DOES MENTORSHIP IMPROVE REENTRY OUTCOMES? ANALYZING THE EFFECTS OF MENTORSHIP ON REARREST

by

Samantha Darling

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Criminal Justice

Charlotte

2024

Approved by:

_____
Dr. Shelley Johnson

_____
Dr. Janne Gaub

_____
Dr. Maisha Cooper

ABSTRACT

SAMANTHA DARLING. Does Mentorship Improve Reentry Outcomes? Analyzing the Effects of Mentorship on Rearrest. (Under the direction of DR. SHELLEY JOHNSON)

Formerly incarcerated persons face challenges in obtaining employment and housing upon release, and the literature is consistent in showing themes of social support as a positive influence in obtaining these necessities. These themes are supportive of life-course approaches that suggest social support structures are necessary for desistance from crime. This paper utilizes data from the Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) in New York City to assess the impact of mentorship on rearrest for members of the program group. The sample includes CEO program participants who were referred to the program by their parole officers and were able to participate in transitional jobs, coaching and development, parenting classes, and post-placement services. Binary logistic regression was used to assess the influence of mentorship on rearrest while controlling for age, marital status, education, prior felony arrests, and housing. Results indicate that mentorship does not influence rearrest. The results do indicate that age and prior felony arrests have influence on rearrest. Suggestions for future research and policy discuss measuring mentorship through participant evaluations of existing and future programs.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to the men at Davidson Correctional Center, to whom I owe thanks to for further narrowing my research interests to reentry and correctional policy. I am grateful to the students who were in my classes and to the others who would chat with me in the yard or in the chapel. Thank you for the stories, anxieties, dreams, goals, hobbies, and lessons shared. Thank you for allowing me to learn from you as much as you learned from me, if not more. Thank you for also reminding me, both directly and indirectly, that no matter how much I think that I have learned about the criminal justice system, nothing will ever compare to the lived experiences of those who are and have been incarcerated. The sentiment is not only humbling, but is an additional encouragement to dedicate time to match words with actions by spending time with justice involved individuals and hear their experiences to better inform research and policy efforts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Despite legislation such as the Second Chance Act of 2007, the corrections system continues to operate as a "revolving door" for many justice involved individuals, with about 68% of returning citizens being rearrested within three years of release (Liu, 2020). Recidivism is the relapse of criminal behavior, which can include rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration (Ortiz & Jackey, 2019). Formerly incarcerated persons face challenges upon release, often needing to quickly obtain employment and housing to meet parole requirements and avoid recidivism. However, there are many obstacles that stand between them and success, such as discrimination or lack of skills (Reisdorf et al., 2022; Ward et al., 2021). Numerous studies find that correctional education and vocational training programs can be effective in helping the person obtain employment and housing (Bozick et al., 2018; Newton et al., 2018; Nur & Nguyen, 2023; Pompoco et al., 2017; Sokoloff & Schenck-Fontaine, 2017). However, some scholars argue that these programs do not solve the problems that stem from mass incarceration practices and that incarceration alternatives are a more effective resource in reducing reoffending (Anestis & Carbonell, 2014; Austin, 2017). Additionally, a fragmented network of nonprofit organizations are relied upon to fill gaps left by correctional institutions regarding rehabilitation and reentry preparation (Augustine, 2019).

The literature consistently shows that formerly incarcerated persons need access to employment and housing to have a successful reentry. Themes of social support as a positive influence in obtaining these necessities are found throughout the literature (Augustine, 2019; Clark, 2016; D'Amato et al., 2021; Kjellstrand et al., 2021; Liu, 2024; McNeeley, 2022; Mielitz et al., 2018; Mowen et al., 2019; Newton et al., 2018; Rydberg,

2018; Wodahl & Freng, 2017), which supports Sampson & Laub's (2005) life-course approach that suggests social structures of support are a necessity for desistance from crime. When incorporating community members and community institutions in the reentry process, there is a chance of improving public perceptions of formerly incarcerated persons (Ward et al., 2021). Notwithstanding the bias and stigma associated with criminal involvement, there is still public support towards reducing felon disenfranchisement and improving other areas to assist with reentry (Petrich et al., 2021; Ward et al., 2021). While there is literature that addresses the impacts of social support such as familial contacts on reentry outcomes, there are fewer studies showing the impacts of mentorship on reentry outcomes. Between 2018 and 2024, there seems to be evidence that mentorship can improve reentry outcomes through informal socialization, connection to necessary resources, and companionship as motivation for desistance (Sells et al., 2020; Kjellstrand et al., 2021). However, the impacts of mentorship on recidivism is mixed, with some research finding a significant decrease in recidivism (Sells et al., 2020) and others finding a seemingly neutral impact (Kenemore & In, 2020; Kjellstrand et al., 2021).

The purpose of this thesis is to assess the impact of mentorship on recidivism for formerly incarcerated persons. To assess this, the thesis will focus on the effect of mentorship on rearrest by utilizing data from the Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) in New York City to run a binary logistic regression. Factors that contribute to recidivism are controlled to allow for a stronger analysis of mentorship and rearrest. These additional factors are age, marital status, education, employment, and housing, and are discussed throughout the following

literature review. This thesis will add to the recidivism literature by addressing how mentorship for formerly incarcerated persons impacts arrest post-release.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Revolving Door of Incarceration and Barriers to Reentry

The purpose of this thesis is to assess whether mentorship has a positive impact on arrest post-release. Throughout the reentry literature, studies suggest that strong social support can provide encouragement for desisting from crime (Clark, 2016; Sampson & Laub, 2005; Sells et al., 2020) and that strong attachment to others decreases the likelihood of criminal activity (Hirschi, 2004). Life-course criminology and social control theory suggest that friends, family, and mentors who ensure that returning citizens have a smooth transition from incarceration to society can provide individuals with motivation to achieve upward mobility (Hirschi, 2004; Sampson & Laub, 2005). Mentors that provide mentees with companionship, emotional support, informational support, and instrumental support can relieve strains caused by the reentry process by providing returning citizens with situated choices. This allows mentees desiring to desist from crime to have structural support through resource access, which assists with navigating the structural barriers to reentry (Kjellstrand et al., 2021; Sampson & Laub, 2005).

Recidivism and return to prison is so high in the United States that criminologists refer to the phenomenon as the "revolving door" effect (Hunter & Mercier, 2023; Rodriguez & Usman, 2023). The term is fitting, given that nearly 70% of returning citizens are rearrested within five years of release (Liu, 2020; Ortiz & Jackey, 2019; Reisdorf & Rikard, 2018; Wodahl & Freng, 2017). Actions and inactions of federal departments are argued to have some influence on this cycle of incarceration. Ortiz and Jackey (2019) note that the responsibility of rehabilitation and reentry is often assigned to

small nonprofit organizations and agencies that are underfunded and are not prepared to assist formerly incarcerated persons.

To combat this, the Second Chance Act of 2007 partnered with community organizations to implement and fund reentry programs focused on employment assistance and behavioral treatment (Petrich et al., 2021). This Act, however, has a number of strengths and weaknesses. For example, funding of the Second Chance Act was argued to be insignificant in increasing the effectiveness of the programs, leading some scholars to refer to the act simply as a symbolic gesture (Ortiz & Jackey, 2019). Additionally, reentry programs were administered within the same communities that formerly incarcerated individuals were being released to and were meant to be rehabilitated in, which are often concentrations of justice-involved, racially segregated, and disadvantaged communities. The expanded surveillance from the programs seemed to be akin to over-policing within minority communities (Miller, 2014). On the other hand, the Second Chance Act did provide some support in connecting returning citizens to housing, personal budgeting, and employment opportunities (Beck et al., 2023). Additionally, the Second Chance Act partnered with community organizations to facilitate these efforts (Petrich et al., 2021).

A successful reentry process relies on a combination of factors. Reentry refers to the reintegration of released incarcerated individuals back into society and is considered to be successful when there is no recidivism from the formerly incarcerated individual (Grossi, 2017). Factors that contribute to lower recidivism rates are often identified as securing employment, housing, and healthcare quickly following release (Niebuhr & Orrick, 2020). In addition to lowering recidivism rates, access to gainful employment and

housing provides returning citizens with the ability to develop positive self-esteem, social networks, and improved health (Alexander, 2011; Beck et al., 2023). However, there are obstacles towards securing these necessities. For example, the general public may be biased, and believe in the principle of least eligibility, which argues that incarcerated individuals are the least deserving of societal benefits (Ward et al., 2021). Additionally, individuals with felony convictions are almost prohibited from voting while incarcerated and for an uncertain amount of time upon release, ranging from a few years to permanently (Alexander, 2011). These barriers emphasize the need for public support in policy-making as justice-involved individuals are unable to advocate themselves. While not consistent across all participants, staff members comment that many of these barriers to reentry are systemic (Beck et al., 2023), which will be highlighted throughout the literature review.

