

# International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology

<http://ijo.sagepub.com>

---

## **Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners: Type and Degree of Change in Variables Influencing Successful Reintegration**

Alison J. Shinkfield and Joseph Graffam

*Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol* 2009; 53; 29 originally published online Dec 6, 2007;

DOI: 10.1177/0306624X07309757

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://ijo.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/53/1/29>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* can be found at:

**Email Alerts:** <http://ijo.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://ijo.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations** <http://ijo.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/53/1/29>

# Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners

## Type and Degree of Change in Variables Influencing Successful Reintegration

Alison J. Shinkfield

Joseph Graffam

*Deakin University, Burwood, Victoria, Australia*

Community reintegration of ex-prisoners is an important issue in efforts to reduce recidivism. The present study examined the multiple, complex, and dynamic nature of variables influencing successful reintegration by assessing the type and degree of change in reintegration variables over time. Participants were 79 adult prisoners (54 male, 25 female) who completed a prerelease questionnaire 1 month before their release, which focused on prison-related variables, participant background, and anticipated conditions upon release. A postrelease questionnaire was administered to the same participants at 1-4 weeks and 3-4 months postrelease, focusing on the quality of life conditions experienced following release. Results indicate that current health ratings and several indicators of drug use were significantly different over the three measurement phases. Ratings of employment and housing stability, finance, and social support were unchanged over the postrelease period. Theoretical implications of the present investigation for reintegration theory are discussed, together with practical applications.

**Keywords:** *reintegration; ex-prisoners*

There has been a significant increase in the Australian prison population over the last 10 years that has precipitated a flood of prisoners returning to the community, many of whom are ill-equipped to meet the challenge of reintegration. Reintegration of ex-prisoners is currently one of the major issues in the correctional services field, and promoting successful reintegration is an ongoing concern in efforts to reduce recidivism. Historically, few studies have examined the postrelease experiences of ex-prisoners (e.g., Waller, 1974; Zamble & Quinsey, 1997). Although we have a general understanding of the problems encountered during the process of community reintegration, there is rather limited empirical information about the postrelease adjustment

**Authors' Note:** This research was partially funded by a grant from WISE Employment Limited. That support is gratefully acknowledged. Please address correspondence to Joseph Graffam, PhD, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Hwy, Burwood, Victoria, Australia; e-mail: [jgraffam@deakin.edu.au](mailto:jgraffam@deakin.edu.au).

of ex-prisoners over an extended period of reintegration. The present study fills this gap by examining variables influencing successful reintegration, using a longitudinal framework.

Reintegration into the community is multifaceted, and typically, ex-prisoners experience wide-ranging challenges to reintegration. Variables influencing reintegration may be conceptualised as falling within three domains: intrapersonal conditions, including physical and psychological health, substance use, education and skill levels, and emotional state; subsistence conditions, including finance, employment, and housing; and support conditions, including social support, formal support services, and criminal justice support (Shinkfield, 2006). The literature on the intrapersonal conditions of prisoners and ex-prisoners indicates that this group is characterised by physical health problems (Deloitte Consulting, 2003; National Commission on Correctional Health Care, 2002) and psychological health problems (Fazel & Danesh, 2002), including high levels of drug and alcohol use (Makkai & Payne, 2003). This group is also significantly educationally disadvantaged in comparison to the general population (Fletcher, 2001), and it is characterised by a low level of basic skill development (Bearing Point, 2003). Although there is limited research on how these intrapersonal conditions may influence the process of reintegration, it is likely that these variables, alone and in combination, can have a profound effect on reintegration.

In addition to intrapersonal conditions, numerous subsistence variables affect ex-prisoners. They typically have limited financial resources at their disposal (La Vigne, Visher, & Castro, 2004), and they often carry the financial burden of debt (Stringer, 2002). Employment is clearly critical to alleviating the financial pressure typically experienced by ex-prisoners and is therefore a significant factor in community reintegration. There is a range of barriers to employment, including attitudes of employers toward ex-prisoners and crime, lack of job contacts, lack of basic skills, poor qualifications, and absent or poor work history (e.g., Fletcher, 2001; Webster, Hedderman, Turnbull, & May, 2001).

