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ABSTRACT

MANAGING FACTORS OF STIGMA
INFLUENCING THE REINTEGRATION OF
EX-INMATES AS LAW-ABIDING CITIZENS

by Richard Phillips

Chairperson of the Supervisory Committee: Professor Alan Hall
Department of Anthropology and Sociology

The thesis examines ex-inmates' self-report accounts of their experience with reintegration. In order to arrive at an understanding of this social stage, the labelling approach is used as a broad theoretical framework to develop a typology for understanding the different ways in which stigma is experienced and managed by ex-inmates with different criminal histories and life situations. While the study recognizes the social barriers to reintegration and the problems that every ex-inmate experiences because of social stigma, an important facet of this work is to understand that there are distinct personal, criminal, institutional, and social patterns of the stigma experience and management which can be identified within three ex-offender categories: the career criminal, the occasional criminal, and the episodic or one-time offender. The understanding of distinct reintegration needs, based on these categorizations, will assist community corrections in matching ex-offender profiles to the appropriate intensity for community correctional programme delivery, and release criteria to assure that the ex-inmate receives the best fit, based on his profile to become a law-abiding citizen.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Stigma is an undesirable, discrediting attribute which is "incongruous with our stereotype of what a given type of individual should be" (Goffman 1963, 13) Stigma reflects the affixing of a master's status to a person replacing his social identity as a conventional other. It also reflects the internalization of the master status to the degree that the person understands that he is limited in who he is as a result of the stigmata he now socially embodies. If stigma acts as a social barrier preventing the reintegration of offenders when released from prison then an understanding of the ways in which different ex-offenders experience and manage stigma as they are attempting to re-enter conventional society is crucial. In this thesis three questions are examined: 1) Are there distinct stigma experiences and management practices which differentially affect reintegration? 2) Are there distinct experiences and management practices linking particular ex-inmates to others with similar social backgrounds? And, 3) What are the implications of these differences for community corrections?

The problems associated with reintegration of individuals who have spent time in a federal penal institution are complex. To fully understand the elements involved in reintegration would require a volume of work that would occupy a lifetime of research. This work focuses on male1 ex-inmates' characteristics and their social and vocational

---

1 The socialization experience will be substantially different for males that for females, therefore the thesis subject refers to male reintegration. For more information on this point read Steffensmeier, Darrell J. and John H. Kramer (1980). "The Differential Impact of Criminal Stigmatization on Male and Female Felons," in Sex Roles: a Journal of Research 6, 6, December 1980: 1-8

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
experience before prison, while in prison and during the early stages of reintegration to the community. This includes, the ex-inmates’ personal experiences, the ex-offenders’ vocational and institutional background that influencing their social reintegrative preparedness, their criminal background characteristics, their experience with societal stigma based on their violation of social norms, values and beliefs, their family’s social and economic status; and, their experiences within the criminal justice system’s have impacted on its ability to assist in the ex-inmate’s reintegration to society. Each factor is relevant to their reintegration successes and failures. It is hoped that a better understanding of the challenges that ex-inmates face while on parole (see Appendix X for types of parole) and residing in a halfway facility will logically contribute to the development of a more effective approach to programming for ex-inmates’ reintegration.

While the sociology of the 1960s placed considerable emphasis on the problems of offender stigmatization (Schwartz and Skolnick, 1964; Goffman, 1959 and 1961) relatively little research attention is currently being directed to this problem. Yet, within the current context of increased sentences and growing prison populations, the problem of ex-inmate integration and the role of community corrections in assisting with reintegration are critical, requiring redress through effective research. The key is to better define the factors related to reintegration and stigma so as to better meet the needs of the person doing a portion of his sentence in the community – in a halfway facility.

The role played by community corrections in reintegration is an important one. The practical problem addressed herein is whether a more structured approach can better serve the different needs of ex-inmates in the community. While Correctional Services of 2 See Rasmusen, 1995 for more on this perspective
Canada (CSC) has employed the 'Level of Service Inventory' (LSI) for assessing the placement of inmates, community corrections, (CC) particularly halfway agencies (HWA), have not yet developed a comparable instrument for addressing release classification and risk assessment of ex-inmates.

An ex-inmate seeks his own placement in a HWA. This thesis takes the view that for effective reintegration the HWA must be able to assist the ex-inmate in his efforts to construct, maintain or reconstruct an identity as a law-abiding citizen. This is crucial for intervention and interactions in the community after he has served time in a federal penal institution.

While stigmatization is seen as a common problem faced by all ex-inmates, as argued in Chapter 3, this study seeks to show that there are identifiable differences in the histories and social relations of ex-offenders which alter the type and quality of stigmatization experiences. This follows the work of Chaiken and Chaiken (1982) who suggested the value of establishing a basis for different types of ex-inmates when considering the impact of stigma and reintegration. Chapter 4 builds on their suggestions and attempts to develop a method for classifying ex-inmates into types. There are distinct consequences for social outcomes and implications for community correctional programming as will be discussed in Chapter 5.

As will be demonstrated, each respondent expresses his struggle with stigmatization as a key factor in his personal and social identity as a 'criminal' while seeking to gain, maintain, or regain some sense of citizenship and acceptance in the community. However, the research also reveals that there are distinguishable types of ex-offenders who face substantially different personal challenges when trying to integrate the
non-offender community. The understanding that there are differing degrees of socialization and stigmatization focuses the study on developing a framework for understanding three distinct types of ex-offenders. Each requiring differential intervention approaches to more effectively return ex-inmates to society.

In order to better understand how the individual experienced reintegration, open-ended interviews were conducted of ex-inmates residing in Ontario halfway agencies. The interview schedule delved closely into the individual's expressions as to how the experience with reintegration was perceived and understood by them. At issue here is their identification of themselves as offending and offensive persons, and their identification by familiar and significant others as such. Access was also gained to reveal their experience with overcoming or coping with their period of criminal institutionalization. Here the question is whether reintegration requiring social acceptance can occur for an ex-inmate who wishes to change his role in society (Fein, 1990).

By taking and working with the ex-inmate's perspective, this research seeks to contribute to more effective methods of reducing crime through greater attention to the problems of effective reintegration approaches for released inmates. The literature review, and then the study will provide an understanding of how a person comes to be an outcast and what the elements are that need to be addressed to return them to society as citizens. The inmate once institutionalized, becomes further stigmatized through family and social interactions, as a result of the period of time he spent in prison, yet he is expected to become a citizen with exemplary prosocial behaviour allowing the public to permit him to remain among them, subjected to barriers constructed by close public and correctional scrutiny and stigma.
LITERATURE REVIEW

*Stigma: Barriers, Coping Strategies for Reintegration*

What is known about the barriers to reintegration? In the main, ex-offenders are compelled to cope with stigma, self-identity problems and barriers to employment. Logically, if barriers to normalcy are placed in their way, then some will revert to a lifestyle where they are not excluded (Fein, 1990; Ericson, 1977; Goffman, 1963). Other ex-offenders accept them at least to the extent that they are not stigmatized because they are offenders. As such, there is a degree of comfort involved in associating with those who will not reject them because of a static trait. They have “fallen from grace” in the prosocial world but are part of the criminal subculture (Benson, 1974).

By definition, to reintegrate denotes “to socially enter into society again”. If a person’s socially constructed, maintained or reinforced identity bars re-entry to society, then reintegration is not possible. However, the problems created by stigma and labelling often requires the development of coping strategies that may allow for periods of peaceful co-existence with conventional others, however, to be discovered is to be discredited, as Goffman (1959) explained.

However, it needs to be recognized that coping mechanisms often yield mixed effects on the individual’s self-image (Letkemann, 2002). The resulting bifurcation of consciousness is due to the consequence of being an offender -- a reintegrating ex-citizen. The ex-inmate must perceive himself differently than he believes that others do or would if
they knew of the stigma. This self-deception can be accomplished through rationalizing, or
justifying or denying his offending identity. The ex-inmate must use strategies including
being brutally honest while interacting with conventional others (Goffman, 1959; Adler,
1993; Herman, 1993).

Return to Sender: Reintegrative Stigma-Management Strategies of Ex-
Psychiatric Patients, is a summary of the longitudinal research conducted by Nancy
Herman (1993). Herman adopts Goffman’s and John Braithwaite’s intellectual approach to
stigma, that of frames, and restorative justice. She effectively synthesized the
management strategies used by the stigmatized person. These approaches to managing
stigma will be apparent in the accounts that this study uncovered. Herman found that the
stigmatized person adopts strategies of normalization in an effort to re-establish social
reintegration (pp. 305 - 322). Herman also provides a comprehensive categorization of the
techniques used by those who are stigmatized yielding the following four categories of
coping strategies:

Selective concealment is a strategy where the discreditable person decides
who he discloses or withholds information in accord with Goffman’s (1963) dilemmas (to
disclose or not to disclose). This is a recurrent theme in throughout the thesis. The
decision about managing information appears to be arbitrarily decided on by the person as
to what contextual frame requires the use of this technique. This area could include self-
isolation as a strategy of concealment; or the use of deception, which will be discussed
later in the review of Links, et al. (1991) on non-disclosure as per Derlaga et al., 1993.

Therapeutic disclosure is a strategy where the discreditable person decides to
confide in those whom he trusts and whom he believes will be sympathetic to his situation
or who will be able to offer assistance. Body's findings tend to suggest that familiarity would factor into this equation. Generally, the person in whom he confides will be expected to assist him in dealing with the effects of the stigma in a positive way. The Braithwaite's (1989) RJ model would endorse this approach. However, but Derlaga et al., 1993 suggests this can always backfire if the trust is betrayed.

**Preventive disclosure** is a strategy where the discreditable person decides to disclose the stigmatizing information in an effort to solicit from the other a favourable or unfavourable response depending on the context. This might relate to selective avoidance of responsibility for the action or the experience. Within this category, Herman (1993) offers four sub-approaches to information management:

The first, medical disclaimers are neutralization strategies where the discreditable person decides to disclose the stigmatizing information in an effort to solicit from the other sympathy for his lack of free will, due to physiological trauma. The stigmatized person could also attempt to place the blame for the stigma or a physical condition. For example, 'I was stoned out of my mind, and I blacked out, I don't remember a thing that happened.' To this he would add, 'so it was not my fault,' i.e. utilizing Gresham Sykes and David Matza's (1957) "Techniques of Neutralization".

Deception/Coaching occurs when the discreditable person decides to distort the information regarding the stigmatizing experience. The intent is to deceive the other into believing a more favourable explanation of the stigmatizing experience then was the case. The clear intent here is to remove oneself from responsibility for the institutionalization experience. Examples of this might be, 'Jesus was branded and persecuted as a criminal,
I am in good company"; or, 'you don't understand the pressure that the boss put on me to do this or that, if it were not for the bosses pressure the crime would never have happened'.

Education occurs when the discreditable person may decide to educate others about the experience, in an attempt to influence perceptions of him as a flawed person. The intent of education is to advise, usually youths, that it is better to engage in prosocial behaviours. Many halfway agencies encourage ex-inmates to speak to community groups. An example of this could be trying to convince others that, 'I made a mistake, in a moment of weakness I did something I was not proud of, now all I want to do is make things right.' 'All people make mistakes, can't you see how it could have just as easily been you or someone else you knew.' Or 'you don't want to go through the same things that I did, so listen to what I have to say'.

The final approach under preventative disclosure is normalization is where the discreditable person decides to deny that their offender identity is in fact deviant. Consider this example, 'I didn't do anything different than any of my colleagues, or that of the so-called "Square John" it is just that I got caught and someone else didn't. Doesn't everyone need money?'

Political activism is the final strategy, whereby the discreditable person decides to join or initiate the development of a group of people whose purpose it is to address the problems associated with the stigma at a public level. This is also understood in the discussion earlier on education, but in a more inclusive sense here. This is often a strategy used by those who do public speaking while at the halfway facility. There is no attempt to

3 This sentiment is featured in a graphic hanging in the common area in St. Leonard's Houses
lessen the fact that the person has been criminal, the efforts are intended to establish a method of escaping the past so as to facilitate movement into the future. This leads to public advocacy and in some cases organizing actions to bring about change for the affected group (Webber and McGilvary, 1988). This could prompt a person to want to change how the correctional system functions so as to make things more positive for others (see Keve, 1982). To accomplish this systemic change, the person would need to find and convince others to join him in the struggle (as discussed by Fein 1990). It may also lead to wide social recognition for that person of his stigma. Paul Letkeman concluded, "in attempting to manage the initial stigma, people can become the authors of further damage to their identity" (2002, p. 509).

In light of these stigmatic issues, Adler, (1993) argued that reintegration is dependant on factors that influence the process of exiting the criminal subculture, and rejection of the negative affiliation leading to joining into a socially acceptable lifestyle. The key issue is that stigma or the ex-offender identity must be dealt with in some manner. However, the use of these strategies can often lead to more negative labels being placed on the person: such as liar, con man, or irresponsible. He also may be identified as deceptive, rationalistic, irresponsible, or manipulative thus enhancing the stigma. As such, according to Herman's (1993) research, just profiled, the ex-offender may attempt to use techniques as defenses against stigma. Clearly, such dialogue and concealment could lead to further affixing the offender label.¹ Notwithstanding, they can be effective because as P.T. Barnum said 'a sucker is born everyday.' However, to survive the process the ex-inmate must decide whether to fight, disclose, or to take flight, not to disclose, as Goffman (1959) argued. Management strategies vary based on the perceived support the person
considers he can secure from the person he is speaking with, so as Goffman (1959, 1961) argued, he may choose to disclose if he perceives that the reaction will not lead to his being socially discredited.

To disclose or not to disclose

Researching from the perspective that stigma precipitates stresses, Valerina J. Derlaga et al. (1993) uncovered reintegration issues surrounding self-disclosure. The researchers found that, in the main, for people harbouring a secret it was best to disclose and share this with those to whom they were in close relations. For Derlaga (1993) et al., “self-disclosure loosely defined as what individuals verbally reveal about themselves to others plays a major role in close relationships” (p. 1). In this perspective what a person knows about another will have an effect on the course of that relationship. Therefore, building social relationships involves ceremonies related to getting to know, getting along, and finding a prosocial role where communications about discrediting features are managed and controlled.

Derlaga's (1993) et al. research discovered that “self-disclosure is an important component of the development of a close relationship” (Ibid., p.2). Some purposes of self-disclosure are:

Social validation, getting feedback from others about our thoughts or feelings or getting help with problems in our lives; or we may use self-disclosure for social control, selectively presenting information about ourselves to create a good impression (Ibid).

The key social factor in this approach occurs when,
Self-disclosure occurs as part of ongoing social interactions between relationships, partners, and interactants must determine jointly what, when, where, and how they will communicate with one another, including whether to disclose private feelings about themselves individually or about their relationship with one another (Ibid. p. 3).

These points are concordant with Erickson (1973) et al., and Goffman's (1959 - 1963) important research focus. However, in developing close relationships cause and effect associations cannot be strictly determined. That is, it is not clear how in all cases the best result emerges from disclosure nor is it easily discernable how disclosure itself will negatively impact on the progress of a relationship.

Derlaga (1993) et al. posits two stages in relationships “coming together”, and “coming apart”. For the most part, “if the message is disclosing, the receiver reacts not only to the information but also to what it seems to say about the relationship, the character and intentions of the sender, implications for future interactions, and so forth…” (Ibid. p. 10). If the information is not so severe that it affects the root of the receiver's sensitivities and biases the relationship may come together, but it places the teller in a vulnerable position depending of course on their social orientation. In reintegrating, the process is based on “initiating, experimenting, intensifying, integrating and bonding (Ibid.)”. The more pervasive is the person's criminal record then the more likely that the disclosure process will lead to coming apart. Communication disintegrates where “differentiating, circumscribing, stagnating, avoiding, and terminating” takes place (Derlaga, 1993, p. 13).

For Derlaga et. Al. (1993) self-disclosure is mutually transformational which indicates that to disclose changes both the person bearing the stigma and the person who receives the information. They demonstrate their findings by the example whereby
disclosing to a lover may produce a tender moment at one stage of a relationship but may
come back to be used as a weapon at another stage (Ibid., p. 10).

However, it is of particular significance to this thesis, as Derlaga (1993) et al.,
found that the “vulnerability to stress was not equal among all” (p. 90) people who share
an experience. People do not necessarily react the same. In examining why there are
differences in affective stress, Derlaga (1993) et al. developed some important findings
concerning the matter of managing stigma. First, linkages are made between
disclosure/nondisclosure about stressful life events and health consequences. Second,
there are positive effects for health and negative consequences of failing to disclose.
Third, self-disclosure may not be beneficial to the individual doing the disclosing. Finally,
the confidants play an important role in mitigating or exacerbating the effects of the
problem on the individual. A full examination here of each of these factors is not on point
as this thesis is not about the effects of stress. However, it suffices to note that disclosure
can be positive in terms of stress management because the person feels better, and has
shared an aspect of his life experience, which could lead to increasing the degree of social
intimacy. And by disclosing something, the confidant(s) could respond by accepting them.
However, disclosure can lead to immediate rejection, social isolation and fear.

Derlaga et al. (1993) also determined that there are consequences for people
who do not disclose. For “adult subjects (average age 42)” those who “scored highest on
the Self-concealment Scale had significantly more bodily symptoms, anxiety, and
depression than did persons who scored lowest on the Self-concealment Scale” (pg. 93).
To this end to disclose and to accept the consequences that follow can be cathartic.
However, the researchers note that there are three reasons for not disclosing: 1) the person routinely keeps matter to himself; 2) the person has secrets or negative thoughts about himself that have been told to no one or only to a few others; 3) the person has fears about what would happen if the concealed information were revealed by others (Derlaga, 1993, p. 93). In the case of managing the ex-offender identity the person can possibly fall into all three categories simultaneously. Disclosure can lead to immediate rejection and social isolation.

In summary, self-disclosure as a method of obtaining social support is important. However, acceptance might not follow when the recipient’s criminal information is perceived as negative and defining. Clearly then there is always the concern that the person will fear the information coming out through third party disclosure. Or where the fear of being found out will overshadow the ideal relationship. There are a number of socially mediated benefits associated with disclosing, understood in terms of the kind of support that can be acquired, whereby the ex-inmate’s struggles to move beyond his past into a more secure future. Without support from significant others and institutions and agencies, then the person is left to cope on his own. The pressure may cause him to give in to depression and social withdrawal, or on point a as defining a reinforced identification as a criminal.

This review has already considered methods of disclosure that lent some understanding to how disclosure can occur. Employment represents a unique problem bearing special attention in terms of reintegration outcomes.
Stigma's effect on employment: to disclose or not to disclose

As the literature suggests ex-offenders should be assisted in achieving personal makeovers. Reciprocally, the community will need efforts put forward so that it is able to change how it views the person's criminal offence history. Goffman (1959) advanced that the problems experienced by some are due to their refusal or inability to change their presentation in everyday life, hence the accentuation of their stigmatization and its social effects. Stigma is disintegrative in the sense that it may prevent and interfere with the transition from an ex-offender to a law-abiding citizen identity (Braithwaite and Mugford, 1994; Ericson, 1977; Erickson, Crow, Zurcher and Connett, 1973). As both Rasmusen (1995) and Goffman (1973) conclude, stigma results in an indelible semiotic whereby the individual must negotiate his place in the alienating social world.

As has been argued in the literature since Goffman (1959), stigma is established when information about a person's criminality becomes known. He also recognises that the person's presentation in everyday life (1961) has an impact on how long and to what degree the person is perceived as an offender by conventional others. To this end, the person's criminal history and social background have a bearing on how the person is recognised over time in social situations.

Goffman (1959) followed Tannenbaum (1938) where it was discovered that the dramatization of evil affects all ex-offenders. Tannenbaum recognised that public fear shadows every aspect of a criminalized person social perception. Goffman nuances this argument in that if people do not know of the criminal past then the person is not yet discredited. This point becomes clearer in the study conducted by Erickson (1973) et al.
who demonstrated that a parolee is released from prison but is not yet free because he has obligations to the system that still encumber and affect his reintegration.

Personal job preparedness is significant and the effects of institutionalization impacts on the ex-inmate’s employability as discussed by Thomas Townsend (1996):

Work plays a significant role in our lives. With little effort, we can all remember highly significant experiences associated with the world of work getting the job, getting the promotion, getting laid off and even getting fired... It is easy to understand why work plays such a dominant role in our lives and culture... The work we do gives purpose to our days and, at least partly, defines our social identity.\(^4\)

The importance of work to the institutional fabric of Canadian society according to Townsend’s report is work does not have the same social meaning for offenders. Roughly 70% of offenders indicate that they have never held a steady job...” (Ibid) The ex-offender deviates from social institution of being gainfully employed in a way that lends credence to the position that they are not functionally a part of Canadian society. The process of social development fails for some people at some stage in their development. As such, this impacts negatively on ex-offender identity and reintegration outcomes.

Although the degree of criminality is distinguishable and the restriction needed to address an individual's degree of criminality variable, all criminals are often assumed to have certain common characteristics, which make them untrustworthy and dangerous. For example, the one time offender is often treated as an equal threat as the career offender (Chaiken and Chaiken, 1984 pp 195-7) as a result of the drama produced by public perception of crime. In theoretical terms, perceptually derived meanings are attached to

\(^4\) (1996, from offenders and work in the Correctional Service of Canada: A historical evolution, Internet).
people whereby their master status is altered so as to affix to them negative labels thus producing psychological, social and economic consequences (Detroit Press, 1996; Benson, 1984; Ericson, 1977; Becker, 1961; Lemert, 1951).

Stigma related to reintegration is a recurrent theme and requires more review where it applies to employment and the importance of being able to earn a living after a transformational period. The individual who is barred from pro-social identity can have his offender stigma exacerbated as Schwartz and Skolnick’s (1964) research demonstrated:

*From a theoretical point of view, the finding (only one potential employer was interested in hiring a person who had been accused or convicted of a crime) leads toward the conclusion that conviction constituted a powerful form of “status degradation” which continues to operate after the time when, according to the generalized theory of justice underlying punishment in our society, the individual’s ‘debt’ has been paid” (1964, p. 107).*

Erickson (1973) et al. found that employment was still a problem for ex-offenders. Twenty-three years later Townsend (1996) was still discussing this problem that work in prison does not automatically lead to employment upon release. Skill development and experience will not go far if the released offender cannot overcome barriers to finding jobs”. Although, he was making a claim about job preparedness, the barrier caused by stigma has remained a social problem over the last 40 years.

Stigma’s effects on employment opportunities present a primary problem where a person cannot be bonded because he has a criminal record. Where insurance bonds are necessary for employment, disclosure is mandated, which will often act as a barrier to employment. This too often correlates to significantly higher unemployment or underemployment for members of the stigmatized group (Parker (1994); Ericson, 1977;
and Brand and Claiborn, 1976) with serious implications for reintegration. However, some researchers have questioned whether the employment problems reflect more than just stigma.

The first of two studies conducted by Brand and Claiborn (1976) looked at stigmatization toward ex-inmates where they determined that the stigma did act as a barrier to employment. Stigma was determined to have a significant impact on reintegration outcomes "since employment has been seen by many authors as a central requirement for the social reintegration of the individual following total institutionalization" (ibid. p. 175). In the first study they found that 80.6% of the job applications asked questions about the individual's criminal background. This was sufficient to state that stigma did act as a barrier to employment. However, this did not account for why some ex-inmates did find work in some of the companies that did ask for such information. So the follow-up study looked at job interview conditions.

Brand and Claiborn (1976) are quite clear that job skills and preparation are only part of what the discreditable person needs to consider. The study revealed that the ex-offenders' values and presentation are important factors of their finding a place in society. If they appear to an employer with rolled up sleeves revealing arms filled with tattoos, or visible piercing, or street rounder grooming and clothing then they will likely not gain employment. They will need to take on new values and exact new behaviours to find a place in a society that rejects their criminal persona.

In the second study they determined that stigma was not the only social distance factor that ex-inmates experienced. They found that the ex-offender often acted differently than conventional others and this factored as a measure as to which person an employer
would not take a chance on. Hence, the person who appeared at an interview to present as any one else might had a better chance of succeeding despite the presence of the stigma.

This very interesting discovery has a bearing on the discussion and data analysis in Chapter 3 and 4. Personal characteristics, some due to institutionalization, have a direct bearing on reintegration outcomes. This however, does not mean that the only factor is the person’s presentation. If there was one job and two applicants both presented well, then as Brand and Claiborn (1976) found in the first study the one with the record would likely not get the job.

Theorists agree that the further from conventional norms that a person is in terms of social status, familiar background and financial stability then the harder it will be for them to adjust after a period of institutionalization (Braithwaite, 1959; Garrett; 1966; Ericson, 1977; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1984; Fein, 1990; and, Herman, 1993). The reason, as one might sense, is that a person raised in a criminal family environment openly displaying deviant traits (in some higher level organized crime families the behaviour is camouflaged) has already begun the process of developing a criminal identity exacerbated during a period in prison Goffman (1959) began the meaningful discussion on this point when he argued that the process of institutionalization reinforces criminal identity. He argued that, “whenever worlds are laid on, underlives develop” (p. 305). In summary, the person may have attributes that will lend toward doing a particular job but lack the social skills to gain access during the job interview.

Released inmates must carefully manage disclosure of information. However, the more time they spent in the criminal subculture the less their skills set will be conventional,
so that when they do get a job they may lack the confidence and the ability to hold the job. Work is an essential factor of reintegration behaviour without employment allowing the person to support himself. He will likely turn to other means to manage his life leading to more crime (Motiuk, undated; Motiuk and Brown, 1993; Adler, 1993; Link, Mirotznik and Cullen, 1991; Astone 1982; Brand and Claiborn, 1976; Soothill, 1974; and, Boshier and Johnson, 1974). Indeed, unemployment can itself be stigmatizing (Letkeman, 2002).

Brand and Claiborn (1976) are quite clear that job skills and preparation are only part of what the discreditable person needs to consider. The study revealed that the ex-offenders’ values and presentation are important factors of employability and reintegration outcomes. The study argues that “it may not be the stigma that dramatically interferes with an applicant’s ability to find suitable employment” (p. 173)) but rather his deviant attributes are barriers to positive reintegration outcomes. For instance, in prison swearing is used reflexively to emphasize points. Some ex-offenders use very colourful aphorism like “cock soup”\(^5\). Also, the prisoner’s resistance to authority and scrutiny can act as barriers to reintegration. This validates the finding that “rather the failure to find jobs might result from an applicant’s inadequate self-presentation in the interview situation” (p. 173). This results in a diminishing self-esteem reinforcing his personal identity as an offender.

Consequently, there is little question that the literature on stigma suggests that some people contribute to the negative stereotyping, by presenting of self as deviant and do so intentionally. Some simply are unprepared for reintegration, but stigma also exists as a barrier to complete reintegration. The problem is that for some, no matter what they

\(^5\) Is a term used by one of the respondents to this study.
try to do they continue to run into stigmatic barriers, i.e. racial difference, and class (economic disparity) and fear of crime. As one ex-offender puts it;

*I have done my best to find a way to go on living, loving and creating. I am going to continue to do my best. But the offender – no matter how hard he tries to, no matter how worthy he becomes – can only join with and feel he is a part of society to the extent that other people are willing to identify with and accept him on a one-to-one basis* (Erickson, Crow, Zurcher and Connett, 1973, Epilogue).

This summarily expresses the need for institutional change and social tolerance in dealing with (ex) offenders' reintegration. Again, nothing is more apparent to reintegration failures than unemployment or under-employment (Uggen, 1999). The ex-offender’s presentations due to his criminal institutionalization and society’s tendency to stigmatize must be managed allowing him to achieve the status that he is working toward.

The issue of disclosing has already been reviewed, but what will be examined now is ways that this might be operationalized in a real world context. The examination of literature relates to coping orientations on employment. In this context, three major categories can be applied. Specifically, individuals who are seeking to re-enter society often revert to one of three forms of managing information about themselves when dealing with employers, *secrecy, education* and *withdrawal* (Link, Mirotznik and Cullen, 1991; Boshier and Johnson, 1974, p. 264).

To live with a secret that could change your ability to care for yourself is to live in fear of your social survival. Some choose to cope by explaining why or how they are not different. However, to someone who has made it clear that they will not retain a person as an employee who has a criminal record, this attempt to explain oneself may be an act of
futility reinforcing the negative social identity if Townsend's (1996) and other labelling arguments are given any weight.

Formal education means that the person tries to educate others about who he is, apart from being an offender, or about the crime so that acceptance can occur. This can lead to acceptance and greater opportunity, at least in the specific context, but it does not remove the meaning that attaches to the individual as an offender. To change how the public reacts to ex-offenders will require a concerted, protracted effort on the part of government and non-government organizations (NGO). The ex-offender who is trying to reintegrate cannot afford to wait for the change in direction on the part of those who can influence the public perception — he needs a meaningful job now.

To withdraw can often lead to social isolation moving the person further from a desired reintegration outcome, as they will not seek employment for fear of rejection. True, the person is not rejected by others when he withdraws but he does not gain access to the social world either (Ibid. pp 264-266). A person who withdraws may be a success in terms of the CJS because he no longer offends, but he is not an asset to himself, his family or society (Rollof and Ifert, 2000; Uggen, 1999; McKnight, 1987; Keve 1982; and, Ericson, 1977).

Michael Rollof and Dannette Ifert (2000) found that to not disclose is harmful to both the person who hides the information and the person who does not receive the information. They argue that communications must be open and complete for the development of healthy relationships. Christopher Uggen (1999) argued that to remove a person from society is to remove an employment and economic asset. That the removal of offenders in some cases (non-violent) contributes to family, community and economic
degradation. John McKnight's (1987) argued that the most important function of corrections should be to prepare offenders for reintegrating society. Keve (1982) contends that the potential or the degree of success a person can achieve with managing stigma is tied to his typing within the group⁹ as well as his presentation and social skills as previously reviewed. Keve's research disclosed the dilemma that the ex-inmate must prove reliable to employers before he is employed, and they will not employ him because he has a criminal record or the appearance that led them to the assumption that he is not reliable. If access is initially made, it can be denied whenever the information is disclosed. Therefore, if the employer knows of his criminal background he would not be hired or he could be fired.

This paradox has been attended to in the literature where acceptance can be accomplished through Bodys' (1989) reintegration/stigmatization argument, whereby to interact with an ex-offender is to sometimes nullify the stigma. Notwithstanding, as argued by Ericson (1977), since the ex-inmate is often not given an opportunity to interact or educate himself, and given that he has experienced a period of unemployment due to imprisonment requiring explanation, or has no or a fragmented work history, he is caught in the paradox; i.e., he must get a job to support himself and enhance his social identity and yet because he is an ex-offender, he cannot get a decent job that would allow him to meet his basic needs.

His marketability therefore is equal to the myth concerning his identity as an offender. His ability to market himself hinges on his ability to hide in plain sight – to reintegrate means to be someone who he is not. This finding seems to support the earlier
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⁹ This is the focus of Chapter 4.
reviewed findings of Derlaga et al. (1993) about the differences between the real world self and the ideal self. A review of Bodys (1989) and Ericson's (1977) research will add some clarity to the dilemma regarding coping with stigma.

The reintegration stigmatization hypothesis

Richard S. Bodys' (1989) research suggests an inverse relationship between the amount of interaction individuals have with deviants and the degree to which these individuals stigmatize these deviants" (p. 159). This denotes a number of things. First, the individual who is primarily prosocial may be able to reintegrate faster than a person who is more anti-social, Bodys' (1989) work suggests that familiarity brings about acceptance. His initial findings were that the more time that conventional people spent with an ex-offender, the more they came to accept the ex-offender as a member of their social network. This indicates that if an ex-offender is given an opportunity to interact with other employees and his employers then he will fit in over time. This also clearly relates to reintegration success based on the opportunities that individuals have to interact with conventional others both during and after incarceration, which draws in a number of factors including length and type of institutionalization and the size and shape of the individuals' social network prior to and after his release.⁷

Ericson's (1977) study suggests a similar but perhaps more nuanced view of how interpersonal relations impact on stigmatization. As one of the informants in Ericson's study put it, "the one's that know you, they don't see you as criminal...but with others, it will be a big cross on your back" (p.29). The offences that this person committed made the
front page of the papers so “being in the papers, you get it from the neighbours, busy-bodies, your work-mates – everyone else” (p. 29). As this suggests, it is not just the amount of time spent with a person but the prior closeness of the contact or relationship that is important.

People who knew and trusted the ex-offender before the offence may continue to do so despite the crime - that is, they continue to see the person they knew before the crime. Others who were close to the person may not, perhaps because they were affected by the crime or perhaps because they already saw the person as deviant. However, Ericson’s (1977) research suggests that the people most likely to stigmatize the person as a criminal are those with whom the person had weaker or more casual relationships. They may not allow the person to move beyond the act or acts committed. They will hold onto the negative frame of reference in their perception of the ex-offender and in their communication to others about the subject, as Goffman coined, the person is discredited. This leads to the ex-offender not possessing the ability to reintegrate effectively, specifically in terms of gainful employment.

As Astone (1982) argues, integration depends on a number of factors including emotional support and interpersonal relations, incarceration, probation and parole experiences, personal motivation and discipline, alcohol and drug problems, and levels of vocational training, employment and education (p.117). Additionally, the social and economic development of the ex-inmate as an individual is essential to positive reintegration outcomes (Ericson, 1977).

---

1 Adler’s (1993) work discussed later will provide even more clarity to this point
2 The interview schedule designed for this study considers each of these elementary features
Some argue as well that a single non-violent infraction does not necessarily place a person outside of the accepted normal range of attributes and attitudes of conventional society as is the case for the least criminally entrenched individuals (Braithwaite and Mugford, 1994; Adler, 1993; Braithwaite, 1989; Bodys, 1989; Cohen, 1966; and Becker, 1964). To this extent, employment should be based on who the person was before the offence(s) and who he is today, also reflecting on the potential value he represents to the company. Concentration on the period in which he was an inmate and an ex-offender is counter to positive reintegration.

Stigma and Social Constructed of Identity: Recognizing Differences

This review presents a perspective derived from the literature on labelling and identity theory beginning with the understanding that the ex-offender identity is socially constructed. The social world defines what is and what is not acceptable in terms of the dominant group’s ability to set definitions applied to types and groups. Karl Mannheim (1936) found that we know ourselves through the definitions placed on us by society.

_We see ever more clearly that from whatever source we get our meanings, whether they be true or false, they have a certain psychological-sociological function, namely to fix the attention of those men who wish to do something in common upon a certain 'definition of the situation.' _(1936, p 21)

Here Mannheim argues that whether or not a definition is true, differing views of a social action engaged in by a group or its members can be obliterated when certain social forces are brought to bear on defining another group in a particular manner. These acts described and labelled are definitional of a struggle between groups who have a different station, if you will, in life. By extension, relevant to this work, the ex-offender is viewed as
fundamentally socially different; this is a matter of perspective taking and not necessarily true as a social fact. The act of becoming an offender is objectified and applied to the social situation he now finds himself in.

The ex-offender often struggles to make it in life through barriers constructed by social institutions. Mannheim continues:

> We belong to a group not only because we are born into it, not merely because we profess to belong to it, nor finally because we give it our loyalty and allegiance, but primarily because we see the world and certain things in the world the way it does (i.e. in terms of the meanings of the group in question). (Ibid., p. 22)

Interpreting Mannheim reveals how the meaning of (ex) offender is socially constructed. A person may be born to a criminal family and yet emerge an upstanding citizen. He may, on the one hand, profess to a law-abiding lifestyle and convey that he is no different than other people behaviourally. He may even be dedicated to prosocial and conventional behaviours in his life, yet he is perceived as flawed. It is interesting that once a person becomes an offender, regardless of his original position, he takes on characteristically the socially constructed meaning of all group members as outcasts, miscreants, and criminals as discussed in Chapter 3 to follow in this study.

In the 1950s and 70s sociologists’ focused considerable attention on the concept of stigma and its relevance to our understanding of crime and recidivism (Ericson, 1977; Garrett and Romper, 1966; Goffman, 1959-73). This emphasis was unique because it placed the responsibility for criminal behaviour on the public’s rejection and condemnation of those labelled as criminals (Cohen, 1968; Becker, 1961). The social problem focused on arising from stigma for developing avenues for managing social crime is that it did not
focus enough on who the person was before the stigmatizing event(s) or action(s). Nor did it attend to who the person was after the time he spent in a prison institution.

In terms of developmental diversity Berger and Luckman’s (1967) argument is very important to the study.

*Very formally, the scope of institutionalization depends on the generality of the relevance structures. If many or most relevance structures in a society are generally shared, the scope of institutionalization will be wide. If only a few relevant structures are generally shared, the scope of institutionalization will be narrow (1967, p. 80).*

It is generally shared that criminals, especially those who have served federal time, are dangerous and pose a threat because they have broken indictable laws. A person reacts to social labels based on how he or she has internalized relevant meanings from the external environment. The way others see him has a bearing on how he sees himself.

A major factor in the institutionalization process is the family where adult family members pass on knowledge about the institutional order in an attempt to develop in their children’s conformist behaviour as with Hirschi’s and Gottfredson’s (1980) social control theory another member may exemplify social disorder. They argue that there exists a real likelihood that deviant children will emerge from deviant families, resulting in a further breakdown in the family and society. The family’s role in reinforcing values in children reflects an onset of the stigmatizing process:

*Maternal uncles do not transmit this particular stock of knowledge of the institutional values because they know it, but they know it (that is defined as knowers) because they are maternal uncles. If an institutionally designated maternal uncle, for particular reasons, turns out to be incapable of transmitting the knowledge in question, he is no longer a maternal uncle in the full sense of the word, and, indeed, institutional recognition of this status may be withdrawn from him (Hirschi and*
This statement is subject to debate because all people are the sum of their roles influencing how they function in the lived world. In fact, an uncle is an uncle by virtue of biological birth. However, each personalized role held in terms of conveying messages, through practice, and through educational maxims/knowledge should be in accord with the institutional order. The family model imprints characteristics on an impressionable youth.

For instance, if uncle Bill robs banks, the parents may let the child know that this was done and they do not agree with the uncle's behaviours and the child shouldn't either. Notwithstanding, the uncle may still be permitted to interact with the family and consequently he can still have an influence on the child's development. For instance, if uncle Bill gives the children spending money every time he visits, he may be considered a favourite uncle by the children despite admonishment and sometimes as a consequence of the warnings from parents. This is certainly the case where the person's presentation is fashionable, and where the person sports flashy jewellery, drives a sporty car, and has lots of disposable money. He may appear attractive to the youth and for that matter to some adults.

The role as a conveyor of truth changes to the degree that the mentor or model does or does not fit social expectations but does reflect a youthful, modern image. Even when the child is told 'uncle X just got out of jail', this qualifier alerts the child to the fact that the conveyor has identified a feature of the person. It does not necessarily indicate a failure of the person to provide stable lessons for social behaviour. This may or may not limit the impact that the person will have on the child as an agent of social development but it is useful in setting him apart from those who are insiders (p. 87). The relevance of
this will be clear in the discussion in Chapter 3 and 4 on criminal association and personal and social identity as offenders.

Berger and Luckman also discussed the importance of recognising types in The Sociology of Knowledge.

In sum, the actor identifies with the socially objectivated typification of conduct in actu, but re-establishes distance from them as he reflects about his conduct afterward. This distance between the actor and his action can be retained in consciousness and projected to future repetitions of the actions. In this way, both acting self and acting others are apprehended not as unique individuals, but as types. By definition, these types are interchangeable (p. 73).

The use of the term ‘types’ delineates individuals within collectives. Society is made up of individuals who can be cast into groups or types based on their behaviours. Each type of person or grouped person makes up to some degree the social world of the type they best represent.

An ex-inmate is a person who has spent time in jail, his role or master status may be changed as a result of this experience. A maternal uncle can be a flag burner (communist, hippie etc...) or a criminal (a drug, dealer, murderer, or embezzler) as offender (Goffman, 1959...; Chaiken and Chaiken 1984; Benson, 1984; Davies, 1985; Shoham, and Giora, 1982; Adler, 1993), (Becker, 1961; Berger and Luckman, 1967; Schur, 1971; Fein, 1990). In practice, the flag burning maternal uncle could appear to be a perfect exemplar of a maternal uncle but then, in a moment of rage he murders his wife. Consequently, he is sent to jail and becomes an inmate, no longer entitled to be a purveyor of social truth. While in prison he is unable to communicate or exemplify the role of maternal uncle, he is a prisoner, an outsider – who no longer has the same influence on insiders. Then upon release, during the early stages of reintegration, he becomes a
purveyor of correctional institutional/de-institutional knowledge emerging from his newly internalized experience and most recent change in worldview.

However, because he held an influential role at one time he may retain some ability to be a reflector of social institutional values, albeit tainted by the time he spent in prison and his alleged failure to maintain normative behaviours. The transition back to normative status, of course, will be much smoother if intimates can understand the reasons for his killing his wife. For instance she had been known to be sleeping and entertaining lovers in his home while he worked, and had also been considered a non-conveyor of social institutional values norms and beliefs she was a drug addict/alcoholic, she was not a model sister-in-law, daughter in-law, aunt, wife or mother. In other words she was discredited. This being said, the perpetrator of harm will still need to denounce the act of murder or he may find himself still considered an outsider (Becker, 1981; and, Goffman, 1959...).

However, it can be understood then that the sanction or the degree of loss of cultural/institutional currency that the person experiences will vary when his total character is considered in light of certain changes relative to societal perception of the person within the social group. Through this point of view, a one-time offender may not be as socially penalized as the habitual criminal. But through attribution, he now belongs to the outcast type. Stigma can be seen as a variable that will be effective to the degree that an outsider label is externalized and applied to the type and then internalized by individual members of that type. Scott's 1969 study sheds more clarifying light on this issue.

Scott's (1969) classic study, the Making of Blind Men, shows how the person comes to assume an identity due to some socially determined decision that he is not
normal. Scott offers that blindness is a physical characteristic of a person but it need not be limiting in the respect that it places the person in a lesser social status to sighted people.

It may be a matter of clinical fact that the person is blind, however, he or she is capable of living with others and sharing in all social venues, except those requiring sight. Nevertheless, Scott shows that institutions and programs for the blind impose a variety of assumptions which encourage the blind to accept their limitations and in effect, take on the role of ‘being blind’.

In effect, institutions put in place to assist the person with a disability are instead acting to compel the person to accept his or her condition where this becomes socially defining of that person. Accordingly, the social construction of the meaning of being a blind person denotes that the person is inferior, and socially dependent. Moreover, individual differences and capabilities are ignored under the effect of the “master status” of being a blind person.

Let us examine the problem in a practical social context. It is reasonably accepted that a person who is legally blind should not fly a commercial aircraft. However, this might be mitigated, if the person had proper corrective lens. In this case, he might be able fly a private plane but would not be allowed to fly commercially for if the corrective lens were broken, it could put others in a compromised position. Obviously, a person who is mildly nearsighted should not have the same restriction, but the point is that the label of
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9 Modified by the limits of how they are blind in a clinical and in a legal sense.

10 This is very much the case in community corrections, and halfway agencies. Although encouraged to move beyond the label the offender is continuously reminded that has a different status than conventional others.
blindness can operate to reduce the person to a set of characteristics applied to every member of the group.

In this vein, a person convicted of assault might not be trusted to baby sit children but could be accepted as a person who performed landscaping. In this manner, the type of ex-offender should denote the social restrictions that are put in place for a period of time. The fact that a person is an ex-offender should not bar them from all legitimate social activities. Unlike permanent blindness, criminal behaviour and orientation is correctable -- if a person is not labelled a dangerous offender then they should not receive an indeterminate extra judicial sanction.

