2017

Recidivism: An Analysis of Race, Locus of Control, and Resilience

Danisha Latrell Thomas
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Danisha Thomas

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

Review Committee
Dr. Martha Giles, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Leann Stadtlander, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Rodney Ford, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2017

Abstract

Recidivism: An Analysis of Race, Locus of Control, and Resilience

by

Danisha Thomas

MS, Walden University, 2010

BS, Texas Woman's University, 2003

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Clinical Psychology

Walden University

November 2017

Abstract

Recidivism is a growing problem in the United States that has contributed to prison overcrowding. In the United States, this is especially true for minorities, who have the highest incarceration, conviction, and recidivism rates. The purpose of this mixed methods study was to explore the relationship between race, recidivism, locus of control, and resilience. For the quantitative component, the Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CD-RISC) and the multidimensional locus of control scales were used to measure resiliency and locus of control differences among racial groups ($N = 126$) on parole at a Fort Worth, Texas parole office. For the qualitative component, in-depth interviews of participants ($n = 12$) provide a context for them to express the challenges they face that may contribute to recidivism. Data collected from both the CD-RISC, and the three multidimensional locus of control subscales were used in a MANOVA analysis to find differences and commonalities among racial groups. The findings showed there were no significant racial differences among resilience and locus of control scores. However, there were noticeable trends revealed in the in-depth interviews regarding socioeconomic status, education, employment, and neighborhood. Future research should focus on a longitudinal examination of resilience and locus of control, and on how factors such as education, familial involvement, and employment may impact an individuals' success or failure while on parole. This study may bring social change by alerting policy makers to the challenges offenders face, thereby creating laws that help change how the criminal justice system addresses recidivism.

Recidivism: An Analysis of Race, Locus of Control, and Resilience

by

Danisha Thomas

MS, Walden University, 2010

BS, Texas Woman's University, 2003

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Clinical Psychology

Walden University

November 2017

Dedication

This is for my mother, Hilda L. Felton. Gone, but never forgotten.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to my husband and all my friends and colleagues who stood by me and pushed me to finish this process.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

Recidivism is the return of an individual to prison or jail because he or she violated the rules of probation or parole, or received new charges (Pew, 2011). Between 2005 and 2010, 16.1% of those released from prison in the United States accounted for roughly 48.4% of the 1.2 million arrests during that time (Durose, Cooper, & Snyder, 2014). Addressing recidivism is difficult because it is not a one-solution-fits-all issue. It is an intractable problem that involves various aspects of the legal system ranging from the criminal justice system, to state and local governments. In this mixed methods study, I examined the different contributors to recidivism for African American, Caucasian, and Hispanic ex-offenders through interviewing ex-offenders and having them explain what challenges they face that may contribute to recidivism. In addition, I administered the Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CD-RISC) and the multidimensional locus of control scales (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Levenson, 1974). Results from the study may offer some understanding of the recidivism rates in the United States which ultimately may bring about social change. By providing information regarding the reasons surrounding recidivism, this study may help address the challenges offenders face, and assist them in making a successful transition back into society, thereby reducing the recidivism rate overall.

In this chapter, I review the possible contributors to recidivism by looking at the background of the issues. In the problem statement, I explain why recidivism is a problem that warrants studying. Next, I describe the research methodology used and

discuss the research questions and the hypotheses of the study. I then outline the theoretical framework and describe the theories that served as the basis of the study. Subsequently, I identify the nature of the study and its variables, and provide definitions of key terms. The assumptions section includes descriptions of components of the study that I took to be true, but that cannot be demonstrated. The limitations and delimitations sections include discussions of sample size, participant issues, and potential study concerns. Finally, in the significance and summary sections, I discuss what I hope to contribute to the problem that I researched, and then offer a conclusion to Chapter 1 and an introduction to Chapter 2.

Background

Understanding recidivism requires understanding that the social barriers (e.g. education, unemployment, and addiction) that inmates and ex-offenders face are many and complex. One must look beyond certain offenders committing more crimes than others. Multiple reasons should be considered when examining recidivism. For example, Golembeski and Fullilove (2008) examined the social barriers that African Americans and Hispanics face (e.g. limited job skills, disability), and how these issues remain unaddressed within the criminal justice system. The impact of stricter sentencing, the "war on crime," and social barriers continue to affect individuals negatively before, during, and after imprisonment (Day, 2007).

There are racial differences in the recidivism rates. McGovern, Demuth, and Jacoby (2009) found there was an increased risk of recidivism among minorities, especially for African Americans. Previous researchers have focused on recidivism;

however, few have concentrated on discovering if there were racial differences in resilience and locus of control. Resilience is the internal strength that helps individuals get through difficult or stressful situations (Connor & Davidson, 2003). Locus of control is one's personal beliefs about actions or behavior and consequences (Ryon & Gleason, 2014). In this study, I aimed to identify if racial differences exist in resiliency and locus of control in order to better understand recidivism among minorities.

It is important to know if racial differences exist in the areas of resilience and locus of control so that appropriate assistance in the form of preventative community and social programs may be developed to reduce recidivism (Drake, Aos, & Miller, 2009). I thus aimed to address the gap in the literature by discovering if there are racial differences that impact recidivism that are internal (i.e., resilience, locus of control) in nature.

Problem Statement

Criminal recidivism is a problem of growing concern in the United States, both legally and socially. The plight of minorities in the criminal justice system continues to be inadequately addressed (Mahmood, 2004). Although previous researchers have demonstrated that minorities are incarcerated at higher rates and are more likely to return to prison than Caucasians, understanding why remains unclear. McGovern, Demuth, and Jacoby (2009) found of men aged 18-24, African Americans (26.8%) and Hispanics (29.4%) are imprisoned more often than Caucasians (20.6%); African Americans, Hispanics, and Caucasians make up roughly 12.6%, 16.3%, and 63.7% of the total population respectively (United States Census Bureau, 2011). Also, African Americans

and Hispanics are imprisoned more often for drug trafficking and possession crimes (McGovern et al., 2009). Both groups received higher sentences for these crimes when compared to Caucasians charged with the same crimes: 63.9 months, 58.0 months, and 52.8 months respectively (McGovern et al., 2009). Also, 70.9% of African Americans and 60.6% of Hispanics are rearrested, compared to 58.5% of Caucasians (McGovern et al., 2009).

Interestingly, recidivism rates increase each year the offender is released (Langan & Levin, 2002). By the third year of release, 67.5% of ex-offenders are rearrested, 46.9% reconvicted, and 25.4% receive new convictions (Langan & Levin, 2002). Again, African Americans have higher rates of recidivism than Hispanics or Caucasians (Langan & Levin, 2002). It is unclear what is occurring in the first 3 years of release that contributes to increased rates of recidivism. Researchers have reported that preventative types of programs (e.g., education, rehabilitation) cost less and have an enormous impact on the recidivism rate (Drake, Aos, & Miller, 2009). For example, in the state of Washington, offering a general education program to inmates reduced the rate of recidivism by roughly 8.3%, according to findings from 17 evidence-based studies (Drake et al., 2009). Use of education and other programs may help to lower the costs of incarceration and reduce recidivism rates overall. Thus, my aim was to discover if any racial differences exist concerning resilience and locus of control that may contribute to recidivism, and to offer alternative solutions to increase the offenders' chances of success by understanding the challenges they face once released from prison.

Nature of the Study

In this study, I used a mixed-methods approach. Quantitative analysis helped me identify predictors of resilience and locus of control. Qualitative analysis aligned with the resilience theory and the social disorganization theory. I used these theories to understand the depth of barriers parolees face and how these barriers impact their lives (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013; Kingston et al., 2009).

Variables

Participants in this mixed methods study were parolees recruited from a parole office in Texas who had previous experience being under supervision. The independent variables for this study were the race of the participants: African American, Caucasian, and Hispanic. These variables are important because previous researchers have reported racial differences in recidivism; therefore, I aimed to discover if these same racial groups have differences concerning resilience and locus of control (McGovern et al., 2009). The total sample size (n = 126) was obtained using G*Power analysis with the following criteria: a MANOVA with 3 racial groups and 4 scales, medium effect size (n = .063), alpha of .05, and power of .80 for three racial groups. The dependent variables were scores from the Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CD-RISC) and the multidimensional locus of control scales using the total scores of the CD-RISC and the scores from the subscales internality, powerful others, and chance for the multidimensional locus of control scales (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Levenson, 1974). I used these variables to discover if any racial differences exist concerning resilience and locus of control that may impact recidivism. I also conducted qualitative interviews with randomly selected

participants from the same sample group (n = 12). In the interviews, I explored the challenges that parolees believed contributed to their recidivism and resiliency.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

I developed several research questions (RQs) and hypotheses for this project that were focused on resilience, racial differences, locus of control, and recidivism:

Quantitative RQ: What racial differences are evident in resilience and locus of control scores among parolees?

H_0: There are no racial differences in resilience and locus of control scores among parolees.

H_1: There are racial differences in resilience and locus of control scores among parolees.

Analyses: A 3 (African American x Hispanic x Caucasian) x 4 (CD-RISC, internality, powerful others, and chance) MANOVA using the CD-RISC scale scores and the locus of control subscale scores as the dependent variables.

Qualitative RQ: How do parolees explain their recidivism?

In Chapter 3, I offer a more in-depth discussion is found within existing literature and in further detail in chapter 3.

Purpose

The purpose of this project was to discover if there are any racial differences in resilience and locus of control that may contribute to or impact recidivism. I also aimed to understand the challenges parolees face after release from jail or prison that may contribute to recidivism. I used the social disorganization theory to understand the

relationship between environment (e.g., neighborhood) and criminality (see Kingston, Huizinga, & Elliott, 2009). By understanding these challenges, it may become more apparent why newly released offenders, especially African Americans, recidivate within the first 3 years at higher rates than Caucasian or Hispanic offenders (Langan & Levin, 2002). Addressing these challenges will help to create positive social change by creating programs and changing existing policies to help reduce recidivism within the criminal justice system.

Theoretical Frameworks

The theoretical frameworks for this study were resilience theory (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013) and social disorganization theory (Kingston et al., 2009). I used both to understand how environment and barriers (e.g., lack of education, poverty) influence individuals either positively or negatively. In the future, these theories may help a multidisciplinary team identify how best to address social barriers and lack of programs (e.g., education, addiction) by looking at disadvantaged neighborhoods. Working with community leaders and police to set up programs may lessen future crime and increase community involvement of its residents. Using a multidisciplinary approach may break the cycle of recidivism.

Resiliency Theory

Connor and Zhang (2006) defined resiliency as the individual characteristics that allow one to achieve homeostasis or harmony and strength. Homeostasis (e.g., balance) weakens because of stressors that control or influence adaptability and coping ability (Connor & Zhang, 2006). The length of exposure to stressors determines if homeostasis

is returned to or altered (Connor & Zhang, 2006). Altered homeostasis results in the individual's ability to be resilient (e.g., reintegrative process), reduced homeostasis, or dysfunction (Connor & Zhang, 2006). In Chapter 2, I discuss this theory further.

Social Disorganization Theory

Social disorganization theory helps researchers understand the link between poverty-stricken neighborhoods, criminal activity, and resident instability (Kubrin et al., 2007). This instability results in higher levels of residents moving in and out of the neighborhood (Kubrin et al., 2007). These areas typically consist of minorities and lack opportunities such as jobs and education (Kubrin et al., 2007). Also, ex-offenders usually return to these same environments that help to create the cycle of criminality and recidivism (Kubrin et al., 2007). I offer further discussion of this theory in Chapter 2.

Definitions

I use several terms throughout this study that need further clarification.

