prison programs as the criteria for entrance into each program varies from prison to prison.

The Alabama prison system is experiencing a severe overcrowding situation to the degree a Senate Joint Resolution was drafted and passed to address the critical prison

situation. Senate Joint Resolution 20 (SJR 20), signed by Governor Robert Bentley, on February 18, 2014. SJR 20 established a Prison Reform Task Force to specifically address the critical inmate and staffing issues in the Alabama prison system.

To explore the overcrowding issue in the Alabama prison system, one must also address rates of recidivism as one of the root causes. To that end, it is necessary to compare three definitions of recidivism; one provided by the PEW Center, one by the ADOC, and the last from Senate Bill 412 (SB 412). The PEW Center defines recidivism as: “The act of criminal offending despite having been punished. The prison recidivism rate is the proportion of persons released from prison who are rearrested, reconvicted or returned to custody within a specified time period, typically three years” (PEW Center, 2011, p. 7).

Conversely, the ADOC has a somewhat narrower definition of recidivism, which may adversely affect the statistical information provided by the ADOC. The ADOC defines recidivism as “any felon, who has been released from the ADOC system and commits a criminal act within three years, and is subsequently returned to ADOC jurisdiction (ADOC, 2014, p. 6). A third definition of recidivism is noted in Alabama Senate Bill (SB 412), which reads: “A subsequent conviction or plea of *nolo contendere* in this or any other state or federal court of the United States within three years of successful completion of, or termination from, drug court for any offense carrying a sentence of one year or more” (SB 412, 2014, p. 3).

For the purposes of my research, the ADOC’s definition of recidivism was utilized due to the quantitative and qualitative information received from the department

of corrections and the ABPP. In doing so, individuals who may have been arrested and convicted of a criminal offense, but not remanded to the jurisdiction of the ADOC, may not have been documented as a recidivist. This is due to the fact the ADOC does not possess the capability to do so unless other jurisdictions provide the information to the Research and Planning Division of the department of corrections. Recidivism, in the ADOC prison system poses a social and economic dilemma, which may be curtailed by the availability and use of effective vocational, industrial, rehabilitative, and reentry programs.

Major Chapter Sections

Chapter two contains four major subsections: Literature Search Strategy, Theoretical Foundation, Literature Review Related to Key Variables and Concepts, and Summary and Conclusions. Literature Search Strategy discusses the methodology incorporated for searching pertinent literature as it relates to the effect of inmate prison programs on rates of recidivism. Key search terms, years searched, and types of literature are discussed in this section.

The theoretical foundation section presents the framework used in the study. The theories, major propositions and hypotheses are presented. An analysis of the theories incorporated in the study as well as a rationale for the theories utilized in the current study, and previous research will follow. The selected theories and research questions are discussed as they relate to the manner in which the selected theories are presented. Key statements and definitions relevant to the theoretical framework conclude this section.

The literature review related to the Key Variables and Concepts section discusses the literature pertinent to the constructs and methodology of the study. The uniqueness of the study, as it directly pertains to the Alabama correctional system, limited prior research in the field. The nexus between prison programs and rates of recidivism is discussed in this section. A review of the studies related to the independent and dependent variables as they relate to the study are presented. Varying views of the effectiveness of different prison programs will be discussed.

The Summary and Conclusions section discusses the major themes in the literature including what is known and what is not known regarding the relationship of rates of recidivism and prison programs. This section describes the gap in literature between the current study and what has previously been researched in the field of prison programs. Chapter Two will conclude with a brief transition to Chapter Three connecting the gap in literature to the methods utilized in the study.

Literature Search Strategy

The nature of recidivism encompasses a wide variety of literature, and as such, search efforts began with accessing databases through the Walden Library Portal and the EBSCOhost search engine. The following databases were used to extract peer reviewed literature. They were: Criminal Justice Periodicals, Political Science: A Sage Full Text Collection, Policy Administration and Security, SocINDEX, and ProQuest Central. Each of these databases was used to net a particular type of information.

The criminal justice periodicals were used to obtain information regarding current prison policies, procedures, and problems that were experienced throughout the United

States Penal system. The Sage Text Collection netted peer reviewed articles regarding recidivism and prison programs, to name a few. The Policy Administration and Security in conjunction with the LEXIS NEXUS database were used to research case law and public policy. Articles from both databases were legal decisions, Senate, and Assembly Bills. ProQuest Central was used to research articles and dissertations relating to recidivism and prison programs. SocINDEX was used to research any sociological views regarding reentry adjustments of inmates into society. Petersilia's work regarding reentry of inmates into society is referenced in the SocINDEX.

Statistical information was obtained through the DoJ, BoJ, ABPP, and the ADOC databases, Monthly Statistical Reports, and Annual Reports. The most significant quantitative data, which was used in the study, was obtained from the ABPP and ADOC Monthly Statistical and Annual reports. The data from the BoJ and DoJ was used to augment ABPP and ADOC data.

The key terms used to search the listed databases were recidivism, prison, parole, and supervised reentry. Additional terms were prison programs, reentry, vocational, prison industries, and substance abuse programs. These terms were first used separately and subsequently used in conjunction with the common denominator of prison.

Literature regarding prison programs, other than educational and substance abuse, is rather sparse with the bulk of the literature focusing upon the benefits of educational prison programs, such as general education (GED). Literature pertaining to substance abuse programs (SAP) has been the focus of previous research. One may deduce the abundance of literature in the area of GED and SAP may partly be due to the ability to

measure the success of each of these programs by individuals who obtain a GED certificate and are able to obtain employment or by those who receive SAP treatment and do not recidivate (Stein et al., 2014). There is very little, if any, literature examining the relationship between rates of recidivism and Alabama's vocational, industrial, or reentry prison programs. Therefore, literature pertaining to prison programs and recidivism encompassed 1999 to present. Theories incorporated in the study begin with Merton's 1938 Anomie and Strain Theory to Cornish and Clark's 2006 Rational Choice Theory. The information and data obtained regarding criminal theories was derived from three publications. They were: *Criminological Theory Past and Present*, *Criminological Theories Bridging the Past to the Future*, and *Criminological Theory Context and Consequences*. All three of these publications provided an inordinate amount of information regarding criminal theory and were the predominate source of information regarding criminal theory.

The study incorporated peer reviewed articles from the listed databases, quantitative data from the ADOC, ABPP DoJ, and BoJ, Senate and Assembly Bills, and articles appearing in the *Huntsville Times* newspaper. Due to the scarcity of information regarding the Alabama correctional system, it was necessary to procure information from the secondary sources including the DoJ and BoJ. The triangulation method was utilized to ensure accuracy.

Theoretical Framework

There are several theories, which have been introduced by researchers, to explain criminal behavior. Classical criminal theory by Cesare Beccaria, suggests individuals will

refrain from committing further deviant acts, if the punishment for said acts is swift and severe to the degree where the individual will be dissuaded from further activity. This concept is the basis for close custody (Level IV) prisons and segregated housing units (SHU), which serve to correct behavior by instilling stringent restrictions with very little rehabilitative methods. However, some close custody prisons that are devoid of rehabilitative programs are not able to provide the inmate with training to reduce the probability of the individual recidivating.

The theoretical section begins with Sutherland's Theory of Differential Association. Cornish and Clarke's Rational Choice Theory is next ending with Merton's Theory of Strain. The three theories comprise the theoretical framework of the study.

The theories were extrapolated from three textbook sources. They were: *Criminological Theory Past and Present*, *Criminological Theories Bridging the Past to the Future*, and *Criminological Theory Context and Consequences*. Each theory presented is accompanied with an analysis of the relationship between the theory and the study.

Theory of Differential Association

Sutherland (1947) argued an individual will learn deviant behavior in the same manner as the individual learns what behavior is favorable and thus acceptable to society. An inmate will interact with other individuals to socialize and be accepted by the group. In doing so, the inmate will either assimilate and abide by the conditions as set forth by the correctional facility or continue to exhibit deviant behavior. Sutherland further argued a person will continue to exhibit deviant behavior because of an excess of policies, laws,

and regulations, which are unfavorable and difficult for the inmate to accept and maintain. This is in effect the basis for Sutherland's sixth proposition.

Sutherland argued there are nine propositions. The propositions relate his theory of differential association to criminal or deviant behavior. The first four propositions may be reduced to one sentence: criminal behavior, including those techniques and procedures that are illegal and deviant, are learned through intimate relations such as in the setting of a prison with other inmates.

The final five propositions relate to the needs and values of the inmate in relationship to the strict adherence to policy and regulations instituted by the correctional facility. The inmate faces a quagmire in that the need to affiliate with a criminal element to ensure survival become at odds with the many regulations and restrictions imposed upon the inmate. The needs and values of the inmate are jeopardized as the inmate must either be rehabilitated by participating in prison rehabilitative, vocational, or rehabilitative programs instead of subjecting himself to learning the criminal behavior that will invariably be present while incarcerated.

The propositions correlate to inmates and prison programs, or lack thereof. Propositions one, two, three, and four speak to criminal behavior being learned with the assistance of intimate personal groups, which serve to motivate and rear the inmate to a particular type of behavior. One must then focus on proposition eight, which specifically states the methodology utilized to learn criminal activity is the same that is used to learn any other activity. One may argue if prison rehabilitative programs are available, the same cognitive skills utilized by inmates to influence others to continue criminal activity,

can be used by other inmates to promote rehabilitative, vocational, and industrial programs in order to prepare the individual to reenter society. The same type of kinships that are developed to promote criminal activity while incarcerated, will inspire and motivate the inmate to participate in a prison program. Developing positive kinships will increase the likelihood the inmates will not recidivate once released from prison.

Proposition nine discusses criminal behavior as an expression of the needs and values of an individual. The value offered and obtained by a rehabilitative, industrial, vocational, or reentry program serves to satisfy the inmate's needs. Participation in inmate programs are in lieu of resorting to the influence others may exhibit to engage in criminal or deviant activity.

Akers (1997) presented his Social Learning Theory, which expounded upon Sutherland's Differential Association Theory. Akers argued individuals learn to commit criminal acts predicated upon the environment. An individual, who is exposed to criminal or deviant behavior as a matter of routine, will accept and learn the traits used to commit criminal acts and thus become proficient as any other individual would master a craft having been exposed to and practice a particular activity. The individual, based upon the degree of the criminal behavior, will receive some type of reward for the act. Conversely, if the criminal act does not meet the standards as set forth by the group, punishment may be inflicted.

An inmate must assimilate into the culture of the prison environment and is immediately faced with a dilemma as to which type of behavior, deviant or model prisoner, he will follow. The inmate may either subscribe to the criminal social learning

of inmates who he has developed close kinships or choose acceptable behavior in the form of rehabilitation and the norms of established prison regulations. The inmate, due to self preservation, may involuntarily exhibit deviant reflex behavior associated with the conditioning he receives while in prison (Banduras, 1973).

The variables associated with either deviant behavior or conformity to the policy and regulations of the prison is predicated upon the direction and influence the inmate receives while incarcerated (Akers, 1997). One may infer prison rehabilitative, reentry, vocational, or educational programs, available to the inmate, will serve as a positive reward to dissuade the individual from participating in criminal or deviant behavior. As the probability of rehabilitation opportunities increases, the likelihood the inmate will succumb to the influence of criminal behavior is lessened. The inmate must realize if he disapproves of certain deviant acts and attitudes, engaging in deviant behavior is minimal. If the attitude of the inmate is such that he approves or posits the behavior cannot be helped due to the environment, then the individual will accept the behavior as morally permissible (Colvin, 2000).

Although Sutherland's theory of differential association has been cited in numerous works related to criminal behavior and recidivism, it has not been applied directly to inmate prison programs. There is a correlation between criminal behavior, as learned by inmates and demonstrated by Sutherland's theory, and prison programs. Prison rehabilitative, vocational, and industrial programs may offer a positive learning environment thereby minimizing the probability inmates will engage in deviant or

criminal behavior verse participating in activities, which will assist them in securing employment once released from prison.

The differential association and social learning theories speak to behavior that is learned through interaction with others through close social ties. The behavior exhibited by those who avail themselves of inmate programs provides inmates with a positive view of life after incarceration. Behavior may be positively influenced predicated upon variables such as rehabilitative, vocational, or industrial prison programs.

Theory of Rational Choice

Cornish and Clarke (1986) present their theory of rational choice as a means of determining what choices an individual will make regarding criminal behavior. Several factors or variables may contribute significantly to the choices an inmate will make regarding their behavior while incarcerated. The inmate's background is the foundation for deviant behavior. Cornish and Clark argued psychological factors such as temperament and intelligence form the inmate's ability to rationalize the situation of being incarcerated and request assistance to deviate from the behavior, which caused him to be imprisoned. Other background factors including how the inmate was reared and socialized also play a critical part in the behavioral pattern of the inmate (Cornish et al., 1986).

Another major variable is the inmate's previous experience and learning including but not limited to crime involvement, contacts with law enforcement, prior arrests, incarcerations, and moral attitudes, which can be attributed to the enumerated experiences noted. An inmate, who has prior arrests and or incarcerations has performed

a cost benefit analysis as to whether to continue committing crime, with the possibility of being apprehended, versus the benefits of said actions prior to being arrested and confined (Cornish and Clarke, 1986). A similar cost benefit analysis transpires while the inmate is contemplating what needs must be satisfied while incarcerated.

While Cornish and Clarke argued the choice to deviate from accepted behavior is left to the individual, Tittle (1995) argued there is a specific formula, incorporated in his control balance theory, which may preclude the individual from making a rational choice, or at least one that will not affect the ability of the inmate to resist criminal activity. The control an individual, or a group, exerts over the inmate while incarcerated may adversely affect the inmate's ability to accept or reject the norms of the correctional facility versus the norms established by other inmates. This formula is expressed as: $D=CE/EP$, where D represents deviance, CE represents control a person exercised, and EP represents control which is exercised over a person. Tittle argued if there is an imbalance of CE/EP, deviance will occur. The controlling person's use of debasement, belittlement or humiliation, all of which occur with regularity in prison and may be delivered by other inmates or prison staff, may attribute to the imbalance of provocation. The greater the imbalance, the more likely deviance or criminal behavior will manifest (Tittle, 1995).

Colvin (2000) expounds on the rational choice and control balance theories by presenting a variable, an individual's background, which frequently contributes to criminal and deviant behavior of inmates. Colvin argued the reward system is an essential element to criminal behavior, especially in prison. Conversely, the prison punishment system, predicated upon whether the punishment is administered fairly and proportional

to the offense, is frequently construed as coercive to the inmates and promotes unrest and unruly behavior. The mere fact that one is incarcerated, without the ability of freedom of movement, in and of itself is coercive as the individual is subjected to stringent state or federal control (Colvin, 2000). Colvin refers to a situation that transpired on February 2 and 3, 1980, at the Penitentiary of New Mexico, the only Maximum Security Prison in the state, as an example of coercive control over the inmates.

Inmates at the New Mexico Penitentiary had been offered a variety of rehabilitation programs, which satisfied their needs to be productive. A reduction of funds for the New Mexico Penitentiary necessitated a change in prison policy regarding the availability of inmate programs. As the programs and incentives diminished, coercive control, “providing low levels of support and a myriad of restrictions on behavior”, and punishment began to rise (Colvin, 2000, p 36). The result was an increase in coercion, which is a tactic of intimidation either by fear or the removal of support by the prison staff members. This created an atmosphere of dissention and inimical behavior among the inmates who had previously received rewards in the form of educational, vocational, and early release programs in exchange for continued good behavior. During the 2-day riot, 33 inmates were killed while over 200 other inmates and staff members were wounded. Causes of the riot were cited as overcrowding (1,136 inmates with a design capacity of 900), meals that were barely consumable, and the elimination of most vocational, educational, and rehabilitative prison programs (Colvin, 2000). The two most prevalent factors contributing to the riot were the lack of prison programs and overcrowding. One may argue regardless of the prison conditions that are thrust upon an inmate, the decision

to commit crime or engage in activities that are not within the guidelines of acceptable prison behavior, notwithstanding the critical coercion variable, rests upon the inmate.

Tittle (1995) and Colvin (2000) provide variables to Cornish and Clark's rational choice theory. Given the extensive influence other inmates have on individuals while incarcerated, one may lend greater credence to why individuals recidivate within three years of being released. Coercive behavior toward the inmate by either other inmates or prison staff, combined with strict controls limiting the movement and socialization of the individual, may contribute significantly to repeated acts of criminal activity.

Cornish and Clark's rational choice theory, in conjunction with Tittle and Colvin's work, provide a substantial foundation as to why inmates behave in a manner, which frequently is inimical and destructive. This is exemplified by Colvin's research regarding the New Mexico's Penitentiary prison riot in 1980. Contributing factors to the riot at New Mexico Penitentiary were overcrowding and the lack of prison programs to provide inmates with a sense of self-worth. Overcrowding exist in the ADOC prison system as well as the ability to provide a myriad of prison programs due to staffing issues. These problematic areas will be expounded in Chapter Three.

To a certain degree, an inmate's decision to engage in deviant or criminal behavior verse productive inmate programs is the choice the individual must decide. This does not negate the fact that there may be substantial positive or negative influences affecting the inmate's behavior. The influences may either contribute significantly to the deviant behavior of the inmate or offer the individual a means of elevating himself to a

position, once released, where they are able to assimilate into the community as a viable member.

Theory of Anomie and Strain

Merton (1938) first introduced his theory of theory of anomie and strain as a means of explaining plausible causes of criminal behavior. There have been several variations of Merton's work, which have been used as a basis for further research. To that end, classical strain theory suggests individuals are pressured into crime when they are prevented from achieving cultural, monetary, and status goals. classical anomie theory argues society places great emphasis on monetary success or goals but fails to adequately address the means to achieve the prescribed goals. An individual is likely to pursue the goals by whatever means necessary in order to obtain status, wealth, or power (Merton, 1938).

Although Merton's theory is somewhat antiquated, his theory of strain is applicable to the pressures thrust upon individuals while incarcerated. Merton presented two plausible theories regarding deviant behavior, both of which are applicable to inmates while incarcerated in prison. An examination of Merton's anomie and strain theory presents a possible relationship between deviant behavior and the decision of the inmate to pursue rehabilitative measures as a means of securing employment once released from prison.

Merton argued individuals (inmates) are more likely to illicit illegal or deviant behavior to obtain goals when they are precluded from doing so through legitimate means (Merton, 1938). Featherstone and Deflem (2003) argued in the case of an anomie,

cultural goals are overemphasized to the detriment of institutional means. To further comprehend Featherstone's argument, one may deduce the cultural goals are those developed and instituted by the inmates; a code so to speak. The institutional means equate to the policy, rules, and regulations set forth by the correctional facility. An inmate is faced with the decision to either abide by the expectations of the institution and to conform to the standards of prison conduct as delineated by the correctional facility or exhibit behavior in a manner in which the individual must conduct himself as a means of survival among other inmates. A strain exists as the inmate must pursue whatever means necessary to survive thus placing the cultural goals over the institutional goals.

Merton argued an individual will invariably adjust to the patterns and goals by exhibiting one or more behavioral traits referred to as modes of adaption. The first and most common mode of adaption is conformity, where an individual accepts both the cultural and institutional goals. One may equate this to an inmate's initial arrival at a correctional facility where the individual is informed of the policy, rules, regulations, and expectations of the ADOC. A formal socialization process is conducted by the facility to assist the inmate in assimilating into the rigid standards and expectations of the correctional system. This typically transpires in a reception center prior to the inmate being assigned to a permanent correctional facility. In Alabama, the Kilby Reception Correctional Center is tasked with receiving all inmates and providing an evaluation of the inmate to assist the ADOC main office in determining what correctional facility will best suit the needs of the inmate.

The second mode of adaption is innovation. In this phase, the inmate accepts the cultural goals as set forth by other inmates. However, the inmate typically experiences difficulty in accepting the policy, regulations, and rules of the correctional facility, which he or she must follow. A strain exists between the acceptance of the institutional means and therefore possibly alienating the individual from the established cultural goals of the inmates. The inmate must devise a manner in which the behavior is accepted by other inmates but not to the degree where punishment is inflicted upon him for deviating from the correctional rules and regulations.

The third mode of adaption is ritualism. In this mode, an individual frequently rejects the cultural goals but accepts the institutionalized means. I would argue an inmate, after a normative time span of being incarcerated, falls into a specific regimented ritual, which is the product of being institutionalized or rehabilitated. The inmate accepts the rules, policy, and regulations of the institution with the understanding that good behavior will provide a reward. During the New Mexico Penitentiary riot of 1980, the inmates had rationalized good behavior equated to substantial rewards in the form of a variety of prison programs and early releases. When the rewards ceased, but the expectations for inmates to behave in accordance with established prison policy remained, the inmates exhibited violent and destructive behavior.

The fourth mode of adaption is retreatism, where an inmate rejects the cultural goals of the inmate's creed and the means of society or institution. Inmates in this mode of adaption exhibit inimical behavior toward the staff and other inmates. The behavior

leads to either punishment inflicted upon the inmate by the correctional facility or confrontation with inmates.

The final mode of adaption is rebellion. In this mode, the inmate rejects both the institutional means and cultural goals. The inmate substitutes their own goals for those imposed upon him by the institution and other inmates. This mode of adaption may lead to the inmate being placed in a Secure Housing Unit (SHU), which is designed to rectify the behavior of those inmates that are deemed incorrigible, problematic, or pose a detriment to the safety of other inmates or staff (ADOC, 2012).

Featherstone and Deflem (2003) argued Merton's original anomie and strain theory has been used to explain why individuals engage in deviant behavior and are prone to continue to commit illegal acts regardless of the consequences. Merton extolled when there is an imbalance between cultural goals (inmate accepted norms) and socially accepted means (correctional facility rules and regulations), a deinstitutionalization of legitimate means (anomie) occurs (Merton, 1938). Similarly, when various barriers preclude the individual from achieving specified goals, the individual is forced to obtain or achieve goals through alternate means thus creating a strain.

Theoretical Conclusion

The three theories discussed are relevant to the degree that they are applicable to inmates who must assimilate into a culture that is frequently vastly different than the norm. The inmates must make rational choices and accept the rules and regulations of the institution and be rehabilitated or engage in deviant behavior. The culture shift transpires while under the enormous strain of being confined with little or no control over one's

well-being. Sutherland (1947) argued individuals will learn criminal behavior and exhibit traits in the same manner as any other learning activity. Tittle (1995) argued as inmates experience belittlement, coercion, or humiliation, they are constantly reminded they have very little control over their lives, which invariably leads to deviant behavior. Colvin (2000) argued incarceration, beyond one's control, is coercive and lends itself to criminal behavior. Cornish and Clarke (1986) argued an individual makes a rational choice as to whether to engage in criminal behavior while incarcerated or follow the established rules and regulations of the correctional facility. Many variables affect the inmate's decision as to what course of action he may follow. Unfortunately, there may be only two options available: survival by affiliating with other inmates who exhibit deviant behavior or survival by adhering to the institution's established policy and procedures to ensure rehabilitation, which may lead to conflict and strain with other inmates.