An ex-inmate may want to act as a citizen if society would allow him to move beyond the master status of offender. If this is not possible then the only recourse left for him is to be an offender for life. For those who do not commit new offences this is a disruptive problem that affects reintegration outcomes.

In summary of Scott’s (1969) findings, blindness, like being an offender, has some objective social meaning in terms of limits that the person ought to have on his identity and functioning. However, in the case of the ex-inmate they have been processed through the criminal justice system and have been found to be guilty of a criminal code offence, and consequently have served a period of time in a correction facility -- the expectation is that they had paid their debt upon completion of the period of incarceration -- arguably, they have undergone corrective measures. Therefore, they should be permitted, as a person wearing corrective lens should, to take part in social activity with social blinders put in place concerning their prior condition where there is little relevance to
harming the public. The key turning point is that the offender may always be seen as potentially able to harm society or its members.

The ex-offender is not incapacitated in the sense of blindness, where the infirmity may bar them social activities for life. Offending, in itself is not a handicap nor is it permanently debilitating unless those in positions of social power deem it so, nor is it a de facto barrier to reintegration unless society deems it to be so, as argued by Berger and Luckman. Scott's (1969) study alerts us to the social construction of exception based on prejudice about perceived infirmities. But he also reminds us that each person has the capacity to rise above the limitation of the disability that befalls them should society permit and encourage personal growth rather than acceptance of socially entrenched disability.

_The Impact of Correctional Institution on Criminal Identity_

Goffman in 1961 began to discuss social institutions not as a social process but as a location or physical place in society that produces anti-social behaviour and identity. The key for Goffman (1961) is that the institution is a place that serves an ongoing function in society; its structure imposes a different institutional knowledge base (pp. 12-15) on those people subjected to its direction and influence. Prison is a total institution (p.4-5). “Total institutions are fateful for the inmate’s civilian self, although the attachment of the inmate to this civilian self can vary considerably” (p. 47). The degree within a total institution can vary by type of inmate – the more socially compliant before the incarceration, the less indelible the institutional experience.

In prisons, the functions that a person is permitted to engage in must conform to institutional ideals and goals for surveillance. Goffman (1961) describes the total institution
as "a natural and fruitful one because its members appear to have so much in common – so much, in fact, that to learn about one of the institutions we would be well advised to look at the others."

First, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority. Second, each phase of the member's daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing together. Third, all phases of the day's activities are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution (Goffman, 1961, p. 6).

This indicates that all prisoners are common to each other, and as such can be understood by considering aspects of any one experience. In this respect, prisons according to this argument were homogonous in membership, function and administration. The result of narrowing the degree and exposure to the prison can modify the effects of the total experience. Berger and Luckman (1967) add, "there is further possibility that the institutional order will be highly fragmented, as certain relevance structures are shared by groups within the society as a whole" (Ibid.). In the case of a person imprisoned, the shared relevance structure, according to Goffman (1959 and 1961), is that they are "discredited".

Goffman describes the initial incarceration experience by showing how it can be more pervasively intrusive than social or historic institutionalization, even in a proportionately narrow time period. The inmate is subjected to mortification in that he must live in immediate proximity to contaminative exposure (Ibid. 1961, p. 23). They live with others in "collective sleeping arrangement" with "doorless toilets" (Ibid. p.24) in "cages with
bars for walls" (Ibid. p. 25). For a person who begins his incarceration at an early age this
effect can be indelible. According to Goffman the effects are temporally bound, how long a
person experiences this disassociation with the wider society will describe something
about the effect it will have on his correctional institutionalization and subsequent social
development during reintegration

As such prisons are disintegrative in that they contribute to antisocial
development. In regard to the mortification process, ten years after Goffman's (1961)
seminal work Zimbardo (1972) stated: "in less than a week the experience of
imprisonment undid (temporarily) a lifetime of learning; human values were suspended;
self-concepts were challenged and the ugliest, most base pathological side of human
nature surfaced" (p. 4). All members in this relation are adversely affected and then at
some point they are released back to the general public. Guards return daily to the public
and in many cases the immediate family must deal with the effects that follow from their
experience within the prison institution.

Zimbardo's (1972) findings were the result of a simulated prison experience using
students as guards and prisoners. The team of researchers discovered that within one
week many had severe psychological trauma, even in the continued circumstances,
causing the researchers to end the experiment prematurely. According to Goffman (1961)
it is clear that the process of becoming an inmate is profound for anyone who experiences
mortification and status degradation. They are forced to go through psychological, physical
and material stripping. They soon find out upon entering prison that they have no or little
control over privacy, bodies, possessions, and in fact their own identities. They undergo an
identity transformation through mortification. Reception, in Canada Milhaven and Kingston
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Penitentiary serve as the primary assessment institutions for all first time federal inmates. They also approximate the SHU and Goffman's definition of the correctional institution; to this end, all federal inmates undergo a period of intense mortification.

The different grades of correctional security have an impact on the intensity of the mortification or de-institutionalization process. From community corrections to super maximum security a vast difference exists which will have a bearing on the degree of de-institutional requirements for each ex-inmate. In community corrections, the majority of the ex-inmate's time is spent interacting in the community, while in the SHU the only time that is spent outside of the cell is two hours a day. As Goffman would want us to recognize, the key function of a total institution is to exercise controls, in an isolated environment, on those individuals who have been discredited and who must submit to its rule. Notwithstanding, the argument about difference within security levels, must account for the realization that control and surveillance is the primary function of corrections, which contributes to the mortification of inmates.

Essentially, it is important to recognize that the ex-inmate's institutional experience is not the same for all. Some inmates are incarcerated with different conditions. There are some inmates who do nothing with their time, except put it in, and others who are engaged with interacting with others in recreational activities (playing cards, lifting weights etc...); and then there are those who are involved with activities that take them outside of the prison for periods of the day, or who work at different jobs within the institution allowing for a degree of personal freedom of movement. This recognition of different types of inmates needs to be translated to fit within community corrections.
In summary, the knowledge that exists about prisons seems to indicate that it serves as a counterfoil to social development. A person is indoctrinated to social life to varying degrees of prosocial development from birth through to death. If he undergoes transformation in a prison institution he is compromised in his ability to be normal and act normally, he has become institutionalized. Obviously, this fatalistic position is subject to argumentation. Corrections Canada, and community correctional administrators want to convey the belief that they are able to produce non-offenders from offenders, hence, the term "corrections".

From the institution to the community

Within social learning and labelling theory, meanings translate to real phenomena in the social world (Mannheim, 1939). According to Goffman (1961) ex-inmates learn that they face significant social barriers to reintegration since others perceive them as criminal. They are not immediately permitted re-entry to society as full citizens and over time may come to believe that they will never be permitted to so identify. More importantly, where the group perception and exposure is strong, they may not believe that they belong anywhere else but in the deviant group. Consequently, to be an offender often means to accept the social identity that society and its institutions have fixed on those labels (similar to the argument by Scott 1969). The individual is pushed to identify with a criminal subculture, as in Braithwaite's (1989, 1994, and 2000) work on restorative justice, and this affects their self-concept to the point where they are now an "offender" in the social and personal sense (Goffman, 1961-1973; and Mannheim, Ibid.).
Labelling theory places its emphasis on understanding the effects on, and manifest responses of those who are identified as deviant. Criminal stigmatization, the negative labelling of individuals as criminals is seen as a barrier to reintegration or acceptance into the "normal" law abiding community (Rasmusen, 1995; Shoham and Rahav, 1982; Brand & Claiborn, 1976; Scott, 1969; and Goffman, 1961-1973). While released offenders have varying skills and tools necessary to cope and manage their identity, the key problem is that the label may lead to a reinforcement of the person's anti-social identification within the tapestry of groups that make up a conventional social world (Adler, 1993).

Rev. Neil Libby, the founder of the adult male offender halfway house movement in Canada, asked “what would you if you’d been in prison for five years and they turned you out with 20 bucks in your pocket” (Bolton, 1997, pp. 61-3). The answer for many was, "you'd grab yourself a bottle and a woman and get yourself a room" (p.62); ... then "pretty soon you’re back where you started" (Ibid.; Lauen, 1988). The rational after-note behind stigmatization reaction is: 'does he deserve anything more'? Our response has to be that if society cannot help ex-offenders re-integrate upon release, then it is left with people who will continue to cause harm to themselves and others. This viewpoint was an integral part of the development of the liberal/critical integrationists' approach in sociology and criminology (Erickson, Crow, Zürcher and Connett, 1977; Brand and Claiborn, 1976; Waller, 1974; and, Garrett and Rompler, 1966). According to the proponents of this approach, government needed to recognize that social and institutional labelling responses often contributed to the crime problem by enhancing criminal identification and alienation.
Early research demonstrated the negative impact of official and informal labelling on the way people are defined and treated by society and on how people see themselves (Goffman, 1963; Scheff, 1966). Although, halfway agencies are not developed to advocate for social change this study seeks to demonstrate the reason why this needs to become part of its mandate. This study seeks to validate a perspective on this problem, while providing insights into the way to which the problems of reintegration may be better addressed within and by the community correctional system. This literature marked the reshaping of the debate about stigma, identity and behavioural change with an emphasis on changing the system as much or more than on addressing change in the individual caught up in the system.

The development of the halfway agency in 1963, in Canada, partly emerged from a concern about the effects that stigma had within the community on those who were outcast as a result of being labelled (Bolton, 1982 and 1997; Zeithoun, L, 1976). The progenitors recognized that the forgotten and abandoned ex-con was given barely enough money to find lodging and food for a week and yet they were expected to be law-abiding. The social movement addressed by Libby was a precipitate of social involvement in curative measures, and consequently was part of the drive toward rehabilitating offenders, which emerged in the 60's and is now remerging at the turn of the millennium (Goffman, 1961..., Garrett, 1966; Astone, 1982; Rose and Clear, 1998; Petrino, 2000). The mission is to protect society by socially developing ex-inmates into law-abiding citizens. The problem that persists is that if society remains inflexible in stigmatizing ex-inmates the efforts of community corrections is being frustrated by the institutions that it supports.
Attention will now turn to Chapter 2 the methodology as to how the thesis was developed and structured. Chapter 3 will argue central issues and elements involved in stigma managed and being an ex-offender. Stigma is a social fact for all ex-offenders regardless of the degree they have been inculcated in the CJS. Chapter 4 details the elements of the three types of ex-offenders, which demonstrates that one size of social identity does not fit all ex-inmates. The concluding Chapter 5 suggests the necessity to match the function of community corrections to meet the needs of types of ex-offenders in terms of security, programming and other reintegration issues.
Chapter 2: Methodology

Introduction to the Research Methodology

My interest in the topic of reintegration of ex-inmates originated from personal experience, and a curiosity about what works in community corrections. I am sensitive to the issue of positive reintegration outcomes because I am an ex-inmate of a federal penitentiary. I am also a former resident of a halfway house, and eventually became an employee of the halfway house for eleven years.

To this end, my personal experience has played an important role in shaping the objectives and approach of this study. My purpose was to portray an understanding of the real world experiences of ex-offenders as they cope strategically with stigmatization, based on their own accounts. The study approached this task within a qualitative research and theoretical framework in the genre of the research conducted by Adler (1993); Ericson (1977); Erickson et al. (1973); and, Goffman (1968).

The data used in this thesis was collected through open-ended interviews of twenty-three male, Canadian, federal ex-inmates who were serving a portion of their sentence in an Ontario community-based federal or federally funded halfway facility. The respondents were drawn from seven halfway facilities in four Ontario communities. The research interviews were focused on the ex-inmates' perception of stigma and related factors impacting on his re-entry into the community.

Approval from Correctional Services of Canada was obtained to conduct the research (see Appendix 1, for the proposal). Six CSC research committee members
reviewed a "Proposal to Conduct Research" and permission was given allowing the project to go ahead. The local parole office provided some guidelines that had to be followed (See Appendix II). There were no other concerns expressed by CSC. St. Leonard's House Windsor provided some research funding for the project based on a proposal submitted to them (see Appendix III).

The Selection of Research Participants

The study was conducted through seven halfway agencies. Four institutions were run by affiliates of the St. Leonard's Society of Canada, one by the Salvation Army and another by Correctional Services of Canada. Approval to conduct the research was obtained by the researcher from each agency. The three organizations were chosen because they represent the three largest community corrections organizations in Canada.

With the exception of the CSC facility the researcher was able to conduct or take part in a house or general meeting attended by most of the residents where the researcher described the research and answered questions. The agency on-duty staff member(s) were responsible for arranging the general meeting. Approximately, 20% of the potential respondents chose to take part in the research. Those who had comments or questions during the house meeting were more likely to take part in the research. The staff in some agencies offered to direct residents to take part in the interview but this offer was rejected in favour of a less directive approach of walking around the agency waiting for the residents to approach and ask questions. There was an absence of coercion involved in this approach.
The interview procedure and schedule

The purpose of the interview was to allow interaction with the subject using a semi-structured interview schedule (see Appendix V) aimed at capturing what it is that the individual experienced in the course of his reintegration. The interview was chosen over survey methods because of the need to explore their experience and perception as to how they communicated them was considered essential to gaining access to their world. The richness of a person's experience cannot possibly be captured by a survey encompassing mainly true or false answers to questions. Open-ended interviews were also seen as crucial in gaining more open cooperation. The interviews were conducted in a private “house counsellor” office, class or program room, and one was conducted in the resident's room. The respondent was read the consent form (see Appendix IV). He was asked whether he objected to the interview being taped. The interviews ranged in duration from forty-five minutes to an hour and a half. He was given the consent form to sign and he was provided with a copy for future reference. No respondents withdrew at any point after the interview began.

Transcripts of the tapes were used in the analysis. The respondent was told that while research notes would be written during the interview this was not an indication that attention was not being given to his every word. He was assured that what he had to say was important and nothing was devalued by the procedure. However, if it became clear that he was waiting for the interviewer to stop writing before continuing the notes were reserved until after the interview was completed. Consequently, some highlights of what they had to say, in context, were captured in the research notes.
At the end of the interview, the respondent was debriefed. He was given time to ask questions of the interviewer and to express any concerns with the interview. There were many good comments after the formal interview ended, contributing to a better understanding of what the respondent felt about self-help approaches to community corrections. Although not directly related to the data required for this analysis Chapter 5 reflects on how reintegration can be better managed within community corrections through self-help.

The Interview Schedule

The interview schedule includes questions falling into five categories. Biographical information provided an understanding of the individual. The interview schedule consisted of a mix of 53 open- and close-ended questions with explanation-type questions where applicable. His age, marital status, dependants and last grade completed in school. This led to a more inclusive examination of the respondent’s criminal identity issues. In this section the questions were aimed at capturing how the person saw himself and how others saw him. It also attempted to gain access as to whether the individual’s behaviour contributed to his identification issues. This led to questions about his experience within the criminal justice system and whether his needs were met by the prison system.

The issue of how reintegration has been impacted by his experience in the system was also solicited. In this way he had to consider what his basic needs were and whether the needs for reintegration were met during his stay in the halfway facility. This logically led to questions about his social experience with reintegration: education and
family and friends relations. The final battery of questions sought to address how he managed stigma. In response the respondent discussed what some of the strategies he used and whether he was able to better handle reintegration as a result of his approach to managing stigma.

The interview schedule instrument was pre-tested on five members of the agency where the researcher worked. Of note these interviews are not profiled directly for analysis. There will be an obvious influence represented by these individuals, as their general and type experiences are not at all dissimilar to those of the other respondents.

The interview schedule contained questions intended to scope the personal profile of each respondent. The structure of the schedule allowed for a complete understanding of how the person felt. For instance, to the question as to whether the person considered himself to be an offender; he may have responded that he did not. But later in the section on institutional experience, he described himself as criminally oriented. This facilitated a better understanding of the classification of ex-inmates so as to determine certain type characteristics as will be demonstrated in Chapter 4.

The schedule also contained data that led to the discussion on the general experience with reintegration engaged in Chapter 3. The findings led to the discussion on potential intervention aimed at aiding in the reintegration of ex-offenders as law-abiding citizens Chapter 5.

The interview schedule is divided into five sections: (1) a biographical sketch; (2) a social experience with the offender identity; (3) criminal history; (4) social experience with the managing the offender identity; and, (5) management strategies used by the offender in coping with stigma. Each section and question was scripted to obtain an
understanding of how and in what manner the ex-inmate experienced problems and coped with his reintegration during the early stages of reintegrating society.

**Biographical sketch**

The respondent's data began with the assignment of a pseudonym (baseball players names were assigned). The age of the respondent, his last grade completed, his marital status and number of dependants.

The use of the term dependants provoked probes as to whether they had children who were dependant on them. Many reported little to no involvement in child rearing for many different reasons. These were not focused on in depth but the direct comments are included in Table 1, Chapter 3. The respondent's age, as argued by Adler (1993), were found to have had an effect on attitudes affecting reintegration, also a case was made on this point in Andrews' (1994) discussion on responsivity factors. The biographical sketch provided access to the demographics of the sample.

**Offender Identity Profile**

Correctional history relates to correctional experience with the offender identity. The section was designed to assess whether, based on self report, the respondents chose the offender identity; and whether it was the choice of lifestyle that may have contributed to his experience with reintegration, i.e. sporting or wearing long hair, tattoos, and leather jackets might have an impact on employment opportunities. In accordance with the theories of Goffman (1959) it is important to delve into whether it was the person's choices of presentation and association that may have created the stigma and continues to sustain
it. Another purpose of these questions was to determine whether the person preferred being identified as an offender or criminal deviant. I.e. was the person a member of an organized crime gang, or simply socialized as a criminal due to other factors such as family, or educational/vocational deficits. The other issue was, did he prefer the “bad boy” image, for a more conservative one even when he has given up on the criminal behaviour. Or in a positive sense whether his work history assisted him in reintegration.

*Correctional history*

This section required some memory work on the part of the respondents. The respondent was cautioned that “if you cannot remember, please state whether you wish to think about the answer and we can return to it later.” The purpose of these questions was to capture the respondent’s experiences and attitudes toward the criminal justice system, and to understand how he perceived himself related to becoming a law-abiding citizen within it.

This section was important, as the attitudes expressed assisted in providing an understanding as to why a person was in fact stigmatized or experienced other problems related to his identity and reintegration. For example, if a person thought that the criminal justice system was corrupt, it might be more difficult for him to achieve the correctional expectation of becoming a law-abiding citizen. Some might adopt the position that “what is good for the goose, is good for the gander” in practice. Whether their opinion was true or false, negative attitudes about the social order often lead to exit problems.

*Social experience*
Understanding the experience meant asking questions pertaining to managing the offender identity, which involved questions allowing for an understanding of how relationship to significant others were rated and how he views himself within the social tapestry. More to the point, it required that he reflect on whether familiar relations treated him differently than before he went to prison. The criminal history and his experience in the criminal justice system along with how he managed his identity were also factors impacting on reintegration outcomes. For example, where a person reported that there was little or no positive change in people’s attitudes, or that they had a poor or no work history, the person’s past lifestyle would have been criminal, also reviewed in the literature. Conversely, if they experienced relatively little change, it may have reflected a limited criminal history and a support system that made reintegration manageable by not emphasizing the unfortunate aspects of their life as explained by Goffman (1959) and more recently Adler (1993).

*Stigma management strategies*

This sections solicited information as to how the individual managed himself in a variety of social situations. The emphasis was on how he managed disclosure and gained support to and from others. The last question solicited information as to how he viewed his membership in the community. Whether being an offender required that he gain support for his reintegration from other reintegrating ex-offenders.
Data analysis

The respondents to this study were all paroled, one was on work-release from prison to a halfway facility, and therefore they had a common frame of reference. Chapter 3 examines elements of this as understood by each of the respondents. It demonstrates that each experienced stigma impacting on or perceived to have a bearing on reintegration outcomes.
Given this literature the data analysis concentrated on the degree to which the individual was institutionalized (Goffman, 1963). How long had he spent in the criminal justice or correctional system has been thought to be a key determinant in classifying offenders? (Chaiken and Chaiken, 1984). This analysis produced the data contained in Appendix VII. The person's view of himself and his experiences were then analyzed to reclassify the respondent qualitatively in Appendix VIII.

The richness of the data provided by the respondent lent an insight that was more useful in classifying CC types than just the time spent in the criminal justice system. Type 1 respondents remained in their type because the transcript revealed was that he had experienced no protracted prosocial activity in their eligible life, such as completing high school while in the community. Or working for more than a few months at a time. Type 1 ex-inmates are true to the type by the evidence that they had limited social preparedness, which had not been part of the prison experience.

Type 2 based on his criminal history, are not as clearly demarcated. The reason for this is that members of the type lived in and out of the criminal subculture which depending on the proficiency of their ability to move in and out reflected how much time they spent in the CJS. As such this type became more difficult to classify based on time in the system alone. They were however, clearly not similar to Type 1 but a few fit into Type 3 because of the degree to which they had lived conventional lives. Those who lived prosocial lives for long periods but who occasionally took part in criminal activity over the span of their eligible life but maintained work, family and social activities, such as coaching kids teams etc... were moved to Type 3.
Type 3, are those who spent a representatively smaller amount of time in the CJS. They were easily demarcated because of the lack of involvement they experienced in their lives. Even where they did not work as the result of a disability, they were not involved in crime. Their transcripts revealed a predominantly prosocial orientation.

To summarize, Type 3 respondents were principally prosocial. Type 3 spent relatively little time in prison. They reported living conventional lives until some remarkable event occurred. In fact, they had spent approximately half the time of Type 2 and a third the time of Type 1 in prison. When considering this alone one third of the respondents fit into this type. But when the qualitative analysis was complete it was discovered that some respondents who had limited institutional exposure fit better into Type 2. Although they had spent less time, then the typical Type 2 in prison or in the CJS they explained that they had been involved in criminal or risky activity for a protracted period similar to those who drifted or moved into a criminal lifestyle.

In this way, it was not simply the criminal history and prison experience that was relevant for the analysis of type placement his subjective life experience or 'life world' was used to group him in community correctional intervention categories.

When the data was analyzed quantitatively, using the amount of time spent in the correctional system, there were three clusters in the distribution. The first distribution ranged from 62% to 85% of the time was spent in the criminal justice system since they were 12 years old. Seven of the twenty-three respondents fell into this category. The second group ranged in time in the system from 14% to 40% of their eligible period representing nine of the twenty-three respondents. The last distribution ranged from 3% to 21% institutional concentration, six respondents were represented here. The data in
Appendix VII contains the rating for each respondent. This distribution provided the base line for considering three types of ex-offenders in Chapter 4.

The traditional manner of the experience in the system was initially used to classify an inmate. The research method determined quantitative factors about the person, such as time in prison, time on parole, and time spent in a halfway facility. It was thought that the greater the institutionalization factors the more difficult the process of reintegration and the more that stigma would factor into the person's self-perception. This led to analysis of types as follows:

Type 1 ex-inmates were those who had spent a substantial amount of time in the criminal justice system. Type 1 ex-inmates are those with the most criminogenic and criminal attitudes and behavioural patterns. They expressed that they were or had been very much a part of the criminal subculture. For those who were attempting to move beyond the criminal lifestyle they saw that their greatest challenge was to avoid reverting back to previous behavioural patterns. They historically had little understanding of prosocial behaviours.

Type 2 ex-inmates were those who had spent a substantially smaller amount of time institutionalized. Type 2 ex-inmates are those with a moderate criminogenic and criminal attitudes and behavioural patterns. They also understand and have experience with a conventional and criminal lifestyle. They recognise that they will need to maintain socially accepted behaviours and avoid drifting in order to remain free of crime. They often expressed that they were part of the criminal subculture and the greater society at the same time or they entered into crime for a protracted period following a life of predominantly conventional behaviour. Most saw themselves as normal people who also
were comfortable in a criminal environment, they were contiguously or simultaneously involved in crime. They historically have knowledge of what it means to be prosocial and antisocial.

Type 3 ex-inmates were those who had spent a smaller degree of time in prison and in the CJS than both Type 1 and 2. Type 3 ex-inmates are those with little criminogenic and criminal attitudes and behavioural patterns before prison. They expressed that they were and still consider themselves to be part of the dominant culture. They entered into crime for reasons that were uncharacteristic. For those who were attempting to move beyond the criminal lifestyle they saw that their greatest challenge was to try to resume life from where they left off. They historically have little direct knowledge and experience of what is meant to be criminally antisocial.

Type 3 were clearly demarcated from the first two types in that they had been productive and established in the community when they perpetrated the crime or crimes that placed them in conflict with the law. Or they had a means of legitimate support such as disability pensions. Some event caused them to act uncharacteristically in a criminal manner i.e., a murder of a spouse who had betrayed them, or the spouse’s lover or the use of illegal drugs to manage the pain they experienced from their physical impairment.

In the analysis, all respondents are profiled to delineate the common problem Chapter 3, and then to distinguish differences according to types in Chapter 4. All responses provided data by which to determine what they experienced. This inclusion has allowed for a very rich overview of the reintegration experience(s).

In summary, the salient point of analysis for this research is complex. The typical scoring for institutionalization, which led to the initial typing of all respondents fit into
discreet types ranging from the most seriously challenged reintegration typology to the least. This did break down after the data was considered qualitatively. Type 1, the typical criminal type held true in both their experience in society and the amount of time they spent in prison. Their criminal life led to their having little prosocial orientation.

Type 2 was clearly identified as having both prosocial and criminal orientation by their accounts in the transcripts. However, there were two variances. There were those who drifted from one social environment to another on an almost daily basis, and those who lived prosocial lives for a substantial period of time then abandoned that lifestyle for a protracted period in a drug and/or criminal lifestyle leading to imprisonment, sometimes for the first time.

This presented a unique characteristic of the interview schedule. It was able to differentiate between respondents on the basis of both institutional, and social experiences. In the case of Type 2 respondents the significant qualitative difference is that they had social experience that allowed him to more easily manage reintegration while in a halfway facility. One key aspect was the amount of positive family support.

As explicated in Chapter 3, there are links typing all ex-offenders to each other. These are what precipitated the tendency to dramatize an evil presence in society. The issue is whether different types can more easily facilitate reintegration challenges. The following discussion is not meant to establish that a criminal is not a criminal; once a person is found guilty they become a criminal. The issue is to what extent does this pose a problem for criminals. Axiomatically, those who have little or no experience with social order will have greater adjustment and steeper learning curves than those who have been involved in conventional life but have become criminal in the process. Those who had no
real orientation or exposure to criminal subcultures, such as white-collar criminals, and blue-collar murderers will have their skills to help them with the adjustment back into society.

The experience of each member of the sample will be described and analysed to arrive at a consensus position about the problems faced by all ex-inmates affecting their reintegration as law-abiding citizens. Institutionalization, and stigma affect the person's ability to reintegrate. It is basic to the thesis argument that community-based intervention is required to deal with these social problems contribute to recidivism. Public information and education about the place that an ex-offender holds in society contributes to the criminal threat to the community is required to begin the process which allows a person to realize his authentic self in the real world. The twenty-three respondents explain their struggles with reintegration in a manner that allows for recognition of the basic needs they have that will allow them to regain citizen status.

Chapter 4 in addition to the three type exemplars also provides statements and criminogenic data from each member of the sample demonstrating why they are included in that particular type. This evidence will involve one or two statements providing strength to the argument about the features of the type.

Chapter 5 concludes the study by interacting with the literature on social stigma, reintegration and stigma management strategies to argue that there appears to be a need to address stigma as a central theme for community corrections. In addition to the problem of stigma are the recognitions that different types of ex-offenders can recognise and manage reintegration based on their historic and institutional profile. For reintegration best practices the experience of the ex-inmate needs to be a primary focus for community
corrections. It is important to recognise that one intervention approach does not fit all, and further, the mixing of types in a therapeutic environment may frustrate positive reintegration outcomes.

It is recognised within a labelling perspective that the emphasis is on how the label affects the individual bearing the stigma. This study moves beyond this limited view where the imposition of an identifier can affect how a person sees himself. In the case of ex-offenders, they are what the label implies (Ericson, 1977; Garrett and Rompler, 1966; Goffman, 1959-73). They have characteristics and behaviours associated with ex-offenders. Their activities have caused them to be removed from society for a period. The study demonstrates how the person may also contribute to the development and the entrenchment of the label by virtue of his personal presentation, social history, and institutional experience.

This does not indicate that the label is appropriately affixed for life upon the individual and to a lesser extent to all offenders; rather it is essential to assist the individual to move beyond the behaviours that the label indicated. Correspondingly, society must accept and support efforts that allow the person to move beyond the label. Crime is a social activity performed in a social setting, and created because of certain social conditions. Each party, the ex-offender, the citizen and the victim are all participants in the creation, development and manifestation of social disorder. When crime is committed, each stakeholder requires appropriate attention to address restoration issues. In a civil society, emphasis on how the act has changed lives must be given but moreover emphasis should be on how they can regain their bearings within a social world that
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acknowledges that for a healthy community each party must be treated in manner that will reflect health.

The person bearing the negative label must be engaged in moving beyond the behaviours that put them in conflict with the law. The public who is potentially threatened by the ex-offender needs to feel safe. The victim needs to be allowed the opportunity to believe that the harm they endured is addressed in manner that indicates that the person who affected them is no longer a person they need to fear or loath.

Ethics

Ethical matters arose from the onset of the project. As an employee of a halfway agency pretest participants might feel some responsibility to take part. For this reason participation was made completely voluntary and the interviews were done while the researcher was off duty. Finally, they were told that their interviews would not be recorded.

Criticism of the system of stigmatization will not reflect the position of the researcher. Rather these will be discussed in terms of the respondents' responses. A concerted effort was made to translate accounts by overshadowing what the researcher knew to be based on his prior experience alone. Working with ex-offenders for eleven years did allow for some interpretations of individual positions. The data was analysed based on the accounts themselves reflective of the criteria as discerned from the method described in the previous subsection.

Respondents were told that the researcher was employed as a shift supervisor in a halfway house, so that they could make an informed decision as to whether they wished
to participate. The issue of conflicting roles, i.e., if they told me about an offence that they had not been arrested for, then I would be compelled to relate this to the authorities. On the other hand the problem of confidentiality was explained to them, i.e. if they related details about an offence to which they had been adjudicated (this did not occur), the researcher would not have to relay this information to the authorities.

Confidentiality is an important factor within any social research. There were a number of methods used to assure that confidentiality and other safeguards were employed to protect the identity of the respondent. The researcher was careful to avoid situations and questions that would indicate who the person is but this was not always possible. An example of an exception is where a person talked about personal injury and its impact on his criminal behaviour. This was important to the research and unique to that individual so his experience is captured and anyone knowing him would be able to recognize that the experience referred to him. These had more to do with his prosocial life before turning to crime and therefore would not negatively impact on him. Consequently, it was not reasonable nor was it necessary to change the information in order to protect the individual.

Pseudonym identifiers were used, specifically, the names of baseball players, to replace the names of the respondents. They were randomly assigned to the respondent's transcript. To certain questions such as, 'whether they committed criminal offences since being released from prison, they were told not to give details. It would have been interesting to use offences committed under supervised release and use these as part of the typology, but this would not lend itself to professional ethical conduct, unless the researcher made the information immediately available to the authorities. This was
particularly the case for this researcher since he works in the field and has signed agreements that relate to issue of disclosure making it his duty, whether he is working or in his civilian life to report any breaches that he witnesses or became privy to was proscribed.

Another helpful historic area was to find out what crimes they had committed in the past. In some cases the information was revealed during the interview, but not all respondents information contained the specific type of crime committed. Significantly, it would be necessary to identify all offences they committed not just those that they had been processed for. Even if the question asked for the most recent crime or the criminal docket information, to use this information without accessing the files on the individual would cause inconsistencies and other problems of reliability. If someone reading the report was able to identify the person or worse errantly thought they could identify the person by his description and history and the respondent was a paedophile, there is at least one in the sample, the person could be labelled in one case correctly in another because of false association with the research.

The names of the agency were not used in the accounts thus safeguarding where the person resided. The researcher did not use any reference as to the city of the respondent's origin, or the name of the business where he worked. The researcher did not use the name of councillors when mentioned by the respondent. The researcher did not use the name of family members. The researcher substituted all these references with randomly selected identifiers or dashes.

The interview procedure was the same for each interviewee. The respondent was told that if there were any question that he did not wish to respond to, for any reason, then
he could simply not respond to the question. The respondent was told that he had the right to refuse and withdraw from participation in this study at any time. As previously mentioned it was made clear that participation was voluntary.

In some agencies the staff had offered to send people to be interviewed. The researcher did not accept this offer and instead the researcher simply walked around the agency, after having a general meeting with the residents, waiting for them to approach. The attention paid to voluntary participation should add to the reliability of the data collected. Were the respondents coerced in any way to participate then their response may have been influenced by their need to protect themselves.
Institutional Experience With Stigma And Reintegration

Four premises underlie the argument in this chapter that to be an offender is to still be apart from the community as a discredited outsider Goffman (1959) and Becker (1961). First, it is argued that all ex-offenders are affected to some extent by stigma limiting their capacity to reintegrate (Schwartz and Skolnick, 1964; and Goffman, 1959...); Second stigma often reinforces membership or identification in the offender sub-culture either through self or social identification (Adler, 1993); Third, ex-inmate's personal and social attributes affect their ability to move into certain prosocial areas of society effectively (Benson, 1984); and, finally, their experience with the criminal justice system assumes a critical role as to gaining, maintaining or sustaining membership in the larger community (Roloff & Danette, 2000; Rasmusen, 1995; Adler, 1993, Fein, 1990; Chaiken & Chaiken, 1989; Goffman, 1963,68 and 69 provide insight into these factors).

The presentation of the cases will fall into three categories. First, I look at the extent to which inmates self-identify as a criminal and accept responsibility for the act committed (Erickson et al., 1973; Goffman, 1959...). The second discussion is about managing aspects related to reintegration outcomes (Fein, 1990; Keve, 1982; Ericson, 1977). Finally, a discussion as to how the offender stigma is managed during the early stages of reintegration is presented, (Derlaga et. al, 2000; Roloff and Danette, 2000; Herman, 1993).
All respondents to this study have experienced a period spent in a correctional facility and as such have been subjected to the label of offender (Braithwaite, 1959; Garrett, 1966; Ericson, 1977; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1984; Fein, 1990; and, Herman, 1993). They now bear that stigma and are dealing with their new status as parolees (Erickson et al., 1973). Every ex-inmate has problems with their identity as a criminal and as a citizen (Goffman, 1959). All ex-inmates are trying to manage their stigma utilizing differing tools allowing for inroads during reintegration (Derlaga et al., 1993; Adler, 1993; Herman, 1993; and Link and Mirotznik, 1991).

Chapter 3 features expressions from the entire sample providing a general description of the effects of stigma and related problems of identity during reintegration (Fein, 1990; Goffman, 1961; 1963). Reintegration is not simply a matter of physically returning an ex-inmate to society (Braithwaite, 1989; Keve, 1982; Waller, 1974). Rather it relates to returning a discredited person to society, a person with restricted means of becoming a functional part of the social world because of the offender stigma he now bears (Goffman, 1959). This chapter focuses on understanding the ex-offenders’ experience with the process of reintegration in light of criminal stigmatization and the resulting impact on self-identification, social isolation and marginalization due to impacting social attitudes and correctional institutionalization (Bolton, 1997; Braithwaite and Mugford, 1994; Adler, 1993; Davies, 1985; Benson, 1984; Keve, 1982; Ericson, 1977; Goffman, 1961, 1963; 1968).

The focus is on identifying factors of stigma influencing the reintegration of ex-inmates as law-abiding citizens. First all ex-inmates are forced to consider their abhorrent status as offenders. They must manage their identity. Finally, the image of offender seems
to endure in certain social context, leaving them in a challenged social condition, causing social distance in relations. To demonstrate the problems, the twenty-three members of the sample will share their experience as derived through the analysis of the transcript.

The process of social identification and relations follow this logic in the real world. A person acknowledges certain factors about who they are and then they adopt strategies to cope with this only to find additional barriers as they establish, try to maintain or re-establish relations with conventional others.

The key factors of the identity issue are taken from the cases as shown according to the following key issues:

1) All ex-inmates have a criminal record so as a matter of law they are criminal
2) All ex-inmates have lost time by virtue of the time they spent in prison
3) All criminal are criminal by virtue of the admission that they do criminal things
4) All ex-offenders believe that stigma is part of the process of being labelled criminal
5) All ex-offenders have done something(s) irrational and irresponsible that led to their becoming criminal
6) All ex-offenders must endure the burden of being labelled criminal
7) All ex-offenders must admit at some point in their reintegration that they put the label on themselves
8) All ex-offenders chose to hide their identity from others because they don’t like to be outed
9) All ex-offenders use techniques to avoid letting certain people know about their criminal identity
10) All federal ex-inmates, who are still on parole, can be sent back to prison without due process of law
11) All ex-offenders are confronted by those people who do not believe that they can change
12) All ex-offenders engage in techniques in an effort to avoid undesired pain
13) All ex-inmates find acceptances in certain relations and not in others

The list is not exhaustive of the ex-offender experience. The thirteen points are factors and features that all ex-inmates have in common which will be developed in this chapter.
The thesis argument representing types of ex-inmates who face varied challenges that can be typed also acknowledges that there are characteristics that are common to all ex-inmates. However, as Ericson stated, "among intimates, as compared with more socially distant persons, he is not first defined as a criminal and then evaluated, but is evaluated according to all aspects of his identity before he is defined" (1977, p. 7). This dated finding is supported here in this study. The focus here on common traits will set the context for Chapter 4 where institutional, vocational, social and familial attributes are linked to differences in capacities to reintegrate society.

Understanding the criminalization experience

This section considers how the respondents experience their reentry to society. Identity transformation carries with it a number of problems which are illustrated by specifically examining subjects related to reintegration. Each of the brief accounts should shed light on how ex-offenders view their lives in respect to the stigma they carry and how they believe others perceive and consequently treat them.

They require assistance with managing their change in social status. They need to make the transition to their new life as law-abiding citizens. Enmity targeted by the public, who are not aware of the challenges, contributes to reintegration failures. Stigma means that they need to manage the flow of information about themselves, to non-offending citizens, so as to attempt to normalize their relationships as argued by Derlaga et. al. (1993). They are subject to additional social consequences when some who know of their identity use this information in a manner that affects their reintegration as discussed in the research conducted by Herman (1993), Keve, (1982) and Link et. al. (1991). To this
end, their self-image is affected by this stigmatizing information, which was the focus for Goffman beginning the sociological focus in 1959. As noted by Keve (1982) they are forced to employ coping strategies, some of them socially and psychologically harmful, in their efforts to avoid detection or to manage the effects of the information. Finally, the offender stigma is indelible in the sense that it can resurface at any time to interfere with the reintegration of the individual as a law-abiding citizen (Link, et. al. 1991; and Brand et. al., 1976 discussed this point quite well). The person's ability to function with the debilitating problems of stigma is a dynamic factor related to reintegration.

Identifying self as a criminal

The following have been abstracted from the respondent's transcripts. The analysis of the data has benefited from the work of Goffman on the presentation of self in everyday society. The respondents explain how their experience with the criminal justice system, becoming discredited has impacted on their self-image. Herman (1993), Link et. al. (1991), and Keve (1982) developed the concept that Goffman began on the effects of becoming 'outed' or discredited. What then follows are descriptive narratives of what it means to be an ex-offender during reintegration.

ANDREW JONES: ALL I AM IS CRIMINAL

Adler (1993) found that for all ex-inmates “their reattachment to conventional society was problematic due to their many years of out of the mainstream society” (p. 203). The process of becoming and being a criminal is defining. He comes to distrust, in some respects, any claim that he has to becoming conventional. Despite his distance from conventional life, as Adler argues "each attempt at reintegration brought them further back
into society and away from the insulated world of the fast life (Ibid)”; therefore, he may eventually succeed as long as he is willing to try to make changes in his thinking and behaviours.

Andruw Jones’ experience in the system and society has dictated his self-identity. There appears to be only a slight attempt at managing his negative identity through strategies. He accepts that he has lived a criminal life and as such is a criminal.

Ah, I guess I am a criminal. I have done, like I said four federal sentences. And ah, I don't know what a prosocial lifestyle is. I grew up in a neighbourhood that is all crime. And to me, crime is my prosocial. So, yea I am a criminal. Without a doubt I would prefer to break the law then follow the law. And that is not something that I try to say, I don't say that as a rebellious statement. I say that because my prosocial behaviour is that of a criminal. It is all that I know.

There are a couple of important features here: Jones, is a confessed criminal who states that he “prefers to break the law”; he also does not perceive that he has had a choice as his entire frame of reference has been criminal. Jones self-perception and all that he is appears to be the personification of criminal. Despite this Jones does not contradict an earlier statement where all were intent on no longer breaking the law. He admits,

by my thinking processes reintegration is made difficult.

He suggests that others

will think of consequences when they are doing something wrong, and I don’t give a shit”.

He has difficulty differentiating between his past attitude and his emergent desire to reintegrate. As Rose and Clear (1998) and Schloegel and Kinast (1988) have argued the ex-inmate will require a great deal of assistance in learning how to live a prosocial life. Elementary things such as grooming, speech, and techniques of selective concealment will need to be incorporated into his reintegration plan.
He reflects,

well I didn’t, I am trying to change. I would like to think like other people. I am going to be tested truly when I do get out, because I do have a different attitude.

He wants to be like others and move beyond the identification as an offender.

I want to make it now; I don’t want to be in jail.

He recognises that for him to not identify as a criminal “is the only thing that is going to make me succeed” when finally released to the community. The other is that the people who he comes into contact with will also need to accept that he can change and not constantly refer to his previous lifestyle as a barrier to his ability to succeed.

**JIM MEYERS: I LOOK LIKE A CRIMINAL**

Goffman (1959) found that how one presents in everyday life has an impact on how others react to him. Meyers represents a case where some ex-inmates look like and do not purely believe that they act like a criminal. This case is differentiated from the previous in that Jones sees himself as preferring the criminal life, Meyers prefers the criminal or bad boy appearance and not necessarily the life. One issue here is stereotyping based on physical presentation. Certainly, Goffman’s (1959...) accounts of presentation of self, and management of spoiled identity apply to many ex-inmates.

Jim Meyers represents a case of undifferentiated self and social image as a criminal.

Yea, yea, definitely. Whether it be family for sure, since I have been sixteen, my mother always considered me to be that way, my wife always did. She always thought about my friends that way. My appearance easily, always wearing black leather jackets and tattoos, and hair this way, bang right away you are a biker criminal. But it just comes from part of the course. I walk down the road and I get pulled over, so I just take it as part of life now.
Brand and Claiborn (1976) research argued that in many cases it is not stigma alone that acts as a barrier but how the person socially distances himself from conventional others by his manner and demeanour. Meyers has constructed his life as a criminal, however, he is intent on changing his previous pattern of living.

So when I got out I haven’t seen anybody, I haven’t seen a soul. I just started right fresh, new friends, new everything, I haven’t seen anybody. So it would still be true, if I went back into it, started hanging around with same people (bolded text added for clarity).

Association has a lot to do with a person’s self-image affecting his reintegration. Meyers, despite his demeanour, and his trappings as an offender believes that he can reintegrate as a normal person. Meyers is attempting to move beyond his past by avoiding anyone who had anything to do with his past. His chosen lifestyle has an affect on all aspects of his life today.

