

PERCEPTIONS OF INMATES, INMATES' LIFE IN PRISON, AND REENTRY INTO SOCIETY:
AN EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL INFLUENCE ON SOCIETAL
PERCEPTIONS VERSUS THE REALITIES
OF INMATES' EXPERIENCES

by

KRYSTAL SALAZAR

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

May 2012

Copyright © by Krystal Salazar 2012

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Rhonda Dobbs for all her patience and guidance throughout my Master's degree journey. Thank you to my thesis committee members Dr. Theron Bowman (Chief Bowman) and Dr. Robert Bing for their support. I would like to give a special thanks to all the professors that allowed me to enter their classroom to conduct my research. Without their cooperation, my study would not have taken place. Finally, I would like to acknowledge my family for the support they have given me, especially my husband Luis Salazar. He has supported my higher education ambitions and always believed in me.

April 19, 2012

ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF INMATES, INMATES' LIFE IN PRISON, AND REENTRY INTO SOCIETY:
AN EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL INFLUENCE ON SOCIETAL
PERCEPTIONS VERSUS THE REALITIES
OF INMATES' EXPERIENCES

Krystal Salazar, M.A.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2012

Supervising Professor: Rhonda Dobbs

The purpose of this study was to examine perceptions of inmates, inmates' life in prison and reentry into society. The study hoped to gain understanding of educational influence on perceptions on the topic. Statistical analyses of t-tests were conducted to control for gender, victimization, and knowing someone who was ever incarcerated versus not knowing someone ever incarcerated. The results suggested many victims agreed that inmates face hardships in prison and in society. Furthermore, victims believed community cohesion is crucial to reintegration. The study hypothesized that perceptions of inmates, inmates' life in prison and reentry into society would depend on the educational level and/or knowledge of the topic.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Problem/Objective	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Inmates and Life in Prison.....	6
2.2 Inmate Reentry.....	14
2.3 Perceptions of Criminal Justice Professional and Communities.....	18
3. METHODOLOGY	23
3.1 Participants.....	23
3.2 Procedures	24
4. FINDINGS	26
4.1 T-test Controlling for Gender.....	26
4.2 T-test Controlling for Victimization	29
4.3 T-test Controlling for Knowing Someone Who was Ever Incarcerated	34
5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION	39
5.1 Conclusion.....	39

5.2 Discussion	42
5.2.1 Limitations	44
5.2.2 Further Research	44
APPENDIX	
A. SURVEY	48
REFERENCES	61
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Table Describing the Sample.....	23
4.1 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Gender in Perception of Inmates.....	26
4.2 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Gender in Perceptions of Inmates' Life in Prison	27
4.3 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Gender in Perception of Reentry.....	28
4.4 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Victimization in Perception of Inmates.....	30
4.5 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Victimization in Perception of Inmates' Life in Prison	31
4.6 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Victimization in Perception of Reentry	33
4.7 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Knowing Someone Who was Ever Incarcerated in Perception of Inmates.....	35
4.8 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Knowing Someone Who was Ever Incarcerated in Perception of Inmates' Life in Prison	36
4.9 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Knowing Someone Who was Ever Incarcerated in Perception of Reentry	37

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Problem/Objective

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in 2007, there were 2,293,200 people incarcerated in prison or jail. There was almost double that amount with 5,119,300 people under some form of community supervision, with 799,875 of those people on parole alone. Needless to say, that is a large correctional population in the United States criminal justice system. This population was once in the criminal justice system and undergoes reentry into society. Amongst this large portion of society 1,284,337 of the total correctional population was at-risk of re-incarceration. Society has the power to influence whether or not this at risk population will become part of the statistic of recycled inmates within the criminal justice system. However, it is not an everyday thought of a societal member that this amount of people is faced with risk of re-incarceration. Furthermore, many do not realize that the correctional population will reenter into society at some point in time. With these large populations in mind, the consideration of societal perceptions becomes increasingly important. If perceptions remain unknown the at-risk population for re-incarceration will continue to grow. This is costly to the economy and does not allow for those who enter the criminal justice system to ever get out of the system. A full understanding of how society perceives inmate, inmates' life in prison, and reentry into society will ultimately allow insight into what average Americans understand about the correctional section of the criminal justice system. With this knowledge, educational information can be

formed to distribute to society. This would allow an educated society to impact current ineffective policies regarding corrections and diminish the risk of continuing failed policies. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine perceptions of inmates, inmate life in prison, and reentry of inmates into the community hopes to gain a more in depth understanding of educational influences on perceptions versus the realities of inmates' experiences of life in prison and reentry to the community.

There were several definitions that needed to be addressed due to previous literature referring to concepts differently than this study defined them. For purposes of this study, "society" consisted of students at the University of Texas at Arlington. "Perceptions" were considered the current views and thoughts of these students on inmates, inmate life in prison, and reentry of inmates. "Inmates" were defined as an incarcerated person that is serving or was serving a prison sentence due to conviction of crime and time served is more than a year. "Life in prison" consisted of all situations inmates face while incarcerated. Specifically, the prior research implied an inmate's life in prison consisted of a variety of components such as the adjustment prison culture physically, psychologically, emotionally, and well-being during routine activities of prison. The preceding components would be used for the current research study as well. Furthermore, this portion of the research examined inmates' adjustment, effects of imprisonment, coping and the prison culture. Some researchers commonly used reentry and reintegration interchangeably. For purposes of this study, "reentry" specifically referred to the transition from an inmate's life during incarceration to life in a community. "Reintegration" was defined as the process of rejoining the society and becoming a fully functioning member of society again. To clarify reintegration is simply one component of the reentry process an inmate undertakes to transition from inmate to community member. An evaluation of corrections such as parole was included as reentry data. Reentry data revealed methods of coping, explanations of recidivism, and "fitting in" as a member of society again. Furthermore, the examination of this

data allowed insight into the adjustment to prison life by taking into account factors of health, environment, physical, emotional, and psychological/mental well-being.

The previously collected data dissected past successful and unsuccessful reentry programs for a new direction of reentry philosophy and policies. Previously collected data demonstrated the need for studying perception of inmates due to little research on the topic. Preceding empirical data was examined to understand the realities of everyday prison life. This data was used to establish the lack of education society has on the topic. Furthermore, the establishment of empirical data of the realities inmates faced validated that participants do not necessarily have the same perceptions of inmates, inmates' life in prison, and reentry into society.

The current research study's survey conducted consisted of five components: Perceptions of a Community Model, Perceptions of Inmates, Perceptions of Inmates' Life in Prison, Perceptions of Reentry of Inmates into Society, and Demographics. Further analysis of the components was categorizing perceptions of inmate to include characteristics, personal opinion, potential for rehabilitation, and thoughts of hardships faced by inmates. Perceptions of inmates' life in prison included coping, hardships faced, well-being effects, and victimization of inmates. Perceptions of reentry of inmates into society included reintegration, parole, community resources, hardships, and success/failure. Finally, demographic questions were general questions about the participant.

The research goal was to examine perceptions and compare the differences that previously collected empirical research data on the reality/actuality of inmates, inmates' life in prison and the process of reentry into society when released from custody revealed. The current study hoped to understand the possible differences between societal perceptions and the reality of prison life and life after prison with the intention to educate society on inmate life. Additionally, the research goal was to emphasize the importance of reentry process for inmate adjustment

and ultimate success in society. Essentially, the research project could help create new policies for reentry programs, possibly reduce recidivism and/or reduce violence/maladjustment in prison through societal acknowledgement of the discrepancies between the perception of prison life and the reality of prison life. This research is unlike any previous research. It embraced previous empirical data to reveal the lack of education society has on the possible differences the reality many inmates face versus their preconceived notions about inmates. The current research project is critical in understanding the needs of not only inmates, but society in order to improve our criminal justice system's reentry process.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Have you ever thought about inmates or their reentry process back to society? What about how it would affect the community you live in or affect you directly? This is not a topic many people reflect upon on a daily basis. Many researchers refer to the “out of sight, out of mind” technique that much of society embraces once offenders are convicted and become known as “inmates”(Pettus & Severson, 2006). Many people no longer care what happens to the inmate with reasoning that the inmate is “out of sight” and isolated from society. Thus, the inmates become “out of mind”. After review of the literature on the topic of study, a gap in the literature became apparent with regards to perception of inmates, inmate life in prison, and reentry. Little is known about current societal perceptions on these three topics due to the “out of sight, out of mind” philosophy. Society has embraced legislation that increased incarceration without evaluating the cost and/or benefit of the policies. For instance, societal perceptions on a policy such as inmate reentry into society after released from incarceration remains uncertain. Thus, a review of the literature surrounding inmates, inmate life in prison, and reentry will highlight realities inmates face that are possibly unknown to the majority of society. The purpose of this literature review is to demonstrate that although there are many studies conducted on the topic of inmates’ life in prison and reentry, the current study is the only research to evaluate societal perceptions of these variables together in one study to compare it with realities faced by inmates (or ex-inmates) on a daily basis.

First, there was a review of inmates and inmates' life in prison. Much of the following data referred to the dynamics inmates encountered while attempting to adjust to life in prison. Secondly, there was a review of reentry of inmates into society. Lastly, the research examined a few studies regarding criminal justice professionals' concerns with inmate reentry. Additionally, the data is chronological in time period to highlight the evolution of the prior research on inmates and inmates' life in prison.

2.1 Inmates and Life in Prison

The first major area of research focused on the inmates' life in prison. In 1952, Driscoll (1952) was one of the first researchers to examine institutional adjustment of prison inmates. He conceived four main components that influenced the adjustment of inmates, whether the influence was positive or negative on the adjustment. These components were social, vocational, personal, and behavioral factors (Driscoll, 1952). Driscoll (1952) summarized that prison was an environment that was conducive to many demands on behavior of inmates, which could possibly lead to maladaptation even in post-release environments. This early research laid the foundation for the research on adjustment of inmates. Although, the research topic did not reemerge until quite some time later, Driscoll's (1952) development helped researchers to originate other studies to identify insight into what the realities of an inmate's life endures.

In 1999, Biggam and Powers took a new approach to focus on understanding the psychological effects of an inmate's life in prison. Specifically, these authors focused on how psychological effects could be important to intervention programs. These authors acknowledged that studies prior to 1999 failed to uncover psychological health's significance on an inmate. Biggam and Powers (1999) explained how social problem solving skills have psychological and behaviors consequences to adjustment. However, much of Biggam and Powers' (1999) research was dedicated to maladjusted children, emotionally disturbed adolescents and psychiatric patients. Not many inferences were made about inmate adjustment. Rather than general adjustment, these authors examined more personal issues inmates were faced with

such as parasuicidal inmates and inmates dealing with depression. This research was difficult to conduct due to the unclear operationalization of problem solving skills specifically defined for inmates. However, a significant finding Biggam and Powers (1999) discovered was that problem solving skills were low among prison inmates. This discovery had potential to improve society's comprehension on the authors' empirically supported data that suggested inmates had a lower chance of becoming inmates if they solved problems without criminal behavior. Unfortunately, there still remained lack of research on societal perceptions with regards to inmates.