Honor

Wyatt-Brown (1986) presented a new dimension, which may explain certain deviant behavior by inmates. She argued there are three critical aspects of honor, that are innate qualities of most individuals. The first is the notion of self worth and individuality. Inmates relinquish individuality upon incarceration but retain a sense of self worth through their ability to be rehabilitated by obtaining a skill that may be useful once released or by status within the inmate structure. The second aspect of honor is the ability of the inmate to be recognized by other inmates as one who possesses power and prestige. The third and most critical aspect of honor is reputation. An inmate's reputation, either prior to being incarcerated or while in prison, earns the individual a certain status among

the other inmates. Honor is reputation and self esteem, which are two attributes that are revered and necessary for each inmate to survive while in prison (Wyatt-Brown, 1986).

Ironically, honor is typically associated with an inner virtue to perform good deeds and earn the respect of others. Honor regarding inmates is reputation that is earned through power, prestige, or deviant behavior and is considered the primary influence on inmates second only to physical appearance. Reputation is one of the most critical attributes an inmate may possess and will either hinder or assist the individual in being rehabilitated.

Inmate Prison Programs

For the purposes of this study, inmate prison programs were separated into six basic categories. They are drug rehabilitation, educational, faith based, prison industry, reentry, and vocational inmate programs. Each of these prison programs offers the inmate an opportunity to participate in a rehabilitation and is designed to assist the individual in reentering society with either a useful skill (Latessa, 2004).

The ADOC compiles data on inmates who have completed drug treatment programs in accordance with the Alabama Crime Bill, also known as the Substance Abuse Program (SAP). In many cases, inmates must complete the SAP prior to release predicated upon the type of drug conviction or conditions of parole or release (ADOC, 2015). Statistical data is also compiled for inmates who have entered and completed an educational program such as the GED. The educational programs and the SAP are closely monitored by the ADOC and reported monthly in the ADOC Monthly Statistical Report as well as the ADOC Annual Report (ADOC, 2016).

Data regarding the availability and duration of the in-house reentry program varies from prison to prison based upon the modules each correctional facility adopts (Table 1). The data provided in the ADOC Monthly Statistical and Annual Reports provides the number of individuals, system wide, which have entered and completed the program. There is no information regarding the number of inmates who have recidivated after going through the program or the type of inmate, end of sentence (EOS), parolee, split sentence inmate, who availed themselves of the program. The in-house reentry program is not a mandatory requirement for an inmate to be released from prison.

The ADOC does not publish data regarding the number of inmates in faith-based or vocational training nor is there an established method to determine whether any inmate prison program reduces rates of recidivism. Faith-based, prison industry, reentry, and vocational programs will comprise the bulk of the discussion regarding inmate prison programs. The relationship between educational programs and rates of recidivism has been researched in depth and will be mentioned briefly in the Literature Review. The remaining four categories of inmate prison programs will be presented, albeit there is very little research pertaining to the effectiveness of faith based, prison industries, reentry, and vocational programs and rates of recidivism.

Faith-Based Inmate Programs

Faith-based or religious based inmate programs have historically been used as a method to rehabilitate inmates through reading biblical passages. It was thought having the inmate become familiar with the bible would lessen the probability he would recidivate and ease his transition from prison life to the community. Through spiritual

reading, the inmate would adopt prosocial behavior rather than exhibiting violent tendencies while incarcerated and when released from custody (Roman, Wolff, Correa, and Buck, 2007). Dodson, Cabage, and Klenowski (2011) argued faith-based programs are considered intentional education, which serves a rehabilitative purpose. Secular education serve to enhance the inmate's ability to secure employment once released.

Conclusions regarding the positive effectiveness of faith-based programs in reducing rates of recidivism have been challenged by various researchers. Individuals, who participate in Christian based programs that emphasize prayer, Bible study, and spiritual transformation, visualize the program as a means of avoiding future offending. Thus, inmates are less likely to engage in criminal behavior once engaged in a faith-based program (Dodson et al., 2011).

Roman, Wolf, Correa, and Buck (2007) argued the most comprehensive study regarding the effectiveness of inmate faith-based programs was performed by Johnson and Larson (2003) in which they examined the Inner Change Freedom Initiative (IFI). The IFI was developed by the Prison Fellowship Ministries as a pre-prison release program to provide inmates with biblical education, life skills, community service, leadership, GED tutoring, drug abuse prevention instruction, and various support groups to assist inmates in reentering the family and community. An evaluation of the program revealed inmates, who completed all phases of the program, were 50% less likely to recidivate within two years as compared to inmates who either did not enroll or complete the program (Johnson & Larson, 2003).

The IFI program is provided in three phases over a 16-24-month period. A graduate of the program must complete all three phases of the program in addition to a 6-month aftercare program. During the program, the inmate attends weekly Bible study classes for an hour and a 1-3-day seminar offered several times during the year. The inmate receives a maximum of fifty hours of Bible study and several days of in depth seminars where the individual is isolated from the general population and is placed within a IFI group. Upon release from prison, the inmate attends regular aftercare sessions for a period of 6 months and is in constant contact with a mentor (Johnson and Larson, 2003). IFI states the recidivism rate for individuals who complete the entire program is considerably less than those participants who were not graduates of the program. (17.3% vs 50%)

The IFI program is extensive and requires at least 6 months of close aftercare supervision for the individual to be considered a graduate. The IFI program measures the recidivism rate as an individual who is arrested and/or convicted of a crime within two years rather than three years, which does not meet the ADOC or the PEW Center's definition of recidivism (ADOC, 2015; PEW Center, 2011). The disparity in the definition of recidivism may have skewed the results if the IFI utilized the industry standard of three years rather than two years.

The intensive 16-24-month faith-based program, albeit staffed by volunteers, necessitated the use of additional prison staff to thoroughly review each inmate's prison and arrest record to determine the suitability for the program. Factors such as disciplinary record, release plans to halfway houses, and pending detainers were reviewed. If selected,

the inmate was directed to complete a 30-day self-study program. After completion of the self-study phase, a committee comprised of members from the Texas Department of Criminal Justice and the IFI reviewed the inmate's progress and made the final determination as to whether the inmate was suitable for the program. If the inmate met all criteria, he was then transferred to the Vance Unit, which is a special unit specifically for IFI participants (Johnson and Larson, 2003).

The example provided by IFI is atypical of inmate faith-based programs both in duration and procedure. The relationship between inmate faith-based programs and reductions in rates of recidivism have not been thoroughly researched. Evans, Cullen, Dunaway & Burton (1995) argued they had discovered six studies related to religion and deviant behavior. In each study, there was evidence of an inverse relationship between adult deviance and religion.

Johnson and Larson (2003) argued faith-based programs offer similar services as other secular programs with the goal of curtailing the inmate's deviant or criminal behavior, thus reducing the probability the inmate will recidivate once released. Dodson et al. (2007) argued that the inmate must possess a dedication to succeed in the program. Regardless of whether the program is faith-based or secular, the inmate's conviction toward the program will determine the probability the individual will recidivate.

Policy makers and prison officials, due to the lower costs of the programs, are becoming more interested in faith-based prison programs. They see the programs as a possible solution to curtail inmate violence and to reduce overcrowding as a result of many factors including recidivism. However, as Dodson et al. argued, more research

needs to be conducted to positively state there exists a relationship between faith-based programs and recidivism.

Prison Industry

Latessa (2004) argued because prisons are rarely self sufficient, and consume a large portion of a state's budget, the correctional facility must provide a means of offsetting the cost of housing inmates. Hattery (2008) agreed and argued the cost of housing inmates places an economic burden on states. The cost incurred to house inmates places a strain on state budgets.

Kiltz (2010) argued the inmate population of the United States has increased dramatically in direct proportion with the costs of housing offenders in correctional facilities. This is exemplified by the staggering rising cost of corrections in Alabama. The 2013 Alabama Budget reflects the cost for corrections in 2013 was \$438,064,150.00. In 2014, the cost was \$477,126,691.00. In 2015, due to budget reductions, the allotted funds for corrections were \$469,123,402.00.

Historically, to offset prison costs, many states employ inmates to perform manual labor by maintaining the prison grounds, city highways, and manufacturing goods. Correctional facilities produce furniture, vehicle license plates, machined parts, institutional clothing and mattresses, as well as janitorial products. Inmates are paid a sub-par wage, which is transferred to the inmate's prison account so that he may purchase goods at the prison commissary. Although some type of prison industry has been in existence for decades, very little research has been conducted to determine the relationship between inmates who participate in prison industries and rates of recidivism.

Kiltz (2010) provided information regarding a 2006 Oregon longitudinal correctional study. The study focused upon the correlation between inmate work experience and rates of recidivism. Kiltz adds the Oregon study is one of the few conducted addressing the relationship between rates of recidivism and prison work programs.

The Portland State University Criminal Justice and Policy Research Institute, in conjunction with the Oregon Department of Corrections (ODC) and the Oregon Correctional Enterprises (OCE), chose fifty-three inmates to participate in the research study. Pre-selection factors included employment, training, and education prior to incarceration. Due to the limited number of participants, the study was not able to provide a definitive conclusion regarding the viability or effectiveness of prison work programs in reducing rates of recidivism. Although the conclusions did not clearly show a nexus between an inmate's prison work experience and rates of recidivism once the same inmate is released from custody and secures employment, the study did raise the question regarding inmate prison programs. The effectiveness of inmate prison programs, as they relate to reducing rates of recidivism, is difficult to measure.

In 1999, Yae conducted an analysis regarding the viability of prison industries. Research regarding correctional industries provides an insight as to the logic of why correctional institutions face substantial hurdles in maintaining a profit for goods that are manufactured by prisons. This invariably limits industrial programs available to inmates.

Yae (1999) argued there are several problems associated with prison industries. Among them are: an untrained workforce, and lack of ability to work effectively with

other inmates in a team work atmosphere. Additionally, correctional facilities experienced work stoppage due to prison procedures including strict control of tools, and the inherent difficulty in moving materials necessary for fabrication in and out of the correctional facility. One other major factor is the high turnover rate of inmate workers due to sabotage of the equipment, disciplinary actions or disgruntled workers (Yae, 1999).

Prison industries must be competitive to be profitable. Achieving this goal is difficult for most correctional industries due to state and local regulations. State regulations preclude the prison from distributing and selling manufactured goods to any entities other than governmental agencies. The Alabama Correctional Industries (ACI) is hampered by similar regulations. Alabama Law Regular Session 1976, Act Number 286, mandates ACI may only sell goods, manufactured by inmates, to state departments and political subdivisions of the state. An additional requirement imposed is that the state departments must be supported in whole or in part by monies derived from taxation.

Regardless of the inherent difficulties in maintaining prison industries, inmates who participate in prison industries obtain a sense of work ethic and are provided an opportunity to not only earn a wage, but to develop a skill. Latessa (2004) argued one of the most effective treatment programs to rectify deviant or criminal behavior is to assess the offender's ability to change, and then afford him the opportunity to garner a skill. Prison or correctional industries serve to provide a skill to the inmate and to reduce operational costs of housing inmates as well as provide a source of revenue for the correctional facility. The following paragraphs discuss the ACI program, which is a

division of the ADOC. Information extrapolated from the ADOC's Monthly Statistical Report provides statistical data regarding the number of inmates employed and the goods each prison produces.

The ADOC inmate custody population includes inmates where the ADOC maintains and or oversees custody of an inmate sentenced by the court. The ADOC March 2016 in-house inmate population was 24,189, which includes inmates that are in transient between correctional facilities and all inmates that are housed in any ADOC facility (ADOC, 2016). Of the 16 Alabama minimum to close custody correctional facilities, 6 institutions comprise the ACI. The following is a list of the correctional facility with the product(s) each facility produces. Each of the correctional facilities listed are in-custody facilities, which range from minimum to close custody.

- Chair Plant - Ventress Medium Security Correctional Facility: (Clayton)
- Chemical Plant - St. Clair Close Security Correctional Facility: (Springville)
- Furniture Restoration - St. Clair Correctional Facility (Springville)
- Mattress Plant - St. Clair Correctional Facility (Springville)
- Modular Plant - St. Clair Correctional Facility (Springville)
- Tutwiler/ Holman Clothing Manufacturing - Tutwiler Female Medium Security (Wetumpka)
- Construction/Remodeling - Montgomery Draper Furniture - Draper Correctional Facility (Elmore)
- Draper/Bibb Furniture - Draper Correctional Facility (Elmore)
- Holman Metal Fabric - Holman Correctional Facility (Atmore)
- Vehicle Tag Plant - Holman Correctional Facility (Atmore)
- Printing Plant - Kilby Correctional Facility (Mt Meigs) (ADOC, 2015)

The 11 ACIs employ approximately 700 inmates to manufacture and distribute goods (ADOC, 2015). The ADOC Monthly Statistical Report provides the total expenses, revenue, profit, and loss for each of the listed prison industries. In 2015, the total

expenses for the ACI were \$12,196,306.40. The revenues were \$14,786,556.41 leaving a profit of \$2,590,250.01 (ADOC, 2015). In 2016, ACI netted a profit of \$1,270,575.23 (ADOC, 2016). Although the ADOC continues to display a profit with regards to prison industries, little, if any, is known as to whether participation in prison industries has any relationship to reductions in rates of recidivism. Understandably, the 700 inmates in 2015 and 449 in 2016, who were afforded the opportunity to participate in ACI constitutes a small fraction of the total in-house prison population and may be extremely difficult to measure (ADOC, 2015; ADOC, 2016).

Hattery (2008) argued although inmates are employed by prison industries, and essentially paying the state for their incarceration, the inmates still receive an average of \$1.00 per hour for their service. The compensation for labor performed, while employed by prison industries, is far less than competitive wages earned by citizens performing similar work outside of the Alabama prison system. This poses a dilemma for some communities to ensure citizens are employed. The ability of the correctional facility to manufacture goods, in conjunction with the inmate labor, reduces the probability a citizen will be able to secure employment performing a similar manufacturing job (Hattery, 2008).

Tripodi, Bledsoe, Kim, and Bender (2009) argued the purpose of any prison program, including prison industries, is to provide the inmate with a skill to best prepare him to reenter society. A useful skill will reduce the probability the inmate will recidivate. The ACI affords inmates, who are selected to participate in the program, an

opportunity to acquire a skill. The skill acquired while employed by prison industries may be valuable in securing employment once the inmate is released from custody.

Makarios, Steiner, and Travis (2010) argued the lack of rehabilitative, vocational, or educational programs in a supermax prison will invariably increase the likelihood an inmate will recidivate. Makarios et al.'s work regarding factors, which contribute to rates of recidivism of ex-convicts in the Ohio prison system demonstrate the need for effective prison rehabilitative programs. An effective inmate program is difficult to measure in terms of which skills, obtained in prison, will aid in reducing rates of recidivism.

Referring to ACI, the St. Clair correctional facility, which is a close custody prison, is the center for a chemical, modular, and mattress plant as well as a furniture restoration facility. The St. Clair facility housed 1,220 inmates with a design capacity of 984, equating to 124% capacity (ADOC March, 2016). The facility on an average employs 92 inmates to perform a variety of manufacturing jobs. In 2015, the ADOC reported the St. Clair facility showed a profit of \$960,454.46 from its four correctional industries plants (ADOC, 2015).

The success of the St. Clair correctional facility contradicted one aspect of Yae's 1999 research regarding the profitability of prison industries. The St. Clair correctional facility has shown a continuous profit through the manufacturing of goods. 92 of the 1,220 inmates (13%) are engaged in ACI, which provides the inmate with a source of income and self worth.

An analysis of the St. Clair correctional facility's March 2016 statistics shows 62 disciplinary reports occurring during the month of March with a total of 734 incidents

transpiring from January 2016 to March 31, 2016. What is not known is the percentage, if any, of the disciplinary actions occurred among inmates assigned to ACI. If a vast amount of disciplinary actions transpired among ACI inmates, this would give credence to Yae's assertion that disgruntle prison industries inmates may affect production of goods.

There has been very little research relating to the relationship between inmates who are engaged in prison industries and rates of recidivism once the inmates are released. Three research questions regarding inmates employed by prison industries must be explored in future research. The first is: What is the relationship between inmates employed by prison industries and rates of disciplinary action compared to those inmates who have no affiliation with prison industries? The second is: What is the relationship between inmates who are employed by prison industries and rates of recidivism once the inmate is released? The final question is: What is the relationship between inmates who are employed by prison industries and their ability to secure employment once released?

Yae argued prison industries are costly and are not able to compete with other entities producing similar goods. ACI manufactures goods that may only be purchased by government agencies who meet specific criteria. Yae's assessment regarding the competitiveness of prison industries may hold true in other states. However, state and local regulations preclude ACI from competing with non-governmental vendors. Yae and Kiltz both concede further research is needed in the field of prison industries to provide a nexus between rates of recidivism and prison industries.

Reentry Programs

Seiter and Kadela (2003) argued a department of corrections obligation to prepare an individual to reenter society commences when the inmate initially enters the prison under their jurisdiction. The initial classification of an inmate is accomplished using a validated risk assessment in conjunction with the presentence investigation report. The presentence investigation report is a document, compiled by a staff member affiliated with the sentencing court where the inmate was sentenced, to determine the risk of the inmate to a variety of factors including violence and gang activity. The assessment, which is performed at the Kilby correctional facility, determines which programs are best suited to rehabilitate the inmate thus lessening the probability the inmate will recidivate. Essentially, every prison program may be construed as a means of rehabilitation. However, inmate programs, which focus upon transition from incarceration to civilian life, including life skills, work release, substance abuse, sex and violent offender, cognitive behavioral, and education training, have assisted inmates in assimilating back into the community.

Pinard (2007) agreed with Seiter & Kadela and argued due to the complexity and the vast differences of inmates being incarcerated, it is of paramount importance that a validated risk assessment of the inmate be performed upon entry into the prison system. Having done so, the correctional facility will be in a better position to determine the capacity for learning, violent tendencies, and the background of the inmate. This information is crucial as the risk assessment is the beginning of the reentry process to ensure the inmate, once released, can assimilate back into society.

The reentry process has not been consistent throughout correctional systems (Pinard, 2007; ADOC, 2014). Some Alabama correctional facilities offer an in-house reentry program within one year of release, such as the Donaldson close custody correctional facility, while others, such as the St. Clair close custody correctional facility, provide an in-house reentry program 3-6 months prior to release. The ADOC strives to ensure inmates, who have served their entire sentence, probationers with a split sentence of prison and probation, and inmates who are due to be paroled, avail themselves of the correctional facility's in-house reentry program (ADOC, 2016). The in-house reentry programs vary in duration predicated upon the correctional facility. The ADOC in-house reentry program, which is also referred to as the Institutional Pre-Release Program (IPR), is utilized throughout the Alabama correctional system. The program is from 4 days to 2 weeks, and is not mandatory unless it is mandated as a condition of parole, directed by the court, or by the ABPP (ADOC, 2015).

A second reentry program, offered by the ADOC, and located at the Limestone correctional facility is a 24-week pre-release program. The Limestone pre-release program incorporates a biopsychological approach to address the needs of inmates. The program can accommodate 300 inmates and offers courses in preparing for change, goal setting and priorities, effective communication skills in addition to 21 other courses. Inmates, who wish to be considered for the program, must complete an application and commit to the intensive program of instruction. Inmates are selected in accordance with information derived from the presentence investigation, classification information, and their behavior while incarcerated.

Braga (2009) argued the American correctional system does not properly equip inmates, who are due to be released from custody, with the necessary skills and guidance to reduce the probability the individual will recidivate. Research regarding the effectiveness of reentry programs to provide decision makers with adequate information as to the cost benefit of inmate reentry programs has been minimal (Petersilia, 2005). However, prison officials do agree inmate programs designed to increase educational or vocational skills, offer valuable instructions and aid to reduce rates of recidivism (Cullen, Smith, Lowenkamp, & Latessa, 2009). Prison officials also agree that any correctional facility program, designed or focused in providing a skill to alleviate inmate idleness, will prove to be beneficial to the institution as well as to public safety (GAO, 2012).

The in-house reentry program, established by the ADOC, is utilized throughout the entire Alabama correctional system. Braga (2009) stated the generic one size fits all inmate program may not be appropriate for all inmates. He suggests a tailored program for each inmate would be more effective. Although Piehl (2009) agreed and argued most reentry programs are constructed and operate within the institutional domain of the correctional facility. The programs are designed to assist a small section of the inmate population. Those who agree to avail themselves of the program and are due to be released within a normative time span.

Bueche (2014) provided an analysis of reentry programs. He extolled voluntary enrollment and active participation in a reentry program, if available, provides the inmate with a certain degree of vital information including counseling for drug dependency and a

network of government agencies to assist the newly released inmate. The information is necessary for the individual to assimilate back into society.

An aspect of any prison program, including reentry, is the structure of the program, which should be tailored to the inmate and must be voluntary as to ensure the participant maximizes the presented information. The program must meet the objective of providing the inmate with necessary assistance. Additionally, programs should also have the goal of providing the inmate with suitable information and guidance as to lessen the probability the individual will recidivate (Latessa, 2012).

Seiter & Kadela (2003) argued any prison inmate program, including reentry where the individual is provided essential information for success, should not be mandatory. The individual should not be coerced in any manner to enroll and complete any prison program. The ADOC practices a similar methodology as inmate prison programs, such as rehabilitative or drug treatment, are only mandatory if the program is court ordered or as a condition of release.

Vocational Programs

Ward (2009) argued past arguments have differed regarding the roles of prison. Punishment verse rehabilitation had been previously cited by theorist such as Beccaria, who advocated for swift and severe punishment to offenders. Ward advocated although rehabilitation is of primary concern to prison officials, punishment to correct deviant behavior is the basic premise of prisons. However, Bueche (2014) argued vocational programs such as auto mechanics, and carpentry, electrical works, heating, ventilation and air conditioning, barber, mill & cabinetry, painting, plumbing, and welding have

proven to provide inmates with skills needed to secure employment once released from prison (CDCR Curriculum Evaluation, 2009; Bueche, 2014).

Uggen & Staff (2001) argued work based programs tend to reduce rates of recidivism once the inmate is released. However, the probability for the newly released inmate to secure some sort of employment is tenuous at best without some type of vocational training to supplement any education the inmate may have obtained prior to or while incarcerated. Inmates, who have demonstrated a commitment to work-based vocational programs, are 33% less likely to recidivate and are more likely to secure a skilled based position rather than a food service or manufacturing position. Older inmates are more likely to benefit from vocational work-based programs rather than younger offenders due to the labor market being more attractive to the older and more mature ex-convict (Uggen et. al, 2001).