Oh, as I said right away I get pulled over. Everywhere I go because of the way I look and act probably. They assume that you are right away a criminal, immediately. You know, being pulled over, walking into a doctors office, people will move away from you so it is kind of the way I want to lead it too, so in a away I can’t say its not. I could change and wear different cloths and cover up my tattoos, and not get so many of them. I am still getting more, and I am still looking the way I want, so its...

He has not given up his criminal demeanour or the related wardrobe. In the case of becoming an offender or experiencing incarceration, the offender is understood by his total experience. He is an offender and recognises that others can identify him by his offensive appearance. In this case stigma is something that he accepts.

**JACK BROSKIE: I WILL ALWAYS TAKE THE EASY WAY**

According to the transcripts, in one respect or another, all ex-inmates recognise that they made the choices to become criminal. They however, reject the fact that they should have the consequences connected as an ongoing barrier to reintegration.
Broskie represents an interesting case that shed light on Motiuk's (undated) and Motiuk and Brown (1993) and Townsend's (1996) research.

Please explain whether you consider yourself to be a criminal?

Yes, I do. I will always take the easy way out as opposed to trying to always find a job.

If there is – If I need a job, or if I need money or I can't get a job; I won't go out and break into someone else's house. But there are certain things in my life or certain people in my life that I can get access to make money with.

Please explain whether you think that others (probes: family, friends, coworkers, etc.) view you as a criminal?

Some of my friends, some of my family think that I am.

Explain what it is that you have experienced in your efforts to start living a "normal" lifestyle?

Other than the fact that, I think, nothing has affected me as far as friends. Where it has affected me at this point is in my education, what I would have liked to take, I can't. When you go to jail you pay back your debt to society, this does not mean that you pay back for the rest of your life. If I wanted to be a doctor, or whatever maybe I can't, because of a drug charge.

What is it that you wanted to study?

I would not have minded taking courses to become a pharmacist, but I can't.

You said that you are still going to College, what are you taking?

Diesel technician. Big difference, that was the third option that I had taken three years ago. I tried to get into Humber College as a Funeral Director but I didn't make it. So I ended up taking the other one was an ambulance attendant, my driving record is not the best for them; so I couldn't take that. And so I tried for Diesel technician I was accepted there, so that is what I took.

Parker (1994) discusses the variable benefit of education for ex-inmates that is worth reading in this regard. Becoming educated in some practical field is essential to reintegration success for many ex-inmates. There are a number of barriers that can be experienced during reintegration. Not only a criminal record, a driving record can lessen the choices that you have in terms of trying to reintegrate society.
Explain to me how some people have acted differently toward you because you are an offender.

The only ones that I find are a big hindrance to that are company owners or people who are in a position to give you something. I will give you an example.

There was a guy; he was a friend of mine from inside; he was in for drug trafficking. He owned a company before this experience. He was like an average business owner. He looked at people with long hair or any word mentioned as to their being a con; then he did not want to have anything to do with them as far as their business.

He couldn’t trust them! Now that he has been in, his whole outlook now is completely different. To the point that he will talk and he knows that there is a lot of good cons; they are humans; they have made their mistakes.

A con is more upfront and more open as to what they have done, or about to do. And if their crime is B&E’s, then you know that they are going to case your place out. And the con knows it. If the guy is in for drugs, he is not looking at your business to rip it off; he is looking for a job.

I knew this but it showed me more of it, since this time being in.

Boshier and Johnson back in 1974 recognised this as a problem. Broskie’s story points to three aspects of stigma. 1) A person who has fallen is likely to change his opinion about the character of all ex-inmates. 2) Relations with each ex-inmate need to be considered and managed as to certain criminal preference. And 3) most business people may believe that the offender is undesirable which has clear implication for employment (Boshier and Johnson, 1974).

His work experience has also reflected a loss of trust.

When I did get picked up, I was working. And since I have been at the halfway house, I did go back to the company that I was working for. By talking to people in the back, I did not talk to the boss personally, I talked to some people that were working in the office and there was no hope of way that I was ever going to get a job back with them. Which I did nothing to them.

Throughout the transcripts it is apparent that ex-inmates understand the concept of hurting specific others. They have a more difficult time in dealing with the negative reaction from people who had nothing to do with the offence. From the excerpt, he snuck
in the back of the company, expecting to be rejected by the boss, and spoke to people he once worked with, who told him that he was not welcome.

In light of the relationship he spoke of earlier with the business owner he had met in prison who harboured bias against offenders, he was prepared for but not accepting of the rejection that he received. He may have decided to go to school so as to be able to muffle the effect of being an offender.

**BILL BOSKIE, I COMMITTED AN OFFENCE, I AM A CRIMINAL**

Stemming from societal reaction theory (Lemert 1951), a criminal is a person who has departed from the social norms and is in conflict with conventional lifestyles resulting in social pathology (Davies, 1985; Becker, 1961; Lemert, 1951). To this end a criminal is a criminal because the law made up by people states that he is (Rasmusen, 1995; Ericson, 1977; and Cohen, 1966). Bill Boskie's response to self-identity provides a nuanced explanation in this vein as to why offenders identify as criminal. He sees himself as a criminal because,

*Yes, I committed a criminal offence!*

When challenged he supported the reason he views himself as a criminal. The socially imposed identification attaches to

*someone who commits a criminal offence, is an offender.*

Boskie has summarized the position taken by most ex-inmates despite their desire not to self-identify; they are shaped by the conviction and the period of imprisonment they experienced. At different points in the process of becoming a criminal all recognised they were socially compromised by their prison experience.
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Being an offender and reintegrating back into society is exactly what it is. It is who you are and that is what you are doing. There is nothing that you can compare it to because there is no other reintegration. There is no other reality, that is all there is. And what you do is, you just, it is like starting another life after spending the time in prison that I did. You cannot come out with the idea that you are going to pick up from where you left off. That is behind you now all you can do is move forward. Everyday is a new day and every day is a learning experience and this time around you hope to do it the right way. The last time you did it the wrong way.

As noted in the previous case, an important element in reintegration is employment not just work, but employment that will allow the person to pay his own way.

A priority for me is employment. Permanent employment [inaudible] because having a steady income will assist me in time to leave the halfway house. And it will also provide me security to moving out of the halfway house and function pretty much as a normal person.

Moving beyond the halfway agency is a goal for ex-inmates, however those who have made some attitudinal adjustments find that cutting the halfway umbilical cord may be very challenging. The halfway house buffers many of the challenges that the normal person has learned to endure and manage.

Halfway house offer to these offenders access to specialized community services, re-establish and monitor vital community support and reduce the potential debilitating aspects of incarceration (St. Leonard's Society, April 1996, from a brief presented to the Ontario Standing committee on the administration of justice).

Many factors will impact on the success the ex-inmate could have during his reintegration. It is important that he can move beyond the conflict concept of 'I am an offender because I have committed an offence'.

**MATT LAWTON: MY RECORD SAYS THAT I AM A CRIMINAL**

Now it is just -- I gotten out this time around -- sure I am a bad person -- I am not really a bad person -- I did a bad thing at one time; but you know. I just got the criminal history -- saying that the record -- saying that I am a criminal.
In the same respect as Boskie, Lawton sees himself as a criminal. Lawton, however represents a case of transference of responsibility. He explains that his differential association, as understood in the school of thought from Edwin Sutherland in 1940, is the reason why he became a criminal not because he committed an offence. He has managed to avoid totally fixing his criminal identity by partially blaming others. From this perspective they led him into his behaviours because they presented an environment where the criminal act was the most desirable one to take within that context. He wants people to see him as a mindless automaton going where they told him to and doing what he was programmed to do. However, based on what is known about antecedents of crime, Sutherland's (1939) seminal work provides a support for his claim that he was socialized to become an offender.

At one time yes, because the people I was hanging around with, it was a really bad crowd and they got me into the drugs and they got me into the alcohol. And the next thing you know were doing break and enters and whatnot. And I figured I was a real bad ass, that I could do anything. You know, basically I was a big bad crime type person, a big bad criminal.

The above indicates the problem that offenders confront while attempting to deal with issues of self-image. 'I am a bad person' because I have a criminal history, contrast this to "I am not really a bad person". He has problems normalizing his past behaviours and therefore cannot easily separate these behaviours from who he essentially is. He will require assistance to reinforce the positive and avoid the negative. He admits to perceiving himself as a budding career criminal. He, like Boskie, recognises that his record will have an effect on his identity but he does not see that the stigma is indelible.

In another important aspect, street family usually denotes members of a criminal or deviant network, as is the case with Harris, to be reviewed later. In this case, street family appears to represent non-biological, non-criminal family made up of prosocial
friends. When embracing this type of acceptance and alliance Lawton will be facilitated in his reintegration. Lawton does not want to see himself as a criminal and his street family accepts his ideation.

Lawton reflects on the different stigmatic relationship held by biological and street families. His account demonstrates how ex-inmates tend to bond to people who accept them and resign themselves to or avoid others who rebuke them. It is interesting that non-adherence to biological family values led to his association with a "bad crowd" on the street.

Oh yea, my family big time.

Well actually, I have two sets of family, ones a flesh and blood; the other one is a street family. It is composed of friends. My real family, they consider me a criminal. They are like oh, you have done this much time you have been in and out of jail. Yada, yada, yada and more or less they have basically disowned me; they do not want anything to do with me anymore.

This represents a serious problem to the achievement of reintegration. Significant people in the offender's circle have given up, they have branded him habitually criminal, compelling him to turn to others for social affirmation. He then may turn to people who will accept him seemingly without conditions, as he admitted, he also turned to 'a real bad crowd' that accepted him. Too often these people who accepted him represent the counter-cultural values that the biological family have rejected.

As he has admitted he was led by others into the behaviour which conventional others are labelling undesirable. Rejection from significant others will leave little choice but to isolate or turn to others outside of the familiar unit.

You know, in my opinion that is fine. They are entitled to their opinion.

But my street family they just look at me as well this is my Matt, he has done a bad thing in the past, he is trying to turn his life around now, he is not doing it anymore, he is not actually a criminal. They don't look at me as a criminal; they just look at me as a human being. You know a person who did bad things
in the past. You know, I am actually not a bad person.

Bodys (1989) stigmatization/reintegration hypothesis suggest the process indicated here by Lawton is one that many ex-offenders experience. When a non-criminal person accepts an ex-inmate then he can more easily put the identification behind him as he becomes accepted. His positive efforts are rewarded not clouded by past disappointments.

The ones that I have developed since I have been out, a few of the people really don't trust me anymore. Others they start to trust me and one day I will get mad and say ‘fuck this all!’ You know! and this will completely destroy the trust that we have with each other, you know! The next thing you know they won’t talk to me for a while. They will talk to me but they won’t, they want me to rebuild that trust with them.

This indicates a major problem for ex-offenders. Every slip leads to a starting over. They are not granted the rights of most to make a mistake. Stigma represents that every branded person must become super-human and infallible. An ex-inmate is constantly walking a tightrope of social relations. If he begins to lose his balance then the proverbial gasp goes out that he is going to fall. Lawton’s account spells out stigma in action. Lawton has experienced rejection from his parents and other members of his family. When he expressed to friends that he is fed up, they automatically assume he is about to return to crime. For him open and honest communication does not denote understanding. He must resort to what Herman (1993) called selective concealment. With this as a pressure on reintegration Lawton is highly challenged; yet, he is still trying to live a good life free of crime.

Lawton’s recounting of his relationships indicates that he is always, in all venues, walking on eggshells. His family relationship informs a fairly common problem that ex-inmates face. Rasmusen (1995) argued what he is experiencing is a self-fulfilling expectation of criminality that imposes on ex-offenders through the stigmatization process.
Rate your amount of contact with your immediate family. Do you see or communicate with them?

Maybe once every two to three months.

Despite his being disowned he still reaches out to his biological family, which adds weight to the importance that the ex-inmate places on traditional social ties and support. It also speaks to rejection and tension that may affect reintegration.

What have you experienced in acquiring or maintaining relationships with your family?

My real family don’t want to talk to me anymore because of what I did. The way I used to act; they figure that I am not going to change so.

Then what did you do to make things easier?

I have tried to explain to them that I am trying to turn my life around but the majority of them don’t want to listen.

I have one brother and one sister that have noticed that I am trying to turn my life around. So maybe once a month, if I contact them, they will call back and we will sit for a while on the phone and they will give me advice and what not; they will actually try to help me.

What did they do to effect your reintegration?

Their attitude is just that I am a screw up -- he is going to go back.

But how has that affected you?

I am not letting it affect me; I am just feeling well that is their opinion let them have their opinion; they can drift. I know what I am doing to try to turn my life around, if they cannot accept it then that is just too bad.

Has your family been of any assistance to you?

Yes, just my one sister out west every so often I will call her and we’ll sit down and talk on the phone for a while and she will give me advice, when it comes to like looking for work or relationships.

Explain whether being an offender has had an affect on friendships, refer to those you had before you went to prison and those after you have been released.

Oh the friendships that I had before prison they are all gone, they all left town. Except for a few of them, I can tell what I did, didn’t affect them too much; they were glad to actually see me get out and they are happy to see me staying out of trouble.
Reintegration is like a teeter-totter as discussed by Motiuk and Brown (1993). It is easier to be up when the individual has support. Keve (1982) argues that offenders need a supportive prosocial network if they are going to experience success with reintegration.

In the absence of prosocial support, as argued by Bolton (1982, and 1997) the ex-inmate will seek and establish relations with those people who do accept him. These tend to be negative social influences that can lead to more criminal behaviour. Acceptance of their efforts to change need to be reinforced, but when they are not then the person is left to reject those who are negative about them, Goffman, 1959.... However, this does not stop them from reaching out from time to time to test the waters, to see if intimates have themselves changed their attitudes toward them, as argued by Herman (1993). Huque (1994) conveys the practice in Hong Kong whereby reintegration and support for offender’s immediate family is a community responsibility. In this approach reintegration and social stability are interrelated.

BILL HASBROOK: YES I AM A CRIMINAL, I HAVE LOST A LOT OF TIME

Vincent Sacco (1995) recognised in his research that “crime... is experienced as both a private trouble and a public issue.” Prison represents a loss to society and a loss to the person being imprisoned. The longer the person is in prison the greater the loss.

My life before prison was pretty simple, but not knowing why exactly but when I left prison after twelve years everything seems to be harder to deal with. I am not sure if it is the amount of time I gained and what I lost.

Hasbrook presents an interesting overview of the self-identification problem. He distinguishes being a criminal from not identifying as one.

Criminal in the sense that I did a criminal act, and went to jail, yes! Criminal in the sense where I make
Hasbrook differentiates violent crime -- he killed two people -- from property or drug trafficking. He was asked

*How about in the sense that you have been involved with crime for some time?*

*Ab, I was when I was younger and I got away from it, and the last crime that I committed was a crime of compassion.*

*I am doing a life sentence, so I am on a life sentence, ab, it was, because I stopped someone from hurting a friend of mine.*

Herman's (1993) normalization applies here; where he asks 'wouldn't any good person help a friend?' Yet Hasbrook self-identifies as a lifer as he will be part of the CJs for the remainder of his life. He will be subject to stigma and related consequences because as Allard, another respondent in this study, stated 'he is subject to increased scrutiny and can be returned to prison for non-criminal acts or public concerns.'

Hasbrook has been around, he has come to see himself as a vigilante, or knight in shining armour. This is not uncommon; offenders will justify their actions in an attempt to remove the full burden of dealing with their own actions. He also saw his previous activity as youthful and not criminal. Of significance, he differentiates criminal events from Adler's (1993) criminal careers. He too uses illegal drugs. He has been returned to prison on a number of occasions and feels that this is unjust as he usually engages in these practices with others who do not share the same social burden of the lifer stigma and parole restrictions.

*When asked,*

*Do you believe that you act differently then those who have not gone to prison; if yes, how do you act differently?*
Yes, I, ah, it's harder for me to trust somebody and then it is difficult for me to understand their side of the story because of all the activity I've been through.

This is a very interesting response. Cohen's 1966 definition of differential association makes perspective taking a challenge for ex-inmates. The issue of trust is a two-way street. The public distrusts the ex-inmate and the ex-inmate distrusts the public. These issues contribute some meaning as to why a person can have problems during reintegration.

I keep telling myself that I do not have to make up anything that it will all come to me. But to socialize with people it is a little more difficult because of the time I have lost, even after seven years of being out.

The life that I led before is not the life that I live now, and it is very hard to get back. I really don't know why it is as hard as it is. I think that it is just me having to deal with all the daily problems that I didn't have to deal with inside.

Then on the other hand I had to deal with crisis's inside that I never had to deal with on the outside. So it really twists the mind you are dealing with a lot of violence and dysfunctional people. They get mad at things that normal people wouldn't get mad at. Then you have the opposite; they are breaking down and crying at things that normally people wouldn't do on the street. So it is completely backwards.

You do that for twelve years and then you come out side again and you try to pick up where you left when you came in. And it doesn't seem to click the same way anymore. Either you get stressed out or you can't deal with it or you get too frustrated. I don't know how to explain it; it is very difficult, very difficult.

Clearly, Hasbrook is grappling with the problems of living as an ex-inmate. Living in a non-accepting community is harder than living in prison. Where the public does not recognise that it is a stakeholder in this man's success it fails to address its own problems.

He has become socially debilitated by his prison experience. None-the-less, he is astute in identifying the problems related to changing environments as in the research conducted by Davies (1985). In prison, life is the opposite of what it is on the outside. In prison, his basic needs are limited but they are met. On the outside the basic needs are more urgent yet they are more difficult to meet.
The longer the time spent in the system the more the ex-inmate becomes debilitating and socially disadvantaged as supported by Goffman (1959). Benson (1984) discusses how the effect of falling from social grace places an indelible imprint on the ex-inmate. Berger and Luckman (1977) explain that the process of institutionalizing meaning coupled with those who fit certain real definitions of social behaviour forces upon that person a semiotic that is defining of the difficulty in functioning in a normal manner.

**JAMES WOOD: YOU NEVER KNOW WHEN YOU CAN BE SENT BACK TO PRISON**

Wood gives life to a central problem faced by federal ex-inmates, they do not have to commit another criminal code offence to be sent back to the prison institution. As Erickson et al. (1973) researched he is paroled but not free.

Well it has an impact because, I mean, you know, you never know one thing might send you back to jail. I mean, there is an occasion where people, you know, didn’t do anything, where the parole thought he had done something right, and ah, you know what I mean...

In part stigma refers to the ability to remain institutionalized, not because of what you had done in the past but because you are an offender. The problem is compounded because reincarceration is not due to what the individual did or is doing but because of how he is perceived. Offenders are paroled but are not free, which speaks directly to the problem for those who are under community supervision. They are not returned to society as citizens, but as ex-inmates and people subject to public mistrust.

Ex-inmates in the halfway house see others being returned to prison. In some cases, they know that the person did not do what he was accused of perpetrating. In other cases they can empathise with the person who breached. They themselves may have had a few drinks the night before but did not get caught or as mentioned earlier did not have a
condition that barred them from drinking. They have a problem with 'survivor syndrome' on the one hand and feel fear that they could be returned to prison on the other. The fear for the federal ex-inmate is that he does not need to be deemed to have committed another offence, if support is pulled by the agency, they can be returned to prison.

In the case of Hasbrook, whose case was reviewed earlier, he was sent back to prison for associating with a woman he got pregnant. When the parole officer did a background check on her it was discovered that she had an extensive criminal record and he was prohibited from seeing her again. When she almost miscarried he broke this restriction and went to see her, he was returned to prison for breaking the association condition. His efforts to be a responsible person led to imprisonment because of another person's history. In part, this kind of treatment sends fear through all ex-inmates who come to recognise that there is no aspect of their life they cannot be sanctioned for. Wood has come to recognise that he cannot afford to do anything that might jeopardise his freedom. He cannot even appear to have done anything.

In terms of employment, he will disclose by trying to sell his accomplishments while he was in prison even though he recognises that he might not get the job by doing so. In keeping with Herman's therapeutic concealment, he will confide his identity to a person who is in a position to assist him.

We'll you know what. I don't think that I will have another employer when I leave this job. I think I will be my own employer. Now, if I don't go that route and I go the route of finding a job, I will basically tell him how I used my time in jail. And ah, he can see what I have achieved over the years and things like that.

I mean, basically, some of the things that I have done will blow him away, basically, ahm, you know, you can't tell him just that you have a criminal record. You can't do anything but tell him the truth. You might not get the job, but you know you are better off to tell the truth.
There are two key points in this message: sell your prison accomplishments, but
don't just say that you have a criminal record. The other is that it is better to tell the truth.
On the one side he recognises that to sell his achievements to an employer he may
demonstrate his value, and therefore cloak the stigmatizing information. On the other, he
cannot tell the entire truth because he could suffer the consequences for being an
offender, which could be unemployment. He also could be returned to prison when the
employer finds out that he was lied to, and records a formal complaint to the parole
authority.

Wood provides an interesting anecdote regarding disclosure. In this account, the
information about being an offender can be used in a light-hearted manner or as an
implied threat due to the person's criminal identity yet if misinterpreted he could be
reincarcerated.

Well you know, I kind of use it with my mechanic where I take my car. Ok, and I think he is
overcharging me right. So then I say listen man, "I just got out of jail, and you know, if you overcharge
me, I will have the boys come in here right now to kill you, you know what I mean."

You know for things like that I will disclose the information right. Or when it is not like someone who
doesn't know, I wouldn't really say to someone who I didn't know that information, no.

This case reflects Herman's selective disclosure criteria. The problem for ex-
offenders in the community is that being an offender has two sides to it, where people
know of the status it gives you some status (Ericson, 1978) and allows the information to
be shared in a light-hearted manner. But it also stands as a barrier to proper interactions
with people who know and potentially for those who do not (Derlaga, 2000). Wood
believes that he is better off not disclosing to people who do not know about his criminal
past. He is free to kibitz with those who do.

In terms of relationships with women he said,
No! What I would do, I would let her, you see, I would let her hear from somebody else because it would be longer then if I tell her. If I tell her now, or she waits to hear from somebody else, then I can sure it would be a lot longer and she would get to know me even better. Alright! She might never find out at all. I mean, I will tell her eventually, but you know...

This comment, when taken with his earlier assertion that it is better to tell the truth demonstrates how difficult it is for ex-inmates to negotiate the problem of disclosure. As Derlaga (2000) argues there is a cycle of disclosure with intimates. The key here is that he is not clear as to what is better, to let her find out from someone else, or to try to explain to her himself. He sees the latter course as protracted and maybe as standing as a barrier to having the time for them to get to know each other. They want people to know who they are and what they can do before they find out about the criminal stigma which leads to them never gaining access to the conventional world.

**JERRY LEWIS: I DO CRIMINAL THINGS**

Jerry Lewis articulates the position that society sees him as a criminal but that he is no more criminal than the average person. According to Davies (1985) he sees himself as a prisoner of society. He rationalizes his own behaviour in this way

_Nah. I get stoned every once and a while that is all. I guess if you want to call me criminal most people are and a lot of people would be._

This is a classic case of what Herman (1993) called normalization as some offenders (Allard case to follow) recognised, as an ex-offender he cannot do certain things Lewis has normalized the behaviours and gives himself permission to "get stoned every once in a while" which okay since most people smoke weed. He is not only considered to be a criminal by the public but also by his own actions and rationalizations.
He was asked whether he acts different, he said that the institutionalized experience has had an impact on his social demeanour,

well of course, of course you do. Because there is (sic) different things, temperaments, that you would not have jumped on someone for before prison.

When asked to explain he states

Ok somebody calls you goof; before I went to prison I thought nothing of it; I brushed it off as a slang word for you are not too smart right now or at this particular moment. If somebody calls you a goof now you punch them in the mouth; and suggest to yourself that you may have done something wrong there as you are walking away.

Clearly, Lewis does identify, he acts and thinks as a criminal would. He knows the right things to do but by conditioned reflex now acts as he did while a prisoner. He is a deviant despite his knowing how he is supposed to act. In some respects, he has a problem following a normal behavioural compass, as does every ex-offender to the degree that they occasionally give themselves permission to act in a manner that could be threatening to their freedom.

For Lewis, stigma is everywhere; to be an offender is to be exposed to problems from everyone. When asked if he has experienced or anticipates reintegration barriers due to people’s attitudes toward him, he responded,

Sure they do. The legal system does. Friends would. I guess family too.

As recounted earlier, he claims that he is no longer involved in criminal activity despite his use of illicit drugs ‘every once in a while’. Lewis has a pessimistic outlook in regards to his reintegration.

In your experience, what do you believe is meant by “assisting the offender to become a law-abiding citizen?”

To start with, I have to straighten something out, I had no intentions of coming out here. I wanted to stay in prison and finish my sentence. They forced me to come here – they forced me out of the institution.
I wrote a letter to the warden; I was going to write one to the parole board but he told me that it wouldn’t make much difference, he was going to put me out on the street anyway and if I didn’t leave and go to the parole office in twenty-four hours, he would pick up the phone and call the cops and have me taken back to jail.

This statement is quite interesting. Lewis was anxious about coming into the community on his own. He actually requested that he could remain in the institution until his warrant expiry. Parole was more threatening than life in prison. Yet, when in the community he was concerned that the warden would call the police and have him returned to jail so he complied with the condition to report to the parole office.

This also may provide some insight as to why ex-offenders breach conditions. The fear of being out causes them to place possible impediments in their path to staying out. The epic movie Shawshank Redemption provide a classic case of this phenomenon, a character who had been in prison for fifty years was to be released contemplated murder of another inmate so that he would not be released to a world he had little knowledge of.

Lewis was concerned that he could not take care of himself on the outside. He was reapplying for a disability pension while in the halfway agency. He had lost these benefits when he was returned to prison for a breach of his parole conditions after seven years living outside of the prison walls.

Lewis has not committed to a predominantly productive lifestyle. He is struggling with his ability to stay out in the face of stigma, and his own inability to provide for himself. He is on disability because he is a criminal, and the corresponding lifestyle has left him unable to function in society. In some cases stigma is disabling. Where a person recognises the factors involved in role change, Fein (1990), they can become socially paralysed as argued by Ericson (1977), Keve (1982) and Rose and Clear (1998).
Can you tell me the things that CSC provided you that have increased your ability to successfully return to society?

Nothing! I came here, the house don’t buy my clothes. I have the same pair of four underwear that, I had when I left the jail.

What assistance has the halfway house provided you in terms of increasing your ability to successfully return to society?

They don’t charge me for rent. I guess CSC pays for that while I am here. You see, but I didn’t have to come here. But since I am here they are paying. They buy my clothes they don’t buy my shoes, my underwear, and my socks my personal needs and stuff like that.

Interestingly he recants on an earlier statement that the agency does not buy his clothes. As discussed in the literature review, people like Lewis provided the focus for the halfway movement in Canada. Libby began the halfway house movement to address basic needs. Some forty years later, the ex-inmate still requires attention to their basic needs, without the ability to provide for daily needs, some will choose a return to prison.

Final comments

This concludes the initial descriptive examination of what it is like to be a criminal during the halfway stage of reintegration. The identification problem is complex playing out in the social context in a number of ways. 1) First, there are those ex-inmates who have been unambiguously criminal in lifestyle and choice. Then there are those who have both criminal and prosocial references, and Finally, those who have committed an offence and are now considered criminal. The three types have in common that they are ex-inmates attempting reintegration of a society that places barriers in their path. These three categories will be amplified in Chapter 4 as discreet types. It suffices to say that ex-inmates are left to grapple with criminal identity with little or no support from conventional
society. The study now turns to cases where the ex-inmate has attempted to manage stigma and their criminal identity during early stages of reintegration.

Managing Criminal Identity

The following extracts for the transcripts and analysis have benefited by the work of Goffman (1959...), Ericson (1977), Herman (1993) Adler (1993) on managing spoiled identity, managing social distance, coping strategies and managing transitions from a criminal career. In these accounts, the respondents recount what it means to identify as criminal and what they have done to manage reintegration. To follow are explanatory narratives as to managing the offender identity during initial reintegration to society. To some extent, these stories refer to the essence of coping with stigma.

**RAMON GARCIA: STIGMA IS PART OF THE PROCESS**

Garcia's position reflects an interesting dilemma experienced by most ex-inmates.

*Anybody who goes to jail and does time are marked as that — People will see them that way. I know that I saw people that way myself. I never thought that I would see myself in the same manner; I never thought that I would see myself sitting in them shoes.*

To be involved with crime is to gain a self-identity as an offender, as argued by Goffman et al. since 1959. To be a citizen before the offence is to have certain preconceptions of offenders, and this tends to increase the shame associated with becoming something that you once despised or discounted. To be a citizen and then to become an offender causes a serious split in self-identity that can impact on reintegration.

Garcia believes that the offender stigma represents an indelible blot on his life.

*Ah, it has had an effect, it has had a big effect in that I robbed a bank. In the other way coming out wasn't extremely bad, but it was a big adjustment as far as dealing with the fact that you are a criminal.*
You are looked at as a criminal forever. Basically that was the only situation that I had that really sticks in my mind.

Being an offender impacts on the identities of ex-inmates directing attention to the importance the label holds to reintegration. They must believe that there is hope for them to become a citizen again, without blemishes, based on their efforts to reintegrate as a law-abiding citizen. As Benson (1984) argued, they need to recover from their fall from grace.

JOHN ROSER: I DID SOME STUPID THINGS AND NOW I HAVE TO SHOW THAT I HAVE CHANGED

Roser appeared in the interview to be a very sensitive man. His experience was captured in the research of Benson (1984) in what occurs when a person falls from grace. He had this to say about how stigma was attached to his self-identification.

No, I don’t consider myself to be criminal, I am forced to take that role right now but I don’t feel like a criminal.

Despite claiming to not self-identify as a criminal he acknowledges that in society, he is “forced to take that role” (Fein (1990). Roser is engaged in what Goffman (1963) management of his spoiled identity. In an account of his experience, he explained:

Well it is kind of hard to answer that one because everyone who knew me from before this happened right; the only thing that I hear from them is that I was stupid to do this. Before I hung out with some very, like, people known in the community. I felt really, like, I let them down by doing what I did. There are some of them that I can’t even just go up and face up to right now. And they are powerful people in what they do and it is like I just had to stay away from them. Stay away from them -- don’t really make them see me.

Avoidance is a method of managing reintegration. Roloff and Ifert (2000) discuss this approach at length. In their account this approach leads to social isolation. Roser feels that he must deal with his shame by avoiding social contacts that could contribute to easing the process of reintegration.
My mom, she is like one of those real estate, not a real estate agent, she works for realtors and she manages all the buildings. Those for instance, she works for ________, she is like she knows everybody. And everybody comes and asks me like you know, why did you get yourself to do this? and all that kind of stuff.

Right now she has all that weight on her shoulders, as I do have on mine. The weight of saying well you don’t have to believe but I have this on my shoulders too.

I don’t think that you guys would want me to do that because some of the properties that, especially that her... are in her portfolio some really, really nice properties so she takes care of them. I don’t think that they would want somebody like me there, unless I really had straightened out.

Explain to them the involvement in what I did, where I was coming from and all that stuff; they could see that I have been in the front then they might give me a job, that kind of job

Roser has experienced stigma from people who know and work with his mother. They have empathy for her position and do not recognise that he too has suffered because of his actions. He recognises that they will not trust him near any of their properties. This affects his employment opportunities as discussed by Brand and Claiborn (1976).

He also feels responsible for placing scrutiny on his mother by the people she works with. In some ways some people feel that the leaf does not fall far from the tree. For those who respect his mother the stigma is more pronounced because they cannot see how he could have become criminal given the character of his mother. Her virtue makes him more suspect.

He recognises that he will have to explain and prove himself to people before they may decide to trust him again. Yet, he avoids contact with them making it impossible for them to recognise that he has changed. He seeks to avoid people who condemn him for his criminal behaviour.

He has experienced stigma and must manage the effects. Roser may say that he does not feel like an offender but his account belies this claim. Roser manages his
offender identity by acknowledging that the correctness of his return to conventional life is tied to his proving that he no longer will make the stupid mistakes that allowed him to be labelled as an offender. He now carries a burden that will require that he can prove that he is acceptable.

_BILL ALLARD: THE BURDEN OF CARRYING THE CRIMINAL LABEL_

Becker (1961) defined the process of becoming an outsider. Allard explains this in terms of the burden of carrying the criminal label. In responding to the question about what he has experienced during his reintegration.

_Yes. I have an extra burden, which can result in my re-incarceration through the venue of an argument or a disagreement._

_So you can be re-incarcerated because of anti-social behaviour, not criminal but anti-social behaviours!_  

_Not anti-social behaviour something that would be accepted by someone without a criminal record._

_Because of less tolerance for certain otherwise social behaviour_

_More bias. The system is set up in such a way that although you are not doing anything either socially or legally wrong, you still have the threat that the person can say a few lies, if you want to go legal, cause a charge of mischief to be laid against themselves in order to incarcerate me._

_Allard describes his experience in three elemental ways: He has an extra burden; Members of the public take certain things for granted which the offender cannot; he is unable to do some socially practiced activity without risking a return to prison. I.e. He cannot drink alcohol; he cannot stay out overnight; he cannot have a relationship with a woman without her being subjected to assessment by a parole officer. He is subject to_
sanction, not because he is doing anything offensive but simply because he has parole conditions. If a member of the public says for instance that he is threatening, he can be returned to prison. The person may not, in his opinion, be truthful in their assertions, yet they can get him returned to prison. This is a central problem for offenders. Tannenbaum's (1939) dramatisation of evil places the offender in a precarious position.

As Goffman (1959...) explains the person bearing the known stigma is discredited in all areas of social interaction. As Berger and Luckman (1967) offered, truth is a social construct. The reality for the person with the stigma is that they are subject to the construction of their identity based on nothing more than the social meaning attached to their past behaviour. Giving members of society power to impact on them in ways that they do not have at their disposal renders them, as Davies (1985) argued, prisoners of society. The offender has undergone a social role change as argued by Fein (1990)

He explains why people may fear him.

Yes. People are given to give rise to all the horror stories that they have ever heard. So they are most forefront in their minds when they are trying to deal with you. They try not to show it a lot of times, and some of them... some of them despise you outright; but you know when you are in my position.

He is very sensitive to his position as an offender. So much so, that for him people's body language can be translated as their fear of his imposed identity. He also speaks of those people who despise him outright because he is an offender. His fixed identity is impossible to negotiate since he is a lifer and will be one for the balance of his natural life. Notwithstanding, he believes, as Body's (1989) research revealed, overtime people might come to accept the person despite the criminal stigma.

When you want to pursue it, you have to do it in such a way as to gain their interest in you. So that you do not become the pursuer, they become the pursuer.
Petrino (2000) recognised this technique discussed this in balancing secrets of disclosure. Because of the attendant risk, the ex-offender must become passive in his attempts to be accepted by others, according to the accounts of Allard. The inference here is that you never want your intentions to be misconstrued because you are an offender, so you don’t reveal them as argued by (Derlaga et. al, 2000) and Herman in the description of selective concealment.

As argued by Bodys (1989)

You experience the barriers coming down the longer that the relationship goes on. And the more interpersonal reaction that you have with the person eventually all the horror stories slide back into their allotted spaces that they were in before and they no longer perceive you as the imminent threat.

Fact becomes fiction. The fact that I am a parolee, and the fact that I am accused and convicted of some horrendous crime that is already a fact, so as time goes on the person gets to know you the fiction that they have... They see you as just another person who has this background.

In interpreting Allard’s transcript he has suffered consequences by being convicted of murder for his past adherence to directives within the criminal subculture. He was there but he was not involved in the murder. He would not ‘rat’ on the others who he claims were the perpetrators of the murder so it was pinned on him.

Consequently, he considers that any associated sanction such as he can be returned to prison because someone indicates that he is or has done something offensive not necessarily criminal is unfair. He has experienced this. He was returned to prison on a breach based on nothing more than a suspicion of a supervisor that he had used alcohol. He subsequently spent seven years in prison on this breach.

Again, he claims that the allegations were as false as with the initial conviction. He may be in chronic denial or he may in fact be the victim of a system whereby a person who is discredited is subject to the whim of societal institutions and its officers.
Allard's attitude about being an offender has been mixed. It is interesting that he believes that overtime he can be accepted by those who get to know him. He is struggling with being like everyone else but must reconcile his fear of the power that others have over his freedoms. Because his pleas can be seen as denial and attempts at avoidance of responsibility for his actions, he clearly lives as an offender, acting and thinking as a criminal and is subject to all the negative consequences that can accompany this identity. To some extent, his assertion that he is a victim of society renders him a threat and a concern to supervisors, as he explained.

**BILL MOORE: I DON'T LIKE OTHERS KNOWING MY CRIMINAL IDENTITY**

This account reflects on the argument put forth by Adler (1993) about the problem with reintegrative shaming. It may serve to imprint on the offender that he is flawed and that he needs to subjugate his life to others who can guide him in his reintegration. That is, the process of shaming is a negative reinforcement on the identity of the person being shamed despite Braithwaite's (1989) position that reintegrative shaming is curative.

*Very uncomfortable, I don’t like people knowing my identity being an offender. You know, I still have trouble dealing with that. There is guilt and shame involved in that, I don’t like that.*

Moore has an extensive criminal history he is trying to put behind him. Braithwaite (2000) admits that reintegrative shaming may not apply for people have considerable experience in the criminal subculture. Moore hopes to hide his criminal identity because he does not trust people’s reaction. He has experienced stigma despite his attempts to change. When asked what has occurred during his reintegration, he stated,

*I don’t know, I guess other than experiencing the distrust of other people. You know people find out that...*
you are a criminal and they are eerie (sic) of it, but you know I have experienced ab, my employer. He has nothing against my background as being a criminal he has given me a chance to work. He likes my work ethic and he thinks that I am a good guy. I don't really have a very, have a very big social life outside of my family and my work. So I don't really know how other people consider me and I really don't give a fuck.

Moore found that his employer did not care that he was an ex-inmate. As argued by Ericson (1974) these employers are “tolerant because of the conditions of employment (p. 24)”. People with little direct or specialized experience or expertise can accomplish the work. In this, the employer can take advantage of people who require work of any kind and will work on the cheap. Moore works with three people two of them are from the halfway agency. His life is restricted in the early stages of reintegration to people who are aware of his background. He has expressed that he does not care about other people’s opinion, yet he does not want others to know about his past.

He rejects those who would see him as only an offender. He is comfortable with people who are involved in his life in a monitoring capacity. He resents the fact that he is not able to be like normal people.

How I act differently, no, I can’t make, I can’t do things that normal people can do. I can’t go places ab, I also have a criminal mind that thinks like a criminal, whereas, quote, unquote the norm doesn’t. So yeah.

Well sometimes I act scared. Like I could be in a situation, I hear a police car behind me, automatically my criminal mind thinks oh fuck they are coming after me. Whereas a normal person, there is no reaction; they will just keep going about their way.

I have different ... my automatic thought when I have a chance to snatch something my automatic thought is to do it. Whereas a normal person wouldn’t think that way. So I have to continue to stay on top of my thinking; whereas it is natural for a normal person.

The most supportive relationship exists with his sister, which demonstrates his lack of confidence that others trust his ability to reintegrate society. He has experienced
mistrust in his dealing with most people. His feeling about his offender self leads to his lack of confidence in his own ability to reintegrate.

*My sister. She has been most supportive. I spend most time with her. Ah, she always, ah, giving me positive criticism. She is always stepping on my toes when I do something wrong.*

*When I look at a girl, she smacks me on the back of the head. You know, part of my downfall are (sic) relationships finding toxic relationships. And every time I talk to a girl. She will allow me to talk, but when we get home, it is ok, what did you talk about. Oh yea, waa waa waa waa waa, she, a hundred questions, no I don't want to talk about it __________, yea you are going to talk. So she's right there. Right there.*

During the early stages of his reintegation he does not resent this intrusion into everything he does. Lubimiv (1978) researched this connection between recidivism and resocialization where there is a fear that his sister's concerns can become reinforcing of the offender label. The problem related to closely monitoring ex-offenders is the presumption that they will fail without close scrutiny by others. According to his account, he is ashamed of himself and is aware that he himself cannot control his social interactions. He does not trust himself to make the decisions that he will need to make to stay out of prison. This position relates to Adler's argument about Braithwaite's (1989) reintegrative shaming. The process of shaming can produce a self-loathing and self-doubt that debilitates the ex-offender in his reintegration.

However, the question is will this acceptance of criticism persist, where everything that he does is suspect and subject to scrutiny and sensor. 'She will allow me to talk,' means that he has subjugated his 'life world' to the direction of conventional others. He has little faith in his own ability to make good choices. As Goffman (1963) stated "every relationship obliges the related person too exchange and appropriate amount of intimate facts about self, as evidence of trust and mutual commitment" (p. 86). When disclosure is one sided as with Moore trying to appease the concerns of his sister,
this may be evidence that there is a commitment to reintegration that has not been internalized. The conventional person is living the life for the non-conventional person.

**SHAWN GREEN: I HIDE MY IDENTITY AS A CRIMINAL FROM OTHERS**

Green copes with stigma by keeping the information to himself for the most part. Derlaga et al. (2000) investigation of self-disclosure speaks directly to the problems that Green seeks to avoid. Green experienced stigma in his efforts to reintegrate. Like Roser, he does not let people see him as an offender. He has tried to keep his identity secret; he acknowledges how much he has changed as a result of the time that he spent in prison.

He had this to say about whether others see him as criminal.

*Definitely not, nobody at work knows who I am.*

*My family they have been so supportive and they know what my family meant and whatnot.*

The prison experience has changed him and he believes that this may affect his ability to be accepted by others.

*Yes I do. Number one with this car and stuff. I had a hard time thinking that I had to go to the ministry about the car dealer. I thought, I don't want to rat on this guy and it took me a while. It took me two weeks to decide to do it. So stuff like that I learned inside, keep your mouth shut. You know keep your eyes closed and mouth shut.*

The effects of correctional institutionalization are recurrent themes throughout the sample despite the insulation some have because of other social factors. He is secretive and does not easily allow new people to access the discrediting feature of his life. Derlaga's (1993) self-concealment scale applies in this and other cases like it.

*Explain to me how you think people would treat you differently.*

*I think that people would be afraid, especially if they do not know me. Now there are a few people up where I go, and they do know who I am, and there is no problem. But maybe there would be some others that would be afraid.*
Interestingly, Green has not had problems with people who know of his criminal identity. He anticipates rejection would occur with people who did not really know him or the person he was before he murdered someone. Despite acceptance by some of those who know, there is still the fear of rejection, so he chooses, where it is an option, to not disclose. He applies Herman’s selective concealment. He, as do others who use this technique, identifies as a criminal but does not choose to take this on as a master status, so he attempts to hide the information. This two-edged sword is a problem all ex-offenders face.

Do you think that they whisper behind your back?

Yea, yea I think that because of the different actions that I have. I listen to some of the people up there and I say, I can tell if this guy has been inside or not, and he might be able to tell that I have been inside from somebody else.

Despite saying that no one at work knows, he is afraid that he now acts like a criminal and another criminal can ‘out’ him. As such he is very vulnerable to people because some can associate certain behaviour that he now has as existing as a consequence of his imprisonment.

Explain how some people, who know that you are an offender, treat you differently since you have returned to the community.

Again, I was lucky because with my family, I was always close. I think that the ones that were more interested and whatnot, were more relaxed.