Resilience: Those individual characteristics that push one to persevere in times of trouble (Connor & Davidson, 2003). Resilience is constantly in flux; it is forever changing and is influenced by characteristics such as age, gender, and culture (Connor & Davidson, 2003). In its basic understanding, resilience defines how well one adapts during times of stress (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007).

Recidivism: The return to jail or prison while on supervision (e.g., probation, parole) within the first 3 years of release. An individual could recidivate because of probation or parole violations, getting new charges, or being convicted of a new crime (Pew, 2011).

Locus of control: The belief that one's behavior determines consequences (Ryon & Gleason, 2014).

Assumptions

In this project, I assumed that participants answered questions truthfully and without force. Participants were reminded that answers are confidential and accessible by me only. I also reminded them that participation was voluntary, and that they could withdraw at any time during the study. I also assumed that participants were previously on probation or parole. This assumption ensured that participants could give an accurate account of their experiences while under supervision.

Limitations

One limitation is that the results cannot be generalized for all parolees. For the qualitative study, the overall sample size was suitable (n = 12); however, the sample size was small for each racial group (n = 4). Therefore, the results may not be representative of all parolees who recidivate. The information gained can be used to further understand the challenges parolees face racially and socially. The stigma of being labeled as ex-offenders or parolees may limit successful reintegration back into the community. Therefore, by addressing the limitations (e.g., employment, housing) associated with such labels may help in developing programs that may decrease the recidivism rate overall.

A homogeneous assumption is that there are marked limits to making claims about entire groups according to their racial positionality. Also, participants' experiences, or challenges, within the criminal justice system may vary (Teti et al., 2012).

Finally, participants' ages may be a limitation. In this study, the participant's current age was taken into account during the administration of the resilience and locus of control scales. I did not consider the participant's age at first arrest. Age of first arrest could help show a correlation with future recidivism and needs consideration when researching this issue. Therefore, participants may not have been representative of the age of most offenders (i.e., they may have been older than most offenders). However, my focus was on participants' perception of resilience, locus of control, and recidivism.

Delimitations

I delimited this study to include participants that were previously on probation or parole at least once. I focused on those with prior supervision so that participants could give an honest account of their experiences and challenges. Participants were limited to those with drug charges because they have the highest recidivism rates within the criminal justice system (Langan & Levin, 2002). Also, I limited the age of participants to 18 and over. Participants must also identify as African American (Black), Hispanic, and Caucasian for this study. I focused on adult parolees in the aforementioned racial groups to discover if any racial differences exist among resilience, locus of control, and recidivism. Finally, participants must have been able to read, write, and speak in English to complete the questionnaires and the interview portion of the study.

The results of this study could be generalized to other states with higher recidivism rates among ex-offenders, specifically minorities, with drug charges who are on supervision. The findings of this study may help to give insight to the challenges

offenders face that may contribute to their increased recidivism rates, specifically within the first 3 years of their release.

Significance

This project increases understanding of ex-offenders and the barriers that contribute to the United States' recidivism problem. It also provides information to those who work with parolees, as well as the public, on how to address the challenges that ex-offenders face when they return to their communities, and it offers insight as to why ex-offenders return to the criminal justice system so soon after their release. Further, this study provides insight into how to use a multidisciplinary approach to address barriers and understand predictors of resiliency. This study thus provides insight into the challenges of ex-offenders, having a positive impact on the community and the criminal justice system thereby, creating social change in the form of state and government policy reform.

Summary

In this chapter I gave an overview of the issues surrounding recidivism. The focus of this study was to understand if there are any racial differences in resilience and locus of control that may contribute to or impact recidivism. I also examined the complexity of recidivism by looking at various challenges ex-offenders face during probation and parole. In Chapter 2, I examine various factors that impact recidivism and go into further detail about the theoretical frameworks, resiliency theory and social disorganization theory. These theories may offer added insight into the possible contributors of

recidivism and provide greater understanding of racial differences among offenders who have difficulty staying out of the prison system.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Recidivism is a problem that has continued to plague the United States over the last several decades. As the U.S. justice system has become more punitive in nature, especially for non-violent drug offenses, the increasing number of individuals housed within the criminal justice system continues to be a problem (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Unfortunately, this problem has negatively impacted racial minorities the most (McGovern, Demuth, and Jacoby, 2009).

In order to understand recidivism, it is important to understand that the problem is not simple. The criminal justice system is complex, and its problems are confounded by many factors. In this chapter, I review how the prison industrial complex and race play a role in the recidivism problem. I also discuss the social disorganization and resiliency theories that I used to understand factors and issues contributing to recidivism in African Americans. Lastly, I present possible solutions and programs to help reduce recidivism.

Literature Search

In this chapter, I discuss the current peer-reviewed research on the topics of recidivism and the challenges those within the criminal justice system face, social disorganization theory, restorative justice, retributive justice, and resiliency theory. Most of the literature reviewed was published from 2010 to 2014. However, some of the literature is older, with publication dates ranging from 1999 to 2005, because of its significance. Furthermore, most are peer-reviewed articles, and some are from state and/or government agencies such as the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Specific

search terms I used include *recidivism, racial and recidivism, resilience, hardiness, resiliency theory, social disorganization, social disorganization theory, restorative justice* and *retributive justice*. I began scholarly research using Walden Library's EBSCO host to access SAGE, ProQuest, and PsycARTICLES databases. Additional literature research was done using Internet resources such as Google Scholar, which led me to other primary sources of information on the topics mentioned above.

Literature Reviewed Concepts

Recidivism

Recidivism is a complex problem in the United States' criminal justice system. As I noted in Chapter 1, it is a complex issue that comprises state, local, and federal components. Pew (2011) reported that in 2008, for every 100 people, one was incarcerated. Pew (2011) also reported that in 2009, one adult out of 31 was under supervision (i.e., probation, parole) or in prison. This increase in incarceration has cost over $52 billion; a 305% increase in both state and federal spending (Pew, 2011). For example, McGovern et al. (2009) found that African Americans and Hispanics were incarcerated more frequently for drug-related charges (e.g., trafficking, possession). African Americans (63.9 months) and Hispanics (58.0 months) also receive longer sentences than Caucasians (52.8 months) when charged with the same crimes (McGovern et al., 2009). In addition, African Americans were found to have the highest re-arrest (i.e., recidivism) rates overall (McGovern et al., 2009). McGovern et al. (2009) found recidivism rates were 70.9% for African Americans, 60.6% for Hispanics, and 58.5% for Caucasians.

Although crime rates across the nation are declining, the recidivism rate nationally remains at approximately 40% (Pew, 2011). In order to understand the recidivism data reported, one must understand what contributes to the recidivism rate. Pew (2011) indicated that the recidivism rate is comprised of the number of offenders that are released then rearrested, brought back to custody, or reconvicted in a specified timeframe, usually 3 years. An offender is considered to have recidivated and is returned to prison if they are convicted of a new crime. Also, recidivism occurs if probation or parole is revoked due to a technical violation such as missing curfew or failing a drug test (Pew, 2011). For example, from 1999 to 2002 and from 2004 to 2007 there was an 11.9% increase in offenders released from prison (Pew, 2011). Research also showed there was a 17.7% decrease in offenders returned to prison due to technical violations (Pew, 2011). However, these data are misleading. As previously discussed, the national recidivism rate has remained steady at approximately 40% (Pew, 2011). California plays a significant role in how the national recidivism rates are produced because of the large prison population it has. Therefore, when removing California from data analysis, the national rate from 1999 to 2002 was 39.7% and 38.5% from 2004 to 2007 (Pew, 2011).

Each state has its recidivism problem. This problem is impacted by policy, legislators, probation and parole officers, and the criminal justice system (e.g., judges, lawyers, prosecutors) overall. How each state handles newly released offenders will have a positive or negative impact on their recidivism rate (Pew, 2011). For example, if a state releases more low-risk offenders (e.g., non-violent), they are more likely to have fewer re-arrests and lower recidivism rates than their counterparts in other states (Pew, 2011).

These recidivism statistics are misleading because low-risk offenders are less likely to commit additional crimes once released. For example, in 2004 Oklahoma had a recidivism rate of 26.4% (Pew, 2011). Oklahoma's low recidivism rate was because low-risk offenders were incarcerated instead of placed in programs or on supervision (Pew, 2011). Therefore, simply looking at Oklahoma's recidivism rate and assuming its system is working would be premature.

One of the greatest impacts on recidivism rates is technical violations (Pew, 2011). Technical violations are violations of the rules that must be followed (e.g., curfew, employment) as a condition of probation or parole (Pew, 2011). The less time an offender has on probation or parole, the less likely they will have their supervision revoked and return to prison due to a technical violation (Pew, 2011). Technical violations are variable and are determined by a number of factors (Pew, 2011). The probation or parole officers' caseload, rule compliance, and the relationship with the offender influence the frequency of technical violations (Pew, 2011).

Another impact on states' recidivism rates is laws and policies that affect sentencing and parole. For example, a state that has the truth in sentencing law in place has fewer offenders on probation/parole because they had to serve 85% of their sentence (Pew, 2011). This law helped Arizona in 2004 to have one of the lowest recidivism rates, at 11.5% (Pew, 2011). However, some policies (e.g., mandatory minimum sentencing) have negatively impacted both the release and recidivism rates. For example, in 2004 Missouri had a 54.4% recidivism rate with 40.3% revocation due to technical violations

(Pew, 2011). Although this number has decreased to 36.4% in 2009, Missouri's inmate population has been steady (Pew, 2011).

Langan and Levin (2002) conducted a 3-year study on recidivism rates for offenders released from 15 states across the United States. They found that 67.5% of offenders were rearrested, 46.9% committed a new crime, and 25.4% were resentenced (Langan & Levin, 2002). Also, 51.8% had new sentences or were re-incarcerated due to technical violations (Langan & Levin, 2002). In addition, approximately 29.9% of offenders recidivated (e.g., rearrested) within the first six months of their release (Langan & Levin, 2002). This number almost doubles with each year added. In one year of release 44.1% recidivated, within 2 years 59.2%, and within 3 years 67.5% recidivated (Langan & Levin, 2002). These numbers continued to increase steadily for reconviction and new sentences for offenders. Within 3 years, 46.9% of offenders were reconvicted, and 25.4% received new sentences (Langan & Levin, 2002).

Researchers have reported that offenders released from prison in one of 15 states committed new crimes in one of the same 15 states (Langan & Levin, 2002). It is unclear why these states had such a large number of offenders committing new crimes. Officials and researchers believed that the states' close proximity to each other played a role in the migration of offenders once released (Langan & Levin, 2002).

Most of the crimes recommitted by offenders upon release were property offenses such as robbery (70.2%) and burglary (74.0%), to (70.2%) selling/possessing illegal weapons (Langan & Levin, 2002). Interestingly, these crimes are most often committed

to obtain money, and offer some insight into the problems that offenders face in society once they are released from prison (Langan & Levin, 2002).

Another type of crime that newly released offenders commit, and that contribute to recidivism, is drug offenses. For example, Langan and Levin (2002) reported that 66.7% of offenders released in their study were rearrested within the first 3 years. Approximately 47.0% were reconvicted, 25.2% received new prison sentences, and 49.2% were re-incarcerated due to technical violations (Langan & Levin, 2002). In addition, the number of prior arrests serves as a useful indicator of how soon offenders will recidivate and be rearrested. For example, an offender with one previous arrest will have a 20.6% rearrest rate in 1 year (Langan & Levin, 2002). Recidivism increases to 40.6% rearrest rate within 3 years (Langan & Levin, 2002). Therefore, the more prior arrests the offender has, the more likely he or she is to recidivate within the first 3 years of release (Langan & Levin, 2002).