With the emphasis on specific types of situational adjustments, Biggam and Powers (1999) became increasingly knowledgeable on victimization of inmates and lack of care for these inmates. They attributed victimization and lack of care to increased demands of institutions and custodial personnel due to a subsequent increase in incarceration rates during this time (Biggam & Powers, 1999). In 1999, Biggam and Powers examined victims of bullying in the general prison population, inmates removed or placed under supervision for safety, and suicidal inmates. The authors reasoned that these three types of inmates would be best suited for adjustment evaluation because of the lack of coping skills and potential risk of inflicting self-harm. Interviews were conducted on "coping adjustment". Although no rewards were given to participants, the researchers gained 100 % participation. Inmate total participation and interest in the researchers' program revealed that inmates were willing to seek help. The participants were given questionnaires, structured interviews, and help to the illiterate. Problem solving was given orally. There were four types of questions asked anxiety versus depression, mood states, hopelessness/negative expectations, and means-end problem solving (Biggam & Powers, 1999).

Thus, during this time it seemed that research on maladjusted inmates would aid with societal appreciation of the realities inmates face in prison. However, prior research to Biggam and Powers (1999) only stressed importance of age or time incarcerated and levels of stress. These researchers emphasized situational experiences. They found that the highest levels of

hopelessness were found to be bully victims in the general prison population. Therefore, inmates with maladjustment can have low problem solving skills. Furthermore, the maladjusted inmates might not know how to gain help. Biggam and Powers (1999) research contributed to the current study with the finding that maladjusted inmates do not have well-developed problem solving skills. Thus, before released into society they need to be taught problem solving skills without using criminal activity if society expects inmates to have a smooth reintegration during reentry. The current study suggested that problem solving skills need to be accessible in prison programs for the success of reentry to prevail.

Warren, Hurt, Loper, and Chauhan (2004) evaluated the importance of psychological and historical factors on adjustment. Prior to Warren et al. (2004) research on inmate adjustment was primarily focused on factors such as length of sentence, prior history with the criminal justice system, and mental states. These researchers believed that situational factors could play a role in adjustment, but that reaction to stress was key to adjustment. Warren et al. (2004) concentrated on incarcerated women. Their study found that prior incarceration increased stress, but length of the sentences did not affect conflict of adjustment. The researchers further emphasized that historical factors such as how one dealt with anger, distress, and separation from family/children influences inmate adjustment to life in prison.

In 2004, Warren et al., found that women were more maladjusted in prison rather than in communities. Women were more fearful when they entered back into communities. Thus, this could support that prison effects adjustment in other aspects of life for the inmate such as reentry. However, one must be careful when making this assumption due to the lack of clear causality of the adjustment, that is, whether or not the maladjustment can be attributed to prison environment or previous characteristics of maladjustment. However, more self-reports could be done with research complimenting personality and personal experiences of inmates to control for the former issue. This research contributed to the knowledge of inmate adjustment with the suggestion that adjustment into society can be effected based on situational factors and

possible personal characteristic of the inmate. Ultimately, the research reemphasized the need for more education on the realities faced by inmates.

Next, there were other elements that weigh into how inmates adjust to life in prison. For example, there are many levels of security, but super maximum prisons have become popular for means of control. Pizarro and Stenius (2004) state that “supermax” prisons could cause increased psychological and mental health issues. These prisons increased economic costs without benefits to the inmate or society. They were designed to house dangerous inmates, ensure order/safety, and deter others from misconduct. Pizarro and Stenius discussed how detrimental these institutions were on inmates, especially if the inmate was expected to reenter into society. The inmates were housed 22-23 hours out of the day, given minimal contact with any other human being (including guards), were only given 3-7 hours of exercise a week, and were very limited in programs available to the inmate (Pizarro & Stenius, 2004).

The complete lack of unity of supermax prison policies and resources did not allow for success on the inmate’s part. How does society expect to create a reentry or transition program for inmates subjected to prisons of this nature if there are no set guidelines for the facilities to enforce? Understandably, there will always be a debate of constitutionality due to the consequences imposed by supermax prisons. These inmates lose liberty, autonomy, and heterosexual relationships. Furthermore, they are deprived of goods, services and lack security (Pizarro & Stenius, 2004). One might ask, should inmates be entitled to “pleasures” we enjoy in society? Although this is a controversial question, society needs to embrace further research on this topic, especially if treating inmates with more respect and dignity would result in better transitions during reintegration. Pizarro and Stenius (2004) did not refute that short term segregation could lead to beneficial effects such as self-confidence and optimism. However, Pizarro and Stenius (2004) suggested only minimal use of solitary confinement be used to empower the inmate instead of supermax prisons that diminish successful adjustment and/or

reintegration. Finally, the researchers warned that these facilities could lead to serious mental illness that potentially further burden communities once the inmate is released into society.

Hochstetler, Murphy, and Simons (2004) became interested in reintegration and reentry because they believed the “ability to desist from crime and reintegrate into law-abiding lifestyles” was a key topic to share with others (pg. 436). They found that prisoners’ conditions in prison were influential in predicting success in reentry. The experiences in prison were found to be crucial as well. However, the researchers could not distinguish whether prison affected the inmate or the prison exacerbated already established problems within the inmate. Hochstetler, Murphy, and Simons (2004) found that supportive relationships made it easier to deal with hardships faced in post-release as well as the former inmate’s well-being. Furthermore, this increased the chances of rehabilitative success. Some statistical findings that Hochstetler, Murphy, and Simons (2004) stated were that less than half of released inmates would be convicted of a new crime within the first three years of release, victimization while in prison led to future problems, and self-control did not have a strong predicting factor of victimization. These findings were all important in recognizing factors to successful and failures of reentry and prison adjustment in order to move forward and create new, improved policies in criminal justice.

Institutional crowding could have effects on inmate adjustment as well. Not only are inmates dealing with many factors that are exclusive to prison environment, but much legislation increased incarceration rates, which impacted adjustment as well. Steiner and Wooldredge (2009) explored this further. The researchers explained that prisons used crowding to predict inmate deviance, violence, and safety which are all important factors to adjustment. Inmates had more psychological and physiological stress in crowded prisons (Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009). Although psychological and physiological stress was not a direct link to misconduct, it is important for understanding adjustment to prison environments. The definition of crowding was unclear in this research and was left subjective to the inmate. Thus, the research relied on

inmates' perceptions of their own adjustment to crowding in prisons. Inmate insight could benefit policy reformation for reentry. Inmates suggestions of what needs to be done in order to better adjust in prison would be more meaningful. Furthermore, inmate first hand data could possibly correlate to better adjustment in the community. Hence, there is a possible connection between adjustment in prison and the adjustment in the community.

Van Tongeren and Klebe (2010) took a more multidimensional methodological approach to examine adjustment to prison life. They acknowledged that prison increased stress; therefore environmental factors would influence adjustment. Further findings suggested prison could breed dishonesty, deceit, and aggression which could potentially hinder a person's growth once released in the community. The researchers also acknowledged that prison require coping skills. However, as previously discussed inmates do not have high quality coping skills. This was evident in the fact that lack of coping with societal norms and values led to incarceration for the inmate in the first place.

Van Tongeren and Klebe (2010) created a foundation for their research on four previous adjustment factors: locus of control, self-esteem, motivation for change, and religiosity an inmate would have prior to incarceration. Then, they established five main adjustment styles inmates assimilated once they were incarcerated. First, "maladjusted criminal thinkers" were poorly adjusted, high in criminal thinking, and unable to obtain resources in prison or healthy relationships. These inmates could not consider norms or engage in rehabilitation. Hence, there were some inmates that would not succeed in prison adjustment or in community adjustment, this type included. Second, were the "hardened prisonized offenders" who were adequately adjusted, rejected cultural norms and maintained criminal thinking. These inmates upheld the "criminal code". Third, "externalized adapters" were well adjusted and were elevated criminal thinkers. These inmates would be the most difficult to aid in reentry since they are well adjusted to criminal life and criminal mindsets. Fourth, were "optimal adjusters", well-adjusted to institutional environment, although were still aware of mainstream values, culture, and norms.

These inmates had potential for good adjustment in the community if they decreased their criminal thinking. Optimal adjusters showed the best potential for both prison and post-release success. However, they would need assistance in decreasing criminal thinking. Fifth, were “emerging reformers” who were properly adjusted and had decreased criminal thinking. However, they were permanently assimilated to the prison environment and have no awareness of possible release or success. Van Tongeren and Klebe (2010) suggested that prison staff be trained in better ways to assist with adjustment to improve the prison system, offenders’ life, and society in general. The discovery of these adjustment styles were crucial to understanding how inmates adjusted in general to any situation. If this could be understood, then insight could be gained into how these inmates would adjust in the community or if they had potential for success in community life.

Souza and Dhimi (2010) compared and contrasted first time offenders and recurrent offenders with regards to the experiences of imprisonment. Much research found that recidivism increased during the first three months post-release. These researchers found that first time offenders in prison experienced more fears and concerns of violence, had many preconceived notions of prison, and transformed boredom and detachment to prison activities (Souza & Dhimi, 2010). Recurrent inmates experienced some “pains” similar to first time offenders such as concerns of attacks. However, there were significant differences with people who visit inmates, health, such as smoking and drinking habits, drug use, missing luxuries and perceiving “good” things about prison among first time offenders and recurrent offenders. Recurrent offenders generally had family involvement in criminality, were half the age of first time offenders, had increased drug use and increased property crimes, usually to fund a drug habit. Ironically, first time offenders had convictions of drug offenses, but low drug use problems.

Despite the differences within first time offenders and recurrent offenders, resources offered were utilized by both types of inmates. Furthermore, Souza and Dhimi (2010) found that participation in programs reduced recidivism rates. Thus, the question still remained of why

not offer more programs and resources for successful adjustment if recidivism could be reduced in doing so. Unfortunately, the continuous lack of understanding what inmates actually experience and misconceptions from society preserves the former question. Inmates resocialized when they were in prison to conform to the environment of prison (Souza and Dhami, 2010). However, the inmate must resocialize again once they are faced with post-release. Ultimately, these researchers found that when given the opportunity inmates would utilize what was given to them. Thus, further research should be done on perceptions of society in order to educate the public that inmates would utilize help offered.