There is an important point raised by Green, ‘those who were most interested were more relaxed’. The fact that others do not choose to talk about his past makes him uncomfortable. So in one case the ex-inmate may not disclose but this lack of disclosure on this subject causes stress. Stigma can occur as a result of silence between the person bearing the stigma and the other.
It is important to disclose as Derlaga et al. (2000) suggests. It is even more important to be able to discuss the stigmatizing event(s) with others, in that way when the relationship progresses, the fear of having details found out, or the fear of having the problem thrown into their face is more manageable. During the interview Green expresses how silence affects him.

*Have you experienced any roadblocks with those people who know?*

*No. The only thing that I feel sometimes is that they don’t indulge; they don’t ask. So it puts me a little, especially relatives, they don’t ask what happened or why, so it puts a little tension.*

Green supports his position. Those who do not ask are thought to have negative feelings toward him. He has had a good experience for the most part with his parents but there are still indications that stigma has affected him in negative ways. When people are not addressing the stigma, he experiences tension; he also lives in fear of disclosing to others and therefore is not as opened or sociable as he would like to be. The tension that he refers to may affect his reintegration success (as explored by the research of Lubimiv, 1978 and Ericson, 1977).

*ALAN BRADLEY: PEOPLE DON’T BELIEVE THAT I HAVE CHANGED*

One of the key elements of stigma and reintegration is the disbelief that a person must undergo a substantial role change (Fein, 1990). The problem was captured by Sandy Reutzel (1997); she asked the question “how can we effect change in ourselves and those around us without forcing people to conform to one segment of society’s methods of control?” a rebellious learned disposition of many offenders begs this question. Once labelled as non-conformist they have a hard time convincing others that they are now able and willing to conform.
Alan Bradley believes that society views him as a criminal. In this respect he reflects Fein’s (1990) findings where he investigated the relationship between role change and resocialization. Fein (1990) discovered that the process of change is challenged as a result of creditability. Once a person is known for one thing it becomes difficult for them to be seen in a different social role. Bradley’s experience is similar to that of Allard with a more fatalistic attitude toward managing stigma.

I believe that people do so. Yea, the minute you go to jail, you become a criminal in the eyes of society.

Well, my lifestyle that I choose now is what you would call normal. But normal people don’t understand it. I can’t really live how other people want me to live. Because when I live in righteousness, I do it right. There are people who see you doing right and they don’t understand what you are doing; they think you are going crazy either way. So you can’t really live by other people; you have to live for yourself.

Bradley has chosen to not internalize the social reaction of others who view him with suspicion. He recognises that they think he is ‘crazy either way’ and to accept this is to separate himself from them.

He is now known as an offender therefore, he is discredited which accords with the findings by Goffman (1959-1969). He expressed that whether the ex-offender is engaged in crime or not people consider him to be mentally and spiritually flawed. He uses a reliance on his faith in his god to manage his reintegration.

Despite the claim that he is living in “righteousness” he believes that he has to lie to get a job. He cannot let an employer know that he is an ex-offender or he will not likely be hired, he chooses to lie. As such he is forced into an ex-inmate’s dilemma. This accords with the literature as argued by Goffman (1961), Brand and Claiborn (1976), and Motiuk and Brown (1993). Bradley elaborates on the connection as follows:

Sometimes you have to lie because you have been out for short period of time, where you can’t really explain where you have been on your resume for that period of time. And with the honest words, you lie.
And sometimes the requirement for work, you always have something in the back of your mind, like you don’t want to know that people know that you were in jail because you would not likely, not to get the job.

And I guess that I don’t blame them. It is not fair, but what can you do, it is just the kind of society that we live in.

Again, we see that the ex-offender must accept the condemnation of others and employ techniques to avoid detection as in Herman’s selective concealment strategy. He must see himself through the eyes of the public, “I guess I don’t blame them”. In some ways, the ex-offender must agree with the right of the public to view him as flawed without allowing it to defeat him.

But I try not to let it bother me what other people think about me rather than what I want to do with my life. I can’t really base it on other people. Then I would never move forward.

He summarizes how he manages his status as an offender as not letting it interfere with his desire to move on, stay out of prison or become integrated. Bradley also addresses the problems related to stigma in this way:

So you can’t really live by other people; you have to live for yourself.

You do what you need to do to stay out. The ex-inmate needs to accept the added demands placed on him, ‘you do them and then go home’. Bradley continues.

the law is founded on this. There are conditions to respect the law, and if you don’t there is (sic) consequences.

The ex-inmate experience is the same as any other citizen, in that he has to live within the law, except that his burden is extraordinary whereby breaches of some elementary laws or parole conditions can result in his return to prison. In this case an employer who discovers that a person is an offender and that he deceived him to get a job could complain to parole and have the person’s parole revoked. In this way stigma is
institutionalized, whereby an ex-inmate remains discredited despite the decision to return him halfway to society.

Many ex-inmates have conditions that become legal prohibitions as Allard stated ‘that are not against the law for others’. Bradley had no prohibition against drinking, yet he could be living in the same halfway environment as Allard thus exacerbating the stigma that Allard feels. So they are subject to persecution because of the label that they carry.

When ask whether his prison experience has an effect on his ability to remain in the community, he responded,

\textit{it has made me a better person.}

This statement requires some examination. He continues,

\textit{not jail itself the experience through people, ah, ...for me the staff member and the guards, from the attitude of the volunteers” have made me change for the better. Yea, definitely it has yea, the way others have been inside they have helped me to stay out.}

Lubimiv (1978) spoke directly to the influence that correctional staff can have on ex-detainees. He said “if there is to be development in the therapeutic community approach to prison programs, the role and the importance of each individual staff member must be recognised.”

Bradley explains,

\textit{when you go through so many negatives, negatives, negatives, where you find very little positive then if you take advantage of the positive – When you take that home and work with it, then it is a choice and a decision that you got to make.}

This speaks directly to the central position taken by Lubimiv. “Most offenders have deep-seated sense of unworthiness and rejection.”

The effects of interacting with the authorities in prison has directed Bradley to choose to avoid going back to prison, where before the experience he was somewhat
cavalier about consequences. He has learned that being involved in the criminal justice system is negative. If he is to avoid continued exposure then he must ignore the negatives and concentrate on positives.

I found that in jail -- I mean that I don't like when people tell me all the time to go to bed. And they tell me what time I have to get up.

But now in the halfway agency I got to live by the other people that are trying not to tell you when to go to bed and when to get up but rather they help you to address your problems. So you have a whole bunch of combinations that you can put it all together and say 'put the pieces together'. I think that I will accept this and forget about the rest. In this way, I found a lot of spiritual help in jail, which I didn't choose on the street but I did find that in jail (bold text added or substituted for clarity).

Despite efforts taken by Bradley to change his lifestyle, he is coping with the realization that some people do not see him as changed. Assistance comes from those who help him to focus on positives forgetting the negative aspects of reintegration. This is a theme repeated frequently throughout the twenty-three transcripts.

Motiuk and Brown (1993) speak to meeting the needs for affecting reintegration. The ex-inmate has endured the negatives of prison and found himself turning to positives, in Bradley's case his spirituality, to pull him through, in this he has balanced the secret of disclosure as argued by Petronio (2000). He believes that if he can maintain the sense that all can be managed that he will be fine.

**BILL JENSEN: WELL I PUT THE LABEL ON MYSELF**

Bill Jensen represents an interesting success story for a person who has made a transformation from essentially criminal to a productive member of society. Jensen is a man who had a dominant criminal identity that landed him in prison for more than seventeen years. The road to reintegration has not been paved for him, but he has made
significant strides on his own that will make reintegration manageable in the early stages of his release. However, like all ex-inmates he is still dealing with the stigma that relates to his past criminal behaviour.

Please explain whether you think that others (probes: family, friends, co-workers, etc.) view you as a criminal?

Yes, oh yea.

And how does that make you feel?

Well, I put the label on myself all the years of criminal activity. Now that I am out, it is up to me now. So I have to prove myself so that they don’t think that no more.

Jensen believes that reintegration and a return to normal status can be earned.

He was determined during his last term in prison to make a change in his life by modifying his behaviours. He recognises the importance of stress management and techniques such as Herman’s selective avoidance of disclosure. When he was asked if he saw himself a criminal he made this admission.

Yea.

Why?

Because of my last, past life everything had to do with criminal activity. There wouldn’t be anything that I did in society wasn’t against the law. From day one that I get out the institution or whether it be two days or whether it be a month that I am out, not much over a month ever. I mean everything in my past was always to get boozey, and it didn’t matter what I did to get it, if it was there and I could take it was gone. And I thought nothing of it if I wanted it then I took it and if it meant money to me to get boozey it was even more of a challenge to get it. Everything and everybody that I hung around with were alcoholics and criminal, like criminally orientated.

I guess after the last sentence that I got; I said fuck it; I have had enough. That was it! I worked inside the joint to get out.

For the first time!

Yea, for the first time! Seventeen years and eleven months I had in, so.

Adler (1993) describes this process as “burning out”. Given correctional institutionalization and addictions he has approached reintegration with a mind to succeed.
He should have problems gaining and maintaining employment but he has adopted strategies for managing these factors as well. As almost every respondent has said at one time during the interview the ex-inmate has to be prepared to prove himself; he must be extraordinary before acceptance occurs.

Does your boss know that you are an offender? If yes, did you tell him?

No! My supervisor does, he knows that I live in a halfway house. He doesn’t know what for.

Do you plan to reveal your offender identity to your employer?

Well, I mean if it ever came to an issue where he called me in the office and said I am bearing rumours that you are living in a halfway house, and that you have a record, ‘would you enlighten me on a little bit of this’. I would tell him ‘yes’, I would say ‘sure, yes I am living in a halfway house getting my life straighten out. You know this job is helping me to do that.’

What have you experienced in maintaining employment?

Keeping my job? I mean it is pretty easy keeping a job, all you have to do is be there and work hard. Be there a half an hour early every time, and just work my best, and at the end of the day go home.

This accords with the research done by Brand and Claiborn (1976) where the comportment of the ex-offender has an impact on acceptance in a job situation. As a result of bridging social distance ideals and practices Jensen found that he was able to maintain work. A good work ethic led for him to maintaining employment.

Do your fellow employees treat you differently because you have spent time in prison?

They all know.

How did they find out?

I told them.

Why did you tell them?

Because I am covered with tattoos arm and arm are done, so when they saw them when I change at work they say, holy Christ.

Plus I get a ride from a guy and he picks me up everyday. And I mean, when I invite him in for a coffee, you have to let him know, because you have to sign in and sign out. So yea, I told the guys that I am living in a halfway house right now, and so they know; they don’t treat me any different.
Jensen had experienced stigma with his co-workers in terms of their reaction to his physical presence. They did not reject him out of hand, but as the supervisor stated, "I have heard rumours". He has been tested in his first month and a half on the job.

I think at first, my supervisor after he found out, I noticed the week after that it was work, work, work; he worked the shit out of me. I don't know if that was to get me to quit, or he thought that I would get pissed off and go tell him to go and fuck himself, but even the guys that I was working with he told them, 'work that bastard; work him hard'. And they would tell me, don't get pissed at me. At the end of the day they would say he told me to work the shit out of you today, so that is what I had to do.

Its alright! I was wondering why you did that but I had at the back of the mind that that is probably why". I think now he is coming around, because he is starting to know me a little better, so I think that things are starting to even out again.

Jensen had to work harder than anyone else to maintain employment. In fact, his co-workers were ordered to punish him. They were fearful of him "don't get pissed at me". More to the point, he had to exercise self-control in dealing with the burden laid on him by his supervisor. Because he was an offender, the supervisor solicited the involvement of his co-workers in putting him through the paces.

In keeping with Bodys (1992), the problem seems to have eased as Jensen proved that he could handle the added burden without acting inappropriately. However, he has not been at his place of employment long and it is possible that the putting him through his paces will resurface because he is an offender. He cannot afford to react to this behaviour in any manner indicating that he is upset or the full attribution of 'offender' may be affixed and he will be unemployed or back to square one in his effort to reintegrate.

What have you experienced in acquiring employment?

I didn't have a problem, I found out that this place was hiring, so I took my resume... it showed me at the same place for seventeen years. I put auto bodywork because that is what I did in the joint, they didn't ask where I had done. I just put on there that I have been an auto body man for the last seventeen years.
When he looked at my resume, 'oh jeez, you have been there a while.' I said 'oh, yea' I didn't tell him any information that he don't have to know.

And he asked me when I could start; I said 'I could start next week if you like'. I am getting my tow motor license right now, so Friday I will be done then I will have it; I can come here and start. So that is basically how that happened. The first job that I applied for is the first job that I got so I didn't have a problem.

This is another indication of Herman's (1993) selective concealment. He allowed the person to believe that he was actually working in the private sector and that he allowed the interviewer to believe that the time he had spent in the Kingston area was not for punishment but that it was for employment.

Work in prison and work release helped him to manage the problems related to correctional institutionalization so that he had the confidence to believe that he could function in the community. As argued by Motiuk (undated) and others, relevant work experience inside plays a part in preparing a person for reintegration. Work while inside increases a person's ability to find and to maintain employment when released so long as they can hide that the experience was obtained while in prison.

Do you plan to disclose your offender identity to potential employers?

Not unless they ask.

In this case, work in prison and work release helped him to manage the problems related to correctional institutionalization so that he had the confidence to believe that he could function in the community. As determined by the research of Motiuk (undated, internet) and others, relevant work experience inside plays a part in preparing a person for reintegration. According to this account and the argument of Townsend (1996) work while inside increases a person's ability to find and to maintain employment when released, as long as they can hide the fact that the experience was obtained while in
prison. According to Jansen, the fear of rejection leads offenders to not disclose as shown in the research conducted by Derlaga (1993) et al. and Goffman (1959).

**BOBBY BISHOP: I DON'T WANT TO BE HURT**

Not wanting to be hurt is not unique to ex-inmates. Self-preservation impacts on decisions to disclose or not disclose (Roloff and Ifert, 2000; Goffman, 1959).

Yes, that is a big question. The one that I use is the one of self-preservation and not wishing to be hurt so therefore I don't tell anyone anything that is none of their business or not relevant to the situation. And anything, any situations where it would be relevant, I guess, I explain the situation without giving any apologies.

Because I don't feel that I have to apologize to anyone, number one. And basically when it comes to that point it is out on the table and see how the other person responds. And depending on how they respond governs my reaction. And if they respond negatively, and it is a social setting or anything else I write them off. So as I said I want apologize to anyone.

If it is a work environment or something like that, if it comes up, I will explain the situation and if they don't like it then we will have to try to find a way to come to some sort of equitable arrangement regarding it.

Bishop recognizes that the best way to deal with stigma is to avoid those who would act negatively toward him. He attempts to educate the people who have a negative reaction to his past, but if that fails, he ignores them. As argued by Derlaga, 2000) negotiating status is an ongoing challenge for ex-inmates.

According to the literature the primary consideration when making a decision to disclose is premised on avoiding hurt. If the person can hide in plain sight then he believes that no one is harmed if barriers are put in place by disclosure then the decision to disclose may be rejected.

If the information about oneself can cause harm then don't give it something that appears to be unanimously agreed upon — that criminals are untrustworthy. As there are
occasions where there is a need to convey the information in some manner it is hurtful to be found out and stigmatized. The anticipation of being found out or stigmatized causes tension. Bishop exhibits his jailhouse tattoos until there is a negative reaction then he will hide them.

To a point because of my chosen lifestyle I have a lot of tattoos and yet that does affect me. But as for how I conduct myself now, comport myself, yes, that also. As to how I comport myself now, if you take away the tattoos they accept me the way that I am.

When I am out in public the way I act is fine on a face-to-face basis. I am not trying to say that the tattoos were a mistake, because I enjoy them. But there are some people who don’t like them, some do, ‘oh my god look at that’. In that situation I cover them up.

Bishop admits that in many respects he is different and he has to hide indication of his past from the new people he meets. His decision to show signs of who he is indicates his desire to disclose through non-direct methods.

Reintegration is not easy, as the prison experience has had an impact on him. The violence that he experienced in prison has led to his feeling estranged from others who have not had the same exposure.

I have had a different experience then they have had. They did not wake up at six in the morning hearing a guy screaming because his throat was cut. At least I hope that they haven’t.

The experience in prison was the result of his being convicted of murder. Yet the thought of others experiencing extreme violence is a concern for him. He understands that his label as an offender is something that he will have to manage until he dies because people imagine the worst when they find out that he is a convicted murderer.

Why? Because what happened, happened, I am serving my time, I served my time inside, and I am serving my time outside, and I will serve my time until I die. And that is just the way it is. There is no hiding it. What is the point?

Yes! Sometimes there was a bit of intimidation, I believe. Intimidation on their part because of who they thought I might be. But there was also aggression toward myself. It is like ‘he used to be in jail, he is a
tough guy you know, lets see if we can get a row out of him. Lets see if he is as tough as he thinks he is. It goes both ways.

Most times I didn't tell them, most times it came in through the back door. Number one, when you look at the tattoos on me and I go strolling in with my vest on. A lot of people are [inaudible] they know people who have been inside or they have been there themselves. They can recognize jailhouse tattoos when they see them. So the first thing they say is where did you do time? How long did you do? Well then, this is it. A lot of it is just deduction on their part, rather than me raising the flag.

Again some behaviours or physical manifestations of being in prison reveal the identifying information to other people, or they believe that it does. In this case, Bishop believes that others recognise them as labelling him an offender. As he says, I reveal them "by wearing my vest" and they deduce that I have done time. In this way, he avoids having to explain the information to people because they can deduce from his appearance the offender identity and choose to leave him alone or to interact with him openly. Disclosure does not need to be verbal to be effective.

BOBBY MADDUX: I CAN'T FORGIVE MYSELF

One of the most interesting problems involved with being an ex-inmate is where forgiveness is forthcoming from others but the individual cannot forgive himself. Does Ericson (1974) state that there is no stigma in this case? "The primary condition under which a person is likely to be fundamentally stigmatized is where there is unanimous opinion among all relevant social groups that he is essentially criminal" (p. 16), including the offender as a "relevant social" entity. The answer here is that when an offence is recognised by others or by the offender, then the offender stigmata is attached to the person. It is not always barring in all circumstances, but as Derlaga (1993) stated it can come back at some future time to result in a negative stigma. Maddux speaks to this problem and another interesting phenomena concerning employment.
The nature of the crime was very horrendous as far as I am concerned as far as anyone is concerned. So it is something that I can never forget. I know that some people have said they have forgiven me, but it is harder for me to do the same for myself. I am not sure that I will ever be able to do that but the only thing that I can do is try to be a better person now and work on me.

Maddux recognises the problem that at the time people offend they have made a decision to do so. Where they do not trust themselves this leaves them concerned that they are more than capable of making decisions that are offensive. Maddux when asked, What has it been like for you to start living a normal lifestyle?

Hard. Not easy. You have to learn different spots, different beliefs change your beliefs. A lot of things in life are not the same as you thought they were, so you change the way you have to think about things.

People have not been abusive instead he found that some people are walking on eggshells. They expect me to fly off the handle over nothing, when the actual fact is I have more self-restraint now than before.

He believes, as many do, that people have not been able to distinguish that he is not the same person who did the "horrendous" act. Not only are they walking on eggshells, so is Maddux and all ex-inmates. The feeling is hard for many to manage.

It is not a pleasant feeling. It is not nice having people walk around you like their scared or don't know what to say or are cautious of what they say about you or around you, it makes your whole life different.

Maddux had an interesting experience with stigma at work. Because he tried to help someone else from the halfway agency, find employment, he found that he was questioned as to his criminal status.

Because at some point, I got somebody here a job and their parole officer phoned, and the shift supervisor came up to me and asked me what was this person in a federal prison for. And I couldn’t tell him. So I had to… they asked me to go and talk to him and ask him. And they wanted to know if it was to do with thefts or frauds or anything like that, and that is the only reason he could be a security risk to the company. So I went and asked him and he told me it wasn’t to do with that, and I had to tell them. And they asked me, well were you in prison too, I am kind of an honest person, so I didn’t lie so I said yes.

The result of this exchange was as could be expected.
I got dismissed.  
Did the other guy get dismissed as well?  
No, he is still working there.

Irvin Waller (1979) found that any record connected to an assault had profound negative impact on employment, suggesting that the kind of crime has something to do with the degree of stigma that the person will have. In this case, it was apparent that Maddux's crime was interpreted by the business as one that may compromise the integrity of the organisation.

*REGGIE HARRIS: THE ACCIDENT CHANGED MY LIFE*

Reggie Harris represents a case of Fein's (1990) role-change. According to this theory, a person who was a functional member of society and then a defining social action occurs where he no longer is in the role(s) he had then he will undergo a role change (Fein, 1990) resulting in social dysfunction in the early stages of this transformation. Harris had a defining event other than his criminal acts that changed the course of his life. He was self-reported as prosocial before an industrial accident changed his life. He recounted his present state as his living with a disability.

He stated that

*since my accident, yea, I am a criminal*

He has appeared as an offender to others. He attempts to modify this

*now that they see me now, the way they see me now today, no. but, by the time I cut my hand up until I got arrested for the aggravated assault and everything, yea, I was a criminal. But the way they see me now, you know they don't.*
He admits that since the accident he has been a criminal, but now that he is in the hallway house, people do not see him as such. His transcript revealed that he has in fact been a criminal since his accident.

He reasons

*Ok, but I am saying they don’t know about it and so therefore they don’t see me as being a criminal.*

Here is an important distinction from that of Green’s. Harris would like to believe that although he is still involved with criminal activity that he can hide it from others. Later in the interview he revealed how he was able to fool his parents while using their house to store stolen goods and drugs. He believes that they didn’t know that he was involved in criminal activity.

> I am very lucky to have... my mom and dad have been most supportive. Just being so loving, being there. I mean not, like not forgetting my past but not throwing it in my face and not saying like... you know. I used to bring stolen things home and store them in the garage. My parent’s house used to be under surveillance. I put them through hell. I am so lucky that they are, it is unbelievable. Because I have talked to guys, their parents just gave up on them. They don’t have a mother or a father. I have a mother and a father, I consider myself very lucky.

Harris has strong family support. Harris also represents a different coping mechanism; he hopes that he will not be discovered in his present activity. But he recognises that his criminal past is defining and that people have not forgotten but have forgiven, again however, what they don’t know won’t hurt him. In this case acceptance has been enabling, in Green’s case it will act as a buffer against stigma.

Harris developed into a criminal that he admits no one should trust. Yet he perceives that people trust him. His response as to whether others see him as criminal is interesting, before ‘no’, after the accident, ‘yes’, and now ‘no’. Yet he is still indulging in similar activity as he began after the accident.
To explore in more depth how Harris perceives himself in the world.

Explain to me how your chosen lifestyle affects how "normal" people treat you.

Well lack of trust. Who trusts a crack head? Nobody! Who trusts somebody that robs and steals and beats people up? Nobody!

He knows that others do not, and probably should not trust him, yet he states that intimates don't see him as a criminal. Ericson (1974) explains "the greater degree of intimacy between the criminal and another, the less the likelihood that the criminal will be labelled as such and fundamentally stigmatized." There is an obvious problem with his response recorded as a 'no' to whether he identifies as a criminal.

His line of thinking is based on subterfuge, or self-delusion yet there are glimpses of truth; by his own account he has become a person who no one should trust.

Do you believe that you act differently then those who have not gone to prison, if yes how do you act differently?

A little bit yes, because I have more to prove. I have to prove that I am not a criminal. I am not! Like you know, I have a criminal record now, I have more to prove to show that I am worthy.

There is a great deal of inner inconsistencies in Harris' account of his experience. This is not uncommon among ex-inmates. They know that they have been branded criminal, they may not wish to be considered as such any longer but cannot escape the reality that they have to try to prove that they are not what they, on the surface appear to be.

Explain to me how some people have acted differently then they did before you went into prison:

they are different now than they were before because they see a big change in me.

How do they act differently?

They-- you know what I am starting to get back some trust from family. I am starting to get some of my good friends.
Their lives have changed drastically. I mean in six years of smoking crack, I am giving up. Their lives have changed drastically; mine has too. But these are really good family friends, and they are like my family, my cousins and stuff like that, and I am starting to get trust back from them; and that was amazing.

Explain how some people, who know that you are an offender, treat you differently since you have returned to the community.

I have some people who are like -- I feel they are afraid of me.

But you know what I tell them; you know what you don't have to be afraid of me, because I am not fucking anything for you to be afraid of. And I am not. I get along with anybody.

Even like in Collins Bay, the fights I got in were because I was doing schoolwork and I was getting out on parole. So I got into a fight because, a long story, but I got into a bullshit fight with some bikers because I didn't want to play their game anymore.

This statement is very important in terms of reintegration; once an offender becomes indentured to organized crime he cannot extricate himself without great pressure. And even when he manages to do so the biker (or those involved in organized crime) will call on him when they need to. Should he refuse his safety becomes compromised.

Harris has problems reconciling his behaviours. He has experienced stigma but interestingly it was because he was now disabled, where people have considered his explanation of why he was a crack head as him feeling sorry for himself. He is seen as a victim of circumstance and not just a criminal.

Can you tell me whether you disclose with an explanation, what might you typically say to a person? And I think that in your case you have already said, that when that thing happened to your hand your whole life changed.

Yes that is the truth and I have said that to some people and they look at me and say 'you feel sorry for yourself'. I don't know if I do. I don't think that I feel sorry for myself. I am just telling them the truth.

That when I lost my hand my life fucken (sic) just went crazy. Everything that I did was with my hands, and now I don't do that no more. It was like a drastic change. Drastic.
Harris reveals a number of management strategies that he uses to deal with his offender identity. 1) He simply denies his deviance, in accord with Herman’s (1993) selective concealment), while admitting to some aspects of his deviant activity; 2) he seeks to hide his behaviours from others, in accord with Goffman’s (1959) management of spoiled identity; 3) he minimizes his activities (Goffman, 1959); 4) he seeks to explain how losing his hand has led to his losing a grip on his life, which aligns with Herman’s 1993) medical disclaimer); 5) he uses deceptive statements to cloak how he still feels about himself and his behaviour which relates to Herman’s (1993) deception/coaching; and 6) he uses the support of his family to validate his legitimacy as a citizen, which is another example of deception/coaching. He is however, a reflection of what it means to be an ex-offender in that he is socially compromised by his experiences.

It is going great other than this past week, when I was late for my curfew. I had my mom crying on the phone. My mom thinking ‘oh my god what did he do’. ‘Like did he just change over night’, before it happened, why are you in there?

I tell them the truth; I don’t lie. I tell them that I took a pain medication that I should have never took, and that is why I was given a six o’clock curfew. Where before I would lie to them, no I am not doing coke, no I am not smoking crack. Even though everybody knew what I was doing.

Harris is struggling with his identity as an offender, his handicap, his drug addiction, and his role as a father and a son. He needs particular attention to be given to the multitude of problems that he now faces during his reintegration.

LENNY HARRIS: MOTHER YES, PRESENT FAMILY, NO

Lenny Harris provided another example of a different family type and the meaning it holds for coping with and affecting reintegration. There is the biological family,
who have experienced directly the worst of the criminal's behaviour, and the new family, made up of a child, a significant other and her family who are post criminal period.

Some, ah, my immediate family, like my family, my girlfriend and my son and her, like her mother, they don't view me as a criminal, they view me as a person who made a bad decision.

This is similar to the Lawton, another respondent's account of his street family, with the difference that these relationships may be more permanent because a child emerged from the conjugal relationship. The son and the wife will remain a part of Harris' life even if the intimate relationship fails there is a biological reality that will keep them linked.

Roloff and Danette's (2000) study informed this issue in that there is a 'honeymoon' period where acceptance is a given and where tender moments can follow. However, the information about the person's past can be used against the ex-inmate at some later date to place a wedge in the relationship as explained in the work of Derlaga (1993) et. al... In light of this what is supportive at one time can become a major source of rejection at another. Those individuals who find support among intimates and family are also subject to what Lawton experienced, if they show signs of being overwhelmed by social pressures they can be rejected by those who previously were their source of support. Not because they have exhibited recidivistic behaviour but because they are human and have moments of weakness.

He continues they believe that "I tried to go about doing something the wrong way. I think that everybody can make a mistake." He adjoins,

But as far as my mother is concerned, like I guess like a lot of stuff I used to do when I was a kid, you know what I mean, leading up to all of this, yes, she is going to look at my past history and say, 'you know I tried to tell you that you were going the wrong way', so she is going to think that, until I can show and prove, like prove to her, like now and in the future, that she is going to look at me as a criminal.
Harris recognises the problem of proving himself to others. It is an ongoing process. It is not something that is ever finished. The ex-offender is constantly judged in accordance with his attitude at the moment. However, his statements reflect hope, stigma, acceptance, and denial. On careful review the indelible blot is reflected in his statement “like now and in the future” reflecting a belief that he is stigmatized.

L. Harris does not want to perceive himself as a criminal anymore, while acknowledging that it will take time for him to prove to others that he is not going to revert to his past behaviours—where in the future does this onus end? Some people see him as the label tied to his past behaviour, while others do not openly hold his past against him. For L. Harris he believes that by changing social relations and starting over he can become a new person over time. Some accounts demonstrate that the label fits the identity in such a way as to make identification absolute, even if behaviours change.

**ERNIE WHITT: MY WIFE THINKS THAT I AM A CRIMINAL**

Ernie Whitt believes that

*what I did, I broke the law; other people got hurt who shouldn’t have been hurt.*

Whitt has experienced estrangement for hurting others. He has not been able to have contact with his wife and son and has not seen his friends in years.

*I guess what I did I broke the law. I did some time. In my situation, my wife does, and I don’t have any other friends, no contact at all with them.*

*I don’t have contact, I haven’t talk to them for years. I, and right now my wife and son, has a restraining order.*

Even in the case of his best friend, he does not see him anymore because he is now an outcast.

*Well, I had one pretty good friend from school, and the odd time we would get together and go downtown,*
and you know listen to some music and <inaudible>. But now I just haven't seen him at all.

Stigma can leave an ex-inmate with no one left in his life when he is trying to reintegrate. This can lead to a sense of great loss and self-loathing. Whitt breached his parole the day after he was released. He received his food allowance instead of buying food he found himself in a bar where people started to talk with him and he felt like he belonged, leading to his not returning for curfew and staying out over night.

TED MOORE: STIGMA AND EMPLOYMENT

Moore's employer hires from the halfway agency on a routine basis. He is a minimum wage employer in a non-minimum wage industry.

Ah, my employer, he knows that I am in the halfway house here, so I believe that he thinks that I am a criminal.

When ex-inmates are accepted into employment there is often exploitation involved. Stigma has an effect on employment and self-image where many fear pursuing decent employment opportunities because of the potential for rejection and they also believe themselves to be unworthy.

I don't know I guess ah, other than experiencing the distrust of other people, people find out that you are a criminal and they are eerie (sic) of it. They don't, but I have experienced, you know my employer, you know he has nothing against my background of being a criminal. He has given me a chance to work. He likes my work ethics and he thinks that I am a good guy so.

As put forth by Brand and Claiborn (1976) in the literature review, this can have serious implication for reintegration. Many ex-offenders have restricted their contacts to people who accept them. When they find a place in society, they tend to stay there for as long as they can because it is a safe place when they try to focus on positives.
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CHUCK LYNN: COMPANY BROUGHT IN A POLICY TO KEEP ME OUT

Lynn feels acceptance from family and friends but he has experienced rejection from his previous employer.

Co-workers, yes, because the company that I worked for, for nine years, when I got out I went back to them and they wouldn’t hire me due to the fact that I had a criminal record now.

The decision was based on an ad hoc policy something that never had before in the company, they brought it in.

The company brought in a policy that no one with a criminal record could work for them to avoid having to rehire Lynn after his incarceration.

Lynn views himself as a criminal,

because it was my choice. The criminal activity I was busted for drug use, for trafficking drugs and it was my choice to do so.

He has experienced an identity transformation from an external and internal source and has accepted responsibility for his own actions. He has experienced public and private policy affecting his immediate ability to reintegrate. The immediate affect is to increase the imprint of his criminal identity.

JASON KENDALL: I WAS UP FOR PROMOTION WHEN THEY FOUND OUT

Kendall had a defining experience at work that explicates the problem of being an ex-offender and attempting to integrate society.

And one of the jobs that I actually, this is my second time re-offending, and ah, during my first time I tried to get my life back on track. With some luck I came across a pretty good firm that would hire me. They took me on.

A few months down the road there was another opening within the firm. Something that I was qualified for and it was at the suggestion of my boss and I did so. For that position they ended up doing, basically a criminal check, and apparently they found out that I had a record.
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So never mind the new position I also was let go of the present job.

The problem of stigma is one that can affect a person's reintegration. Kendall experienced a problem when he was actually functioning well in his life. This rejection was quite problematic causing him to become a recidivist. He is now restricting his activity to self-employment so as to avoid being let go because of the stigma placed on his criminal past.

Final discussion

All twenty-three respondents described in this chapter have experienced problems and struggles with the offender identity and related stigma. All ex-inmates are "criminal" by virtue of their conviction and incarceration and must deal with these pressures with little or no guidance or support. Whether they admitted to being offenders or not, they all bear a stigma because they are ex-inmates. They may have support in one social area but have been stigmatized in other areas.

As referred to during the interviews, being an ex-offender requires that they act in certain ways; they are in fact living in society as offenders. Their actions and their movements are monitored and their relationships are subjected to vetting through an officer of the parole authority or the halfway agency, employers and in some cases family members. Friends and family often do not trust them to make good decisions.

It was shown that all are managing the problem of being ex-offenders by using techniques that minimize or explain their behaviour as explained by Herman (1993). Some managed to avoid being found out by acquaintances (Roloff, and Danette, 2000) but all
had to figure out their relationship in terms of family who knew (Goffman, 1959…; Ericson, 1977; Petronio, 2000). While the ex-inmate’s identity ranged from, ‘I am criminal’ to ‘I don’t see myself as a criminal anymore’ to “I am not a criminal I just made a mistake” most of the sample members were engaged in putting the label behind them or accepting responsibility for the acts committed wanting to move on. Among those who still saw themselves as criminal, their experience with stigma was tempered, in that they often stated that they did not care whether others, rejected them. They each acknowledged having experienced stigma in a significant manner. Some lost jobs, some lost families, some lost friends and all have had their sense of self-worth affected. They have all experienced the process of committing an offence, being arrested and then processed through the courts and being institutionalized released back to the community and then having to cope with stigma.

Many felt that they had changed from being in prison and that others could see this negative change in them (Becker, 1961, and Fein, 1990). In the cases where the family no longer wished to deal with the individual, the estrangement was a factor that affected their ability or desire to remain in the community (Pfuhl, 1986; Lauen, 1988).

In summary, their experiences indicate that stigma is a social reality requiring attention from community corrections (Berger and Luckman, 1967). They had experienced some form of stigma and discrimination as a result of their offender experience. As Chapter 4 will show the degree of stigma has something to do with other characteristics than merely being an offender. To better address ex-offender’s needs as Motiuk and Brown (1993) did, stigma is a reality that corresponds to the reintegration experiences they often had not acknowledged. It is apparent from the foregoing accounts that stigma
management needs to be a focus of CSC in their mandate “to reintegrate offenders as law-abiding citizens”.

Chapter 4 will outline different types of ex-offenders delineated from the sample as profiled in this chapter. This chapter has shown that they all have stigma in common, but they have different social, vocational, familial and personal attributes that tend to impact on the degree to which stigma affects reintegration outcomes. The factors discussed in the next chapter have heretofore only received cursory attention in the literature. The development of a community approach to classifying ex-offenders will lead to best practices in dealing with reintegrating ex-offenders to their communities of exit from prison.
Chapter 4: Toward an Ex-inmate Reintegration Typology

Reintegration: Understanding Ex-Offender Types

Chapter 3 revealed similarities in regard to ex-offender problems and profiles using the twenty-three respondents. This chapter's arguments moves the study toward the development of a community corrections classification system for ex-inmates recognizing that there are different types in terms of stigma and reintegration experiences. The framework developed incorporates the different conditions and demands on the reintegration experiences of ex-inmates stemming from institutional experiences and historic indoctrination.

The data derived from the interview schedule (Appendix V) will be first considered for the entire sample using their defining statements. The issue of stigma and reintegration are not always explicit in the statement i.e. they may not use terminology such as the term stigma but this is interpreted from the description of their social experience. The person's criminal behaviour during reintegration denotes personal responsibility, not simply prejudice, but this is useful in recognising the intensity of reintegration needs intervention required for programming for the type of individual.

Each member of the type is considered in brief. In this manner a profile is developed using multiple cases. Then a more complete analysis is done on one of the type members. Through this approach a comprehensive picture of each of the respondents, as a member of a type, will be derived leading to information that is relevant to use in determining typing and intervention approaches.
The conceptual basis of the classification system emerged from the realization that to reintegrate involves a process of identity development or altering (Fein, 1990), whereby the ex-inmate must try to move from an identity as “criminal” to an identity as a “law-abiding citizen” (Erickson, et al. 1973). In-as-much-as the challenge to reintegration in Chapter 3 had provided evidence of the development and entrenchment of criminal identity (Goffman, 1959), Chapter 4 builds on this and takes the analysis toward understanding the degree to which the ex-offender identity may define reintegration outcomes by types (Chaiken and Chaiken, 1984). It will be argued that the more entrenched the person has been in the criminal subculture, relative to his prosocial orientation, the more challenging the process of reintegration will be. The more that stigma is internalized, because of the public’s dramatization of evil, then the greater the obligation upon community corrections to meet the person’s level of need.

**Description and Analysis of Types**

This section demonstrates that ex-inmates with different criminal and social histories can be distinguished in terms of the kinds of reintegration, stigmatization and identity challenges faced upon release into the community (See Appendix VI for the questions that need to be analysed in determining these factors). This reflects differences not only on a basis of how they see themselves but also as to how others see them each relating to the merits of the label that is applied to them (See Appendix IX). As will be shown, there are certain skills, resources and behavioural markers tied to a person’s history, thereby altering the perceived intensity of stigmatization and the corresponding capacity of the ex-inmate to manage his reintegration.
Additionally, the ex-inmate's experience with managing his identity, so as to facilitate reintegration, can be substantially related to the lifestyle choices that he makes while in the halfway facility. These may impact on what problems he has with establishing, maintaining, or re-establishing his identity as a law-abiding citizen. Prosocial self-perception and good social support as well as social preparedness play a major part in his developing a prosocial lifestyle during reintegration.

The chapter will also show that barriers to achieving the objective of individual plans of care, within community corrections, will vary depending on specific characteristics and attitudes of ex-inmates. This analysis will be done through interpreting responses given by members of the sample as to their experience in prison, in the community correctional facility, and within the CJS in general (See Appendix V).

As a prelude to the more developed description to follow: Type 1 ex-inmates will require long-term intervention by community corrections as they are trying to construct a new identity as a law-abiding citizen after spending most of their eligible life as offenders. The emphasis for Type 1 will be on the halfway facility. Type 2 will also require long-term care, firstly in a halfway agency, and then by support agencies that can provide life skills, addiction counseling and social support (often a complete family approach will be required) when they make the transition to more independent living. Type 3 will require a short-term in the halfway facility followed by aftercare programs and an expedited return to normal living circumstances such as re-establishing themselves in the community but also they will need to become acclimated to their new role as an ex-offender/citizen.

Analysis of the data will occur in three stages: (1) Each member of the type will be described in accordance with their experience in the criminal justice system; (2) each
profile will contain an excerpt from the individual’s transcript describing a problem that is generally shared by members of the type; (3) A single case analysis of a subject’s transcript is profiled.

Descriptive data: Elements of Type 1 ex-inmates

The analysis begins with the long-term offender. This is often the public stereotype of what an offender is and why government is needed to contain the criminal population. They have been involved in a criminal lifestyle or subculture for more than half their life, using age twelve\(^{12}\) as an entry benchmark. For these Type 1 ex-offenders, reintegration involves the construction of an entirely new identity, often for the first time, as law-abiding citizens. Until this point in life, they have seen themselves unambiguously as “criminals”. Significantly, the label of offender has reinforced their identity problem. The fact that others see them as criminal and treated them as such represents one of the reinforcing stimuli that explain their criminal subcultural membership.

In the case of those who have begun to move beyond their criminal history, they may feel that they are no longer criminals but admit that this is the result of a new emergent attitude. They recognize that they are on unfamiliar territory in terms of behaviour. They are, as Adler (1993) informed the subject “burnt out”. The criminal lifestyle is no longer attractive. They no longer want to live a life on the periphery of society.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{12}\) The time they may have entered the juvenile or youth justice system.

\(^{13}\) Andrew Jones is featured in the case exemplar section, which follows the preliminary review of the sample. For this reason his profile will not yet be considered here. The other six members of this type are utilized to give an impression of salient
This type has both the criminal history and the social background that indicates that they are long-time criminals. They have been in a criminal environment almost exclusively since they were very young. The seven members who were first selected as to their prison time since age twelve and their time in the criminal justice system were also identified as having supporting social histories that demonstrated why they had spent so much of their lives in prison.

For example, Bill Allard was 49-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent 216 months in prison representing forty nine percent of his time has been in an institution. For seventy seven percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. Since he is now a lifer, this percentage will increase until he becomes deceased. He has been in two different halfway facilities during his federal incarceration.

He explains that his identity and experience with reintegration is most affected by his inability to connect to others. In his case, he does not have a relationship with his family. He has not made any effort to contact his family.

What have you experienced in acquiring or maintaining relationships with your family?

Distance. And the fact that my long terms of incarceration the bonds get lost in their personal lives, their personal lives have to go on. So you lose the experiences, the shared experiences.

Then what did you do to make things easier?

factors in determining whether they are properly classified as a Type 1 (see Appendix VIII).
Not bothered (sic) them. I let them get on with their lives. Not burden them with my problems.

Allard represents a central problem for many ex-inmates, particularly Type 1 respondents. Their family has given up on them or they have distanced themselves from any relationship on the outside that will remind them of what they are missing. They have made a commitment to a deviant sub-culture and rejected the conventional world. They do not and cannot be identified with their conventional biological family any longer as they have spent so much time in prison or in the criminal justice system that their reality is different. Where there is a relationship with the family it is usually part of the criminogenic pattern. The family is sometimes the source of the criminal lifestyle. In the case of Jones, to be considered later, his mother is a biker's woman. His father was an unnamed member of Satan's Choice.

Bill Boskie was 48-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent 360 months in prison representing eighty-three percent of his time in an institution. For ninety-three percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. He has been in the halfway house for three years at the time of the interview. This represents the second time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

For Type 1 ex-offenders who have spent so much time in prison, being released from prison, and trying to change their lives, represent a similar experience to that which we might associate with alien landing on earth for the first time. Everyday is a challenge to discover where they fit within a strange, challenging environment.

Being an offender and reintegrating back into society is exactly what it is. It is who you are and that is

14 For lifers the percentage of time in the criminal justice system will increase by virtue of the reality that they are serving a natural life sentence and will be a part of the criminal justice system for life.
what you are doing. There is nothing that you can compare it to because there is no other reintegration. There is no other reality, that is all there is. And what you do is you just; it is like starting another life.

After spending the time in prison that I did. You cannot come out with the idea that you are going to pick up from where you left off. That is behind you now all you can do is move forward. Everyday is a new day and every day is a learning experience. And this time around you hope to do it the right way. The last time you did it the wrong way.

Well after having spent the amount of time in prison that I have I know nothing about relationships, I know little about the work force. I have no social and or leisure activities, so I am actually starting life.

Type I ex-inmates will state in some fashion that they are starting their conventional lives from scratch. They acknowledge that most things are foreign to them. In this case Broskie’s world had been prison. He really had no other concept of life other than that of a prisoner, not just an offender but also a person who was alien to normal society. For him, it is not surprising that people treat him with suspicion and rejection. His having spent three years in the halfway facility lent some weight to the necessity of long term care for Type I ex-inmates.