Employment

The literature has been consistent in showing that gainful employment is key to a successful reentry. Despite this, many returning citizens struggle with finding employment opportunities that provide a livable wage and a steady income (Augustine, 2019; Cook et al., 2015; Mielitz et al., 2018). Many formerly incarcerated individuals, despite wanting to work, are unemployed for extended lengths of time following their release for reasons such as employer discrimination or lack of education and skills (Bowen et al., 2019; Grossi, 2017; Liu, 2014; Rydberg, 2018; Ward et al., 2021). It is found that around 40% of those who are convicted have less than a high school education and with the large population, it is not possible for all incarcerated individuals to complete their high school equivalency due to long wait lists (Grossi, 2017; Pompoco et

al., 2017). Additionally, they are often legally excluded from many job opportunities that they could apply their skills to, such as transit driver or barbering (Augustine, 2019; Grossi, 2017). They may also be excluded from other jobs that they may have had experience and licensure in prior to incarceration, such as education or healthcare (Augustine, 2019). The urgency to secure employment is heightened for individuals who do not have strong social networks to assist in improving marketability or providing access to job opportunities (Mielitz et al., 2018). Jobs that require background checks have potential for discrimination towards formerly incarcerated persons as employers may use the results to justify not hiring based on criminal history. In addition to overt barriers to employment, many formerly incarcerated individuals are unable to access jobs due to transportation issues. Nearly half of formerly incarcerated individuals do not have access to reliable transportation after release either from difficulties in reinstating their drivers licenses or from not having social networks that can guarantee them transportation (Hamlin, 2022; Silver et al., 2021). While transportation barriers are not exclusive to returning citizens, they add another obstacle to overcome.

Many returning citizens are struggling to find employment as a means to support themselves and their families, meet parole and probation requirements, and/or pay towards debts accrued during incarceration (Augustine, 2019). The pressure to meet expectations and release requirements can lead to returning citizens to avoid addressing their criminal history with potential employers entirely. If applicants are able to secure legal employment, regardless of whether they lied on their application, the employment is often temporary, low-skill, and low-wage work (Augustine, 2019). The literature finds that about 20% of returning citizens have a disproportionate debt-to-income ratio (Bowen

et al., 2019) and are not often provided with financial literacy tools that can assist them in stretching a lower income to meet needs, which can in turn alleviate financial strain (Mielitz et al., 2018).

Housing

The difficulties of obtaining legitimate and gainful employment further impacts the ability of formerly incarcerated persons to secure housing. Without financial stability, it can be extremely difficult for anyone to find housing. Many formerly incarcerated persons rely on formal and informal assistance to meet housing needs and requirements, such as staying with family members, friends, or living in a halfway house (Beck et al., 2023; Hamlin, 2022; Johnson, 2023; Kenemore & In, 2023). However, these housing arrangements are often temporary (Johnson, 2023). In addition to being temporary, these arrangements are not widely accessible to returning citizens. While halfway housing may be designed to ease reentry concerns, they often have limited availability (Hamlin, 2022). Some residents have thought of halfway homes as an extension of incarceration due to procedures like having to sign in/out when leaving and reentering the home, provide justification for leaving, room checks, mandated counseling meetings, and uniformed furnishings that residents are unable to change without management approval (Clark, 2016; Purser & Hamlin, 2022). These rules and stigmas can lead to mixed feelings from residents, who feel both frustrated with the lack of autonomy and grateful for their housing arrangements in comparison to being homeless (Purser & Hamlin, 2022). While restrictive, halfway housing allows returning citizens a place to live while they get back on their feet, which can be beneficial in instances where individuals do not have the funds to move into their own place, lack social networks to offer them housing, or the social

networks are unable to offer housing due to property management or government assistance restrictions. Family members and friends who may otherwise be willing to grant temporary or even permanent housing are often prohibited from allowing individuals with a criminal record into their homes and onto their leases (Beck et al., 2023; Johnson, 2023).

Individuals who do not have social networks or halfway houses are up against the private housing and rental market, which imposes many restrictions that returning citizens struggle to navigate. Even with employment, formerly incarcerated persons face rental discrimination, community backlash, and geographical restraints. Landlords and rental companies have the option to take several factors into consideration when deciding whether to deny an application, including criminal history, credit scores, and employment and/or income (Grossi, 2017). Rentals that require tenants to prove that their income meets a certain threshold, such as a monthly income of three times the rent, can disqualify applicants who have been unable to secure employment that is stable and pays a livable wage (Beck et al., 2023). It is also noted by Grossi (2017) that these biases and standards of landlords and rental companies are sometimes influenced by the perceived community backlash of knowingly allowing someone with a criminal history to reside in the same neighborhood or apartment complex. In the event that they are granted residency, they risk negative social interactions that have potential to be aggressive if their neighbors are made aware of their criminal history. Depending on the convicted offense, formerly incarcerated persons may also be geographically limited in their housing options due to formal and informal constraints. Rental application rejections due to stigma-fueled decision-making, high costs of living, and lack of employment

opportunity ensures that formerly incarcerated persons are returning to areas of concentrated disadvantage (Augustine & Kushel, 2022; Hamlin, 2022; Purser & Hamlin, 2022). Informal factors can limit housing options by being consistently disrupted by parole officers, causing discomfort for formerly incarcerated residents and their families (Hamlin, 2022). The situation is even more dire for sexual offenders who are often removed from access to social support, job opportunities, and housing opportunities due to residential and working restrictions. These restrictions limit their options, as policies prohibit them from being within certain distances of areas that children frequent, like schools, daycares or community centers (Grossi, 2017; Rydberg, 2018).

Unfortunately, with the barriers to reentry that formerly incarcerated individuals face, they have an increased likelihood of becoming homeless (Hunter & Mercier, 2023). This outcome of reentry has its own cycle, as incarceration and homelessness interact with one another (Augustine & Kushel, 2022; Hunter & Mercier, 2023). Additionally, without a permanent address, homeless individuals are locked out of employment opportunities. Lack of housing and employment further fuels reincarceration by violating "quality-of-life" ordinances that result in rearrest (Beck et al., 2023; Hunter & Mercier, 2023).

Racial Discrimination

Unsurprisingly, minorities that were formerly incarcerated face additional challenges in finding employment and housing due to racial and ethnic discrimination. The literature has been clear in showing that racial discrimination plagues the criminal justice system, with Black men being six to eight times more likely to be incarcerated than White men (Alexander, 2011; Anderson et al., 2022; Henry, 2021; Kruttschnitt &

Otto, 2021; Liu, 2024; Ortiz & Jackey, 2019; Reisdorf & DeCook, 2022; Ugwudike, 2020; Wodahl & Freng, 2017). Over-policing of areas that are predominantly Black or Latino lead to disproportionate drug-related arrests and convictions, despite people possessing, using, and selling drugs at similar rates regardless of race (Alexander, 2011). This overrepresentation of Black people in the corrections system is clear, as they make up 40% of the prison population despite being roughly 12% of the entire United States population (Wodahl & Freng, 2017). Although they make up less of the prison population than Black people, Native Americans and Hispanic people also find themselves overrepresented in the prison population (Ugwudike, 2020). Additionally, Black and Hispanic people are subject to overprediction of recidivism risks and harsher sentencing guidelines due to algorithmic assessments, promoted as race-neutral, that rely on statistics that have been skewed due to the historic racism of the criminal justice system (Alexander, 2011; Anderson et al., 2022; Ugwidike, 2020).

2.2. Correctional and Reentry Programs

In attempts to prepare individuals for release, there are a variety of educational and vocational programs that incarcerated individuals can participate in. “Reach-in” programs can provide individuals preparing for release with housing and employment search assistance while they are incarcerated, to potentially reduce the amount of time returning citizens spend searching for these necessities upon release (Cook et al., 2015). When correctional programs include mentorship, whether as a supplemental addition or as a foundation, participants can be motivated to desist through companionship and

emotional, informational, and instrumental methods of social support (Kjellstrand et al., 2021).

From a decarceration approach, these programs are more impactful when they are implemented and accessible as a means of avoiding incarceration (Austin, 2017). Programs are seen as effective when they can prove that they are cost-effective and/or reduce recidivism rates, but also have the potential transformative experiences that participants have a right to (Gould, 2018; Smith, 2017). For example, the Free Expression Authors program emphasizes the learning experience as "a means of personal liberation and reclamation of dignity rather than as simply a tool geared toward lowering recidivism rates" (Smith, 2017, p. 96). Access to education and vocational training as a right rests with the idea that social structures needed to stay on a path of desistance should be guaranteed (Sampson & Laub, 2005). Incarcerated individuals desiring to desist from crime are able to participate in programs that provide them with the skills needed to stand out in the job market as well as access a learning experience that promotes rehabilitation through liberation.

Educational Programs

Correctional education and vocational training programs are designed to alleviate the post-reentry strains or gaps in educational achievement and work experience by providing incarcerated individuals with opportunities to develop these necessary skills while incarcerated. Programs vary across facilities depending on the resources available - educational programs can range from Adult Basic Education/GED courses to college or university partnerships (Sokoloff & Schenck-Fontaine, 2017). Vocational training programs can vary from custodial work assignments to specialized training in hands-on

fields like construction or animal training (Duwe & McNeeley, 2020; Nur & Nguyen, 2023).

Many studies show an increase in employment obtainment and a decrease in recidivism rates when compared to those who did not participate in educational programs during incarceration (Bozick et al., 2018; Rodriguez & Usman, 2023). Some scholars find that while the results of these programs are positive for those who participated, there is a gap in participation status as most incarcerated individuals are unable to access educational and vocational programs due to limited resources and eligibility requirements (Rodriguez & Usman, 2023). In attempts to combat this accessibility gap, the Federal Bureau of Prisons implemented policies that require incarcerated individuals who have not received a standard level of education to participate in appropriate educational programs to fulfill this educational gap (Pompoco et al., 2017). Pompoco et al. (2017) cautions that many individuals in some of these facilities still do not get the chance to participate in these programs due to waitlist times overlapping with sentence lengths.