Risk Assessment

Senate Joint Resolution 20 (SJR 20) was drafted and signed by Governor Bentley on February 18, 2014 (SJR20, 2014). SJR 20 formed and granted authority to the APRTF to investigate problems associated with the overcrowding in the Alabama prisons. The Justice Center, under the auspices of the Council of State Governors (CSG), produced four reports detailing recommendations for improvement in several areas of the criminal justice system. Among them were sentencing, probation and parole supervision, inmate population reduction, and risk assessment.

Senator Cam Ward introduced Senate Bill 67 on March 3, 2015. One of the most critical tenants of SB 67 was noted 13 times in the bill. Senator Ward argued for an

urgent need for a validated risk assessment in accordance with Code of Alabama 1975, Volume 11A, 12-25-32, Section 29, Subsection 10. The Code of Alabama 1975 defined a risk assessment as: “An instrument designed to assess an offender’s relative risk for reoffending” (Senate Bill 67 2015).

The ADOC’s Research and Planning Division, which works closely with the CSG, noted the ORAS was suggested as the validated risk assessment that should be instituted throughout the ADOC. The ORAS is used from the time the inmate is admitted to release. The Ohio Department of Corrections adopted the ORAS in 2011 as a pilot program. Currently, the ADOC uses an in-house risk assessment in conjunction with the presentence investigation report. The presentence investigation report (PSI) contains vital information regarding the inmate, including but not limited to past criminal history, family history, residences, education, and substance abuse. The report is critical in assisting the ADOC in classifying the inmate in terms of custody and security levels as well as which prison programs are best suited for the inmate to aid in rehabilitation.

Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)

In 2006, a team of researchers, from the University of Cincinnati’s Criminal Justice Research Center (UCCJR), who were contracted by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections (ODRC), began development of the ORAS. The goals of the UCCJR were to develop a tool, which would provide a risk assessment in various stages of the criminal justice system. Additionally, the risk assessment would be used as a tool to assist in predicting the probability the individual would recidivate (ORAS, 2006).

The initial research assessment separated the instrument into four distinct categories: Pretrial, Community Supervision, Prison Intake, and Community Reentry. The four selected categories would provide for effective classification of individuals who had been arrested for a felony and faced the possibility of incarceration in prison. The ORAS would also assist managers and supervisors in effectively allocating resources to rehabilitate those convicted of felonious crimes and reduce rates of recidivism (ORAS, 2006).

During the Ohio Risk Assessment Project, 1800 inmates were interviewed and included in the research over a span of three years. The researchers adopted four major principles in developing the ORAS. They were the risk, needs, responsivity, and the professional discretion principles. The risk principle states correctional intervention programs are most effective when they are congruent with the needs of the inmate, and in most cases, offenders that are at high risk to recidivate. The needs principle focuses upon the specific needs of the inmate, which may be revealed at the time the intake assessment is administered. The responsivity principle focuses upon those barriers, which preclude the individual from effectively benefiting from rehabilitative programs or treatment. The final principle, professional discretion, suggests case managers and counselors are ultimately responsible for synthesizing the information obtained from their clients and using their discretion to as to what the needs are of the individual (ORAS, 2009).

The final product contained seven assessment tools related to addressing recidivism. The assessments were targeted at specific phases of the judicial process beginning with an analysis of the person who would be facing trial for a criminal offense.

The seven assessment tools were: Pretrial Assessment Tool (PAT), Prison Intake Tool (PIT), Prison Screening Tool (PST), Reentry Tool (RT), Supplemental Reentry Tool (SRT), Community Supervision Screening Tool (CSST), and Community Supervision Tool (CST) (ORAS, 2009).

Although there are seven assessment tools, the remainder of this summary will focus upon the PIT and RT. The PIT satisfies the requirements of a validated risk assessment as noted in Senate Bill 67 and the Code of Alabama 1975, Volume 11A, 12-25-32, Section 29, Subsection 10. The PIT was designed to illicit specific information regarding the inmate's prior experience and is divided into five categories: criminal history, education, employment, and financial situation, family and social support, substance abuse and mental health, and criminal attitudes and behavioral patterns. Each category required the inmate to answer several questions pertaining to areas including but not limited to number of prior adult felony convictions, ever expulsion or suspension from school, longest length of employment past two years, emotional and personal support available from family or others, problems with health due to drug use, gang membership, and ability to control anger. Each category is scored with a 0, 1, or 2 to represent responses to the assessment (ORAS-PIT, 2010).

The ORAS-RT was designed to be administered within six months of release from prison and is separated into three categories, which are similar to the ORAS-PIT. They are: criminal history, education, employment, financial situation, and criminal attitudes and behavioral patterns. The ORAS PIT and RT tools are valuable instruments,

utilized by the ADOC, to provide the reviewing authority an idea as to the probability of success or failure once the inmate is released.

Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R)

The Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) is a risk assessment tool. The risk assessment is similar in composition to the ORAS. The LSI-R was initially developed as means of providing probation and parole officers a standard for assessing the risk needs of a probationer or parolee in community corrections (Manchak, Skeem & Douglas, 2008).

The LSI-R has ten factors, which requires the respondent to answer 54 items. The factors of the LSI-R are: criminal History, education and employment, financial, family, accommodation, leisure and recreation, companions, alcohol or drug problems, emotional and personal issues, and attitudes. The LSI-R measures dynamic risk factors and is considered a 3rd generation structured professional judgment assessment, which has become the most widely used instrument for assessing risk and needs (Manchak et.al, 2008). Unlike the ORAS, the LSI-R was developed utilizing over 18,000 inmates across the United States, and is also a validated risk assessment. The credibility and versatility of the LSI-R has proved to be an accurate risk assessment instrument used by a plethora of probation, parole, and correctional institutions throughout the world (Manchak et.al, 2008).

Summary

The review of the current literature has demonstrated inmate prison program research has focused upon the added value the individual may receive if participation in

said programs is voluntary. Bouffard (2000) argued there have been differing studies regarding the relationship of inmate prison programs to rates of recidivism. A study, conducted by Saylor & Gaes in 1996, concluded there was no significant decrease in rates of recidivism of inmates who participated in prison programs. Harer (1995) argued inmate prison programs show promise in terms of reducing rates of recidivism.

The differing statistical conclusions from various studies are the result of failure to separate and measure each inmate program in relationship to rates of recidivism. Studies have measured rates of recidivism of inmates who have enrolled in a reentry program and had also availed themselves of other rehabilitative programs while incarcerated. Bouffard argued it is difficult to discern which prison programs are most effective in reducing rates of recidivism when an inmate participated in more than one inmate program (Bouffard, 2000).

The literature has also shown the viability of prison industries and vocational programs in providing the inmate with a skill to assist in obtaining a job once released. Yae (1999) argued prison industries are frequently not cost prohibitive to the institution in terms of providing a product at a competitive price. Additionally, studies regarding inmates who participate in prison industries have not substantially shown a decrease in recidivism. However, according to the ADOC's Annual 2015 Report, ACI showed a profit of \$2,590,250.01 while employing 457 inmates, which negates Yae's theory regarding the profitability of prison industries (ADOC, 2015).

The current study focuses upon the effectiveness of the ADOC's prison programs. Research has been conducted regarding various types of inmate prison programs but no

study has addressed any Alabama correctional facility inmate program. Although only five prisons were included in the study, the information and data obtained during this study from the ADOC, ABPP, and other reliable sources may be used throughout the entire ADOC system. The qualitative data obtained through the questionnaires and interviews in conjunction with the quantitative data addresses the critical gap between previous studies and the current study.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

The mixed methods case study was designed and engineered to assist the ADOC in identifying what ADOC prison staff, including wardens, education coordinators, classification specialists, and criminal justice experts from the ABPP view as effective reentry, vocational, and faith based inmate prison programs. It is the intent of this research to assist the ADOC in identifying inmate prison programs that will afford the greatest opportunity for newly released inmates in assimilating back into society. Chapter 3 includes an examination of the setting, research design, and methodology, participant selection logic, data collection and analysis, threats to validity and ethical procedures.

Setting

The setting for this case study involved four close custody prisons: Kilby, St. Clair, Tutwiler, and Limestone correctional facilities. One medium custody prison, Draper correctional facility, was chosen due to the inmate population, which is 83.5% over capacity and the age of the prison (ADOC, 2016). Draper prison, which was built in 1939, is the oldest Alabama correctional facility. The close custody prisons are in the north and central parts of Alabama while the medium custody prison is in central Alabama. The correctional facilities and personnel were chosen due to their ability to provide data regarding prison programs and the challenges each of these institutions face, due to overcrowding and the age of the prisons with respect to providing inmate prison programs.

Research Design and Rationale

Creswell and Plano-Clark (2011) posited the rationale for a qualitative case study methodology exists when the researcher investigates real life situations within a given time span. Various sources of data were extracted from interviews, observations, databases, reports, and documents pertaining to the ADOC and ABPP that is the focus of the research.

Three research questions were developed to investigate the relationship between various prison programs at the close custody or Level IV correctional facility and rates of recidivism. The questions were broad in nature as to allow the individuals providing answers some latitude. The research questions are as follows:

RQ1: What is the relationship between ADOC prison industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, and vocational programs, at close custody prisons, and rates of recidivism?

RQ2: What are the criteria for inmates to be afforded the opportunity to participate in some type of prison program including prison industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, or vocational?

RQ3: What is the relationship between the presentence investigation report and the internal risk assessment utilized by the ADOC and the ORAS utilized by the ABPP in predicting rates of recidivism and as criteria for the Board's consideration for release?

Each of the questions focuses on a central concept of the relationship between prison programs and recidivism. Due to the nature of the case study, quantitative data was insufficient to address the research questions. Quantitative data merely answered the

question of how many inmate programs were available rather than specific criteria as to why certain programs existed and the process utilized to select individuals to receive the instruction. Questions regarding specific inmate programs and processes could only be obtained through the use of qualitative data, as the information is not published in any ADOC or ABPP's Annual or Monthly Reports.

Creswell (2009) argued a mixed methods research plan employs a combination of both qualitative and quantitative data in conjunction with the research procedures and processes unique to each strategy. The qualitative data obtained from the ADOC and ABPP was essential in explaining the procedures for evaluating and admitting inmates into certain prison programs. To ensure validity, the triangulation method was used to verify the quantitative and qualitative data.

While researching the ADOC, I obtained the quantitative data, which was readily available. I used the data to develop interview questions for various staff members of the ADOC and ABPP. The sequential method of securing the quantitative data prior to the qualitative data provided a sound platform for the development of interview questions for the ADOC and ABPP.

Role of the Researcher

Yin (2009) posited a well-trained investigator is needed to conduct a case study to ensure correlation between captured data from sources such as the DoJ and BoJ crime databases and qualitative data obtained from surveys and questionnaires. To that end, the researcher must have some familiarity with the individuals in the study, institution or processes of the institution to formulate sound questions and conduct meaningful

interviews. The interviewees will provide detailed information predicated upon the type of questions posed by the researcher.

I spent 27 years in law enforcement of which a portion of my tenure was spent commanding the Jail Division. As the jail commander, I was able to obtain empirical evidence of the relationship between jail programs and recidivism by acting as an observer and investigator. My role in this research is that of an investigator.

My role as an investigator was to establish relationships with members of the ADOC and ABPP to become more familiar with prison programs and processes. Additionally, the ADOC queried each correctional facility regarding inmate prison programs. Interviews with wardens and prison officials were conducted in accordance with ADOC and ABPP policy. The interviews were also approved by the ADOC's Public Affairs Officers and the ABPP's Assistant Executive Director prior to the interviews.

Biases

Patton (2002) argued any research strategy the investigator undertakes must be conducted with neutrality to ensure credibility. It is imperative the researcher and/or investigator recognize their biases toward a particular individual, entity, or organization. Yin (2013) argued the weakness of any qualitative interview is the bias the interviewee may display toward the organization under study, the questions asked, or merely providing answers the interviewer may want to hear as to minimize the amount of time in the interview.

I had bias toward a particular ADOC correctional facility. The facility had experienced several problems, which had been documented in various complaints and

televised by the media. Therefore, Holman correctional facility was not selected as one of the close custody correctional facilities.

Open ended questions were posed to ADOC wardens and various staff members regarding prison programs. Additionally, questions relating to recidivism, staffing, overcrowding, and the availability of space to provide inmate programs were conducted. The qualitative answers to the questions posed to ADOC wardens and staff members were triangulated with the quantitative data received from the ADOC, ABPP, and DoJ to ensure validity.

The ADOC April 2016 Monthly Statistical Report shows the four close custody (Maximum Security) prisons that are the focus of the study. Kilby correctional facility showed an inmate population of 292.7%, Limestone was 136.9%, Tutwiler showed 165.9%, and ST. Clair 124%. The one medium custody correctional facility, Draper, was operating at 183.5% capacity. Each correctional facility was operating at least 24% over capacity while Kilby correctional facility was operating at 192% over capacity (ADOC, April 2016).

The wardens and staff of the correctional facilities may have been prone to a certain degree of bias given the recent change of the ADOC's Commissioner and the passage of Alabama Senate Bill 67, which required changes to the way the ADOC provided services. Senate Bill 67 mandated prison reform by increasing the number of probation and parole officers, revamping sentencing guidelines, restructuring the parole process, and the reduction of prison population, to name a few. (SB 67, 2015) However,

the Alabama budget was passed and signed by Governor Bentley in September 2015 and no cuts to the corrections' budget were noted.

The bias was somewhat mitigated by the development of the interview questions. The interview questions focused upon the effectiveness of prison programs and variables such as staffing and the availability of space, which may reduce the prison's ability to deliver inmate programs. By combining multiple theories, data, observations, and interviews, the bias should be minimal compared to single method research.

Ethical Issues

Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) argued there are essentially two standards that must be adhered when using participants. The first is anonymity, which refers to protecting the identity of specific individuals. The second is confidentiality, which pertains to ensuring the information received from the participants to be secret and private.

Permission from the ADOC's Public Affairs Officer and the ABPP's Assistant Executive Director were necessary prior to securing qualitative information from the correctional facilities staff including the parole officer, who is employed by the ABPP. The parole officer, who is located at each prison, compiles the parole package that is reviewed by the ABPP. Due to the ADOC and ABPP's process for obtaining information, any ethical concerns were negated.

Methodology; Participant Selection Logic

Patton (2002) argued the qualitative aspect of research permits the researcher to inquire into selected issues without being constrained by the perimeters of the standard

quantitative questions. The nature of rehabilitation encompasses several variables including age, criminal history, gender, and socioeconomic environment prior to confinement. Therefore, it is imperative qualitative questions be presented to adequately examine the inner workings of Alabama's correctional facilities. Thus, the type of sampling used was purposeful, which provided me with pertinent information to address the research questions.

Absent the ability to speak directly to inmates while incarcerated, prison officials from four close custody correctional facilities and one medium custody prison, who had direct knowledge of prison programs were selected as participants. The sample included the warden of each prison, the prison program coordinator, classification specialist, and other ADOC staff members. The sample also included an interview with an ABPP assistant executive director. The executive director attested to the duties and procedures of the parole officer assigned to each prison and to the parole process including the criteria the Board examines to determine the inmate's eligibility for release.

Additionally, two other ADOC staff members were interviewed due to their knowledge of prison programs and statistical information regarding the correctional facilities. One of the participants interviewed is the Deputy Commissioner in charge of Women's Services. The commissioner provided additional information regarding prison programs that are unique to female inmates. An associate commissioner, who oversees the ADOC Plans and Programs Division, provided supplemental information regarding inmate prison programs and Senate Bill 67. Questionnaires were developed, which were

different than the instruments used for the one-on-one interviews of the wardens and prison staff, to garner additional information regarding inmate prison programs. Creswell (2013) argued a case study is appropriate when the focus is a particular program, event, or process. The participants selected possess the knowledge and expertise regarding prison programs and could validate a portion of the quantitative data.

Instrumentation

Rubin and Rubin (2012) argued the researcher must customize the questions in accordance with the knowledge of the interviewee and what information the individual would feel most comfortable in disclosing. The nature of the case study necessitated the development of a questionnaire, to pose to the ADOC and ABPP. The questionnaire would address the research questions. The questions varied predicated upon the data needed from a specific department within the ADOC or the ABPP. I developed questions based on information needed to answer the research questions. The questions were directed to the Research and Planning Division, Correctional Industries Division, and interview questions for ADOC and ABPP staff.

Yin (2009) argued a case study, utilizing external validity, has been challenged due to generalization. The question as to the validity of the research due to generalization is mitigated in this case study as it focuses solely upon the ADOCs' close and medium custody correctional facilities. The results and conclusions will be applicable to the processes of the ADOC and may not apply to penal systems outside of the State of Alabama. A questionnaire, regarding what programs were available to inmates and the criteria for eligibility was sent to the ADOC.

The questionnaire provided the researcher basic information regarding what programs are available to inmates in specific prisons. Work furlough and community corrections were not included. Inmates in work furlough and community corrections are deemed in custody but not in the category of a close or medium custody correctional facility.

Based upon the information received from the correctional facilities to the Research and Planning Division of the ADOC, a questionnaire was developed by me, to assist in answering the research questions regarding prison programs. The questionnaire was electronically sent to the ADOC's Research and Planning Division requesting information and clarification regarding the ADOC's Monthly Statistical and Annual Reports, which included minimal prison program data. The questionnaire was returned, which in conjunction with the prison program data, provided the basis for the ADOC interview questions.

The ABPP granted 2,236 of 5,958 inmates who were eligible for parole (ABPP, 2015). The information was generic in nature and required further clarification. A questionnaire was developed inquiring as to what the process is for parole, including if the Board considers the inmate's participation in prison rehabilitation programs. Additionally, questions regarding the use of a validated risk assessment to ascertain the probability the inmate would recidivate were also incorporated in the questionnaire. The questions were used to interview the executive assistant director of the ABPP.

The recent passage of Alabama Senate Bill 67, which was drafted to address prison reform and overcrowding, may have an impact on the availability of prison

programs. Therefore, a question regarding SB 67 was incorporated in the interview questions, which was directed to the warden and programs coordinator of each correctional facility. This was done to ascertain what impact Alabama Senate Bill 67 had on prison programs.

The expertise obtained from the ADOC, ABPP executives, and staff members in conjunction with the data extrapolated from credible sources including the DoJ and BoJ, ensured content validity. The interviewees are experts in their specific divisions. The published quantitative data from the ADOC and ABPP was triangulated to ensure credibility and accuracy.

The use of questionnaires, which were sent to separate divisions of the ABPP and ADOC, were necessary to answer the research questions. Except for interviews conducted with the Associate Commissioner of the Plans and Programs Division and the Deputy Commissioner of Women's Services, the one-on-one interviews were conducted in person, at each correctional facility. The interviews with the commissioners of the ADOC and the executive assistant of the ABPP were conducted via telephone due to availability. The prison program questions that were directed to the five selected correctional facilities, provided information to partially answer the research question regarding the availability of at least one prison program; reentry.

Data Collection

The mixed methods case study necessitated the collection of sequential quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data was collected through accessing various governmental websites. Data was obtained from the ADOC's website, which

publishes the information for public use. The ADOC website publishes a monthly statistical report. The ADOC Monthly Statistical Report contains but is not limited to, prison staffing shortages, inmate population, both current and historical, rated prison capacity, number of inmate disciplinary actions, number of inmates in drug rehabilitative and GED programs, number of escapes, ethnic composition of inmates incarcerated including race, gender, and age. The monthly statistical report also provides the profit and loss of the prison industries. The ADOC publishes an annual report, which is a culmination of the Monthly Statistical Reports, as well as budgetary and rates of recidivism information. Quantitative data was obtained from the ABPP website, which is available to the public. The ABPP's Annual Report provide budgetary information, parole and probation statistics, number of individuals paroled for each calendar year, number rejected, and the number of individuals pardoned. The ABPP's Annual Report for fiscal year 2014-2015 was captured and stored on the flash drive with all the dissertation related research and material.

Quantitative data from the BoJ was retrieved from their public use website. The BoJ data displays inmate information for federal and state prisons, nation-wide rates of recidivism, and special notes regarding operational capacity of prisons. The 2010 Prisoner Report, which was published in 2012 and is the latest report, was captured and stored on the flash drive with all the dissertation related research and material.

The preliminary qualitative data was requested from both the ADOC and the ABPP in the form of questionnaires. The prison program information, which included but not limited to specific inmate programs available to inmates, the duration of the program,

and the eligibility requirements to participate in each program, was the first data to be received from the ADOC. A telephone call to the ADOC's Research and Planning Division put me in contact with a staff member, who was able to gather the information upon a formal request to the supervisor and a submission of my Curriculum Vitae.

A request for data concerning the policy and criteria for granting parole was directed to the ABPP. A telephone call to the ABPP put me in contact with the Public Affairs Officer, who required a formal written request and a copy of the questions, which were to be answered. The request asked for information regarding prison program participation as it relates to parole consideration, rates of recidivism as defined by the ABPP, and what the recidivism rate is regarding those who are remanded due to technical violations. This information was necessary to answer a research question.

Data concerning rates of recidivism in relationship to inmate prison programs, and the way data is collected, was requested of the ADOC. The ADOC captures data regarding some inmate programs such as Substance Abuse and General Education, which are reflected in the monthly statistical report. Data regarding vocational, prison industries and faith-based programs are not reflected in any ADOC report. The ADOC reports data regarding the in-house reentry program utilized by all the correctional facilities in Alabama. However, the data does not reflect any one correctional facility, but rather the entire correctional system.

An email was sent to the ADOC's Public Information Manager requesting interviews with personnel of five specific close and medium custody correctional

facilities. The request was made to conduct either a face-to-face or phone interviews. The request was made to interview the prison program coordinator, classification specialist, warden and other staff members to ascertain information regarding inmate prison programs as they relate to rates of recidivism.

Data Analysis Plan

Creswell and Plano (2011) extoled the procedure for analyzing a mixed methods research design must follow two distinct processes. The first one is for the qualitative data and the other for the quantitative data. Each method relies in part on the other to answer the research questions and for validation.

Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008) argued qualitative data analysis is an ongoing endeavor with the researcher coding specific themes and phrases from interviews, field notes, and observations. They argued it is useful to look for regularities and patterns, which would either negate or prove the hypothesis. Interviews conducted with staff members of the ADOC and ABPP provide a source of data. Teddlie and Tashakkori posited a mixed methods approach, utilizing an expansion design will permit the qualitative aspect of the approach to expand upon the quantitative data. I used the mixed methods approach to answer the research questions and conduct the study.