It is also apparent that some ex-prisoners are seriously disadvantaged in finding stable accommodation (Melbourne Criminology Research and Evaluation Unit, 2003). Unstable and unsafe accommodation has been linked to problematic drug use and reincarceration (Baldry, McDonnell, Maplestone, & Peeters, 2003). Family support appears to play a significant positive role in the provision of not only stable housing for ex-prisoners but also services and supports that focus on prisoner release (Baldry et al., 2003).

Numerous support variables are important to prisoner reintegration. The extant research on the social network and social support of prisoners and ex-prisoners, though limited, indicates that family support is critical to positive postrelease outcomes for ex-prisoners (La Vigne et al., 2004). Unfortunately, this group is often marginalised upon release, with limited family and friend networks. Those with negative family relationships appear particularly vulnerable to a return to crime, reconviction, and

reincarceration (La Vigne et al., 2004). These different forms of support may significantly affect postrelease outcomes for ex-prisoners—either promoting successful reintegration or reducing likelihood for success, depending on the quality and quantity of support.

The aim of the present investigation was to examine the multiple, complex, and dynamic variables influencing community reintegration of ex-prisoners. To achieve this aim, this study examined the type and degree of change in the main reintegration variables relating to the three domains of intrapersonal conditions, subsistence conditions, and support conditions over time. Participants were 79 prisoners who were approaching release from prison. A prerelease questionnaire was administered to participants in the month before prison release, and a postrelease questionnaire was administered to the same participants at 1-4 weeks and 3-4 months following prison release.

Thirteen outcome variables were identified as measures of community reintegration. There were six intrapersonal condition variables, all of which were measured on three occasions: prerelease, 1-4 weeks postrelease, and 3-4 months postrelease. There were four subsistence condition variables and three support condition variables, all of which were measured at the two postrelease points because they specifically referred to postrelease conditions.

The six intrapersonal condition variables measured included the following: rating of current physical health, rating of current psychological health, number of drugs used, number of times the participant has used drugs, number of alcohol drinks consumed in a session, and number of times the participant had drunk alcohol. We hypothesised that current ratings of physical and psychological health would be unchanged over time. In terms of drug and alcohol use, we expected scores to be significantly higher at prerelease (reports of preprison use) than for the two postrelease points, with scores lowest at 1-4 weeks postrelease, followed by a significant increase at 3-4 months postrelease.

The four subsistence condition variables measured were as follows: proportion of time spent in the same housing, proportion of time spent in employment, amount of money that the participant had for living expenses per 2-week period, and rated impact of lack of money on lifestyle. We hypothesised that ratings of housing stability would be unchanged over time, whereas scores relating to employment stability and financial conditions would be consistent with an improvement in the quality of life conditions over the postrelease period.

The three support condition variables measured were as follows: number of people who had provided the participant with support, level of practical support, and level of emotional support. We hypothesised that the total number of support people would be unchanged over the postrelease period. Ratings of the average level of emotional and practical support were expected to decline over the postrelease period, consistent with a reduction in perceived support over time.

## Method

### Participants

The sample comprised 54 male and 25 female adult prisoners with a projected prison release date of approximately 1 month. The participants were recruited from five prisons on the outskirts of Melbourne, Australia. Ages ranged from 18 to 61 years for the prisoner participants ( $M = 34.13$ ,  $SD = 9.66$ ). The majority of the prisoner participants (81%) had not completed high school. Among the prisoner sample, the average level of education of those who had not completed high school was Year 9 ( $M = 9.61$ ,  $SD = 1.52$ ). Seventy-nine participants were interviewed in prison approximately 1 month before release. Of this group, 36 participants were interviewed within the first month of release, which corresponds to a 46% retention rate. Of the original 79 prisoners, 19 participants were interviewed at 3-4 months postrelease, which corresponds to a retention rate of 24%.

### Instruments

The instruments were a prerelease and postrelease questionnaire developed for the study. The prerelease questionnaire focused on participant background (e.g., age, ethnicity, education level); prison health care and other services; housing conditions before incarceration and anticipated housing conditions upon release; employment, training, and finance; support from family and friends; drug and alcohol use before incarceration; and preparation for release. The postrelease questionnaire examined details of release; current housing conditions; employment conditions, education, and training; health care; financial conditions; contact with family and friends; drug and alcohol use; participation in postrelease programs; criminal activity; and supervision and reporting. The postrelease questionnaire also included a Social Support Inventory for Successful Transition (ASSIST) that was developed for this study, examining the quantity and quality of emotional support (six items) and practical support (five items) received from significant others. A copy of ASSIST is presented in the appendix.