For those who are able to get into an educational program, their success is dependent on a variety of factors, such as efficacy, sentence length, facility transfers, learning disability status, and quality of education (Koo, 2015; Mastrorilli, 2016; Roth et al., 2017). When incarcerated students are motivated to learn and complete their educational programs, they are found to be more active in their course participation. Unsurprisingly, when students do not feel motivated to learn due to factors such as simply not being interested in the program or not feeling confident in their personal and academic abilities, they may avoid participating in these programs (Roth et al., 2017). The strength of the student's confidence in their ability to successfully complete tasks

with their existing skills, which can be referred to as self-efficacy, can vary based on their age and sentence lengths. Students who are younger may feel more optimistic about the impacts of participating in correctional education, whereas older students may feel that it is not necessary (Roth et al., 2017). Individuals with shorter sentences may not view educational programs as a valuable use of their time (Roth et al., 2017). When incarcerated individuals are released prior to completing their educational programs, they may have the opportunity to continue their studies after release, but they face barriers to access. Formerly incarcerated students may find themselves unable to access financial aid or unable to pay for their education out-of-pocket (Mastrorilli, 2016). This is in addition to not having the time to complete their education while working or attending to other obligations.

During incarceration, students may struggle with completing their educational programs due to facility transfers. Mastrorilli (2016) notes in their review of prison postsecondary education that educational disruption of facility transferring happens without consideration of what the incarcerated student is participating in at their current facility. They also suggest that these abrupt transfers serve as a reminder that institutional needs are more important than rehabilitation, which can have lasting effects on individual self efficacy and decrease motivation to continue their education at their new facility or upon release. However, the educational environments that educators cultivate within these correctional facilities can provide their students with a motivational environment that can increase their self efficacy, network of social support, and potentially improve educational outcomes (Bozick et al., 2018).

Vocational Programs

Similar to educational programs, correctional vocational training programs are implemented to improve reentry outcomes by providing opportunities for incarcerated persons to develop skills and obtain certification for specific fields of employment (Nur & Nguyen, 2023). These fields are often hands-on industries such as construction, horticulture technology, or animal training, but vocational training programs can also focus on preparing incarcerated individuals for post-release job searching and interview practice. Vocational training programs offering certification and/or licensure in hands-on industries can address employment concerns from being unable to return to work that they may have been licensed in prior to incarceration, such as education or healthcare (Augustine, 2019). These training programs can provide opportunity for certification or licensure in fields that may be more accessible post-release.

Some may consider custodial work assignments while incarcerated to be included in vocational training, as correctional administrators promote these work assignments as ways to develop work ethic and prepare for post-release working conditions. Custodial work assignments can vary from on-site maintenance and facility upkeep (e.g., landscaping, laundry, or food preparation) to specialized work assignments where participants are contracted to private businesses such as Prison Industry Enhancement Certification Programs for production of goods like furniture or license plates for minimum wage pay (Nur & Nguyen, 2023). Unlike the concerns of participant access with educational programs (Pompoco et al., 2017; Rodriguez & Usman, 2023), it is estimated that over 90% of all incarcerated individuals will participate in custodial work and up to 5% of these individuals will be involved in private business employment (Nur & Nguyen, 2013). Some facilities mandate educational program participation and

custodial work. In North Carolina, the Department of Adult Corrections mandates that incarcerated individuals who are "physically and mentally able to work" be assigned to a job and they are to work diligently and conscientiously until ordered otherwise (State of North Carolina Department of Public Safety Prisons, 2019). This policy also requires that activities that conflict with the work assignment schedules must be approved by their supervisors. Individuals on carceral work assignments are able to earn "no more than $1.00 per day" or up to $5.00 per day when working at Correction Enterprises or through the Construction Apprenticeship Program (State of North Carolina Department of Public Safety Prisons, 2018). Although administrators suggest that these programs are to prepare for post-release working conditions, these custodial work programs are focused more on incarcerated behavioral impacts by reducing leisure time for incarcerated workers to engage in misconduct (Duwe & McNeeley, 2020; Nur & Nguyen, 2023). In a study conducted on Minnesota prison labor, it is found that while there was little impact on recidivism, there were significant improvements in obtaining post-release employment (Duwe & McNeeley, 2020).

Vocational programs that focus on training for specific fields of employment could potentially yield positive release outcomes for returning citizens. The Affordable Homes Program in Minnesota, which allows incarcerated individuals to gain experience in construction during their incarceration, led to increased participant employability post-release in the construction field, but did not increase employability in other fields (Duwe & McNeeley, 2020). While vocational training has mixed results regarding recidivism rates, programs are found to increase self efficacy for one's ability to find post-release employment and are less likely to have prison misconduct during incarceration (Duwe &

McNeeley, 2020; Rodriguez & Usman, 2023). It is also important to consider that inconclusive findings on whether vocational training improves post-release outcomes could be due to factors that are larger than the scope of the studies, with systemic barriers to housing and employment opportunities. Cook et al. (2015) notes in their evaluation of employment-oriented reentry programs that these studies would be stronger when providing "a bigger 'dose' of legitimate opportunity" when released (p. 378), supporting the idea that access to legitimate employment and housing can aid desistance.

For participants of vocational training and educational programs, they are found to be 12% more likely to gain post-release employment compared to individuals who did not participate in correctional programs (Bozick et al., 2018). It is also found that participants of educational programs are less likely to recidivate, with a 32% decrease in comparison to individuals who did not participate in correctional education programs. Rodriguez & Usman (2023) suggest that simply attending correctional programs can have positive impacts over time. To increase participation access and motivation, programs should consider highlighting post-release success stories, provide incentives to participate and complete programs, and offer good-time credits to reduce prison sentence lengths (Austin, 2017; Pompoco et al., 2017).

Reentry Programs

"Reach-in" programs provide currently incarcerated individuals with the opportunity to search for and/or gain experience in employment prior to release. These programs can allow participants to truly prepare for reentry by securing employment and sometimes housing while incarcerated. Routh & Hamilton (2015) suggest that returning citizens are not prepared for the reentry process, and that providing structured

interventions to meet needs will promote a successful reentry. Work release programs such as the aforementioned Affordable Homes Program increased participant likelihood of securing post-release employment in the construction industry and also allowed for participants to build professional and social connections which could arguably benefit them in securing employment in addition to meeting social needs (Duwe & McNeeley, 2020). Due to society functioning as an inherently social environment, it can be argued that social integration can be an important factor in post-release outcomes (Newton et al., 2018). Additionally, work release programs have been found to reduce recidivism rates while being cost-effective (Routh & Hamilton, 2015). Because work release programs can allow incarcerated individuals to work for a minimum wage or wage comparable to that of a non-incarcerated employee, these programs can address the strains of only about 44% of incarcerated individuals having any release funds (Cook et al., 2015; Nur & Nguyen, 2023). It is suggested in the literature that "reach-in" programs that provide opportunity to connect incarcerated individuals with resources prior to release could have positive impacts on employment and housing, leading to lower recidivism rates, and should be included as a key part of release plans (Newton et al., 2018; Routh & Hamilton, 2015).

An example of a successful reentry program is Minnesota's EMPLOY program, which significantly improved participant employment, wages, and hours (McNeeley, 2022). The "reach-in" program specialists worked with participants months prior to release to assist with resume building, interviewing skills, and matching participants with potential employers near the community in which they will be released. EMPLOY provided participants with assistance in finding clothing for their interviews as well as

one-month transit passes to address transportation issues. The assigned specialists would maintain contact with participants for a full year following release to provide employment assistance when needed to ensure that participants are consistent in their reentry process (McNeeley, 2022).

In addition to work release "reach-in" programs, correctional programs that address the Risk, Need, and Responsivity model can yield positive results by ensuring that incarcerated individuals are prepared for release (Routh & Hamilton, 2015). The RNR model urges rehabilitative programs to be offered to high risk individuals, address dynamic factors that relate to criminal behavior, and to be accommodating to participant learning styles (Bozick et al., 2018; McNeeley, 2022; Routh & Hamilton, 2015). It is important to note that risk assessments are not always equitable and can be problematic when reliant on algorithmic methods of calculation, which often approach risk evaluation with a colorblind perspective and lack of context per individual (Day & Tamatea, 2021). Additionally, there is an important distinction to be made between risk and between dangerousness, as recidivism does not necessarily equate to danger, as scholars of reentry housing note (Beck et al., 2023; O'Malley & Smith, 2021). Requiring additional factors to be considered such as family support, strains, religion, societal gender roles, and ensuring that assessors have an overall comprehensive understanding of the environments in which incarcerated individuals come from and return to can provide a more equitable assessment of risk and needs (Day & Tamatea, 2021). With these considerations in mind, programs that provide a comprehensive utilization of the RNR model can be successful through addressing criminogenic needs such as housing and employment.

While arguably carceral for those who are released, halfway houses are promoted as providing returning citizens with a structured and supportive reentry environment (Clark, 2016; Hamlin & Purser, 2021; Purser & Hamlin, 2022; Routh & Hamilton, 2015). Halfway houses are often designed to provide returning citizens with vocational training, work opportunities, and treatment resources while under supervision (Clark, 2016), with the goal of increasing gainful employment to improve stability (Hamlin, 2020). Reno, Nevada's Ridge House has been cited as a successful halfway housing program, with lower recidivism for participants that completed all program components (Clark, 2016). However, in their analysis of post-release housing placements, Clark (2016) considers neighborhood economic disadvantage and finds that halfway houses significantly influence recidivism. They go on to suggest that close supervision could account for the increase in recidivism, which ties back to criticisms of halfway housing supervision being an extension of incarceration (Hamlin, 2020; Hamlin & Purser 2021; Purser & Hamlin, 2022). Although halfway housing as a whole seems to fall short in their goals to rehabilitate individuals and neighborhoods, programs like New Beginnings and the Chicago Housing Authority pilot reentry program serve as positive influences towards social integration and shifting public perception by decreasing stigma that returning citizens are unable to be good neighbors or tenants and providing participants with means to access and develop social networks (Hamlin, 2020; Purser & Hamlin, 2022). It is important to emphasize that while halfway house residents feel gratitude for their access to shelter, there is still a need to reform halfway housing to address over-surveillance and lack of self agency experienced in the reentry process. Addressing these

criminogenic factors will help these programs to adhere to the RNR model (Routh & Hamilton, 2015).