The hypothesis relating to RQ1 reads: Inmates who avail themselves of prison programs will experience lower rates of recidivism compared to those inmates who do not participate in any correctional industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based or vocational programs. The null hypothesis relating to RQ1 reads: There is no relationship

between ADOC correctional industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, and vocational programs, in close custody and medium custody prisons and rates of recidivism?

The hypothesis relating to RQ2 reads: Inmates who meet certain ADOC or collegiate requirements for study are afforded the opportunity to participate in prison program including prison industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, or vocational programs. The null hypothesis relating to RQ2 reads: There are no requirements for inmates to participate in prison programs including prison industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, and vocational?

The hypothesis relating to RQ3 reads: The presentence investigation report and the ORAS used by the ABPP are accurate assessments in evaluating an inmate for parole and in predicting rates of recidivism. The null hypothesis reads: The presentence investigation report and the ORAS used by the ABPP do not provide accurate assessments of an inmate's time while incarcerated nor is the presentence investigation report or the ORAS useful in predicting rates of recidivism.

To analyze the quantitative data, SPSS software with a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. The logic of using ANOVA was the data obtained from the ADOC separated the prison programs into essentially four categories. The first is rehabilitative drug and alcohol programs, which frequently are mandated by the courts. Monthly statistics regarding participants are maintained by the ADOC and published in the monthly statistical report. The second is GED statistics, which are also captured by the ADOC and published in the monthly statistical report. The third category is the prison inmate reentry or prerelease programs, which are not mandatory for inmates to accept as

a condition of release and are offered only to inmates if they so desire the information.

The final category is a combination of prison industries; vocational and faith-based prison inmate programs. The monthly statistical report reflects the number of inmates employed by prison industries. There is no indication as to the rate of recidivism of those who have availed themselves of vocational, faith-based, prison industries, or reentry programs.

Further, there is no statistical data regarding the demographics of inmates that have participated in vocational, faith-based, prison industries, or reentry programs.

Quantitative data from the close custody correctional facilities, regarding prison programs, was analyzed in conjunction with the sole medium custody correctional facility. The analysis was done because there are at least twice as many prison industries located at the St. Clair correctional facility, which is a close custody correctional facility, than any other correctional facility in the State of Alabama. Limestone correctional facility reports the number of inmates who have completed the Limestone 90 Day Reentry Program, which is delineated in the ADOC's Monthly Statistical Report. During calendar year 2015, the Limestone correctional facility, which has the largest inmate population of all the correctional facilities located in Alabama, graduated 660 individuals from their 90-day reentry program (ADOC, 2016). Limestone correctional facility offered the Supervised Reentry Program (SRP), which is a reentry program that required the approval for inmate attendance from the ADOC prison staff. The selection for inmates to enter the SRP is made in accordance with the State of Alabama Department of Corrections Administrative Regulation 452.

Each close and medium custody facility surveyed reported the institution offered at least one of the following prison programs: reentry, faith-based, ACI or vocational. SPSS software was used to calculate the average prison population compared to the number of inmates enrolled or who had participated in a prison program other than a drug rehabilitation or GED program. Further analysis of the quantitative data will be presented in Chapter 4.

To analyze the qualitative data, QSR Nvivo 9 was used. Data obtained from the ADOC correctional facilities, ABPP's executive staff, wardens of the selected correctional facilities, and the Research and Planning Division of the ADOC was used to provide emergent coding. The interviews with the participants, including staff personnel associated with the ADOC and ABPP, were coded also with the use of QSR Nvivo 9. The interview questions focus upon policy, processes, data collection, and prison programs.

Threats to Validity

Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) argued recognizing problems, which may be associated with each type of validity, may mitigate threats to validity. In this case study, threats to external validity are minimized and controlled by the stipulations and formal procedures for obtaining information and conducting interviews, as dictated by the ADOC and ABPP. The procedures were applicable to all participants who were employed by the ADOC or ABPP. Each prison is faced with different problems regarding inmate population and its ability to provide prison programs to all those who request to be enrolled. However, the mission of the ADOC is universal throughout the 16 major correctional facilities, which is to rehabilitate inmates.

Creswell and Plano-Clark (2011) argued it is imperative researchers develop a strategy during the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data to ensure validity and credibility. During the qualitative data collection process, participants selected occupied similar positions in all five prisons and were administered the same questions when interviewed. This minimized the probability of problems with internal validity using one instrument for all one-on-one interviews except for the interviews conducted with the deputy and associate commissioners.

Yin (2009) argued that although the case study is a mixed methods approach, the survey and quantitative data follow a statistical generalization. The qualitative data lends itself to an analytical generalization. This study will not be able to measure the construct of rates of recidivism as they relate to prison programs. However, data captured and measured regarding the construct of reentry programs in comparison to inmates released has been captured.

Case studies have suffered from credibility issues due to generalization (Yin, 2009). The research regarding the ADOC and ABPP seeks to understand if there is a relationship between inmate programs and rates of recidivism. By comprehending how inmates are selected for inmate prison programs in conjunction with whether the ABPP considers participation in inmate prison programs for parole as a factor in reducing the probability the inmate will recidivate, partially answers two of the research questions. The ADOC's credibility in terms of providing statistical information pertaining to, but not limited to, rates of recidivism, inmate population, disciplinary actions, and number of inmates participating inmate prison programs is unequivocal and deemed reliable. There

are no threats to the external validity pertaining to the information received from the ADOC or ABPP.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Teddle and Tashakkori (2009) posited credibility, internal validity, is established through various techniques such as triangulation and persistent observation. The quantitative data obtained from the ADOC and ABPP, was analyzed against the qualitative interviews conducted with the ADOC and ABPP. This ensured the information received from various sources was credible and reliable.

The questionnaires and interviews provided to the ADOC and ABPP served to validate the quantitative data obtained from both agencies as well as from the legal documents such as SJR 20 and SB 67. Participant selection consisted of a variety of individuals from the ADOC and ABPP, chosen for their expertise and positions in the organizations. The participant from the ABPP was asked questions pertaining to parole criteria, policy, and procedure while the ADOC questionnaires and interviews inquired as to data collection, prison programs, overcrowding, and funding. The mixed methods methodology ensured transferability. This information is deemed reliable and dependable.

Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted in accordance with the standards as set forth with Walden's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB ensured ethical concerns were addressed prior to interviews of ADOC and ABPP staff. The Walden University IRB

assigned approval number 03-07-16-0240162 for this study, which expires on March 6, 2018.

Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008) argued informed consent is one of the fundamental canons of ethics a researcher must undertake prior to involving participants. In this research study, consent was needed by both the ADOC and ABPP to garner information regarding their organizations. It was imperative that full information obtained from the ADOC and ABPP be voluntary. Prior to the ADOC releasing any information, the ADOC's Research and Planning Division requested: "background information on yourself and the purpose of your research." The information was supplied to both the ADOC and the ABPP for approval.

Teddle and Tashakkori (2009) argued the main goal of any research project is to obtain credible answers to the research questions and/or negate or prove the hypothesis. Further, during the research, participants should not suffer any harm nor should they be better or worse off for assisting in the research. Rubin & Rubin (2012) posited the results of a research study should be offered to the organization under investigation and predicated upon the circumstances, the participants. The findings may be utilized to improve the organization if this was the intent of the case study.

The purpose of this research case study was to assist the ADOC in defining which prison programs are the most viable and effective in preparing inmates to reenter society. Once the inmate receives viable rehabilitative training that would enhance their ability to secure employment and thus lessen the probability the inmate will recidivate. It is my hopes that both the ADOC and ABPP will benefit from the study.

Ethical issues were mitigated due to the extensive requirements of the ADOC and ABPP. The ADOC and ABPP, in accordance with their policy and procedures, required me to obtain each agencies approval prior to interviewing any of their employees. Additionally, approval was need from the ADOC and ABPP to obtain information from participants that was not delineated in the ADOC and ABPP's monthly or annual Reports.

Summary

Chapter Three provided an explanation of the research design, data collection, data analysis, participant selection, ethical considerations, and the instruments used to name a few. Chapter Three showed the techniques for data collection of this mixed methods case study with the role of the researcher being that of an interviewer and collector of data. The ethical concerns regarding participants, interviews and questionnaires obtained were mitigated by the protocols instituted by the guidelines set forth by Walden University, the ADOC and ABPP. Chapter 4 will contain a thorough report of the quantitative and qualitative data obtained through the course of this mixed methods case study.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis

Introduction

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to assist the ADOC in identifying which inmate prison programs are most effective in reducing rates of recidivism. In an effort to identify the methodology and criteria for the deliverance and effectiveness of inmate programs, research questions were developed. The research questions are as follows:

RQ 1: What is the relationship between ADOC's correctional industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, and vocational programs, at close custody and medium custody prisons and rates of recidivism?

RQ2: What is the criteria for inmates to be afforded the opportunity to participate in some type of prison program including prison industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith-based, or vocational?

RQ3: What is the relationship between the presentence investigation report and the internal risk assessment utilized by the ADOC and the ORAS utilized by the ABPP, in predicting rates of recidivism and as criteria for the Board's consideration for release?

A consent form, detailing 21 questions, was emailed to the ADOC for their approval. The questions necessitated different divisions within the ADOC provide information. Chapter 4 begins with the results of the first two questions posed to the ADOC:

1. What programs are offered to inmates at each prison?
2. What is the duration of the program?

Chapter 4 continues with the results of seven other questions, which were directed and answered by Participant One.

3. How does the ADOC track rates of recidivism?
4. Does the ADOC consider any arrest, whether it be a misdemeanor, technical violation, or felony, recidivism if it occurs within three years after the inmate was released from prison?
5. Does any arrest, which results in a city or county jail facility incarceration, considered recidivism?
6. Does the ADOC experience many violations of parole?
7. Does the ADOC track for technical violations?
8. Does the ADOC track rates of recidivism by prison or collectively?
9. Does each prison report their statistics monthly?

The next section of Chapter 4 discusses the qualitative data obtained from the interviews with selected participants of the ADOC. The interviews were conducted in accordance with the established policy of the ADOC and ABPP. Additionally, the interview questions were e-mailed to the ADOC and the ABPP and incorporated in the consent form for approval.

A survey was emailed to the ADOC and was completed by Participant One, who provided the statistical information. One-on-one interviews were conducted with Participants 2 through 15, in person, at the selected correctional facilities. Participants 16, 17, and 18 were conducted via phone due to availability. 8 males and 10 females were interviewed. Each interview was recorded with the permission of the interviewee.

The way the data was collected and analyzed are discussed in Chapter 4. Chapter 4 will present any issues of trustworthiness regarding the qualitative data collected from the interviews with the participants. Chapter 4 will conclude with a summary of the chapter.

Setting

The setting for the case study was five ADOC facilities and the ABPP. The five correctional facilities were chosen due to specific qualities each of the prisons possessed. The Draper facility is the oldest correctional facility in the state of Alabama, albeit it is a medium custody facility and posed some difficulties in providing inmate prison programs. The Kilby facility is the reception center for all male inmates entering the ADOC system with approximately half of the prison population in transient. The Kilby Reception Center classifies inmates and makes recommendations to the main office in Montgomery what correctional facility each inmate would best be suited to rehabilitate the individual. The Limestone correctional facility, which houses approximately 2,214 inmates, has the greatest inmate population of any prison in the state of Alabama and is at 136% (ADOC, 2017). The St. Clair facility, in addition to vocational and faith-based programs, is the site of four inmate Correctional Industries manufacturing plants. The St. Clair facility offers the greatest number of paid inmate correctional industry jobs in the state of Alabama, which affords inmates to garner a useful vocational skill. The Tutwiler facility, which is one of the three female correctional facilities in Alabama, was constructed in 1942. The facility serves as not only the reception center for female inmates, but as a close or maximum custody facility. The Tutwiler facility also serves to

house female inmates who are awaiting execution. Additionally, the Tutwiler correctional facility is situated next to JF Ingram State College, which affords some inmates of Tutwiler the ability to participate in vocational programs such as cosmetology, logistics, and welding.

The ADOC experienced a change in leadership on April 1, 2015. Commissioner Kim Thomas, who had been appointed by the Governor of Alabama on January 17, 2011, and who had served in the ADOC since 1983, was replaced by Jefferson Dunn. Commissioner Dunn is a retired Air Force Officer and now serves as the head of the Department of Corrections (ADOC, 2015). During the study, the ADOC underwent a period of transition. However, qualitative data provided by the ADOC in the form of the interviews and questionnaires, displayed complete transparency and as such, all requests to interview commissioners, wardens, program coordinators, and classification specialists were approved.

The ABPP also experienced a change in leadership during this study. Two of the three board members were replaced with new members, which may have necessitated different policy and procedures regarding the interviewing of ABPP staff. The three-member board serves as executive management. A request was made, of the ABPP, to interview the parole officers assigned to the correctional facilities in the study. The ABPP precluded me from interviewing the parole officers and offered an interview with the assistant executive director, who was well versed in the duties of a parole officer, but assigned to the main office in Montgomery. This was a limiting factor as I was not able to

interview parole officers, assigned to various prisons, regarding the procedures for assembling inmate files for the parole board.

Demographics

18 interviews were conducted during the study. 10 females and 8 males were interviewed by either phone or in person. The interviewees included wardens, commissioners, classification specialists, a psychologist, an executive director, inmate prison programmer, correctional industry specialist, and a research and planning director. The information gathered from the interviewees represented a wide cross section of individuals familiar with inmate prison programs and rates of recidivism.

Data Collection

The quantitative data was collected, from Participant 1, prior to any qualitative interviews to ensure this researcher possessed a sound understanding of the ADOC's prison system. Two questions regarding prison programs were directed to the ADOC's Public Information Manager via e-mail, who then forwarded the questions to Participant One. Participant One provided a spreadsheet of the inmate prison programs offered by each major facility in the ADOC system. Information regarding the duration of each inmate program, in many of the prisons, was not provided by the ADOC and therefore not reflected in each of the 3 prison program tables. The inmate prison programs offered at the selected prisons are reflected in Tables 1, 2 and 3. There were no variations in the data collection methods that were originally described in Chapter 3. Additionally, there were no unusual circumstances that this researcher encountered in the data collection process.

Each correctional facility offers several rehabilitative and vocational programs to assist the inmates in preparing themselves to eventually reenter society. The process of classifying and sending inmates to a correctional facility within the ADOC's system. The process of selecting an inmate to be transferred to a correctional facility is predicated upon the security and custody levels to house the inmate, the needs of the inmate, and the availability of space at that institution. The Kilby Correctional Facility classifies each male inmate, conducts a risk assessment, and makes a recommendation as to which facility the inmate should serve his sentence. The ADOC's central headquarters, located in Montgomery, makes the final decision as to where the inmate will serve his sentence.

Referring to Table 1, 20 inmate prison programs were listed. The various vocational and correctional industries programs, which are available at the selected prisons, are listed individually in Tables 2 and 3. The SRP, which is the only inmate prison program tracked for rates of recidivism by the ADOC, was discontinued due to specific provisions detailed in Alabama SB 67. In 2015, the SRP reported a recidivism rate of less than 20% compared to the institutional rate, which was over 30% (ADOC, 2015). SB 67 was passed on May 12, 2015 and was implemented in February 2016. SB 67 provided for a mechanism of post-supervision by the ABPP. Prior to the SRP, inmates were being released at the end of their sentences without any supervision from the ADOC and ABPP. The SRP provided critical services including post-release supervision, which has been replaced with the provisions of SB 67. All inmates, who are either paroled or at the end of their sentence, will be supervised by the ABPP (ADOC, 2016).

The inmate prison programs listed in Table 1 are divided into 4 separate categories; Alcohol and Drug, Education, Re-entry, and Vocational. The New Outlook Therapeutic Program, which is only available at the St. Clair Correctional Facility, is an extensive reentry program.

Alcohol and Drug Programs

Many drug treatment programs are offered by the ADOC. Crime Bill and SAP were offered at each of the 5 prisons in the study. Specialized programs including Aftercare, Co-Occurring Disorders, Matrix Model Stimulant and Relapse, are offered at select prisons due to the availability of instructors to teach and monitor the programs.

Aftercare is a program that assists inmates after that have finished a specific program such as SAP. Aftercare may vary in duration predicated upon the specific needs of the inmate. Co-Occurring Disorders is a program that addresses individuals that suffer from some form of a mild mental disorder such as mood and anxiety disorders in conjunction with substance abuse. Crime Bill, which is also known as Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners (RSAT) is a substance abuse program, which is evidence based, and is available at 4 of the 5 correctional facilities in the study; Draper, Kilby, Tutwiler, and St. Clair. RSAT is a 6-12-month treatment program that educates inmates on the problems associated with substance abuse including consequences, recovery, behavior, and anger. RSAT assists inmates with anger management, how to resolve conflicts, setting goals, and the development of social skills to name a few. 340 inmates participated in the RSAT program (ADOC, 2016). The Substance Abuse Program (SAP), which is also evidence based, is an 8-week program

Table 1

Prison Programs (May 2015)

| | Draper | Kilby | Limestone | St. Clair | Tutwiler |
|-------------------------|--------|-------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Program | | | | | |
| Adult Basic Ed | X | X | X | X | X |
| Aftercare | X | | X | | X |
| Co-Occurring Disorders | | | X | | X |
| Correctional Industries | X | X | X | X | X |
| Crime Bill | X | X | X | X | X |
| Faith Based | X | X | X | X | X |
| GED | X | X | X | X | X |
| Laubauch | X | | | | |
| Literacy | | | | | |
| Matrix Model | | | | | X |
| Stimulant Treatment | | | | | |
| New Outlook | | | | X | |
| Therapeutic | | | | | |
| Pre-Release | X | X | X | X | X |
| Ready-to-Work | | | X | | |
| Reentry | X | X | X | X | X |
| Relapse Treatment | | | | | X |
| Restart | | | X | | |
| SAP | X | X | X | X | X |
| Self-Help | X | | X | X | X |
| Special-Ed | X | | | | |
| Supervised Reentry | | | X | X | |
| Vocational | X | X | X | X | X |

that focuses upon some of the same attributes as the RSAT but not as in depth. 1,479 inmates participated in the Substance Abuse Program in 2016 (ADOC, 2016).

The Matrix Model Stimulant Treatment Program is offered at one of the correctional facilities in the study. It is an 8-week substance abuse program that primarily

concentrates on the treatment of methamphetamines and opiates, such as cocaine. The inmates in the program learn to recognize the indicators that trigger the dependency. The program assists inmates in alleviating the need for drugs.

Educational Programs

The ADOC offers a variety of educational programs including but not limited to adult basic education, GED, Laubauch Literacy, and special education. Adult basic education, which is taught in all the correctional facilities in the study, provides inmates with basic educational courses to increase the probability of securing employment once the inmate is released from custody. GED programs afford the inmates the opportunity to obtain a high school diploma while incarcerated. In 2016, 227 inmates received a GED Certificate with a pass rate of 87%, which was above the national average of 82% (ADOC, 2016).

The Laubauch Literacy program, which is offered at one of the correctional facilities in the study, provides educational services to inmates, who have little or no reading skills and require a structured learning environment. The program is a 4-level step by step process that enhances adult learning. The special education program, which is offered at the same facility as the Laubauch Literacy program, provides inmates, who experience great difficulties in learning, educational guidance and instruction.

Reentry Programs

The ADOC offers a prerelease, ready-to-work, reentry, restart, self-help, supervised reentry, and new outlook therapeutic programs. The Limestone correctional facility provides a 24-week pre-release program and receives inmates from other

correctional institutions who have been approved to enter Limestone's pre-release program. Limestone's 300 bed dorm for the program is the only 24-week pre-release program in the state and offers a variety of classes including anger management, problem solving, and financial management. Over 24 courses are offered in the 24-week pre-release program (ADOC, 2016).

The ready-to-work program provides inmates, who possess limited education and employment experience, entry level skills that are required for most businesses. The correctional facility partners with a community college to provide the necessary training and education. Students must achieve a 70% or above on the written Alabama Certified Worker Examination to receive a certificate. One correctional facility in the study offered the ready-to-work program.

The 16 major Alabama correctional facilities offer a 4 day to 2-week reentry program. The reentry program, which is uniform throughout the ADOC system, offers classes in addiction recovery, communication skills, health education, family integration, and law enforcement. Each facility dictates the modules and the duration of the program.

The restart program is a second chance, specialized reentry program for those parolees or probationers who have been arrested due to a technical violation. Technical violations include, but are not limited to carrying a weapon, association with known criminals, and visiting areas that are prohibited by the terms of probation or parole. Upon completion of the program, the offender's probation or parole is restored (ADOC, 2016).

The SRP, which was discontinued in 2016, offered inmates a restrictive reentry and rehabilitative means of assimilating back into society by means of education,

training, and strict supervision. Inmates, who wished to enter the program, were required to complete a comprehensive check through the correctional facility, be approved for acceptance, and sign an inmate document agreeing to the terms of the program. The SRP was discontinued due to the passage of Senate Bill 67, which required the ABPP to provide close supervision to inmates who have been paroled or released from prison on probation.

The new outlook therapeutic program is offered at only one Alabama correctional facility in the state and is an intensive 12 to 14-month behavior modification program. Classes in recovery, relapse, coping, criminal thinking, and spiritual healing are but a few of the programs offered. Inmates who are within 2 years of either parole or end of sentence, may request to attend the program. Inmates must have no disciplinary actions for at least 6 months prior to entering the program. The inmates are selected based upon recommendations from the classification specialist at the prison and a psychological associate. The inmate is transferred to St. Clair correctional facility where they will be housed in a special dorm dedicated to the program. The new outlook therapeutic program is the longest inmate program in the ADOC system and can accommodate up to 200 inmates and graduates from 5-6 inmates every 1-2 months.

Vocational Programs

Table 2 reflects the vocational programs that are available at the selected prison. It is important to note the diversity of the programs, which affords an inmate the ability to garner specific skills in one of the many vocational programs. An inmate, who is

Table 2

Vocational Programs (August 2017)

| Program | Draper | Kilby | Limestone | St. Clair | Tutwiler |
|-----------------------------|--------|-------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Automotive | | | X | | X |
| Auto Mechanics | X | | | | X |
| Barbering | X | | | | X |
| Brick Masonry | X | | | | |
| Cabinet Making | X | | | | |
| Carpentry | X | | X | | |
| Computer Information System | | | | | X |
| Cosmetology | | | | | X |
| Electrical | | | X | X | |
| Horticulture | X | | X | | |
| HVAC | | | | X | |
| Logistics | | | | | X |
| Plumbing | X | | | | |
| Small Engine Repair | X | | | | |
| Upholstery | X | | | | X |
| Welding | X | | X | X | X |

processed through the Kilby Reception Center, receives an initial classification to ascertain the needs of the individual and the probability the institution will provide a suitable environment to rehabilitate the inmate. The presentence investigation report in addition to the ADOC's classification tool, assists the correctional facility in adequately providing a sound platform for rehabilitative services. The recommendation for a specific prison that will assist the inmate in becoming rehabilitated, is forwarded to the central office in Montgomery where the final decision is made.