Maruna (2011) explains reentry as a rite of passage. This researcher stated that our society is full of rituals that are practiced daily. Society even made a ritual out of the punishment process in the criminal justice system. Maruna (2011) stated that punishment is a social ritual that advocates social order for people to “draw honest consciences together” (pg. 6). Furthermore, the researcher suggested that ignoring a ritual could lead to maladjustment in all aspects of life that follow the ritual. Maruna (2011) suggested that the criminal justice system has rites of passages during imprisonment, criminal trial, and labels (i.e. offenders or criminals). The researcher also suggested that there should be a ritual of delabelization to involve the community in the reentry process, focus on achievement, and possibly wipe the slate clean for the inmate. The current research project would suggest that society needs to be reeducated and reemphasize that the inmates will reenter into the community and if a “ritual” is missed during reentry it could be detrimental to the success.

Now that there is a better understanding of research that previously recognized the adjustment of inmates in prison, previous research on evaluation of reentry programs should be discussed. Much of the reentry literature suggested that prison incarceration rates drastically increased which meant many inmates were released into society at one point in time. Thus, there is a need for a formal evaluation of whether or not the reentry programs currently in place are efficiently reintegrating inmates into their communities.

2.2 Inmate Reentry

Petersilia (2001) stated that many inmates wanted to succeed in reentry. However, parole in the United States had some problems for success. Determinate sentencing allowed for automatic release, which parolees may have had unmet needs (i.e. lack of programs, educational levels, skills), and most parolees would return to prison due to the unmet needs. Petersilia (2001) emphasized that this not only hindered the inmates' ability for success, but hindered the community's potential for success as well. For example, "recycling" parolees decreased community cohesion, decreases employment, which essentially cannot stabilize the economy. Family development could be impacted as well. Political alienation which excluded felons from voting excluded vital information ex-inmates have to offer on various topics including an important one such as criminal justice policies (i.e. reentry). Policy needs to be a shift away from punitiveness, toward involvement of victims in parole process, and bring value of "eligibility" of parole back to inmates (Petersilia, 2001).

Pettus and Severson (2006) criticized prison policies of release. They stated that many inmates came out of prison "broken", especially mental illnesses that get ignored upon release. They explained that neighborhoods with high criminal activity generally consisted of inmates struggling with success of reintegration due to stigma, financial burdens, identity, and lack of interpersonal relationships. Pettus and Severson (2006) also stated that common risks to successful reentry included criminal histories, educations, employment status, finances, accommodations, leisure, relationships in general, drug use, emotional/mental health, and attitudes toward success. These findings were important because it helped the current study focus questions of the survey directed on these issues with hopes of gaining clarity on societal perceptions.

Listwan (2009) focused on serious and violent offenders' reentry, particularly an evaluation of Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI). The researchers found that unemployed offenders who did not live with family had an increased risk to fail programs of

community reentry. Furthermore, individuals without high school diplomas or GEDs had an increased likelihood to fail as well. Many educational and vocational programs were limited in availability (Listwan, 2009). How does society expect inmates to find jobs and contribute to community cohesiveness if little skills, class, and/or programs are provided for the inmate? The current research study will further examine societal perceptions with regards to this question.

Braga, Piehl, and Hureau (2009) evaluated the Boston Reentry Initiative (BRI). This program consisted of mentoring, social service assistance, and vocational development. These authors found that many inmates had substance abuse issues, low educational levels, which meant less functioning and skills for everyday activity. The authors suggested that policy makers should aid communities that inmates return to in efforts to create more successful opportunities and avenues for resources to become available during times of inmate weakness. Recidivism can be reduced by increasing education levels, job skills, and social functioning (Braga, Piehl, & Hureau, 2009). Some might ask why give so much time, energy and resources to inmates when they disobeyed social rules other abide. Research has suggested that many inmates do want to change when given the opportunity. Thus, further research should emphasize the good in the compassion for others as well as the data that supports elements of recidivism reduction.

Settles (2009) supplemented the process of reentry with the idea of restorative justice. She examined whether social capital could improve with a restorative justice approach. Settles (2009) found that involvement was needed with victim, offender, and change in roles of government and communities for improved reentry programs. The author believed there was only a small opportunity to succeed in rehabilitation and for creation of social bonds. Settles (2009) found that parole supervision was important in the inmate and community relationship. Settles (2009) found several steps that needed to occur for reentry to be restorative and successful. The wrongdoer must earn their place in society again, but could only do so if allowed by victim and community. Also, there needed to be integration of inmates, not

segregation. For instance, ex-offenders should not be shunned away, instead given opportunities to become successful. However, there were some critics that state restorative justice would harm the victim. However, since the restorative aspect did not occur until the parolee was released during reentry, it was possible that victims could have made peace and are more willing to participate with restorative justice.

Paparozzi and Guy (2009) expressed concerns about the role of parole politics in the parole process. This article discussed how the parole process is based on appointment of the parole board. The parole board employees generally had employment backgrounds of marketing, real estate, politics, merchandise security, and profession sports. How does society expect to have successful programs if there is no value placed on criminal justice professional working within these practices? This was an important contribution to understanding reentry's success and failures. Further research in the current study will address how the perceptions of success and failures can be attributed to possible misconceptions of profession criminal justice practitioners' involvement in these processes.

Bahr, Harris, Fisher, and Armstrong (2010) attempted to determine factors that would be successful to reentry. These researchers used the parolees' perspective who served at least one year in incarceration. They found that the parolees had to find a place to live, reconnect with family/friends, find and maintain employment. Bahr et al. (2010) used four major theories to understand the parole process. First, Social Learning theory was used to explain how learning criminal behavior by associating with other criminals. This theory suggested criminality is the network a person builds with those who reinforce behaviors of criminal activity. Thus, it remained critical for the inmate to refrain from associating with previous criminal acquaintances. The Social Control theory relied on bonds in society to explain behavior. For instance, one would be successful in parole reentry if they made bonds to society during reintegration and did not want to lose them. Third, Cognitive Transformation theory had four main components, openness to change, "hooks" for motivation, replacing old self, and reinterpretation of previous

illegal behavior. Bahr et al. (2010) emphasized that maturation was a major complement for this theory. Fourth, Life Course theory integrated the previous three theories. Bahr et al.'s (2010) main point in this research was that reentry was not an event that can be done and over with, but reentry was a process that needed social support such as family, friends, employment and social agencies to be successful. This data reemphasized the need for community involvement in the reentry process.

Kleis (2010) examined Prison Reentry Industry (PRI) and found that there was much privatization in parole, lack of uniformity and oversight, negative consequences due to motivation for profit to enhance private sector and ignore the well-being of inmates. She also found that many of the policies set in place were conflicting. For example, the programs inmates were required to participate in were also held during the hours of majority of potential employment times. Conflicting policies further included mandated participation in programs, parole conditions that conflicted with participation in those programs, and risk of labeled as uncooperative if an inmate complained about the conflicting policies. These were crucial points to analyze when creating new policies in order to make a new, more improved policy that did not repeat the same mistakes. Additionally, to allow the inmate to accomplish success, instead of defeat by conflicting policies the inmate has no control over. However, this is not often done.

Morani, Wikoff, Linhorst, and Bratton (2011) had many key concerns about reentry as well. They found that many of the inmates were successful with reentry when the inmate self-identified, self-perceived needs and when this data was collected while inmates were still incarcerated. This showed that there was value in beginning the reentry process before post-release (during incarceration). Morani et al. (2011) also found many concerns such as housing, income (legitimate kind), family relations, safety, substance use, refraining from illegal behavior, parole conditions and health to be among the inmate's top worries. Morani et al. (2011) recognized that there are many ex-offenders who took advantage of services provided to them,

even if it was service that was a requirement of their parole. Again, these were crucial findings to influence the creation of reentry policies.

2.3 Perceptions of Criminal Justice Professionals and Communities

The last body of literature to be reviewed covered a selected few studies that examine some perceptions of correctional officers and communities to establishing the difference in perceptions of individuals educated about the criminal justice process. Raphael (2011) gave an overall view of how reentry in the United States worked. Raphael is a professor of public policy at the University of California, Berkeley. He highlighted difficulties faced by inmates such as housing issues, weakened social connections, poor jobs, stigma of a criminal record. Raphael (2011) stated that new policy changes in America were to blame for increased incarceration rates. Additionally, when parolees were given new charges for violations returning to incarceration became more costly for imprisonment than the costs of supervision in the community. Moreover, most inmates paid restitution for their parole. Furthermore, minorities were the majority of incarcerated inmates and when paroled they faced the hardship of post-release in the same “disadvantaged” neighborhood they came from (Raphael, 2011). It may be difficult for one to admit that they come from a disadvantaged community or that they need help. Although, this is not an easy task at hand, this issue needs to be addressed when creating policies for reentry. Policy makers could make the issue a positive one, so these “disadvantaged” communities are not viewed as disadvantaged, rather they can be seen as given resources and opportunities to help prosper.

Another issue Raphael (2011) brought to light was that many inmates were at the age of fertility, which meant that the likelihood of them having small children was highly likely. Thus, more resources needed to be provided for these young families to succeed in life after incarceration. Having a family imposed a further struggle when applying for employment since the parolee has the stigma of an ex-offender. Raphael (2011) pointed to many previous findings discussed in other previous research such as low levels of education, little work experience,

limited employment opportunities, discrimination of employers, stigmatization, and prison life creating antisocial behaviors along with the inclination to react with violence. Ultimately, in 2011, Raphael found that there were many hurdles inmates faced within poverty. With previous reintegration policies in place many would continue to recidivate unless something else was done to revise these clearly damaging policies of reentry. Society has tried preventing crime with incarceration, but many continue to recidivate. Thus, incarceration alone is not currently effective. According to Raphael (2011), incarceration might prevent minor property crime, but the focus should be on violent offenders who will eventually integrate back into our society and communities. The current research project would argue that change is everlasting in our society, so those in power to change policies and the general public needs to be educated as well as reassured that the new change that is needed would not simply be a leap of faith, but an investment worth the risk.

In 2011, Gunnison and Helfgott discussed the perceptions of inmates and correctional officers with regards to reentry success. These researchers surveyed transitional agencies, employers, property managers, educational institutions, the general public and offenders to assess the perception of success of reentry. Gunnison and Helfgott (2011) found that offenders are faced with challenges of housing, employment, substance abuse, limited credit, limited rental history, limited finances, and even mental health issues.