### Procedure

Identification of prospective participants and provision of background information on those who volunteered to participate was managed through collaboration with Corrections Victoria. A project officer from a prisoner support agency identified prospective participants who were approaching release. The project was explained in plain language to the prospective participants, and they were invited to participate. Those participants who indicated their willingness to participate provided written informed consent. The participant completed the questionnaire in a quiet room in the prison, side by side with one of the researchers. The postrelease questionnaires were administered either in person or over the telephone. The two

questionnaires were administered to participants in the month before prison release and again at 1-4 weeks and 3-4 months following their release from prison.

## Management of Missing Data and Analysis

High dropout rates are common in research involving the tracking of prisoners following their prison release (La Vigne et al., 2004; Nelson, Deess, & Allen, 1999). To accommodate for missing data owing to discontinuation of participation in the postrelease period, a frequently employed and statistically sound data imputation method called the expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm (e.g., Allison, 2002) was applied. The EM algorithm provides maximum likelihood estimates of missing data by modelling the marginal estimation of the response variable (or variables) with respect to variances and covariances specified over repeated measurements. Put simply, the EM algorithm was applied so that the data set contained 79 complete observations for those variables that included a prerelease measure. Likewise, those variables that were appropriate to analyse only over the postrelease period were increased to 39 data points. Following application of the EM method, repeated measures analyses of variance were conducted on the scores relating to the 13 outcome variables.

## Results

### Intrapersonal Conditions

*Physical and psychological health.* Participants were asked to rate their current physical and psychological health on a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = *extremely poor*, 6 = *extremely good*). Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of health ratings for the participants, as well as the frequency and extent of polydrug use and alcohol use at each of the three points.

Physical health was rated *good* to *very good* on all three measurement occasions. A repeated measures ANOVA on the physical health ratings revealed a significant main effect for time,  $F(2, 156) = 7.88, p < .01$ . Contrary to the hypothesis, the mean rating of physical health at 1-4 weeks postrelease was significantly higher than that at prerelease and 3-4 months postrelease, indicative of better perceived physical health initially following release.

Psychological health was rated *good* to *very good* at prerelease and at both postrelease points. A repeated measures ANOVA on the psychological health ratings revealed a significant main effect for time,  $F(2, 156) = 9.24, p < .001$ . Contrary to the hypothesis, the mean rating of psychological health was significantly lower at 1-4 weeks postrelease than at prerelease and 3-4 months postrelease, indicative of poorer perceived psychological health initially following release, which may be associated with unmet expectations or greater difficulties than that expected upon release.

**Table 1**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of Intrapersonal Condition**  
**Variables at Prerelease and Postrelease**

	Prerelease ( <i>n</i> = 79) <sup>a</sup> <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Postrelease: 1-4 weeks ( <i>n</i> = 79) <sup>b</sup> <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Postrelease: 3-4 months ( <i>n</i> = 79) <sup>c</sup> <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )
Physical health	4.54 (1.05)**	4.74 (0.99)**	4.53 (0.91)**
Psychological health	4.77 (1.02)***	4.51 (0.88)***	4.94 (0.60)***
No. of times used drugs	2.72 (0.64)***	1.08 (0.34)***	1.97 (0.28)***
No. of drugs used (polydrug use)	2.39 (1.15)***	0.96 (0.54)***	1.16 (0.56)***
No. of times drank alcohol	5.31 (9.57)	5.68 (7.69)	4.99 (5.83)
No. of alcoholic drinks in session	10.72 (9.83)***	5.75 (4.43)***	3.21 (2.14)***

Note: Mean scores were compared over the three periods (see text for multiple comparison results).

a. Participants responded to the questions concerning drug and alcohol use in terms of usage each month in the 6 months before prison.

b. Participants who were interviewed at 1-4 weeks postrelease recalled drug and alcohol use since prison release.

c. Participants who were interviewed at 3-4 months postrelease recalled drug and alcohol use over the past month.