The correctional facilities in the study have developed a partnership, with collegiate or technical institutions to provide vocational training to the inmates. ADOC Administration Regulation 021 provides guidance as to how correctional facilities, vocational, and higher learning institutions will coordinate in delivering inmate programs. Higher learning institutions provide classes that are not readily available within the confines of the prison (ADOC AR 021, 1985).

Once the inmate is transferred to a permanent correctional facility, the inmate may request to participate in a vocational program such as electrician. The college or technical institute may conduct an additional assessment to determine if the inmate possesses the necessary basic education or skill to succeed in the program. J.F. Ingram Technical College provides instruction for Draper and Tutwiler Correctional Facilities while Calhoun Community College supports Limestone Correctional Facility.

Correctional Industries

Table 3 reflects the correctional industries, which are located at the selected correctional institutions. Correctional industries provide the correctional facility with a source of revenue, which offsets some of the costs incurred by the prison. In 2015, correctional industries collectively generated a profit of \$2,590,250.01 from the 6 prisons that have the program (ADOC, 2015). In 2016, Correctional Industries generated a profit of \$1,270,575.23 (ADOC, 2016).

However, in September of 2016, inmates in various prisons nationwide, including inmates incarcerated within the ADOC, refused to work. Thus, jobs within the prison that

Table 3

Correctional Industries (August 2017)

| | Draper | Kilby | Limestone | St. Clair | Tutwiler |
|-----------------------|--------|-------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Program | | | | | |
| Auto Mechanics | | | | X | |
| Chemical Plant | | | | X | |
| Clothing | | | | | X |
| Construction | X | | | | |
| Furniture | X | | | | |
| Furniture Restoration | | | | X | |
| Mattress | | | | | |
| Modular Plant | | | | | |
| Printing Plant | | | | | |

are normally performed by inmates such as preparing the meals for the inmates, laundry services, and general maintenance of the correctional facility, including correctional industries, were either performed by staff members or ceased altogether for a brief period. Inmates argued they were forced into slave labor due to the extremely low wages earned. Inmates within the ADOC earn from 15 to 70 cents per hour predicated upon the job classification and experience (ADOC, 2015). The work stoppage hindered operations within the ADOC including the delivery of inmate prison programs. Normal operations resumed within a few days with the inmates resuming their duties.

5 additional questions were directed to Participant One regarding the ADOC Monthly Statistical Report. The questions were in reference to the manner in which the ADOC tracks and classifies recidivism. The questions were e-mailed to the Research and Planning Division. Participant One completed the questionnaire and e-mailed the

responses back to me. Summarizing the questions regarding recidivism, Participant One provided the following data:

Rates of recidivism are tracked annually and produced in the ADOC Annual Report. The recidivism section of the annual report captures statistical data that is 3 years prior and does not reflect current data. The recidivism data is captured in accordance to the ADOC's definition of recidivism.

Unless an individual is remanded to the jurisdiction of the ADOC, the ADOC does not consider the offender has recidivated. Additionally, a conviction that results in an individual being remanded to a city or county jail facility is not considered recidivism. Rates of recidivism are tracked through the ADOC's Research and Planning Division and do not reflect the current year. The data regarding inmates that are paroled, released, or who reenter the ADOC system are tracked through an inmate database.

The responses received from Participant One provided credence regarding the way the ADOC tracks rates of recidivism. Additionally, the introduction of Senate Bill 67, with specific provision regarding the supervision of inmates by the ABPP who have been released from prison, will undoubtedly have an effect on the reporting of inmates who recidivate.

Participant Interviews

The quantitative data provided by the ADOC and ABPP was not sufficient to answer the research questions. The ADOC's Public Information Manager arranged for me to interview various staff members. The sampling conducted was a combination of convenience and criterion. The sample provided a mixture of various staff positions and

professional experience throughout the state. Each in-person interview was conducted at designated locations dictated by the ADOC. The interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed by me. Each interview lasted between 5 and 47 minutes. Three interviews were conducted via phone, digitally recorded and transcribed by the researcher. There were no variations from the original data collection plan as presented in Chapter 3. Additionally, there were no unusual circumstances encountered during the data collection process.

Data Analysis

Smith (2009) argued a phenomenological method affords the researcher the ability to garner information, which are real life experiences, from the participants (Smith, 2009). Most of the interviews conducted by me were from those individuals who had real life experience either within the confines of a prison or through the course of employment. Their contact with inmates, parolees, and probationers provided the interviewees with a unique perspective of how those who have been convicted of criminal activity and thus incarcerated, view the state's ability to rehabilitate them.

Miles argued codes are used to categorize sections or "chunks" of data that usually encompass various words, phrases, or sentences (Miles (1994). The interview questions were open ended and provided for a variety of responses. Coding began with analyzing the interview data as a whole then filtering sections of the interviews that would answer the research questions. Several general themes emerged initially, which necessitated an iterative process narrowing the data to 6 major themes. Each interview

netted more information albeit the interview questions remained the same. Therefore, it became necessary to dive deeper into the responses.

A total of 18 ADOC and ABPP staff members were interviewed. Table 4 represents the initial themes extrapolated through the iterative process. After coding the initial themes, it became apparent that some of the themes could be reduced to specific categories. To avoid reentering the data and arriving with the same structure, the data was manually separated into major themes after reviewing the transcripts of the each of the participants. based upon the information derived from the interviews. This process narrowed the number of themes from 21 to 6 grouping attributes such as prison population, security level, custody level, and location into one central theme. After reducing the number of themes to 6 major findings, I was able to categorize the participant's responses under 6 major sections.

Results

Theme 1: Overcrowding and Space

During the interviews with the participants, one of the most critical concerns was the issue of the inmate population of the correctional facility, which in turn impacts space. A question was posed to the participants regarding prison overcrowding. The question read as follows: There has been several discussions regarding prison overcrowding and expenses.

In one correctional facility, the inmate population during the time of the interview was 165.7% over capacity. The overcrowding issue made it extremely difficult for the

Table 4

Initial Themes and their Reduction

| Initial Themes | Reduced Themes |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Prison Population | Overcrowding and Space |
| Security Level | |
| Custody Level | |
| Location | |
| Authorized Correctional Officers | Staffing Levels |
| Assigned Correctional Officers | |
| Other Staff Members | |
| Cost of Repairs | Age of the Prison |
| Lack of Technology | |
| Staff and Inmate Comfort | Inmate Programs |
| Evidence Based | |
| Correctional Industries | |
| Vocational Programs | |
| Educational Programs | |
| Substance Abuse Programs | Risk Assessments |
| Women's Risk Needs Assessment | |
| Ohio Risk Assessment System | |
| ADOC In-House Risk Assessment | |
| Pre-Sentence Investigation Report | Recidivism |
| Reentry Preparation | |
| Ban the Box Legislation | |

prison to provide inmate rehabilitative programs (ADOC, 2016). In another facility, the inmate population was 75.2% over capacity while another was 52.3% over capacity. Only one correctional facility, during the interviewing process, was below 100%. The Alabama Prison Transformation Initiative Act was introduced for the purposes of reducing prison overcrowding, providing improved safety for correctional officers, and to allow for additional inmate programs to include reentry.

The participants provided several comments regarding prison population and inmate programs. The participants stated the following:

Table 5

Major Themes (August 2017)

| Themes | Overcrowding and Space | Staffing Levels | Age of the Prison | Inmate Programs | Risk Assessment | Recidivism |
|-------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Participant | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | X | X |
| 2 | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 3 | X | | | | X | |
| 4 | X | X | | X | X | |
| 5 | | X | | X | X | X |
| 6 | X | | | X | | |
| 7 | X | X | | X | X | X |
| 8 | | | | X | X | X |
| 9 | | | | X | X | X |
| 10 | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 11 | X | | | X | X | X |
| 12 | | | | X | | |
| 13 | X | | X | X | | |
| 14 | | | | X | X | |
| 15 | | | | X | X | |
| 16 | | | | X | X | X |
| 17 | X | | | X | X | X |
| 18 | | X | | X | X | X |

Participant Two stated: “If you look at the conditions they are living in, that may be the reason why they are like they are. If we give them better living conditions, some of the violence will stop.”

Participant Four echoed a similar comment stating: “There’s really no space to call your own. If we put them in an environment that is conducive to what it is we are trying to do, I think it will work a whole lot better.”

Participant Seven commented regarding the safety of the inmates and staff by stating: “When we send some of them to a violent facility with hard-core guys and they’re going to have to defend for themselves or be a victim. We need something so that they don’t send these guys to prison. Prisons should be for hard-core offenders. But we have too many folks that are locked up for these little property crimes; these little minor drug violations and it is killing our numbers.”

Participant Ten provided a somewhat different view stating: “Overcrowding is a misnomer. The original cellblock was designed to have double occupancy cells. There are some institutions that are overcrowded because more inmates were put into a facility that was designed to house this number of beds.”

Participant 11 stated: “We still provide programs for inmates but overcrowding and staffing are big issues.”

Participant 13 argued the institution was limited by the space available to provide programs to inmates. “Our issue is space. We don’t have the space to conduct the classes. I feel that if we have the space that is needed to run the programs that we have, and the staff to do what is needed, that will greatly help.”

Participant 17 provided an analysis of the current prison population situation by stating: “The system did not get overcrowded overnight and it’s not going to be turned around overnight either. It’s going to take a lot of very purposeful programs and all agencies in the criminal justice system coming together and having an agreement on these changes.”

The comments extolled by the participants during the interviews with regards to overcrowding and space restrictions within the ADOC system are similar. The Alabama Prison Transformation Initiative Act (APTIA), which failed to pass during the July 2016 Legislative Session, created funding for the construction of at least 4 new facilities to alleviate the overcrowding situation. During the months of June through August 2016, the close custody correctional facilities averaged 150.7 %, 146.7%, and 147.2% respectively. The medium custody correctional facilities averaged 198.3%, 198.1%, and 196.4% (ADOC, 2016). The ADOC Monthly Statistical Reports exemplify the fact that most participants felt prison overcrowding was an issue but did not hinder the delivery of inmate prison programs.

Theme 2: Staffing Levels

One of the major themes concerning the deliverance of inmate prison programs was staffing. In 2016, during the months of June, July, and August, the one-on-one interviews were conducted at the 5 selected prisons. In June 2016, the overall staffing level throughout the ADOC close custody prisons was at 50.2% with 10.1 inmates to every correctional officer. Additionally, the overall correctional staffing level was 53.9% (ADOC, Jun 2016). In July 2016, the overall staffing level was 50.7% with 9.8 inmates to every correctional officer. The overall correctional officer staffing level was 54.1% (ADOC, Jul 2016). The August ADOC Monthly Statistical Report reflected an overall staffing level of 50.1% with 10 inmates to every correctional officer. The correctional staffing level was 53.2% (ADOC, Aug 2016).

The statistical information, as discussed in the interviews, had a direct effect on the delivery of inmate prison programs. To illicit comments and opinions regarding staffing, as it relates to the delivery of prison programs, a question was posed to the participants. The question read: The APTIA provides for the closure of several prisons, consolidating the male inmates into 3 prisons with an average population of 4000 each and 1 female prison of 1200 inmates. Although the Act was not passed, would this have hindered the ADOC in delivering rehabilitative, faith-based, vocational, or educational programs?

The participants expressed the following statements regarding staffing and the delivery of inmate prison programs:

Participant Two referenced the building of large prisons by stating: “The concept of having 4000 inmates in a prison would be a challenge. Large facilities have 2000. I’m listening to other staff members and how that’s a headache. When the ADOC first started out, we started as the Board of Corrections. We had gotten away from that. We just basically handle day to day what we are given due to overcrowding and understaffing. We are short several officers.”

Participant Four echoed a similar statement. “With the building of the new prisons, I think it will open up to some more space, would take care of the overcrowding, and it will give us adequate space for some of the programs we want to have.”

Participant Five discussed officer safety. “You know we pull officers off post because the officers I use are probably needed in the inside but we have to pull an officer

to make sure you're safe in the classroom because we have people coming in from the outside. We're pulling people from everywhere just to make the day go by."

Participant Seven stated: "But, if we were in the same predicament as some of the other facilities, if that officer called in, we may have to shut class down for the day. Because we cannot afford to pull an officer from another security post to come over and monitor that pre-release building while they hold class."

Participant Eight discussed combining prisons. "It would probably have a positive effect on programs. Because when you are combining the prisons, you are also combining the staff. You would be able to provide more programs if you combine the staff together." "And sometimes I am so short staffed I cannot open up the yard today. Or I was so short staffed that I could not open up the canteen today."

Participant Ten echoed a similar comment. "The super presence of a 4000-man facility, the way they were designed, sounds good. They would have places for industry and different programs." "Sometimes we are staff challenged to the point where we have to lock down and not have much movement as necessary as to run ACI and trade school and things like that. But, there will be sometimes that it will impact that. But, for the most part it wouldn't."

The statements from the participants were but a few regarding the staffing issues throughout the ADOC. To adequately deliver inmate prison programs, correctional officers must be available to provide security for the instructor. However, the safety of the correctional officers, inmates, and the prison take precedence over the delivery of inmate prison programs and as such, maybe limited predicated upon the staffing levels of

the prison. The ADOC's Monthly Statistical Report reflects a correctional staffing average for close custody prisons at 53.2% (ADOC, Aug 2016). This would further add credence to the comments made by the participants.

Theme 3: Age of the Prison

The APTIA, drafted by Senator Cam Ward of Alabama, addressed the problems with the aging correctional structures in Alabama. The APTIA contained specific language regarding the age of the ADOC's correctional facilities. Additionally, APTIA noted the construction of many of the prisons in Alabama do not conform to federal regulations regarding design and inmate security. Further, APTIA noted continued maintenance of facilities that are antiquated is cost prohibitive (APTIA, 2016). This was evident in at least three of the prisons that I toured.

Draper Correctional Facility, erected in 1939, is a medium custody prison. It is the oldest institution within the ADOC system. Tutwiler correctional facility for women was erected in 1942, which is similar to the Draper facility in age, appears to suffer the same architectural problems in delivering inmate programs. Tutwiler is the reception center for all females that are sentenced to prison within the ADOC. The Kilby correctional facility was built in 1969 and is the reception center for all male inmates entering the ADOC system. The Kilby correctional facility, albeit 30 years newer than the Draper facility, is limited in space to provide inmate programs, which was a common theme in all five prisons. In addition to the provisions delineated in APTIA, participants provided the following comments:

Participant Two commented regarding funds expended to repair the current facilities. “We constantly put money into facilities just to keep the water running and to keep the lights on. We constantly have issues.”

Participant Ten stated: “Every one of our correctional facilities are quite old. All of our institutions are showing their age. Anytime you can modernize your facilities, I think it is a good thing.”

Participant 12 stated: “In order for us to bring programs, and have space, and not be overcrowded, we need a new facility. We need that.”

I asked the following of participant 12: “Do you feel the age of the institution has somewhat hindered you from delivering inmate programs?” The answer, in one word from the participant was: “Definitely.”

After speaking to the participants, a clear understanding as to the challenges Alabama correctional facilities face in terms of space, overcrowding, and the age of the institutions; all of which impact the delivery of inmate programs. A tour of three of the selected prisons confirmed what I had been told by participants regarding the ability to provide prison programs to inmates due to the age of the prison, staffing and overcrowding. The age of the facility and allocation of space for inmate programs has hampered institutions from effectively delivering inmate programs. However, ADOC personnel make every attempt to ensure inmates are afforded the opportunity to participate in rehabilitative programs provided security and space are available.

Physical security of correctional facilities is also a contributing factor to administering inmate programs. Physical security focuses on the actual physical construction of the facility including but not limited to technological security measures such as electronic monitoring of inmate movement, electronic high voltage security fences, electronic opening and closure of security doors, and perimeter surveillance equipment. Correctional facilities such as Draper and Tutwiler, which were constructed over seven decades ago, are not equipped with the necessary electronic surveillance and security equipment to ensure officers and inmates are safe during the delivery of inmate programs.

Theme Four: Inmate Programs

Table 1 depicts the inmate programs that are available at the selected prisons. Each prison provided a roster of the programs that were available to inmates. Certain programs such as adult education, GED, and reentry, were offered at each ADOC prison with no specific requirements for entry. One of the questions posed to participants was: Which inmate programs do you think are most effective in assisting inmates in assimilating back into society once released excluding SAP and GED? As one might expect, there were varying opinions regarding programs that were most beneficial to inmates. The responses from the participants were as follows:

Participant Two stated: “If we put them out without a trade or education or some type of self-help program they are going to automatically come back.”

Participant Three agreed and stated: “In my opinion, the inmates need a trade when they get out. They have all the problems of being a convict when they’re released.”

Participant Four argued the value of the reentry program and stated: “The reentry program because it gives them all of the tools that they need to leave here and go back out in society as far as getting a driver’s license and Social Security. It covers an abundance of things.”

Participant Five stated: “Drug treatment. I almost never hear that they want to go into a mental health program. Now, they will also ask about reentry if they have a short date. But almost every single time it’s drug treatment.”

Participant Six stated: “Drug treatment.

Participant Seven discussed providing the inmate with basic skills. “To give classes like job interviews, how to fill out applications, using the computer; stuff that we take for granted that these guys have never experienced because they have been locked up for so long.”

Participant Eight agreed and stated: “I feel that vocational programs let the inmates learn a trade so that when they get out, that’s when the reentry part comes in. They have learned how to be a waiter, carpenter, or a plumber.”

Participant Nine stated: “If they have been in prison for many years and they don’t have any family ties, we make sure that we set them up with a mentoring program to make sure they will be okay once released.”

Participant Ten offered: “Any program that an individual has the mindset to do right. And anytime he is positively involved in a program, be it ACI, trade school, be it GED, anytime an individual has decided for himself to do better for themselves they have a better chance of reducing their recidivism rate.”

Participant 11 commented regarding additional assistance provided by colleges contracted through the ADOC. “We have a college that offers electrical Heating Ventilation Air Conditioning (HVAC) training, welding, and brick mason. Welding is the most popular one along with electrical. This helps them get a job on the outside.”

Participant 12 stated: “Feeding the inmates into the ACI depends on if they have a clear record and they have a specific skill set that they learned on the streets that would benefit ACI. If you have no support from your family, this is the only way you have a paying job.”

Participant 13 commented regarding evidence-based programs. “We were working with the inmates to introduce this new process that we were are going to start. The focus was with the inmates and when we told them about the new programs that were evidence-based, they were excited.”

Participant 14 commented on the availability of programs. “Programs are made available for several reasons. One may be that the inmate is court ordered to take a specific program. So, programming needs and the availability of programs are not solely based on classification.”

Participant 15 stated: “With these guys sitting here, I have to say pre-release. Because we had ready-to-work programs and we had some guys who have been incarcerated for years. Can you imagine him without some program in place to prepare him to be released?”

Participant 16 commented on the lack of evidence-based programs by stating: “At this time, we cannot hold ourselves out to providing any evidence-based programs.

Because evidence based programs, as you full well know, requires validations for that particular population to be able to hold yourself out there as being utilized as evidence based programming.”

Participant 17 also commented regarding evidence-based programs. “We are in the process of vetting several different evidence-based programs that are gender responsive to women and we will be implementing several of those in the coming months. Our main concern for the programs that we want to implement in the women’s facility is that they have to be designed for women.

Participant 18 stated: “The board does not deny parole based on the lack of programs as far as inmates are concerned. Rehabilitative efforts the inmate made while they were in the penitentiary is one of the biggest factors in determining parole.”

Each interview that was conducted at the selected prisons provided differing opinions regarding inmate programs. The reentry program was favored by the majority of the participants followed by vocational programs, which are frequently augmented by community colleges such as Limestone correctional facility that has a partnership with Calhoun Community College. The St. Clair correctional facility maintains 4 correctional industries, which provides a means of obtaining monetary compensation for the inmate. However, the pay is miniscule compared to a similar civilian job. Correctional industries provide the inmate with a skill that can used to secure employment once the inmate is released from prison. Each of the prisons included in the study offers a reentry program that varied from 4 days to 2 weeks. The prison staff, including the wardens, suggested the reentry program was essential to inmates who were to be released. The reentry program

gives the inmate critical information regarding services that are available to the individual to assist him in a successful transition from incarceration to civilian life. However, the reentry program is not mandatory, or a condition of release, for any inmate including those who are paroled. If an inmate program is not specified by the court, the correctional facility is prohibited from mandating the inmate participate in a course as a condition for release.

During an interview with participants at one of the prisons, a statement was uttered, regarding prison programs, which exemplified a consensus of most of the participants in the study. Participant 2 commented: “When we are talking about programs and recidivism, in my opinion, when the ADOC first started out, we started as the Board of Corrections. We have gotten away from that. We now just basically handle day to day what we’re given because of overcrowding and understaffing.”

The issues with overcrowding and staffing have forced the ADOC to allocate resources, such as correctional officers, in areas to ensure officer and inmate safety. On occasion, inmate programs have been temporarily suspended until staffing is available to provide security for the instructors as well as for the inmates. The safety of the staff and inmates is of paramount importance to the ADOC.

During one of the interviews with Participant 7, I learned that the SRP was due to be discontinued as of August 1, 2016. The SRP was the only inmate prison program, within the ADOC system, where inmates who had completed the program were tracked in relationship to rates of recidivism. Participant 2 was unable to provide a definitive answer as to why the program was discontinued and suggested that I speak to someone at

the Central Office in Montgomery, which was arranged through the ADOC. During an interview with another participant, I was informed of new evidence-based programs that would be implemented within the year. I was directed to a commissioner at the Central Office in Montgomery for further details.

Theme 5: Risk Assessment

When an inmate is transferred to the Kilby Reception Center in Montgomery, after being sentenced by the court, frequently a presentence investigation report (PSI), which was compiled by an investigator, is accessible through the justice computer system. The PSI report contains information including but not limited to past criminal history, employment, associates, age, residence, and current criminal offense. The PSI report, if available, in conjunction with an ADOC risk assessment, are critical documents in ensuring the inmate is classified correctly.

A risk assessment is a tool utilized by correctional facilities, and the ADOC, to ascertain how to best rehabilitate and serve the needs of the inmate. Additionally, the risk assessment is used to determine what type of prison, minimum, medium, or close custody, would best suit the inmate. The risk assessment is a critical component in the initial placement of the inmate to the degree that a Senate Bill specifically addressed the need for a “validated risk assessment” (SB 67, pg. 8, 2015).