Community correctional officers' perceptions were examined by Gunnison and Helfgott (2011). After reviewing the data, these researchers found that the attitudes of correctional officers differed greatly by age, education, gender, and years of service. The main factors correctional officers took into account when evaluating the parolee was job status, offender characteristics, and their own rehabilitation philosophy (Gunnison & Helfgott, 2011). These researchers discovered a term they consider "offender-officer social distance". This can be defined by Gunnison and Helfgott (2011) by "the level of trust one group has for the other" (pp. 291). If the correctional officer's background was that of a higher social class than the offender,

the offender perceived little in common with the officer and increased potential for maladjustment. Furthermore, the offender would feel the correctional officer would not appreciate the hardships faced by the offender. However, Gunnison and Helfgott (2011) found that although the offender-officer social distance might exist, it did not affect the evaluation of needs of the offender with regards to reentry. Thus, one could suggest that although there were different perceived backgrounds and “social distance”, the correctional officers remained professional when it came to assessment of the true needs of the offender. Thus, offenders could not make the excuse that the correctional officer was not doing their part. Now, although this is an excellent finding it has to be addressed with caution. This study was not generalizable due to the fact that the study was conducted in Washington State and the policies in place in that state more than likely differ from other states. Some suggestions offered by Gunnison and Helfgott (2011) would be to create job fair designated to ex-offender to help aid with the challenge of finding employment. All the information provided in this particular study was a prospective addition to reentry policies.

Finally, Leverentz (2011) studied neighborhood attitudes on crime and reentry. This was the key part to understanding what needs to be done to improve the reentry and reintegration of inmates. This study was recently conducted which demonstrates the current interest in this area of study. There were two phases in the study. The first phase surveyed a Massachusetts community and the attitudes and experience with crime and reentry. The second phase was qualitative interviews to assess the answers provide in the surveys. The research goal was observe participants to explain how crime and reentry was formed across the community. Leverentz (2011) found that public attitudes toward crime reflected much of historical and social movement throughout society (i.e. civil rights). Furthermore, there were many mixed attitudes which were contributed to racial differences in attitudes and punitive philosophy. The perception of both crime and reentry depended greatly on the environment or neighborhood under questioning. Leverentz (2011) discovered that crime and reentry attitudes

were greatly formed by the neighborhood in which the ex-offender lived in and the reaction of others in that community. Ultimately, the neighborhoods with inmates undergoing reentry and reintegration had stronger opinions for reform of such policies. Thus, this research contributed to the knowledge of reentry by finding that society reacts to events and process according to how others around them react and their environment. The reactions have little to do with their own perception on the topic at hand. With this knowledge, reeducating society and communities would help the society form its own educated opinion in the matter, rather than complying with others' beliefs. If efforts are focused to reeducating the realities of inmate, inmate life in prison, and reentry challenges faced by both inmate and society, reentry could become a smoother process and society would be at ease. Additionally, society would be more cooperative in aiding these inmates become a productive member of society.

As demonstrated, there is a domino effect within the criminal justice system. Most of those within the criminal justice field would agree that each step greatly affects the next. Hence, there is a significant importance of helping others in society understand the implication of the realities inmates face in order to create better policies of reentry for success. Much of the research on reentry is fairly new. This area of study is of growing interest within the criminal justice field. The issue is that although criminal justice professional do not deny there are discrepancies within the reentry policy, process, and realities inmates face, the people who will come in contact with these inmates during reentry, such as community members need to acknowledge these discrepancies and take action to improve them. The concerns society incur should be considered along with their perceptions on the topic of inmates, inmates' life in prison and reentry into society. In essence, policy makers can address why inmates are having difficulty adjusting to becoming a community member and clarify legitimate concerns held by society.

It is clear that when reviewing the literature that most research demonstrated the same issues the inmates were faced with while attempting adjustment to prison life and reentry into

society. However, it remains unclear as to why criminal justice professionals and society can agree on the problem, but there has not been a solution. At the bare minimum, there should be some type of new procedure attempted to discover the possible improvement to reentry. Society will not be willing to change policies in places if research cannot demonstrate the significant impact it will have if there no change occurs. This research project has utmost importance to pave a new era in policy revisions for reentry of inmates in our society. Thus, the research study examined whether the perceptions of inmates, inmates' life in prison and reentry into society would depend on the participant having knowledge of the topic. Specifically, knowledge of the topic was categorized by two main factors, association with inmates by victimization or by knowing someone who had ever been incarcerated.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants

The current research study consisted of human participants. The subjects of study were students at the University of Texas at Arlington in Arlington, Texas. The students were derived from the Criminology and Criminal Justice Department and Non-Criminology and Criminal Justice Departments. Undergraduate and graduate students were among the sample. There were a total of 320 participants in the study. Table 3.1 illustrates the percentages of the sample categorized by gender, age, and race. There were 50.5% females and 44.2% males in the sample. The sample also consisted of .9% of 17 years old or younger, 42.4% 18-20 years old, 44.5% 21-29 years old, 6.2% 30-39 years old, and .6% in both age groups of 40-9 and 50-59. Table 3.1 illustrates that the majority of the sample population were between ages 18-29. Race in this sample population was 41.1% White, 12.8% Black/African-American, 12.8% Asian, 12.8% Multiple races and 13.7% other.

Table 3.1 Table Describing the Sample

Gender	Percent	Age	Percent	Race	Percent
Female	50.5	17 or younger	.9	White	41.1
Male	44.2	18-20	42.4	Black/African-American	12.8
		21-29	44.5	Asian	12.8
		30-39	6.2	Multiple races	12.8
		40-49	.6	Other	13.7
		50-59	.6		

3.2 Procedures

The current research study began with randomly selecting faculty members from Criminology and Criminal Justice and Non-Criminology and Criminal Justice Departments. The researcher does note that complete randomization was not possible due to the desire to study of Criminology and Criminal Justice majors versus Non-Criminology and Criminal Justice majors. Thus, this study was quasi-experimental. Faculty had to give written consent to allow research to be conducted in their classroom. Once permission to enter their classrooms was obtained, a date and time was schedule to conduct a 15 minute in class survey. A cross-sectional approach was used. The survey consisted of five questions about the perceptions of a community model, eleven demographic questions and the remainder of the survey consisted of a 5-point likert scale. The likert scale questions were separated into three components. First, perceptions of inmates had nine question beginning with "I believe inmates...". Second, perceptions of inmates' life in prison began with "An inmates' life in prison..." and had ten questions. Third, perceptions of reentry of inmates into society consisted of twelve questions beginning with the statement "After release from incarceration...". Participants were advised that the study was confidential, anonymous, and strictly voluntary. No deception was used in this study. The participants gave verbal consent to participate in the survey and were given the option to cease participation at any time during the study. Furthermore, the participants were told the study did not impose risk or direct benefit to the participant. However, the potential benefit of the study was to the greater society by grasping an understanding the perceptions people encounter when faced with questions about inmates, inmates' life in prison, and reentry into the society. Ultimately, society would benefit from comparing perceptions to realities. Finally, after data was collected, an analysis of t-test were conducted for an investigation of statically significant differences of perceptions based on gender, victimization, and knowing someone who was ever incarcerated versus not knowing someone who was ever incarcerated.

Those three categories were further dissected to analyze perceptions of inmates, inmates' life in prison, and reentry into society.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

There were three sets of t-tests conducted for analysis of the findings.

4.1 T-test Controlling for Gender

A t-test was conducted to compare the means for males and females. A five point likert scale measured 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree. As illustrated in Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, there were statistically significant differences between men and women for 3 of the 31 items.

While the t-tests indicated that there were statistical differences between males and females on these three items, it should be noted that the means are all in the same direction, in that both males and females are generally agreeing with these items. The scale for the items were 1 to 5 with 1 being strongly agree and 5 being strongly disagree. For all three variables, the lower mean for males indicates that they agree more strongly with the item than the females did.

As illustrated in Table 4.1, the first item that was statistically significant was the variable "I believe inmates deserve to be in prison", with a mean of 2.06 for males (SD=.826) and a mean of 2.21 for females (SD=.776). This was a significant difference at the .05 level.

Table 4.1 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Gender in Perception of Inmates

QUESTION/VARIABLE	MALE Mean (St. dev.)	FEMALE Mean (St. dev.)	P-Value
I BELIEVE INMATES CAN BE REHABILITATED	2.30 (1.104)	2.30 (1.184)	.968
I BELIEVE INMATES DESERVE TO BE IN PRISON	2.06 (.826)	2.21 (.776)	.015 *
I BELIEVE INMATES COMMIT CRIMES AFTER RELEASED FROM PRISON	2.55 (.786)	2.62 (.772)	.225

Table 4.1 – *Continued*

I BELIEVE INMATES DO NOT DESERVE TO HAVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS A NON-OFFENDER IN SOCIETY	2.79 (1.135)	2.84 (1.080)	.560
I BELIEVE INMATES FACE MULTIPLE HARDSHIPS AFTER RELEASE	1.92 (.863)	1.81 (.813)	.102
I BELIEVE INMATES ARE EMBEDDED IN A CRIMINAL CULTURE	2.35 (.818)	2.38 (.842)	.689
I BELIEVE INMATES SHOULD BE KEPT IN PRISON	3.18 (.845)	3.29 (.869)	.125
I BELIEVE INMATES SHOULD BE GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO CHANGE CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR	1.82 (.680)	2.10 (2.386)	.139
I BELIEVE INMATES RELEASED IN SOCIETY WILL INCREASE MY CHANCES OF VICTIMIZATION	2.84 (.795)	2.98 (.891)	.055

*Significance at the .05 level

**Significance at the .01 level

Table 4.2 illustrates the second item that was statistically significant was the variable “Inmates life in prison has a negative impact on the inmate’s behavior”, with a mean of 2.31 for males (SD=.855) and a mean of 2.56 for females (SD= .863). This was a significant difference at the .01 level. The third item that was statistically significant was the variable “Inmates life in prison creates consequences that inmates will face once released from custody, with a mean of 2.23 for males (SD=.743) and a mean of 2.41 for females (SD= .949). This was a significant difference at the .05 level.