The problem related to association for Type 1 ex-inmates is that their frame of reference and social patterns have been associated with crime or prison. Everyone who they know is criminal or was a prisoner and acceptance or the lack thereof from conventional others leads them to seek out people who will not judge them.

Bill Hasbrook was 46-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent 186 months in prison representing forty-six percent of his time has been in an institution. For sixty-two percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the fifth time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

Abmun, first of all, they put a condition on me that I cannot associate with known criminal so when I make friends at work and I find out that they have a criminal record I can’t go to their house for dinner, I can’t go out to the show with them I can’t do any socializing with them.
It also hampers me in dating, because having a criminal record you have to tell people eventually my being so serious, for murder, it’s hard to tell a woman that you are getting involved with that your criminal background and then murder, they don’t understand or they don’t want to understand so it doesn’t usually work out. So the one’s that do understand and the ones that do work out are the one’s that have a little bit or a lot of a criminal record. Even though they are not active anymore, they understand more because they have been there and done that.

They accept that people can change because they changed so it is easier to have a relationship with a woman who has been in trouble before than it is to have a relationship with someone who hasn’t been in trouble before.

Again, this account represents a very important aspect for Type 1 respondents. Their frame of reference is that of a criminal. They have little or no concept of a life with people outside of the criminal subculture. Dating, relationships with co-workers, meeting new people these all represent to them seemingly insurmountable obstacles. They are more comfortable associating with criminal types then they are with conventional people because of their fear of rejection or because of the shame they feel.

They identify as criminal to a degree that they have a hard time envisioning that others would see them as anything other than the label they have assumed for most of their lives. Moving on requires associating with others who are also deviants and are trying to move on. Many self-help advisors or sponsors will advise against association with people who are also struggling. In this case parole mandated that this not occur. This means for many their social network is non-existent.

Bill Jensen was 36-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent 204 months in prison representing seventy-one percent of his time has been in an institution. For seventy-two percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.
Type 1 ex-inmates are likely to have problems with substance abuse, which ties their criminal behaviours to funding their habit. They see life through the next fix, or the next drink.

Because of my past, past life everything had to do with criminal activity. There wouldn’t be anything that I did in society wasn’t against the law. From day one that I get out the institution or whether it be two days or whether it be a month that I am out, not much over a month ever. I mean everything in my past was always to get boozie, and it didn’t matter what I did to get it, if it was there and I could take it was gone.

And I thought nothing of it if I wanted it then I took it and if it meant money to me to get boozie it was even more of a challenge to get it. Everything and everybody that I hung around with were alcoholics and criminal, like criminally orientated.

I guess after the last sentence that I get I said fuck it; I have had enough. That was it! I worked inside the joint to get out.

Jensen burnt out; he has turned an important corner in his life. He is now embarked on trying to construct a life as a law-abiding citizen. It is obvious from his statement, which is similar to those made by others of this type that he will need to change his entire attitudes about life and his place in it.

Bill Moore was 41-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent 264 months in prison representing seventy-six percent of his time has been in an institution. For seventy-eight percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the second time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

A central problem for Type 1 ex-inmates is finding and holding employment. Their records are so extensive that any decent job they seek will either be barred to them because they have a record, or they do not have the acquired skills to do the job. More often out of fear of rejection they stop seeking gainful employment.

Very challenging, first of all seeking suitable employment was difficult. I have had opportunities for good jobs and they have asked for police checks, so I was swayed away from those positions. Ah, the criminal
mind of mine, sometimes I go back to that stinking thinking. And ah, that is the difficult part. But I try to use my skills and ah, stay on the straight and narrow.

The most important factor of this statement is 'sometimes I go back'. For Type 1 ex-inmates going back often doesn't represent a slip but a slide back into the criminal patterns that they know best. Their adherence to differential association requires more effort for them to stay straight then it does for them to return to membership in the criminal subculture.

A key indicator of the Type 1 profile is criminal identity. This type is distinct in their self-characterization whereby they admit to living a life steeped in the criminal subculture.

Ted Moorehead was 42-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent 270 months in prison representing seventy-five percent of his time has been in an institution. For seventy-six percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the second time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

Type 1 ex-inmates represent a challenge in terms of relating stigma to them. The label they bear has been earned over a protracted period of criminal behaviour. They often are not trying to prove themselves to others but they expressed that they do want people to prove to them that they are trustworthy. Many see themselves as victims of the deceit from others or parties in a corrupt culture. They relate that others' behaviours and attitudes toward them are the biggest threat to their ability to reintegrate. This is logical because when a person who is used to criminal deviance is violated, this tends to substantiate that they are themselves non-deviant, they are simply conforming to the lead set by the person who violated them
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Well let me answer the second part of the question ah. I disclose very little, I don't trust anybody with a great deal of knowledge of my ah, my past. I give them little pieces at a time and if they can work with it and deal with it and accept it.

My trust isn't given. If you want my trust you have to earn it, this time. I have been fucked around too many times so, little by little.

Can you give me an example of how you have disclosed to those who are in a position to help you.

I was released from prison in '96 and I got into a very, very toxic relationship that was going bad. And I sought (sic) help from someone else, and they (sic) turned everything around and I was sent back for it. And that is the latest experience that I have had with trust.

This area of the Type 1 struggling with trusting others is interesting, requiring additional research focus. When the label carried harms him, as a habitual criminal, it appears to reinforce the deviant identification through distancing him from conventional others. Type 1 respondents do not often acknowledge that they have a debt to pay to society but rather that society owes them something. Society does not treat them as if they have a right to be, i.e. trusted, creditable, and accepted. They immediately resort to reinforcing consequences.

These accounts represent some of the evidence that can be discerned from the interview with Type 1 respondents. The profile of Andruw Jones will show in more detail how these apply and to some degree are amplified. Type 1 ex-inmates, even those who are starting to live lives apart from crime have a myriad of problems that they must cope with to move them toward empowerment and inclusion in society.

Type 1: Case Analysis of Andruw Jones

The following narrative and analysis is developed from Andruw Jones' responses to the interview schedule. It is interesting in reading his transcript that he admits to burning
out of crime, but also concedes that he is still drawn to the criminal lifestyle, which is all he has known. As such he is emblematic of the problems faced by this type who will struggle with identity transformation for a protracted period and therefore require intensive community support.

The narrative is divided into five sections: (1) a biographical sketch; (2) a criminogenic profile; (3) the interviewee's correctional profile; (4) social experience; and (5) management strategies. Each section and question is meant to obtain an understanding of how he has experienced his reintegration into society. His story disclosed how he has managed his ex-offender role during the early stages of his reintegration to society. It also stands as an example of the type.

At the time of the interview Jones was a 32 years old Caucasian male. He had achieved the bulk of his education while in prison. He said that he only required three additional credits to complete his high school diploma.

He was in a common-law relationship before his last prison bit. He is single at the time of the interview. He has a son from another relationship who he does not have any contact with.

Jones identifies as a criminal. He explains, "I have done, like I said four federal sentences. And ah, I don't know what a prosocial lifestyle is. I grew up in a neighbourhood that is all crime. And to me, crime is my prosocial." This admission directs attention to a Type I personality, he will have substantial problems with social orientation. He continues, "so yea! I am a criminal! Without a doubt I would prefer to break the law then follow the law."
Jones has experienced stigma in that people have tended to unambiguously reinforce his identity as an offender. All of his friends are criminally active.

_I feel comfortable around criminals. I can trust them. Even if they rat me out, I still feel comfortable around them before I would somebody else, and that is a sad thing._

There are two aspects to interpreting this statement. First, Jones is comfortable with a person who has harmed him who is also criminal, representing a clear indicator of a Type 1 profile. Also, he has learned to mistrust anyone who does not have a criminal history. This is another indicator of Type 1. The question is whether the prosocial people in his life have given him more reason to mistrust them than a 'rat'.

Jones does not change his behaviour to accommodate different surrounding or relationships. The only place where he is the same as others is in prison. He denies that criminal associates are affecting his ability to reintegrate. He rationalises.

_I don’t think that it is affecting me in anyway. I don’t want to go back to jail when I finally do get out; and what they do is their business._

He tries to justify this point by stating that he is a gang leader not a follower. So if he directs criminal activity it will happen, if he does not it won’t. He explains his character and behaviour in a manner that reinforces this point

_I prey on the weak._

As stated Jones feels most comfortable with criminal personalities. He despises anyone who is not criminal. His words indicate how he views conventional others.

_Don’t really care when I have that kind of lifestyle going. I don’t really care I have the money; I have the power. I don’t really care what they say, what they think, and what they do. They don’t exist._

This is a definitive expression for a Type 1. Conventional people have existed to be preyed upon. There is no awareness of the effect that the type might have on them.
Jones cannot guarantee that he will not go back to associating with other offenders when he gets released from the halfway facility or prison. This is asserted despite stating that he is the one who is in control and that they do not influence him. He explains the problem that he faces in this way.

I have thought of nothing but crime. When I came here, I thought I would do a few things myself, not major things but just planning. And since I have been here I don't want to do it no more. I starting to see what kind of a person I am, you know what I mean, and what I have to offer, and I have a lot to offer so.

I don't know it is pretty weird this is all new to me.

I am used to being picked up when I get out of jail or something, you know, maybe a beer in hand right away. I don't use drugs or overindulge in the alcohol, so it would be right out home and get my crew together and make plans. I would not be back in __________ more than twenty minutes and I would have a quarter pound of cocaine no matter what and I am ready to push. I am going right back into the environment that I left.

As a consequence of his criminal indoctrination Jones is on a work release at the halfway facility. The parole board does not trust him in a day parole. The only time that he is out of the house is for supervised work. The only exception is that he gets four hours, on one day on the weekend of non-supervised community time. He has earned this privilege while on his work release. Other than this period he is supervised when he goes outside the facility. This can account for why he claims that he has not been involved in criminal activity since his release.

He had an interesting perspective on his reintegration in terms of credibility issues. He is,

fighting between good and evil twenty-four hours a day, even in my sleep.

He feels that people in the system do not believe him when he states that he wants help to change. He expresses concern that

they think that I am a joke.
He explains what happens when he has been released from an institution in the past in this graphic manner.

*Don’t know. For it would be selling cocaine. Having strippers and lots of women, bisexual preferably. I am not trying to be rude; this is just me. I like to be surrounded by beautiful women; more than one at a time that is normal to me. And having lots of dope and power and money. I like it when I can tell people to do things; that is normal (this caption was also used in Chapter 3).*

The profound impact of this identity is described in this admission.

*Ah, I am thirty-two years old. I can guarantee that I have spent two thirds of that locked up easily.*

He has calculated that he has spent nineteen to twenty years locked up on four federal bits, numerous provincial and JDA and YO custody periods. The first bit he believes that he served was when he was five years old. This was when he was sent to live with foster parents. Because his mother was a biker woman, he was taken into child custody. For him and his frame of reference this represented his first institutional incarceration.

He has never, in his memory, been under anything but some sort of child-care, juvenile or correctional supervision.

*I have always been watched... I never really been free.*

He sees himself caught in the web of his own spin on life. The revolving door of the justice system is one that he has been caught in for most of his life.

For Jones, being put on parole does not represent a hardship, as he cannot remember anything but supervision. Jones does not believe that the system functions on the basis of assisting him to reintegrate. He does not believe that CSC practices its core values. He explains his situation in a very important manner.

*If I can’t get a mandatory, I mean if I can’t get an escorted pass to my city, then where the hell is the sense of sending me home on a mandatory. It does not make sense. And you know what CSC, I don’t know, I get to many verbally bad words about it to be quite honest about it. I am disappointed in our system. (See*
Appendix X for conditional parole information

Jones would like to have the support of a halfway house to assist him during his reintegration. He recognises that he will require careful supervision for a protracted period.

I wish. Ha, I don't know I ask them sometimes you know why don't you support me but it is always the same thing, you don't have a problem a substance problem. You know this is, this is the funny part you do the same thing that I do you kind of frown on it. How can I not have a problem? I sell dope, what is the difference between a user and a pusher?

The house that he was in specializes in ex-inmates with addiction problems. They also have a work release programme for. He was eligible for work release, but he was not accepted for day parole because he did not have an addiction problem, he was also not entitled to escorted passes to his home.

Jones was asked to provide more information as to what CSC has done to assist him in reintegration; he had this to say.

Cock soup, as far as I am concerned, this is all they got work release. They gave me this to shut me up. As soon as I threw the mission statement in their face, you know what I mean. Everything I gotten from CSC was nothing but a hard time. They laughed at me. They think that I am a joke. I tell them who I am, you know what I mean, and basically I tell them I am not the low guy on the totem pole.

I was in a training school and bad things happened there, when I got out of there, buddy I was never going to be screwed around again. And that is why I became what I became. And I just learned that...

CSC did help me, I guess, they gave me a psychologist. But it is not a CSC psychologist, I said I won't talk to CSC, so they contract somebody that is complete confidentiality. She has helped me; not CSC has just footed the bill. (Bolded text added for clarity).

Jones does not differentiate his role in the prison experience from where he is within the CC facility as he is on work release. "I am trapped, I feel desolate sometimes it is hard being here for me on a work release." He continues by explaining that it is not the facility but his release status that is the problem.

This is a great house, without, I can't slam them. The people are great; the house is great if I was on day parole. I would want to be here to be honest with you. But on this, I told them the same thing it sucks, I mean I am trapped, I can't do nothing.
But because I don’t have a substance abuse problem, I can’t come here.

If I had a halfway house that would accept me, I could probably get a day parole. And this is what doesn’t make sense to me. How can I get a halfway house to support me, when they say to get a day parole first. I can’t get a day parole unless I have a halfway house support, but they all say get a day parole. That is what is killing me. They just won’t take me.

Jones’ institutional experience has had a profound impact on his life:

Training school affected my whole life. That is what changed me. I went into training school as a twelve year old kid who was abused and when I got out of there, I was just a small guy, mark my words, I said to myself never again, these people won’t do this to me and I never let it happen again.

I am a strong guy. When I got beat up one time, you know I fought it and I fought it, and I always won, knock on wood.

But when I got beat up, I got beat up good. And that is what I said, this guy that I was in the joint with that looks like he is about two hundred and eighty five pounds seven foot that is who is fighting for me from now on. And that is what I do. I don’t fight my own battles no more, why is that? because of the training school. It is all in the back of my head whatever you call that. Your memory like, you know you have, you can your subconscious. You remember, trigger effects whatever.

Jones is emphatic that he acts differently than so called normal people. He explains “By my thinking process; they will think of consequences when they are doing something wrong and I don’t give a shit.” This assessment likely stems from the professional treatment that he has received over his life in crime. From his accounts he has no experience in the conventional world on which to draw this self-evaluation.

He believes that people are afraid of him. Jones has been rejected by intimates because they are afraid that he will attempt to avenge some perceived wrong he has told them they have done to him. Remember that Jones mentioned people ratting on him.

They fear what I might have done because they were not there for me when I was in. Anyways, they can kiss my ass. And that is what makes me more powerful in the mind and that.

Not only his relationship with his family represent a problem his work and educational history continues the impression that his reintegration will be difficult. He
cannot work for others because there is "no excitement". He has never worked for anyone else for more than one month. The problem he has had with employment is explained:

Just my attitude. That is why I never could hold a job. If a guy starts buging me I think he is a guard and I tell him to go fuck himself and leave. That is what I am used to doing. That is the only way that I can see it.

Jones will tell potential employers about his past because he believes that it will come out, and that it would be better if it came from him.

His work inside has been problematic, at one time in the interview he stated that he worked to buy cigarettes and that was the only benefit to working inside. In another account he claims that he earned his papers as an electrician on his own while inside. He also states that he is a licensed welder by trade, which he claims he earned while in the training school.

His mother has no trust in him. His family fear him. They do not make any attempt to reach out to him. "When I am there we are close, when I am not out of mind out of sight." After saying this he admits, "It sucks. I don't have a good familial bond really. Not really. You know, just something quickly... I don't want to go into detail. It sucks."

There is little social support or those who can assist Jones in modelling a prosocial life. People have learned, in social interactions not to trust him, and as he stated, he does not trust anyone.

No the truth itself at all times is very important to me. I ended up leaving my girlfriend because her not telling me something she was lying to me. And she is the only thing that I had, she stuck by me, since the beginning, and I still left her because I don't want to be lied to.

Like I say, I know, when I know I am living the truth and it is making me vomit by some of the decisions that I have made, because I am not used to doing that, it has literally made me sick. Then I know that I am doing something right, and I don't want anyone lying to me, especially my women. I can't live a lie no more.
Jones manages disclosure without justifying his behaviour. He is direct about how he is and about his situation. His account suggests that he has been criminal in most aspects.

No, to me I use drugs and alcohol before but very moderate, and ah, to me I can't give you a good answer on that because drugs make you weak and I am not a weak person. I like my mind to be in total control of everything that I do and say, and think. Even if it comes out retarded, stupid or nonsense, I still like to make, if I make a wrong decision it is just a mistake, it is important that people realize that you are in control.

That is correct, and I feel comfortable with every decision I have made. I am not happy with the way the outcome was but at the time at the moment I have always felt comfortable doing what I have done.

No, no, no I tell everybody that I am a bad guy. I tell everybody. I am not, you know what, again like I say, your past experiences speak for themselves unfortunately, because the paper work or the paper articles or word of mouth that people go by unfortunately, most people won't make an opinion of their own and that is the sad part. So, I don't try to explain it I say I am a bad guy, I extort, I torture, I sell cocaine, I usually have guns, weapons or whatever. I am not a nice guy.

You know sad but, you know like I say, I am not the kind of guy who is going to explain myself with a bullshit story to you, even when I lied and cheated and you know, I would still pretty much be honest about everything that I did. Like I have no problem.

I have gone to cops and said 'hey man what's up are we going to go and sell some cocaine over here, you don't have a problem with that,' because I thought I was a smart ass. And they are like "ok whatever," but I really was.

Jones has experienced rejection from a woman who once travelled with his group. Although he claims that her reaction was not redefining, it did open his eyes.

I know one good woman who I really care about very much; I am not changing for her. When I think of what I have to offer to her and her daughter and what I have in return to offer me...

Nothing broke my heart worse when I tried to court her and she told me that 'I can't be around you. Your morals and values do not fit into my schedule and I don't want my kid around that.'

That was a wake up call.

So I look at it like, she has something to offer me because she always, always, always supports me. She always, always, always gives me good advice. You know and when I say I whine to her, that is the word, she would say 'stop your whining, I don't want to hear it call me another day.'

I think of her and think if she can do this there has got to be other people out there. I don't know what is going to make me succeed only I can make myself succeed, but I figure if I, I guess you have probably heard the old saying surround myself with positive people. That is not what I am looking for. I want
negative people around me so that I can remember, you know what I mean, it is easy to put yourself into an environment that everybody is a Joe from the street and has never been in trouble and they go to church. To me that is boring.

I am not going to lie to you, I am not going to go to church; I am not going to listen to God stories; and like that is crap to me. I want to be around negative people but the thing is that once I get out I want to try to help them people because I didn’t get the help.

Jones was asked what he thought about an ex-offender support group similar to Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous, or the Aids Committee in the community.

Sure I could recruit them all to sell drugs for me. That is a dangerous (inaudible) to get a guy like me again an opportunist let’s call me, you get a guy that is an offender, good grief. On the street the guy has got no cash, he is coming to these things for support, he is weak, he is vulnerable, I am going to this group not because I am weak but because I am strong and I am going to manipulate that guy to come and help me out. I don’t believe in them things man.

Like I believe that if everybody could admit that, ‘hey all have criminal lifestyles that are active’, I would go to that group, you know because I think that we would get more out of each other. Not to make us better as criminals but you know having someone like, a counsellor there, who is not a criminal maybe that would work, or someone who was an offender who has turned their life around.

I don’t know it is hard to say, you know what, you were there you know how many times you heard people say, ‘me I don’t have this feeling’, I think that any ex-con who gets out of jail can do what you are doing especially, I have a lot of respect for. But how many people have you heard say, he is an ex-fucking-con, who does he think he is. Running a halfway house, working in a halfway house, running a group. How many people have you actually heard say that?

Now let me carry on from that. That fucking guy is an ex-con. I am talking as an offender; you are going to have offenders telling other offenders; that is the only problem that I see. Again, I don’t share that opinion, I want to make that clear that is not of my opinion.

I have a lot of respect for guys who can get out and number one get a job in a place like you are working, that is a feat in itself, you just can’t pull the snow over people’s eyes like that I tried it for so long and it doesn’t work. So I commend you on that. I am just saying that for the average Joe in jail, you know all the signs and all the things that are said. You have an edge on these people that work there who are not in the position that you are in. You know how to go about doing.

That is their problem. I would be more fearful of what you know about me, if I was a resident at your house, then what this guy would be. Because you would pick up more off of me, being in the environment that I have been in, and this stiff reading it off a piece of paper, and looking for signs that ain’t going to show.

Summary Discussion Andrew Jones
Jones provides a very good example of a Type 1 profile. He has demonstrated each of the six problems spoken of by the other six members of this type. He has experienced: 1) Poor family ties, where the family is also criminal; 2) problems related to starting a new life; 3) criminal association as normal and comfortable; 4) employment barriers; 5) trust issues in connection with social others; and, 6) problems making and maintaining intimate relationships with conventional significant others.

Jones clearly identifies as a criminal. His prosocial is criminal. He states that he wants to move beyond this life-style but he has no idea of how this can be achieved. He is just beginning to see worth in himself allowing him to consider that he may have an option to criminal behaviours; but these are in the embryonic stage requiring careful nurturing and monitoring to assure that he is delivered in time to the community able to act on his new beliefs as a novice citizen.

Jones is forthcoming, if not strictly consistent in his answers, many of his statements are conflicted. Jones correctly shared that his efforts to reintegrate his community of origin will lead to more crime. Yet he cannot understand why CSC will not allow him to return, in their care, to his home. It could also be that his mother does not want him at her home. Also that she cannot pass a community assessment.

He describes how his family members are criminally oriented yet he rails at CSC for not allowing him passes to his mother's house in the community where he has all his criminal contacts. He admits to the dangers associated with returning to his neighbourhood. Despite this he explains that what others do does not affect him. He also stated that he knows that he would benefit from associating with positive people but he
rejects them as boring. He has a limited idea of how to break out of the criminal persona he has become.

Jones is savvy and a well-spoken person. He has been abused at home, in the community and in institutions. He uses and abuses people. He knows how to manipulate his criminal surroundings so as to exert control. If he is taught to use the same basic kit of mental tools they could allow him to change so as to affect successful reintegration.

His training school experience was significant in terms of his adult development as a member of the criminal subculture. Whatever happened there he states was very traumatic. He mentions fights while in training school, but this is not the only thing that occurred.

He makes a good point that if he cannot have a pass to his home, then what is the good of releasing him, without supervision to his home at mandatory release date. It would be much better to monitor him during a protracted day parole at a halfway facility.

He correctly points out that to release a Type 1 at mandatory supervision or statutory release points without supervision is nonsensical. Those who are not trusted should not be released to the environment they emerged from; to do so is to invite and to contribute to their return to the institution. He states, that it would be most helpful if he could receive long-term supervision in a community corrections facility away from his hometown. But none will accept him.

His comments about the halfway facility are important. He is in a facility that he trusts. However, he cannot go there on parole because he is not an admitted addict. Their approach is that of a therapeutic house, and for this reason they are trained in handling problem criminal personalities. Non-therapeutic houses would see his case as incorrigible.
and they would see him as a threat to the community, so they would not advocate for him.

Quite clearly, to advocate for a person with his profile would be a problem in terms of manageable risk. Jones even admits that he has no plan for reintegration except to return to his old ways.

His movements would need to be curtailed, even when on day parole. He should be expected to earn any privileges and freedom that he would receive. I.e. acknowledging that he has maintained employment for one month he could be given Saturdays free of reporting, except for returning at curfew.

His attitude toward CSC is telling of his criminal identity. The system has not helped him. The issue is that he has not been open to whatever help they wished to provide. As he stated he would not even see one of its psychologists. He does admit that he needs help from trained people, possibly for the remainder of his life. He also acknowledges that he would be more receptive to assistance from a person who had a criminal history and had moved beyond it. He would be more likely to fear this person because he feels he or she would know when he was being duplicitous. His claim to be an owner of a corporation and a taxpayer is suspect. He does not likely own a business on the outside. It is even unlikely that he ever owned a business. It is however possible that he laundered drug money into a retail store at one time.

He will be severely challenged in finding and maintaining work. He will require the safety of subsidized living until he can adjust to work for minimal pay. Given the income that he claims to have had, due to his drug dealing money and other financial offences and ventures, his lifestyle standards would require a major accommodation.
It is again not likely that he worked for himself, as self-employment usually requires more effort, exertion than in conventional employment. Further, the business that he has stated that he is involved with seems to have little or nothing to do with a personal work history, which he admits is almost non-existent. In his account he corrected a mistruth that he had advanced earlier. He stated here “I had a retail store”, not as he said earlier “I have a retail store”. He has a criminal attitude that is underscored by his behaviour and his words. It is hard for him to admit that he is trying to change. It is interesting that he claims that work inside is for the purpose of meeting his basic needs. This is in keeping with his no longer being involved in drug dealing inside. His decision to isolate, and his acknowledgement that he needed to stay away from others while in prison to pursue his studies is a good first step. To not see prison as a recruiting ground any longer marks a major turning point for Jones.

Jones’ work ethic and tolerance of non-criminal types adds to his difficulty with reintegration. He says that he is a licensed welder; this claim is not valid, as he could not have the apprenticeship portion of the requirement to be licensed when he has never worked for more than a month. Again he showed signs that he has fabricated a prosocial life that he knows will not be practicable in the real world unless he can change his attitudes and gain the needed training and experience.

He admits that the main threat to reintegration is associating with other criminally active people. He appears to begin identifying triggers that he must avoid. Whether his statements in this section were verifiable or not, it is significant that he has identified some problems that he claims to have taken some steps toward addressing.
Jones is in for, as he admits, a challenging time with his reintegration. As he recognises, he is left to his own and in this he will probably revert to his old ways despite saying that in prison he avoided other inmates and that he has now found a sense of self-worth as something other than an inmate or offender. His parole officer will not allow him to associate with other offenders; he states he is coming to believe that this is a good thing.

The girl who he cares about, the halfway agency that he is in, other halfway agencies, corrections, and his family and friends provide little to no incentive for him to continue to change. Their continued rejection will need to be controlled by Jones. He will have to learn to care about how others feel while learning how to manage their reserved behavioural reactions. Jones recognises that reintegration rests on him and him alone – He must want to become a remade social person, who learns how to act and how to be free in the world. He must learn to trust and to be trusted. He must learn that true strength comes from building a prosocial lifestyle not tearing it down.

As a Type 1 ex-inmate he is likely to struggle with becoming a new identity. He will require a protracted period where he is with people who understand where he is coming from and where he is trying to go. The major problem that he faces is that he is going to stumble, because there is no social support, which will likely result in his being returned to prison. He needs a system where he can make mistakes and where he can trust that the facility's staff are there for him to lean on when he is weak, he does not always have to be 'strong'. He has no history with prosocial behaviour everything will need to be rehearsed and practiced repeatedly before positive change will take place and then change will be slow in emerging.
Jones has demonstrated that traditional punishment and banishment has done nothing for him. He should not have to spend another day in closed custody. He needs to learn how to function in society and the only place where this can occur is outside of the prison walls. This does not mean that he should be allowed free rein upon release; he will need to be contained in a community correctional facility, where his ventures into the community will be carefully monitored. He will be allowed time to engage in proper activity and no free time to do as he pleases until he proves that he can use his time constructively. For community correctional treatment and programming that serves as a template recording and reporting a person's responses to the interview schedule see Appendix XI for the methodology for classifying Type 1 ex-inmates.

Descriptive data: Elements of the Type 2 ex-inmates

The second type of ex-offender identified in the research is understood as seeking to maintain and strengthen their law-abiding status and behaviours while diminishing the urge to drift into crime. Members of this type tend to identify with society and the criminal subculture simultaneously, or contiguously moving in and out of or back and forth in the two diverse and conflicting social worlds while managing to create, for those whom they met in both worlds, a feeling that they belonged. In some cases they lived a relatively long period of conventional life and lapsed into a protracted period in the criminal subculture. In these cases they will often be employed or living in a conventional household while conducting a predominantly criminal career.

Where Type 1 are quite clearly in need of long-term programming and attention in terms of allowing them to learn, practice and then rehearse their new role as a law-
abiding person, they represent less of a programming challenge than Type 2 because their treatment requirements are more nuanced. As one respondent stated Type 2 live a life as a chameleon. The needs of this type are not as straight forward as either of the other two types. They thrive on their ability to fit into conventional culture and the criminal subculture in this way they express some pride in being able to deceive others as to their identity and as to what they are doing. The problem for Type 2 is that they need to gain a better understanding of matching their ability to their aspirations. Too often they express unrealistic expectations. Their accounts of their history left the interviewer questioning the likelihood of what they had to say. I.e. One respondent will express genuine concern about leaving his wife and kids destitute. He will also express that now that he is out that he rides his horses every Saturday. Or that what he wants to do is travel. In this respect he is not involved with his family but indulges his own needs while abandoning them.

Reggie Harris’ profile is considered later in its entirety. There were ten members identified as Type 2 (see Appendix VIII). The nine others will be reviewed here to demonstrate salient elements of identifying Type 2 ex-inmates.

Bobby Bishop was 43-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent ninety-six months in prison representing twenty-six percent of his time has been in an institution. For forty percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. He is a lifer and as such this ratio will increase. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

Bishop speaks to the question of association for Type 2 ex-inmates. They express a comfort level with both criminal and straight people.
It doesn’t matter because I am not doing what I used to do years ago. I haven’t done that for a long time.

Do I feel comfortable coming back, being with and around and associating with people with criminal records?

Yes!

The halfway house is part of my support system. And so therefore yes, I feel perfectly comfortable with individuals who are in a halfway house.

No one can influence me nor can anyone lead me astray. Because they have a criminal record, I am just as comfortable with people who are normal or straight people.

There are two indicators for typing given here. First, Type 2 have not been involved with criminal activity for some time, i.e. the person was involved as a youth but got away from it and then returned. They may have committed another offence years later, in this case he murdered his common-law wife, but he was not engaged in criminal activity for a long period before that event. The second factor is that Type 2 express that they are equally comfortable with straight and criminal people. They have had social experience in both cultures.

Bobby Maddux’s was 33-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent fifty-six months in prison representing twenty-two percent of his time has been in an institution. For thirty-eight percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the second time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

The Type 2 respondent is sometimes difficult to identify. In Maddux’s case he was denied passes to his home because most of his family were criminal. Indicating a Type 1 profile similar to that of Andruw Jones.

He recounts that he was given a pass when he was at a halfway facility because the parole officer was not aware of the prohibition, and it took him another seven months
to get an overnight pass anywhere. However, he worked in his mother's business for five years and for another employer for three years. While in prison he worked as a steel cutter.

Type 2 ex-inmates will tend to believe in programmes that reinforce prosocial behaviours. Maddux had this to say about ex-offenders support groups.

Yes! I have already went to one. It is called “ex-offenders”.

It is more like ah, it is not like we, like everybody wants to know why you were in prison. It is, ok, we are ex-cons, we are going to try to communicate with each other, try to show each other our strengths and our weaknesses, whatever we can do to try to help each other to reintegrate in society.

It is run by the church that, I was going to. I found it to be a very good support, especially for somebody who has just come out. Even if you are not a religious person or whatever, you don’t go over there and they don’t pump the bible at you. Most of the people there are all ex-cons. They have all gone through the system they all know what it is like. You know and they just try to support each other as you are going through the process of reintegration.

Because when you first get out you are in shock, you may not realize it right off the bat, but you are in shock. It took me a good month and I was still in shock. Being thrown out into the community locked up for so long and always having that tightness around you, being on guard all the time looking over your back. It is a big shock to get thrown out into the community and having to try to live your life again, it is not easy, especially your first three weeks of your being out is very difficult. A lot of people don’t want to admit it, it’s true. You don’t want to admit it yourself. I am out here, now what do I do.

There are a number of important indicators here. First, Maddux turned to religion for support. Second, he turned to other ex-offenders for support. He felt comfortable in church and in the company of other ex-offenders. Third, he has also turned to the company and council with people in the church; the key is support during the early stages of reintegration. To spend time in prison and to be released is a shock to the system for all ex-inmates.

Type 1 ex-inmates are often still trying to get use to being out, even after three years in a halfway facility. Type 2 find that they must get their sea legs back so to speak, which is disconcerting but not unmanageable. Maddux spoke of a month to get his
bearings back. During this period this type will be at the greatest risk of breaching or reoffending. After spending time as a prisoner, where they were able to fit in, they now find themselves fitting in with so called normal people after a period of adjustment yet they are still residing with other ex-offenders in a halfway facility. He therefore, has some employable skills that can be built on for him to maintain his reintegration.

James Wood was 29-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent forty-two months in prison representing twenty-one percent of his time has been in an institution. For twenty six percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

A key feature of Type 2 is that they seem to be teetering on the edge of criminal behaviour.

Well I mean, parole keeps telling me to keep avoiding people in crime.

A lot of people don't even know what I went to jail for.... They think that I was out of the country because I travel a lot. So when we talk, we just talk about come by my way ... life in general.

Instead of coming back to crime talk, no way! I am temporarily abstaining from the activity for life.

This statement indicates that Wood has not yet decided to maintain a life free of crime. First, 'parole keeps telling me' not "I know that I have to avoid people in crime." Second, 'A lot of people don't even know what I went to jail for...'. This indicates that there are prosocial people in his life who were there before who thought that he was travelling who tend to see him as a normal person. Last, he does not engage people, at this time with crime talk. But, and this is important, 'I am temporarily abstaining from the activity for life.' Life is forever, temporarily is not. Type 2 ex-inmates are challenged by extremes. This account moved from an imposed prohibition, to how certain people are
allowed to labour under misinformation about where he has been, to not engaging in
criminal talk, to temporarily abstaining from crime. Managing identity is a normal course of
social intercourse with this type of ex-offender.

Jimmy Meyers was 37-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12
years old he has spent thirty months in prison representing ten percent of his time has
been in an institution. For fourteen percent of his life he has been involved with the
criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a
halfway facility.

Meyers, looks like a biker. In other respects he has had a conventional family life.

It doesn't really affect or not. I mean I have friends who are straight and clean, and real estate agents,
businessmen I feel just as comfortable with them as I do with a guy who rides a Harley and has done ten
years, so it really does not matter to me.

This represents the definitive statement for a Type 2. The most respectable and
the least respectable can be members of his social world simultaneously.

John Roser was 31-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years
old he has spent sixty months in prison representing twenty-six percent of his time has
been in an institution. For thirty-four percent of his life he has been involved with the
criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a
halfway facility.

Type 2 ex-inmates have friends in both cultures. They are embarrassed by the
time they spent in prison and the associated label that they now have affixed to them, to
the point where they may keep themselves away from re-establishing or putting in the
effort to maintain social relations.

Oh let's see now. It is terrible to say that I am more reacting to them then they are reacting to me. As I
said my friends before, I had really bad friends, and then I had friends who were really great friends. And the friends that I had that were really great friends, I tend to only stick with them a little bit.

Right now the other part of the bigger part of the whole picture, I’m sending myself away from them. Because I really don’t want them to see me in this situation, I feel more embarrassed than anything else.

They are often uncomfortable about being in a halfway facility, which represents to conventional people that they are still not trusted by the system. They are influenced by incarceration and institutionalization in a manner which allows them to remain protected by avoiding conventional others. Friends accept them but their feelings about their own behaviours represent a barrier in their ability to properly connect with these people. If they have strong family support and some friends who will stick by them then they do have an opportunity to move beyond the label.

Ok, ahm. What kind of friendships? Are you talking like friendships? Ok, friendships, alright there was friends that I had from before really bad association, class stuff because that means a lot of trouble or maybe even death by now.

I was glad that actually when this happened because it separated me from those type of people. Not realizing how close I was to [inaudible] my friends he just died this last year. In December, coming off the farm; he is from the farm in _____________. He is actually the godfather of my son that is just to show you how close it came to where I could have been in the same situation. I hated the change from this type of thing.

I had calls from just before my sister moved because I was living with my sister, she moved while I was inside. The amount of calls that I used to get even when I was inside, people didn’t even know that I was even inside. Once they heard that I was inside they just disappeared into the woodwork. The only people who stuck around are the people who I am with today. And it is a small group and that group is good enough for me.

I don’t have to have this friend, and that friend, and that friend it just makes more money to spend. And it means more problems, now it is a small group and it is tight knit and I would bend over backwards for these two guys and I would bend over backwards for my family too. That, as far as friendship goes it is right there.

A problem for Type 2 is to face the consequences associated with being rejected by friends. In this case he had a friend who was killed. He reflects that if he had stayed on the same course he would have ended up in the same condition. They will tend to cling to
prosocial support for maintaining their resolve to reintegrate society where the people know of their criminal history; who still accept them. Two major events the murder of a close friend; and incarceration may be enough impetus for this individual to change.

Lenny Harris was 22-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent thirty-six months in prison representing thirty percent of his time has been in an institution. For forty percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

Harris reflects a dilemma for Type 2, they struggle with facing basic responsibilities. A number of the respondents stated that being involved in trafficking narcotics, or more to the point transporting them, as was reflected in the research of Adler (1993) the lucrative nature of this type of offence tends to act as a barrier to going straight or a magnet that draws them back into the lifestyle. Many got to travel to exotic places to perform their criminal activity. More to the point, they make as much in one trip as they would make in half a year of conventional work. Therefore, to maintain law-abiding status becomes an ongoing challenge and actually represents nonsensical behaviour for them at times.

“Ahh, because one of the crimes that I am in for is trafficking, right, and it is a glamour life. You always have money, and if you don’t have money you can always get money.

So when I come out now and reality kicks you again and says this is why you were selling drugs in the first place because you couldn’t do this, or you couldn’t get that or you can’t get this. It already comes back to after the initial oyea, I am out, I am free yea, then reality kicks in that yea, the bills are still there and you know so, and you see these guys, and yea, its there you can do it, you can make that money. In the same time I have in the back of my head that I can make that money in a day.

Type 2 ex-inmates require ongoing support. Everyday spells a temptation to return to the easy way. Why work for six months when I can get the money today? Despite
this, they know that to stay free means that they cannot give into the temptation. They also
recognise that the activity they were involved with has led to murder or being murdered.
They need to maintain the resolve that doing the right things will need to be ongoing for a
protracted period.

Matt Lawton was 22-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12
years old he has spent twenty-one months in prison representing thirty-three percent of his
time has been in an institution. For forty-eight percent of his life he has been involved with
the criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a
halfway facility.

Dealing with the stigma of being an offender is a particular problem for Type 2.
They tend to see themselves as both criminal and normal. When they are not engaged in
crime they see themselves as being like everyone else and they would trust that other
people would concur.

Yes, because a lot of people who know you are here, they really look down on you and what not. I had
one friend and her parents found out that I was an ex-offender and that I live in the halfway house and
whatnot, now I am not even allowed to associate with her because of her parents. Like they are
threatening her from even being friends, and that is all she is to me is just a friend, and I can't hardly
hang around with her unless she is with her boyfriend. And that is only on the job occasionally, every
other weekend I will get to see her, so like it sucks plain and simple.

Stigma and lack of trust are important problems that Type 2 individuals must deal
with. The recognition of their own ability to be duplicitous can lead to transference of that
attribute to others. In light of the temptations involved in the seeming logic of returning to
the old patterns rejection can propel them back into a criminal lifestyle.

Well, it is tough sometimes because sometimes I just want to give up you know. I just figure, I have
nothing out here for me, sure I have a few friends, whoopie, you know.

What I want is, I can't find a decent job you know.
And like I got all these other things like they are expecting of me, like urinalysis, and breathalyser programs, you know.

Sometimes every thing keeps adding up and piling up to the point where I am just willing to break and just say forget it, you know. Just go to parole and send me back and do whatever, you know; and other times I look at it and say at least I am out, you know.

The Type 2 ex-inmate is always walking the line between whether being prosocial is better than being a criminal. When they are moving in the right direction, they will take solace in the fact that they are out. When they are in a negative frame they would just as soon be returned to prison. After all, if there are no legitimate opportunities outside, why should they bother?

Where this attitude differs from that of a Type 1 is that they will try to find something to hold onto. But when people in society reject them they easily drift back into criminal thinking. Type 1 ex-inmates have no frame of positive reference in which to turn, they are struggling on an ongoing basis with rejecting their first thought which is to remain criminal. Prison is more a home than the community for Type 1. Prison is the consequence that resulted from social strain for Type 2 ex-inmates.

Jack Broskie was 41-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent thirty months in prison representing nine percent of his time has been in an institution. For sixteen percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

Many Type 2 ex-inmates engage in double speak. They seem to talk in circles. This is an indication that they are struggling with their dual tendency, being open is unfamiliar territory.

I don’t change who I am. I change maybe. I do not know if I change that, I talk a little bit different depending on who I am talking to.
But as far as what you are asking, the criminal aspect of it, I don't change that aspect of it. I talk, I act the way I have always acted.

Where I have changed, I haven't really changed it is the wrong word, my outlook has changed to where... I will give you an example:

There was a guy the other day that wanted me to go and panhandle with him, I am sure that he wanted me to go and hock my jewellery, and he was trying to get me to go and smoke a joint. And it's like I don't need it, I don't want it, so why should I do it. Well he said 'how long have you been locked up'; I said, "but I don't need it".

This is an indication of how Type 2 can be expected to be criminal. They have difficulty in dealing with the question of belonging in either world. Yet they have a foot in both. If they feel the need to commit an offence, they do, if not they don't. One day they 'don't need it' the next day they do. The fear of going to jail is not a problem. Broskie on the other hand describes how he considers himself in a more conventional setting.

Well I was going to say, my teacher the other day when I went to the orientation. He asked me about the house, 'did I have it finished yet'. So I pulled him aside to his office and I said, "the house is not finished yet, I am just getting out of a halfway house. I got busted".

He said, 'I realize that I was just breaking the ice'.

He needed to know, he is the coordinator of that program, (2) the reason why I thought that he needed to know is because on a personal level, although he is a teacher and I do not hang around with him, he is still an acquaintance a friend. I didn't feel shy to tell him.

I felt comfortable with him. And I also felt that he needed to know because he could then work with me for what I needed to get.

This example of therapeutic disclosure is typical of Type 2 ex-inmates. They manipulate situations and people to bring about what they believe to be the best outcome for themselves. They can relate to people in either culture in a manner that will allow them to function. They tend to be more discrete in hiding their criminal information from conventional people. They are the opposite when dealing with other offenders. Broskie explains, "but as far as what you are asking, the criminal aspect of it, I don't change that aspect of it."
Chuck Lynn was 34-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent twelve months in prison representing five percent of his time has been in an institution. For nine percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the second time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

Lynn is an interesting case for Type 2 ex-inmates. He has spent very little time in prison or in the criminal justice system. He has worked for one company for nine years. He has a grade 12 education. He was in a common-law marriage with children when he was also involved in the crime that he was sentenced for. These all indicate that he may be a Type 3 ex-inmate.

The distinguishing features that changed him from Type 3, based on his criminal profile, will be considered. He speaks to whether others view him as criminal.