Each correctional facility in the State of Alabama employs an Institutional Classification Unit to assist in processing inmates once they arrive at the institution. The classification specialist is charged with determining the level of custody and programs needed to rehabilitate the inmate (MIH, 2013). The classification specialist evaluates the

inmate and determines what risk the individual poses to other inmates and to what degree the inmate will be receptive to rehabilitation. At the time the study was conducted, the ADOC has not utilized a validated risk assessment to classify the inmates. Rather, the ADOC uses an in-house risk assessment in conjunction with the presentence investigation report. The presentence investigation report supplements the ADOC's Inmate Classification form and contains detailed information regarding the inmate to include but not limited to criminal history, gang affiliation, past employment, medical and mental status, and education (P & P, 2015). The ORAS, which was mentioned in Chapter 3, will be the universal risk and classification tool for ADOC correctional facilities.

Interviews with participants in the study netted a mixture of comments and opinions. A question was posed to the participants regarding classification. The question read: The ADOC Male Inmate Handbook, Number 114, Educational and Vocational Training, mentions a Classification Specialist, who will assist the inmate in registering for any vocational or educational programs. Is the availability of inmate programs, to the individual, based upon the risk assessment? The following are the comments from the participants:

Participant Two provided an understanding of the risk assessment process. "The inmates are classified at the RCC then filtered out to whatever custody level they can get classes and programs. The concept is to go to Kilby, have your risk assessment, see what your needs are, and send you to Ventress if you have a drug problem or to Bullock County if there is a need for mental health."

Participant Three commented regarding the 6-month review. “Every time there is a review, the risk assessment comes into play. The inmates receive a review at least every 6 months. If at the end of the six months there are no problems with the inmate that warrants a special review, then there is not a risk assessment conducted.”

Participant Four commented on the value of the PSI: “The PSI and the assessment are needed because there could be a determination when they are screening the inmates during the intake process that they may need some other type of a program especially if they have been violent all of their life.”

Participant Six agreed with Participant Four and stated: “The PSI is a lot more detailed and gives us a lot more background to the offenses as well as it provides the offenses they may have committed in other states.”

Participant Eight stated: “The risk assessment the ADOC currently utilizes measures and validates for risk within the prison. The ADOC has not adopted the ORAS yet. Implementation is in various stages. There is an assessment but all that determines is what type of facility they are housed in, custody level and their placement.”

Participant Ten commented on the classification process. “We don’t do any other classification process when they come into the institution other than the packet of orientation for this institution. The classification process in Alabama is that they have an annual progress review and a semiannual progress review. So Kilby, when they get that initial classification process, thus begins their annual progress review date.”

Participant 11 stated: “Well, we don’t reclassify them when they get here. We do look at them at what history they have. We talk to them to see if there is a certain

reoccurring date. What we do is a semi-annual and an annual review. So, twice a year we can reclassify them.”

Participant 14 agreed with Participants Four and Five. “We use the PSI once they get here to classify them. That’s one of the instruments we use. It gives the details of the offense and the reason why they are here. That’s one of the things we utilize as far as classifying them and determining their custody level.”

Participant 16 provided information regarding the viability of the. “ORAS is the one that is universally adopted by our state and in every aspect of the criminal justice system, on the parole side, the community corrections side, the ADOC side, and the probation side. What you’re trying to get at are the criminogenic factors that need attention by this individual that is in front of you. Now classification will drive the train in terms of getting the individual to the right facility and to have the right programming available. But the only way you can get to do that is to have that individualized risk and needs assessment tool to be a companion with the classification that we have used for a couple of decades.”

Participant 17 discussed a version of the ORAS, which is specifically designed to assess women inmates. “The WRNA, which is the Women’s Risk Needs Assessment was implemented on August 15, 2016. It is helping us to determine an appropriate custody classification for the women. So, it provides us with the input and the case planning information that is needed as far as programming that woman need in order to position them for positive transition and reentry.”

Participant 18 commented regarding specific ORAS reports. “The Board use the Reentry and Supplementary Reentry Tools from the ORAS that is obtained from the institutional parole officer to make their determination of the inmate’s risk of reoffending.”

The interviews with the participants, especially Participants Sixteen and Seventeen, partially answered research question number 3: What is the relationship between the presentence investigation report and the internal risk assessment utilized by the ADOC and the ORAS utilized by the ABPP in predicting rates of recidivism and as a criterion for the Board’s consideration for release?

The document used by the ADOC for males is an internal risk assessment, which in conjunction with the PSI report assist in classifying the individual. However, the internal risk assessment is not used to, nor is it equipped to predict rates of recidivism. Additionally, the instrument does not provide an in-depth assessment of the inmate, which supports the ADOC’s position for introducing a validated risk assessment as required by Senate Bill 67.

The ORAS is used by the ABPP as a parole assessment tool. A women’s version has been adopted and implemented in one of the ADOC women’s correctional facilities. The ORAS will be implemented in the male facilities at a future date, which has not been determined.

Parole officers assigned to each prison utilize a version of the ORAS referred to as the Reentry Tool (RT) and the Supplemental Reentry Tool (SRT). Each of these assessments are used with the parole officer’s historical file of the inmate. The ORAS–

RT, ORAS-SRT, and the parole officer's report comprise the bulk of the information that is sent to the parole board. Additionally, a parole plan, which is a document detailing the inmate's employment, housing, and family support system play a vital role in determining rates of recidivism and the granting of parole.

A section of the inmate's file speaks directly to programs the inmate has participated in and the number of disciplinary infractions or incidents the individual has received. A poor disciplinary record carries more weight than past criminal history and program participation. Therefore, an inmate who has participated in several programs to assist with his rehabilitation, but also has several incidents of disciplinary infractions, may experience difficulty in obtaining parole.

Theme 6: Recidivism

The mission of the ADOC is to provide rehabilitative programs for convicted felons in a safe, secure, and humane environment (ADOC, 2016). The mission statement of the ADOC ensures inmates are provided with the necessary tools to reenter society and to minimize the probability the inmate will recidivate. A similar mission statement is published in the ABPP. The ABPP mission statement is provide effective public safety by conducting supervision of paroled or probationary inmates and to ensure they effectively reenter society as a productive member of society (ABPP, 2016). The ADOC and the ABPP are charged with ensuring inmates and parolees receive the necessary guidance and supervision to not only reenter society, but to lessen the chance they will reoffend.

Although there were no direct questions during the interview process that specifically addressed the issue of recidivism, a cross section of the participants provided comments regarding the relationship of rehabilitative programs and rates of recidivism.

Participant Two stated: “My philosophy is if we keep them busy and try to get them prepared to go out because the statistics show that the majority of inmates will eventually get out. If we put them out without a trade or education, or some type of self-help program, they are going to automatically come back.”

Participant Ten commented regarding rates of recidivism among a certain age group. “Inmates will continue to be in our system until they reach about 35 or 40 years old and they keep that revolving door open until they reach that age. Then they take stock of their life. If we had more extensive programs, more programs designed to up lift social skills, those are the programs that have been proven in other department of corrections to impact recidivism.”

Participant 11 stated: “I don’t have any statistics about when they leave the prison. I have seen some of the same inmates come back periodically. It’s always going to be hard to give that individual the skills he needs to rise above what has happened to him in the past. And if you don’t give him those skills or anything to work with you are asking for the same result, recidivism.”

Participant 16 discussed factors that impact recidivism. “In the past, we saw inmates, that were not being supervised, as a recipe for recidivism because they did not have the infrastructure to support or assist them with being successful post-release. The same criminogenic factors that impact recidivism, also impacts behavior and conduct

while they are in prison. ORAS is proven to be evidence-based and is reliable for informing on recidivism.”

Participant 17 argued the viability of inmate programs in relationship to rates of recidivism. “Nationally, programs over the last 5 to 10 years have probably had the most impact on recidivism.”

Participant 18 provided information regarding the supervision of probationers and parolees and the effect inmate programs would have on rates of recidivism. Participant 18 stated: “We are going through justice reinvestment now and we are taking a top to bottom look at everything we are doing with our supervised parolees and probationers that are under are care. We believe firmly that programming, education and the stability of the home plan is critical to reducing recidivism in the state.”

One critical section of the study revealed that currently only one correctional facility, within the ADOC system, is in the process of implementing inmate evidence based programs. Tutwiler correctional facility has adopted and is implementing a finite number of evidence based programs, which the ADOC believes will aid in reducing rates of recidivism. However, as Participant 17 stated: “It will be 18-24 months before the evidence based programs will be fully implemented. It will be 3 to 5 years before we will be able to know if the new evidence based programs will have any effect on rates of recidivism.”

The importance of utilizing evidence based inmate programs, such as substance abuse and general education, is the programs have been researched and validated based on experiments involving a certain number of participants. The effectiveness of the

evidence based programs in reducing rates of recidivism, which are currently being implemented in one ADOC correctional facility, will not be known for at least 3 years.

Discrepant Case

18 interviews were conducted at various locations throughout the state of Alabama. Prior to each interview, the researcher obtained a copy of the ADOC's Monthly Statistical Report from the Department of Corrections website. This was done to compare the statistical information provided by Research and Planning Division to information provided by the participants. I noted two major discrepancies. The first seemed to be a common denominator with some of the participants. During the interviews, I provided staffing levels of the correctional facilities in the study to the participants. At least 5 participants stated the staffing levels, as delineated in the ADOC Monthly Statistical Report, were higher than reported by the Research and Planning Division. The ADOC Monthly Statistical Report reflects, including but not limited to inmate population, disciplinary actions, and staffing levels and is considered reliable and credible. The ADOC Monthly Statistical Report is generally published 3 months behind the actual month and varies from month to month. This may explain the discrepancy.

The second discrepant case focused on inmate population and overcrowding. One participant noted prison overcrowding was "a misnomer." Referring to the ADOC Monthly Statistical Report, the inmate population, in every close and medium custody Alabama correctional facility, were over the maximum designed capacity. In both cases, the Research and Planning Division, for the ADOC is the focal point for statistical data and therefore considered reliable.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

18 participants were interviewed in accordance with the ADOC and ABPP. There were no issues of credibility with the participants. The face to face interviews allowed me to observe the facial expressions and the moods of the interviewees. Additionally, touring the correctional facilities after the interviews added further credence to information derived from the interviews and data extrapolated from the ADOC's Monthly Statistical Reports, Annual Report, and the Annual ABPP Report.

The data received from the ADOC's Research and Planning Division, in conjunction with the interviewees' statements and the researcher's observations ensured the data received was dependable. The researcher used the triangulation method to confirm published, empirical, and interviewee data. There were no issues of trustworthiness.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to assist the ADOC in determining the relationship between inmate prison programs and rates of recidivism. The first research question focused upon the relationship between correctional industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith based, and vocational programs and rates of recidivism. Participants were candid expressing the fact that currently the ADOC does not have any established evidence based inmate programs, which through scientific testing had been proven to reduce rates of recidivism. One correctional facility is in the process of implementing evidence based inmate programs. However, as Participant 17 noted: "It will be 3 to 5 years before we will be able to measure the results of the evidence based inmate programs. The SAP and

Crime Bill programs are evidence based programs that are utilized by the ADOC.” There is no data available regarding rates of recidivism for SAP. The SRP, as noted in Chapter 3, was discontinued in 2016. The recidivism rate for that program was 21% (ADOC, 2016).

The second research question focused upon the criteria for any inmate to avail themselves of inmate prison programs. Participants, who were classification specialists, stated: “All inmates have the ability to take advantage of inmate prison programs.” The caveat to the statement is the inmate must meet certain criteria. The inmate must meet a certain custody and security level as well as meet aptitude requirements for certain programs. For example, if an inmate had been sentenced for burglary, which is a property offense, and had a desire to become a HVAC technician, the probability for the inmate to be accepted into the program would be based upon the classification and psychologist assessment, bed space at the correctional facility, custody level, security level, and concurrence from the central office in Montgomery. Referring to Table 2, HVAC is only available at the St. Clair correctional facility, which is a close custody prison. Security and custody levels, as well as the specific needs of the inmate are of paramount importance when placing an inmate in a correctional facility. However, general inmate programs such as G.E.D. and reentry are available at all prisons. Classification dictates where the inmate will be sent after they are processed at the Kilby Reception Center. Classification may be reduced to a simple formula: Classification/Placement = Custody Level + Security Level + Inmate Needs (AR 400, 2004).

The final research question focused upon a risk assessment. The risk assessment is the basis for classification, placement, custody level, and security level. 15 of the 18 participants discussed a risk assessment as an indicator to gage the probability the inmate will recidivate. Currently, there are essentially three different risk assessments utilized by the ADOC. The first is an in-house risk assessment, which has been used by the ADOC to classify inmates upon arrival at the Kilby Reception Center. If a PSI report, which is compiled by either an investigator, probation or parole officer is available, the report is used with the ADOC risk assessment to classify inmates. The third risk assessment, which is the Women's Risk Needs Assessment (WRNA), is gender specific and has been implemented at the women's Tutwiler correctional facility. WRNA is an in-depth risk assessment tool, which is similar to the ORAS. The ADOC will be implementing the ORAS sometime this year to coincide with the ABPP, who uses the ORAS when determining suitability for parole. Additionally, the ABPP uses the ORAS as one of the predictors for recidivism.

Chapter 4 contained the findings of the study. 18 individuals, from various positions within the ADOC and the ABPP were interviewed. 21 themes were produced from the interviews, which were reduced to 6; Overcrowding and space, staffing levels, age of the prison, inmate programs, risk assessment, and recidivism. The qualitative data was presented in the participant's words. Chapter 5 will contain an interpretation of the findings, the limitations of the study, recommendations, and implications for social change.

Chapter 5: Interpretation of the Findings

Introduction

The intent of this study was two-fold. The first was to explore the relationship between correctional industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith based, and vocational programs in close and medium custody correctional facilities and rates of recidivism. The second was to indicate inmate programs that are most effective in preparing the inmate to reenter society and thus lessen the probability that the individual will recidivate. Additionally, although not stated initially, the study was to assist the ADOC in identifying which inmate prison programs were evidence-based. Four close custody correctional facilities; Kilby, St. Clair, Tutwiler, and Limestone, and one medium custody prison; Draper were selected. 18 interviews were conducted ranging from 8 minutes to 47 minutes predicated upon the interviewee's responses.

Interpretation of the Findings

Bouffard (2000) argued varying studies have been presented regarding the correlation between inmate prison programs and rates of recidivism. Saylor & Gaes (1996) conducted a study where they concluded there was no significant decrease in rates of recidivism from inmates who had availed themselves of prison programs and those who did not. The ADOC tracked rates of recidivism through one inmate prison program, SRP, which was discontinued in 2016. The study revealed the ADOC does not track rates of recidivism by inmate programs but incorporates a recidivism report in the ADOC Annual Report. The one-page report, which reflects data that is 3 years old, specifies rates of recidivism in community corrections (23.7%), close custody (34.4%), medium

custody (34.6%), minimum custody (31.9%), SRP (17.6%), males (33.3%), and females (23.8%). The report notes the average combined recidivism rate is 31.9% but does not provide any further information regarding the relationship between inmate programs and rates of recidivism (ADOC, 2016).

The study revealed two evidence-based programs that have been utilized by the ADOC for several years. Substance Abuse and Crime Bill are both evidence-based and are tracked by the number of participants. In 2016, 467 inmates completed SAP while 19 inmates completed the Crime Bill Program (ADOC, 2017). However, there is no data regarding rates of recidivism for either program. Tutwiler correctional facility will implement evidence-based programs such as Beyond Violence, Seeking Safety, and Beyond Trauma during calendar year 2017. This information was derived from an interview with Participant 17.

The passage of Senate Bill 67 in 2015, required the ABPP to provide greater supervision to parolees thus lessening the probability the ex-convict would recidivate. The SRP netted a recidivism rate of less than 20% compared to the overall recidivism rate of 31% within the ADOC system (ADOC, 2016). The requirements to enter the SRP are delineated in ADOC Administrative Regulation 452. The requirements included, but not limited to:

1. Male inmates must be within 1 year of EOS and female inmates within 18 months of EOS.
2. Inmates must not have been convicted of a violent crime.
3. Inmates must not have been convicted of drug trafficking.

4. Inmates must not have been convicted of a sex crime.

5. Inmates must not have been convicted of an assault on a correctional officer.

Additionally, the inmate must complete an application and have the recommendation approved by the Classification Specialist, Warden, and 3 members of the SRP Board.

Once the inmate enters the program, he or she must meet specific criteria to successfully graduate and be released from the program.

One may argue one of the main reasons for the low recidivism rate and success was due to the entrance requirements, selection process, and intense supervision once the inmate entered the program. The intense supervision of parolees is one of the focuses of Senate Bill 67. Section 9, subsection (d), reads: “Release of an offender to supervision pursuant to this section shall be released to an intensive program under the supervision of the ABPP” (SB 67, 2015). One of the provisions of the SRP was to ensure inmates received intense supervision once released from prison. SB 67 incorporated the same mandates regarding intense supervision but placed the responsibility on the ABPP.

Senate Bill 67, which was passed on March 3, 2015, required the ABPP to closely supervise parolees and probationers to assist in providing guidance and possibly reduce rates of recidivism. The APTIA, if passed, would have provided funding for 4 new prisons while closing many of the older prisons such as Draper, Tutwiler, and Kilby. Additionally, the initiative required the construction of male prisons that would each have a capacity of 3000-4000 inmates while the women’s prison would have a capacity of 1200 inmates.

The study revealed several variables regarding the availability of correctional facility programs for the inmate. The ability for the inmate to participate in an inmate program was partially based on the classification of the individual. Classification is accomplished using a risk assessment, which will also dictate the eligibility of the inmate to participate in prison programs.

Three risk assessments are currently used by the ADOC to assist in classifying inmates; an in-house risk assessment, the ORAS and a WRNA. A PSI, which is compiled by an investigator prior to the inmate arriving at the correctional facility, is frequently used in conjunction with the in-house risk assessment. The ADOC has implemented two sections of the ORAS in a select number of male correctional facilities. In October of 2017, the ADOC is scheduled to implement, in a limited capacity, another phase of ORAS, which is the Intake Tool. The male correctional facility ORAS Intake Tool will provide an evidence-based classification tool as required by Senate Bill 67. The ORAS will be the standard risk assessment for all male correctional facilities while WRNA will serve as the risk assessment for all women correctional facilities. Both risk assessments are evidence-based and serve as one of the indicators to determine the probability the inmate may recidivate.

Another major variable that hindered the availability of inmate programs is the lack of staffing as indicated by 6 of the 18 participants interviewed in the study. The 16 major correctional facilities averaged 42.8% correctional officer staffing level while the in-house prison population as of April 2017, was 22,233. This is a reduction of 1,887 inmates from April 2016 in-house population of 24,120 (ADOC, 2017). The population

statistics are important as it gives credence to the ADOC's efforts to reduce in-house prison population prior to the DoJ mandating the ADOC to do so. The reduction of the in-house prison population reduces the inmate to correctional officer ratio and lessens the probability of inmate violence due to overcrowding. However, the limited staffing, on occasion, has precluded the correctional facilities from providing inmate programs due to security issues.

The ADOC publishes a monthly statistical and annual report. The reports provide information that includes, but not limited to, prison population, incidents of disciplinary actions, assaults on guards and inmates, staffing levels, some inmate program participation, and inmates that have entered and been released (ADOC, 2016; ADOC, 2017). The ADOC 2016 Annual Report list data regarding recidivism, which is for calendar year 2013. The report separates rates of recidivism by custody level, parole, split sentence, end of sentence, and by gender. The annual report does not provide any data regarding rates of recidivism of inmates who availed themselves of any rehabilitative, vocational, correctional industries, substance abuse, or faith based programs.

The ADOC provides Faith and Character Based Reentry Reintegration Programs (FCBRP) in each of the facilities in the study. The program is conducted in accordance with ADOC Administrative Regulation 460, which stipulates certain responsibilities of all participants to include, but not limited to the warden, chaplain, and inmates. The purpose of the FCBRP is to help manage inmates to control possible incidents of misconduct and violence. The program focuses on several topics such as spiritual education, life, job, and communication skills, conflict resolution, alternatives to

violence, ethics and morality, and parental skills in an effort to reduce recidivism. An application is completed by the inmate and forwarded to the Administrative Review Committee, which are part of the criteria for enrollment into the program. If the inmate is accepted into the program, the inmate is placed in a Residential Housing Unit where the individual begins the program. The ADOC does not publish any data regarding the number of inmates in the program, graduates, or rates of recidivism albeit there is a formal ADOC Administrative Regulation governing the program. Additionally, there is no information to indicate whether the program is evidence-based.

Ramon (2007) argued the Inner Change Freedom Initiative (IFI) conducted a study regarding the viability of their faith based program, which ranged from 16-24 months. The recidivism rate for those who completed the entire program was 17.3% verse 50% for those inmates who did not avail themselves of the program. Based on the results of the study, Ramon concluded the IFI faith based program was effective in reducing rates of recidivism in comparison to those who did not participate in the program. The ADOC's FCBRP is a 2-year program and is delivered in 4 phases of 6 months each. There is no indication, according to ADOC Administrative Instruction 460, of whether an aftercare program is either available or mandated by the ADOC or the ABPP.

Participants 16, 17, and 18 provided information answering Research Question 3. Question 3 pertained to the relationship between the PSI and the internal risk assessment, utilized by the ADOC, and the ORAS used by the ABPP in predicting rates of recidivism and the ABPP's consideration for release. The ADOC is implementing the ORAS to

provide an accurate assessment of inmates who enter the system as well as those who will be released into society. The ABPP uses the ORAS as one of the criteria in determining the inmate's suitability for release. Incorporated in the ORAS Reentry Tool (RT) are specific questions delineated in a 23-page risk assessment. The ORAS, which is evidence-based, is used with a parole plan to lessen the probability the inmate will recidivate. A patrol plan is an ADOC in-house document completed while the inmate is incarcerated. The document includes, but not limited to family support, employment prospects, housing, and colleagues.

Theoretical Framework

Chapter 1 discussed three theories: theory of differential association, theory of rational choice, and theory of strain. The findings of the study show a correlation between inmate prison programs, strain, rational choice, and learned behavior theories. Inmate experience strain due to incarceration and must make rational choices to survive their sentence. Additionally, inmates reside in close proximity to other inmates who may exert a certain amount of influence on their behavior

Sutherland's theory of differential association extolled behavior is learned through intimate interactions and relationships. Inmates, who are either confined in the same cell, or assimilate into the culture of the prison by socializing with other inmates, learn the behaviors, rules and regulations of the institution. Clear (2012) argued this process is known as prisonization, where the inmate absorbs the customs of the prison society and thus learns how to adapt to the environment. The study revealed inmates in the 5 selected prisons adapted and exhibited one of two modes. The first is doing time,

which refers to an inmate who believes incarceration is the cost of involving oneself in criminal behavior. The inmate believes incarceration will be brief and as such, wishes to do their time with minimal suffering and the greatest amount of comfort. The inmate places great emphasis on the fundamental tenet of the “Inmate Code”, which is to do your own time (Clear et al., 2012). All the participants stated a certain percentage of the inmates exhibit “doing time”.