Table 4.2 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Gender in Perception of Inmates’ Life in Prison

QUESTION/VARIABLE	MALE Mean (St. dev.)	FEMALE Mean (St. dev.)	P-Value
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON HAS A POSITIVE IMPACT ON THE INMATE’S BEHAVIOR	3.41 (1.096)	3.38 (.984)	.666

Table 4.2 – *Continued*

INMATES LIFE IN PRISON HAS A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE INMATE'S BEHAVIOR	2.31 (.855)	2.56 (.863)	.000**
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON CREATES CONSEQUENCES THAT INMATES WILL FACE ONCE RELEASED FROM CUSTODY	2.23 (.743)	2.41 (.949)	.019*
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON HAS PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES FOR THE INMATE	1.89 (.704)	1.96 (.803)	.249
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON IMPOSES HEALTH RISKS ON THE INMATE	2.36 (.945)	2.43 (.971)	.346
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON PROVIDES USEFUL SKILLS FOR THE INMATE ONCE RELEASED FROM PRISON	3.15 (1.021)	3.04 (.977)	.143
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON IS DETRIMENTAL TO THE PHYSICAL WELL-BEING OF THE INMATE	2.91 (.844)	3.02 (.945)	.125
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON PROVIDES THE INMATES WITH SKILLS TO COPE WITH IMPRISONMENT	3.01 (.982)	3.14 (.971)	.100
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON CONSISTS OF VICTIMIZATION	2.55 (.832)	2.52 (.858)	.708
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON LEADS TO NUMEROUS EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS FOR THE INMATE	2.30 (.845)	2.30 (.820)	.969

*Significance at the .05 level

**Significance at the .01 level

There were no significant statistical differences in table 4.3 with regards to gender on the section that measured perceptions of inmate reentry.

Table 4.3 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Gender in Perception of Reentry

QUESTION/VARIABLE	MALE Mean (St. dev.)	FEMALE Mean (St. dev.)	P-Value
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES ARE PRODUCTIVE MEMBERS OF SOCIETY	3.38 (.883)	3.46 (.749)	.160
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES DESERVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS NON-OFFENDERS	3.15 (1.062)	3.13 (1.137)	.820
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES CAN IMPROVE THEIR BEHAVIOR WITH PROPER GUIDANCE AND RESOURCES	2.08 (.728)	1.98 (.807)	.122
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES ARE FACED WITH STIGMATIZATION FROM SOCIETY THAT IS EASY TO OVERCOME	3.77 (.961)	3.78 (.984)	.920

Table 4.3 – *Continued*

AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES SHOULD BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST IN THE HIRING PROCESS	3.23 (1.100)	3.35 (1.011)	.135
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITH RESOURCES TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN SOCIETY	2.11 (.876)	2.01 (.740)	.078
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS SUCH AS PAROLE HAVE SHOWN TO BE EFFECTIVE AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS	3.06 (1.027)	3.16 (.983)	.189
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES' RECIDIVISM RATES ARE NOT HIGH, THAT IS NOT MANY INMATES RETURN TO PRISON AFTER PREVIOUS RELEASE INTO SOCIETY	3.60 (.978)	3.61 (.904)	.861
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATE REINTEGRATION IS CRUCIAL TO COMMUNITY COHESION	2.60 (.978)	2.49 (.888)	.120
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES AS FACED WITH MANY CHALLENGES FROM THE COMMUNITY	1.79 (.541)	1.81 (.654)	.647
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION IT IS THE COMMUNITY'S RESPONSIBILITY TO AID INMATES FOR SUCCESSFUL REINTEGRATION	3.24 (1.114)	3.17 (1.143)	.464
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES WILL COMMIT CRIME BECAUSE THEY WANT TO BE INCARCERATED	3.24 (1.112)	3.27 (.975)	.665

*Significance at the .05 level

**Significance at the .01 level

4.2 T-test controlling for Victimization

Another t-test was conducted to compare the means for victims and non-victims. As shown in Tables 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6, there were statically significant differences between victims and non-victims for 14 of the 31 items.

While the t-tests indicated that there were statistical differences between victims and non-victims on these fourteen items, it should be noted that the means are all in the same direction, in that both victims and non-victims are generally agreeing or remained neutral with these items. For all fourteen variables, the lower mean for non-victims indicates that they agree more strongly with the item than the victims did.

Table 4.4 illustrated the significantly statistical differences on perceptions of inmates when controlling for victimization. The first item that was statistically significant was the variable “I believe inmates face multiple hardships after release”, with a mean of 1.73 for victims (SD=.821) and a mean of 1.95 for non-victims (SD=.831). This was a significant difference at the .01 level. The second item that was statistically significant was the variable “I believe inmates should be kept in prison”, with a mean of 3.32 for victims (SD=.895) and a mean of 3.17 for non-victims (SD=.821). This was a significant difference at the .05 level.

Table 4.4 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Victimization in Perception of Inmates

QUESTION/VARIABLE	VICTIM Mean (St. dev.)	NON-VICTIM Mean (St. dev.)	P-Value
I BELIEVE INMATES CAN BE REHABILITATED	2.24 (.830)	2.34 (1.347)	.362
I BELIEVE INMATES DESERVE TO BE IN PRISON	2.13 (.841)	2.15 (.776)	.733
I BELIEVE INMATES COMMIT CRIMES AFTER RELEASED FROM PRISON	2.57 (.842)	2.60 (.737)	.614
I BELIEVE INMATES DO NOT DESERVE TO HAVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS A NON-OFFENDER IN SOCIETY	2.81 (1.160)	2.81 (1.068)	.958
I BELIEVE INMATES FACE MULTIPLE HARDSHIPS AFTER RELEASE	1.73 (.821)	1.95 (.831)	.001**
I BELIEVE INMATES ARE EMBEDDED IN A CRIMINAL CULTURE	2.28 (.834)	2.40 (.829)	.061
I BELIEVE INMATES SHOULD BE KEPT IN PRISON	3.32 (.895)	3.17 (.821)	.023*
I BELIEVE INMATES SHOULD BE GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO CHANGE CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR	1.81 (.693)	2.07 (2.351)	.152
I BELIEVE INMATES RELEASED IN SOCIETY WILL INCREASE MY CHANCES OF VICTIMIZATION	2.88 (.893)	2.93 (.796)	.435

*Significance at the .05 level

**Significance at the .01 level

Illustrated in Table 4.5, were the statistically significant difference on perceptions of inmates' life in prison when controlling for victimization. The third item that was statistically

significant was the variable “Inmates life in prison has a positive impact on the inmate’s behavior”, with a mean of 3.55 for victims (SD=.990) and a mean of 3.28 for non-victims (SD=1.065). This is a significant difference at the .01 level. The fourth item that was statistically significant was the variable “Inmates life in prison has a negative impact on the inmate’s behavior”, with the mean of 2.36 for victims (SD=.878) and a mean of 2.50 for non-victims (SD=.865). This is a significant difference at the .05 level. The fifth item that was a statistically significant was the variable “Inmates life in prison has psychological consequences for the inmates”, with the mean of 1.80 for victims (SD=.700) and a mean of 2.03 for non-victims (SD=.797). This is a significant difference at the .01 level. The sixth item that was statistically significant was the variable “Inmates life in prison provides useful skills for the inmate once released from prison”, with the mean of 3.21 for victims (SD=1.075) and a mean of 3.01 for non-victims (SD=.937). This is a significant difference at the .01 level. The seventh item that was statically significant was the variable “Inmates life in prison provides the inmate with skills to cope with imprisonment”, with the mean of 3.21 for victims (SD=.964) and the mean of 2.95 for non-victims (SD=.974). This is a significant difference at the .01 level. The eighth item that was statically significant was the variable “Inmates life in prison leads to numerous emotional problems for the inmate”, with the mean of 2.21 for victims (SD=.876) and a mean of 2.38 for non-victims (SD=.790). This is a significant difference at the .01 level.

Table 4.5 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Victimization in Perception of Inmates’ Life in Prison

QUESTION/VARIABLE	VICTIM Mean (St. dev.)	NON-VICTIM Mean (St. dev.)	P-Value
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON HAS A POSITIVE INPACT ON THE INMATE’S BEHAVIOR	3.55 (.990)	3.28 (1.065)	.001**
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON HAS A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE INMATE’S BEHAVIOR	2.36 (.878)	2.50 (.865)	.039*
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON CREATES CONSEQUENCES THAT INMATES WILL FACE ONCE RELEASED FROM CUSTODY	2.27 (.885)	2.38 (.851)	.112
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON HAS PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES FOR THE INMATE	1.80 (.700)	2.03 (.797)	.000**

Table 4.5 – *Continued*

INMATES LIFE IN PRISON IMPOSES HEALTH RISKS ON THE INMATE	2.35 (1.028)	2.43 (.917)	.241
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON PROVIDES USEFUL SKILLS FOR THE INMATE ONCE RELEASED FROM PRISON	3.21 (1.075)	3.01 (.937)	.006**
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON IS DETRIMENTAL TO THE PHYSICAL WELL-BEING OF THE INMATE	2.99 (.946)	2.95 (.876)	.516
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON PROVIDES THE NMATES WITH SKILLS TO COPE WITH IMPRISONMENT	3.24 (.964)	2.95 (.974)	.000**
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON CONSISTS OF VICTIMIZATION	2.51 (.888)	2.57 (.804)	.320
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON LEADS TO NUMEROUS EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS FOR THE INMATE	2.21 (.876)	2.38 (.790)	.006**

*Significance at the .05 level

**Significance at the .01 level

Table 4.6 illustrates the statistically significant differences among perceptions of inmate reentry with regards to victims and non-victims. The ninth item that was statistically significant was the variable “After release from incarceration inmates are productive members of society”, with a mean of 3.52 for victims (SD=.845) and a mean of 3.36 for non-victims (SD=.786). This is a significant difference at the .01 level. The tenth item that was statistically significant was the variable “After release from incarceration inmates are facing stigmatization from society that is easy to overcome”, with a mean of 3.92 for victims (SD=1.015) and a mean of 3.66 for non-victims (SD=.931). This is a significant difference at the .01 level. The eleventh item that was statistically significant was the variable “After release from incarceration inmates should be discriminated against in the hiring process”, with a mean of 3.43 for victims (SD=1.086) and a mean of 3.18 for non-victims (SD=1.008). This is a significant difference at the .01 level. The twelfth item that was statistically significant was the variable “After release from incarceration inmate reintegration is crucial to community cohesion”, with a mean of 2.41 for victims (SD=.941) and a mean of 2.63 for non-victims (SD=.925). This is a significant difference at the .01 level. The thirteenth item that was statistically significant was the variable “After release

from incarceration inmates are faced with many challenges from the community”, with a mean of 1.67 for victims (SD=.571) and a mean of 1.90 for non-victims (SD=.611). This is a significant difference at the .01 level. The fourteenth item that was statistically significant was the variable “After release from incarceration inmates will commit crime because they want to be incarcerated”, with a mean of 3.37 for victims (SD=1.094) and a mean of 3.18 for non-victims (SD=1.002). This is a significant difference at the .05 level.