Reentry programs that provide direct assistance to formerly incarcerated participants have been fairly successful in enhancing reentry outcomes. The Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) in New York City provided returning citizens with temporary, paid employment experience and resources to connect participants to long-term employment (Redcross et al., 2012). CEO emphasized the development of soft skills to promote marketability and workplace social integration by cultivating environments of positive peer influence and mentorship (Redcross et al., 2012). A study including the project finds that participants who entered the program within three months of release were less likely to recidivate (Newton et al., 2018). The outcomes for high risk participants were highlighted as it is suggested that they had the most effective results. In an analysis of reentry programs, Newton et al. (2018) notes that participants of the CEO program felt connected to the staff and that the sense of connection from the social environments within the program could have had a positive influence on their reentry success.

While CEO and studies utilizing the CEO dataset are consistent in finding that initially positive employment impacts tapered out over time (Nguyen et al., 2023), some of these studies also find that CEO had significant impacts on reducing rearrest, conviction, and reincarceration for participants who were recently released from prison (Newton et al., 2018; Redcross et al., 2012). In the aforementioned study conducted by Newton et al. (2018), it was found that these results were strongest for high risk participants. Another study conducted by Nguyen et al. (2023) focusing on the influence

of age on employment and recidivism finds that older participants of the CEO were less likely to recidivate. Nguyen et al. (2023) suggests that age, in combination with multiple sources of social control such as marriage, may contribute to a more effective outcome from employment programs. It is also suggested by CEO that increasing positive social networks in combination with stable routines and income can assist in the reentry process (Redcross, 2012). This suggestion aligns with the suggestion posed by Newton et al. (2018) that the social integration within the CEO program's work crews and connection to CEO staff may have contributed to employment success.

In North Carolina, the Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office implemented a program designed to ease returning citizens back into the community referred to as Re-entry Support Services. Through their Digital Literacy program, participants are taught the basic functions of a computer, how to navigate internet search engines, and internet security (Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office, 2021). Participants that successfully complete the digital literacy program earn a free laptop, which is not something that many formerly incarcerated persons have access to (Reisdorf et al., 2022). Providing returning citizens with the opportunity to develop digital skills and reward them with a device upon completion addresses a critical need in the increasingly technology dependent society. Digital skills are a prerequisite to obtaining many necessities that impact quality of life such as housing, employment, healthcare, education, benefits, and social needs (Strover et al., 2020; Tirado-Morueta et al., 2018) as many applications to access these needs have shifted primarily, if not entirely, online (Reisdorf & DeCook, 2022). Providing returning citizens with the opportunity to develop digital skills necessary to access resources and rewarding them with a digital device upon completion

addresses the digital divide experienced by formerly incarcerated persons, potentially improving their post-release outcomes. Another program within the Re-entry Support Services is an Employment Readiness program that serves as a workshop for participants to strengthen their resumes, fill out job applications, and practice their interviewing skills (Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office, 2021). Despite public perception being a barrier to policies that allow access to employment and housing (Ward et al., 2021) in addition to diminishing public support when the topic of raising taxes or giving preferential treatment to returning citizens (Jonson & Cullen, 2015), the Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office Re-entry Support Services initiative has received overwhelming public support. The collective community effort to assist in providing a successful reentry could arguably strengthen perceptions of social support for formerly incarcerated persons.

Mentorship

Mentorship can be an additional resource within a program or the foundation of an entire program, with mentors providing resources and assistance to their mentee. The inclusion of mentorship in the reentry process can help with easing the stressors of reentry while also providing an opportunity for informal socialization back into society (Sells et al., 2020). This informal socialization can provide social support through companionship, emotional support, informational support, and instrumental support (Kjellstrand et al., 2021). While anyone can provide social support, mentors who are knowledgeable in the reentry process through training or lived experience can provide credible informational support through connecting mentees to resources and/or instrumental support, such as providing resources like transportation or housing and job opportunities (Kjellstrand et al., 2021). Mentors can help to relieve strains caused by the

reentry process by addressing social needs and providing their mentees with undivided attention. This is highlighted by Kenemore & In (2020), who found mentees appreciated the support and reported improved self-esteem and empowerment. Programs that utilized peer mentorship also provided validation and representation to mentees, allowing them to find more credibility in the advice and resources provided by a mentor who has the lived experience of incarceration (Matthews, 2021). Mentorship as a supplemental benefit of a program or as the foundation of a program can also help to get ahead of the fact that returning citizens struggle with asking for assistance (Matthews, 2021).

While much of the literature has focused on familial support in the reentry process, there is a growing body of literature that focuses on non-familial platonic relationships, such as mentorship in the reentry process. Because the justice system relies on nonprofit organizations and agencies to assist in the reentry process (Augustine & Kushel, 2022; Ortiz & Jackey, 2019), it is important to understand the ways in which mentorship helps and hinders mentees so programs seeking to add mentorship can do so effectively. The literature has mixed results on whether or not mentorship improves post-release outcomes, with mentorship having little to no impact on recidivism in some studies (Kenemore & In, 2020; Kjellstrand et al., 2021) but showing a decrease in recidivism in others (Sells et al., 2020).

Despite the inconclusiveness on recidivism in the current literature, there is still a collective agreement that access to social support is necessary for currently and formerly incarcerated individuals and can be an effective addition to standard reentry programs. The social support that is provided by mentorship can improve self-efficacy through motivation, financial literacy, empathetic public and peer relationships, and can have

positive impacts on sense of belonging by having access to necessary resources like transportation, education, and legal resources (Kenemore & In, 2020; Kjellstrand et al., 2021; Matthews, 2021; Sells et al., 2020). Such support can promote situated choices where mentees are working to desist from crime and mentors provide structural support through not only educating mentees on skill development and resource attainment, but also promoting liberation through destigmatization and companionship.

2.3. Theoretical Framework

While this study is not a test of theory, Agnew's general strain theory and Sampson & Laub's life-course criminology approach are both reviewed to better understand transitional stress in reentry and factors of recidivism. General strain theory suggests that stressors lead to an increase of negative emotions that could further lead to committing crime (Agnew, 2001). At the individual level, general strain theory identifies that the reentry process itself is a stressor (i.e., strain), that could influence the chances of reoffending (Cook & Haynes, 2021). Failure to meet the needs that would relieve the strain and stressors of reentry – such as accessing social support, substance abuse treatment, housing, and employment – increases the chances of recidivism (Cook & Haynes, 2021; Liu et al., 2021). Barriers to achievement and the absence of legitimate skills and resources to manage these strains can lead to crime, or recidivism in the case of the formerly incarcerated (Agnew, 2001). This is evident in Augustine's (2019) interviews with justice-involved job seekers, as the stressors of needing an income despite employment discrimination influenced some job seekers to intentionally not disclose their criminal history or shift to "extralegal" employment. While many of the

returning citizens in this study desired to find legal and meaningful employment, they lack structures of support to ensure that these necessary goals are achieved.

As Sampson & Laub (2005) suggest in their life-course approach, social structures of support are necessary for individuals with desire to desist from crime. The concept of social structures influencing desistance can be connected to other social control theories, like rational choice, social learning, and differential association. Sampson & Laub's life-course approach builds on these theories through the questioning and exploration of gaps in the existing literature, with the goal of highlighting social dynamics and human agency (Laub & Sampson, 2001; Sampson & Laub, 2005). While life-course criminology tends to review patterns of crime and desistance over the life-span, we can focus on the suggestion that strong social ties to institutions such as marriage and employment offer an explanation for desistance, and therefore, recidivism rates. This approach suggests that the desire to desist in crime paired with the social structures of marriage and employment can provide stability for formerly incarcerated persons and can promote mobility in human agency. Structured support can relieve the strains of reentry by providing social support and can increase social and professional networks that lead to job opportunities, or at the very least, can provide individuals with social control that motivates desistance.

Narrowing in on social bonds and family values, marriage has been considered a strong influence on recidivism. The literature suggests that marriage provides structured role stability and resources to meet needs in the reentry process such as housing, transportation, and financial support (Hood & Gaston, 2021; Laub & Sampson, 2001; Mowen et al., 2019). Additionally, the stability of marriage has been found to improve

recidivism rates as returning citizens living with their spouse are less likely to recidivate (Clark, 2016). This ties into housing literature as the decrease in recidivism may be attributed to a dual-income household and having another trusted party to contribute to living expenses. Social bonds theorists associate the outcomes with the close-proximity influence that modifies individual attitudes (Sampson & Laub, 2005). Marriage encourages desistance by providing formerly incarcerated persons with additional motivation to refrain from crime as to not damage their relationship (Liu, 2020).

2.4. Current Study

Building upon the research on mentorship, the present study builds on the current reentry literature by exploring the impact of mentorship on arrest. Using the CEO data from New York, this thesis seeks to examine if having a mentorship figure has a positive influence on the reentry process by decreasing recidivism. To address this, this thesis focuses on the relationship between mentorship and rearrest, with controls for additional factors of recidivism. The central research question to be answered is whether mentorship lowers the likelihood of rearrest for formerly incarcerated persons.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

3.1. Research Question and Hypothesis

This thesis will add to the existing reentry literature by testing the influence of mentorship on rearrest. The literature surrounding mentorship and social bonds suggests that having strong social support has influence on a successful reentry through addressing social needs and providing informational and instrumental support. This study will test the following hypothesis:

> H1: Formerly incarcerated persons who have a mentor are less likely to be rearrested after release.