Inmates may take advantage of vocational, prison industries, faith based, and educational programs to better themselves. This process is referred to as gleaning. The ADOC’s Annual Statistical Report for 2016 revealed an inmate population of 23,328 where 2,760 participated in drug treatment programs, 2,105 earned vocational educational certificates, 2,684 completed an in-house reentry program, and 245 were awarded a GED Certificate (ADOC, 2017). The number of inmates who availed themselves of inmate programs is a fraction of the in-house inmate population. Inmates who participated in prison programs, including prison industries, may influence other inmates to follow suit in order to look favorably upon the parole board, have a source of funds, and prepare themselves to reenter society. Participation in some type of inmate program may lessen the probability the inmate will recidivate.

Cornish and Clarke (1986) argued individuals will choose to engage in criminal activity if the benefit outweighs the cost of being apprehended. Inmates must make several rational choices once they have been incarcerated in prison. Among the choices are whether to avail themselves of rehabilitative, faith based, prison industry, prison maintenance, educational, or vocational programs. Inmates may also elect to assimilate

into the prison culture (prisonization) and exercise their right to merely do their time rather than participate in any inmate programs. Inmates who took advantage of GED, reentry, and drug treatment programs are noted in the ADOC's Monthly and Annual Statistical Reports.

The study, as noted in Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the inmate prison programs that are available in the 5 selected correctional facilities. Research question 2 reads: What is the criteria for inmates to be afforded the opportunity to participate in some type of prison program including prison industries, rehabilitative, reentry, faith based, or vocational program? Three programs, faith based, inmate work, and SRP required certain ADOC criteria for the inmate to participate in the program. The criteria were delineated in ADOC Administration Regulations 460, 444, and 452. The SRP was discontinued while the other inmate rehabilitative programs remained.

Certain inmate vocational programs such as computer information systems, electrical, and auto mechanics may require an aptitude test to be accepted into the program. The correctional facility, or affiliated college that offers the program, may set minimum requirements for the inmate to enter the program. The criteria for participation is to ensure the individual's success.

Inmates, in accordance with their classification, possess the ability to choose what programs, if any, they will participate to improve themselves based on availability and aptitude for the program. The inmate will choose, once admitted, classified, and delivered to the prison that suits the inmate's needs and the needs of the correctional

system, to either accept the norms of the institution or the norms and inmate code of those incarcerated.

Although some programs such as Crime Bill, SAP, and anger management in many circumstances are mandated by the court, it is the inmate's prerogative as to whether they participate in the programs. The ramifications of an inmate refusing to abide by a court order is noted by the correctional facility in the inmate's file, which is one of the factors when the inmate is considered for parole. Additionally, an inmate may be sanctioned in the form of solitary confinement, loss of good time, or some type of restriction for violating a directive from the court. The extent of any punitive action directed toward the inmate is at the discretion of the correctional facility and is outlined in ADOC Administrative Regulation: *Procedures for Inmate Rule Violations*.

Merton's theory of strain is the last theory presented in Chapter 1. Merton argued individuals are strained when they are not able to obtain monetary success or achieve institutional goals. Rather than monetary success, inmates strive to achieve a certain status within the prison. Inmates, by the very nature of being incarcerated, are faced with the strain of prison life. Inmates must make a difficult decision as to the role they will occupy in prison. The institutional goals are set forth by the correctional facility and are delineated in the ADOC Male Inmate Handbook, which is distributed to each inmate (ADOC, 2017). The inmate code, to a new inmate, is somewhat nebulous as the inmate must seek the advice and trust of others to ensure survival.

I visited 5 correctional facilities and conducted 18 interviews. The interviews and the on-site visits to the correctional facilities provided a confirmation regarding the

theoretical framework. Participant 2 stated: “If you put an animal in a zoo, they are going to act like an animal. They are a product of their environment.” Participant 2’s remarks exemplify the theory of differential association. The overcrowding issue places inmates near each other and as such, the other inmates may exert a tremendous influence, either positive or negative, toward the individual.

Inmates must decide whether they will avail themselves of inmate programs to prepare them to reenter society. This is the basis for the rational choice theory as it relates to inmates. Participants provided credence to the rational choice theory during the interviews. Participant 4 stated: “None of the programs are mandatory on the ADOC side of it. It can be court ordered but not mandatory.” Participant 10 stated: “The inmate can choose not to go through the program. No program is absolute that you absolutely have to go through it.”

Overcrowding has also contributed significantly to the strain theory. One correctional facility in the study, had an inmate population of 183.9% over capacity. In April 2017, the correctional facility experienced 96 disciplinary infractions with 94 of the infractions being major violations of the ADOC Male Inmate Handbook (ADOC, April 2017). There were more disciplinary actions in that facility than any other correctional facility in the ADOC system. Overcrowding has contributed significantly to inmate on inmate assaults, inmate on guard assaults, lack of supervision of the inmates, and tension among inmates due to limited recreation and program availability.

Limitations of the Study

There were two critical limitations I experienced while conducting the study. The first was the inability to interview parole officers located at the selected prisons. A Letter of Consent and a Letter of Participation were both sent to the ABPP requesting permission to interview 5 parole officers. The interviews were to be conducted either prior to, or after interviewing ADOC participants. The interviews would be conducted at a time and location at the discretion of the ABPP. The ABPP allowed me to interview one representative, who was an executive and was authorized to speak on behalf of the ABPP. This restriction limited the diversity of responses I had hoped to obtain from the actual parole officers, who were assigned to the correctional facilities. The parole officers compile the inmate files, which are reviewed by the ABPP for consideration of parole.

The second limitation was that I was precluded from interviewing inmates. However, I was allowed to tour the correctional facilities to see firsthand the conditions of the selected prisons. This proved to be an invaluable experience. There were no other limitations in the study.

Recommendations

While visiting and interviewing participants at the selected correctional facilities, I discovered the ADOC does not track rates of recidivism in real time. The ADOC's Recidivism Study, which is presented in the ADOC's Annual Report, reflects data that is 3 years old. Additionally, the ADOC does not track rates of recidivism of an inmate that has completed any rehabilitative program, except for the SRP, which is no longer in offered in any Alabama correctional facility. One may track rates of recidivism in a

program, such as faith based, in the same manner recidivism was tracked with the SRP. The criteria to enter the faith based program is not as stringent as the SRP. However, the inmate must apply for the program, which necessitates an application and a separate file. If the inmate recidivated, the name would be cross referenced with the faith based data file.

Tutwiler correctional facility began implementing evidence-based programs in August 2016. A study of the effectiveness of the new evidence-based programs in reducing rates of recidivism is in order. One may compare inmates who avail themselves of the evidence-based programs with those who do not participate in any inmate programs. Several other variables such as criminal history, sentence, parole plan, and age must be considered when determining the effectiveness of a program.

The ADOC offers a reentry program that varies from 1-2 weeks predicated upon the number of modules that are taught and the correctional institution's protocol. The program is offered at all ADOC correctional institutions and is tracked by the number of participants that graduate from the program. Further research is needed to analyze the number of individuals who participated in the program verse those who did not in terms of rates of recidivism, employment, or the ability to regain their civil liberties. Each module in the reentry program focuses upon specific information that a newly released inmate find beneficial such as job communication skills, health education, and law enforcement. The reentry program is essential in equipping inmates with necessary information to assist them in assimilating back into society.

In 2016, ACI generated \$1,270,575.23 (ADOC, 2016). Research pertaining to the inmates who were able to secure employment because of skills they obtained while employed in ACI would assist the ADOC in possibly securing more contracts to manufacture goods. In doing so, inmates would receive a useful skill and increase the probability they would secure employment once released from custody.

Several of the correctional facilities have experienced high incidents of inmate violence. This is exemplified by the ADOC Monthly Statistical Report, which annotates all inmate disciplinary actions that have occurred during the month. The report also delineates assaults on officers. Research regarding the relationship between inmates who avail themselves of rehabilitative programs and incidents of violence is warranted. An analysis of inmate disciplinary actions with respect to inmates who participate in some type of rehabilitative program may assist the ADOC in reducing incidents of violence among inmates and correctional officers.

The recommendations for further research are necessary to assist the ADOC in achieving three basic goals. The goals are to provide a safe environment for staff and inmates, reduce rates of recidivism, and rehabilitate the inmate. The recommendations are within the scope of the study and require the researcher to follow a similar procedure as the current study.

Implications

There are many variables that may cause an individual to recidivate. Among these are lack of education, employment, vocational skills, and the stigma of being a convict. Although many studies have focused on the root causes of recidivism, few have

concentrated on the effectiveness of inmate programs as a means of reducing rates of recidivism. The focus of the study was to ascertain which inmate programs would be most effective in preparing the newly released inmate to reenter society. If the inmate has some type of a useful skill, or possesses a certain level of education, the probability the individual will serve the family, community, and society is greatly enhanced.

When an inmate is separated from the family, a void must be filled to take the individual's place in the home. Once the inmate is released, the individual must relinquish the prison norms and assimilate to a culture that is much different than the rigid surroundings of prison life. If the inmate took advantage of the many programs offered by the correctional facility, the probability the individual would be able to secure employment is much higher. The individual would be able to contribute to the family and the community thus reducing the probability the individual would recidivate.

It was essential to ascertain what programs were available at each correctional facility and the criteria for the inmate to enter the program. Some correctional facilities that have a partnership with a community college vary inmate programs offered according to the job market. Thus, inmate programs that seem to be in demand by employers net a greater chance of the inmate becoming employed once released from prison.

Social change for inmates begins with rehabilitation while incarcerated. In order for the inmate to receive the much-needed services, the inmate must be advised of what is available and how participation in inmate programs will not only enhance the inmate's ability to succeed with a useful skill, but will assist the inmate in providing for their

family. By interviewing a variety of ADOC employees, who directly worked with inmates, and an official with the ABPP, it became apparent that to effect change in the inmate, the correctional facility must be able to provide the services. This is a difficult task considering the staffing, inmate population, and age of the prisons.

Conclusion

The study, as one participant stated, could not have been conducted at a better time. During the course of the study, changes in leadership, policy, and procedure transpired that affected the manner in which the ADOC delivered services to inmates. This included, but not limited to lawsuits filed against the ADOC on behalf of inmates, ADOC staff assaulted, inmate on inmate violence, prison riots, and the resignation of the Governor of Alabama, Robert Bentley. The following paragraphs are a culmination of the major events, which transpired from 2013 to 2017.

On April 1, 2015, Governor Bentley appointed Jefferson Dunn, a recently retired Air Force Colonel, to head the ADOC (ADOC, 2015). On April 17, 2015, 15 inmates were treated for injuries as a result of a riot at St. Clair Correctional Facility (ADOC, 2015). On March 12, 2016, a correctional officer and the warden were stabbed at Holman correctional facility during a riot that involved 100 inmates (ADOC, 2016). In August of 2016, the SRP was cancelled due to the passage of Senate Bill 67, which required the close supervision of parolees and probationers by the ABPP. On September 1, 2016, Kenneth Bettis, who was a correctional officer at Holman correctional facility, was stabbed. He succumbed to his wounds and passed away on September 16, 2016 (ADOC, 2016). On September 9, 2016, 45 inmates assigned to the kitchen and the Tag Plant, at

the Holman correctional facility, staged a work stoppage. The work stoppage was in unison with several other correctional facilities, around the nation, in protest of substandard wages for work performed by inmates (ADOC, 2016). In October 2016, the DoJ launched an investigation regarding the Alabama prison system citing overcrowding and the lack of mental health treatment. On February 16, 2017, an inmate was stabbed to death at the Elmore medium custody correctional facility. On February 16, 2017, an inmate was stabbed to death at the Staton medium custody correctional facility. The Staton facility was 165.7% at the time of the incident. On February 26, 2017, another inmate was stabbed at the same correctional facility. At the time both incidents transpired, the Elmore facility was 90.8% over capacity. On April 10, 2017, Governor Robert Bentley resigned as Alabama's governor. Lieutenant Governor Kay Ivey succeeded Governor Bentley. The in-house population saw a decrease of 1,887 inmates from April 2016 to April 2017 albeit the in-house inmate population was 22,233, well over the design capacity of 13,318 (ADOC, 2017). On April 12, 2017, a correctional officer was stabbed at the Donaldson correctional facility, which is a close custody facility (ADOC, 2017). On May 15, 2017, an inmate was stabbed to death at Bibb correctional facility, which is a medium custody facility (ADOC, 2017).

In 2013, the DoJ launched an investigation into abusive behavior, by the correctional officers, toward inmates at Tutwiler correctional facility for women. On May 28, 2015, the DoJ reached a settlement agreement with the State of Alabama and the ADOC instructing the ADOC to make drastic changes to Tutwiler's correctional staff and operations (U.S. v. State of Alabama and Alabama Department of Corrections, 2015).

On March 2, 2015, Alabama Senate Bill 67 was introduced by Senator Ward. Among several provisions of the bill, it required reclassification of some offenses and sentencing, which accompanied those offenses. The legislation required the ABPP provide close supervision to parolees and probationers once released from custody to reduce the probability the individual will recidivate. As noted earlier, the added responsibility of the ABPP relieved the ADOC of providing the SRP.

On February 8, 2016, the APTIA was introduced. APTIA addressed four critical dilemmas facing the ADOC. The first was the issue of overcrowding. APTIA provided for 3 new male prisons, each with a capacity of 4000 inmates while the female prison, which would replace Tutwiler correctional facility, would house 1200 female inmates. Further, the construction of 4 new prisons would allow for additional space to provide for inmate rehabilitation and reentry programs. Secondly, APTIA stipulated improvements for the safety of correctional officers and inmates. The construction of 4 new prisons required the installation of advanced technological surveillance and security equipment thus lessening the probability for inmate on correctional officer and inmate on inmate assaults. Third, the aging prison system, where maintenance costs for correctional facilities such as Draper and Tutwiler, were staggering, would be alleviated. By erecting 4 new modern prisons, the ADOC would rectify the expense of maintaining correctional facilities that are in dire need of security and infrastructure repairs and updates. Finally, APTIA would improve operational practices and procedures as mandated by the DoJ (APTIA, 2016).

The APTIA failed to pass during legislature calendar year 2016. On February 7, 2017, APTIA was reintroduced in the form of Alabama Senate Bill 59. The substance of the bill did not change citing the urgency to build 4 new prisons to address the serious overcrowding issue in the Alabama correctional facilities. The bill was postponed indefinitely (AL SB59, 2016).

On March 17, 2017, APTIA was reintroduced as the Corrections Construction and Renovation Public Safety Act (SB 302). Senate Bill 302 was a scaled down version of APTIA. Instead of building 4 new prisons at a cost of \$800 million, 3 prisons, 2 male and 1 female, would be constructed at a cost of \$350 million. The revised Senate Bill passed the Senate but failed to pass in the House (AL SB302, 2017).

On April 20, 2017, Alabama House Bill 545 was introduced, which was essentially another version of APTIA. The bill called for the renovation and the equipping of facilities that are in disrepair and the demolishing of obsolete prison facilities (AL HB545, 2017). House Bill 545 remained active until the end of the legislative session in August 2017.

The ADOC experienced a plethora of incidents that have caused the Alabama legislature to draft and introduce Senate and House Bills to address the critical correctional facility problems. The prison overcrowding issue, combined with limited staffing, limits the availability of inmate prison programs. Each prison in the study, as exemplified in Tables 1, 2, and 3, offered several rehabilitative programs to assist inmates in reentering society and reducing the probability the individual will recidivate.

The ADOC does not track rates of recidivism in real time. Additionally, the ADOC does not track the relationship of any rehabilitative program offered in the correctional facilities and rates of recidivism. Nor does the ADOC track the relationship between incidents of disciplinary actions among inmates and rehabilitative programs. The ADOC recently implemented a new classification system, ORAS, in conjunction with evidence-based inmate rehabilitative programs, in the women's correctional facilities. ORAS was designed to assist agencies in predicting rates of recidivism. I will revisit Tutwiler correctional facility, if it is still operational, at the later part of 2018, to inquire as to the success of ORAS and the evidence-based programs. As noted by Participant 17, it may be at least 5 years before any reliable data will be available regarding the relationship between the ADOC's evidence-based rehabilitative programs and rates of recidivism.

Passage of the APTIA, currently referred to as the Corrections Construction and Renovation Public Safety Act (HB 545), is critical for the State of Alabama and the ADOC. As a final note, this study has concluded the success of future inmate rehabilitative programs, reduction of inmate population, and the compliance with the DoJ's orders, to a certain degree, rests with the passage of HB 545. The Alabama legislature has attempted to pass legislation to accomplish this beginning February 2016. A special session to address the critical ADOC's correctional system had been discussed but never materialized. When the Alabama legislature returns in January 2018, HB 545, or some version thereof, will certainly be foremost on the agenda.

References

- Abadinsky, H. (2015). *Probation and parole: Theory and practice*. 12th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Akers, R. (1997) *Criminological theories: Introduction and evaluation*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles, California: Roxbury Publishing
- Alabama Board of Pardons and Paroles (2015). Annual Report Fiscal 2014-2015. Retrieved from www.pardons.state.al.us/ALABPP/main
- Alabama Board of Pardons and Paroles (2016). Annual Report Fiscal 2015-2016. Retrieved from www.pardons.state.al.us/ALABPP/main
- Alabama Department of Corrections (1985). Administrative regulation number 021: Consultation with colleges and universities. Retrieved from www.doc.state.al.us/Regulations.aspx
- Alabama Department of Corrections (2004). Administrative regulation number 400: Classification of inmates. Retrieved from www.doc.state.al.us/Regulations.aspx
- Alabama Department of Corrections (2008). Administrative regulation number 452: Classification of inmates. Retrieved from www.doc.state.al.us/Regulations.aspx
- Alabama Department of Corrections (2008). Administrative regulation number 460: Faith /character based programs. Retrieved from www.doc.state.al.us/Regulations.aspx
- Alabama Department of Corrections (2012). The state prison system. Retrieved from www.doc.state.al.us/facility

Alabama Department of Corrections (2013). Administrative regulation number 403:

Procedures for inmate rule violations. Retrieved from

www.doc.state.al.us/Regulations.aspx

Alabama Department of Corrections (2013). Male inmate handbook. Retrieved from:

www.doc.state.al.us/docs/PublicMaleInmateHandbook.pdf

Alabama Department of Corrections (2015). Annual report for the fiscal year 2015.

Retrieved from www.doc.state.al.us/docs/AnnualRpts/2015AnnualReport.pdf

Alabama Department of Corrections (2016). Annual report for the fiscal year 2016.

Retrieved from www.doc.alabama.gov/docs/AnnualRpts/2016AnnualReport.pdf

Alabama Department of Corrections (2016). Monthly statistical report for March, fiscal

year 2016. Retrieved from www.doc.state.al.us/StatReports.aspx

Alabama Department of Corrections (2016). Monthly statistical report for June, fiscal

year 2016. Retrieved from www.doc.state.al.us/StatReports.aspx

Alabama Department of Corrections (2016). Monthly statistical report for July, fiscal

year 2016. Retrieved from www.doc.state.al.us/StatReports.aspx

Alabama Department of Corrections (2016). Monthly statistical report for August, fiscal

year 2016. Retrieved from www.doc.stat.al.us/StatReport.aspx

Alabama Judicial System. Retrieved from <http://www.judicial.alabama.gov>

Alabama Public Safety and Sentencing Coalition (2011). Consensus Report March 2011.

Retrieved from www.huntsvillebar.org/Resources/DocumentsCLE/2014/coalition

Alabama State Budget (Fiscal Year 2016). Retrieved from: www.alabama.gov/budget

- Alarid, L., Burton, V., & Cullen, F. (2000). Gender and crime among felony offenders: Assessing the generality of social control and differential association theories. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 37*, 171-172.
doi:10.1177/0022400037002002
- Bahr, S. J., Armstrong, A., Gibbs, B., Harris, P. E., & Fisher, J. K. (2005). The reentry process: How parolees adjust to release from prison. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers, 3*, 243-265. Retrieved from <http://www.fatheringjournal.com/>
- Bales, W., & Mears, D. (2008). Inmate social ties and transition to society. Does visitation reduce recidivism? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 45*, 287. doi: 10.1177/0022427808317574
- Barbee, A., Armstrong, P., Pelka, M., & Whelan-Wuest, E. (2014). First presentation to prison reform task force. *Council of State Governments Justice Center*. Retrieved from: www.csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015
- Barbee, A., Armstrong, P., Pelka, M., & Warney, C. (2014). Second presentation to prison reform task force. *Council of State Governments Justice Center*. Retrieved from: www.csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015
- Barbee, A., Armstrong, P., & Warney, C. (2014). Third presentation to prison reform task force. *Council of State Governments Justice Center*. Retrieved from: www.csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015

- Bastedo, M. N. (2009). Conflicts, commitments, and cliques in the university: Moral seduction as a threat to trustee independence. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(2), 354–386. doi: 10.3102/0002831208329439
- Bouffard, J. (2000). Effectiveness of vocational education and employment programs for adult offenders: A methodology bases analysis of the literature. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, Vol 31(1/2).
- Braga, A., Piehl, A., & Hureau, D. (2009). Controlling violent offenders released to the community: An evaluation of the Boston reentry initiative. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 46(4). doi: 10.1177/0022427809341935
- Bueche, J., (2014). Adult offender recidivism rates: How effective is prerelease and vocational education programming and what demographic factors contribute to an offender's return to prison? (Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University). Retrieved from www.digitalcommons.lsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1289&context=graduateeschool
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2015). Federal justice statistics, 2011 statistical tables. Retrieved from www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/fjs11_st.pdf
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (2010). Adult institutions outcome evaluation report. Retrieved from www.cdr.ca.gov/adult_research_branch/research_documents/ARB_fy0506_outcome_evaluation_report

- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (2007). A roadmap for effective offender programming in California. Retrieved from www.cdcr.ca.gov/adult_research_branch/research.
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (2009). Curriculum Evaluation. Retrieved from www.cdcr.ca.gov/adult_research_branch/research-documents/final%20curric_evaluation
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Year at a Glance (2011). Retrieved from www.cdcr.ca.gov/News/docs/2011_Annual_Report_Final.pdf
- Carson, A. & Sabol, W. (2012). Prisoners in 2011. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*. NCJ239808. Retrieved from www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pd/pf.11.pdf
- Clear, T., Cole, G., & Reisig, M. (2012). *American corrections*. Boston, Massachusetts: Cengage Learning.
- Cobbina, J., Huebner, B., & Berg, M. (2012). Men, women, and post release offending, an examination of the nature of the link between relational ties and recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency*, 58, 331. doi: 10.1177/0011128710382348
- Code of Alabama 1975, Volume 11A (2012). Codes Publishing Center, St. Paul, MN.
- Colvin, M. (2000). *Crime and coercion: An integrated theory of chronic criminality*. New York, NY.
- Colvin, M. (2007). Applying differential coercion and social support theory to prison organizations: The case of the penitentiary of New Mexico. *The Prison Journal*, 87, 367-387.