Table 4.6 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Victimization in Perception of Reentry

QUESTION/VARIABLE	VICTIM Mean (St. dev.)	NON-VICTIM Mean (St. dev.)	P-Value
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES ARE PRODUCTIVE MEMBERS OF SOCIETY	3.52 (.845)	3.36 (.786)	.008**
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES DESERVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS NON-OFFENDERS	3.20 (1.151)	3.05 (1.063)	.079
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES CAN IMPROVE THEIR BEHAVIOR WITH PROPER GUIDANCE AND RESOURCES	1.99 (.686)	2.05 (.840)	.326
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES ARE FACED WITH STIGMATIZATION FROM SOCIETY THAT IS EASY TO OVERCOME	3.92 (1.015)	3.66 (.931)	.000**
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES SHOULD BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST IN THE HIRING PROCESS	3.43 (1.086)	3.18 (1.008)	.002**
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITH RESOURCES TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN SOCIETY	2.00 (.832)	2.10 (.786)	.094
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS SUCH AS PAROLE HAVE SHOWN TO BE EFFECTIVE AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS	3.13 (1.053)	3.10 (.948)	.715
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES' RECIDIVISM RATES ARE NOT HIGH, THAT IS NOT MANY INMATES RETURN TO PRISON AFTER PREVIOUS RELEASE INTO SOCIETY	3.63 (1.016)	3.60 (.929)	.679
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATE REENTIGATION IS CRUCIAL TO COMMUNITY COHESION	2.41 (.941)	2.63 (.925)	.003**
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES ARE FACED WITH MANY CHALLENGES FROM THE COMMUNITY	1.67 (.571)	1.90 (.611)	.000**

Table 4.6 – *Continued*

AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION IT IS THE COMMUNITY'S RESPONSIBILITY TO AID INMATES FOR SUCCESSFUL REINTEEGRATION	3.19 (1.173)	3.22 (1.099)	.742
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES WILL COMMIT CRIME BECAUSE THEY WANT TO BE INCARCERATED	3.37 (1.094)	3.18 (1.002)	.017*

*Significance at the .05 level

**Significance at the .01 level

4.3 T-test Controlling for Knowing Someone Who was Ever Incarcerated

Lastly, a t-test was conducted to compare the means for respondents who knew someone who was ever incarcerated and those who did not. As shown in Tables 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9, there were statistically significant differences between participants who knew someone who was ever incarcerated and those who did not for 6 of the 31 items.

While the t-tests indicated that there were statistical differences between knowing someone who was ever incarcerated and not knowing on these six items, it should be noted that the means are all in the same direction, in that both knowing someone ever incarcerated and not knowing someone ever incarcerated are generally agreeing with these items. For all both variables, the lower mean indicates that they agree more strongly with the item than the higher mean.

The following items in Table 4.7 were statically significant differences found among perceptions of inmates for those who knew someone who was ever incarcerated and those who did not. The first item that was statistically significant was the variable "I believe inmates face multiple hardships after release", with the mean of 1.76 for knowing someone ever incarcerated (SD=.827) and a mean of 2.07 for not knowing someone ever incarcerated (SD=.828). This was a significant difference at the .01 level. The second item that was statistically significant was the variable "I believe inmates should be kept in prison", with a mean of 3.30 for knowing someone

ever incarcerated (SD=.865) and a mean of 3.09 for not knowing someone ever incarcerated (SD=.825). This is a significant difference at the .05 level.

Table 4.7 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Knowing Someone Who was Ever Incarcerated in Perception of Inmates

QUESTION/VARIABLE	Knowing Someone Who Was Ever Incarcerated Mean (St. dev.)	Not Knowing Someone Who Was Ever Incarcerated Mean (St. dev.)	P-Value
I BELIEVE INMATES CAN BE REHABILITATED	2.25 (1.037)	2.40 (1.377)	.317
I BELIEVE INMATES DESERVE TO BE IN PRISON	2.18 (.816)	2.05 (.761)	.104
I BELIEVE INMATES COMMIT CRIMES AFTER RELEASED FROM PRISON	2.57 (.832)	2.63 (.649)	.429
I BELIEVE INMATES DO NOT DESERVE TO HAVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS A NON-OFFENDER IN SOCIETY	2.81 (1.116)	2.80 (1.095)	.901
I BELIEVE INMATES FACE MULTIPLE HARDSHIPS AFTER RELEASE	1.76 (.827)	2.07 (.828)	.001**
I BELIEVE INMATES ARE EMBEDDED IN A CRIMINAL CULTURE	2.34 (.843)	2.39 (.823)	.598
I BELIEVE INMATES SHOULD BE KEPT IN PRISON	3.30 (.865)	3.09 (.825)	.020*
I BELIEVE INMATES SHOULD BE GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO CHANGE CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR	1.81 (.700)	2.31 (3.156)	.143
I BELIEVE INMATES RELEASED IN SOCIETY WILL INCREASE MY CHANCES OF VICTIMIZATION	2.95 (.858)	2.83 (.820)	.172

*Significance at the .05 level

**Significance at the .01 level

No significant statistical differences were found on perceptions of inmates' life in prison when controlling for those who knew someone who was ever incarcerated and those who did not illustrated in table 4.8.

Table 4.8 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Knowing Someone Who was Ever Incarcerated in Perception of Inmates' Life in Prison

QUESTION/VARIABLE	Knowing Someone Who Was Ever Incarcerated Mean (St. dev.)	Not Knowing Someone Who Was Ever Incarcerated Mean (St. dev.)	P-Value
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON HAS A POSITIVE IMPACT ON THE INMATE'S BEHAVIOR	3.45 (1.060)	3.25 (.979)	.064
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON HAS A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE INMATE'S BEHAVIOR	2.42 (.896)	2.52 (.819)	.271
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON CREATES CONSEQUENCES THAT INMATES WILL FACE ONCE RELEASED FROM CUSTODY	2.32 (.881)	2.35 (.823)	.746
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON HAS PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES FOR THE INMATE	1.89 (.779)	2.01 (.707)	.113
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON IMPOSES HEALTH RISKS ON THE INMATE	2.36 (.985)	2.48 (.913)	.213
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON PROVIDES USEFUL SKILLS FOR THE INMATE ONCE RELEASED FROM PRISON	3.14 (1.038)	3.01 (.909)	.191
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON IS DETRIMENTAL TO THE PHYSICAL WELL-BEING OF THE INMATE	3.00 (.933)	2.87 (.833)	.160
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON PROVIDES THE INMATES WITH SKILLS TO COPE WITH IMPRISONMENT	3.16 (.995)	2.91 (.903)	.011
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON CONSISTS OF VICTIMIZATION	2.53 (.867)	2.56 (.788)	.695
INMATES LIFE IN PRISON LEADS TO NUMEROUS EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS FOR THE INMATE	2.29 (.830)	2.36 (.835)	.461

*Significance at the .05 level

**Significance at the .01 level

Finally, Table 4.9 illustrates the statistically significant differences on perception of inmate reentry with those who knew someone ever incarcerated and those who did not. The third item that was statistically significant was the variable "After incarceration inmates can improve their behavior with proper guidance and resources", with the mean of 1.97 for knowing someone ever incarcerated (SD=.749) and a mean of 2.16 for not knowing someone ever

incarcerated (SD=.819). This is a significant difference at the .05 level. The fourth item that was statistically significant was the variable “After release from incarceration inmates are faced with stigmatization from society that is easy to overcome”, with the mean of 3.86 for knowing someone ever incarcerated (SD=1.008) and a mean of 3.60 for not knowing someone ever incarcerated (SD=.855). This is a significant difference at the .01 level. The fifth item that was statistically significant was the variable “After release from incarceration inmates should be discriminated against in the hiring process”, with a mean of 3.36 for knowing someone ever incarcerate (SD=1.056) and a mean of 3.13 for not knowing someone ever incarcerated (SD=1.032). This is a significant difference at the .05 level. The sixth item that was statistically significant was the variable “After release from incarceration inmates should be provided with resources to be successful in society”, with a mean of 1.95 for knowing someone ever incarcerated (SD=.774) and a mean of 2.31 for not knowing someone ever incarcerated (SD=.826). This is a significant difference at the .01 level.

Table 4.9 T-test Comparison of Means Controlling for Knowing Someone Who was Ever Incarcerated in Perception of Reentry

QUESTION/VARIABLE	Knowing Someone Who Was Ever Incarcerated Mean (St. dev.)	Not Knowing Someone Who Was Ever Incarcerated Mean (St. dev.)	P-Value
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES ARE PRODUCTIVE MEMBERS OF SOCIETY	3.44 (.827)	3.39 (.798)	.567
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES DESERVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS NON-OFFENDERS	3.11 (1.119)	3.15 (1.062)	.730
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES CAN IMPROVE THEIR BEHAVIOR WITH PROPER GUIDANCE AND RESOURCES	1.97 (.749)	2.16 (.819)	.033*

Table 4.9 – *Continued*

AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES ARE FACED WITH STIGMATIZATION FROM SOCIETY THAT IS EASY TO OVERCOME	3.86 (1.008)	3.60 (.855)	.005**
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES SHOULD BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST IN THE HIRING PROCESS	3.36 (1.056)	3.13 (1.032)	.038*
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITH RESOURCES TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN SOCIETY	1.95 (.774)	2.31 (.826)	.000**
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS SUCH AS PAROLE HAVE SHOWN TO BE EFFECTIVE AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS	3.13 (1.035)	3.08 (.826)	.606
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES' RECIDIVISM RATES ARE NOT HIGH, THAT IS NOT MANY INMATES RETURN TO PRISON AFTER PREVIOUS RELEASE INTO SOCIETY	3.66 (.974)	3.51 (.938)	.129
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATE REINTEGRATION IS CRUCIAL TO COMMUNITY COHESION	2.51 (.964)	2.60 (.855)	.342
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES AS FACED WITH MANY CHALLENGES FROM THE COMMUNITY	1.76 (.616)	1.90 (.551)	.023*
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION IT IS THE COMMUNITY'S RESPONSIBILITY TO AID INMATES FOR SUCCESSFUL REINTEGRATION	3.19 (1.140)	3.25 (1.102)	.596
AFTER RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION INMATES WILL COMMIT CRIME BECAUSE THEY WANT TO BE INCARCERATED	3.33 (1.062)	3.13 (.986)	.057

*Significance at the .05 level

**Significance at the .01 level

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Conclusion

After analyzing the data, males were found to believe that inmates deserve to be in prison more often than females did. However, males also believed more strongly than females that life in prison had a negative impact on inmate behavior. Furthermore, males believed life in prison led to consequences inmates face once released from custody, more strongly than females did. These conclusions of gender differences can be complimented by the previously discussed data that focused on women. The current study's finding that females did not agree as much as males that prison imposed consequences faced once released into society can be supported with the previous research data that demonstrated women did not have a difficult time in societal reentry, but rather in prison adjustment. Moreover, this point is supported by the result that males agreed more than females that inmate life in prison had a negative impact on the inmate.