Beginning in the Nixon era, officials thought that giving offenders harsher or longer sentences would have a positive impact on crime, therefore reducing the recidivism rate. However, Langan and Levin (2002) found that that recidivism rates remained relatively unchanged. For prison sentences of 6 months or less, the recidivism rate was 66.0% (Langan & Levin, 2002). Also, offenders serving 7 to 12 months, the recidivism rate was 64.8% (Langan & Levin, 2002). In addition, for offenders sentenced to 13-18 months and 19-24 months, recidivism rates were 64.2% and 65.4% respectively (Langan & Levin, 2002). Even those serving 61 months or longer had a recidivism rate of 54.2% within 3 years (Langan & Levin, 2002).

Locus of Control

Locus of control was initially defined by psychologist Julian Rotter in 1966 as the belief that one's behavior determines consequences (Ryon & Gleason, 2014). It was initially conceptualized as a unidimensional construct. However, over the years it has become dichotomized and divided into internal and external dimensions (Ryon & Gleason, 2014). Therefore, researchers now believe that individuals have either internal or external locus of controls (Ryon & Gleason, 2014). Locus of control is a continuum for each person that can result in an individual having more control at one time and less in another (Ryon & Gleason, 2014). Thus, locus of control is fluid and can change depending on the situation (Huntley, Palmer, & Wakeling, 2012).

Individuals with a more internal locus of control are thought to believe that things occur or happen to them due to their behavior and actions (Ryon & Gleason, 2014). Those with a more external locus of control believe "powerful others, fate, or chance determine events" (Ryon & Gleason, 2014, p. 121). Stress and how the individual handles stressful events has been linked to locus of control (Ryon & Gleason, 2014). Those who believe they have more control over their lives, experience less stress when compared to those who believe they have less control over their life events (Ryon & Gleason, 2014). Research has indicated that those with more external locus of control had more support, and those with more internal locus of control had more ability to deal with stress (Ryon & Gleason, 2014). Research also suggested that those with lower internal locus of control were less capable of dealing with stress (Ryon & Gleason, 2014). Lower

internal locus of control may decrease one's ability to seek help when trying to work through stressful events (Ryon & Gleason, 2014).

Those who believe things happen to them due to their own ability are thought by researchers to have internal locus of control (Goodman & Leggett, 2007). Those with external locus of control believe things occur due to outside influences beyond their control, such as luck or happenstance (Goodman & Leggett, 2007). Researchers have demonstrated that offenders have a higher external locus of control than non-offenders (Goodman & Leggett, 2007). In addition, researchers have reported that criminal activity is influenced by locus of control (Goodman & Leggett, 2007). Goodman and Leggett (2007) found that offenders who committed more violent types of crime had higher external locus of control. For example, adolescents with conduct disorders were found to have higher external locus of control (Goodman & Leggett, 2007).

Rotter (1966) believed that those with external locus of control are the result of maladaptive behaviors (Huntley et al., 2012). He believed that individuals having problems failed to understand that their adverse circumstances are the result of their negative behavior (Huntley et al., 2012). Those with an internal locus of control have more adaptive behaviors because positive consequences support the individual's beliefs and behaviors causing them to be repeated (Huntley et al., 2012). Also, one's ability to solve problems and self-esteem are related to locus of control in both non-offenders and offenders (Huntley et al., 2012). For example, researchers have reported that those with low self-esteem and poor problem-solving skills are more influenced by others and shared commonalities of external locus of control (Huntley et al., 2012). Therefore, one's

sense of control is thought to be a part of causal reasoning, where control over outcomes involve the ability to judge and analyze the correlation between the individual, the behavior, and the consequence (Kormanik & Rocco, 2009). Thus, the present study aimed to discover if there were racial differences in locus of control that contributed to or impacted recidivism.

Prison Industrial Complex

In order to understand recidivism, one must understand how the prison industrial complex has contributed to the incarceration problem today. The privatization of prisons is used to describe the prison industrial complex. The prison industrial complex is the overlapping relationship of government and industries that influence policy (e.g., policing, prison) to address systemic (i.e., economic, social, political) problems (Herzing, 2005). The increasing need for prisons is perceived to bring a positive change in criminal activity. The prison population has increased at an alarming rate. In 1980, nearly 319,598 people were incarcerated (Pollock, Hogan, Lambert, Ross, & Sundt, 2012). In 2009, almost 1,613,740 people were incarcerated, earning the United States the title of being the world's leader in imprisonment (Pollock et al., 2012).

The goal of prisons was to rehabilitate offenders so that they could become productive citizens upon their release (Pollock et al., 2012). This goal was also supported by the public; however, there was also the perception that society should be "tough on crime." This point of view was lobbied for by politicians and policy makers and was typically acceptable to society (Pollock et al., 2012). To be "soft" on crime was paramount to political suicide. Therefore, because of harsher laws and stricter sentencing,

the need for more prisons have grown into a multibillion-dollar political giant (Pollock et al., 2012).

Privatization of prisons began in the 1980s and has increased by approximately 1600% from the 1990 to 2009 (ACLU, 2011). Private prisons contain about 6% state, 16% federal, and nearly half of detained immigrants (ACLU, 2012). The justification for building and maintaining the prison industrial complex was the idea that it would save money which was not true (ACLU, 2012). For example, despite evidence that showed private prisons cost more money than public ones, private prisons are still contracted to house almost 5,000 more offenders in Arizona (ACLU, 2012). However, this proposal continued to be lobbied for primarily by state officials and lawmakers who had conflicting interests with the companies who own these facilities.

Tougher laws such as mandatory minimum sentencing, truth in sentencing, and three strikes laws have had a negative impact on the prison system (ACLU, 2012). These laws resulted in the need for mass incarceration and the prison industrial complex (ACLU, 2012). Stricter laws also served to increase profits for prison companies like Corrections Corporation of American (CCA) and the GEO Group by increasing the demand to house more offenders (ACLU, 2012). In addition, CCA and the GEO Group influenced policy by teaming up with the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC). ALEC is also responsible for the creation and implementation of these same harsh sentencing laws in over 27 states (ACLU, 2012).

Private prison companies receive their money from the United States government in the form of taxpayer dollars (ACLU, 2012). With the help of ALEC, the Private

Correctional Facilities Act was created (ACLU, 2012). This act allowed governmental agencies to obtain private sector contracts for services previously conducted by correctional institutions (ACLU, 2012). Furthermore, the act resulted in a revolving door in the criminal justice system (ACLU, 2012). Privately owned facilities can now house offenders from any state, without the original states' authorization, and outsource prison labor (ACLU, 2012).

Privately owned prisons have been associated with increased violence and higher staff turnover (ACLU, 2012). Also, private facilities are less inclined to focus on rehabilitation and more on the housing of offenders (ACLU, 2012). For example, the more crimes committed resulted in more individuals that would need to be incarcerated, thus increasing recidivism and the need for more prisons (ACLU, 2012). Therefore, it could be argued that private prison facilities are more focused on ensuring their own viability, and not solving the growing incarceration problem in the United States (Mason, 2012).

As mentioned earlier, lawmakers and private prison companies have relationships that contributed to the growing prison industrial complex. For example, private prison companies like CCA and GEO, fund many state and federal legislators (ACLU, 2102). In addition, private prison companies are huge lobbyist for federal agencies, such as the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the House of Representatives, and Homeland Security (ACLU, 2012). For example, CCA had 199 lobbyists in more than 30 states from 2003 to 2011; GEO had 72 lobbyists in 17 states during the same period (ACLU, 2012). Also,

CCA, GEO, and Cornell have contributed to political campaigns and have their own Political Action Committees or PACs (ACLU, 2012).

Restorative and Retributive Justice

As crime and punishment changed focus, concern for the victims of crime increased. Bloom (1999) estimated that 83% of the nation would be a victim of a violent crime at some point in their life (p. 259). As a result, Bloom (1999) indicated many victims would exhibit psychological symptoms such as depression and anxiety. In order for these victims to be healed, restoration (i.e., autonomy) must occur (Bloom, 1999).

Currently, the criminal justice system is offender-focused, with little focus on the victim which often leads to victim revictimization (Bloom, 1999). The criminal justice system fails to change criminal behavior that would make offenders more responsible; therefore, a cycle of criminality is developed (Bloom, 1999). In addition, Bloom (1999) indicated that the criminal justice system was focused on obtaining retribution by attempting to answer the following questions: "1) What laws were broken? 2) Who "done" it? and 3) What punishment do they deserve?" (p. 260). Bloom (1999) further indicated that crime meant law breaking, law breaking meant a violation of the state, and the victim was therefore the state (p. 260). In this basic premise, the victim was not identified as a person per say, but an entity and retribution, or "blame and pain" must be achieved (Bloom, 1999, p. 260).

With restorative justice, the focus was on healing relationships and the needs of the victim, community, and offender (Bloom, 1999). Bloom (1999) argued that there was a fundamental human need for "confession, remorse, atonement, restitution and

forgiveness as essential components of human healing" (p. 260). Thus, restorative justice helped the offender acknowledge that he or she has done wrong, take responsibility for their actions while society takes responsibility for both the victim and offender (Bloom, 1999).

Arguably, justice was focused on fairness and wrongdoing (e.g., retribution) where the offender was punished or compensation was given to the victim (Strelan, Feather, & McKee, 2011). The notion of retribution was not a new one; it has been the norm in Western society and continues to be supported by our criminal justice system (Strelan et al., 2011). However, there was growing evidence that a more prosocial response (e.g., forgiveness) was being considered by society (Strelan et al., 2011). Forgiveness was associated more with the moral values of the individual as well as debt cancelation, but could also work in conjunction with our criminal justice system (Strelan et al., 2011).

At its most basic level, retributive justice was punishing someone for doing wrong (Strelan et al., 2011). But, there are quite a few differences in how society felt about how someone should be punished (Strelan et al., 2011). The absolute penal (retributive) view stated that the crimes against society required an action that brought balance and justice by the punishment of wrongdoers (Strelan et al., 2011). This view suggested that the punishment that was meted out was appropriate to the crime committed (Strelan et al., 2011). In other words, the violator gets what he or she deserved (Strelan et al., 2011). Strelan et al. (2011) further explained that punishment was a rightful and moral response to breaking societal rules.

More utilitarian (retributive) theories (e.g., relative penal theories) suggested that justice did not consider morality when dealing with offenders (Strelan et al., 2011). Thus, punishment should focus on the possibility of future criminal acts or behavior (Strelan et al., 2011). The primary goal of retributive theory focuses on deterrence of future criminal behavior, protecting society via incarceration, and rehabilitation (Strelan et al., 2011). However, restorative justice focused on repairing relationships between victims, offenders, and society, not punishment (Strelan et al., 2011). Strelan et al. (2011) found that although restorative justice was not punishment focused, it was an overall goal of justice. In addition, restorative justice also has aspects of forgiveness in that restorative justice looked beyond the crime and considered both the victim and the offender (Strelan et al., 2011).

It was also suggested that people are less inclined to offer forgiveness depending on the overall goal of justice (Strelan et al., 2011). For example, if justice goals are intended to punish, forgiveness was less likely to be considered (Strelan et al., 2011). If punishment was the focus of justice to protect society and act as a deterrent, or it was believed the offender received what he or she deserved, forgiveness was likely to be considered (Strelan et al., 2011). However, Strelan et al. (2011) found the opposite was true if the goal of justice was inclusive (e.g., restorative) in nature. Rehabilitation and restoring victim/offender/community relationships increased forgiveness tendencies (Strelan et al., 2011). Thus, individuals who supported retributive justice are less likely to offer forgiveness (Strelan et al., 2011). Conversely, people who favored restorative justice are more apt to offer forgiveness (Strelan et al., 2011).