Family, and friends, family, No!
My family love me very much they and they knew what I did and I explained why I did it and they understand and they took it at face value. It was something I did a mistake I made and I got caught. Paying, doing the time, say you do the time and you pay the crime and you do the time out of it. So they understood.

This in itself would distinguish Lynn as a Type 3.

Friends, there is not a whole lot of those. The only reason why there were friends, because you were into the drug use and you were drug selling, and that is why they were around.

This could classify Lynn as a Type 1.

And since it all transpired and I got out now, due to circumstances I am not allowed to be associated anyway with these people, who would really matter anyway for the simple reason of the whole experience with these people was due to the drug scene.

Co-workers, yes, because the company that I worked for, for nine years when I got out I went back to them and they wouldn't hire me.
This last part of his statement is what distinguishes him as a Type 2. He was working all the time that he was also using and selling drugs. He had a dual life. He maintained a job while drug dealing and using.

Pretty much the structure, due to my past, I was getting away from my goals that I previously set in my life. Things never kept me on the path that I wanted to keep onto.

Getting arrested and incarcerated gave me time to start thinking about where I was going. I was just kicking a dead dog down the road the last eight years never doing a worthwhile thing in my life. Wasn't getting me anywhere.

From the time that I was incarcerated and the structure that I received from ___________ and the goals that they are pushing me toward. I was out, I was out, by the time I got to __________, I was already into working a week, and ah, and the structural environment that I have here it is incredible. I just perceive that the structure that I have here and the structure that I have with my home life now it is just so much better it is just, all the structure that you receive it just keeps you on the straight and narrow and you can project goals for yourself. It just keeps you plugging away.

The central feature of Type 2 ex-inmates is that they need to adhere to social structures to be able to stay on task. Even when they are engaged in learning techniques and patterns that would allow them to maintain a life free of crime they have prior knowledge of prosocial behaviour. A problem they face dealing with the realism of what they can now expect from life.

A normal lifestyle for me, right now would be to get off work in the evenings and to go home and to see my wife to be home with her. Be home with my dogs. Be home so on Saturday to wake up and go ride our horses that we have. My goal is to have within... like working hard and obeying the laws; which is something that I wasn't doing before because drugs were a problem in my life. Going home and pulling into my little white picket fence at my little house in the woods. That is an incredible life and I think that that is what I want for myself years down the road.

Type 2 ex-inmates are given to grandiose expectations. Lynn states that he has horses. Yet,

Putting my criminal past behind me. Is the last thing that I want to remember because it brings back a lot of pain. Due to the fact that when I got busted I left her in a farmhouse in the middle of the country with no heat, no hydro, no nothing, no money, no vehicles, no nothing.

And she stuck with me and saw me through this and she told me that she was going to be there.
It is not likely that Lynn's wife was able to keep horses when she had no hydro, money, vehicles no resources. Unless Type 2 individuals give up their unrealistic expectations and ideations they are likely to be unable to maintain a life free of crime. They also need to deal with their guilt over how they have hurt innocent people in their lives. This statement from Lynn accentuates the need he has for a structured life.

To come back out to learn to live a normal lifestyle it was a little bit difficult for reasons, that when you went through the system you had pretty much your day was for, for twenty-three hours a day locked down.

That when you finally did get to camp, it was sanctioned for what you did during today type thing, and to come out and to be let loose back into society from the halfway house where I came from first before I got here to __________ there was no structure. It was anarchy personally and I would have rather be sent back to the penitentiary. Like I even asked to be.

Type 2 ex-inmates do best within a structured environment. They need to have governors so that they do not give into the many temptations and diversions that life can throw at them. They also need the opportunity to pursue their dreams in conventional life without facing constant mistrust and rejection.

Type 2: Case study of Reggie Harris

As drawn from each of the transcripts the main characteristics of Type 2 are as follows: 1) they are comfortable associating with both conventional and criminal others; 2) they have employable skills; 3) they may become part of a religious order; 4) they take less time during the initial stages of their release to adjust to everyday life; 5) their commitment to change is always tenuous; 6) they may appear criminal or conventional in their physical appearance, but this is not defining in-as-much-as cloths do not define the man; 7) institutionalization increased their commitment to criminal thinking; 8) They dream of or have had a lavish lifestyle; 9) they are particularly adversely affected by social
rejection (stigma) as it does not allow them to hide; 10) they will engage in therapeutic disclosure (use their criminal identity to gain support from some who they feel will act positively to their apparent attempts to change).

Harris' transcript reflects each of the ten points defining a Type 2. The following narrative and analysis is developed from Reggie Harris' responses to the interview schedule. At the time of the interview Reggie Harris was a thirty-year-old Caucasian male. He has acquired grade twelve, completed in prison. He had completed grade nine before he went to prison. He is engaged to marry. He has two dependents.

He has some problems admitting to being a criminal. He was gainfully employed when an industrial accident took away his identity as a body builder, boxer, and employee. He recognises that he may be simply a person steeped in self-pity and as such went out and did things that were self-destructive. After some reflection he admits that he is a criminal. He believes that others have considered him to be a criminal since his accident due to his behavioural shift. He claims that people no longer see him as an offender since he has been out of prison.

The following, from the transcripts, will set the tone for understanding where Harris is in terms of denial and avoidance issues.

Since my accident, yea. Now that they see me now, the way they see me now today, no. I don't know if that makes sense to you, but, by the time I cut my hand up until I got arrested for the aggravated assault and everything, yea, I was a criminal. But the way my family see me now you know they don't (bold text added for clarity).

His family has been led to believe that he is attempting to change and that he is the son they used to know before the defining incident where he lost his hand.

Even though you returned to jail, even though you used crack, they don't see you as a criminal?
Yea, I guess I used crack for the first three days. Ok, but I am saying they don’t know about it and so therefore they don’t see me as being a criminal.

His commitment to change is tenuous. He admits to being involved in smoking crack for three days when he first got out of prison. His initial reaction to being out of prison was to use crack, as he was unsure of himself. As such he has been involved in criminal activity since his release. He claims that he has no intention of establishing connection with people who are known to the police when he is released from the halfway agency. He claims that he is not still involved with people he knows who are involved with criminal activity yet he acquired cocaine for use. He is aware that for him to associate with drug dealers and people from his criminal lifestyle will result in his return to crack use and other criminal behaviour.

No. I see people, I walk to ______ square and I see some of the dealers that I used to buy off of, or some of the people I used to smoke crack with; I just walk by them I don’t even look at them.

I don’t. I say this my life has changed, I don’t even stop and talk, I just keep going. Because I know if I stop and talk, my son, who expects to be with me every weekend, is not going to see daddy again. I haven’t seen him in four years and then the day I seen him, I was like, it was like, he was like daddy, and I am like, holy cow, I didn’t know what to do, so I just grabbed him, hugged him, squeezed him, kissed him and I just started crying. Here is this little boy that I have never been in his life, and now that I have a chance to be in his life, I am going to be in his life.

For some Type 2 ex-inmates religion is not the answer, however, they may turn to children as the anchor they require to maintain conventional behaviour. His principal motivation to stay out of prison is his son and making amends to his parents. His fiancée is also a source of guidance and support. The only input about his fiancée is that she has tried to connect him to counselling through the minister where they go to church. She also has provided an influence that has started him attending church. But most importantly she has allowed him to be involved in the life of their son.
He claims that he is about to start a business management course. He has money coming from the industrial accident, but because of his crack use he missed appointments and court dates. He had to start the process over again when he was released from prison. He immediately started the process of getting his settlement upon release from prison.

His life has been out of control since the accident. He tried correspondence courses while at the halfway agency but he could not stay on task. He has employable skills if it were not for his handicap so now he must turn to learning a new skill to gain employment.

He has had difficulty adhering to the conditions at the halfway house. As stated, he had smoked crack, and two weeks prior to the interview he had been two hours late coming back for curfew. He lost his weekend pass, referred to above, and had his curfew reduced from ten to six o'clock. Another example of his tenuous ties to authority and conventional life.

That is when I was put on a six o'clock curfew. I see my son every weekend, and I had to explain to him that you can't come over this weekend, because daddy can't be there. And he said to me, "so daddy, are you going back to jail? Don't you love me?" You know all those little five-year-old questions, and I kind of just sat there.

The following provides details as to what got him to where he is today.

I was kicked out of school when I was sixteen, fifteen or sixteen. I started working for a friend's one of my dad's friend's company. Construction ___________________________ and ___________________________. I got hired on at ______when I was eighteen; I was saving money at this time.

This indicates that he was rebellious in school. Family support allowed him to gain employment. He saved his money.

When I cut my hand up, I had roughly, forty to fifty grand and I wanted to get a ferryboat going from
to somebody, and I heard that somebody tried that already and it went under. I wanted to do this when I was eighteen nineteen, and then I had all these business ventures; you know I was a fighter. I had so much going for me. I was so business-oriented; that is what I wanted to do. I was saving money for business and then all of a sudden.

What was your question again? I forget where I am going with this.

He appeared to be conventional in appearance at the time of the accident. He comports himself and dresses in a conventional manner. He summarizes the obstacles that he has in front of him in this way:

Well lack of trust. Who trusts a crack head? Nobody! Who trusts somebody that robs and steals and beats people up? Nobody!

This indicates that he has real problem with rejection. It is made more profound because he led a life as a crack head while living a conventional life at his parents.

Harris has spent two years in prison and four years in the corrections system. He has been in one halfway facility for a period of thirteen months.

He does not believe that CSC provides any guidance for assisting in ex-inmates', or prisoners' return to community. He believes that the halfway house does provide necessary guidance. Upon consideration, he acknowledges that while in prison he was able to get his grade twelve.

Harris has been denied full parole on a few occasions. He admits to using crack again because of this. He says that he is not clear himself as to whether it was because of the stress or the pain that he is in. Staff had provided him supportive advice at the halfway facility. "They are always here to talk to. Any time I have a problem I can talk to any counsellor and they are always happy to sit in a room and talk to me."
He would not like people to refer to him in terms of his status as an offender. He says that I have a name and they should use it. For a staff member to refer to him as being on his or her caseload would make him feel like a criminal.

For him day parole allows him the freedom to work on personal change that would not have been possible in prison. He can see his family, pursue a life but he wants more freedom of movement – he wants full parole.

He has another six months in the halfway facility before the parole board will consider granting full parole because of his most recent breach. He sees prison and the community as two different worlds, and he claims to have made a decision to remain in the community. The prison experience has had an indelible effect on him. He has experienced the worst of prison life, people being killed and injured.

There was a few fights in prison, and ah, I have seen many stabbing, I have seen guys get killed, and when I was in Collins Bay I seen blood gushing out of a guy's throat, I mean that is just sick, that is scary. Now that I am out that scares me. That does.

Now that he is on the street, he does not believe that he acts differently than normal people. He does not admit that being a crack user, a robber, a thug has changed who he is or how he acts. He thinks that the prison experience has given him more to prove to show that he is not the person the criminal experience indicates.

He is moving away from identifying as a criminal because of intimates support.

You know what? I am starting to get back some trust from family, I am starting to get some of my good friends. Their lives have changed drastically. I mean in six years of smoking crack I am giving up. Their lives have changed drastically; mine has too.

But these are really good family friends, and they are like my family, my cousins stuff like that. And I am starting to get trust back from them. And that was amazing.

All is not positive. There are still many people who are afraid of him, as to what he may do to them and what he may do to himself or others.
I have some people who are like I feel they are afraid of me.

But you know what I tell them, you know what you don't have to be afraid of me because I am not fucking anything for you to be afraid of. And I am not. I get along with anybody.

The last job that he had on the outside lasted two years, which was the longest that he had ever been at any job. He had not been gainfully employed for nine years, because of crack use and prison. He was not working at the time of the interview. He had money coming in and plans to start his own business. He does not have any intention of trying to work for anyone else. He has been subject to disassociation explained in this way.

Actually, I feel that I have been numb for the past seven years, six, seven years. So I feel that I am twenty something. Truthfully I feel that I am just a twenty-year-old kid still trying to make it.

He has almost daily contact with his family. The feedback that he received from the previous breach of his parole conditions where he was late for curfew had an impact on him and his family. Any credibility that he had built up was lost.

It is going great other than this past week, when I was late for my curfew. I had my mom crying on the phone. My mom thinking oh my god what did he do. Like did he just change overnight, before it happened, why are you in there?

I am very lucky to have my mom and dad; have been most supportive. Just being so loving, being there. I mean not, like not forgetting my past but not throwing it in my face and not saying like.

You know I used to bring stolen things home and store them in the garage. My parent’s house used to be under surveillance. I put them through hell. I am so lucky that they are, it is unbelievable.

Because I have talked to guys, their parents just gave up on them; they don’t have a mother or a father. I have a mother and a father, I consider myself very lucky.

Harris uses certain management strategies to affect reintegration. When he meets people whom he knows are still involved with criminal activity he “leaves. I just say ‘Ya!’. When he speaks he says “my life has changed, I am not the person that I used to be. I don’t even stop to talk to them. I just move on.” He repeats that he is not now more comfortable with them, “Back then yea, not now.”
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In terms of disclosure he has this to say

*If it ain't family they don't need to know. Family, close friends.*

Upon further examination he expands his network of those he discloses to.

*At the schools, I go to church on Sundays. Actually, today a pastor phoned me, my lady where she works, one of the lawyers there. She goes to church every Sunday and she invited me, she asked if I wanted to talk to him; he called today and I have an appointment on November 4th. What that is going to do, I don't know.*

Harris is also subject to being identified in the community as an offender because he speaks at schools about his experience. He also must deal with those people who his lady speaks to about his past or those who want to help him. He is constantly dealing with external sources that are influencing his reintegration.

He tries to justify his action with others by explaining that the accident that removed his hand completely changed his life, and everything went crazy. He does not accept that he is feeling sorry for himself. He accepts the fact that others can see him as being a loser.

He explains how his life was out of control,

*Even the women I was with... I would say that I am going to buy a package of cigarettes. I would say that I would be back in half an hour and I would be back in five days.*

*I completely played games with them. I was a complete loser while I was smoking crack.*

He is giving consideration to becoming a childcare worker. He has even looked into the requirements at the local college. He recognises that he needs to assist others in avoiding going down the road that he took.

He also recognises that many of his problems came from keeping all that he was feeling bottled up. He now seeks out people to talk to who can help him to make sense of what he is feeling. He accepts that this is important to his rehabilitation and reintegration.
He has learned to reject those people who judge him because of his past activity. He expresses pain at how some people still look at him but does not spend time trying to convince them that he had changed, he simply ignores them.

The interview closed with the following statement.

*May I say something? I don't want to hang around with friends. I don't want to live a criminal life. That is just me, and as far as this halfway house is concerned every counsellor, it is a great place, it is just a great place. This is a super fucking, I mean it beats sitting in prison and maybe getting killed. So the halfway house thing is great.*

He is not yet set in his ways.

Summary discussion

Reggie Harris is a 30 year old who has spent ten years in lifestyle that has resulted in his feeling that they never occurred. He states that he feels like he is 20. This marks the point when an industrial accident changed his life.

He is in a potentially healthy relationship with a woman who has conventional values. He appears to be devoted to a relationship with his son. He has strong family and extended family support. His parents have stuck with him throughout, this may have been enabling, but he is now viewing them as a reason to stay on course. There was no information provided on the other dependant that he admits to having. He does recognise that he is vulnerable to returning to a criminal lifestyle, as he is a "criminal". He believes that others accept that he has changed. He has, for the most part restricted his association to those people who have a positive influence on his reintegration efforts.

He has serious problems with remaining on focus. He has had numerous breaches for crack use, curfew violation and use of illegal non-prescribed medication. In
the case of Harris and other Type 2 ex-inmates the criminal identity is only one of the social labels that they have to deal with. Some will be dropouts, some will be handicapped, and some will bear a racial stigma. The problem related to a dual identity is often compounded by the barriers from other social problems they have.

The accident that took his hand set him on a course that he has not been able to control. He is a cripple, a crack head, a criminal and an ex-inmate. He has a great deal to overcome.

The compensation that will come from the accident may provide him with the means to begin his own business. This reflects his desire to live a lavish lifestyle. He also has made some efforts to look into going back to school and training in childcare. His handicap has forced him to believe that he cannot work in steel industry any longer.

Some people reject him, and others are afraid of him. He does not want to be considered as the person he used to be. He is no longer a crack head, despite using on a few occasions. He has not become totally submerged in the lifestyle. He is however vulnerable to returning to that sub-culture so he avoids people whom he knows to still be involved in drugs and crime.

Harris has done very little time in prison. Relationally, he has served a much longer period in the halfway facility than is usual. Using crack for the first three days after release could be the reason. The problem with reacting with longer periods is that this practice does not anticipate the programme needs of the person. It is still punishment based and not programme based. It also has a great deal to do with the parole board not granting him full parole. He is not ready for full release to the community but does not want to have to stay at the halfway facility.
His experience in prison brought him into conflict with bikers when he tried to distance himself from working as a dealer/enforcer in prison for them. He stated that he did work for them in the beginning of his incarceration. This claim is not creditable since such affiliation would usually cause the parole board to not grant early parole, at least his deviant behaviour in prison must have been very short lived.

He has seen a number of people in prison who have been stabbed, killed and beaten. If he was involved with the biker culture inside there is reason to believe that he was involved in the activity at one time. This behaviour may have shortened his tenure, as it scared him.

He is a Type 2 ex-inmate because he has lived in both worlds. He has strong prosocial support. He has spent time gainfully employed, and there is good reason to believe that if the accident did not occur he would still be a productive member of society. He will require monitoring and direction for maintaining prosocial behaviours. The ongoing communication with the minister and/or a mental health care provider may assist him. It is incongruous that he is not seeing a psychologist. For a general detailed profile of Type 2 see Appendix XII.

Descriptive data: Elements of the Type 3 ex-inmates

The third and final typing is made up of Type 3 ex-inmates who are involved with reconstructing their social identity as law-abiding citizens - that is, they had normatively self-identified as conventional citizens and for the most part still do. They had, until their conviction(s) and subsequent imprisonment been identified by others as normal citizen.
Their principal orientation is law-abiding, however they have fallen from grace as a result of poor or rash judgement stemming from social pressures.

Jason Kendall was selected to represent Type 3 in the profiling section to follow. There were four other respondents who fit the Type 3 profile who will be considered. The salient points that define Type 3 will be described.

Allen Bradley was 28-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent eleven months in prison representing six percent of his time has been in an institution. For thirteen percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

Type 3 ex-inmates do not consider themselves to be entrenched as criminals. They see the event or series of events as episodic.

Yes, I have committed a criminal activity but I don’t consider myself to be a criminal. This is not something that I plan to do for a living, I happen to make a mistake in life and hopefully I have learned from it and continue on and that is not the right way to go. I would like to turn that around and do something positive.

They invariably, during the interview, express that they are not criminally oriented. They do not see the behaviour as something that they will be repeating. The experience has taught them that they must ‘continue on’; re-establish a pattern of behaviour that aligns with ‘something positive’.

Ernie Whitt was 39-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent thirty-eight months in prison representing twelve percent of his time has been in an institution. For twelve percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.
Type 3 ex-inmates are trying to re-establish themselves in the community. In some cases they are returning to a warm environment. Whitt’s crime had to do with an offence against his family. He will not be able to re-establish a relationship with them. I guess, what I did I broke the law. I did some time. In my situation, my wife does, and I don’t have any other friends, no contact at all with them. So I don’t really know what they think.

In the case of those who have serious drug or alcohol problems, they may not be returning to join the work force.

Abm, I have had a lot of different jobs. I had a big government job once, but for comprehension. I am ok for the start but if something happens I get behind and I get frustrated and I get worried and I just can’t keep up, and that leads to stress, I have been on disability before so; I am in need of a monthly trip so.

Once his pension is re-established and with programming that he can access, like other Type 3 he may be able to function in the community with minimal supervision.

I did finish a self-help substance abuse at RTC but my teacher there suggested that I should go at least once a week and I will talk to my parole officer about that I do think that I need it.

Jerry Lewis was 48-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent forty-eight months in prison representing eleven percent of his time has been in an institution. For twelve percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

Whitt represents another perspective on Type 3 disability issues.

I don’t really feel that it is right because they make it too hard on a guy. In my opinion it should have never got cut off in the first place it should have got reduced. But I don’t feel that I should have got cut off. When you are entitled to a pension, totally disabled, four heart attacks, open heart surgery, I had the open heart surgery after I went to the institution. I had the heart attacks prior to going.

The most important feature of Type 3 is whether a protracted time in community corrections can contribute anything to this person’s life. In the case of those who require a disability the halfway agency is useful in providing them with food, lodging and other basic needs while the paperwork can be processed and they are able to then take care of
themselves in the community. Because of the criminogenic factors, structured activities in
the community can go a long way to assisting these people to stay out of prison. Boredom
and loneliness can be a problem for people who do not have an active lifestyle.

When you are inside it certainly does affect you, when you are told that you are disabled and you have
nowhere to make any money. Which you can do inside the institution because the institution provides
places to work for those who have the ability to do so. If you can't work then you live on the canteen that
they give you, which is nothing. Well its not nothing it is $40 or something every two weeks. And
therefore you have nothing to occupy your time in there you sit in your cell and you have no hobby crafts
you can't buy things you can't buy woodwork you can't buy woodcarving tools you just can't do a lot of
things in there. If you don't have the family to send in money, some people do and some people don't. I
found it very boring and disturbing in there because in my opinion I was, instead of getting better doing
something in there or have the opportunity to find something like [inaudible]. If I were to have the money
I could have come out of there a hell of a good woodcarver or painter or something. Forty months is a long
time. Now I am in exactly the same position that I was when I went in there.

Type 3 must try to re-establish a life when they are released to the community.

The problems that society provides opportunities for the able bodied to work and that
pensions only meet basic needs will mirror the problems that Lewis had with his time in
prison. He will find that 'Now I am in exactly the same position that I was when I went in
there'.

Ramon Garcia was 34-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12
years old he has spent six months in prison representing two percent of his time has been
in an institution. For three percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice
system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

Type 3 ex-inmates see themselves in conventional terms.

I am a hard worker, so I enjoy working I have no problem with my ambitions are still there. I have that
drive to achieve a lot of goals. And if my job is very interesting, it is not a boring job, sitting down that
type of thing where I like to be active. So I just go back to my original routine. I build moulds for plastic
rejection moulding and it is. I am a leader I am in charge and I have apprentices so I am busy. It is just
that I enjoy being secure and reading the prints and doing the line-up dealing with this type of job.
A key to interpreting this statement is 'so I just go back to my original routine'. He has re-established himself in his occupation and is starting to feel good about his life again.

I think that it is just a matter of time that people are just going to forget it. I know that I am not an extremely bad person, again I know what I have done wrong. And I know that most of the people that I have grown up with, and people that I have known most of my life know exactly what I am like. I believe that they think that it is more out of my character. And I am sure that they will see that in time.

Type 3 ex-inmates acted in ways that are out of character. Most people in their lives realise that the criminal behaviour was episodic.

Getting back into society and doing the things that I already had in my head, my friends and what I really wanted to do. And I followed through with every step since I have been out. They have just been very supportive and not pushy or nothing and very patient about it all.

Type 3 believes that reintegration is possible as long as they can maintain a means of support.

Shawn Green was 44-years-old at the time of the interview. Since he was 12 years old he has spent ninety months in prison representing twenty-three percent of his time has been in an institution. For thirty-one percent of his life he has been involved with the criminal justice system. This represents the first time that he has been paroled to a halfway facility.

Type 3 ex-inmates are episodic criminals. They have often committed a rash act. Domestic murder, based on an emotive outburst is an example of the causality for the event that placed them in conflict with the law.

No. Just was a one-time shot. I have worked all my life, since I was sixteen years old, since I quit school. I was married and had a daughter and I still do not consider myself to be a criminal.

Despite the fact that they may not see themselves as offenders, Chapter 3 demonstrated that they all have experienced stigma as a result of bearing the offender
label. It can be understood from accounts that for a Type 3, who wants to just go on with their lives after prison, to be treated the same as a Type 1 who is still involved with the criminal subculture represents a miscarriage of justice.

All must be allowed to move beyond the label. The issues for community corrections is how long? How much? Does a person require supervision? And, what kind of programming will assist them with their reintegration?

Type 3: Case study of Jason Kendall

Type 3 ex-inmates are conventional in many respects. They are hard workers, professional people or people on pensions. The offending pattern is: 1) episodic; 2) experienced as alienation from all family and friends, usually when the victim(s) were family members; 3) related to substance abuse during the period when the offence took place; 4) reflective of a good work ethic, or conventional expectations on how they are going to support themselves; 5) characterized by good family support (where the victim was not a family member); 6) amenable to recapturing some friendships; usually managed by some degree of concentration on the system as being at fault; and, 7) reflective of a need to start over.

The following narrative and analysis is developed from Jason Kendall’s responses to the interview schedule. At the time of the interview Jason Kendall was a 32-
year-old male of Middle Eastern descent. At the time of the offence he had a diploma in
business administration. He is married with "one little boy".

When he was asked if he felt that he was a criminal he responded, "well I would
like to think not but in actual fact I am." His reason was a little less definitive.

No actually, I don't actually consider myself to be a criminal because I don't have the same attitudes, and
I don't do the same things that I used to do that would categorize me as a criminal. At one point in time;
yes! But not anymore!

A similar duality was reflected in his response to whether others saw him as
criminal. "Ah, I don't think that my immediate family does, but I do believe certain of my
friends and acquaintances do."

He is not still involved with anyone who is living a criminal lifestyle, nor does he
feel more comfortable in the company of other ex-offenders. He has no intention of
associating with other ex-offenders when he is released from the halfway agency. He has
not committed an offence since his release.

The following details his experiences in his attempt to reintegrate.

That is a tough one, and it is very long too. But I will just try to tell you some of the areas.
My background is actually accounting and finance; and it is the only thing that I really had a passion for;
and it is something that I am not able to do anymore; and I was sort of closed minded at looking at other
avenues. So this is basically one of the things that I had a tough time dealing with.

And that is one thing that probably got me in trouble, being closed-minded. However, I had to explore
other avenues, mind you, it is still that I wish I could do some things. While I was incarcerated, I thought
about some of my options and ah, I thought that is the only area that I couldn't get into those things
either. For a simple thing, I was thinking about getting a dealership license; I can't get a dealership
license, I can't get a real estate license. But so, not only was what I did affected, but also my options on
what I can do.

And one of the jobs that I actually, this is my second time re-offending, and ah, during my first time I
tried to get my life back on track. With some luck I came across a pretty good firm that would hire me;
they took me on. A few months down the road, there was another opening within the firm, something that
I was qualified for. And it was at the suggestion of my boss and I did so. For that position they ended up
doing, basically a criminal check, and apparently they found out that I had a record. So never mind the
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new position, I also was let go of the present job.

In my past experience I have handled these experiences very poorly; to think real low of myself that I can't do anything only to re-offend. And I guess one of the most important things is how society views me. And how hard it is that I can't do anything.

So this time around I have done a bit longer time, and I have a lot to think about, about straightening out my life and where I went wrong and what changes I need to do. And there is no question that there has been a lot of obstacles and it has been a very difficult path. Simply because of the way people see us, and the way people behave toward us. And the options that we have, they are limited. They want us to be like everybody else but we really can't be like everybody else.

So lets just say that I am making the best of the situation. I understand that there is going to be obstacles, you know, but the way that I approach them and deal with them is different now.

In light of these statements Kendall's response to what he believes he will need to do is heartening. He said,

To be honest I think that I am on the right path now. I have a wonderful family; really good support from my family. I have a great PO that I can speak to anything about, a great counsellor, I have all the support network in place and I utilize it.

I'm trying to get established in my own business that I just recently set up and it is working out just fine. But, you know, I really, really wanted to actually get back to my roots, which is accounting and finance, but it has been out of the question. You know, I had to explore other avenues and this is one of them, and it is something that is working out, maybe it is for the best.

Kendall has started a business doing web design; a local municipality is one of his clients.

A normal lifestyle for Kendall would be to be free "like everybody else". The restrictions stemming from his criminal activity has placed social strains on himself and on his family.

He has experienced alienation from some people who he used to consider friends, "at times like that you really find out who your friends are". In terms of his immediate family, he does not feel that they treat him differently than before he went to prison. In a similar vein to that taken by Green in Chapter 3 people's body language and silence has an adverse effect on him.
Well I can tell by the conversations that we have. The conversations are not as personal and the eye contact really isn't there anymore. It is not as close anymore. And I can always sense something; that something is there. Maybe it is just me! But you know, I truly believe that there is something there.

Well we have ah, family friends, and we have them over sometimes. They are usually not, like some of the people who I used to get along really good with me, ah, never really talk to me anymore when they come over. So right away I know that there is something there.

Kendall has spent “just over three and a half years,” in prison; and just over four years in the system. He has only been to a halfway agency once. At the time of the interview he had spent two and a half months in the agency.

Kendall does not believe that CSC assists a person to change. He had this to say as to how he experienced his incarceration.

Assisting I guess would mean the help that a person requires to change his ways, or to deal with situations better. Or things that get a person in trouble.

I don't really think that it is assisting. It is more like telling us what we have to do. It is a big difference. Assisting is basically recognizing a problem and also having the input of the offender. Because the offender is the best to let you know the areas that the person has problems in and then taking it from there.

Rather than, you know them just reading up the report on what you did. Well you know, you did this wrong that means that you weren't thinking so you have to do this. So they do all the analysis, and just saying this is our analysis and this is what you have to do. I don't believe that, that is assisting.

Kendall discussed the problem that many have in relations to having to take programmes, “obviously nobody wants to take programs”. He however concedes that there is benefits from taking part in CSC imposed direction. He recalls, “you know? You do pick up little things that you think about later and say ‘yea! I got something out of that program’.

I'll just give you an example. One of the programs that I bad to take was cog skills. My, all the stuff was saying that I didn’t need it, I was saying that I never needed it. But once I started the program and everything right, I took part in it and I got a lot out of it. These programs can be helpful and I know a lot of people don’t like to do them.

A lot of times we don’t know ourselves what the problem is, right. So somebody going through these problems do we realize that we can relate to a lot of these programs and get something out of it?
This is very interesting. Kendall had just finished complaining about not being included in the process of making decisions. He complained about having things imposed, here he has admitted that imposing positive messages will help a person who is struggling with who he is and what he needs to become. It suggests that he wants to be empowered but has problems with trusting.

Kendall explains the difference between the assistance that the halfway agency provides contrasted to CSC.

*Ok this is another. There is a difference between here and the halfway house. The halfway house tried to assist you in the area that you need help. And they recognize the importance of that and usually it is in our best interest that they keep us out because basically, because it looks good upon them, right. They are there if you want to talk to them about anything. And if we need anything they are there for us.*

There are several messages in this statement. First, he refers to “here” meaning prison; the interview was conducted in the halfway agency. There appears to be some difficulty with differentiating the prison experience from that of his time in the facility. He was able to understand that programmes in the halfway agency provided services to the person in need. Some interventions are imposed, as it is prison, but here it is for two good reasons, according to Kendall. The halfway house requires bed days for funding, and “to look good”. Also, “they are there for you”, indicates that the motivation of the CC centre is survival, the client and not to punish.

He explains what it is like to be on parole.

*It is a big step from being inside, first of all. I have my freedom although it is not total freedom. I am still able to work. I am able to have a family. I am able to do a lot of the good things that I wasn’t able to do. A lot of the things that I took for granted before, I can appreciate now.*

Kendall has very conventional needs. He has a business – a source of income and he has strong family bonds. “So I have the basic needs that are there.”
Kendall would like to have the prison, halfway and parole experience behind him. He is realistic that all will come in time. In the mean time, he feels that he is ahead of the schedule that he set for himself and that his reintegration plan is meeting his needs.

His prison experience had a profound influence on him.

Absolutely, absolutely! I am sure you know you have been there also an ex-convict as well. I was at Collins Bay, one of the tougher places. And a lot of things go on there; a lot of things that I have never been exposed to before. A lot of manipulations, a lot of drugs, a lot of this, a lot of all the negative things are there. And it is not a place that I wanted to be in again, and it is not the kind of people that I want to be around again.

Being denied a lot of things, and ah, just made me realize how important it is for me to be outside.

In the main, the distinguishing feature for Kendall, as a Type 3 is that he states that he acts and thinks like a normal person. He believes that his prison experience has not changed how he is in the social world, but it has made him realize that he is not suited for criminal life. He wants his social actions to be transparent, as he wants people to accept who he is now, a normal person. So if a staff member of the halfway agency, or his parole officer introduces him as a parolee he does not appreciate this.

Oh well, (laughter), I don't really appreciate it. You know because I try to keep this very private and it is not something that you know that I just want anyone to know. So I am the type of person who likes to keep my privacy.

Kendall was obviously a competent bookkeeper. He was at the job for only four months when, as he recounted earlier, he was considered for a promotion; and then dismissed because he had a criminal record. This had a lot to do with him dropping out of conventional society. The longest he spent at any one job was four years. As mentioned, he is presently self-employed.

He has chosen to not disclose his offender identity to potential employers, or accounts. He will not disclose to co-workers or employees. He is planning on a
contingency business in case he is also barred from doing the business that he is now engaged in.

He used his time wisely while he was in prison.

Actually it has because it sort of kept me in tune with the outside world. While I was inside I was in the school. I put together a personal finance course. I ran several stock market games, which were sponsored by the Toronto Star. So there was a lot of reading involved a lot of monitoring and a lot of teaching. So it kept me motivated and it is something that I enjoyed doing. It is something that I can relate to.

His previous education, acquired before prison, has done little in terms of affecting his reintegration. Because of professional accreditation problems, his education has an adverse impact on his direct employment opportunities.

He has contact with his family almost everyday. The relationship with his wife has improved since he has been out of prison. Before he went to prison there were serious communication problems in his marriage. As he stated he was "very closed minded". He had an opportunity, while in prison to reflect on his past behaviour and made some changes, which has allowed the relationship to progress upon his release.

I think that I am, first of all I am honest with myself and I am honest with my family; the ones that are around me, the ones that can help me. I am able to communicate my feelings, you know, if something is bothering me, I am able to ask for help. So I think that, you know, I have improved in a lot of areas which were actually pulling me down before.

I think that I am very fortunate for having them because they have been there for me the whole time through. For the past three and a half years my wife came down to see me every weekend, three hours there and three hours back. And my parents they visited me occasionally. And every day I spoke for half an hour to my wife for three and a half years on the phone. So just for them being there for me and them telling me how much I mean to them was enough to keep me going and make my time a bit easier.

As previously admitted Kendall does not get involved with other ex-offenders. In fact he "Absolutely!" avoids contact with ex-offenders outside of the halfway agency.

He does not disclose to anyone. He believes that "outside of people in corrections and his family, no on needs to know".
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He has made a few compromises in terms of disclosure related to people who could help him which accords with Herman's (1993) therapeutic disclosure. "I have gone out to a counsellor and a credit counsellor and you know I have disclosed this information because if someone can help me I am ready to disclose it." So anyone who can help, he recognises that they need to know. However, he avoids getting into details. He takes responsibility for his actions and does not attempt to minimize or deflect responsibility onto his drug use. He never tries to justify his actions. He can identify precipitates for his actions. He explains them as reasons, not excuses. He will share his experience, if he believes that it may help someone else.

Kendall manages the difficult transition from being an ex-offender to becoming a law-abiding citizen in this way.

I think that one of the things are attitude: the way you think, the way you respond, the way you behave. Things that you know that I really didn’t think about before, and now I am able to approach the same problems but in a much more effective way; law-abiding way; I am able to explore other avenues. I am open-minded. I have choices. I have alternatives if this don’t work I can do something else. So it is the whole approach of tackling an issue or problem situation.

The halfway house has contributed to his ability to stay out of prison.

For one thing, I have had some credit problems and they helped me find a credit counsellor. I actually contacted and went out for help. They got me into this. I wanted a little cog skills booster program because initially when I took the cog skills it was a very effective program for me. It is actually the program that actually changed my outlook the way I think and all that. So when I got out I requested you know, maybe a booster program and they got me into it.

And, you know and they are pretty good with me if I am finding something they are there to help.

Kendall is ambivalent about the idea of an ex-offender support group.

I don’t know I have a different opinion on this. I never, it works for some people mind you, don’t get me wrong it is not for everybody. I know for a fact that it is not for me. Just recently I was being sort of told to go to GA meetings. And my attitude is different toward it. As I said you get out basically what you put in. So for me it doesn’t work right now. So overall I think that it can be very helpful for some people who need support.
Summary discussion

Jason Kendall is a thirty-two year old of middle-eastern descent. He is a person who has acknowledged that he has been criminal in his life. He has related this activity to bad judgment in dealing with stressful situations. He has strong family support but has experienced stigma in his dealing with some past friends, some relatives, and some employers.

He had a career in accounting and finance that he is now unable to pursue. Losing his job, because he had a prior criminal record for drug possession, factored into his repeated bad decisions. His life’s passion was lost because of his criminal past, leading to his loss of confidence in his employability. For this reason he has now decided on self-employment.

He has sought counselling for psychological and financial reasons. He also has a problem with gambling but has refused to pursue ongoing self-help in this regard. He does not believe in self-help groups in his case as he has other sources of support in the community. Cognitive skills have helped him to be able to arrive at better decisions.

His ability to appreciate and communicate with his wife has been positive. The fact that there are people who visit their home who do not acknowledge him may be a problem in the future, especially after he leaves the agency and moves home on a permanent basis. He will need to be coached in this regard.

His wife has been a rock throughout, travelling back and forth every week to visit him in prison for three and one half years. His parents have also supported him to the degree that they also visited him, and have helped him and his family to stay together.
His experience in CSC has been mixed. The system has not added anything to his life. However, he admits that he took part in programmes and education that has assisted him while in prison. The experience has made him realize that there is nothing worth putting himself back into that position.

He has availed himself of the benefits that community corrections can provide. The facility's staff served as a source of reintegration assistance. His response to the halfway house and parole has indicated that he is easy to coach and serious about his reintegration.

He spent a considerable amount of time in a maximum-security facility. The details of his case must have been quite serious. The experiences in prison have frightened him. He is motivated by the violence to remain out of prison. He does not have any motivation to associate with other ex-offenders, as he has not made a transformation to an ex-offender identity. His experience has indelibly etched his identity as a law-abiding citizen.

He is able to shape the world around him so that he can be productive and social. He now is flexible and reasonable. He has not completely given up on a future as an accountant, as he recognises that he may be able to pursue it when he receives a pardon. In the mean time, he does not place all his eggs in one basket. He prepares himself for stigmatizing experience so that it does not affect his improving attitude.

He likely does not require much time in the halfway facility. However, his new attitude should be monitored and reinforced. He would probably benefit from an out-resident programme, where he reports for a few hours of review and counseling once a week. See Appendix XIII for a general detailed profile for Type 3 ex-inmates.
Summary Discussion

This chapter has provided detailed descriptive profiles of the three offender types traditionally managed by community corrections. Type 1 ex-inmates are differentiated from the two other types in as much as they have seen themselves unambiguously as offenders. They have lived lives almost exclusively in the criminal subculture. Type 2 ex-inmates have the distinction of being able to exist in both the criminal subculture and the social culture inhabited by law-abiding citizens. Type 3 ex-inmates are on the opposite continuum from Type 1 in as much as they have, with the exception of a singular or brief period of criminal activity, been law-abiding citizens. This chapter has demonstrated that Type 1 ex-inmates will require a protracted period of building an identity as citizens. Type 2 ex-inmates will require a similarly long period of intervention to assure that the individuals are not merely adopting practices that are designed to make them appear to be on the right track while they are actually involved in criminal activity. Type 3 individuals will require little or no halfway house time, but they will require programming aimed at helping them to learn techniques as to how they can manage their new identity as offenders.

These findings are significant in that they challenge the current correctional and halfway house systems, which largely manage ex-inmates homogenously. Under the present approach, ex-inmates are recognized as parolees with individual needs but they are expected to reintegrate into society with similar kinds and amounts of intervention and programming as proscribed by the parole board. As explored in detail in the next chapter,
there is a critical need to develop more targeted programming which recognizes the distinctive integration challenges facing these different types of ex-inmates.
Chapter 5: Reintegration, Community Corrections: and Stigma Management

Review of the study

The study thus far has traversed an ambitious range of interest in the essential problem of managing stigma for the reintegration of ex-offenders as law-abiding citizens. This chapter will attempt to address how and why community corrections should turn its attention to the issues that have been studied since Tannenbaum 1938. If reintegration is to become more effectively realized it will need to be studied and developed recognizing that the dramatization of evil represents the most profound problem upon stigma management and reintegration focused on in the literature review. The salient issue is that the public has been conditioned to recognise a common ex-inmate trait. The essential common factor is that ex-inmates had offended against society and have consequently spent an imposed period in prison as explored in Chapter 3. A factor of effective reintegration practices will be recognising types of ex-offenders as defined in Chapter 4). In summary, Chapter 5 will cover essential points relative to the path that this area of study will need to take.

The studies findings, with reference to reintegration and social needs, are discussed so as to understand problems faced by ex-inmates and challenges that CC will need to address. Community correctional reintegration-programming needs to understand that the individual begins reintegration with an imposed social barrier stemming from the stigma the individual’s correctional experience represents. The argument in this study has
led to providing a better understanding that all ex-inmates are equally deserving of stigma or mistrust in all social context. This position is in the same vein of Albert Cohen (1966) who introduced three important factors in the process of reintegration influencing the structure of this study. Cohen focused on: the developmental of criminal profiles, the situations that ex-inmates find themselves in, and types of ex-inmates. He concluded that there is a correlation between types of ex-inmates and the frequency of deviant behaviours during reintegration. For most ex-offenders, the halfway house or agencies provide services to attempt in a generic to inform their knowledge as to how they will need to function in society now that they are released.

This limited approach to meeting reintegration needs is insufficient. First, to assist ex-offenders with their reintegration the social dramatization of evil will need to be exorcised. In addition, ex-offenders will need to be armed with an understanding how to manage the pressures exerted by social stigma. Society will need to provide agencies where ex-inmates can turn to find assistance with managing socially imposed reintegration barriers. More study needs to be conducted toward understanding how ex-offenders share the criminalization process. That is, ex-inmates will require help in dealing with the common problems that are part of the criminalization and imprisonment experience. On point, the experience that they have undergone has affected them in ways that will need to be addressed. Next, it is necessary to gain a more complete understanding of what are the implications for defining ex-inmates by types. Finally, what contribution has been made by this study that can influence to go from here? All aspects of managing stigma for ex-offender reintegration must be captured using the ex-inmate's accounts derived from a carefully designed interview schedule and an analysis of the resulting data.
Chapter 3 provided a general overview of the reintegration experience where ex-inmates, involved in the criminal justice system, have experienced stigma during the early stages of their reintegration. It captured the concerns associated with ex-inmates when they are viewed through the same lens — that all offenders are the same in terms of Tannenbaum’s (1938) dramatization of evil. It contained a criminal/social profile, and an overview of the sample’s social preparedness for reintegration. Discussed and reviewed were their accounts of the generalized strategies used to manage reintegration.