3.2. Data & Sample

The data used in this thesis are from the Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) in New York City. This study was funded by the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services and was part of the Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ Demonstration and Evaluation Project (HTE), a larger effort to implement effective employment strategies to underemployed populations. Other studies within the HTE project were conducted in Philadelphia, Rhode Island, Kansas, and Missouri and included unemployed recipients of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, parents with major depression, and children living in poverty, respectively (Bloom & Jacobs, 2013; Hsueh, 2013; Kim, 2013). CEO was designed to provide job resources and increase employability for individuals who face significant barriers to employment from having a history that includes arrest, conviction, incarceration, or any combination of justice involvement. CEO provides community resources, educational, and vocational resources to formerly incarcerated persons,

including temporary paid jobs. In the study, 977 CEO program participants who were referred to the program by their parole officer were randomly assigned between January 2004 and October 2005 to either the program group (568) or the control group (409). All of the participants were under parole supervision when they entered the study and joined within one year of release on average. In contrast, CEO reports that around 75% of their population joins the program immediately after release (Redcross et al., 2012). The sample was then followed into the community and contacted after 16-23 months. 68 percent of the sample participated in the follow up survey. The final sample for the current study includes those in the treatment group who participated in the follow up (n=316).

While discussed in detail below, most of the participants were men of color, with 93% male participants and 64.4% Black and 30.6% Hispanic participants. At the time of random assignment, 53.4% of participants had a high school diploma or equivalent. Participants who were assigned to the program group were able to participate in transitional jobs, job coaching and development, parenting classes, and post-placement services. The transitional job included work crews who would work four days a week for minimum wage, with the fifth day of the week dedicated to meeting with CEO staff to report their progress and allow for the opportunity to participate in the additional services granted by being in the program group. When participants were considered ready for job placement, CEO would provide assistance in permanent job placement. Members of the control group had access to basic job search assistance and equipment, in addition to community services.

Data collection from the CEO study comes from various sources. A "Baseline Information Form" was used to collect demographic and characteristic information from participants prior to random assignment. To measure justice involvement before and after the study, the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services and the New York City Department of Corrections collects information regarding arrest, conviction, incarceration, and New York City jail admissions and releases. The New York State Department of Labor provided information about CEO transitional jobs and other employment that were covered by unemployment insurance. CEO measured participation in program activities through internal management and payroll systems. Lastly, study participants were surveyed approximately 16 to 23 months after joining the study, and 19 program group members participated in in-depth interviews. The survey was administered to 531 participants with a response rate of about 68% (N = 316) and asked questions about program services received, housing, employment, and a variety of additional areas that pertain to a successful reentry, such as familial relationship strength, time between random assignment and first rearrest, employee benefits, self-help treatment, substance abuse treatment, times moved and reasons for move, and healthcare access.

CEO offers a dataset that provides many benefits to this research. Researchers followed up with participants several months following the start of the study to assess the impact of their services on reentry outcomes and included multiple administrative sources to build on the baseline and survey data and to account for the various factors involved in the reentry process. Despite CEO not highlighting mentorship within their results, the inclusion of mentoring roles within the dataset allow for an analysis of mentorship and

rearrest to be conducted. To prepare the data for this study, only cases within the program group that participated in the follow-up survey of the original study were included to analyze whether mentorship stands out among the services provided by being included in the program group. This was also to consider that the control group not having access to program group services could have influenced rearrest.

3.3. Measures

For the purpose of this study, recidivism is defined as rearrest. By removing cases outside of the program group, the analysis will test whether having a mentor stands out among the additional resources that the program group had access to. Prior studies suggest that the social environments promoted by the program group work crews allowed for opportunities to develop a mentoring relationship (Newton et al., 2018; Redcross et al., 2012). Data management and analyses were conducted using IBM® SPSS® Statistics 28 software platform.

Independent Variable

The independent variable in this study is *mentorship*. Mentorship is measured as a dichotomous (0/1) variable based on whether respondents reported having "someone who is viewed as a mentor/guide" (0 = no, 1 = yes). This variable existed in the original dataset and did not need to be recoded or transformed. Variables that discussed the aspects of mentorship such as whether a respondent had a mentor who went out of their way to help or whether the respondent had a mentor who gave advice or support with personal issues were considered, but ultimately excluded from the independent variable due to inconsistencies in case matching and to focus on the impact of having a mentor, rather than the level of mentorship provided.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable used in this analysis is rearrest. Rearrest was chosen over conviction or incarceration to consider the first point of justice involvement. The original variable "Never arrested after RA (no arrests in Corr file)" was transformed into a new variable with the label "Arrested after RA (arrests in Corr file)" and the 0/1 values were reverse-coded to 0 = not arrested, 1 = arrested.

Control Variables

To consider additional factors of recidivism in the analysis, six control variables representing influences of recidivism are used. The control variables are *age*, *marital status*, *education*, *prior felony arrest*, *employment*, and *housing*. Factors that would otherwise have been included in the control variables such as race, ethnicity, and gender were excluded due to the sample size and ensuring confidentiality of participants.

Age. Nguyen et al. (2023) focuses on age in their analyses utilizing the CEO dataset, and it is suggested that age has some influence on recidivism and the shift towards desistance (Sampson & Laub, 2005; Nguyen et al., 2023). Age was transformed from a continuous variable to a categorical variable by the primary investigators to maintain confidentiality, resulting in categories of 1 = 18 to 24 years, 2 = 25 to 30 years, 3 = 31 to 40 years, and 4 = 41+ years.

Marital status. Much of the life-course criminology and social bond literature consider marriage as an institution that alleviates reentry stress and improves recidivism rates through social support and stability through assistance in housing, transportation, and financial support (Clark, 2016; Hood & Gaston, 2021; Laub & Sampson, 2001; Mowen et al., 2019). Marital status was measured at both the baseline and in the follow-

up with the program group. To consider the most updated status, the follow-up marriage variable was chosen over the baseline marriage variable. Marital status was an existing dichotomous variable (0 = unmarried, 1 = married).

Education. The variable for education was originally in the dataset and did not need to be recoded. Similarly to marital status, education was measured at the baseline and in the program group follow-up. The follow-up variable was utilized for the most updated status and to consider a larger set of cases, and the dichotomous variable measures whether respondents had a high school diploma or G.E.D. (0 = no, 1 = yes).

Prior felony arrest. Considering justice involvement is known as a "revolving door," it is appropriate to measure prior interactions with the justice system. To keep the measurement of involvement consistent with the arrest after random assignment dependent variable, prior felony arrests are included in the control variables. Felony arrests were chosen over misdemeanor arrests given the comparison of penalties and the felony disenfranchisement that often follows if convicted (Alexander, 2011). Prior felony arrest was measured by a continuous variable ranging from 1 to 9 arrests. This variable was originally present in the dataset, provided by administrative data, and did not need recoding.

Employment. This variable was measured with an existing dichotomous variable measuring whether respondents were currently "working for pay - in the community" at the time of the 16 to 23 month follow-up. Employment was added as a control variable as one of the most recurring themes in reentry literature is the lack of employment opportunities that returning citizens face due to their criminal history, which is not resolved following participation in an employment program. As Nguyen et al. (2023)

note, “if supported or unsupported jobs are to be effective at reducing recidivism, then the jobs that employment programs lead to - low-paying, marginal jobs - should appreciably affect recidivism” (p. 475). Despite the efforts of CEO and similar programs, the issue of legitimate, livable, and stable employment extends beyond the scope of their abilities.

Housing. Similarly to employment, housing is a recurring barrier to reentry for returning citizens and can be connected to inability to secure stable and livable employment to meet rental requirements (Beck et al., 2023). Returning citizens are often dependent on family members, friends, or halfway homes, which are often temporary arrangements or inaccessible due to availability or eligibility barriers (Beck et al., 2023; Hamlin, 2022; Johnson, 2023; Kenemore & In, 2023). Despite family and friends desiring to assist in housing, there are often restrictions in allowing individuals with criminal records to stay with them (Beck et al., 2023; Johnson, 2023). To consider these temporary housing solutions, housing statuses that fall outside of “currently living in own place” are considered unstable housing. This variable was an existing dichotomous variable (0 = no, 1 = yes) from the follow-up survey.

3.4. Analytical Strategy

Logistic regression was used to analyze the impacts of mentorship on rearrest. This is appropriate given the dichotomous dependent variable.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

4.1. Sample Characteristics

As noted by Table 1, roughly a quarter of the individuals within the sample have a high school diploma or equivalency, with 47.2% indicating such in the follow-up survey. In regards to marital status, only 15.5% of respondents were married. Unsurprisingly, the majority of participants do not have stable housing, with 78.2% indicating that they are not living in their own place. These results align with the literature surrounding employment and housing access, as only 36.7% of the sample had active paid employment at the time of the survey. Additionally, the result is supported by the suggestion that having a spouse may be able to provide financial assistance which can, in turn, provide a stable living situation. With these considerations, 64.9% of rearrests within the sample is also unsurprising.