\*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

*Substance use.* As indicated in Table 1, a repeated measures ANOVA on the number of times that the participant had used drugs revealed a significant main effect for time,  $F(2, 90) = 279.82$ ,  $p < .001$ . Results were consistent with the hypothesis. The observed increase in use over postrelease time suggests difficulties in reintegration. Likewise, a repeated measures ANOVA on the number of drugs used by the participants revealed a significant main effect for time,  $F(2, 88) = 83.67$ ,  $p < .001$ . This finding was consistent with the hypothesis. Increased polydrug use over the postrelease period suggests difficulties in reintegration.

In terms of frequency of alcohol use, a repeated measures ANOVA on the number of times the participant had drank alcohol revealed no significant main effect for time,  $F(2, 134) = 0.57$ ,  $p = .54$ , which was contrary to the hypothesis. In terms of intensity of alcohol use, a repeated measures ANOVA on the number of alcoholic drinks consumed in a drinking session revealed a significant main effect for time,  $F(2, 52) = 24.80$ ,  $p < .001$ . This result was consistent with the hypothesis that the number of alcoholic drinks consumed in a drinking session would be significantly higher before prison than at each of the two postrelease points. However, the results showed a significantly higher number of alcoholic drinks consumed in a drinking session at 1-4 weeks postrelease than at 3-4 months following release, indicating a tendency toward binge drinking initially following release.

## Subsistence Conditions

*Finance.* There were two outcome variables related to finance. These included an estimate of available income per 2-week period and the average rated impact of lack of money across several life domains. An estimate of available income was calculated on the basis of the ex-prisoner's reported take-home wages (per 2-week period) and their receipt of allowances. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations for the estimate of available income for participants at 1-4 weeks and 3-4 months postrelease. Contrary to the hypothesis, a repeated measures ANOVA revealed no significant difference in the amount of available income (per 2-week period) over the postrelease phase,  $F(1, 29) = 0.51, p = .48$ , indicating continuing financial difficulties.

Second, lack of finance was investigated as an outcome variable. The extent to which lack of money presented a problem in key areas of the ex-prisoner's life was examined using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (*not at all a problem*) to 6 (*an extremely big problem*). The impact of lack of money was investigated by combining ratings for five items assessing the impact of lack of money on finding or keeping a job, getting a suitable place to live, restoring family relationships, continuing health care, and getting drug and/or alcohol treatment. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for the average impact of lack of money on daily lifestyle. A repeated measures ANOVA on the mean scores for the impact of lack of money on the five life domains revealed no significant main effect for time,  $F(1, 38) = 0.85, p = .36$ . Contrary to the hypothesis, results show that lack of money was not perceived as being problematic at either 1-4 weeks or 3-4 months postrelease, with both mean scores indicating that lack of money was slight to somewhat of a problem.

*Employment stability.* Employment stability was measured in terms of the proportion of time spent in employment relative to either the number of days since release (questionnaire administered at 1-4 weeks following release) or since the prior interview (questionnaire administered at 3-4 months following release). A score of 70% is equal to the number of days that an individual worked in a typical workweek. A lower-percentage score is indicative of lower stability in employment.

Contrary to the hypothesis, a repeated measures ANOVA showed no significant difference in the proportion of time employed,  $F(1, 38) = 2.99, p = .09$  (see Table 2). Participants who were interviewed at 1-4 weeks postrelease had been employed in the same paid job an average of 22.86% of the time since their release. This is approximately 33% of the days worked by a typical worker. At 3-4 months postrelease, participants had been employed an average of 26.74% of the time since their prior interview. This is approximately 38% of the days worked by a typical worker. These results suggest that participants spent only a small fraction of their time in paid employment over the initial weeks and months following prison release, although there was considerable variability in these estimates, which may account for the lack of a significant effect.