- Colvin, M., Cullen, F. T., & Vander Ven, T. (2002). Coercion, social support, and crime: An emerging theoretical consensus. *Criminology*, 40, 19-42.
- Committee on Community Supervision and Desistance from Crime (2007). *Parole, desistance from crime, and community integration*. The National Academies Press
- Cote, S. (2002). *Criminological theories: Bridging the past to the future*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J., & Plano-Clark, V. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. 2nd Edition. Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. 3rd Edition. Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Cullen, F., & Agnew, R. (2006) *Criminological theory: Past to present*. 3rd Edition. Los Angeles, California: Roxbury Publishing.
- Cullen, F., Smith, T., Lowenkamp, C., & Latessa, E. (2009). Nothing works revisited: Deconstructing Farabee's rethinking rehabilitation. *Victims and Offenders*. doi: 10.1080/1556480802612565
- Cullen, F. & Gendreau, P. (2001). From nothing works to what works: Changing professional ideology in the 21st century. *The Prison Journal*. doi: 10.1177/0032885501081003002
- Davis, L., Bozick, R., Steele, J., Saunders, J., & Miles, J. (2014). Evaluating the effectiveness of correctional education. *Rand Corporation*

- Dodson, K., Cabage, L., & Klenowski, P. (2011). An evidence-based assessment of faith-based programs: Do faith-based programs “work” to reduce recidivism? *Journal of Offender and Rehabilitation*. doi: 10.1080/ 10509674.2011-582932
- Evans, T., Cullen, F., Dunaway, G., & Burton, V. (1995). Religion and crime reexamined: The impact of religion, secular controls, and social ecology on adult criminality. *Criminology*, 33.
- Fankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (2008). *Research methods in the social sciences*. 7th ed. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Fox, K. (2010). Second chances: A comparison in civic engagement in offender reentry programs. *Criminal Justice Review*. 35:335. doi:10.1177/0734016809360328
- Garland, B., Wodhal, E., & Mayfield, J. (2011). Prisoner reentry in a small metropolitan community: obstacles and policy recommendations. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 22. doi: 10.1177/088740340935984
- Gibbs, G. (2005). How and what to code. Retrieved from http://onlineqda.hud.ac.uk/Intro_QDA/how_what_to_code.php
- Government Accountability Office (2001). Prisoner Release: Trends and information on reintegration programs. Retrieved from www.gao.gov/assets/240/231597.pdf
- Government Accountability Office (2012). Bureau of prisons: Growing inmate population negatively affects inmates, staff, and infrastructure. Retrieved from www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-743

- Government Accountability Office (2012). Inmate reentry programs: Enhanced information sharing could further strengthen coordination and grant management. Retrieved from www.gao.gov/assets/240/231597.pdf
- Green, S., & Salkind, N. (2011). *Using SPSS for windows and macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data 6th ed.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Griffiths, K., Camic, P. M., & Hutton, J. M. (2009). Participant experiences of a mindfulness-based cognitive therapy group for cardiac rehabilitation. *Journal of Health Psychology, 14*(5), 675–681. doi: 10.1177/1359105309104911
- Gunnison, E. & Helfgott, J. (2011). Factors that hinder offender reentry success: A view from community corrections officers. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol, 55*, 287. doi: 10.1177/0306624X09360661
- H. 545, Alabama legislative session. 183337-2, (2017).
- Haney, C. (2008). A culture of harm: Taming the dynamics of cruelty in supermax prisons. *Criminal Justice Behavior, 35*, 956. doi: 10.1177/0093854808318585
- Harrington, C. B., & Carter, L. H. (2009). *Administrative law and politics: Cases and comments* (4th ed.). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Hickman, L. Suttorp, M. (2010). The recidivism patterns of previously deported aliens released from a local jail: Are they high risk offenders? *Crime and Delinquency, 56*:507, DOI: 10.1177/0011128708317636

- Johnson, B. & Larson D. (2002). *The inner change freedom initiative: A preliminary evaluation of a faith-based prison program*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society
- Johnson, K., Lanza-Kaduce, L., & Woolard, J. (2011). Disregarding graduated treatment, why transfer aggravates recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency*, 57, 756. doi: 10.1177/0011128708328867
- Kiltz, L. (2010). The link between jail industries programs and recidivism. *American Jails*, 23, 6. ProQuest Criminal Justice
- Kohlbacher, F. (2006). The use of qualitative content analysis in case study research. *Qualitative Social Research*, 7, Art 21.
- Laham, K. (2009) Educational participation and inmate misconduct. *Journal of Offender and Rehabilitation*. doi: 10.1080/10509670802572235
- Laham, K. (2009). Inmate assaults on prison staff: A multilevel examination of an overlooked form of prison violence. *The Prison Journal*, 89,131. doi: 10.1177/0032885509334743
- Latessa, E. J. (2004) The challenge of change: Correctional programs and evidence-based programs. *Criminology & Public Policy*
- Latessa, E. J. (2012) Why work is important, and how to improve the effectiveness of correctional re-entry programs that target employment. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 11 (1).

- Lockwood, S., Minally, J., Ho, T., & Knuston, K. (2012). The effect of correctional education on post release employment and recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency*, 58, 380. doi: 10.1177/0011128712441695
- Lovell, D., Johnson, C. & Cain, K. (2007). Recidivism of supermax prisoners in Washington State. *Crime and Delinquency*, 53, 4. doi: 10.1177/0011108706296466
- Lovell, D. (2008). Patterns of disturbed behavior in a supermax population. *Criminal Justice Behavior*, 35, 985. doi: 10.1177/0093854808318584
- Lynch, J. (2006). Prisoner reentry: Beyond program evaluation. *Criminology and Public Policy*. 5, 2.
- Makarios, M., Steiner, B., & Travis, L. (2010). Examining the predictors of recidivism among men and women released from prison in Ohio. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37,12. doi: 10.1177/0093854810382876
- Males, M. (2012). Eight months into realignment: Dramatic reductions in California's prisoners. *Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice*. Retrieved from www.cjcj.org
- Mathews, S., & Agnew, R. (2008). Extending deterrence theory: Do delinquent peers condition the relationship between perceptions of getting caught and offending. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 45, 91. doi: 10.1177/0027422807313702
- McGovern, V., Demuth, S., & Jacoby, J. (2009). Racial and ethnic recidivism risks: A comparison of post incarceration, rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration

- among White, Black, and Hispanic Releases. *The Prison Journal*, 89, 309. doi: 10.1177/0032885509339507
- Mears, D. (2008). An assessment of supermax prisons using an evaluation framework. *The Prison Journal*, 88, 43. doi: 10.1177/0032885507310964
- Mears, D., Castro, J. (2006). Warden's views of supermax prisons. *Crime and Delinquency*, 52, 398. doi: 10.1177/0011128705279484
- Mears, D., Lawrence, S., Solomon, A., & Waul, M. (2002). Prison –based programming: What it can do and why it is needed. *Corrections Today*, 64, 2.
- Mears, D., & Reisig, M. (2006). The theory and practice of supermax prisons. *Punishment and Society*, 8, 33. doi:10.1177/1462474506059139
- Mehlkop, G., Graeff, P. (2010). Modeling a rational choice theory of criminal action: Subjective expected utilities, norms, and interactions. *Rational and Society*, 22, 189. doi: 10.1177/1043463110364730
- Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publishing.
- Morani, N., Wikoff, N., Linhorst, D., & Bratton, S. (2011). A description of the self-identified needs, service expenditures and social outcomes of participants of a prisoner reentry program. *The Prison Journal*, 91, 347. doi: 10.1177/00328855011409896
- Morton, J. (2006). What works and why: Effective approaches to reentry. *Corrections Today*, 68, 1.

- Murphy, D., & Robinson, M. (2008). The maximize: Clarifying Merton's theory of anomie and strain. doi: 10.1177/1362480608097154
- Murray, M. D., & DeSanctis, C. H. (2009). *Legal research methods*. New York: Foundation Press.
- NACJD (2004). Survey of inmates in state and federal correctional facilities. Retrieved from <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/NACJD/ssvd/studies/04572/datasets/0001/variables/V2498?q=prison+programs>
- Naday, A., Freilrch, J., & Mellow, J. (2008). The elusive data on supermax confinement. *The Prison Journal*. 88:69, DOI: 10.1177/032885507310978
- National Institute of Justice (2012). Lessons learned from 30 years of prison programs. *Corrections Today*, 7, 6.
- Osterman, M. (2011). Parole? Nope, not for me: Voluntary maxing out prison. *Crime and Delinquency*, 57, 66. doi: 10:1177/001128710372194
- Parker, R. (2011). Hard times: Is the "rehabilitation revolution" bad news for enrichment activities with prisoners? *British Journal of Community Justice*. ISSN 1475-0279, 9 (1/2).
- Patton, M. (2002) *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 3rd Edition. Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Petersilia, J. (2010). A retrospective view of corrections reform in the Schwarzenegger Administration. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*. Vol 32, No 3

- Petersilia, J. (2005). When prisoners return to the community: Political, economical, and social consequences. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5,1
- Petersilia, J. (2003). *When prisoners come home: Parole and prisoner reentry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pfaff, J. (2017). *Locked in: The true causes of mass incarceration and how to achieve real reform*. New York: Basic Books.
- Phelps, M., (2011). Rehabilitation in the punitive era: The gap between rhetoric and reality in U.S. prison programs. *Law and Society Review*, 45, 1.
- Piehl, A.M. (2009). Preparing prisoners for employment: The power of small rewards. *Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute*. Retrieved from www.manhattaninstitute.org/pdf/cr_57.pdf
- Pizarro, J., & Narag, R. (2008). Supermax prisons, what we know, what we don't know, and where are we going? *The Prison Journal*, 88, 23. doi: 10.1177/0032885507310530
- Pizarro, J., Stenius, V., & Pratt, T. (2006). Supermax prisons: myths, realities, and the politics of punishment in American society. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 17, 6. doi: 1177/0887403405275015
- Reiter, K. (2012). Parole, snitch, or die: California's supermax prisons and prisoners, 1997-2007. *Punishment and Society*, 14, 536. doi: 10.1177/ 146247451264007
- Rhodes, W. (2011). Predicting criminal recidivism: A research note. *JEXP Criminal*. doi: 10.1007/11292-010-9112-6

- Rhodes, W. (2010). Estimating effects and predicting recidivism for community supervision using survival analysis with instrumental variables. *JQUANT Criminal*. doi: 10.1007/10940-010-9090
- Roman, C., Wolff, A., Correa, V., Buck, J. (2007). Assessing intermediate outcomes of a faith-based residential prisoner reentry program. *Research on Social Work Practice*. DOI: 10.1177/1049731506295860
- Rose, C., Reschenberg, K., Richards, S. (2010). The inviting convicts to college program. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. DOI: 10.1080/ 10509671003716092
- Rovio, E., Eskola, J., Kozub, S. A., Duda, J. L., & Lintunen, T. (2009). Can high group cohesion be harmful?: A case study of a junior ice-hockey team. *Small Group Research*, 40(4), 421–435. doi: 10.1177/1046496409334359.
- Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. 3rd Edition. Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- S. 67, Alabama legislative session. 164423-7, (2015).
- S. 59, Alabama legislative session. 1810961-1, (2017).
- S 302, Alabama legislative session. 183959-1, (2017).
- Sarre, R. (2001). Beyond what works? A 25-year jubilee retrospective of Robert Martinson's famous article. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 34, 38. doi: 10.1177/000486580103400103
- Schilling, J. (2009). From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership. *Leadership*, 5, 102–128. doi: 10.1177/1742715008098312

Second Chance Act (2007). Retrieved from:

<http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/110/hr1593/text>

Seiter, R., & Kadela, K. (2003). Prisoner reentry: What works, what does not, and what is promising. *Crime & Delinquency*, *49*, 360. doi: 10.1177/0011128703049003002

Severson, M., Bruns, K., & Veeh, C. (2011). Prison reentry programming: Who recidivates and when? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *50*, 327. doi: 10.1080//10509674.2011-582931

Shraga, O., & Shirom, A. (2009). The construct validity of vigor and its antecedents: A qualitative study. *Human Relations*, *62*(2), 271–291. doi: 10.1177/0018726708100360

Smith, J., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications,

Spivak, A., & Sharp, S. (2008). Inmate recidivism as a measure of private prison performance. *Crime and Delinquency*, *54*, 482. doi: 10.1177/001128707307962193240

Stahler, J., Mennis, J., Belenko, S., Welsh, W. N., Hiller, M. J., & Zajc, G., (2013).

Predicting recidivism for released state prison offenders: Examining the influence of individual and neighborhood characteristics and spatial contagion on the likelihood of reincarceration. Retrieved from www.waldenu.edu.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

- The PEW Center on the States (2011). State of recidivism: The revolving door of America's prisons. Retrieved from www.media.al.com/live/other/state/recidivismpdf
- Travis, J., & Western, B. (2014). *The growth of incarceration in the United States: Exploring causes and consequences*. The National Academies Press.
- Tripodi, S., Bledsoe, S., Kim, J., & Bender, K. (2009). Effects of correctional-based programs for female inmates: A systematic review. *Research on Social Work Practice, 21*, 15. doi: 10.1177/1049731509352337
- Trulson, C., Caudill, J., & Haerle, D. (2012). Cliques up: The post incarceration recidivism of young gang related homicide offenders. *Criminal Justice Review*. doi: 10.1177/0734016811434531
- Trulson, C., Haene, D., Delsi, M., & Marquart, J. (2011) Blended sentencing, early release, and recidivism of violent institutional delinquents. *The Prison Journal, 91*, 255. doi: 10.1177/0032885511409868
- Uggen, C., & Staff, J. (2001). Work as a turning point for criminal offenders. *Corrections Management Quarterly, 5*, 4. Pro Quest Central.
- University of Cincinnati Center for Criminal Justice Research (2009). *Creation and validation of the Ohio risk assessment system: Final report*. Retrieved from: www.OCJS.Ohio.gov/ORAS_FinalReport.pdf
- University of Cincinnati Center for Criminal Justice Research (2010). *Ohio risk assessment system-Prison screening tool (ORAS-PST)*. Retrieved from: www.OCJS.Ohio.gov/ORAS_PST.pdf

- University of Cincinnati Center for Criminal Justice Research (2011). *Ohio risk assessment system-Prison intake tool (ORAS-PIT)*. Retrieved from:
www.OCJS.Ohio.gov/ORAS_PIT.pdf
- Visher, C., & Travis, J. (2011). Life on the outside: Returning home after incarceration. *The Prison Journal*, 91, 102S. doi: 10.1177/0032885511415228
- Walden University (2012). *Dissertation prospectus*. Minneapolis, MN.
- Walden University (2012). *The dissertation guidebook*. Retrieved from:
http://researchcenter.waldenu.edu/documents/dissertation_prospectus.pdf
- Ward, C. (2012).
- Ward, S. (2009). Career and technical education in the United States prisons: What we have learned. *The Journal of Correctional Education*. 60(3)
- Wright, B., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T., & Patternostr, R. (2004). Does the perceived risk of punishment deter criminally prone individuals? Rational choice, self control, and crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 41, 180. doi:
10.1177/0022427803260263
- Wyatt-Brown, B. (1986). *Honor and violence in the old south*. New York:
Oxford Press.
- Yae, Michael, (1999). An analysis of correctional industries programs. *Corrections Today*, 61, 6.
- Yin, R. (2009). *Case study and research: Design and methods*. 4th Edition. Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.

Appendix A: Alabama Prison Program Survey

The purpose of this survey is to ascertain which prison programs are available to inmates and the duration of each program. The information will be used to complete a study regarding the effectiveness of inmate prison programs as they relate to rates of recidivism in the Alabama Correctional system. Please complete the survey as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

- 1) What programs are offered to inmates at your prison?
- 2) What is the duration of each program?

Appendix B: Alabama Board of Pardons and Paroles Staff Interview

Questions

The purpose of these interview questions is to ascertain what risk assessment the Alabama Board of Pardons and Parole utilizes in consideration for parole. Additionally, to what extent does the Board take into consideration an inmate's participation in inmate prison programs? The information will be used to complete a study regarding the effectiveness of inmate prison programs as they relate to rates of recidivism in the Alabama Correctional system.

- 1) To what extent are the parole officers, who are assigned to each Close, Medium, and Minimum Alabama prison, tasked with compiling a package for the parole board to review?
- 2) What type of risk assessment tool does the parole officer utilize?
- 3) When a potential parolee or probationer's package appears before the board, does the board consider any rehabilitative programs the inmate may have participated in?
- 4) If the inmate was not able to avail himself of any faith-based, rehabilitative, vocational, or prison industries program due to availability or circumstances not related to any action on the part of the inmate, does the board take this into account when reviewing the inmate's package for parole?
- 5) There are several factors the board considers for parole, one of which is a parole plan. What is a parole plan?
- 6) Recidivism has been a law enforcement problem for decades, what are the Alabama Board of Pardons and Paroles' views regarding how to best reduce rates of recidivism?
- 7) Are there any statutes, Senate or Assembly Bills, which preclude the Alabama Board of Pardons and Paroles from granting parole?
- 8) Is prison overcrowding a major concern for the Alabama Board of Pardons and Paroles in terms of paroles granted?

- 9) Does the board use a risk assessment and if so, which one? If the board utilizes a risk assessment, is it the same risk assessment used by the same parole officer who compiles the inmate package for parole?

Appendix C: Alabama Department of Corrections Staff Interview Questions

The purpose of this questionnaire is to ascertain which inmate prison programs the prison feels have been most successful in preparing the inmate to reenter society. Additionally, what effect has Senate Bill 67 and the 2016-2017 Alabama Department of Corrections' budget had on the distribution of inmate prison programs? The information will be used to complete a study regarding the effectiveness of inmate prison programs as they relate to rates of recidivism in the Alabama Correctional system. Please complete the survey as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

- 1) How does the ADOC track rates of recidivism?
- 2) Does the ADOC consider any arrest, whether it be a misdemeanor, technical violation, or felony, recidivism if it occurs within three years after the inmate was released from prison?
- 3) Does any arrest, which results in a city or county jail facility incarceration, considered recidivism?
- 4) Do you have many violations of parole?
- 5) Does the ADOC track for technical violations?
- 6) Do you track rates of recidivism by prison or collectively?
- 7) Does each prison report their stats to you monthly?
- 8) There has been an inordinate amount of discussion regarding prison overcrowding and expenses. Have some inmate prison self improvement/rehabilitative programs been eliminated or reduced due to the reduction of funds?

- 9) In your opinion, which inmate prison programs do you think are most effective in assisting inmates in assimilating back into society once released, excluding drug treatment and general education courses?
- 10) Are you aware of any evidence –based inmate prison programs utilized within the ADOC system?
- 11) The ADOC Male Inmate Handbook, Number 114, Educational & Vocational Training, mentions a Classification Specialist, who will assist the inmate in registering for any vocational or educational programs. Is the availability of inmate prison programs, to the individual, based upon the risk assessment?
- 12) The ADOC Male Inmate Handbook, Number 700, Inmate Re-Entry Program, is managed through a Re-Entry Coordinator. Does the Re-Entry Coordinator utilize the risk assessment to determine if the inmate would be receptive to the Re-Entry program?
- 13) Are there any inmate prison programs, which are mandatory for the inmate to receive, with the exception of those mandated by the court, prior to being released?
- 14) Senate Bill 67 speaks to a Legislative Committee to study issues associated with the ADOC including overcrowding. Do you think the committee will have any effect on the inmate prison programs?
- 15) Senate Bill 67 mentions a **Validated Risk Assessment** as defined in Title 12, Section 12-25-32, which reads: “Risk Assessment: An instrument designed to assess an offender’s relative risk for reoffending.” (a) Does your prison utilize an inmate risk assessment and if so, which assessment? (b) Do you think the assessment is fairly accurate in classifying inmates albeit they are classified initially at the Kilby Correctional Facility upon entering the ADOC? (c) If a risk assessment is used, is it the same instrument used when the inmate is EOS, paroled, or SRP?
- 16) Senate Bill 67 creates a new position referred to as an Administrative Hearing Officer, who will consider an inmate’s participation in rehabilitative programs as part of the criteria for release. Do you think an inmate’s participation in rehabilitative programs, as one of the considerations for release, will have any

effect on an inmate's willingness to engage in self improvement/rehabilitative prison programs? Do you think participation in prison programs should be a consideration for release?

- 17) The Alabama Prison Transformation Initiative Act provides for the closure of several prisons (14), consolidating the inmates into 3 male prisons of 4,000 each and 1 female prison of 1200 inmates. In your opinion, will this hinder the ADOC in delivering rehabilitative, faith-based, vocational, or educational programs?
- 18) The St. Clair facility operates the most prison industries of any of the ADOC facilities. Will the Alabama Transformation Initiative ACT affect Correctional Industries?
- 19) What are the ADOC's sentiments regarding the Ban the Box Legislation as proposed by Senate Minority Leader Quinton Ross?

Curriculum Vitae

Kenneth J. Whitman
Ken.Whitman@waldenu.edu

EDUCATION

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Master of Science in Criminal Justice California State University, Sacramento, CA | January 2006 |
| Master of Public Administration California State University, Hayward, CA | 1987 |
| Bachelor of Arts California State University, Hayward, CA | 1986 |
| Associate of Science in Biological Science Los Medanos College, Pittsburg, CA | 2002 |
| Associate of Arts in Social Science Laney College, Oakland, CA | 1984 |
| United States Air Force Air War College United States Air Force Distance Learning | 2008 |
| United States Air Force Air Command and Staff College United States Air Force Distant Learning | 2001 |

Collegiate Instruction Experience

Criminal Justice Instructor,
Alabama A & M University, Normal, Al August 2015 to present

- Serving as an Adjunct Instructor in the Criminal Justice Department teaching upper and lower division criminal justice courses.

Criminal Justice Instructor, Columbia College
(Satellite Campus, Coast Guard Island, Ca) 2002-2009

- Served as an adjunct instructor teaching upper and lower level division classes

- Certified by Columbia College to teach Criminal Justice Ethics, Corrections, Criminal Justice Administration, Management of Police Agencies, Community Policing, and Introduction to Criminal Justice
- Developed a recognized curriculum and syllabus for the Senior Culminating Experience Class, which was measured against all other similar classes

Research Interests

- Corrections
- Criminal Justice Ethics
- Community Policing
- Public Policy and Law