The frequency of prior felony arrests is also consistent with the literature and the suggestion behind the "revolving door", with 81.4% of the sample having at least two or more prior felony arrests. Potentially surprising, however, is the substantial difference in frequencies between having eight prior arrests, 4.1%, and having nine prior arrests, 11.1%. This could be due to the 9 value possibly representing 9 or more prior felony arrests, however, this is not stated within the materials of the dataset. Otherwise, the frequency tends to decrease as the total number of arrests increase until moving to nine prior arrests.

Mentorship had a low turnout, with only 32.6% of respondents indicating that they had someone who they viewed as a mentor or guide. It is possible that if similar mentorship variables covering the level of mentoring were considered, there may be a

larger group of respondents who were mentored overall, but this is not included in this analysis due to the inconsistencies of responses and missing values among cases.

Table 1
Sample Characteristics

Characteristic	N	Percentage
Age in years		
18 – 24	60	19.0%
25 – 30	69	21.8%
31 – 40	105	33.3%
> 40	82	25.9%
Missing	-	-
Marital Status		
Married	49	15.5%
Unmarried	263	83.2%
Missing	4	1.3%
High school diploma or G.E.D.		
Yes		
No	149	47.2%
Missing	164	51.9%
	3	0.9%
Total prior felony arrest		
1	51	16.1%
2	48	15.2%
3	44	13.9%
4	41	13.0%
5	34	10.8%
6	23	7.3%
7	19	6.0%
8	13	4.1%
9	35	11.1%
Missing	8	2.5%
Employed		
Yes	116	36.7%
No	200	63.3%
Missing	-	-
Housing		
Stable housing	69	21.8%
Unstable housing	247	78.2%
Missing	-	-
Has a mentor/guide		
Yes	103	32.6%
No	213	67.4%
Missing	-	-
Arrested after R.A.		
Yes	205	64.9%
No	111	35.1%
Missing	-	-

Note: N = 316

4.2. Binary Logistic Regression

To assess the relationship between mentorship and rearrest, a logistic regression was conducted using SPSS® version 28.

Table 2
Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	24.901	7	< .001
	Block	24.901	7	< .001
	Model	24.901	7	< .001

The Pseudo-R^2 value shows that the logistic regression analysis model explained 5.4% of the variance in rearrest for participants included in the analytical model.

Table 3
Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	369.811 [a]	.079	.108

The logistic regression model was statistically significant. The results are displayed below in Table 4. The study hypothesized that people with a mentor would be less likely to be arrested in the community. The model suggests that mentorship does not have a significant impact on rearrest. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported.

When exploring the control variables, the regression does find significance in the age, total prior felony arrest, and employment control variables. These findings indicate that younger individuals and those with multiple prior felony arrests are more likely to be

rearrested. The model also indicates that individuals who are employed are less likely to be rearrested than those who are unemployed.

Table 4

Binary Logistic Regression Model Predicting the Effect of Mentorship on Rearrest

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Mentorship	.297	.278	1.149	.284	1.346
Age	-.358	.153	5.485	.019**	.699
Marital Status	.121	.365	.109	.741	1.128
High School/G.E.D.	-.042	.256	.026	.871	.959
Total Prior Felony Arrest	.145	.061	5.611	.018**	1.156
Employment	-.920	.261	12.378	< .001***	.399
Housing	-.220	.314	.490	.484	.802
Constant	1.281	.378	11.482	< .001	3.600
$x^2 = 24.901$ Pseudo-$R^2 = .108$					

Note: N = 303; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

5.1. Summary of Findings

The purpose of this thesis was to assess the relationship between mentorship and recidivism through analyzing the effects of having a mentor on rearrest. The results of the logistic regression model indicates that mentorship does not have a significant effect on rearrest, which is not supportive of the hypothesis. This result is consistent with some of the findings from the literature that finds minimal to no impact on recidivism (Kenemore & In, 2020; Kjellstrand et al., 2021). However, other studies find that mentorship does result in a decrease in recidivism (Sells et al., 2020). Based on this and the literature surrounding the importance of social support in the reentry process, it was expected that mentorship would have some significance on rearrest. CEO notes that their program encouraged positive peer influences and the development of mentoring relationships (Redcross et al., 2012). Although Newton et al. (2018) did not examine variables in their study of reentry programs, including CEO, they suggested that the social environments cultivated by the program's services may have contributed to a successful attainment of post-release employment. These suggestions are supported by the social support literature that indicates that informational and instrumental support gained in a mentoring relationship can connect formerly incarcerated persons to employment, housing, education, transportation, and legal resources (Kjellstrand et al., 2021; Matthews, 2021). The literature also suggests that mentorship can motivate returning citizens as they navigate the reentry process through companionship and emotional support (Kenemore & In, 2020; Kjellstrand et al., 2021; Matthews, 2021; Sells et al., 2020).

Although the literature supports the hypothesis that mentorship would reduce rearrest, there are potential explanations for why this study did not find significance in the relationship. The study design contributes to this through the limitations of the dataset, which are discussed in more detail in the following section. Another potential explanation for this outcome could be due to mentorship not being a treatment program in the way that substance abuse treatment, employment, and housing programs are. Where programs that focus on substance abuse treatment, employment, and housing are designed to address a criminogenic need, mentorship can assist in connecting mentees to these resources through informational or instrumental support. Access to these resources can improve reentry outcomes, but mentorship cannot be a substitute for these necessities.

While the model does not find significance in mentorship on rearrest, significance is found in the age, total prior felony arrest, and employment control variables. These findings indicate that age has an influence on rearrest in that younger people are more likely to be rearrested. This is consistent with previous research finding that age does have influence on recidivism (Nguyen et al., 2023). The significance shown in the prior felony arrest control variable is consistent with the “revolving door” of reentry and recidivism. This significance of prior felony arrest on rearrest is discussed in prior studies using the CEO dataset in regards to individuals who are considered high risk having the most effective outcomes of the program (Newton et al., 2018; Redcross et al., 2012). Additionally, employment was found to be a significant predictor of rearrest, with the model indicating that individuals with employment are less likely to be rearrested than those who are unemployed. This finding is consistent with the literature that suggests that

employment is a key determinant of a successful reentry (Augustine, 2019; Augustine & Kushel, 2022; Baloch & Jennings, 2021; Beck et al., 2023; Bowen et al., 2019; Bozick et al., 2018; Cook & Haynes, 2021; Cook et al., 2015; Duwe & McNeeley, 2020; Grossi, 2017; Hunter & Mercier, 2023; Johnson, 2023; Liu, 2024; Liu et al., 2021; Newton et al., 2018; Niebuhr & Orrick, 2020; Nur & Nguyen, 2023; Rodriguez & Usman, 2023; Routh & Hamilton, 2015; Rydberg, 2018; Silver et al., 2021; Ward et al., 2021). The literature further suggests that it goes further than simply having a job, with studies finding that employment opportunities with higher wages, job security, and job satisfaction has a stronger impact on recidivism and time between release and rearrest (Duwe & McNeeley, 2020; Niebuhr & Orrick, 2020).

5.2. Limitations

This study is not without limitations. To begin, the dataset had some limitations that were attributed to ensuring confidentiality, with the loss of several key variables including race and sex. The sample was also limited to participants in New York, as this subset of the Hard-to-Employ Demonstration and Evaluation Project focused on individuals facing barriers to employment due to justice involvement. A nationally representative sample could have returned a stronger analysis by allowing for generalizability inclusion of additional variables such as an expanded mentorship independent variable, recidivism dependent variable, and employment control variable.

In regards to the independent mentorship variable, this study was limited in the measurement of mentorship. While there were variables of mentorship that discussed whether the respondent had a mentor who went out of their way to help or a mentor who gave advice on personal issues, the specific variable asking respondents if they had

someone who they viewed as a mentor or guide was chosen for consistency in the concept of mentorship and to minimize missing cases in the analysis. The values from the additional mentorship variables were inconsistent with the independent variable, as various cases indicated 0 = no for “has someone who is viewed as a mentor/guide” while also indicating that they had a mentor that went out of their way to help or had a mentor that gave advice/support with personal issues. The structuring of these questions within the survey is unclear and the variables were ultimately excluded for a parsimonious study. In regards to the dependent arrest variable, this study is limited in that it only analyzed the impacts of mentorship on rearrest as a representation of recidivism, rather than reconviction, reincarceration, or combination of the three. In addition, an analysis of whether arrest was from a new offense could have yielded interesting results. Further, a comparison on offense types at either stage of the data collection would have provided insight on whether mentorship potentially addresses criminogenic factors that influence offenses that are attributed to reentry strains, such as quality-of-life violations from lack of housing or employment (Beck et al., 2023; Hunter & Mercier, 2023). A mixed-methods follow-up through the rephrasing and redelivery of the mentorship questions within the follow-up survey focusing on the extent mentorship, or lack thereof, was attributed to rearrest would have also allowed for an understanding of the role mentorship plays in deterring recidivism.

5.3. Policy Implications and Future Research

Despite this study finding no significance in mentorship on rearrest, the results contribute to mentorship and reentry literature through discussion that promotes policy and future research suggestions. As discussed in the findings, there are studies that find

mentorship to decrease recidivism (Sells et al., 2020) and studies that find the relationship to have minimal or no impact (Kenemore & In, 2020; Kjellstrand et al., 2021). The inconsistencies within the literature could be indicative of the need to implement more mentorship roles within or as the focus of programs to allow for more evaluations of its effectiveness. The inclusion of mentorship in CEO's employment program had little to no cost, given that mentoring relationships were built upon existing relationships such as a friend, coworker, or supervisor. CEO surveyed participants about their mentoring relationships and found that, despite not having a formal mentor role within the program, participants perceived having a mentor (Redcross et al., 2012). Inclusion of a formal mentor role can be low cost by relying on volunteers who are provided with training to support justice involved individuals through emotional, informational, and instrumental support (Kjellstrand et al., 2021; Matthews, 2021; Stacer & Roberts, 2018). Strengthening interpersonal skills should also be included in mentorship training so mentors can navigate various communication styles from formerly incarcerated persons, who often struggle to ask for assistance in the reentry process (Matthews, 2021).