**Table 2**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of Subsistence Condition**  
**Variables and Support Condition Variables at 1-4 Weeks**  
**Postrelease and 3-4 Months Postrelease**

	Postrelease: 1-4 weeks ( <i>n</i> = 39) <sup>a</sup> <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Postrelease: 3-4 months ( <i>n</i> = 39) <sup>b</sup> <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )
Subsistence condition variables		
Estimate of available income (AU\$) <sup>c</sup>	696.85 (483.41)	656.14 (308.75)
Impact of lack of money	1.31 (1.45)	1.46 (1.16)
Employment stability	22.86 (38.07)	26.74 (37.41)
Housing stability	86.34 (20.11)	87.82 (16.19)
Support condition variables		
Total number of support people	3.66 (1.92)	3.37 (1.11)
Perceived level of emotional support	5.17 (0.82)	5.23 (0.82)
Perceived level of practical support	4.83 (1.29)	4.69 (1.38)

Note: Mean scores were compared over the two time points. See text for multiple comparison results.

a. Participants who were interviewed at 1-4 weeks postrelease recalled their experiences since prison release.

b. Participants who were interviewed at 3-4 months postrelease recalled their experiences over the past month.

c. Participants who were without a job or who had not yet received public assistance were excluded from the analysis. At the time of publication, the Australian dollar was worth approximately US\$0.89.

*Housing stability.* Housing stability was measured in terms of the proportion of time spent in the same dwelling relative to either the number of days since release (questionnaire administered at 1-4 weeks following release) or that since the prior interview (questionnaire administered at 3-4 months following release). A score of 100% indicated that the individual had been in the same housing every day since their release (or since the prior interview), with a lower score indicative of lower stability in housing. Consistent with expectations, a repeated measures ANOVA showed that there was no significant difference ( $p > .05$ ) in the proportion of time spent in the same housing for those participants interviewed at 1-4 weeks and 3-4 months postrelease (see Table 2). In short, a high level of housing stability was associated with both postrelease points in time.

## Support Conditions

*Social support.* There were three outcome variables for social support: the total number of support people and the mean levels of practical and emotional support provided by significant others. Results relating to the three outcome variables for social support are presented in Table 2. As expected, there was no significant difference in the total number of support people identified at 1-4 weeks and 3-4 months

postrelease ( $p > .05$ ), which suggests that the size of an ex-prisoner's support group remained relatively unchanged over the postrelease period. The mean levels of practical and emotional support were high and in the descriptor range, indicating very high levels of support. Contrary to the hypothesised reduction in practical and emotional support over time, two repeated measures ANOVAs showed no significant differences in the levels of practical support ( $p = .27$ ) or those of emotional support ( $p = .36$ ) provided by significant others over the postrelease period.

## Discussion

When all the variables relevant to reintegration are considered, it is clear that many ex-prisoners face real impediments and difficulties in reintegration. Health ratings were high, indicative of good to very good physical and psychological health, both while in prison and following release, as found in numerous other studies (e.g., La Vigne et al., 2004). The finding that the mean physical health rating was highest at 1-4 weeks postrelease may reflect a generally positive attitude to "being on the outside."

The contrary finding of a higher rating of physical health and a lower rating of psychological health at 1-4 weeks postrelease points to the complexity of processes influencing reintegration. The lower mean psychological health rating at 1-4 weeks postrelease may reflect a general level of distress associated with community reentry and reintegration. There are multiple challenges confronting the newly released prisoner, all of which may influence psychological health. The lower mean psychological health rating at 1-4 weeks postrelease may reflect these competing demands.

Substance use may also have a significant impact on community reintegration of ex-prisoners. Substance use is the most prominent condition of ill health among prisoners (Solomon, Waul, Van Ness, & Travis, 2004), with usage directly linked to criminal activity and reincarceration (Makkai & Payne, 2003; Mumola, 1999). The findings of the present study point toward an increase in both the frequency of drug use and the extent of polydrug use over the postrelease period. The frequency of both drug use and polydrug use was lowest at 1-4 weeks postrelease, consistent with an intention to succeed by "getting straight and doing good," which is a commonly reported desire at the point of release (Nelson et al., 1999). Given that the majority of participants who reported a history of substance use were polydrug users, it is not surprising that polydrug use remained relatively high for ex-prisoners over the postrelease period. This finding is counterintuitive with the generally high ratings of physical health, given the known negative effects of regular drug use on physical health (Havard, Teesson, Darke, & Ross, 2006; Ross et al., 2005) and psychological health (Ross et al., 2005). These findings point to the apparent complexity and multiplicity of variables affecting the reintegration process.