Restorative justice has become an alternative means to incarceration by reducing violations and recidivism by deterring others from committing criminal actions (Wenzel, Okimoto, & Cameron, 2012). Restorative justice was not initially developed as an alternative means for justice (Wenzel et al., 2012). It was an actual critique of the Westernized legal system (Wenzel et al., 2012). However, restorative justice became a social movement that led to an alternative form of justice (Wenzel et al., 2012). Also, restorative justice modeled the original critique of the United States' court system where the victim and offender are given control over their conflict (Wenzel et al., 2012). The current model of restorative justice allowed the offender and victim to work together to repair the harm caused by the offender (Wenzel et al., 2012). The offender acknowledged their offense, offered an apology and showed remorse, which led to the victim offering forgiveness (Wenzel et al., 2012).

The measure of success of restorative justice was its effect on recidivism because restorative justice tried to restore justice and offer moral repair to the victim and society (Wenzel et al., 2012). Wenzel et al. (2012) indicated that understanding victims' feelings towards justice restoration would offer more support, and understanding towards restorative justice practices. In addition, those who have empathy for the offender or can identify with the offender are more likely to be proponents of restorative justice (Wenzel et al., 2012).

In the United States, the criminal justice system was arguably focused on retributive justice (Wenzel et al., 2012). Also, most psychological research has been retributive focused where justice was balanced by punishing offenders for doing wrong or

just deserts (Wenzel et al., 2012). Conceptually, social psychologists described retributive justice as the violation of laws that led to the offender deserving punishment to restore balance (Wenzel et al., 2012). Furthermore, restorative justice deemed that offender suffering was an appropriate response to restore justice when criminal actions have occurred (Wenzel et al., 2012). Thus, punishment must convey a message against negative behavior, and it did not consider that the offender necessarily understood said message; only that justice was restored (Wenzel et al., 2012).

Wenzel et al. (2012) also indicated that retributive justice removed the power from the offender via punishment and restored power to those issuing punishment (e.g., victim, community). When power needed to be restored, Wenzel et al. (2012) argued that victims would be more in favor of retributive justice. Also, cultures that focused more on honor or revenge seeking would also support retributive justice (Wenzel et al., 2012). For example, when individuals thought a power/status imbalance occurred, they were more likely to restore balance with retributive justice, such as revenge or punishment (Wenzel et al., 2012). Wenzel et al. (2012) indicated that individuals are more likely to be in favor of restorative justice when there was a transgression against values, and when values needed to be restored. Thus, when restorative or retributive justice was applied depended on the perception that the individual or society has regarding the crime (Wenzel et al., 2012).

There are four types of restorative justice: victim-offender mediation, group conferencing, circles, and "other" (Umbreit, Vos, & Coates, 2006). Most required in-person meetings between victims and offenders, with a third party as mediator. Circles

often have more community involvement and “other” types of restorative justice included reparative boards and community type programs (Umbreit et al., 2006). The requirement was acknowledging what occurred, how the crime impacted the victim and reaching an agreement between all parties for reparation (Umbreit et al., 2006). These forms of restorative justice could occur at any time during the criminal justice process (Umbreit et al., 2006).

The original purpose of involving the victims was to allow younger offenders to see firsthand how their actions affected others and hopefully reduced their chances of recidivism (Umbreit et al., 2006). Researchers have indicated that are several reasons why victims wanted to participate in victim-offender mediation (Umbreit et al., 2006). Reasons such as understanding why a crime was committed, and letting the offender know how their crime impacted the victim, led to participation (Umbreit et al., 2006). Additional reasons for offender participation included repaying the victim, to put the experience behind them, and to gain favor with the court (Umbreit et al., 2006).

Umbreit et al. (2006) found that some racial differences existed. Caucasian victims are more likely to participate if the offender was Caucasian. Additional reasons for participation included if there was a misdemeanor crime and if the victim was associated with an institution (Umbreit et al., 2006). Also, mediation was more likely to occur with property offenses (Umbreit et al., 1006). Personal crimes are less likely to have mediation (Umbreit et al., 2006). However, the longer it took to reach mediation, the more likely for victims to participate (Umbreit et al., 2006).

Regarding participant satisfaction, those participating in victim-offender mediation and group conferencing have a higher satisfaction with both the process and the criminal justice system overall (Umbreit et al., 2006). Circles such as, talking, healing, and sentencing have mixed reviews. For example, a community circle working with sex offenders was found to have positive satisfaction (Umbreit et al., 2006). However, there are concerns regarding privacy, problems working with possible family and friends, and conflicts due to religion (Umbreit et al., 2006). Finally, "other" programs, such as the Vermont Reparative Probation program, have minimal victim participation (Umbreit et al., 2006); however, those who participated were satisfied (Umbreit et al., 2006).

Often, restorative justice attempted to divert offenders from the criminal justice system (Umbreit et al., 2006). For example, a study of a victim-offender mediation in the United Kingdom found nearly 60% of offenders are diverted from prosecution (Umbreit et al., 2006, p. 8). In the United States, a North Carolina mediation program diverted approximately two-thirds of their offenders from prosecution (Umbreit et al., 2006). With group conferencing, there are no changes in diverting offenders (Umbreit et al., 2006). Also, with circles, researchers have indicated that one program diverted over 100 people in a 10-year period (Umbreit et al., 2006).

As indicated previously, a measure of the effectiveness of a restorative justice program was if recidivism decreased. Umbreit et al. (2006) studied several victim-offender programs and found mixed results with most programs having little or no change to recidivism rates. Research has indicated that youth who participated in victim-

offender programs have lower recidivism rates, nearly 32%, and have less serious charges if they did recidivate (Umbreit et al., 2006). Also, there are mixed results for group conferencing and recidivism. Recidivism rates are lower for those who committed violent crimes (Umbreit et al., 2006).

In a 2-year study of a circle program with 65 participants, there was an 80% decrease in recidivism (Umbreit et al., 2006). Also, in a 10-year study of a sex offender program, there was a recidivism rate of 2% (Umbreit et al., 2006). Furthermore, in a 1-year follow-up study of "other" typed programs, there was a significant decrease in recidivism; however, data were not provided (Umbreit et al., 2006).

The cost of restorative justice programs varies. For example, in California it cost approximately $250 per case, but in Missouri, it ranged from $232 to $338 (Umbreit et al., 2006). Also, how much time was spent on a case also impacted its cost (Umbreit et al., 2006. Researchers have indicated that it required less time to process a mediated case (Umbreit et al., 2006). Offering circles impacted the cost of going through the criminal justice system process, saving approximately $6.2 to $15.9 million dollars (Umbreit et al., 2006).

Researchers, as well as policy makers, are considering restorative justice as a plausible alternative to the criminal justice system (Latimer, Dowden, & Muise, 2005). Other countries such as Canada, England, and Japan, including the United States, are considering more restorative forms of justice (Latimer et al., 2005). Restorative justice assumed there was a "violation of people and relationships rather than merely a violation of law" (Latimer et al., 2005, p. 128). Therefore, to achieve justice reparation must occur.

Reparation was accomplished by the offender accepting responsibility for their actions by meeting with the victim to discuss repairing the wrongdoing (Latimer et al., 2005). However, a stipulation of restorative justice was that participation was voluntary (Latimer et al., 2005).

Restorative justice could happen at any point in the criminal justice process. Latimer et al. (2005) identified five entry points for offenders: (pre-charge) police, (post-charge) crown, (pre-sentence) courts, (post-sentence) corrections, and (pre-revocation) parole (p. 129). Restorative justice was thought to be beneficial for the victim because it offered vindication and healing (Latimer et al., 2005). By forming relationships between the victim, offender, and the community, healing occurs (Latimer et al., 2005). Also, when comparing 13 treatment programs, victim satisfaction was higher for those who participated in a restorative justice program (Latimer et al., 2005). However, mixed results was found among offenders. Overall offender satisfaction was higher for those within the program; however, Latimer et al. (2005) found that one of the 13 test programs did not find any statistical significance for offender satisfaction.

One way to ensure offender compliance was with restitution agreements (Latimer et al., 2005). Having to pay victims increased the likelihood of offenders being complaint and taking responsibility for their negative behavior (Latimer et al., 2005). Researchers reported that those who must pay restitution have much higher compliance with restorative justice programs (Latimer et al., 2005). Also, researchers have indicated an overall decrease in recidivism with restorative justice programs compared to offenders who did not participate in these types of programs (Latimer et al., 2005). However,

Latimer et al. (2005) also found that restorative justice was not appropriate to deal with long term criminal or delinquent behavior. Problems such as, substance abuse, antisocial attitudes, and crime-ridden communities are not the focus of restorative justice (Latimer et al., 2005). These issues need to be addressed in greater detail to truly impact and reduce recidivism (Latimer et al., 2005).

There was limited data regarding the education and training of facilitators offering restorative justice programs (Latimer et al., 2005). Latimer et al. (2005) indicated this was important to know because facilitators have a significant impact on the outcome. Also, there was minimal information about offenders' criminal history, offense type, and relationship status between the victims and offenders (Latimer et al., 2005). Thus, more information is needed to understand the real effectiveness of restorative justice programs in future studies (Latimer et al., 2005).

Although there have been reports of overall satisfaction with restorative justice programs such as victim-offender mediation, there was little data provided regarding attrition. Researchers have indicated that attrition rates vary from approximately 4% to 65% with face-to-face intervention (Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, Rooney, & McAnoy, 2002). Variable attrition rates caused doubt, allowing for questions to arise concerning the necessity of these types of programs (Bonta et al., 2002). Bonta et al. (2002) also indicated that most studies evaluating restorative justice programs only measured the frequency of meetings, the satisfaction of participants, and how many restitution agreements were reached. Furthermore, research has indicated that there was not a

precise definition of what a restorative justice program was because there was a lack of consensus (Bonta et al., 2002).

After reviewing nearly 30 studies, Bonta et al. (2002) found that recidivism rates only decreased by approximately 3% overall. Adult programs were more effective in lowering recidivism than youth programs (Bonta et al., 2002). Research has indicated that programs that have restitution have lower recidivism rates, approximately 8%, as well (Bonta et al., 2002). Also, victim-offender meetings (VORP) have slight increases in recidivism, approximately 2% (Bonta et al., 2002). Bonta et al. (2002) found that restorative justice programs are used for a diversion from incarceration; however, these programs are not appropriate for all offenders. Offenders who committed crimes such as, sexual assault, drug charges or other violence are not eligible (Bonta et al., 2002). Furthermore, offenders accepted into the program must plead guilty, take responsibility for their crimes, and make restitution (i.e., amends) to their victims (Bonta et al., 2002). The offender must complete a sentencing plan that was developed by the victim (Bonta et al., 2002). Sentencing plans such as treatment or restitution are submitted to the court and if accepted, are given to the program's staff to ensure offender completion (Bonta et al., 2002).