Next, the results demonstrated that victims were more inclined to believe inmates are faced with multiple hardships than non-victims. Although victims were slightly more inclined to disagree that inmates should be kept in prison, most victims and non-victims remained neutral. On the issue of prison having a positive impact on inmate behavior, again most victims and non-victims remained neutral. Victims were slightly toward the disagreement side. Victims agreed more strongly that inmates' life in prison has a negative impact on inmate behavior. Significantly more victims strongly agreed that prison life for an inmate has psychological consequences on the inmate than non-victims. Victims were less certain about whether prison life provided useful skills for inmates upon release than non-victims, although both were generally neutral. Non-victims agreed that life in prison provided the inmate with skills to cope with imprisonment, while

victims remained neutral on this topic. Victims agree more strongly than non-victims that inmate life in prison leads to numerous emotional problems for the inmate. Both victims and non-victims were mostly neutral on the issue of inmates becoming productive member of society, however, victims were more inclined to lean toward disagreement with the former statement. Victims disagree more than non-victims that inmates are faced with stigmatization that is easy to overcome. Again, victims disagree more so than non-victims with the perception that after release from incarceration inmates should be discriminated against in the hiring process. Community cohesion seems to be more important for inmate reintegration for victims than non-victims. Furthermore, victims believe more so than non-victims that inmates are faced with challenges from the community. Both victims and non-victims were mostly neutral on the perception that inmates will commit crime because they want to be incarcerated. However, victims were closer to disagree than non-victims.

The results surprisingly show that many victims disagree with the current prison conditions; however, victims agree that inmates do not become a productive member of society. Victims agreed more so than non-victims that inmates face hardships after release, life in prison had a negative impact, life in prison had psychological consequences, life in prison imposed numerous emotional problems, and inmates were faced with challenges in the community. Non-victims seems to believe more than victims that inmates should be kept in prison, prison had a positive impact, prison provided skills for release, prison provided skills for coping, community stigmatization was easy to overcome, and discrimination should be used in the hiring process. Interestingly, the victims appear to be more knowledgeable on the realities inmates are faced with. This could possibly be due to more recent interest in victim participation within the criminal justice system. Also, this could be because the victim would like to move on and allow for the inmate to reintegrate helping heal both of their lives. This leads the researcher to believe that the previously discussed literature of empirical research was possibly correct with the suggestion of a restorative justice approach. It seems that victims agreed that inmate

reintegration is crucial to community cohesion, but society is not inclined to why inmates are failing reentry and reintegration. Therefore, this directs the discussion back to the lack of education society has on the fact that inmates are faced with many conflicting policies that simply sets the inmate up for failure. Much of society generally understands that there are inmates who fail at reentry and reintegration. However, most are also oblivious to the fact that reentry is currently functioning to work against the inmates' success. The current research study demonstrated that much of the time society agreed that prison is not necessarily the answer to correct inmate behavior. In fact, prison could potentially do harm to the inmate's success with reentry. However, society remains to stand by and do nothing to change the policies regarding reentry and reintegration. More should be done to ensure that educated people are in legislature positions or that those voting for legislation regarding reentry are educated on the need to not only help the inmate, but ultimately to help society prosper in the long run. The realities inmates face with adjustment not only in prison, but in society is crucial knowledge that society must understand in order to allow for proper assistance and success.

Lastly, a statistical difference was discovered among those who knew someone who was ever incarcerated and those who did not. Those who knew someone ever incarcerated strongly agreed that inmates face multiple hardships after release, than those who did not know anyone (who simply agreed with the perspective). Interestingly, those who knew and did not know someone who was ever incarcerated generally remained neutral to the belief that inmates should be kept in prison. Those who knew someone incarcerated were slightly toward disagreement. Additionally, those who knew someone ever incarcerated agreed more strongly that inmates improved behavior upon release with proper guidance and resources than those who did not know someone ever incarcerated. Not knowing someone ever incarcerated had a greater agreement that stigmatization for the inmate was easy to overcome and discrimination should be used in the hiring process than those who did know someone who was ever incarcerated. Finally, knowing someone who was ever incarcerated led to a stronger agreement

that upon release inmates should be provided with resources for success. It appears that given someone knows someone who was ever incarcerated contributes to more knowledge of the realities inmates faced both in prison and in reentry into society. Thus, that this part of society could be considered as more educated on the realities faced by inmates and therefore, the perceptions do in fact differ.

5.2 Discussion

The current research goal was to explore the effects of educational level on this topic influenced current societal perceptions. The belief was that the higher education and/or knowledge of criminal justice procedure, policies, and reentry would change the perception people endure about inmates, inmates' life in prison and reentry into society to match the findings of previously collected data. The results do in fact indicate that members of society who have come in contact with inmates and the process they endure in incarceration and reintegration, such as victims and/or those who know someone who was ever incarcerated do have significantly differing opinions than those less educated on realities inmates face.

The study originally hoped to examine educational levels by comparing criminal justice majors versus non-criminal justice majors. However, the study was confined by the sample population. Even with this obstacle the research did illustrate another form of education level with significant findings of victims and knowing someone who was ever incarcerated. Victims seemed to be more aware of the hardships that inmates are faced with. Those who were victims acknowledged that inmates suffer from the current prison conditions. One could speculate that by the results, victims wanted punishment for the inmate for the wrongdoing. However, the victims almost sympathized with inmate by expressing agreement that inmates are not given skills to cope with imprisonment, emotional problems arise from life in prison, and that challenges will be faced during reentry. From the results, victims appear to be more optimistic that inmates could refrain from criminal behavior if community cohesion was the focal point of reentry. Victims displayed more optimism by disagreeing with discrimination in the hiring

process. On the other hand, non-victims appeared to be more optimistic that inmate behavior would change through incarceration. This goes to show that non-victims are less knowledgeable of the effects life in prison have on the inmate. Overall, the results support that victims do not want the inmate to suffer from imprisonment, but to grow from it and become a productive member of society.

Then there were results from those who knew someone who had ever been incarcerated. These results demonstrated that knowledge of someone who had gone through the criminal justice system allowed first hand insight into hardships and contradicting policies. For example, those who knew someone who had ever been incarcerated agreed more that inmates do in fact face hardships. Moreover, association with someone who was ever incarcerated led to the stronger belief that stigmatization was difficult to overcome and discrimination should not be used in the hiring process. Discrimination would only exacerbate the problems faced during reentry. Finally, those who knew someone who was ever incarcerated agreed that with the proper guidance and resources the inmate was more likely to succeed in reentry. Thus, these results appear to support that those with the knowledge of issues inmates face within the criminal justice system have perceptions that complement the research of the realities inmates face.

It appears that both these populations are more educated on what empirical data confirms to be realities that inmates face in life in prison and during reentry. Both victims and those who associate with someone who had ever been incarcerated have personal knowledge of dealing with inmates. Although, the two populations have opposing relationships with the inmates of friend and foe, each population come to the same conclusion that inmates' need to be given resources for success during reentry. The research data did support that knowledge of the topic of inmates, inmates' life in prison and reentry was of significance in comparison to the realities inmates face. Nonetheless, the constraints of the current study must be explained.

5.2.1 Limitations

There were several limitations within this study. First, the study was conducted among the educated population of society, college students. The research was intended to decipher the different educational levels such as graduate versus undergraduate students. However, there was a smaller amount of graduate student that actually participated in the study. Furthermore, there was supposed to be distinction between educational knowledge on this topic by exploring criminal justice major versus non-criminal justice majors. However, the data did not allow for that dynamic either. There was not a large enough variety of non-criminal justice majors. The study was conducted with an in class survey which would limit the participants to those who attend class and not allow for distance educational students to participate. Next, the survey itself was rather long with 47 questions total. With college students as the sample population, little generalizability can be gained from the current research.

5.2.2 Further Research

The literature review clearly established a remaining need to understand and appreciate the hardships and consequences an inmate encounters. However, society refrains from either knowing these are issues or taking a position on the issues. The public needs to be educated that they can make a difference and change policy that is not only ineffective in accomplishing its' goal, but also spillover of ineffectiveness to other aspects of the criminal justice system (i.e. incarceration to reentry).

More research should be conducted on this topic, not only due to the limitations in the current study, but for the greater benefit of society. There has been an establishment for the need of education to society on this topic. Thus, further research should do longitudinal studies and rewrite some of the questions asked in the current study to form more in depth questions. After careful review of previous research, one can see the gaps in the literature that remain year after year. Thus far, reentry and reintegration data has failed to address consistent

operationalization for these two concepts. Operationalization that could be studies across multiple studies would be the first step for future research.

A huge issue former research encountered was the lack of established causality for certain reactions/adjustment for inmates. The current researcher would suggest that future research not dwell on causality, but embrace what has been found, which is no matter what the situation many of the same key adjustment patterns for inmates were found during incarceration, reentry and reintegration. Those key patterns need to be the focal point of future data to allow for the understanding of how to help the inmate cope with the realities of life in prison compared to life in a community. Much prior data also contributed low problem solving skills to failure of proper adjustment in incarceration and reintegration. Thus, inmate data surrounding programs would be of good fortune. Moreover, a community that supports an inmates' reintegration could allow for inmates that do not have any support succeed in reentry.

Situational factors that prior research has established such as increased stress decreases proper adjustment for the inmate would be beneficial for further research as well. If society can understand inmates coping need, inmate cognitive dissonance can be reduced and potentially aid with success in reintegration and reentry.

With a declining economy and a constant need to allocate resources properly, societal comprehension of how inmates adjust in society could make or break a national criminal justice budget. As a previous study noted, it costs more money to house an inmate in prison than it does to house them in society. Moreover, society must acknowledge that although punishment is a societal norm that hopes to keep order in society, there needs to be a clear line of when punishment becomes unhealthy for the inmate and greater society. Imprisonment practices should be used to empower the inmate to change criminal behavior not to diminish their potential success for reentry because subsequently, most inmates cannot remain incarcerated for eternity.

Further research should also take into account what type of prison the inmate will be released from such as super maximum prisons. Society should be educated on what occurs at these facilities and the fact that the hardships endured differ depending on what type of facilities. For instance, as the previous research review established that inmates from super maximum facilities often encounter mental illnesses or other health issues that go unaddressed, which unaddressed issues further lead to recidivism. Although, the previous research failed to indicate causality of prison conditions and adjustment, future researcher should note that prison conditions were a decent predictor of success for reentry. Furthermore, that when the inmate maintained some type of supportive relationship success with reentry was often a result.