The frequency of alcohol use remained high over the postrelease period, suggesting that alcohol use remained problematic, a finding that is consistent with the literature (Kinner, 2006). The high variability in responses is also indicative that alcohol use is

a complex issue, differentially affecting ex-prisoners. Although there was evidence for a reduction in the intensity of alcohol use over the postrelease period, the average number of alcoholic drinks consumed in a session was still high for male and female participants at both postrelease points. For the most part, these levels fall within the range defined as binge drinking (National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2004). The high number of alcoholic drinks consumed in a session by male and female participants, particularly at 1-4 weeks postrelease, is likely linked to the commonly reported desire to "party" when they got out of prison. The observed reduction in the intensity of alcohol use at 3-4 months following release may be linked to an intention by ex-prisoners to improve their life circumstances, although the contrary results with respect to drug use highlight that drug and alcohol use is complex. Heavy use is, of course, known to be strongly related to problems with employment, finances, and interpersonal relationships.

Finance also plays an important role in reintegration. Given the recognised disadvantages associated with ongoing limited finances, the fact that lack of money was not perceived as being problematic at either postrelease point is an interesting finding. Given that nearly half the participants were living with their parents following release, it is likely that many of them received some level of financial support from family members. This may well have contributed to reducing the impact that lack of money can have on procuring housing, employment, health care, and drug and alcohol treatment, as well as positively affecting family relationships.

The financial situation of participants was expected to improve over the postrelease period, on the basis of a belief that more of them would be in gainful employment in the months, rather than weeks, following release. This was not the case. Moreover, the average income (per 2-week period) reported at both postrelease points placed participants in the category of low-wage earners, which is an indicator of risk of financial hardship. In fact, a high proportion of the participants fell below the Henderson poverty line (Brotherhood of St. Laurence, 2005), indicating that these individuals are clearly disadvantaged in achieving an adequate standard of living, which may have important implications for a range of life domains.

The proportion of time in paid employment remained low (at about 24%) and unchanged over the postrelease period, affirming that prolonged periods of unemployment are common for ex-prisoners. Improved links between prison programs and community-based programs that focus on skill development, as well as further development of support services and employment programs, may improve the ability of ex-prisoners to obtain and maintain employment. Although attitudes toward the employability of ex-prisoners are complex and somewhat dependent on severity and chronicity of criminal background (Graffam, Shinkfield, & Hardcastle, 2008), employers are typically unwilling to hire ex-prisoners (Albright & Denq, 1996; Holzer, 1996). Education programs to promote positive attitude change among employers would be useful in this regard, as well as greater workforce participation by ex-prisoners.

A positive outcome was that housing stability was high over the postrelease period, which is contrary to the small body of literature on such outcomes for ex-prisoners (e.g., Melbourne Criminology Research and Evaluation Unit, 2003). Short sentences (70% of Victorian prisoners serve 9 months or less) may contribute to housing stability. Given that unstable housing has been linked to rearrest, reincarceration, and drug use (Baldry et al., 2003), the ex-prisoners in the present study may benefit from the stable housing situation that they had established. It is possible that the high housing stability is the result of attrition bias such that this subgroup was more likely to be available for subsequent interviews because of their residential stability. Clearly, a fair proportion of ex-prisoners do experience unstable housing, and as a result, these persons are vulnerable to multiple disadvantages. It is these individuals for whom housing assistance and support are most urgently required.

Support conditions are also important to reintegration of ex-prisoners, with social support one of several support variables that appear crucial to success in community reintegration. In the present study, the number of significant others identified by participants remained low, averaging three support people (mainly family members) at each of the two postrelease points. Participants also indicated how supportive each significant person was in the provision of practical and emotional support. It was expected that the interrelated challenges commonly experienced by ex-prisoners—including substance dependency problems, ill health, limited finances, and employment and housing instability—would compound over the period of reintegration to produce added strain on family relationships. Whereas some participants did return to the community with low or no social support from significant others, it was generally the case that participants had maintained a small but highly supportive network of family members and close friends. These social relationships may have been easier to maintain over the course of their incarceration because the majority of prisoners who flow in and out of Victorian prisons serve short sentences (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006; Corrections Victoria, 2004).