Of the 297 offenders referred to restorative justice programs, approximately 174 or 58.6% received approval (Bonta et al., 2002). Nearly 91.4% have a six-month sentence, 43.7% are first time offenders, and 28.2% are less likely to commit violent crimes (Bonta et al., 2002). Also, approximately 17.8% of referrals for the program are from the prosecutor; however, when referrals are made, almost 83.3% are accepted

(Bonta et al., 2002). Only 69.3% of offenders referred by the defense are accepted (Bonta et al., 2002). Bonta et al. (2002) found that the prosecutor had a significant influence on who was accepted into the program. Of the 99 cases accepted by the judge, the prosecutor recommended 57 for the restorative justice program (Bonta et al., 2002). Only 9.9% of the offenders in the program have a lower risk of recidivating (Bonta et al., 2002). Nearly 50.5% of offenders have a medium risk, and 39.6% have a high risk to recidivate (Bonta et al., 2002, p. 327). Although acceptance of some offenders for the restorative justice program occurred, some are still incarcerated (Bonta et al., 2002). Incarceration called into question the program's intent on restoration and diversion (Bonta et al., 2002). Research has indicated that approximately 55.6% of offenders who received prison time have also committed crimes against an individual (Bonta et al., 2002). Furthermore, those within the restorative justice program have a history of having more technical (i.e., probation) violations (Bonta et al., 2002).

Bonta et al. (2002) also found that the types of crimes offenders committed influenced recommendations for restorative justice programs. Recommendations for the program came from business employees (41.5%), individuals (29.8%), and private business owners (16.5%). Overall monetary losses ranged from approximately $20 to over $20, 000 (Bonta et al., 2002). Additionally, 4.9% of victims had physical injuries, and 22.2% of victims expressed having psychological injuries (Bonta et al., 2002). Also, 56.4% of offenders had to give restitution, ranging from $200 to $42,000 (Bonta et al., 2002). Almost 69% of offenders received community service, ranging from 50 to over 800 hours of service (Bonta et al., 2002, p. 328). Last, approximately 96.7% of the

offenders within the program received a recommendation for counseling or some form of treatment (Bonta et al., 2002). Bonta et al. (2002) found that offender risk profiles indicated that many suffered from drug and alcohol, employment, and family/relationship problems.

Thus, Bonta et al. (2002) found that participants in their study did have lower recidivism rates, ranging from 9% to 31%. However, offenders who did nor did not received treatment, and offenders who were incarceration or were in the restorative justice programs, had no impact on recidivism rates (Bonta et al., 2002). Therefore, the aim of this study was to provide insight into the challenges that ex-offenders face and to determine if there are any racial differences in resiliency and locus of control that impacted or contributed to recidivism.

Racial Implications

The impact of mass incarceration and recidivism have mostly affected African Americans and Hispanics (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005). In 2003, 1 in 8 men incarcerated was African American, compared to 1 in 27 men for Hispanics, and 1 in 63 men for Caucasians (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005). Also, Golembeski and Fullilove (2005) found that there was a correlation between socioeconomic status and imprisonment. For example, in 2002, almost 80% of those incarcerated did not have enough money to hire an attorney. Also, in a 1991 study conducted by the US Department of Justice found that nearly 65% of those incarcerated have limited education, 53% are poor, and almost 50% are unemployed (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005). Furthermore, regarding recidivism, African Americans are dealt with more harshly

than their Caucasian counterparts (Langan & Levin, 2002). For example, African Americans have higher rearrest rates than Caucasians, 72.9%, and 62.7% respectively (Langan & Levin, 2002). African Americans are reconvicted more frequently than Caucasians, 51.1% and 43.3% respectively (Langan & Levin, 2002). Also, 28.5% of African Americans received new sentences, compared to only 22.6% of Caucasians (Langan & Levin, 2002). Furthermore, African Americans are returned to prison more frequently than Caucasians, with overall rates of 52.2% and 49.9% respectively (Langan & Levin, 2002). Overall incarceration rates are higher for Hispanics when compared to Caucasians. Rearrests, reconvictions, and return to prison rates were 71.4% and 64.6%, 50.7% and 43.9%, 57.3% and 51.9% respectively (Langan & Levin, 2002).

African Americans are incarcerated six times more frequently than Caucasians (Massoglia, Firebaugh, and Warner, 2013). Increasing incarceration negatively affected families, communities, earning potential, and has far-reaching political implications. For example, due to incarceration many offenders have lost or severely limited, their voting rights, which impacted elections both on a state and federal level (Massoglia et al., 2013). Limited voting rights created a political shifting of not only power but also, money that shifted from poor inner-city minority neighborhoods to more affluent Caucasian communities (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005).

The housing of inmates also became a part of the politico-socioeconomic scheme. Usually, prisons are placed in mostly rural Caucasian areas or communities. The prisoners (e.g., mostly minorities) are then considered residents of these communities, which determines how the government allocated funding and grants (Golembeski &

Fullilove, 2005). The shift in money decreased the number of subsidies meant for inner-city/urban neighborhoods thereby, giving them to prison communities (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005). Also, because inmates received minimal pay or in some cases no pay at all, these figures helped lower the average income reported to the federal government (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005). Reducing the average reported income enabled these communities to receive federal housing (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005). Last, these figures also helped to rezone political boundaries because inmates contributed to increasing the political power in these communities (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005). Thus, minorities, particularly African Americans, lost not only economically, but politically as well (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005). Minority communities lost because they lacked programs, did not have the money to improve their communities and lacked the power to help offenders returning to those neighborhoods (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005).

Racial differences in arrests for drug offenses are vast. Due to the War on Drugs, arrests from 1985 to 1989 increased for African Americans by 100% compared to only 27% of Caucasians (Kubrin, Squires, and Stewart, 2007). The Bureau of Justice Statistics found that in 2003, 1 in every 3 African American man would likely be incarcerated during his lifetime (The Sentencing Project, 2012). The rates decreased for other races, with only 1 in 6 for Hispanics, and 1 in 17 for Caucasians (The Sentencing Project, 2012). Research has indicated that of the offenders incarcerated in state prisons during 2011, 38% (581,300) were African American, compared to 23% (349,900) of Hispanics, and 35% (516,200) of Caucasians (The Sentencing Project, 2012).

Thus, the negative impact of incarceration and recidivism on African Americans went beyond the offender. It affected families and communities, helped to break up relationships and created an accepted normalcy of incarceration that is passed on to youth. Mahmood (2004) found that mass incarceration negatively impacted the social conditions that caused criminal activity as evidenced by the increasing rates of women and children that are also imprisoned.

Contributors of Recidivism

One area that has contributed to the recidivism problem in the United States was the failure of successfully reintegrating offenders back into society (Hass & Saxon, 2012). Failing reintegration includes providing adequate programs while in prison and upon release, socioeconomic problems such as jobs, housing, and adequate support (Hass & Saxon, 2012). Approximately one-third of offenders released are returned to prison due to technical violations while on probation or parole because of strict rules (Hass & Saxon, 2012). With limited programs for rehabilitation during incarceration, the multiple problems offenders faced before prison (e.g., substance abuse, education), remained upon their release (Kubrin et al., 2007). These unaddressed problems have contributed to offenders' inability to follow the strict rules that are imposed during supervision (Kubrin et al., 2007). For example, in a 2005 study conducted on 676 Texas offenders, researchers have reported that nearly 80% used substances and only 21% received treatment while imprisoned (Kubrin et al., 2007).

Having the stigma of being a convicted felon also contributed to recidivism because it limited what the ex-offender could and could not do in society. Laws and

agendas such as the War on Drugs that placed stricter restrictions on individuals, even for first-time offenses, also contributed to the dilemma (Kubrin et al., 2007). For example, depending on the state, many felons are restricted from receiving public assistance (i.e., welfare) for the rest of their lives. They also cannot receive financial aid to attend college. These restrictions severely limit what these individuals can do upon reentering society.

Social and family support. Another problem that offenders faced upon re-entering society was a lack of social support. Golembeski and Fullilove (2005) found that many offenders left prison with no support from their families or their communities thus, increasing the likelihood of committing a crime to survive. Furthermore, due to this lack of support, many offenders became homeless (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005). For example, in New York, federal law gave power to the Public Housing Authority to restrict housing to those who have criminal records (Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005).

Arguably, adequate social support reduced the chance of ex-offenders from committing an opportunistic crime by limiting the need to associate with peers that are criminals (Cobbina, Huebner, & Berg, 2012). Having a strong social network was thought to encourage ex-offenders to become positive members of society (Cobbina et al., 2012). However, Cobbina et al. (2012) found that having a strong social network has an opposite effect on female ex-offenders. Those who were in relationships with men were found to increase their criminal behavior (Cobbina et al., 2012).

Another strong influence on ex-offenders were their peers. Researchers have indicated that peers influenced everything from romantic partners to criminal activity

(Cobbina et al., 2012). Cobbina et al. (2012) found that for men who committed low-level crimes, social networks (e.g., intimate partner, family) lowered the risk of recidivism. Also, those who had peers committing criminal activity were found to influence the ex-offenders' recidivism (Cobbina et al., 2012). For example, male offenders seek their peers for social support (e.g., gangs), which increased peer pressure and could increase criminal behavior (Cobbina et al., 2012).

Social support also included the offenders' family. Incarceration affected not only the offender but also the family by breaking up the family unit and hurting the family economically. Having strong family support during incarceration decreased the offenders' likelihood of recidivism upon their release (Martinez & Christian, 2009). Also, research has indicated that strong family support reduced the risk of post-release depression (Martinez & Christian, 2009). Furthermore, family support influenced how successfully the offender reentered society and, therefore, stayed out of prison (Martinez & Christian, 2009).

It is also important to understand that family support means different things to different people. Support ranges from housing to information. For example, offenders identified support as giving information and advice (Martinez & Christian, 2009). Also, providing instrumental support, such as occasional transportation or money, by family members was beneficial to ex-offenders (Martinez & Christian, 2009). This form of assistance allowed family members to help ex-offenders without feeling like they were responsible for them, therefore, enabling them to find their way. For example, offenders who engage in more dangerous criminal acts repeatedly was found to have less social

support (Cobbina et al., 2012). Families were less inclined to continue to be involved with the more dangerous offender (Cobbina et al., 2012).

Social support was severely lacking for those offenders who went through the criminal justice system as children (i.e., juveniles) and left as adults. These individuals went in with limited education and job skills and returned with these same deficiencies (Inderbitzin, 2009). Many returned to the same negative environment they were removed from which often included poverty, crime and a lack of social support (Inderbitzen, 2009). Also, it was more problematic for offenders to reenter society for several reasons (Inderbitzen, 2009). Age (e.g., youth), limited education, lack of job or social skills, and temptations within the neighborhood influenced re-entry (Inderbitzen, 2009). Furthermore, incarceration did not reform them. For example, Inderbitzen (2009) found that incarceration taught one subject how to be a more successful drug dealer upon his release.

Many young offenders were worse off after incarceration due to the familiarity of living in a structured system (Inderbitzen, 2009). Upon their release, many juvenile offenders had idle time and lacked the skills to become successful in society (Inderbitzen, 2009). Low-level offenders (i.e., street offenders) had a harder time with reintegration because they are not a part of mainstream society (Inderbitzen, 2009). Thus, this lack of support such as education, family, and community, along with a lack of skill continued the cycle of recidivism (Inderbitzen, 2009).

Neighborhood. Many offenders, particularly African American and Hispanic

offenders came from disadvantaged communities. For example, in a Chicago study, researchers have indicated that offenders released back into the community returned to seven specific counties (Massoglia, Firebaugh, & Warner, 2013). These counties are known to be highly impoverished (Massoglia et al., 2013). Also, there is the perception that reentry neighborhoods impacted recidivism (Massoglia et al., 2013). Although there was not a causal relationship, there are known factors that offenders tended to be minorities who are from disadvantaged neighborhoods (Massoglia et al., 2013). Also, many offenders returned to these same neighborhoods that lacked opportunities but provided significant social and familial ties (Massoglia et al., 2013).