Next, future researchers should focus on removing political figures or unqualified personnel from the roles of criminal justice policy makers. There should be a focus on criminal justice professionals in all aspects of the criminal justice system. Again, the more educated the person is of knowing the realities that inmates face in the criminal justice system, the more likely the proper resources and guidance an inmate will receive. Thus, the more potential for successful reentry and reduction in recidivism can be accomplished. Also, if the criminal justice system focused on professionalization, there could be more clarity in the conflicting policies parolees currently cope with. On several of the current research's surveys were notes from those who worked in the criminal justice field. One particular note to the researcher was that their opinion and perception on many of the questions would differ depending on whether they were taking on the mindset of a regular member of society or the mindset of their criminal justice profession. The researcher suggests that future research explore why there would be a difference in the perspective if the participant is the same person. What would be the basis for the difference in opinions.

Finally, future research should dedicate studies to perceptions of all members of society that an inmate could encounter during reentry such as employers, victims, offenders themselves, neighbors, educational institutions, real estate employees, and psychologists.

Ultimately, more research needs to be accomplished on this topic because society will not attempt to try new policies, although they agree that the current policy is ineffective, if there is no foundation to rely on what could be effective. Even with empirical data suggesting what could potentially benefit society, societal norms are tough to revise. Thus, the more empirical data that supports what will succeed will hold more value for future change. Prosperity for inmates and society both hold a stake in the matter at hand and current ineffectiveness no longer an option. Society cannot bear the burden of ineffective reentry policies any longer.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY

Perception of a Community Model

1. Do you believe inmates deserve to be in current prison conditions?

Yes

No

2. Do you believe current policies regarding reentry are effective?

Yes

No

3. Would you support efforts to improve policies for reentry of inmates into communities so the inmate can be a productive member of society?

Yes

No

4. Do you believe communities can make a difference in the prevention of future crime?

Yes

No

5. Do you believe community models can improve current policies for reentry of inmates into society?

Yes

No

Perception of Inmates, Inmates' Life in Prison, and

Reentry of Inmates into Society

1. I BELIEVE INMATES...

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1) CAN BE REHABILITATED	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
2) DESERVE TO BE IN PRISON	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
3) WILL COMMIT CRIME AFTER RELEASE FROM PRISON	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
4) DO NOT DESERVE TO HAVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS A NON-OFFENDER IN SOCIETY	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

5) FACE MULTIPLE
HARDSHIPS AFTER
RELEASE

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

6) ARE EMBEDDED IN A
CRIMINAL CULTURE

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

7) SHOULD BE KEPT IN
PRISON

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

8) SHOULD BE GIVEN
AN OPPORTUNITY TO
CHANGE CRIMINAL
BEHAVIORS

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

9) RELEASE IN SOCIETY
WILL INCREASE MY
CHANCES OF
VICTIMIZATION

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

2. AN INMATE'S LIFE IN PRISON...

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1) HAS A POSITIVE IMPACT ON THE INMATE'S BEHAVIOR	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
2) HAS A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE INMATE'S BEHAVIOR	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
3) CREATES CONSEQUENCES THAT INMATES WILL FACE ONCE RELEASED FROM CUSTODY	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
4) HAS PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES FOR THE INMATE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
5) IMPOSES HEALTH RISKS ON THE INMATE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
6) PROVIDES USEFUL SKILLS FOR THE INMATE ONCE RELEASED FROM PRISON	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
7) IS DETRIMENTAL TO THE PHYSICAL WELL-BEING OF THE INMATE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
8) PROVIDES THE INMATE WITH SKILLS TO COPE WITH IMPRISONMENT	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
9) CONSISTS OF VICTIMIZATION	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
10) LEADS TO NUMEROUS EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS FOR THE INMATE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE

3. AFTER RELEASED FROM INCARCERATION...

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1) INMATES ARE PRODUCTIVE MEMBERS OF SOCIETY.	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
2) INMATES DESERVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS NON-OFFENDERS	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
3) INMATES CAN IMPROVE THEIR BEHAVIOR WITH PROPER GUIDANCE AND RESOURCES	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
4) INMATES ARE FACED WITH STIGMATIZATION FROM SOCIETY THAT IS EASY TO OVERCOME	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

5) INMATES SHOULD BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST IN THE HIRING PROCESS

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

6) INMATES SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITH RESOURCES TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN SOCIETY

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

7) CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS SUCH AS PAROLE HAVE SHOWN TO BE EFFECTIVE AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

8) INMATES' RECIDIVISM RATES ARE NOT HIGH, THAT IS NOT MANY INMATES RETURN TO PRISON AFTER PREVIOUS RELEASE INTO SOCIETY

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE NEUTRAL DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
9) INMATE REINTEGRATION IS CRUCIAL TO COMMUNITY COHESION	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
10) INMATES ARE FACED WITH MANY CHALLENGES FROM THE COMMUNITY	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
11) IT IS THE COMMUNITY'S RESPONSIBILITY TO AID INMATES FOR SUCCESSFUL REINTEGRATION	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE
12) INMATES WILL COMMIT CRIME BECAUSE THEY WANT TO BE INCARCERATED AGAIN	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY AGREE	<input type="radio"/> AGREE	<input type="radio"/> NEUTRAL	<input type="radio"/> DISAGREE	<input type="radio"/> STRONGLY DISAGREE

Demographics

1. Are you male or female?

- Male
- Female

2. Which category below includes your age?

- 17 or younger
- 18-20
- 21-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60 or older

3. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- Less than high school degree
- High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)
- Some college but no degree
- Associate degree
- Bachelor degree
- Graduate degree

4. Are you White, Black or African-American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific islander, or some other race?

- White
- Black or African-American
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- From multiple races

Some other race (please specify)

5. Which of the following categories best describes your employment status?

- Employed, working 1-39 hours per week
- Employed, working 40 or more hours per week
- Not employed, looking for work
- Not employed, NOT looking for work
- Retired
- Disabled, not able to work

6. How much money did YOU personally earn in 2010? This includes money from jobs; net income from business, farm, or rent; pensions; dividends; interest; social security payments; and any other money income received by YOU. Please report the total amount of money you earned - do not subtract the amount you paid in taxes or any deductions listed on your tax return.

- \$0 - \$9,999
- \$10,000 - \$19,999
- \$20,000 - 29,999
- \$30,000 - \$39,999
- \$40,000 - \$49,999
- \$50,000 - \$59,999
- \$60,000 - \$69,999
- \$70,000 - \$79,999
- \$80,000 - \$89,999
- \$90,000 - \$99,999
- \$100,000 or More

7. Are you a parent?

- Yes
- No

REFERENCES

- Bahr, S. J., Harris, L., & Fisher, J. K. (2010). Successful Reentry: What differentiates successful and unsuccessful parolees? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 54(5), 667-692.
- Biggam, F. H., & Power, K.G. (1999). A comparison of the problem-solving abilities and psychological distress of suicidal, bullied, and protected prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(2), 196-216.
- Braga, A. A., Piehl, A. M., & Hureau, D. (2009). Controlling violent offenders released to the community: An evaluation of the Boston reentry initiative. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 46(4), 411-436.
- Driscoll, P. J. (1952). Factors related to the institutional adjustment of prison inmates. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 47(3), 593-596.
- Glaze, L.E. & Bonczar, T.P. (2009). Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Probation and parole in the United States, 2007 statistical tables*. Retrieved from <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus07st.pdf>
- Gunnison, E., & Helfgott, J. B. (2011). Factors that hinder offender reentry success: A view from community corrections officers. *International journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 55(2), 287-304.
- Hochstetler, A., Murphy, D. S., & Simons, R. L. (2004). Damaged goods: Exploring predictors of distress in prison inmates. *Crime and Delinquency*, 50(3), 436-457.
- Kleis, K. M. (2010). Facilitating failure: Parole, reentry, and obstacles to success. *Dialect Anthropology*, 34, 525-531.
- Leverentz, A. (2011). Neighborhood context of attitudes toward crime and reentry. *Punishment and Society*, 13(1), 64-92.

- Listwan, S. J. (2009). Reentry for serious and violent offenders. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 20(2), 154-169.
- Maruna, S. (2011). Reentry as a rite of passage. *Punishment and Society*, 13(1), 3-28.
- Morani, N. M., Wikoff, N., Linhorst, D. M., & Bratton, S. (2011). A description of the self-identified needs, service expenditures, and social outcomes of participants of a prisoner-reentry program. *The Prison Journal*, 1-19.
- Paparozzi, M. A., & Guy, R. (2009). The giant that never woke: Parole authorities as the lynchpin to evidence-based practices and prisoner reentry. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 25(4), 397-411.
- Petersilia, J. (2001). Prisoner reentry: Public safety and reintegration challenges. *The Prison Journal*, 81(3), 360-375.
- Pettus, C. A., & Severson, M. (2006). Paving the way for effective reentry practice: The critical role and function of the boundary spanner. *The Prison Journal*, 86(2) 206-229.
- Pizarro, J. & Stenius, V. M. K. (2004). Supermax prisons: Their rise, current practices, and effects on inmates. *The Prison Journal*, 84(2), 248-264.
- Raphael, S. (2011). Incarceration and prisoner reentry in the United States. *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 635, 192-215.
- Settles, T. (2009). Restorative reentry: A strategy to improve reentry outcomes by enhancing social capital. *Victims and Offenders*, 4, 285-302.
- Souza, K. A. & Dhami, M. K. (2010). First-time and recurrent inmates' experiences of imprisonment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(12), 1330-1342.
- Steiner, B. & Wooldredge, J. (2009). Rethinking the link between institutional crowding and inmate misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, 89(2), 205-233.
- Van Tongeren, D. R. & Klebe, K. J. (2010). Reconceptualizing prison adjustment: A multidimensional approach exploring female offenders' adjustment to prison life. *The Prison Journal*, 90(1), 48-68.

Warren, J. I., Hurt, S., Loper, A. B., & Chauhan, P. (2004). Exploring prison adjustment among female inmates: Issues of measurement and prediction. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31(5), 624-645.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Krystal Salazar has studied at The University of Texas at Arlington since 2006. She graduated with a dual undergraduate degree of the Bachelor of the Arts in Psychology and Criminal Justice/Criminology. She began her graduate program in 2010 for the Master of the Arts in Criminal Justice/Criminology. Her research interests are reentry, reintegration, and rehabilitation. She plans to work with either inmates or soldiers who are faced with reentry, reintegration, and/or rehabilitation. She aspires to earn her doctoral degree sometime in the near future.