The collateral costs of imprisonment may be measured in terms of the effects on community cohesion, employment and financial well being, family stability and childhood development, health, and housing and homelessness (Hagan & Dinovitzer, 1999). Our findings also suggest that the effects of imprisonment are complex and wide-ranging for ex-prisoners and their families. Taken together, the results of the present study show that ex-prisoners confront multiple challenges to reintegration, with the attainment of employment and a healthy lifestyle (incorporating reduced substance use) particularly difficult to achieve. More positive was the level of housing stability and provision of social support to ex-prisoners in the weeks and months following release. Although the community-related impact of imprisonment and release was not measured directly, it is reasonable to assume that the generally low level of employment participation and relatively high level of ongoing drug and alcohol use among ex-prisoners would directly affect community cohesion. Future research may explore these issues in detail. The collateral consequences of imprisonment and release may be reduced by promoting opportunities for ex-prisoners to reenter the job

market and complete substance abuse treatment. The interdependence of employment, housing, drug and alcohol treatment, and social network support should also be taken into account by service providers in structuring and delivering support as a whole.

This investigation goes some way toward investigating the big pieces of the reintegration puzzle: physical and psychological health, education and skills development, substance use, housing, employment, finances, and social support. Moreover, the present work provides a theoretical framework for understanding the contribution of variables relevant to reintegration as falling within the domains of intrapersonal conditions, subsistence conditions, and support conditions. A large-scale longitudinal study is needed to advance understanding of the multiplicity of conditions within and across these ecological domains, identify the determinants and interventions, and examine the extent to which those interventions might promote success and prevent or reduce so-called failure (including reoffending, escalation, and chronicity). The questions of what makes reintegration work and how it is achieved are among the most important questions in the field of corrections.

## Appendix

### Social Support Inventory for Successful Transition

In the columns provided, please list the main people in your life that give you emotional and/or practical support (max 7 people). Identify each person in terms of their relationship to you (e.g., brother, friend, parole officer, GP, spouse/partner). If you don't have anyone that provides you with support, then just say "nobody." *For each of the people listed*, please answer the following questions using the scale below.

Not at all 0	Slightly 1	Somewhat 2	Moderately 3	Quite a bit 4	Very 5	Extremely 6
Relationship to you (e.g., brother): _____						
Since you have been released . . .						
1. How strongly have you felt a connection with _____ ? _____						
2. How enjoyable has the time been that you have spent with _____ ? _____						
3. How helpful has _____ been in finding or providing you with a suitable place to stay? _____						
4. How helpful has _____ been in either finding you a suitable job or getting you access to a job-training or job-finding program? _____						
5. How helpful has _____ been in providing you with food? _____						
6. How helpful has _____ been in giving you money when you really need it? _____						
7. How helpful has _____ been in giving you advice or support in your personal relationships? _____						
8. How helpful has _____ been in helping you with drug and/or alcohol treatment? _____						
9. How emotionally supportive has _____ been as you adjust to life on the outside? _____						
10. How emotionally supportive has _____ been in encouraging you to stay away from criminal activity? _____						
11. How much of a positive influence on your behaviour is _____ ? _____						

Note: Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 relate to practical support, and Items 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 11 relate to emotional support.