Additionally, there are racial disparities in housing and neighborhood quality or attainment for the public and offenders. For example, Massoglia et al. (2013) found that African Americans, regardless of SES, did not achieve the same neighborhood quality as Caucasians. This difference in neighborhood attainment meant a definite disadvantage to those who lived in places that lacked economic growth, opportunity and have problems with crime. Furthermore, offenders received limited or no help upon their release from prison and often must rely on themselves or their families who are also lacking resources (Massoglia et al., 2013).

Researchers have indicated that Caucasian offenders tended to live in the most advantageous neighborhoods, Hispanics lived in the middle, and African Americans lived in the most disadvantaged areas (Massoglia et al., 2013). Also, Caucasians have the most personal achievements such as education and job opportunities; however, African Americans were found to be poorer and relied on public housing (Massoglia et al., 2013).

Massoglia et al. (2013) also concluded that imprisonment had little consequence with regards to neighborhood attainment for African Americans and Hispanics because they were already living in more disadvantaged areas than their Caucasian counterparts. However, imprisonment significantly affected neighborhood achievement for Caucasian offenders, causing them to live in less affluent areas (Massoglia et al., 2013). Decreased affluence was due to incarceration and not the individual's offense (Massoglia et al., 2013). Furthermore, research has indicated that only 1 in 5 Caucasian subjects returned to their former neighborhood upon release, suggesting there was a causal effect between incarceration and disadvantaged neighborhoods (Massoglia et al., 2013). Upon their release, the offender moved to a more disadvantaged neighborhood (Massoglia et al., 2013). This move was particularly in the case of Caucasian offenders who lived in less affluent areas upon their release; however, minorities returned to similarly disadvantaged environments (Massoglia et al., 2013). Thus, there are significant racial inequalities with regards to offender reentry.

Stahler et al. (2013) defined spatial contagion as the distance the offender was from other deviant peers. Research has indicated that high spatial contagion, or having a closer proximity to deviant peers, played a significant role in the likelihood of recidivism with ex-offenders (Stahler et al., 2013). High spatial contagion has been particularly true of younger offenders and those who were previously incarcerated for drug offenses and violence (Stahler et al., 2013). However, research has not indicated that there was an association between the economic disadvantages of a neighborhood and recidivism (Stahler et al., 2013). There was an increased chance of recidivism for offenders who

were young and African American men who were involved with drugs (Stahler et al., 2013). These findings indicated that this could be due to "hot spot policing" where there was increased police interaction (Stahler et al., 2013). "Hot spot policing" in these areas increased the likelihood of recidivism due to spatial contagion (Stahler et al., 2013).

Barriers. Although the prison population continued to rise, funding for rehabilitative programs has significantly decreased thus, limiting the successful reentry of offenders back into society upon their release (Hass & Saxon, 2012). The lack of appropriate skills such as education and employment are barriers that negatively impact how successful offenders are in society (Hass & Saxon, 2012). Also, offenders are limited in the type of employment they could have. For example, offenders could not legally work with children or the elderly, nor could they work as barbers, plumbers, or real estate professionals (Hass & Saxon, 2012). Thus, the higher paying jobs, even those for skilled laborers, are not available to ex-offenders due to their convictions (Hass & Saxon, 2012).

Ex-offenders lacked the same rights as other citizens that limited their ability to reenter society successfully. Limitations are placed on where the offender could live, what type of employment they could have, and their voting rights. They remained, in a sense, institutionalized even after their release (Hass & Saxon, 2012). These limitations often resulted in homelessness, and with fewer options, led to criminal activity to survive. Hass and Saxon (2012) found that offenders received instructions on what they had to do once they reentered society, but not on how they are supposed to accomplish the tasks. For example, offenders knew that they were expected to get a job, housing, and treatment

(Hass & Saxon, 2012). However, they were not instructed on how to accomplish these tasks (Hass & Saxon, 2012). Thus, remaining sober, as well as other responsibilities, posed a challenge for success (Hass & Saxon, 2012).

The lack of opportunities such as employment played a role in the racial differences in recidivism (Bellair & Kowalski, 2011). Researchers have indicated that there was a link between joblessness and criminality, as well as an inverse relationship between lower educated males with higher than average wages and crime (Bellair & Kowalski, 2011). However, the attitudes of employers also impacted if an offender could receive an opportunity for employment. For example, researchers have indicated that in Los Angeles nearly 21% of companies surveyed would consider employing a convicted felon (Bellair & Kowalski, 2011). Thirty-six percent of employers considered hiring offenders depending on the crime, and almost 42.6% would not (Bellair & Kowalski, 2011).

Additionally, of those offenders paroled, approximately 80.8% of Caucasian offenders lived in neighborhoods that had a 0% to 10% unemployment (Bellair & Kowalski, 2011). Bellair and Kowalski (2011) found that African American parolees have higher recidivism rates than their Caucasian counterparts because of limited job opportunities. Also, those industries (i.e., manufacturing) that are more likely to hire individuals with criminal records are diminishing (Bellair & Kowalski, 2011). Therefore, limited employment opportunities of offenders increased the likelihood of recidivism (Bellair & Kowalski, 2011).

Theoretical Foundations

Social Disorganization Theory

The social disorganization theory could be used to understand how disadvantaged neighborhoods influenced or impacted residents' behavior in a negative fashion. Kubrin et al. (2007) found that the theory could be used to understand criminal behavior in disadvantaged environments. When compared to advantaged environments, disadvantaged environments had higher poverty rates, racial heterogeneity, and (residential) instability that led to social disorganization (Kubrin et al., 2007). Researchers have indicated that socially disorganized neighborhoods, due to their economic and social disadvantages, have less (informal) social control than socially organized neighborhoods (Kubrin et al., 2007). Also, crime rates are influenced by residents living in the neighborhood (Kubrin et al., 2007).

Research has indicated that neighborhood type did have a direct impact on criminal activity (Kubrin et al., 2007). Furthermore, previous research has indicated that neighborhood type influenced victimization and offender rates (Kubrin et al., 2007). Because disadvantaged (i.e., disorganized) neighborhoods often have fewer services for ex-offenders, it was difficult for them to succeed and not recidivate (Kubrin et al., 2007).

Research has indicated that socially disadvantaged neighborhoods did not always have higher crime rates (Kingston, Huizinga, & Elliott, 2009). However, Kingston et al. (2009) studied neighborhood social structure and its complications beyond disadvantage and personal influence. They also studied how areas vary by the opportunities (e.g., positive, negative) they have available (Kingston et al., 2009). For example, areas that

lacked social control (e.g., urban, inner-city neighborhoods) could have more opportunities for criminal activity that exposed residents to these opportunities, especially youth (Kingston et al., 2009).

Social control was composed of three levels—intimate, parochial (e.g., schools, church), and public (e.g., community, agencies). For example, neighborhoods that have strong private and parochial social networks have more access to public resources that offer more opportunities to help residents within the community (Kingston et al., 2009). Also, neighborhoods with higher levels of social control have higher levels of collective efficacy or solidarity (Kingston et al., 2009). A high level of collective efficacy resulted in trust among residents, which was good for the community (Kingston et al., 2009). The higher the level of collective efficacy, the lower the level of criminality especially among young adults or youth (Kingston et al., 2009).

Socially disadvantaged neighborhoods are believed to have limited social controls (e.g., education, health), and the inability to create strong prosocial networks (Kingston et al., 2009). These strong prosocial networks helped to decrease delinquency and criminal behavior (Kingston et al., 2009). For example, increases in single-parent households resulted in frequent moving and reduce the ability to create collective efficacy within the neighborhood, thereby limiting the capacity to create strong prosocial networks (Kingston et al., 2009). Additionally, neighborhoods with more single-parent families have fewer adults available to monitor and build healthy trusting relationships within the community (Kingston et al., 2009).

Poverty also has a significant impact on communities and the residents within them. Poverty limited the ability to create social networks and relationships within the community (Kingston et al., 2009). Due to limited resources, poverty reduced opportunities for individuals to succeed (Kingston et al., 2009). Because poverty reduced personal success, it increased the opportunity for delinquent and criminal behavior (Kingston et al., 2009). Therefore, disadvantaged neighborhoods lack the proper resources that protect against criminal behavior resulting in larger numbers of delinquency (Kingston et al., 2009).

Previous research on social disorganization has focused on macro-level factors that impacted urban neighborhoods, such as poverty and transience (Kurlychek, Krohn, Dong, Hall, & Lizotte, 2012). Macro-level factors negatively affected residents and social control (Kurlychek et al., 2012). Research has indicated that poverty, instability (residential), and racial heterogeneity negatively influenced social controls (Kurlychek et al., 2012). Researchers have also reported that there was a link between high criminal behavior and violence in these types of neighborhoods (Kurlychek et al., 2012). Kurlychek et al. (2012) conducted a study to determine if there were protective factors that influenced individuals living in disadvantaged neighborhoods. Their study was inconclusive; some neighborhood-level factors (e.g., school, peer) did lower the risk of violence but, not significantly (Kurlychek et al., 2012). Thus, understanding the impact of disadvantaged neighborhoods on the individual is complex and consists of many variables (e.g., peers, resources) that influenced criminality.

Martinez, Rosenfeld, and Mares (2008) conducted research to determine if criminal activity was influenced by factors (e.g., instability, poverty) from the social disorganization theory. Researchers have reported that in urban Chicago neighborhoods that were poor, unstable and had population heterogeneity, higher rates of delinquency and drug abuse existed (Martinez et al., 2008). For example, in the 1980s, the loss of jobs, specifically manufacturing, in urban neighborhoods increased poverty and helped contribute to chronic unemployment (Martinez et al., 2008). Also, these urban communities became isolated and more crime-riddled with the addition of drug activity, specifically with the introduction of crack during this period (Martinez et al., 2008). Selling crack then became the new form of employment for youth within the inner-city (Martinez et al., 2008). Unfortunately, this increased addiction, as well as the crime within these neighborhoods, and made it almost impossible to remove this drug (Martinez et al., 2008).

Researchers have reported that because these types of communities' lack social control (e.g., private, parochial, and public), they fit the model of social disorganization (Martinez et al., 2008). However, this could not be used to link drug activity and social disorganization because more than one type of social control was affected (Martinez et al., 2008). Martinez et al. (2008) found that social disorganization had more to do with spatial relationships or how the neighborhood was set up to be systematically disadvantaged overall.

There was a link between the components of social disorganization theory, specifically poverty (e.g., socioeconomic deprivation), population heterogeneity and

aggravated assault and robbery (Martinez et al., 2008). The main factors of the social disorganization theory do not have a link between violence and drug activity (Martinez et al., 2008). However, instability does impact crime, specifically assault, robbery, and marginally drug activity (Martinez et al., 2008). Thus, socially disadvantaged neighborhoods have many factors that contributed to offense type and crime.

The social disorganization theory has been used to define factors or conditions that contributed to criminal activity (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Social disorganization was the lack of a community to address and solve problems (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). The lack of social control, coupled with poverty, racial heterogeneity, and resident mobility helped to lessen positive behavior thereby increasing the potential for crime (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Also, research has indicated that social ties and informal controls impacted neighborhood criminal activity (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Informal controls are those things in which the residents do to lessen criminal activity (e.g., monitoring, involvement) whereas social ties are the connectedness the individual has within the neighborhood (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Research has indicated that those with strong social ties and control have a positive impact on crime rates in their neighborhoods (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). However, this was not a simple task to attain and was not always possible. Researchers have reported that social ties could improve or cause problems for social organization depending on the individuals involved (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003).

Another impact on socially disorganized neighborhoods was collective efficacy or the communities' ability to control the actions of others; however, research has indicated

that collective efficacy also negatively affected crime rates, particularly violence (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). For example, although residents were involved in their neighborhoods, they are at high risk of becoming victims of violence. Kubrin and Weitzer (2003) found that social ties have limited impact on decreasing crime.