These suggestions can also be applied to paid formal and informal mentoring roles, including roles such as an educator or advisor. Programs that have any mentoring role should consider including an assessment of the roles through participant and program evaluations. Including participant feedback on mentorship roles can allow for an understanding of how these relationships help and hinder in the reentry process. Drawing on findings in correctional education programs, the success of a program can be influenced by supportive staff members who motivate participants and increase self-

efficacy (Bozick et al., 2018). These roles can also have a negative influence on participant success stemming from differences in life experiences, beliefs, and sensitivity training (Kjellstrand et al., 2021; Matthews, 2021; Stacer & Roberts, 2018). Program staff members are potentially viewed as a mentor, guide, or role model by participants, and evaluations can provide insight on how these roles are viewed.

5.4. Future Research

As Laub & Sampson (2001) note in their discussion of social bonds, mundane habits have the opportunity to decrease recidivism by structuring the day-to-day and reducing opportunities for crime. This could be considered alongside mentorship as a resource that is not necessarily defined by a set of objectives in the way that an educational or vocational program seeks to directly improve employability and liberation literature that supports education as a right rather than a tool (Smith, 2017). To advocate for increased mentorship to formerly incarcerated and currently incarcerated persons, its value needs to be considered in future studies that discuss correctional programs and social bonds. At the individual and local level, many organizations, nonprofits, and institutions directly provide support to justice involved individuals and rely on volunteers to dedicate their time to strengthening the collective efficacy of their local communities and advocating for change towards an equitable reentry process. These volunteers may find themselves taking on the role of a mentor for currently or formerly incarcerated persons.

Future research should also consider the influence of mentorship and other platonic non-familial relationships on post-release outcomes. Research should consider

the relationship between platonic non-familial relationships on the time spent between release and rearrest, to expand understanding of recidivism. This may allow for more understanding regarding the impact that these relationships can have on addressing criminogenic needs through emotional, informational, and instrumental support. Qualitative studies should be conducted to gain insight directly from justice involved individuals to help shape what an effective mentor should look like, including both peer mentors and mentors that have not experienced the justice system. Lastly, future reentry researchers conducting original surveys, interviews, or program analyses should consider including questions regarding mentorship and non-familial platonic relationships to assess the impact of social relationships in a variety of programs, to allow for further understanding of the effectiveness, or potential effectiveness, of mentorship on reentry.

5.5. Conclusion

Formerly incarcerated persons face extensive barriers to necessities upon release. Many of these barriers are rooted in stigma fueled policies and practices that ultimately add additional strains to the reentry process, which can influence recidivism. There are a many studies that find educational and vocational programs to have a positive impact on employment and housing obtainment (Bozick et al., 2018; Newton et al., 2018; Nur & Nguyen, 2023; Pompoco et al., 2017; Sokoloff & Schenck-Fontaine, 2017), but these programs have limitations in that not all returning citizens are able to access these programs and these programs do not often ensure employment or housing (Anestis & Carbonell, 2014; Austin, 2017). However, within these programs, participants are able to develop social networks, engage in mentorship relationships, and experience informal

social integration (Bozick et al., 2018; Newton et al., 2018; Redcross et al., 2012; Sells et al., 2020).

This thesis assessed the impact of direct mentorship on recidivism for formerly incarcerated persons by conducting a logistic regression analysis. Recidivism was narrowed to arrest after CEO's random assignment and control variables of age, marital status, education, prior felony arrest, employment, and housing were considered to address well-known factors of recidivism. The results did not support the hypothesis that mentorship would have a significant influence on rearrest, but found that there was significance in age, prior felony arrest, and employment. While the hypothesis was not supportive, the results are consistent with the literature given that the literature surrounding mentorship and recidivism itself is inconclusive (Kenemore & In, 2020; Kjellstrand et al., 2021; Sells et al., 2020). It is suggested that further consideration is given to measuring mentorship when reviewing programs to assess the effectiveness of closer non-familial platonic relationships on recidivism and other successful aspects of reentry such as housing and employment.

REFERENCES

Abbott, M. L. (2014). *Understanding educational statistics using Microsoft Excel and SPSS*. John Wiley & Sons.

Agnew, R. (2001). Building on the foundation of general strain theory: Specifying the types of strain most likely to lead to crime and delinquency. *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 38*(4), 319–361. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427801038004001

Alexander, M. (2011). *The New Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness.* New York, NY: New Press.

Anderson, C. N., Wooldredge, J., & Cochran, J. C. (2022). Can "race-neutral" program eligibility requirements in criminal justice have disparate effects? An examination of race, ethnicity, and prison industry employment. *Criminology & Public Policy, 21*(2), 405-432. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12576

Anestis, J. C., & Carbonell, J. L. (2014). Stopping the revolving door: Effectiveness of mental health court in reducing recidivism by mentally ill offenders. *Psychiatric Services, 65*(9), 1105-1112.

Augustine, D. (2019). Working around the law: Navigating legal barriers to employment during reentry. *Law & Social Inquiry, 44*(3), 726–751. https://doi.org/10.1017/lsi.2018.23

Augustine, D., & Kushel, M. (2022). Community supervision, housing insecurity, and homelessness. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 701*(1), 152–171. https://doi.org/10.1177/00027162221113983

Austin, J. (2017). Limits of prison education. *Criminology & Public Policy, 16*(2), 563-569. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12301

Baloch, N. A., & Jennings, W. G. (2021). Examining vocational rehabilitation services provided to incarcerated persons with disabilities. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 32*(3), 268–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403420913621

Beck, E. L., Johnson, N. N., Delgado, S., Helmly, V., McLaren, S. A., Prendergast, A., Alderman, L., Almada, L., Bride, B., Napierala, E., & Sabol, W. J. (2023). Addressing barriers to housing in reentry programs working to address a variety of needs: A qualitative study of Second Chance Act grantees. *Cityscape (Washington, D.C.), 25*(2), 13–34.

Bloom, D. & Jacobs, E. (2013). *Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ Demonstration and Evaluation Project, Philadelphia, PA*. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-01-18. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR33784.v1

Bowen, K. N., Nhan, J., & Polzer, K. (2019). Comparing ex-offenders who use and decline job readiness training. *Corrections: Policy, Practice and Research, 4*(3), 183–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2017.1399094

Bozick, R., Steele, J., Davis, L., & Turner, S. (2018). Does providing inmates with education improve postrelease outcomes? A meta-analysis of correctional education programs in the United States. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 14*(3), 389-428. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-018-9334-6

Clark, V. A. (2016). Predicting two types of recidivism among newly released prisoners: First addresses as “launch pads” for recidivism or reentry success. *Crime and Delinquency, 62*(10), 1364–1400. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128714555760

Cook, A., & Haynes, S. H. (2021). Imprisonment pains, reentry strains, and perceived likelihood of reoffending. *Criminal Justice Studies, 34*(1), 16-32. https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2020.1771332

Cook, P. J., Kang, S., Braga, A. A., Ludwig, J., & O’Brien, M. E. (2015). An experimental evaluation of a comprehensive employment-oriented prisoner re-entry program. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 31*(3), 355–382. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-014-9242-5

D’Amato, C., Silver, I. A., & Newsome, J. (2021). The effects of social disorganization mechanisms: Examining the influence of community-level factors on recidivism across various correctional programs. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 48*(8), 1072-1090. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854820969745

Day, A. & Tamatea, A. (2021). The politics of actuarial justice and risk assessment. In B. A. Arrigo & B. G. Sellers (Eds.), *The pre-crime society: Crime, culture, and control in the ultramodern age.* (pp. 179-200). Bristol, UK: Bristol University Press.

Duwe, G., & McNeeley, S. (2020). The effects of prison labor on institutional misconduct, postprison employment, and recidivism. *Corrections: Policy, Practice and Research, 5*(2), 89–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2017.1416317

Gould, M. R. (2018). Rethinking our metrics: Research in the field of higher education in prison. *The Prison Journal (Philadelphia, Pa.), 98*(4), 387–404. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885518776375

Grossi, L. M. (2017). Sexual offenders, violent offenders, and community reentry: Challenges and treatment considerations. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 34*, 59–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.04.005

Hamlin, M. (2020). Second chances in the second city: Public housing and prisoner reentry in Chicago. Environment and Planning. D, *Society & Space, 38*(4), 587–606. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775820918274

Hamlin, M. (2022). Participatory sketch mapping for policy: A case study of reentry housing from Chicago. *The Professional Geographer, 74*(1), 52–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2021.1952883

Henry, T. K. S. (2021). Revolving doors: Examining the effect of race and ethnicity on discretionary decision-making in parole revocations. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 46*(2), 279-297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-020-09560-2

Hirschi, T. (2004). Self-control and crime. In K. D. Vohs & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications*, 537-552. Guilford Press.

Hood, B. J., & Gaston, S. (2021). How families respond to the collateral consequences of incarceration and prisoner reentry. *Family Relations, 71*(3), 1175-1190. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12616.

Hunter, S. B., & Mercier, S. (2023). Addressing homelessness among people with justice involvement: Los Angeles county's just in reach pay for success demonstration project. *Cityscape (Washington, D.C.), 25*(2), 57–72.