Factors influencing criminal identity were shown to have an important impact on reintegration by research conducted by Gibbons and Jones, 1975; Berger and Luckman, 1967; Cohen, 1966; Becker, 1964; and, Sorokin, 1959. Their research was supported in this study’s findings. Reinvigorating community corrections so as to make it more capable of handling Type 1 and 2 ex-inmates may be essential to producing more success in returning inmates to society. In 1963 a considerable community based effort was made to provide a method of support to aid the ex-inmate in his quest to reintegrate in Canadian society. Archdeacon Ken Bolton wrote a historic biography entitled Halfway Home (1982). In it he tells us of the motivation of the founder of the Canadian halfway movement for male adult ex-inmates. He recounted that Neil Libby lived his “life with a purpose — the untiring pursuit of justice and the persistent urge to see that stigma was removed from those to whom he felt called to minister” (Bolton, 1982, p. 10). He was determined to build a bridge between outgroup and ingroup status, based on his sincere desire to assist the outgroup members to obtain their rightful and law-abiding place in society.
Central to the movement that gave birth to the halfway movement in Canada was the belief that when reintegration is demonstrated in a society by its adherence to civil and human rights and liberties of all its members, then moral values become the lens by which the offending person's reintegration needs can be met. So, the social world, inhabited by the stigmatized and the free, must become less hostile to both groups (p. 17).

"The key to Libby's whole approach was his insistence on the infinite worth of every human being as God's creation, regardless of the offences he may have committed against society, against himself and against his Maker. Every decision for or against an ex-offender was ideally screened through the question;" what effect will this have on this man's growth as a human being, his dignity as a child of God?" (p. 18). The dramatization of evil acts as a counterfoil to this approach when the public believes that ex-offenders will remain threats, there is not reintegration.

Since the mid 80's there has been several approaches taken to managing corrections. They have been debated at both the institutional and the community levels. Up until this point theorists were making assertions and postulating while others criticized. Lauen (1988) argued that "many of these theories are flawed because they don't recognize the fact that ex-offenders are complex human beings, influenced both positively and negatively by many social, political, economic and psychological factors" (p. 17).

Roger J. Lauen (1988) argues further that people operate in a variety of social environments. Some environments are helpful, nurturing, blessed with an abundance of material comforts inhabited by conformists, the socially acceptable and economic elite. He captured the antagonism in society by stating that other social contexts are impoverished and destructive. The prison and most criminal sub-universes are indicative of this state.
He continues by stating, "correctional practitioners need to include more elements of social theory in their work with offenders." Social researchers must determine the ex-inmates' needs from the perspective of the people in need and move quickly to provide the access that they need to correct the problem. After all he has stated that, "the purpose of corrections is to correct." That means that if crime is the result of a socially deprived environment then that environment must be addressed with positive change. He provides a definition of community-managed corrections as a method of improving the system of corrections. He cites Palumbo's theme where

*community-managed corrections includes a variety of human services offered to offenders in natural, noninstitutional settings. The specific types of services offered will be identified, developed, and administered by members of the community in which the offenders are being served. The purpose of these services is to support offenders in community settings as an alternative to institutional confinement. The correctional professional will assist local community members by providing assistance in selecting appropriate offenders training, and program liaison functions.*

The respondents cited in this study echoed this sentiment in its entirety. The conclusion by Lauen (1988) and others is that community managed corrections ought not become another social control agent but rather a vehicle for producing good neighbours in the community. The need to reintegrate requires community facilities that will assist the individual to move from an institutional environment to a community of caring people.

While some community correction agencies offer assistance to the ex-inmate in finding jobs, the question addressed by this research is whether they direct enough attention to the problem that stigma places in the path of successful reintegration. The Financial Post (Feb. 12, 1999) featured a headline on the "Workplace" section entitled "An outside chance of landing a job — society is making it increasingly difficult for ex-offenders
who want to turn their lives around. This problem will need to be explored in more depth in follow up research.

Notwithstanding, community correction agencies are engaged in reintegrating ex-inmates through programs such as life-skills counselling, substance abuse programs and, employment assistance and opportunities. In the case of violent offenders, they provide access to psychological treatment and anger management programs, such as those conducted by John Howard Society. However, they have not addressed the fundamental issue that stigma may have on reintegration — what stimulates aggressive behaviour and causes psychological pressures for the ex-inmate? Often the ex-inmate is forced to rely on deceitful stigma management strategies as a critical agent in his integration outcomes.

The problem is that these are not taught or considered important by CSC or community corrections. Teaching socially acceptable skills and techniques will protect others but is of little consequence when the person is faced with a citizen who rejects them and denies them their right to acquire the essentials that will facilitate their reintegration. So society must also be educated as to how it needs to manage relations with ex-inmates. As such, it is within this context that this research sought to understand the process of ex-inmate reintegration into the community and, more specifically how the ex-inmate, within a halfway context, manages the stigma and its effects on his self-identity and social relations within the integration process.

Managing criminal identity

Is stigma a matter of the individual's subjective perspective? Or, is it a part of the system of punishing those who have been or who society is committed to out-grouping?
Do personal relations compromise reintegration where wives, employers, children, and friends no longer trust the person who has been processed through the criminal justice system? The study approached responses to these questions but it would be an act of hubris to suggest that all these issues have been resolved herein.

If the stigmatization of ex-offenders is part of the publics need to feel secure, by being able to identify ex-offenders as a risk to its safety, then the individual ex-offender is engaged in a continuous process of reintegrating himself. The concept of types becomes irrelevant. They are all painted with the same social brush – they are offenders. If on the other hand stigma can be managed by the ex-offender, so as to reduce its effects, then depending on the ex-inmates' social, vocational and educational tools, removing stigma can in time return an ‘ex-inmate’ to full community participation. To this end, the programmes developed for assisting in reintegration would need to acknowledge that stigma is a problem that is external to whom the person is and that he must learn techniques of neutralisation to cope with.

The present scenario is that stigma is part of an objective social reality. Stigma is part of the institution of establishing safeguards through labelling deviant people for social control (Bodys, 1992, p. 87; Ericson, 1977, pp. 17-29; and, Garrett and Rompler, 1966, p. 28). In this case, then, stigma is only managed by the ex-offender, according to his ability to suppress the negative effect and factors for life.

Goffman (1961) found that “to leave it at this (that the issue of stigma is found in the person and therefore the ability to manage such stimuli also rests with the person) creates a biased perspective, imputing solid reality to what is much shakier than that” (p. 135). The full import of Goffman's theory is that the reason for stigma is a feature of the
person; stigma is not the essence of who that person is. It becomes real in the social context, and the person becomes the victim of the offence he or she committed because they cannot ever escape it (Berger and Luckman social construction of identity).

First, he is known by some to be an offender and consequently is judged as offensive. He has not paid his debt to society when he is living in a halfway house – he is still doing time. He must manage the flow of information about himself to normal people. He is subject to additional consequences when some who know of his identity would use this information against him. His self-image is affected by this information. He is forced to employ coping strategies, some of them socially and psychologically harmful, in his efforts to avoid detection or manage the effects of the information. And finally, let it be known that the offender stigma is indelible – it may appear that the ink is invisible at times but it can come back at any time to interfere with the reintegration of the individual as a law-abiding citizen.

People are different; each manages his or her social life or 'lifeworld' according to Jurgen Habermas (1985), in a manner that allows access to others and certain material, legal, spiritual rights and privileges. For Goffman (1961), this means "the stigmatized and the normal are part of each other" (p. 135). This symbiotic relationship allows access to stigma, understood within the person's contextual framework and that of society, inclusive of norms values and beliefs, underlying social existence (Braithwaite, 1989, p. 7).

Is the person's appearance, language, or his or her social experience a real indication of the worth of that person? The answer to that question is, NO! However, according to Frank Tannenbaum's (1938) early observations, "the person becomes the
thing he is described as being" (p. 20). The person's master status becomes completely definitional of the person with the observed stigma.

Consequently, it is essential to accept that programming for reintegration will need to recognize criminal and social characteristics of the ex-inmate. Efforts will need to be made that will assist him in altering these so as to improve his chances of melding with a stigmatizing and sometimes alienating community.

Stigma management, as a dominant focus for ex-inmates, must be incorporated in community-based programming approaches to reintegration. The three types, as discusses in Chapter 4 have common needs that can best be addressed by halfway facilities as discussed in Chapter 3. However, programming would be most effective if it provides the most intense treatment for those who were least prepared for social re-entry; and out reach services should be provided for those who have had little prison involvement or entrenchment in the criminal subcultural behaviour or institutionalization. The reintegration of ex-inmates as law-abiding citizens requires that stigma be managed within and in concert with a reenergized community correctional system recognising the varied needs of ex-offender types.

Foundationally, it has been argued that recognition of social efforts and initiatives, that indelibly imprint on the ex-offender a negative identity which runs counter to reintegation (Goffman..., and Braithwaite... are two advocates of this finding). The literature on stigma and the subsequent program development direction recognizes, within the various restorative justice initiatives of the John Braithwaite's suggests that stigma represents an informal sanction. It functions in terms of the perceived merits of specific and general deterrence. The question that persists is: can a person who has broken the
law and is serving time in a correctional facility, in the community, be perceived or can they perceive themselves as anything other than law-breakers? The answer from my sample of 23 male parolees living in a halfway house in Ontario is that stigma as a problem renders the process of living in the community much more challenging. It adds stress, a sense of alienation, and a sense that they are living in a glasshouse, an understanding that they are not trusted, and that they are not normal.

According to Richard V. Ericson (1977), stigma is not managed the same by the person in different contexts. To this end the thesis focused on specific concerns in specific contextual frames so as to be effective in developing a sociologically meaningful understanding of the relevance of typographical approach for managing ex-offender reintegration. For Ericson, the social and economic tools that the person has available to them will affect how much stigma imposed upon them by conventional others and to what degree this may impact on their social reintegration.

The sample suggested that since the offender identity allows others to treat them as non-citizens then they are forced to ignore, neutralize, denounce or accept this label or where it is most disintegrational, they reject the people who choose to stigmatize them. The problem with this method of stigma management and responsivity during reintegration is significant. Where they accept the static conditions, i.e. anti-social behaviour and or lifestyle, this can interfere with their becoming prosocial. They recognize that their lives are in a dynamic state while living in a halfway house but the meaning behind the label remains static – they have come halfway back but they are still treated by the system and viewed by members of the general public as offenders.
Programming based on types

Chapter 4 reviewed the concept and description of types. Argued was that for community corrections there is a need to address the individual on the basis of the type of risk and social need that he and other members of the type had in common with each other but not shared with other types of offenders. The analytical focus of this work attempted to bring the interview schedule to life depicting the experience by types.

In a discussion of criminal subcultural membership Adler (1993) found that "although their level of involvement in the business, coupled with the exit barriers they encountered, might have hypothetically enabled or induced them to remain with the activity longer, they burned out, bottomed out, busted out, grew out, and quit" (p. 202). The operational issue is, what is the prospect of success for these individuals who are trying to exit the criminal subculture?

Adler argues that the offender's reintegration is dependent on their amount of involvement in the normal social work (pre-dealing) this was measured by their age of entry into the criminal justice system – the earlier the entry the more difficult is the reintegration process. This study used young offender age of 12 years old as its baseline. Their prior interest and skills represent the tools that determine their period in the drug dealing subculture. The qualitative exhibits in Chapter 4 gave witness to the relevance of the tools the person had at his disposal; and, their effective preparedness (social class pp. 204 – 205).

Foundationally, the three types are made up of people who are individuals, citizens and ex-inmates. As demonstrated, the reintegration experience is to some extent
different for each person. Certainly, there are some characteristics of the individuals' past that are very important and can move him toward reintegration or prison. The study found that while ex-inmates share many stigmatic characteristics what is different are their socialization tools, the person's educational, vocational, occupational and social background, in particular the length and impact of the experience within the CJS has an effect on reintegration outcomes. The help required to address the needs of the offender population is non-generic -- one program length, intensity, and focus do not fit all offenders (Palmer, 1991). The study supports the claim from the literature placing a person in the wrong program may work against reintegration (Ross and Gendreau, 1980). If a Type 1 is given the same treatment as a Type 3 then he is not likely to benefit. Re-establishing in the community means returning to the criminal subculture. If the Type 3 is treated like a Type 1 then the intervention does not apply to him. He is left to feel that he is not understood and that society will not accept that he made a mistake; rather they see him as needing to become constructed as normal. For the most part a Type 3 ex-inmate needs to begin from where he was when he lived a functional lifestyle. Type 1 do not understand what a functional life is. Type 2, needs to be understood in this respect based on careful analysis of where he is at relative to the extreme type intervention approaches.

Societal attitudes are important components of reintegration, these relate to how stigma functions as a barrier or a factor in the process of taking away a person's perceived status as a potential prosocial, productive citizen. The relevance of this rests on the fact that each person brings certain attitudes, behaviours, personifications and experiences to the fulfilment of the intent of Conditional Release and should be treated differentially based on these defining characteristics as shown in Chapter 4.
Ted Palmer (1991) in The effectiveness of intervention: recent trends and current issues discovered some important elements of the argument that this study engaged. He agreed with Ross and Gendreau (1980) that "many programs and approaches have been shown, with reasonable scientific assurance, to work for specific subgroups of offenders" (p. 260). This stands as contrary to the sceptical position that nothing works.

The common ground between the nothing works and the program intervention camps is founded on three important principles as follows:

(1) to be effective with these individuals, intervention should be broadly based. More specifically, it should involve a multiple modality approach (2) intervention should often be more intensive, for instance contacts should be frequent, and (3) differential intervention should be used, involving program and offender matching. A program’s full range of resources should not automatically be applied to every type of offender subgroup. (pp. 260-1)

These premises recognise that the individual, regardless of the type, is first and foremost a complex being. In regard to the first point, he requires support in the various modalities during reintegration. Some of these modalities are family, work, social and criminal justice reintegration challenges. The second issue in reintegration relates to the intensity of intervention contact. All ex-inmates require monitoring during the early stages of reintegration; the intensity would be based on each person’s reintegration curb. When there is only one caseworker for twenty cases then the amount of attention that can be given is not likely to be sufficient for all and those with the greatest need will fall through the cracks of an inadequately staffed system. I.e. in Ontario, parole officers have caseloads of over one hundred parolees, they can only see them once a month for five minutes. The third factor relates directly to the need for recognizing types in providing intervention approaches. Whereas a person who does not drink, and a person who engages in social drinking or the person who has a physiological drinking problem should
not be forced to attend AA together. The person with the drinking problem should access any and all services that can assist him with this problem during reintegration. To treat all to this intervention because there are self-help components in AA is not helpful and will run counter to assisting any who are improperly matched to the inappropriate intervention.

In this way using the technique of meta-analysis, Parker, (1994) was able to determine "the current status of effectiveness" of community-based correctional systems (p. 266). His findings again coincided with this study about factors affecting the reintegration process. He said

_The following seems clear: intervention has a widely recognized and generally accepted role with at least serious and repeat offenders. This role involves not just control- or surveillance-centred approaches, but complex psychological and skill-development methods, as well. In the 1990's, particular focus should be placed upon the third core element: greater attention to offender needs and characteristics (Ibid.)._

This directs attention to the need to develop the concept of types for best practices during reintegration. Parker (1994) stated that the justification for taking on the challenge, "neither meta-analysis nor recent literature reviews indicate that generic types of programs have been found that consistently produce major recidivism reductions." He suggests the following reasons, "that many positive-outcome programs may not be powerful or flexible enough to produce major reductions for all offenders combined" (Ibid., p. 5) Next, many programs that are grouped together and considered a "type" may not be very similar once they are closely examined. Further, although many non-traditional, positive-outcome studies may be quite good themselves, various standard and traditional programs with which they were scientifically compared may have been quite good as well.
What is the correctional culture and where do we go from here?

In a related approach that builds on the seminal efforts of Libby, John L. McKnight (1984) wrote an article on “Regenerating Community”. He concluded that

We all know that community must be the centre of our life because it is only in community that we can be citizens. It is only in community that we can find care. It is only in community that we can hear people singing. And if you, listen carefully, you can hear the words; “I care for you, because you are mine and I am yours”.

This symbiotic relationship between citizens and offenders needs to be made foundational to the institutional change in corrections that was referred to earlier by Keve and Lauen (1982) and McKnight (1984). He begins by stating that people have a map made up of a “social world in our mind, and the way we act, our plans and opinions are the result of that map” (p. 54). He believes that the problem is that the people who make social policy have a map as well that often conflicts with that of the individual. To this end there are two possible outcomes, those of the social institution and those of the individual. Notably, the institutional bureaucracy was developed to manage the gross national product, not citizens’ welfare. According to this line of argument, there are three premises that stem from this social problem.

First, “in spite of ever-growing inputs into institutionalized service systems, many individuals continue to reject their roles as consumers. (McKnight, 1984, p. 55)” This is commonly understood as the educational problem, and the crime problem. People drop out rather than voluntarily accepting the conventional mapping. This represents the front-end process of getting into criminal activity, similar to Adler’s (1993) getting out. McKnight (1984) continues, “there is also the ever-growing number of intractable people who refuse to flourish in institutions created for labelled people, in spite of all the professional and
managerial improvements designed by the system" (p. 55). People, who reject the servitude of obedience, accept the consequences as preferable to compliance with an alienating system.

The second problem is "with programs based upon the typical social policy map is that the sum of their costs can be greater than the wealth of the nation" (Ibid.). This argument is the one most typically heard from social policy makers, social welfare is too expensive. From the needy public the criticisms is that only 37% of the governments funds allocated typically get to the most needy. The remaining 63% goes toward corporate welfare and sustaining the bureaucracy. Ex-inmates needs are not a priority within the Canadian budgeting system.

The third problem with social policy making is "that programs based upon its suppositions are increasingly ineffective and even counterproductive" (p. 56). For example the correctional system trains inmates in crime by segregating them from effective role models who might assist them in adjusting to conventional life. It maintains an anti-social learning environment that is less than accessible to a reintegration mission. So McKnight (1994) concludes that

\begin{quote}
We have come to recognize the possibility that we can create crime-making corrections systems, sickness-making health systems, and stupid-making schools base on a social model that conceives of society as a place bounded by institutions and individuals (Ibid.).
\end{quote}

McKnight (1994) says "the typical social policy map is inaccurate because it excludes a major social domain – the community." This being said, the best place to control the crime problem is in the community where it occurred. However, sufficient resources will need to be allocated for the purpose of providing sufficient person power to
achieve reintegration and to the development of a comprehensive program. The problem is that society’s institutions must accept the role of eradicating crime and not simply be preoccupied with fixing the problem by stigmatizing, and ostracizing and incapacitating the individual.

The paucity of research activity into offender stigma and the lack of responsiveness to adopting the recommendations of those who have considered the problem is alarming given that the Canadian federal correctional polices has placed an increasing emphasis on the importance of reintegration and community corrections, with integral emphasis on the halfway agency. The problem is that the main thrust of CSC’s intervention is and has been part of the process of constructing dangerousness (Webster, Dickens and Addario, 1985). They still rely on incapacitation, locking the person away, moving him back into the community after he has undergone an education in criminal behaviour.

To this end, the role of the halfway house or community corrections must be fashioned toward meeting the needs of the ex-inmate so as to address and mediate, with them, the factors that had previously contributed to their criminal behaviour. If the social world is satisfied by locking the individual in an institution of antisocial learning, which is rarely one of prosocial education, then the product that will often emerge is one that is more prone to anti-social and offending behaviour.

Social praxis requires that theory be operationalized; it is not sufficient to reveal the structure or essence of a problem, effort must go into considering methods to intervene in the social ills represented. Theory leads to social solutions in praxis.
As described in Chapter 4 one person may progress further than the other in terms of social reintegration, because he was better prepared economically, vocationally, and educationally before the period of criminalization. There are many factors that influence reintegration, not the least of which is the person's degree of personal inculcation in the criminal justice system and related subculture.

Stigma affects on all ex-inmates, based on time spent in prison, social distance and social identity. Some are more able to mitigate the effects that stigma has because of their lifestyle choices made before, during and after they were sent to prison. This is not to imply that the total responsibility lies with the individual – a community-based effort aimed at reintegrating the ex-inmate is required.

The identity of offenders ought to be delineated by types based on individual or group but not aggregate traits – one size does not fit all. In the case of Type 2 interventions, the members of this type will belong on a continuum from Type 1 to Type 3. It will be a challenge to determine where this person is and what his tendencies indicate. Is he more Type 1? So therefore, requiring an unlearning and relearning process? Or is he more like a Type 3? where he needs to stay focused on his positive social traits. In either case he will need to maintain a belief as to how he can manage the stigma and his place in the criminal and/or social worlds. This will tend to classify him so that the stigma endured can be regulated based on what he is or is not doing in the community not simply on how others perceive him based on his criminal identity.

Correctional Services of Canada's principles are considered in the analysis here in Chapter 5. If the service adheres to its own emergent principles, then stigma management for reintegration would take on a more central concern of the approach. The
result would become more public and offender education about acceptance, tolerance and forgiveness. Community corrections would be more effectively used as the agent to manage issues affecting reintegration and tearing down barriers to reintegration which the offender now experiences.

CSC's first principle states that "at all times the rights and dignity of all those involved in the correctional process must be respected and upheld." This is a good first step toward directing that the individual should not be prohibited or barred from reintegrating society. Notwithstanding, when a person is stigmatized his dignity is assaulted.

CSC's second principle directs that "the offender remains a member of society and forfeits only those rights and privileges which are expressly taken away by statute or as a necessary consequence of the custody and control imposed by the court." In 2002 the inmate gained the right to take part in elections while in prison.

This value begs the questions, how can an ex-inmate: "remain a member of society?" and also "forfeit only those rights and privileges which are expressly taken away?" while being segregated by "custody?" and any other "control imposed by the court?" As indicated in the study some considerable personal management is required to deal with this paradox and still maintain a positive attitude about reintegration outcomes. Again, this requires that the inmate, upon release, manages his reintegration to make sense of the bifurcation of social consciousness – recognizing that 'ex-inmate' equates to member of society and also a stigmatized offender.

CSC's fifth principle ascribes to "correctional policies and practices must not deny the offender the hope of regaining status as a free citizen." This is very interesting and
refers directly to the problem engaged in this study. This statement acknowledges that all offenders must feel some hope that they will be released back to the society free, new men. It is not sufficient that they are released. It is imperative that they can feel that they are or can be, upon release, “free citizens.” Opportunities for gainful employment allowing them to support themselves, and in some cases a family, including educational and relationship opportunities will need to be made available for them without negative reference to their past status as inmates.

The final of CSC’s principles considered here is “the loss of liberty, restriction of mobility, or any other disposition of the court constitutes the sanction . . . “ In this regard social stigma, as an informal sanction, runs counter to this moral principle as ascribed by CSC. Once released, or when warrant expiry occurs, the sanction of living as an offender should be complete. Instead, in praxis the only change is the man’s status as an inmate—he becomes an ex-inmate. The inmate label persists and requires great effort on the part of the individual to control the effects of the sanction imposed by the court and the informal sanction resulting from persecution experienced in the community (Erickson, et al., 1973).

Michael L. Benson (1984), in The Fall from Grace states, “the harmful consequences of conviction for the offender is comprised of more than formal legal sanctions. Punishment also includes non-criminal sanctions” (p. 574). This study confirmed that a “conviction is assumed to affect the offender’s job opportunities, community standing, and overall status as well as other aspects of his public and private life” (Ibid.).

This study incorporated in its analysis the role of (community corrections) specifically the halfway agency. The halfway agency, and CSC’s "correctional housing
unit" now fall within the rubric of institutional corrections according to Porporino and Baylis (1993). This represents a problem for the person who is attempting to reintegrate while in a halfway agency. The person does not require additional institutionalization, instead attention to his social needs and social identity will assist him in negotiating the move from offender toward citizenship/membership over time.

The study revealed that the individual sees himself as a parolee, an (ex)offender, a halfway house resident, a criminal and this is imprinted on his self-image affecting his reintegration. His segregation and his knowledge that others see him in these roles, negatively impact on his social reintegration. He must manage the reality of the multiple roles he assumes if he would be successful in 'staying out'. He must manage, through negotiation (Goffman, 1973, pp. 9-10) his own reintegration and freedom within the constraints of the CJS and particularly CSC.

Consequently, community corrections needs to be focused on correcting the community's struggle with criminal behaviour by addressing the root causes of criminal behaviour as well as the personal characteristics of those who offend. One of these root causes is society's condemnation and ongoing stigmatization of the offender, who in turn accepts these labels, making him less responsive to programs and CC reintegrative efforts.

As Parker (1994) argued a multi-modal approach is required. The component of an effective reintegration would involve prison reform, social education and offender matching for program intervention. When the public can be shown that the correctional system does correct and is addressing the reason why people offend in an effective manner, then the public may be able to move to accept the ex-inmate as having
addressed his needs and they can believe that he can now live among them without re-offending.

The practice of looking at offenders qua criminals in general may not allow for practices that work which will achieve the correctional goal of “respecting the rule of law”, while it “contributes to the protection of society by actively encouraging and assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens, while exercising reasonable, safe, secure and humane control,” from CSC’s Mission Statement.

To understand how to discharge CSC’s directives practitioners must first go outside of professional, public and institutional perspectives to gain a better understanding of those who are perceived to present the problem in the first place – the offender. The perspective of the ex-inmate must foreshadow any discussion or program approaches adopted by CSC and community corrections (Phillips, 1997).

Arguably, all experiences are not quite the same. Schur states that there is “a discreet act of homicide, for example, which seems to incorporate fewer labelling processes than does long-term addiction to drugs” (1971, p. 21). This was useful in understanding the coding of types in Ch. 4. It was necessary to point out that this is true in the case of significant others because the long-term drug user may be deemed to be less socially stable, where the one time offender is considered to have committed a grievous error. In this way, the act is not deemed as important as is the life the person lived before the act or actions. There is an exception where the individual who did not know the person, and learns of his status, then distinctions might not be as neutralized or gradient.

The foregoing considered issues related to reintegration, if fully adopted by the CSC and CC, stigma management would be less onerous on the ex-inmate. More to the
point, if CSC's principles were realizable, then would stigma not be as negative a part of the experience. Correctional Services of Canada is the main agent of taking away a person's identification as a "free citizen," yet it recognizes that its intrusive function must be temporally limited. It is understood that once released to the community the offender's efforts to reintegrate needs to be the focus; he needs to cease being an offender over time so that he can become a citizen.
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APPENDIX I: PROPOSAL FOR APPROVAL TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Submitted to:

DENNIS KERR, CSC

Introduction

I intended to do my thesis on the effects of stigma on offender reintegration. In keeping with this indoctrination, the title of my thesis is "The Social Problem of Managing Offender Stigma: The Reintegration of Law-abiding Citizens". The work that I am proposing is more complex than what is generally required for a Master's thesis. The reason for this is that I am, as was Rev. Neil Libby, very much concerned that Corrections have ignored this very important area of practice. The proposed focus is in no way novel Father Libby saw this particular concern as being worthy of his life work.

I intend to use the data that I will collect to complete my Master's thesis, but I will use it to develop recommendations on implementing a program of care that will emphasize the need to address the effects of stigma on offender reintegration. Additionally, I wish to build on this research and author a book that St. Leonard's may choose to include in its publishing activity. The problem that the offender faces can be understood as summarized in the introduction to the thesis proposal as recounted next.

The effects of stigma on offender reintegration

The effects of stigma on the reintegration of offenders will be considered in the thesis that will be developed. The intent is to approach the unravelling of the effects stigma on offender reintegration in terms of community safety and humane management of the ex-inmate. The problem itself might be summarized as follows:

I have done my best to find a way to go on living, loving and creating. I am going to continue to do my best. But the offender - no matter how hard he tries to, no matter how worthy he becomes - can only join with and feel he is a part of society to the extent that other people are willing to identify with and accept him on a one-to-one basis (Erickson, Crow, Zurcher and Connett, 1973, Epilogue).

This statement will be examined qualitatively in the proposed research. Some important studies on the effects of stigma have been conducted by: Edward E. Jones, Amerigo Farina, Albert H. Hastorf, Hazel Markus, Dale T. Miller, and Robert A. Scott (1984); Rosemary J. Erickson, Wayman J. Crow, Louis A. Zurcher and Archie V. Connett (1973); and, Erving Goffman (1963). These will be considered in my
examination of how stigma mediates or is managed during the process of social reintegration for ex-inmates.

My thesis will respond to the following question: How does the ex-inmate manage the effects of his offender stigma, in familial, social and economic situations, so as to facilitate his reintegration as a law-abiding citizen? (Correctional Service of Canada, 1997; Fein, 1990, 107-110; Schloegel and Kinast, 1988; Keve, 1982; Lubimiv, 1978; Ericson, 1977; Brand and Claiiborn, 1976; Erickson, Crow, Zurcher and Connett, 1973).

The halfway house in the process of reintegration

The halfway house movement was originated by Neil Libby a man who saw a purpose, according to Archdeacon Ken Bolton in Halfway Home (1982), in working toward the relief of the plight of ex-inmates in their reintegration to society. In it Bolton tells us of the motivation of the founder of the Canadian Halfway House movement for male adult ex-inmates. He recounted that Neil Libby lived his “life with a purpose—the untiring pursuit of justice and the persistent urge to see the stigma was removed from those to whom he felt called to minister” (Bolton, 1982, p. 10).

When reintegration is demonstrated in a society, by its adherence to civil and human rights and liberties, then these values expressed by Libby become the lens by which we can understand the offending person’s reintegration needs and the ethics of the society he once offended against. The social world inhabited by the stigmatized and the free must become less hostile to both groups. More to the point, however, it is the crime and not the person that must be isolated and removed (Braithwaite and Mugford, 1994).

This credo may serve to decrease criminal prosecutions and consequentially facilitate the offending person’s successful integration. As stated, of great interest to this research is the ex-inmate strategies for renegotiating his social position with biographical others (Braithwaite, 1989). He needs to manage relationships with his: work-mates, wife, children, and his friendship relations as well as new acquaintances. How does the ex-inmate manage the effects of his criminal past to facilitate his reintegration?

Libby addressed the important role that the community has played in managing the crime problem posed by so-called (ex) offenders. His concerns are still relevant today. Bolton (1982) expressly stated that the principle role played by the halfway house movement (HHM) is the reintegration of ex-inmates (p.121). St. Leonard’s Society of Canada’s mission was, from the outset, “to follow Christian teaching by the assistance, education and rehabilitation of prisoners, ex-prisoners and parolees, and to promote their establishment in society” (Leatherdale, 1998, p. 4). This course of social activism has not substantially changed over the thirty-one years since the society was first formed.

Bolton stated, “the halfway house movement is designed to help the ex-con bridge the gap between his life in prison and his new life in the community. That
transition can only be made safely and successfully in a community where acceptance is possible" (p. 15). Bolton distinguishes these essential elements: (1) the purpose is to assist the "ex-con...", (2) there is a substantial process inherent in the move from a total institution to full participation in society which needs to be mediated by the halfway house, and (3) the "transition can only be made safely and successfully in a community where acceptance is possible" (Ibid.). Bolton has defined the parameters for the thesis focus on reintegration with these very lucid statements.

Scope of the work

1) I will be interviewing 30 residents of halfway houses in Ontario
2) I will be interviewing residents in as many as 10 different houses
3) I will be publishing a thesis and a book from the data
4) I will be completing the work no later than December of this year
5) I will be collecting all of the data by August
6) I will be using the accounts of the residents to base the qualitative analysis of the process of stigmatizing ex-inmates in an effort to establish an understanding of the impact on individuals who are attempting to reintegrate society
7) I will, in the thesis, have three chapters: [1] The introduction (which includes anecdotal case studies excerpted from the interviews); [2] The section on analyzing the experience of reintegrating; and, [3] defining a direction for programming based on Chapter 2.

Additionally, I will develop specific recommendations in Chapter 4; in Chapter 5 I will attempt to outline a detailed program for implementation, based on cognitive/social intervention approaches to managing offender reintegration. Appendix II: Letter to CSC Windsor Parole Office
APPENDIX II INSTRUCTIONS FROM BRUNO SCHINCARIOL,

AREA MANAGER, CSC PAROLE OFFICE

August 31, 1999

Richard:

RE: Research Proposal

Spoke with Dennis Kerr, Policy Officer at CSC RHQ Kingston (613 545-8213) this date.

Dennis advises that your research proposal falls within CSC requirements for permissions, approvals.

Privacy Act and so forth.

Dennis further advises that you are required to submit the following:

1. Privacy Act Form (Dennis can provide)
2. Security Clearance (copy of your existing one is satisfactory)
3. Research Proposal
4. Instruments/Questionnaires
5. Participant Release Form
6. Ethics Approval Form from the University.

I have taken the liberty of providing Dennis with your fax number as it appears at the bottom of your letterhead but if you can give Dennis your E-Mail account he can communicate with you electronically.

Once you have the package ready to go you may send it directly to Dennis or channel it through this office.

Bruno
APPENDIX III: PROPOSAL FOR FUNDING

To
St. Leonard’s House Windsor

Introduction

Last year I introduced to the Board of St. Leonard’s House Windsor that I intended to do my thesis on the effects of stigma on offender reintegration. In keeping with this indoctrination the title of my thesis is “The Social Problem of Managing Offender Stigma: The Reintegration of Law-abiding Citizens”. The work that I am proposing is more complex than what is generally required for a Master’s thesis. The reason for this is that I am, as was Neil Libby, very much concerned that Corrections have ignored this very important area of practice. The proposed focus is in no way a novel venture, Father Libby, saw this particular concern as being worthy of his life work.

I am requesting of the Board that they fund all or part of the expense for the proposed work (information on the related costs are attached in this proposal) by way of a scholarship. I originally intended to do my research using residents at the Windsor house as subjects. However, for two reasons this has proven not to be acceptable. Because I hold a position of control over the residents in my function as a Shift Supervisor this poses a conflict of interest and suggests ethical problems. Further, I will be testing the questionnaire on some of the residents and as such this would reduce my sample. I require 30 interviews from thirty different individuals and as such I would not have been able to satisfy the requirements using the residents at the house. Further, this is a matter of choice for the respondent, and I feel that not all residents would wish to take the time to take part in an interview. As such I have to travel to as many as 10 different houses hoping to acquire a minimum of three residents from each. The travelling and other related expenses are more than I can finance myself.

I intend to use the data that I will collect to complete my master’s thesis, but I also will use it to develop recommendations on implementing a program of care that will emphasize the need to address the effects of stigma on offender reintegration. Additionally, I wish to build on this research and author a book that St. Leonard’s may choose to include in its publishing activity. The problem that the offender faces can be understood as summarized in the introduction to the thesis proposal as recounted next.

The effects of stigma on offender reintegration

To this end the thesis that will be developed will seek to unravel the effects stigma on offender reintegration.
I have done my best to find a way to go on living, loving and creating. I am going to continue to do my best. But the offender — no matter how hard he tries to, no matter how worthy he becomes — can only join with and feel he is a part of society to the extent that other people are willing to identify with and accept him on a one-to-one basis (Erickson, Crow, Zurcher and Connett, 1973, Epilogue).

This statement will be examined qualitatively in the proposed research. Some important studies on the effects of stigma have been conducted by: Edward E. Jones, Amerigo Farina, Albert H. Hastorf, Hazel Markus, Dale T. Miller, and Robert A. Scott (1984); Rosemary J. Erickson, Wayman J. Crow, Louis A. Zurcher and Archie V. Connett (1973); and, Erving Goffman (1963). These will be considered in my examination of how stigma mediates or is managed during the process of social reintegration for ex-inmates. My proposed thesis will respond to the following question: How does the ex-inmate manage the effects of his offender stigma, in familial, social and economic situations, so as to facilitate his reintegration as a law-abiding citizen? (Correctional Service of Canada, 1997; Fein, 1990, 107-110; Schloegel and Kinast, 1988; Keve, 1982; Lubimiv, 1978; Erickson, 1977; Brand and Claiborn, 1976; Erickson, Crow, Zurcher and Connett, 1973).

The halfway house movement was originated by Neil Libby a man who saw a purpose, according to Archdeacon Ken Bolton in *Halfway Home* (1982), in working...
toward the relief of the plight of ex-inmates in their reintegration to society. In it Bolton tells us of the motivation of the founder of the Canadian Halfway House movement for male adult ex-inmates. He recounted that Neil Libby lived his "life with a purpose—the untiring pursuit of justice and the persistent urge to see the stigma was removed from those to whom he felt called to minister" (Bolton, 1982, p. 10).

When reintegration is demonstrated in a society, by its adherence to civil and human rights and liberties, then these values expressed by Libby become the lens by which we can understand the offending person's reintegration needs. The social world inhabited by the stigmatized and the free must become less hostile to both groups. More to the point, however, it is the crime and not the person that must be isolated and removed (Braithwaite and Mugford, 1994).

This credo may serve to decrease criminal prosecutions and consequentially facilitate the offending person's successful integration. As stated, of great interest to this research is the ex-inmate strategies for renegotiating his social position with biographical others (Braithwaite, 1989). He needs to manage relationships with his: work-mates, wife, children, and his friendship relations as well as new acquaintances. How does the ex-inmate manage the effects of his criminal past to facilitate his reintegration?

Libby addressed the important role that the community has played in managing the crime problem posed by so-called (ex) offenders. His concerns are still relevant today. Bolton (1982) expressly stated that the principle role played by the halfway house movement (HHM) is the reintegration of ex-inmates (p.121). St. Leonard's Society of Canada's mission was, from the outset, "to follow Christian teaching by the assistance, education and rehabilitation of prisoners, ex-prisoners and parolees, and to promote their establishment in society" (Leatherdale, 1998, p. 4). This course of social activism has not substantially changed over the thirty-one years since the society was first formed.

Bolton stated that, "the halfway house movement is designed to help the ex-con bridge the gap between his life in prison and his new life in the community. That transition can only be made safely and successfully in a community where acceptance is possible" (p. 15). Bolton distinguishes these essential elements: (1) the purpose is to assist the "ex-con. ..", (2) there is a substantial process inherent in the move from a total institution to full participation in society which needs to be mediated by the halfway house, and (3) the "transition can only be made safely and successfully in a community where acceptance is possible" (Ibid.). Bolton has defined the parameters for the thesis focus on reintegration with these very lucid statements.

Scope of the work

8) I will be interviewing 30 residents of halfway houses in Ontario
9) I will be interviewing residents in as many as 10 different houses
10) I will be publishing a thesis and a book from the data
11) I will be completing the work no later than December of this year
12) I will be collecting all of the data by August
13) I will be using the accounts of the residents to base the qualitative analysis of the process of stigmatizing ex-inmates in an effort to establish an understanding of the impact on individuals who are attempting to reintegrate society
14) I will, in the thesis, have three chapters: [1] The introduction (which includes anecdotal case studies excerpted from the interviews); [2] The section on analyzing the experience of reintegrating; and, [3] defining a direction for programming based on Chapter 2.
15) I will, in the book, include the three chapters as outlined above. Additionally, I will develop specific recommendations in Chapter 4; in Chapter 5 I will attempt to outline a detailed program for implementation, based on cognitive/social intervention approaches to managing offender reintegration.

Financial information

For the thesis stage:

| Travel expense $0.15 p/km (4,000 km in 5 trips) | $600.00 |
| Accommodations (where I cannot obtain accommodations at the halfway house) | 500.00 |
| Printing and copying expense | 120.00 |
| Gifts for the respondents | 300.00 |
| Tuition for two terms | 1,900.00 |
| Postage | 75.00 |
| Telephone | 120.00 |
| Living expenses while in the field | 350.00 |
| Tapes and printing and transcribing of the interviews | 300.00 |
| Dictaphone machine (I would appreciate the use of St. Leonard's machine) | N/C |

The above amounts have not been totalled as I am requesting that St. Leonard's decide funding on an item basis.

NOTE: The board provided $1,000 in funding.
APPENDIX IV: CONSENT FORM

RESEARCHER: Richard Philips, B. A. (Hon).
AFFILIATION: Master's Candidate the University of Windsor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and, a Supervisor at St. Leonard's House Windsor.

Note: The study has been reviewed and approved by the "Department of Sociology and Anthropology Ethics Committee" at the University of Windsor. Any complaints regarding the ethical conduct of the researcher may be reported to the Chair of the Ethics Committee, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4 ((519) 253-4232 ext. 2190).

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH:

The purpose of this study is to look at the ex-inmate's perception of the management strategies that he employs in the dealing with stigma during the course of his reintegration as a law-abiding citizen. The research is primarily focused on exploring the relationship between stigma and reintegration of ex-inmates. The study is interested in considering the individuals experience, while living in a halfway house in Ontario, with managing stigma to facilitate his resocialization with "normals".

I am interested in the subject of how it is that stigma is perceived to interfere or enhance the process of reintegration for people who have been released from prison. The anticipated results of this research will provide a better understanding of how the ex-inmate perceives the role that stigma management assumes in the process of his reintegration.

PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEW:

The purpose of the interview is to allow the researcher to interact with the subject using a structured interview schedule (allowing for unanticipated or controlled dialog) to capture what the individual has experienced in the course of his reintegration. The objective is to gain an understanding of the experience and then to analyze how stigmatizing events, have been managed or mediated during the early stages of the person's reintegration period. The interview has been chosen over survey methods because of the respondents general educational, sociological and attitudinal characteristics. In short, they may respond better and more candidly with a face to face interview.

INTERVIEW PROCEDURE:

The interview consists of a mix of open-ended and close-ended with explanation type questions. The questions probe into areas the ex-inmate may have experienced while they also attempt to capture how it is that the events have been mediated or managed in terms of education, family and friends, and vocational concerns. There is also a section that requests certain personal information, this data will assist in allowing the researcher to perform some rudimentary profiling of the types of respondents who participated in the research. The interviews will be taped with the respondents permission. The interviews should not take more than an hour to complete. At the end of the interview, as a debriefing, the respondent will be given time to ask questions of the researcher or to express any relevant concerns that he has with the interview. I will also explain to the respondent what I plan to do with the information that I obtained during the interview.
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CONFIDENTIALITY AND SAFEGUARDS:

Confidentiality is an important factor within this type of research. I am aware of the need to safeguard the respondent's identity from the readers of the thesis. I will be careful to avoid situations and questions that will indicate who the person is who gave that particular response. The respondent will be told that if there is any question that he does not wish to respond to, for any reason, then he may simply not respond to the question.

Research identifiers will be randomly fixed to a data bank of fictitious names (non-related to the interviewees) which will be used to identify the responses of the individual in the thesis. Because certain questions would contravene the principles of ethical questioning established by the Sociology Department's Research Ethics Committee this would constitute a rule as to why any question or approach would be considered unethical. Of note, the committee to assure that I am not planning to use any unethical practices, either intentionally or by oversight, in my research that might affect on my sample, will scrutinize this research proposal.

THE RIGHT TO REFUSE AND WITHDRAW PAVFICIMION:

Participation in this study is voluntary. At any time during the interview, the respondent has the right to withdraw his participation and/or participants of any published or conference papers arising from this research and copies will be made available on request.

ACCESS TO THE RESEARCH FINDINGS:

A short summary of the key findings will be made available to interested participants. An effort will also be made to inform participants of any published or conference papers arising from this research and copies will be made available on request.

PARTICIPANT'S STATEMENT OF CONSENT:

Having read and understood the purpose of the study, the demands on my time, the obligations of the researcher and my rights as a research participant, I, the undersigned, consent to participate in this study.

Name (Please Print)

Signature

Date

Address of the halfway house:

Note: Each participant should retain a copy of this form.
APPENDIX V: THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The following is divided into five sections: (1) a biographical sketch; (2) a criminogenic profile; (3) the interviewees correctional profile; (4) social experience; and (5) management strategies. Each section and question is meant to obtain an understanding of how you have experienced your reintegration into society. The stories that you relate could disclose information as to how you have managed your offender role during the early stages of your reintegration to society.