## References

- Albright, S., & Denq, F. (1996). Employer attitudes toward hiring ex-offenders [Electronic version]. *Prison Journal*, 76(2), 118-137.
- Allison, P. D. (2002). *Missing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2006). *Australia now: Year book Australia 2006. Crime and Justice: Prisoners* (No. 1301.0). Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia: Author.
- Baldry, E., McDonnell, D., Maplestone, P., & Peeters, M. (2003). *Ex-prisoners and accommodation: What bearing do different forms of housing have on social reintegration for ex-prisoners?* Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute. Retrieved July 18, 2007, from <http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/housing/baldry.html>
- Bearing Point. (2003). *The review of education and training provision in Victorian prisons—The way forward*. Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Victorian Office of the Correctional Services Commissioner.
- Brotherhood of St. Laurence. (2005). *Poverty line update* (Information Sheet No. 3). Retrieved April 2, 2007, from <http://www.bsl.org.au/main.asp?PageId=130>
- Corrections Victoria. (2004). *Prisoner release statistics for Victorian prisons* [Internal paper]. Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Author.
- Deloitte Consulting. (2003). *Victorian prisoner health status study*. Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Department of Justice. Retrieved October 14, 2007, from [http://www.justice.vic.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/DOJ+Internet/Home/Prisons/Research+and+Statistics/JUSTICE++Victorian+Prisoner+Health+Study+\(PDF\)](http://www.justice.vic.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/DOJ+Internet/Home/Prisons/Research+and+Statistics/JUSTICE++Victorian+Prisoner+Health+Study+(PDF))
- Fazel, S., & Danesh, J. (2002). Serious mental disorder in 23,000 prisoners: A systematic review of 62 surveys. *The Lancet*, 359, 545-550.
- Fletcher, D. R. (2001). Ex-offenders, the labour market and the new public administration. *Public Administration*, 79(4), 871-891.
- Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A. J., & Hardcastle, L. (2008). The perceived employability of ex-prisoners and offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 52, 673-685.
- Hagan, J., & Dinovitzer, R. (1999). Collateral consequences of imprisonment for children, communities, and prisoners. In M. Tonry & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Prisons* (pp. 121-162). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Havard, A., Teesson, M., Darke, S., & Ross, J. (2006). Depression among heroin users: 12-month outcomes from the Australian Treatment Outcome Study (ATOS). *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 30(4), 355-362.
- Holzer, H. (1996). *What employers want: Job prospects for less-educated workers*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kinner, S. (2006, June). *The re-integration challenge: Post-release experience of prisoners in Queensland*. Paper presented at the Reintegration Puzzle Conference, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.
- La Vigne, N. G., Visher, C., & Castro, J. (2004). *Chicago prisoners' experiences returning home*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center. Retrieved July 22, 2007, from <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311115>
- Makkai, T., & Payne, J. (2003). *Drugs and crime: A study of incarcerated male offenders* (Research and Public Policy Series No. 52). Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology. Retrieved July 20, 2007, from <http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/rpp/52/index.html>
- Melbourne Criminology Research and Evaluation Unit. (2003). *Bridging the gap: A release transition support program for Victorian prisoners*. Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Department of Justice. Retrieved July 20, 2007, from <http://www.justice.vic.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/DOJ+Internet/Find/Publications/>
- Mumola, C. J. (1999). *Substance abuse and treatment, state and federal prisoners, 1997*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- National Commission on Correctional Health Care. (2002). *The health care status of soon-to-be-released inmates* (Vol. 1). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice. Retrieved July 23, 2007, from [http://www.nccchc.org/pubs/pubs\\_stbr.v011.html](http://www.nccchc.org/pubs/pubs_stbr.v011.html)
- National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2004). *NIAAA newsletter* (NIH Publication No. 04-5346). Retrieved July 20, 2007, from [http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/Newsletter/winter2004/Newsletter\\_Number3.htm#Council](http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/Newsletter/winter2004/Newsletter_Number3.htm#Council)

- Nelson, M., Deess, P., & Allen, C. (1999). *The first month out: Post-incarceration experiences in New York City*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Ross, J., Teesson, M., Darke, S., Lynskey, M., Ali, R., Ritter, A., et al. (2005). The characteristics of heroin users entering treatment: Findings from the Australian treatment outcome study (ATOS). *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 24(5), 411-418.
- Shinkfield, A. J. (2006). *A three-part ecological model of community reintegration of ex-prisoners*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia.
- Solomon, A. L., Waul, M., Van Ness, A., & Travis, J. (2004). *Outside the walls: A national snapshot of community-based prisoner reentry programs*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center. Retrieved July 24, 2007, from <http://www.urban.org/publications/410911.html>
- Stringer, A. (2002). The prison and debt project (ACOSS Paper No. 122). *Leaping the chasm: Tackling poverty and inequality in Australia. Selected papers from the 2001 ACOSS Congress* (pp. 83-91). Sydney, New South Wales, Australia: Australian Council of Social Service.
- Waller, I. (1974). *Men released from prison*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Webster, R., Hedderman, C., Turnbull, P. J., & May, T. (2001). *Building bridges to employment for prisoners* (Home Office Research Study No. 226). London: Home Office, Communication and Development Unit. Retrieved July 22, 2007, from <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/hors226.pdf>
- Zamble, E., & Quinsey, V. L. (1997). *The criminal recidivism process*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.