Researchers have indicated that if more people became involved in socially disadvantaged neighborhoods, the criminal activity would reduce (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Also, Kubrin and Weitzer (2003) found that it was expected that disadvantaged communities would be crime-riddled and was also more accepted by its residents (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Acceptance of crime could be true because residents realized that there are limited opportunities for success, and limited resources to prevent criminal behavior (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Furthermore, Kubrin and Weitzer (2003) found that residential fear, cynicism, and the "street code" impacted behavior within disadvantaged neighborhoods, therefore, limiting the ability of residents to speak out against crime.

Formal social control (e.g., legal, police) has a positive and adverse impact on socially disadvantaged neighborhoods. Policing these neighborhoods minimally affected criminal activity; however, it also caused tension with residents because they become targets of policing, regardless if they were engaged in criminal activity or not (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Being targeted caused resentment from both the police and residents. Kubrin and Weitzer (2003) found that the police had the perception that individuals living in high-crime neighborhoods deserved to be victims, therefore responding less quickly as they would to more prominent (i.e., rich) areas. This attitude, coupled with "harassing behavior" caused increased tension and resentment for all parties involved.

Furthermore, if residents do not trust the police, they would be less willing to help and become involved. Police mistrust created "street justice" in which residents take the law into their hands as a form of formal control (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Thus, there are no simple solutions to address the issues of those living in socially disorganized neighborhoods.

Resiliency Theory

Resilience has varying meanings. Resilience could mean how individual acts during stress or how an individual thrives despite adverse conditions (Smith et al., 2008). Smith et al. (2003) found that resilience has included the terms thriving and adapting as key components. Researchers have identified six measures of resilience: protective factors; stress-coping ability; central protective resources of health adjustment; resilient coping behavior; and resilient personality characteristics (Smith et al., 2008).

Smith et al. (2008) found that previous research focused more on individual characteristics of coping ability and not broader reasons that impacted resiliency (e.g., health resources, protective factors). Existing measures such as the Resilience scale and the Connor-Davidson Resilience scale focused on individual traits (Smith et al., 2008). Smith et al. (2008) created the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) to determine if resilience was the ability to recover from a stressful event because of resources or good outcomes. Their measure differed from others because it only measured one's ability to come back or remain intact after a stressful event (Smith et al., 2008). Overall, the BRS was helpful in identifying an individual's recovering ability because of existing illness or stress and helped to identify resources that improved resilience (Smith et al., 2008).

Individual and community resilience worked together. Greene and Greene (2009) found that a systemic approach that combined both individual (i.e., personal) and external (i.e., community) factors created a symbiotic relationship that fosters resilience. In other words, both work together and rely on each other for success on a micro and macro system level (Greene & Greene, 2009). Both working together helped decrease adversity and increased the success of recovery or resiliency (Greene & Greene, 2009). Increasing doubt in the environment caused increased stress, and that also created a psychological change (Greene & Greene, 2009). For some, a psychological change increased danger and created a need for increased coping ability (Greene & Greene, 2009).

Greene and Greene (2009) found that several terms were identified as personal resilience. Risk was defined as the increased chance of a negative outcome. Vulnerability was how susceptible to threat(s) a person was (Greene & Greene, 2009). Protective factors are qualities that gave an individual an increased chance when negative situations occurred (Greene & Greene, 2009). Also, resilience was an adaptive pattern over time despite adversity (Greene & Greene, 2009). Some researchers have reported that resilience occurred only when needed such as, in stress, trouble, or macro-level (e.g. environment, government) changes (Greene & Greene, 2009). However, some researchers have reported that resilience occurred over an individual's entire lifetime because it was forever changing (Greene & Greene, 2009).

Teti et al. (2012) found that research was conducted on the resilience of poor, urban, African American men noting that these individuals face unique circumstances. For example, many African American men are poor, uneducated, unemployed, or have

been (prior or currently) in the criminal justice system (Teti et al., 2012). In 2008, researchers reported that African American men are twice as likely to lack employment than Caucasian men (Teti et al., 2012). Additionally, research has indicated that from 2000 to 2008, African American men are 6.5 times more likely to be imprisoned than Caucasians (Teti et al., 2012). Researchers have also indicated that African American men were 3.3 times more likely to be imprisoned when compared to all races (Teti et al., 2012). According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), African American men have the highest mortality rates in the United States (Teti et al., 2012).

Incarceration was a socially complex problem that not only involved the individual but systems, which included education, employment, law and policy makers (Teti et al., 2012). However, despite the challenges, African Americans are resilient even though researchers have not focused on understanding this specific population (Teti et al., 2012). Teti et al. (2012) found the importance of studying resilience among African Americans to a culturally and empirically researched model that considered the unique stressors and proactive factors of African American life overall. Teti et al. (2012) also found four specific stressors for the participants in their study: racial micro-aggressions, incarceration, unemployment, and surviving street life. Despite these stressors, five forms of resilience were identified: perseverance, commitment, reflecting and refocusing to address difficulties, creating a supportive environment, and support from religion or spirituality (Teti et al., 2012, p. 529).

Although there was no single definition of resilience, adversity and success have been identified as components of resilience. Teti et al. (2012) found that threats and

successes are generalized, and does not occur for every person. The stressors or misfortune one faced depended on many causes such as, age, socioeconomic status (SES), and race or ethnicity. Also, previous research has reported that life or severe stressors are rare events (Teti et al., 2012). Rare events are not the case for the subjects of this study (i.e., poor, African American) because their stressors were constant (Teti et al., 2012). Teti et al. (2012) found that constant stressors (e.g., poverty, racism) lacked adequate research using current models of resilience because such models viewed stressors as single events. Although African Americans are resilient, these individuals faced systemic stressors that would challenge their resiliency (Teti et al., 2012). Communities and individuals must work together to try to change the odds, not simply beat them (Teti et al., 2012).

Connor and Zhang (2006) found that previous research on resilience attempted to discover what made individuals survive or successfully overcome misfortune. Through its definition, resilience tried to define individual strengths that helped a person during stressful events (Connor & Zhang, 2006). Resilience are the unique characteristics that are impacted by time, age, gender, and culture (Connor & Zhang, 2006). Other characteristics identified by Connor and Zhang (2006) included patience, humor, faith, and altruism.

The resiliency theory proposes that each person has characteristics that helped him or her gain harmony and strength (Connor & Zhang, 2006). Connor and Zhang (2006) indicated that studies were conducted to determine how individuals reacted to stress unconsciously and consciously by using a resiliency model. This model indicated

that individuals start in homeostasis where there was balance or adaptation in the present (Connor & Zhang, 2006). Depending on stressors, the individual's coping ability would determine how he or she would adapt to stressors (Connor & Zhang, 2006). A reintegration process occurred because of continued stress (Connor & Zhang, 2006). Reintegration created four possibilities: disruption or growing potential; reintegration or homeostasis; recovery due to loss or decreased homeostasis; or dysfunctional state or destructive behaviors (Connor & Zhang, 2006, p. 6-7). Connor and Zhang (2006) found that there are specific determinants of resilience because of a biological or physiological response that changed depending on stress. Other determinants are genetic, temperament or protective factors such as intelligence, family or social support, and environment (Connor & Zhang, 2006). More studies about determinants could help to determine how resilience differed among individuals.

Risk assessments helped to determine the likelihood an individual was to recidivate. Many measures are used to predict and prevent the possibility of recidivism (Lee, 2013). Because many offenders are minorities, understanding cultural differences could help identify risk more readily and create suitable interventions (Lee, 2013). Lee (2013) found that risk assessment should be confirmed cross-culturally and until it was confirmed, it was inappropriate to apply to different racial groups.

Risk factors that influenced or impacted juvenile delinquency included groups such as peers, family, and environment or community (Lee, 2013). Lee (2013) found that a positive correlation existed between risk factors and the likelihood of delinquency. Also, protective factors or things that reduced the effect of risk factors (e.g., family,

community) impacted recidivism positively (Lee, 2013). However, risk and protective factors could not predict delinquency (Lee, 2013).

The risk and resiliency checkup (RRC) identified risk and protective factors to determine resiliency after the removal of protective factors (Lee, 2013). However, this measure was not as informative for Hispanics or other ethnic youths (Lee, 2013). Lee (2013) studied the invariance of the RRC with African American, Caucasian, and Hispanic youth offenders. Lee (2013) found that the measure was valid for all three ethnic groups; however, risk and protective factors did not reflect resiliency (Lee, 2013). Furthermore, it was unclear the effect that risk and protective factors have on recidivism, or that protective factors have on risk factors (Lee, 2013).

Research conducted in 2007 found that roughly 93% of inmates were male, 36% African American, 32% Caucasian, and 20% Hispanic (Maschi, Gibson, Zgoba, & Morgen, 2011). Sixteen percent were aged 18 to 24, and 10% were over age 55 (Maschi et al., 2011). There was an increased concern in correctional facilities because they failed to meet the needs (i.e., age-related, psychological) of these offenders (Maschi et al., 2011). Research has indicated that younger inmates aged 18 to 24, are still dealing with a severe developmental stage in an environment that was contained or restricted (Maschi et al., 2011). Also, older adults faced age-related changes that prisons are not addressing (Maschi et al., 2011). Furthermore, grave threats to inmates are consistent with current trauma and stress. For example, nearly 93% of offenders are either a victim or witnessed physical or sexual assault (Maschi et al., 2011). This continued stress resulted in about

65% of offenders having symptoms of or diagnosed with posttraumatic stress disorder (Maschi et al., 2011).

Research has indicated that nearly 20% of offenders are victimized at some point during their lives (Maschi et al., 2011). Roughly 40% of offenders experienced out of home placement and 25% witnessed substance abuse by their parents during their childhood (Maschi et al., 2011). For example, research conducted in 1998 indicated that 96% of youth within the criminal justice system are witnesses to violent acts (Maschi et al., 2011). Around 44% witnessed the physical assault of a family member, and 21% are victimized (physically) by a relative (Maschi et al., 2011). However, researchers have indicated that long-term exposure to stress and violence caused negative coping skills that led to criminal behavior (Maschi et al., 2012). Also, traumatic grief due to death or loss was a stressor discovered with offenders (Maschi et al., 2011). Researchers have indicated that this form of grief correlated to recidivism (Maschi et al., 2011).

Maschi et al. (2011) found that younger offenders are more likely to report physical violence, whereas older offenders are more apt to report sexual violence. Age group differences determined there was a need for more specific interventions in prison populations (Maschi et al., 2011). Also, youth risk factors for delinquency included age, impulsivity, neurological problems, negative peer groups, and exposure to violence (Mowder, Cummings, & McKinney, 2010). Protective factors included future orientation, social support, and relationships (Mowder et al., 2010). These factors could help identify risks for delinquency as well as prevention (Mowder et al., 2010).

There are three types of resilience: positive outcomes in lieu of negative environment; competent functioning during acute or chronic stress; and recovery from traumatic events (Mowder et al., 2010). Mowder et al. (2010) conducted research on male and female juvenile offenders to determine resiliency levels using the Resiliency Scales for Children and Adolescents (RSCA). Each group was assigned into clusters. Custer 1 participants consisted of mostly young females that had lower levels of resiliency and had the highest levels of rule-breaking behavior (Mowder et al., 2010). Cluster 2 participants consisted of mostly males and had average-ranged scores. Cluster 3 had the highest number of minorities. Subjects in this group were more disruptive, broke the rules, and were isolated more often (Mowder et al., 2010). These types of behaviors decreased protective factors thus, lowering resilience (Mowder et al., 2010). Custer 4 consisted of older subjects with the least time imprisoned, fewer violations, and had average levels of resilience (Mowder et al., 2010). Mowder et al. (2010) suggested that despite having average resiliency, the subjects in Cluster 4 could be the most resilient of all cluster groups. Cluster 4 participants were the most resilient because they spent less time exposed to the criminal justice system and were older (Mowder et al., 2010).