Hsueh, J. (2013). *Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ Demonstration and Evaluation Project: Kansas and Missouri, Enhanced Early Head Start*. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR33801.v1

Johnson, C. C. (2023). Reentry and housing. *Cityscape (Washington, D.C.), 25*(2), 3–12.

Jonson, C. L., & Cullen, F. T. (2015). Prisoner reentry programs. *Crime & Justice (Chicago, Ill), 44*(1), 517–575. https://doi.org/10.1086/681554

Kenemore, T. K., & In, B. S. (2023). Navigating the carceral state: The experience of citizens with criminal backgrounds after finding stable housing. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 306624X231165422-306624X231165422. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X231165422

Kim, S. (2013). *Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ Demonstration and Evaluation Project: Rhode Island, Working Toward Wellness*. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR33782.v1

Kjellstrand, J., Matulis, J., Jackson, A., Smith., J., & Eddy., J. M. (2021). The importance of positive social support during reentry from prison: Examining the role of volunteer mentoring. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 67*(5), 567-587 https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X211059316

Koo, A. (2015). Correctional education can make a greater impact on recidivism by supporting adult inmates with learning disabilities. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 105*(1), 233–269.

Kruttschnitt, C., & Otto, N. B. (2021). Women's experiences in the revolving door of the criminal justice system: implications for their imagined futures. *Women & Criminal Justice, 31*(3), 174-196. https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2019.1664970

Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2001). Understanding desistance from crime. *Crime and Justice (Chicago, Ill.), 28*, 1–69. https://doi.org/10.1086/652208

Liu, L. (2020). Family, parochial, and public levels of social control and recidivism: An extension of the systemic model of social disorganization. *Crime & Delinquency, 66*(6-7), 864-886. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128719901106

Liu, L. (2024). Racialized employment outcomes during reentry: A test of competing explanations. *Crime and Delinquency, 70*(2), 339–366. https://doi.org/10.1177/00111287221107575

Liu, L., Visher, C. A., & O'Connell, D. J. (2021). Strain during reentry: A test of general strain theory using a sample of adult former prisoners. *The Prison Journal (Philadelphia, Pa.), 101*(4), 420–442. https://doi.org/10.1177/00328855211029652

Mastrorilli, M. E. (2016). With pell grants rising: A review of the contemporary empirical literature on prison postsecondary education. *Journal of Correctional Education (1974), 67*(2), 44–60.

McNeeley, S. (2022). A long-term follow-up evaluation of an employment assistance reentry program. *Justice Evaluation Journal (Online), 5*(1), 90–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/24751979.2021.1965494

Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office. (2021). *Resorting with dignity: The community touch.* mecksheriff.com/index.php/re-entry-support-services-ress/

Mielitz, K., Lurtz, M., Clady, J., & Archuleta, K. (2018). After release: A qualitative investigation into the financial lives of previously incarcerated individuals. *Corrections: Policy, Practice and Research, 3*(1), 56–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2017.1383215

Miller, R. (2014). Devolving the carceral state: race, prisoner reentry, and the micro-politics of urban poverty management. *Punishment and Society, 16*(3), 305-335. https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474514527487

Mowen, T. J., Stansfield, R., & Boman, J. H. (2019). Family matters: Moving beyond "if" family support matters to "why" family support matters during reentry from prison. *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 56*(4), 483–523. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427818820902

Newton, D., Day, A., Giles, M., Wodak, J., Graffam, J., & Baldry, E. (2018). The impact of vocational education and training programs on recidivism: A systematic review of current experimental evidence. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 62*(1), 187–207. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X16645083

Nguyen, H., Thomas, K. J., & Tostlebe, J. J. (2023). Revisiting the relationship between age, employment, and recidivism. *Criminology (Beverly Hills), 61*(3), 449-481. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12338

Niebuhr, N., & Orrick, E. A. (2020). Impact of employment satisfaction and stress on time to recidivism. *Corrections: Policy, Practice and Research, 5*(3), 170–187. https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2018.1441761

Novek, E. (2019). Making meaning: reflections on the act of teaching in prison. *The Review of Communication, 19*(1), 55–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2018.1554824

Nur, A. V., & Nguyen, H. (2023). Prison work and vocational programs: A systematic review and analysis of moderators of program success. *Justice Quarterly, 40*(1), 129–158. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2022.2026451

O'Malley, P. & Smith, G. J. D. (2021). Pre-crime and the 'control society': Mass preventative justice and the jurisprudence of safety. In B. A. Arrigo & B. G. Sellers (Eds.), *The pre-crime society: Crime, culture, and control in the ultramodern age.* (pp. 63-80). Bristol, UK: Bristol University Press.

Ortiz, J. M., & Jackey, H. (2019). The system is not broken, it is intentional: The prisoner reentry industry as deliberate structural violence. *The Prison Journal (Philadelphia, Pa.), 99*(4), 484–503. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885519852090

Petrich, D. M., Pratt, T. C., Jonson, C. L., & Cullen, F. T. (2021). Custodial sanctions and reoffending: A meta-analytic review. *Crime and Justice (Chicago, Ill.), 50*(1), 353–424. https://doi.org/10.1086/715100

Pompoco, A., Wooldredge, J., Lugo, M., Sullivan, C., & Latessa, E. J. (2017). Reducing inmate misconduct and prison returns with facility education programs. *Criminology & Public Policy, 16*(2), 515-547. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12290

Purser, G., & Hamlin, M. (2022). "Bodies in the building": Incarceration's afterlife in a reentry housing facility. *The Social Service Review (Chicago), 96*(2), 169–195. https://doi.org/10.1086/719858

Redcross, C. (2012). *Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO), New York City*. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR33783.v1

Redcross, C., Millenky, M., Rudd, T., and Levshin, V. (2012). *More than a job*. New York: MDRC.

Reisdorf, B. C., & DeCook, J. R. (2022). Locked up and left out: Formerly incarcerated people in the context of digital inclusion. *New Media & Society, 24*(2), 478-495. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211063178

Reisdorf, B. C., & Rikard, R. V. (2018). Digital rehabilitation: A model of reentry into the digital age. *American Behavioral Scientist, 62*(9), 1273-1290. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218773817

Reisdorf, B. C., DeCook, J., Foster, M., Cobbina, J., & LaCourse, A. (2022). Digital reentry: uses of and barriers to ICTs in the prisoner reentry process. *Information, Communication & Society, 25*(14), 2028-2045. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1924826

Rodriguez, N., & Usman, H. (2023). An examination of prison-based programming and recommitment to prison. *Justice Evaluation Journal*, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/24751979.2023.2170262

Roth, B. B., Westrheim, K., Jones, L., & Manger, T. (2017). Academic self-efficacy, educational motives and aspects of the prison sentence as predictors for participation in prison education. *Journal of Correctional Education (1974), 68*(3), 19–40.

Rydberg, J. (2018). Employment and housing challenges experienced by sex offenders during reentry on parole. *Corrections: Policy, Practice and Research, 3*(1), 15–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2017.1369373

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (2005). A life-course view of the development of crime. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 602*(1), 12–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716205280075

Sells, D., Curtis, A., Abdur-Raheem, J., Klimczak, M., Barber, C., Meaden, C., Hasson, J., Fallon, P., Emigh-Guy, M. (2020). Peer-mentored community reentry reduces recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior (47)*4, 437-456. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854820901562

Silver, I. A., D'Amato, C., & Wooldredge, J. (2021). The cycle of reentry and reincarceration: Examining the influence on employment over a period of 18 years. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 74*, 101812-. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2021.101812

Smith, C. (2017). Complex sentences: Searching for the purpose of education inside a Massachusetts state prison. *Harvard Educational Review, 87*(1), 81–98. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-87.1.81

Sokoloff, N. J., & Schenck-Fontaine, A. (2017). College programs in prison and upon reentry for men and women: A literature review. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *20*(1), 95–114. https://doi-org.proxy181.nclive.org/10.1080/10282580.2016.1262772

Stacer, M. J. & Roberts, M. R. (2018). "Reversing the trend": The role of mentoring in offender reentry. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation (57)*1, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2017.1416439

State of North Carolina Department of Public Safety Prisons. (2018). *Policy and Procedure Manual*. North Carolina Department of Public Safety. https://files.nc.gov/ncdps/E-.3100-06_17_20.pdf

State of North Carolina Department of Public Safety Prisons. (2019). *Policy and Procedure Manual*. North Carolina Department of Public Safety. https://www.ncdps.gov/documents/files/divisions/dac/prisons/b-0300-offender-conduct-rules/download

Strover, S., Whitacre, B., Rhinesmith, C., & Schrubbe, A. (2020). The digital inclusion role of rural libraries: Social inequalities through space and place. *Media, Culture & Society, 42*(2), 242-259. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443719853504

Tirado-Morueta, R., Aguaded-Gómez, J. I., & Hernando-Gómez, Á. (2018). The socio-demographic divide in Internet usage moderated by digital literacy support. *Technology in Society, 55*, 47-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2018.06.001

Ugwudike, P. (2020). Digital prediction technologies in the justice system: The implications of a 'race-neutral' agenda. *Theoretical Criminology, 24*(3), 482-501. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480619896006

Ward, K. C., Stallings, R. P., & Hawkins, P. M. (2021). Comparing the perceptions of reentry challenges: An examination of Pennsylvania magisterial district judges, probation/parole officers, and inmates. *Corrections: Policy, Practice and Research, 6*(2), 85–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2019.1579685

Wodahl, E. J., & Freng, A. (2017). The challenges of prisoner reentry faced by Native American returning offenders. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 15*(2), 160–184. https://doi.org/10.1080/15377938.2016.1264336