A. Biographical sketch

Please answer the following questions as accurately as you are able. The answers to these questions will allow me to place your responses in the correct order in the research.

1. What is your name? (Assigned name, respondent's identity is protected)
   A.

2. How old are you?
   A.

3. What is the last grade that you completed in school?
   A.

4. What is your marital status? Single, separated, married (common-law included), divorced, other.
   A.

5. Do you have any dependents?
   A.

6. How many dependents do you have?
   A.
B. Criminogenic profile

Please respond to the following questions. They are designed to assist in the analysis as to whether it is your chosen identity that may create the stigma. It is important to note that there will be no way that the information will be used to place you at risk. The information given is strictly confidential. The tapes will be destroyed after the information has been transcribed.

1. Please explain whether you consider yourself to be a criminal?
   A.

2. Please explain whether you think that others (probes: family, friends, coworkers, etc.) view you as a criminal?
   A.

3. Are you still involved with anyone, outside of the halfway house, who you know is living a criminal lifestyle? Please explain how this may be affecting your ability to reintegrate.
   A.

4. Explain whether you feel most comfortable with others who have a criminal record?
   A.

5. (I do not want the details) have you been engaged in criminal activity since you have been released from prison? Yes or no, not sure how to answer.
   A.

6. Explain whether you intend to re-establish connection with individuals, after you leave the halfway house, who you know to be considered criminal by the police? If you do, then why?
   A.

7. Explain what it is that you have experienced in your efforts to start living a “normal” lifestyle?
   A.

8. What do you think that you will need to do in order to start experiencing a “normal” lifestyle?
   A.

9. Explain what a normal lifestyle would be for you.
   A.
10. Explain to me how your chosen lifestyle affects how “normal” people treat you?
A.

C. Interviewee's correctional profile

Please try to answer the following questions as accurately as you are able. There is memory required for these questions. If you cannot remember, please state whether you wish to think about the answer and we can return to it later. The purpose of these questions is to capture your attitude toward the criminal justice system, and to understand how you see yourself within it.

1. How many years have you spent inside prison?
A.

2. How many years have you spent under parole supervision, which includes the time in prison?
A.

3. How many different times have you been paroled to a halfway house?
A.

4. How long have you presently been at your halfway house?
A.

♦ The Mission of the Correctional Service of Canada is summarized as follows (a copy of the Mission statement will be given to the respondent for them to review as well as I will read it to them):

C.S.C. as part of the criminal justice system and respecting the rule of law, contributes to the protection of society by actively encouraging and assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens, while exercising reasonable, safe, secure and humane control.

5. In your experience, what do you believe is meant by “assisting the offender to become a law-abiding citizen”?
A.

6. Can you tell me the things that CSC provided you that has increased your ability to successfully return to society?
7. What assistance has the halfway house provided you in terms of increasing your ability to successfully return to society?
A.

8. How does your being on parole impact on you ability to stay out of prison?
A.

9. What is your reaction to not yet being free of the control of the criminal justice system?
A.

10. What are your basic and immediate needs that would assist you in reintegrating society effectively? Are they being met? If so, how?
A.

11. Please explain whether your prison experience has had an effect on your ability to remain in the community?
A.

Social experience with managing the offender identity

Please answer the following questions as accurately as you are able. The answers to these questions will allow me to understand how you rate your relationship to significant others.

1. Do you believe that you act differently than those who have not gone to prison, if yes how do you act differently?
A.

2. If a person in authority introduces you to another as an offender, an ex-offender, or a parolee, how does this make you feel?
A.

3. Explain to me how some people have acted differently, then they did before you went into prison?
A.
4. Explain how some people, who know that you are an offender, treat you differently since you have returned to the community?

A.

EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION ISSUES: (if the respondent goes to school then the terms which relate to employment will be substituted for educational environmental terms. If he is involved in both education and work then each question will be asked twice reflecting the appropriate terminology, i.e. boss will be replaced with teacher and co-workers with fellow students).

1. How long were you in the last job that you had on the outside?
   A.

2. What was the longest that you spent at any job on the outside?
   A.

3. Are you working at this time?
   A.

4. How long have you been at your present job?
   A.

If he is employed, ask the following, if not employed go to #7.

5. Does your boss know that you are an offender? If yes, did you tell him? If no, how did he find out?
   A.

6. Do you plan to reveal your offender identity to your employer? Yes, no or not sure. Explain.
   A.

7. What have you experienced in maintaining employment, then, what did you do to keep your job?
   A.

8. Do your fellow employees treat you differently because you have spent time in prison?
   A.

9. How did they find out? Or, why did you tell them? Why did your employer tell them? (if none of the foregoing probes) How did they find out?
   A.
10. Explain how your attitude about being an offender has affected your sense of
confidence on the job?
A.

11. What have you experienced in acquiring employment, then, what did you do to get the
job?
A.

12. Do you plan to disclose your offender identity to potential employers? Yes, no or not
sure. Explain.
A.

13. Explain how the work you did while in prison has aided you in your ability to find and
keep employment in the community?
A.

14. Explain whether you think that your level of education has had an impact on the effect
that your being an offender has had on others?
A.

FAMILY AND FRIENDS ISSUES:

1. Rate your amount of contact with your immediate family. Do you see or communicate
with them?
   a) Five to seven times a week
   b) Two to four times a week
   c) Once a week
   d) Other

2. What have you experienced in acquiring or maintaining relationships with your family?
Then; what did you do to make things easier? What did they do to effect your
reintegration?
A.

3. Explain whether your family has been the best source of support for you as you have
been involved in managing your reintegration? Explain giving details as to which
family members are the most supportive, (i.e. mother, father, sisters, brothers, or
spouse) and why.
A.
4. Explain whether being an offender has had an affect on friendships, refer to those you had before you went to prison and those after you have been released.

A.

Stigma management strategies

Please answer the following questions as accurately as you are able. The answers to these questions will allow me to understand what you do to manage the experiences that you have faced during your re-entry to society.

1. When you meet people who you know are involved with criminal activity can you tell me whether you:
   i) act like you always have with them; can you give me some examples of this?
   ii) try to avoid their attention; can you give me some examples of this?
   iii) tell them that you are no longer involved in that lifestyle; Can you give me some examples of this?
   iv) feel more comfortable with them than you do with Square Johns; Can you give me some examples of this?

2. Describe how you use the following four strategies to manage disclosure of your offender identity to others:
   3.
   i) Can you tell be about how you only disclose your offender identity on a need to know basis? Can you tell me about how you decide who needs to know?
   A.
   ii) Can you give me an example of how you have disclosed to those who are in a position to help you. Explain how this strategy has worked the way you wanted it to?
   A.
   iii) Can you tell me whether you disclose with an explanation, what might you typically say to a person?
   A.
   iv) Can you tell me whether you disclose in order to lessen the effects that the information would have if the person were to find out from someone else?
   A.
Please explain, providing examples where possible, as to how the following statements might apply to you:

1. You explain to the person that you were under the influence of drugs, alcohol or medical reasons in order to convince another that the act was not completely under your control;
   A.

2. You try to coach the person by suggest how they should react, or by using some sort of deception (such as only relating a part of the story that places you in the most positive light);
   A.

3. You attempt to educate the person to the reasons why you committed the crime not dealing with the offence itself [i.e., my father beat me, or I was unable to learn in school, or I got into a bad relationship with a woman, others];
   A.

3. You try to explain to the person that what you did is not different than what others do except you got caught. Or you didn't have the money that they had to fight.
   A.

4. You believe that it is important that you get involved in educating others about the experience that you have had and the social problem that crime presents to the offender. How do you go about doing this?
   A.

5. What do you do to find support in dealing with the problems that you face in your efforts to remain out of prison?
   A.

6. What do you do to manage the difficult transition from being an offender to becoming a law-abiding citizen?
   A.

7. Do you avoid people who display negative attitudes toward you because they know that you are an offender?
   A.
8. Do you rely on the halfway house to assist you in dealing with the management of being an offender in the community? If yes, how do they assist you in this? If no, why not?

A.

9. Do you think that having offender support groups (similar to Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous, or the Aids Committee) in the community would assist you in your reintegration? Explain your answer?
APPENDIX VI: OFFENDER IDENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Questions used to provide a snapshot of the social factors that affect a person’s identity as an offender.

1. Please explain whether you consider yourself to be a criminal?

2. Please explain whether you think that others (probes: family, friends, coworkers, etc.) view you as a criminal?

3. What do you think that you will need to do in order to start experiencing a “normal” lifestyle?

4. Explain to me how your chosen lifestyle affects how “normal” people treat you?

5. What are your basic and immediate needs that would assist you in reintegrating society effectively? Are they being met? If so, how?

6. Please explain whether your prison experience has had an effect on your ability to remain in the community?

7. Do you believe that you act differently than those who have not gone to prison, if yes how do you act differently?

1. If a person in authority introduces you to another as an offender, an ex-offender, or a parolee, how does this make you feel?

2. Explain to me how some people have acted differently, then they did before you went into prison?

3. Explain how some people, who know that you are an offender, treat you differently since you have returned to the community?

4. Does your boss know that you are an offender? If yes, did you tell him? If no, how did he find out?

5. Do you plan to reveal your offender identity to your employer? Yes, no or not sure. Explain.
6. What have you experienced in maintaining employment, then, what did you do to keep your job?

7. Do your fellow employees treat you differently because you have spent time in prison? How did they find out? Or, why did you tell them? Why did your employer tell them? (if none of the foregoing probes) How did they find out?

8. Explain how your attitude about being an offender has affected your sense of confidence on the job?

9. What have you experienced in acquiring employment, then, what did you do to get the job?

10. Do you plan to disclose your offender identity to potential employers? Yes, no or not sure. Explain.

11. What have you experienced in acquiring or maintaining relationships with your family? Then, what did you do to make things easier? What did they do to effect your reintegration?

12. Explain whether your family has been the best source of support for you as you have been involved in managing your reintegration? Explain giving details as to which family members are the most supportive, (i.e. mother, father, sisters, brothers, or spouse) and why.

13. Explain whether being an offender has had an affect on friendships, refer to those you had before you went to prison and those after you have been released.

14. When you meet people who you know are involved with criminal activity can you tell me whether you:

   i) act like you always have with them; can you give me some examples of this?
   ii) try to avoid their attention; can you give me some examples of this?
   iii) tell them that you are no longer involved in that lifestyle; Can you give me some examples of this?
   iv) feel more comfortable with them than you do with Square Johns; Can you give me some examples of this?

15. Describe how you use the following four strategies to manage disclosure of your offender identity to others:
i. Can you tell be about how you only disclose your offender identity on a need to know basis? Can you tell me about how you decide who needs to know?

ii. Can you give me an example of how you have disclosed to those who are in a position to help you. Explain how this strategy has worked the way you wanted it to?

iii. Can you tell me whether you disclose with an explanation, what might you typically say to a person?

iv. Can you tell me whether you disclose in order to lessen the effects that the information would have if the person were to find out from someone else?

Please explain, providing examples where possible, as to how the following statements might apply to you:

a) You explain to the person that you were under the influence of drugs, alcohol or medical reasons in order to convince another that the act was not completely under your control;

b) You try to coach the person by suggest how they should react, or by using some sort of deception (such as only relating a part of the story that places you in the most positive light);

c) You attempt to educate the person to the reasons why you committed the crime not dealing with the offence itself [i.e., my father beat me, or I was unable to learn in school, or I got into a bad relationship with a woman, others];

d) You try to explain to the person that what you did is not different than what others do except you got caught. Or you didn’t have the money that they had to fight.

e) You believe that it is important that you get involved in educating others about the experience that you have had and the social problem that crime presents to the offender. How do you go about doing this?

23. What do you do to find support in dealing with the problems that you face in your efforts to remain out of prison?

24. What do you do to manage the difficult transition from being an offender to becoming a law-abiding citizen?

25. Do you avoid people who display negative attitudes toward you because they know that you are an offender?

26. Do you rely on the halfway house to assist you in dealing with the management of being an offender in the community? If yes, how do they assist you in this? If no, why not?
APPENDIX VII: QUANTITATIVE DISTRIBUTION

Analysis of quantitative measures relative to criminal orientation. The figure features data that considers, as is the present practice, a criminogenic factor based on how entrenched a person is in the criminal justice system.

Figure 2 Quantitative Sample Distribution by Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Base age</th>
<th>Months of eligibility</th>
<th>Time in the Jail</th>
<th>Jail percent</th>
<th>Time in the CJS</th>
<th>CJS percentage</th>
<th>Frequency of times in a HWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allard, Bill</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>48.65%</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>77.03%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boskie, Bill</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hasbrook, Bill</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>45.59%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>61.76%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jensen, Bill</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>70.83%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jones, Andruw</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>101.67%</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>114.17%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moore, Bill</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>76.66%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>78.16%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moorshead, Ted</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>75.56%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop, Bobby</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40.32%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Golden, Sharon</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.44%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harris, Leathy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harris, Reginald</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laymon, Matt</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mantha, Bobby</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neyer, Johnny</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ocker, Leith</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34.21%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Woodward, Tommy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28.47%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bradley, Allen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.73%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broskie, Jack</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.62%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Garcia, Ramon</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kennard, Jason</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lewis, Jerry</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15.28%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lyhn, Chuck</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whitt, Ernie</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.73%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.35%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Percentage of eligible time spent in prison, in the CJS and frequency of times paroled to a HWA. All times are in months.

* Andruw Jones numbers are disparate in that he reported the amount of time since he was 5 years old when he was first removed from his home; the information that is provided on the second line is not used in the totals but is given to establish that the percentages still fall within the appropriate range for Type 1.

The types derived from the research data conform to the initial/reception classification instrument known as the offender intake assessment (OIA).\(^5\) CSC
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determines the level of security and the needs of the prisoner in order to affix the appropriate institutional placement and in some cases the availability of appropriate program intervention. The classification decision is based on providing an environment where prisoners, with like profiles, can best serve a portion of their institutional time. The overriding institutional motivation is to assure that the prisoner pays his debt to society before he is released back to the community within an environment whereby the risk he poses can be best contained. Historically, the risk needs issue requires a calculus as to how to best meet the needs of the law, community standards, and institutional ability to manage and control the person while inside, while still attending to how they can be treated through programming.
Qualitative analysis of the interview schedule relative to criminal orientation and social distance scales for the respondents to this study.

**Figure 2 Qualitative Sample Distribution by Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Base age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allard, Bill</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boskie, Bill</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hasbrook, Bill</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jensen, Bill</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Andrew*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moore, Bill</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moorehead, Ted</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop, Bobby</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Broske, Jack</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harris, Lenny</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hank, Renae</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crawford, Matt</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Lewis, Jerry</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynn, Chuck</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macias, Bobby</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Myers, Jimmy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powers, Chris</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wood, James</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bradley, Allen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garcia, Ramon</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green, Steven</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kendali, Jason</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitt, Empee</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The asterisk in the names field represents the movement of Type 2 to Type 3 or from Type 3 to Type 2 based on experience and not just time in the system.*
APPENDIX IX: EXPERIENCE WITH CRIMINAL STIGMATIZATION

Experience with criminal stigmatization and self-identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Question Summary</th>
<th>Sample Quantity</th>
<th>Response Quantity</th>
<th>Simple mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identifies as criminal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Experienced social stigma</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Associates with criminals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prefers criminal association</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>While in the agency committed a criminal offence</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Will associate with criminals after release from the agency</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 1-6, Section B of interview schedule
APPENDIX X: TYPES OF PROBATION RELEASE PLANS

Conditional Release Measures
Conditional release or parole measures are privileges granted the offender according to criteria defined by law. When making a decision concerning conditional release, correctional services or parole boards consider public protection the decisive factor.

Temporary Absences
Temporary absences may be granted with or without an escort for medical, compassionate, or community service reasons, family contact, parental responsibilities or personal development for rehabilitative purposes.

Day Parole
Day parole gives the inmate an opportunity to become involved in community activities and to prepare for full parole or statutory release. Throughout the duration of the day parole program, the inmate must return to the penal institution or halfway house every evening. Day parole is available only to offenders serving sentences of imprisonment of two years or more. The inmate normally becomes eligible for day parole six months before he becomes eligible for parole or, if sentenced to life imprisonment, three years before that date. However, an offender who proved to be non-violent and who is sentenced to imprisonment in a penitentiary for the first time may sooner be granted with day parole. He is eligible for day parole after having been into custody for the longer of the two following periods of time: either for six months or for a period of time equivalent to one-sixth of the punishment.

Parole
Parole allows an inmate to serve the remainder of his sentence in the community under the supervision of a parole or probation officer.
The inmate is generally eligible for parole when he has served one-third of his punishment.
For a sentence of life imprisonment, the inmate is eligible for parole after seven years into custody.
For violent crimes against a person or for drug-trafficking, the judge may decide that the inmate is eligible for parole only after having been into custody for the shortest of the two following periods of time: either for ten years or for a period of time equivalent to half of his punishment.
For a first-degree murder, the inmate is eligible for parole after 25 years into custody.
For a second-degree murder, the inmate is eligible for parole after having been into custody for a period of time extending from 10 to 25 years, depending on the judge's ruling. Parole entails a number of conditions. If the offender fails to respect them, he may be taken into custody again. Parole may also be revoked if, before it has been terminated, the offender is sentenced for another criminal offence or if there is serious reason to believe that he may endanger the public.

Statutory Release

Unless the inmate is serving a sentence of imprisonment for life or an undetermined period, he is eligible for statutory release when he has served two-thirds of his sentence. When the sentence is two years or more, the inmate must be supervised until the entire sentence has been served. In certain exceptional cases, the National Parole Board may keep an inmate in custody until the entire sentence has been served if it deems that he is likely, before the end of his sentence, to commit an offence causing death or serious harm to another person, a sexual offence involving a child, or a serious drug offence.

Earned Remission

In cases where the sentence imposed is less than two years, the inmate may be released after having served two-thirds of it if, owing to good behaviour, he deserves to have his sentence reduced up to one-third. This earned remission is estimated as follows: one out of two days of imprisonment during which the inmate complied with the penal institution's rules and guidelines, up to one-third of the sentence. This measure does not apply when the inmate is on parole, in which case he serves his entire sentence, two-thirds under supervision in the community.

Latest update: October 23, 2001
© Gouvernement du Québec, 1998
APPENDIX XI PARAMETERS OF TYPE 1

Criminal and Social Parameters of Type 1

The following will provide a method to use in interpreting the five areas considered in the narrative for Type 1 identities. The analysis is divided into five sections: (1) a biographical sketch; (2) a criminogenic profile; (3) the interviewees correctional profile; (4) social experience; and (5) management strategies.

Biographical sketch

Type 1 ex-inmates were at least 30 years old. This provides significant time to assess that they have in fact been entrenched unambiguously or contiguously in a criminal lifestyle. They would have received the majority of their training and education while in a juvenile, young offender closed custody, or prison setting. They will not be married. They may say that they were or are in a common law relationship but they are unlikely to have cohabited with the same woman for two consecutive years, sharing in financial obligations. They may have children who they do not support or have much contact with.

Criminogenic profile

Type 1 ex-inmates see themselves as criminals. Each member of this type express that they are trying to put this identification behind them. Notwithstanding they have unambiguously or contiguously see themselves as criminals. They also have recognised that some others view them as criminal.
They will be involved with relationships outside of the halfway facility with other offenders; some will still be active in the criminal subculture. They tend to express that they feel most comfortable with other offenders. They would have all breached conditions of parole, or more likely committed new offences after being released from prison. They will all likely express at some point a desire to associate with others who have a criminal record.

Their experience with reintegration will have been difficult. In some cases they would express that they do not intend to be normally productive; they simply wish to be left alone. Some will apply and receive disability because they are officially diagnosed by CSC as anti-social personalities. They usually have no or an impractical or non-practicable view of what they will need to do to reintegrate into a normal lifestyle.

They will rationalize when explaining how certain practices, attitudes, or behaviours may detract from reintegration success. In some cases they will defend their right to act as they do, i.e. using illegal drugs for pain, smoking marijuana because it should be legal. They will be resistant to admitting that they are still not functioning in a correct manner.

Community Correctional profile

Type 1 ex-inmates have spent more than 45% of their lives in prison. E.g. Andruw Jones spent 75% of his eligible life in custody, and more since he started in home care at age 5. They would have spent more than half of their eligible life in some form of supervised or custodial care. That is a thirty-year-old man would have spent more that
nine years in the justice system. They will interestingly have little experience with adult
community corrections on numerous sentences. The amount of times that they have been
paroled to a halfway facility may indicate a bias that the parole board has toward this type
of inmate. That is they tend to leave them in prison until they have reached mandatory of
statutory release. They would have spent a minimum amount of time in the halfway facility
because they would not usually receive early parole, and many will be volunteer residents,
i.e. they had nowhere to go so they are staying at the halfway facility temporarily.

They do not feel that CSC has assisted them in reintegrating society. With the
exception of imposed programmes, and basic necessities. They do not feel that CSC has
provided them with anything that will assist them to return to society prepared and with the
resources to go straight. Interestingly, they do believe in the halfway facility’s ability to
help. In most cases, it is because “it is better than jail.” Also, “it allows me to do things”.

Parole is something to be tolerated. It does not really affect them, as it requires
very little effort on their part to meet with parole officers. Where parole provides a problem
is in the conditions that are imposed and urinalysis tests. In most cases they would have
little experience with not being supervised in some manner.

Their basic needs are not usually much different than that for normal people.
There is some difficulty in identifying needs, even more difficulty in realising them. Most
normal activity has been boring, or too stressful for them. Also the adjustment, after prison,
of nine to five work or minimum wage is perceived as a barrier.

Their experience in prison has been normalized as they have spent the majority
of their lives in prison. The acts and behaviours inside do not affect them. They may have
been victims at one time but had learned how to adjust so as to insulate themselves from the well-documented dangers and perils in prison. They have learned to victimize as a protective reflex.

Managing the offender identity

Type 1 ex-inmates believe that they function and act differently than a person who has not been in the prison system. They often have tattoos and other trappings that distinguish them in physical ways. Their dress, leather biker jackets, t-shirts and caps may also be preferred attire that identifies them. Speech and aphorisms are also ways they are different e.g. terms like "cock soup". They use profanity and express themselves angrily in inappropriate venues.

They state that they do not care about how normal people view them. When asked certain questions it is revealed that they anticipate rejection so they reject conventional others. In the same vein they see all people who are in authority as guards or people who are intent on monitoring how they act and what they do. They expect to be mistreated by guards and the society they are a part of.

They have experienced alienation in dealing with non-criminal types. In many cases family reject them and do not trust them. They do not trust others, including family. People who are trying to change their lives, who used to be in the lifestyle, have little patience for them, and in most cases will reject them.

Employment history given their age will be dismal. While in prison they would have not gained useful experience that will increase their employability. They are often
involved in dealing or enforcing while in prison affording them an income for cigarettes, etc...

They may be working while at the halfway facility, as this may be a condition of their parole. They will usually go through a number of jobs. Their employment income will not be sufficient when they are released from the facility.

In most cases the employer knows of their criminal record, as they are on work release or have been placed by the agency's employment service. Or their manner is so apparent as to provoke interest.

They do not express fear of disclosing to others. They profess that honesty is crucial to them, while they are not able to be honest in their social dealings. They disclose because some co-workers drive them to and from work. Or because the people they meet are likely not to care, and in some cases will be impressed by their experiences. Also as mentioned their physical presence and speech provoke curiosity.

Maintaining employment is a constant problem because they are likely to argue or fight with foreman and co-workers. They are likely to refuse to do some job or activity. They get bored or discouraged. They also get distracted by relationships, which are more interesting than going to work. They also have no confidence in their ability to perform certain duties and rather than ask for help, as they are strong, they act out by refusing to do the task.

Their level of education is not usually sufficient to allow them to find anything but menial work. They also will need, if they decide to pursue continued education, to repeat
courses and credits acquired while in prison. In many cases getting government funds or loans will be used for other activities not related to education.

They do not have frequent contact with family. Their relationship with families are usually strained or non-existent. Fear is something that they have relied on to control others in the past and this acts as a barrier to familial contact and support. The family is not their best source of support. Usually it will be a sibling who they have any irregular contact with. This relationship will often be controlling and in time they will reject the interference.

Friendships present a challenge as most of the people who they have considered friends are also criminal. Prosocial relations usually come from CC staff and volunteers. The friendships they develop in the workplace or school will usually be with people who are socially challenged.

*Stigma Management Strategies*

Type 1 ex-inmates usually act the same when they meet people who they know to be involved in criminal activity as they do with anyone else. They tend to present themselves the same as they always were. They dress unconventionally, where often they do not hide the tattoos or others signs of their orientation. This allows them to feel that they are not weak. They are expressing themselves as themselves.

They do disclose the offender identity to acquaintances, as this is their master status and they do not need to talk about it. Yet they do not tend to minimize their
involvement in criminal activity. In most cases, they will tend to exaggerate their role in the sub-culture to demonstrate that they were upwardly mobile.

They do believe in counselling young people to stay out of the lifestyle. But for the most part they will recruit anyone, especially the weak, to participate in advancing their interest.

They usually do not utilize support networks. They rely on themselves and whatever they can do that does not affect their chosen way of approaching life. They know that they must be engaged in positive activity but cannot sustain such involvement. They prefer association with people who are like themselves.

However, they will not believe in self-help organisations as they see them as recruiting centres. Being involved with other offenders means that they are back in prison or on the street, therefore reinforcing their negative self-image. They also will tend to look at anyone who has had a criminal record as suspect. They transfer their negative self-image onto others.

They experience stigma but it is difficult to tell whether social reaction is due to their characteristics and behaviours or social bias. For the most part the justified fear the public have of criminals stem from this type of offender. Some of the social distance is due to the dramatisation of evil even with Type 1.
Type 2 Community Correctional profile

Type 2 ex-inmates have spent 20 to 30% of their lives in prison. E.g. Reggie Harris spent 20% of his eligible life in custody, and more since age 12. They would have spent 31 to 40% of their eligible life in some form of supervised or custodial care. They would have been paroled to a halfway facility only once. They would have spent a moderate amount of time in the halfway facility. A larger study would need to be conducted to make these figures credible across the population.

They do not feel that CSC has assisted them in reintegrating society. However, they do admit that they had taken some advantage of their time, i.e. they finished high school or started college or university study. They did not usually have to take part in imposed programs because they were on accelerated release or short-term sentences. Their basic necessities were met because of family support.

They do not feel that CSC has provided them with enough that assists them to return to society prepared. Their experience in the halfway facility was generally positive. In most cases, this is because they were able to work, spend time with family and kids, and pursue a prosocial life. Significantly, they were able to fit into the prison world and subculture. Many will choose, at some point, to reject this in order to work toward release from prison.
In this case parole is a governor on their behaviour. Being subject to supervision provides enough impetus for them to watch what they are doing, however, breaches will occur, as they are limit testers. Parole supervision merely represents a process that must be managed in order to reach warrant expiry.

Where parole provides a problem is in terms of curtailment of freedoms. Their ability to travel is limited to receiving permission in advance from the parole officer. The conditions that are imposed and urinalysis tests are also a problem for many who have drug or alcohol addiction concerns. In most cases they would have had some experience with provincial probation and bail reporting requirements.

Their basic needs are normal. There is little difficulty in identifying what they will need to do in order to affect successful reintegration. They tend toward grandiosity. Most normal activity had been rewarding, but not sufficiently stimulating. They have some family values and profess to being committed to family and children. A word of caution here, they use normal speak to influence people, they may not have the ability or even the intent to follow through on their obligations to others.

They will often decide to attempt self-employment as there is a fear that they cannot make it in the real world because of past failures, physical and health concerns, or simply because of a desire to be wealthy. They will want to be engaged in vocations that they believe they are suited for but they do not have the credentials.

Their experience in a federal prison has been mixed. On the one side it was frightening. They had a notion that prison would not happen to them, and if it did they could cope. The loss of freedom and removal from intimate others have profoundly
impacted on their decision to remain crime free. They also find that being in prison, around others, tended to reinforce anti-social attitudes. At some point while in prison they pursue productive activity and reject anti-social relations. The acts and behaviours inside affect them profoundly. They are often victims of the more hardened criminals while inside.

Managing the offender identity

Type 2 ex-inmates believe that they can get along with both criminal types and normal citizens. They believe that they can affect behaviours allowing them to fit in, in any environment. They sometimes have tattoos, but usually these are professionally done, and not jailhouse tattoos. Their dress tends to be conventional, although they may own leather biker jackets, and caps. They usually prefer environmentally acceptable attire. Their speech and aphorisms will change to fit the company. They sometimes will use profanity and rarely express themselves angrily in social situations. They tend to ramble and have problems staying on topic, as there are conflicting ideas that are triggered from given queries.

They express caring about how normal people view them, especially intimate others. They may not have always been as caring but during their attempts to reintegrate they acknowledge the harm they did to others. They have some problems with people who are in authority, and do resent guards. They expect not to be mistreated and when they are they revert to complaints about rights violations or revert to criminal behaviour.

They are able to experience acceptance over time in dealing with non-criminal types. Other offenders represent temptation and are usually avoided. In many cases family
accept them when they are doing what is expected of them. When anything goes wrong the process of building trust will start from square one.

Employment history is something that can be built on. They have a decent work history. While in prison they would have gained some useful experience that will augment their employability. They often have money that they receive from working in prison or that will be sent from family. In some cases they have money from savings when they were in the community. They will have little problems in acquiring the basic necessities while in prison or out.

They will often be working while at the halfway facility depending on how long they have been out. In fact many may have a job waiting for them when they are released. They will usually go through a number of jobs until they find one that will support them in the manner they expect. Their employment income will usually be sufficient when they are released from the facility.

In most cases the employer does not know of their criminal record. They are able to pass as any other employee and usually will not provoke suspicion. They tend to want to hide in plain sight.

They do not express fear of disclosing to others. They will tend toward minimalism or normalizing their behaviour. They are normal except that they got caught.

They disclose to people who are close to them, because they do not want them to find out from someone else. Or in the case of anti-social contacts this will act as access to the world that they may not at first blush appear to fit into.
Maintaining employment is not a constant problem. Pressures in relationships may distract them, but these will usually not be allowed to interfere with their staying employed. They also have confidence in their ability to perform duties and will ask for help from people who can contribute to their social lives.

Their level of education is usually sufficient to allow them to find adequate employment. When they decide to pursue continued education, the goal will be to increase their value in the employment market or to find work that will help people who are in trouble. They may be motivated by a desire to help others and will pursue training to accomplish this. They may have to upgrade before they can attend an institution of higher learning.

They have frequent contact with family. Their relationship with families are usually strained but can be sustained. Parents and families may have allowed their deviant behaviours because they were perceived as innocent. The family is usually their best source of support. Usually it will be parents who they have regular contact with.

Friendships present a challenge in that they are often concerned as to what prosocial friends think. They are also concerned that anti-social friends can pull them back into a deviant lifestyle. They would have friends on both sides of the social landscape or they may chose to isolate themselves from either or both.

*Stigma Management Strategies*
Type 2 ex-inmates usually change how they act to people who they know to be involved in criminal activity. They know how to fit into both the conventional and criminal worlds.

They do disclose the offender identity to intimates, as this they wish to control public and personal perceptions. They tend to minimize their involvement in criminal activity. In most cases they will not tend to exaggerate their participation in the criminal world. They will often use narcotic addiction to justify their actions.

They do believe in counselling young people to stay out of the lifestyle. But are more concerned with their own family than they are with others. They will become super-citizens for a period, at least while in the view of intimate others, so as to prove their worth. They will have low self-esteem and see themselves as living a life apart from most people. They always have secrets about their behaviours they do not share.

They usually utilize support networks. They rely on others and to a lesser extent they are not self-reliant for providing the necessities of life during reintegration. They know that they must be engaged in positive activity and avoid anti-social activity. They prefer association with people who are like themselves, chameleons, who appear to be able to fit in anywhere.

They tend to not believe in self-help organisations because they have support from family, and other sources. They also realise how duplicitous people can be so they do not trust what they hear coming from other offenders. AAA and NA reinforce their negative self-image and they will tend to attend on an irregular basis.
APPENDIX XIII PARAMETERS OF TYPE 3

Type 3 Community Correctional profile

Type 3 ex-inmates have spent 2 to 18% of their lives in prison. E.g. Jason Kendall spent 18% of his eligible life in custody, 21% and more since age 12. They would have spent from 3 to 21% of their eligible life in some form of supervised or custodial care. They would have been paroled to a halfway facility only once. They would have spent a disproportionate amount of time in the halfway facility (these individuals may have served six months in prison and a subsequent six months in CC).

They do not feel that CSC has assisted them in reintegrating society. It served as punishment, which they may have deserved. However, they do admit that they had taken full advantage of their time, i.e. they continued studies, and pursued intellectual and professional interest while inside. They usually have to take part in imposed programmes because certain traits are perceived as causal factors in the crime committed. The maxim is that the person is not criminal he had a drug, alcohol or gambling problem. Their basic necessities were met because of family support and their personal reserves or pensions.

CSC is something that must be overcome in time it is not expected to provide them with any benefit. Their experience in the halfway facility was always positive. However, it is usually seen as unnecessary. They are easy to work with and are receptive to helpful suggestions. In most cases, this is because they were able to work, spend time with family and kids, and pursue a prosocial lifestyle, contrasted to the prison experience, which was in all ways negative.
In this case parole is an albatross. Being subject to supervision provides social and familial strain. Having to get passes to go anywhere, not able to take protracted vacations etc... The worst is that being on parole acts as a reminder that they have fallen from grace. They will not usually breach conditions of parole. Parole supervision can also be used as support and a sounding board for ideas and activities.

Parole provides a problem in terms of curtailment of freedoms. It appears that their life is not their own. They would hope that the prison experience would mark the end of the intervention. Once released from prison they may chose not to take part in programmes. They will attempt, to the extent possible, to wrest control of their lives back.

Their basic needs are normal. They want to be able to provide for their family, or where they are not married for themselves. They want to do all things in a law-abiding manner. There is no difficulty in identifying what they will need to do in order to affect successful reintegration. There may be some doubt as to whether they will be able to pursue certain vocational avenues but they recognise that they need to maximize what they can do.

Most normal activity had been rewarding. They have strong family values and are recommitted to family and children. They will often decide to attempt self-employment as there is a fear that they cannot make it in the real world because of past failures, physical and health concerns, or simply because of a desire to be wealthy. In some cases they will take a position in a company that they are overqualified for because it is safe.

Their experience in a federal prison has been frightening. The loss of freedom and removal from intimate others has profoundly impacted on their decision to remain
crime free. They also find that being in prison is to be in the company of people who they find distasteful. While in prison they pursue productive activity and continue to reject anti-social relations.

Managing the offender identity

Type 3 ex-inmates lose confidence in their ability to get along with conventional others. They accept rejection from some and remain focused on those people who treat them forgivingly. They rarely have tattoos. Their dress is conventional. Their speech and aphorisms are normal. They sometimes use profanity and rarely express themselves angrily in social situations. They tend to be closed-minded, in that they know what they need to do and do it.

They express caring about how normal people view them, especially intimate others. They may not have always been as caring but during their attempts to reintegrate they acknowledge the need to change their behaviours toward others. They often consider the harm they did to themselves as an extension of the harm they did to others. They have little problems with authority figures. They expect not to be mistreated and when they are, they revert to self-incrimination.

In many cases family accept them unconditionally. When anything goes wrong support people seek to solve the problem and avoid recrimination.

Their employment history tends to be positive. They have good work histories. While in prison they would have gained some useful experience that will augment their employability. They often have money that they receive from working in prison and that will
be sent from family. In some cases they have money from savings when they were in the community. They will have little problems in acquiring the basic necessities while in prison.

They will often be working while at the halfway facility depending on how long they have been out. In fact many may have a job waiting for them when they are released. They will usually go through a number of jobs until they find one that will support them in the manner they expect. Their employment income will usually be sufficient when they are released from the facility.

In most cases the employer does not knows of their criminal record. They are able to pass as any other employee and usually will not provoke suspicion. They tend to hide in plain sight until a detailed examination of their record is conducted.

They do not express fear of disclosing to others. They do prefer to remain private, which could limit their social development. They will tend toward rejecting the past behaviour that put them in conflict with the law. They are normal in every respect except they committed a crime.

They disclose to people who can help them because of the information. They do not want others to talk about their behaviour.

They also have confidence in their ability to perform duties required by their employment. They will ask for help from people who can contribute to their social development and reintegration.

Their level of education is usually sufficient to allow them to find adequate employment. When they decide to pursue continued education the goal will be to increase their value in the employment market.
They have frequent contact with family. Their relationship with families is not usually strained. Parents and families have excused their offence. The family is usually their best source of support. Usually it will be parents and or spouses who they have regular contact with.

Friendships present a challenge in that they are often concerned as to what prosocial friends think. They also can detect change in how people are with them; some will reject them outright.

*Stigma Management Strategies*

Type 3 ex-inmates usually cannot blend with people who they know to be involved in criminal activity. Their frame of reference and demeanour are usually conventional.

They do disclose the offender identity to intimates, as this they wish to control public and personal perceptions. They will rarely provide detailed explanations unless pressed to do so. They tend to rationalize their involvement in criminal activity. In most cases they will tend to play-down their participation in the criminal world.

They do believe in counselling young people to stay out of the lifestyle. But are more concerned with those close to them then they are with other people. They tend to act as they did before the criminal period.

They seek out support networks and will benefit from structured and genuine advice. They rely predominantly on themselves to provide what is necessary for reintegration. They want to engage in positive activity and they avoid anti-social activity.
They prefer association with people who are prosocial and who can contribute to their
development.

They tend to not believe in self-help organisations for themselves. They have
support from family, and other sources to rely on. They tend to see the people in self-help
organisations as deviants and compare them to those who they most abhor from prison.
AAA, NA, and GA reinforce their negative self-image and they will not readily attend.

Concluding comments

The foregoing provided a qualitative description and then a profile of the three
types of ex-inmates. Each will have different challenges that could assist them in
reintegration. The conclusion reached is that the parole board, and CC needs to use these
profiles to determine how much time and at what point an inmate should be conditionally
released to the community. The most important point is that all released federal inmates,
falling into one of these three categories require assistance from community correctional
agencies.

It is clear that the Type 1 will require a long period in which to learn about how he
can adjust his life to fit into a foreign lifestyle. He should be given parole at the earliest
possible point. He should also be instructed that he is on probationary status and that
there will be restrictions placed on what he is free to do. He is what corrections and the
public most fear about those who might harm them. In the case of this type the issue of
stigma is always one that falls into the grey area of social interactions. Is it their
behaviour? Or is it social stigma? That is rejected.
The dilemma is if they have lived as criminal, and if their primary frame of reference is that of a criminal, should society allow them immediate access to social acceptability. The problem is a difficult one to address.

The issue for this type is that they do live in society for brief periods of time. Each time they are returned to prison they become more challenged in terms of coming out and staying out. If they are treated as criminal by society, and they are managed as criminal by parole, and supervised and serviced as criminals by community corrections then they are what society wants them to move away from.

Type 2 will need to find a niche in the community where he can maintain a conventional identity without drifting. He will benefit from more time in prison and less in the community. His activity and associations in prison should dictate when he is released to the community. His actions should be considered as to what he is trying to communicate, and his progress will need to be carefully appraised. He is able to convince people that he is conventional while not planning to practice appropriate behaviour. He should spend a period in a community corrections facility where his actions and associates could be appraised by trained eyes. The importance here is that he will need to be continuously encouraged to remain on the straight. If he shows signs of returning to old behavioural patterns then he would need to be reappraised and maybe have to repeat the programmes devised to reinforce conventional behaviours.

Type 2 ex-inmates should be viewed with a discriminating eye. They are able to deceive people as to who they are and what they are about. The label of criminal does not
true fit them. They are opportunistic and will tend to take part in criminal or deviant behaviours while maintaining a prosocial lifestyle.

Stigma is a problem for them, now that they have suffered the consequences by being imprisoned at the federal level. They need to be able to access jobs that can sustain them. Where the label of offender is applied and where opportunities are barred to them, then they will require assistance in not moving to Type 1 status. Significantly, the more the label of offender is applied then the more likely it is that they will become offensive abandoning a conventional lifestyle.

Type 3 would need help with understanding that he is able to fit into society. He should receive parole at the earliest. He would almost not need to be in the halfway agency. An out-care system with a minimum period in the facility would likely best suit this type. His involvement should be limited to meeting whatever needs that he may have. The halfway facility could act as a buffer while the family goes through the readjustment pains of his coming out. Predominantly, the halfway facility would serve to assist him with starting gainful employment or regaining his disability pension - establishing a legitimate means of support.

Type 3 ex-inmates are not criminals in the sense that they do not likely pose a continued risk to society. They require considerations as the people they were before the defining events, or events. If given the opportunity to return to normal status, normal for them, then they will likely not become a recidivist.

Stigma most applies in this case. These individuals have great difficulty in dealing with people and situations where their criminal experience is used against them. They do
not see themselves as victims but rather they recognise that they need to be able to return to the routines that they had before they fell into a criminal world. They obviously should not be painted with the same brush as the Type 1 or the Type 2. Type 3, if given an opportunity to be like everyone else can easily reassume and maintain that image and behavioural patterns.

Types should be subject to cascading levels of community intervention. As his profile changes, so should the intervention. Typing for community corrections is possibly the answer the positive reintegration outcomes. By giving attention to what he has to say and how he expresses his experience the ex-inmate provides the only really useful window on where he is, where he has been, and where he needs to be assisted in getting to.
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Endnotes

1 Robert A. Scott (1969) discussed how social stigma can make the person stigmatized into the quality that the bias and ignorance impose.

2 The original schedule used had two additional sections, a more in depth section on “social experience” (family, vocational, and educational data). And a section on “stigma management strategies”, which delved into how they managed certain potentially stigmatic situations, was excluded. These two sections would require more interpretation than the three sections that were used bringing the theses to 500+ pages. All data has been transcribed and will be developed at a later time.

3 Jones is the only respondent who was not a form of parole. He was on work release to the halfway house, he was unable to find a halfway facility that would sponsor him for day parole without a work release and other conditional trials.

4 Multi modal refers to an approach that incorporates the cooperation and efforts of all stakeholders in gaining a solution to a social problem: the ex-inmate, their relations, and the community.

5 These are assessed institutionally through correctional Classification, which is generally done within sixty days after the prisoner arrives at the classification center (Kingston Penitentiary). The Custody Rating Scales (CRS which assesses for initial security level placement) is used to determine the individual’s institutional placement. Statistical Information on Recidivism (SIR) impacts on the evaluation of types of offenders and ex-inmates. That is each type listed will have a different likelihood of failure during his reintegration. These are entry level and a pre-release classification, a more comprehensive post release instrument and program is needed. The program would be aimed at dealing with all ex-inmates in a manner that will assist them in coping with the challenges and the self-confirmed needs.

6 This figure was determined after classifying the entire sample and calculating the mean times for the seven of twenty-three respondents who fell within the criteria as Type 1. It uses 12 years old, YOA or JDA jurisdiction, to the age at the time of the interview, divided by the time spent in prison.

7 This figure was determined after classifying the entire sample and calculating the mean times for the seven of twenty-three respondents who fell within the criteria as Type 1. It uses 12 years old, YOA or JDA jurisdiction, to the age at the time of the interview, divided by the time spent in prison.

8 This figure was determined after classifying the entire sample and calculating the mean times for the seven of twenty-three respondents who fell within the criteria as Type 1. It uses 12 years old, YOA or JDA jurisdiction, to the age at the time of the interview, divided by the time spent in prison.
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