Researchers have indicated that individuals could face, at a minimum, one "potentially" traumatic event during a lifespan (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Traumatic events could vary because of how each person reacted to stress (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Reaction differences were studied to determine the differences between people and how they handled stress (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Fletcher and Sarkar (2013) found that prior research was conducted to determine why some (young) people thrive in stressful

environments. Some researchers have indicated that some thrive because of individual characteristics such as temperament or self-esteem or other protective factors (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). However, research has changed its focus from protective factors to gleaning information on how individuals overcome (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013).

Arguably, one problem with resiliency research was that it lacked a precise definition or conceptualization (Smith et al., 2008). Resiliency definitions varied from personal qualities to overcoming misfortune and coping skills, to recovery during stressful situations (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013; Smith et al., 2008). For example, Greene and Greene (2009) found that (personal) resilience consisted of risk (e.g., poverty), vulnerability (e.g., SES), and protective factors (e.g., parents, social support) that allowed an individual to adapt over time despite personal challenges. Also, to define resilience, it requires a clear understanding of negative circumstances (e.g., hardship) that people face daily or at various times in their lives (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Furthermore, there must be a positive adaptation or "internal well-being" to become resilient (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013, p. 14). Positive adaptation meant when facing trouble, an individual could change (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). However, some researchers have indicated that this concept was a Western view that stressed the importance of what the individual must do (e.g., individualism), which did not consider other cultures with more collectivistic points of view (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013).

Conceptualizing resilience was unclear because some researchers have indicated that it was a trait or ability that allowed one to adapt to changing situations (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Conceptualization included using a concept called ego resilience or traits

that showed individual strength or flexibility because of demands (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Conceptualization also included psychological resilience or the changes to a person's personality that occurred because of life events over time (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). The different forms of resilience helped to increase understanding and how each was conceptualized. However, what was also gleaned regarding resilience was if a situation changed, it also changed resilience (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013).

Connor and Davidson (2003) defined resilience as individual characteristics that allowed one to succeed in times of trouble. Resilience was not stagnant; it varied with age, gender, and culture (Connor & Davidson, 2003). Researchers have reported that to understand changing resilience, it required using the resiliency model (Connor & Davidson, 2003). The resiliency model started with homeostasis or balance in the individual (Connor & Davidson, 2003). This balance could be hindered because of stressors, and how one dealt with stressors decided if homeostasis would return. Therefore, four results could occur; disruption or increased resilience and homeostasis; return of starting homeostasis; decrease homeostasis due to loss; and dysfunction due to poor coping skills (Connor & Davidson, 2003). Also, Connor and Davidson (2003) found that there was not an acceptable tool that measured resilience simply. The Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CD-RISC) was created as an empirically sound measure of resilience (Connor & Davidson, 2003). The CD-RISC was found to be a valid and straightforward measure of resilience with varying cultures and conditions (Connor & Davidson, 2003).

Researchers have indicated that every person could be resilient and adapt (Masten, 2001). The ability to adapt created strong development to occur; however, if adaptation was limited in times of trouble, developmental problems could happen (Masten, 2001). Masten (2001) identified two models of resilience. Variable-focused resilience measured the amount of risk and protective qualities an individual had when faced with negative outcomes (Masten, 2001). Person-focused (resilience) compared different groups of people to identify what specific characteristics made certain people more resilient than others (Masten, 2001).

One problem with the variable-focused model was that it sometimes failed to identify patterns across groups that could be at risk or needed help (Masten, 2001). Variable-focused research has found that parenting styles, intellect, SES, and positive self-regard correlated with how well one adapted (Masten, 2001). However, these same variables were also identified as risk factors with negative results during high stress or adverse situations (Masten, 2001). It was unclear of the long-term effects of high stress or adversity on adaptive behaviors (Masten, 2001). Long-term effects depended on the intactness or strength of risk factors (Masten, 2001).

Person-focused research has found that there are distinct differences within high-risk groups. For example, research has indicated that the more resilient group of participants had better parenting and cognitive skills, as well as, higher self-regard (Masten, 2001). Researchers have reported that even within the high-risk group, a resilient subgroup was found to have resilient factors (Masten, 2001). However, one issue with this and similar studies was that it failed to identify low-risk groups and it neglected

to determine if individuals (i.e., children, adults) from low-risk groups would be as resilient without having high-risk factors (Masten, 2001).

Richardson (2002) found that there are three waves of Resiliency Inquiry, which came from a phenomenological approach and was used to described the characteristics of young survivors in high-stress situations. The first wave aimed to discover characteristics of those who had thrived during misfortune (Richardson, 2002). The second wave aimed to define specific resilient qualities (Richardson, 2002). These waves helped to define resilience as an individual's coping ability when faced with adversity or change (Richardson, 2002). Last, the third wave contributed to the conceptualization of resilience. This conceptualization included reintegration and motivation when faced with trouble (Richardson, 2002).

The first wave of resiliency inquiry changed its focus from identifying risk factors to identifying individual strengths that help people in times of trouble (Richardson, 2002). Prior research has identified various measures and traits (e.g., social relationships, coping skills) that many resilient individuals have. Also, previous research has indicated that around 50% to 70% of at-risk children became well-adapted (e.g., caring, confident) adults (Richardson, 2002).

The second wave aimed to determine how people gained resilient qualities (Richardson, 2002). This focus helped to define resiliency as a set of stages that included (biopsychosocial) homeostasis, interactions, disruptions, and reintegration (Richardson, 2002). Resiliency started with adapting to life's challenges (Richardson, 2002). Resiliency also included biopsychosocial homeostasis because this was when the

individual adapted to internal or external stressors either physically, spiritually, or mentally (Richardson, 2002). Richardson (2002) found that individuals battled chronic stress because of ineffective adapting or coping skills to handle life's problems. These challenges offered opportunities for learning and growth which fostered successful reintegration or a place of homeostasis (Richardson, 2002). Last, the third wave of resiliency included reintegration or opportunities for spiritual growth (Richardson, 2002). The resilience theory posited that each person has within them intrinsic features such as, wisdom and strength that allowed them to be resilient (Richardson, 2002).

Payne (2011) found that to understand the plight of African American men and resilience, it required an understanding of their challenges in the form of street life. Street life was individualized, personal, and often needed for survival (Payne, 2011). It was ideology or thought processes and behavior that included legal and illegal activity (Payne, 2011). For example, an individual may work and be involved in dealing drugs or violence (Payne, 2011). Payne (2011) found that involvement in street life was "a choice made for right or for wrong, a consequence of being overwhelmed by personal and economic strife" (p. 428). How strongly or deeply the person's involvement in street life was depended on many factors. Race, SES, gender, location, and development stage determined the involvement in street life (Payne, 2011). Payne (2011) found that the current definition of resilience needed to be reconceptualization to include African American men involved in street life. Also, Payne (2011) found the "site of resilience" theory that described how African American men found meaning and accomplishment, as well as, how they survived despite misfortune.

Previous research has reported that resilience dichotomized individuals, suggesting that some people are resilient while some are not (Payne, 2011). This dichotomy was found when research was conducted on African American boys (Payne, 2011). The argument was that a both-and, rather than an either-or approach needed consideration (Payne, 2011). For example, no one was either good or bad; each person was both good and bad, depending on the circumstances (Payne, 2011). Also, Payne (2011) found that traditional models of resilience were ineffective; they failed to recognize the fluidity of behavior. Therefore, surviving street life was resilience in itself; what is "good" for some may be "bad" for others (Payne, 2011).

Researchers have indicated that daily stress decreased with age; however, there are mixed findings on age and how one dealt with stress (Diehl & Hay, 2010). Older adults reacted less to stress than their younger counterparts because of decreased physiological reactivity (Diehl & Hay, 2010, p. 1133). Researchers have indicated that around 50% of the days reported by adults was stressful (Diehl & Hay, 2010). Moreover, researchers have indicated that older adults recovered from stressful situations (e.g., emotional) faster than younger ones (Diehl & Hay, 2010).

To understand age and stress, Diehl and Hay (2010) analyzed how self-concept influenced resilience. Self-concept differentiation determined how one's perceptions differ, depending on social roles and circumstances (Diehl & Hay, 2010). For example, researchers have indicated that older adults with low self-concept have lower levels of psychological well-being, and increased negative psychological well-being than younger adults (Diehl & Hay, 2010). Diehl and Hay (2010) also found that when subjects reported

more stress, they have a greater negative affect as well. Furthermore, individuals with a more positive self-concept have a more negative affect that varied daily (Diehl & Hay, 2010). Their findings also indicated that self-concept was not related to how one reacted to increased stress (Diehl & Hay, 2010).

Regarding personal control, researchers have indicated that the more (realized) control an individual has, the lower their negative affect (Diehl & Hay, 2010). Therefore, personal control acted as a buffer for stress (Diehl & Hay, 2010). Also, younger adults reported more negative affect regarding decreased personal control than older adults (Diehl & Hay, 2010). This negative affect could be due to younger adults having less life experience to develop coping skills that tend to develop over time (Diehl & Hay, 2010). However, no matter the age, decreased (perceived) personal control correlated with less well-being and lowered response to stress (Diehl & Hay, 2010). Last, Diehl and Hay (2010) found that age was a resilience factor and not a risk factor. This finding indicated that older adults are not at risk to the effects of stress as they aged (Diehl & Hay, 2010).

Resilience could be used to help understand how an individual overcame stress or misfortune throughout the lifespan (Windle, Bennett, & Noyes, 2011). Windle et al. (2011) defined resilience as one's ability to negotiate and deal with varying amounts of stress and trauma. Internal and external factors helped the individual to adapt and overcome misfortune (Windle et al., 2011). Windle et al. (2011) found that there was a need for stringent resilience measures in research. Valid measures meant using measures appropriately and ensuring that they measured what they claimed to measure (Windle et al., 2011). For example, researchers had indicated that when (unpublished) invalidated

measures are used in clinical trials on individuals with schizophrenia, around 40% reported that treatment was effective (Windle et al., 2011). Also, despite there being several measures for resilience, there was no preference because of a lack of robust evidence to guide selection (Windle et al., 2011). Therefore, selection and administration of measures were used arbitrarily, and often wrong (Windle et al., 2011).

Researchers have also compared 15 resilience measures to determine their quality (Windle et al., 2011). Of the 15, the top three were the CD-RISC, the Resilience Scale for Adults (RSA), and the Brief Resilience scale (Windle et al., 2011). Also, only five measures reflected resilience complexly; The Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM), RSA, the Resilience Scale of the California Healthy Kids, Survey the READ, and the (YR: ADS) Youth Resiliency: Assessing Developmental Strengths (Windle et al., 2011).

Researchers have indicated that resilience was the ability to adapt to stress in a positive way (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007). The ability to adapt positively was paramount to understanding resilience (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007). Also, resilience was comprised of several factors such as internal (i.e., genetic, biological, and psychological) and external or environmental (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007). The effectiveness of the CD-RISC on individuals with childhood maltreatment was also researched (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007). Additional research was conducted on people with high and low scores on the CD-RISC to determine their degree of psychiatric symptoms (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007). Researchers have reported that subjects who saw themselves as more resilient on the CD-RISC did not present with higher levels of

psychological symptoms (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007). Therefore, researchers have indicated the CD-RISC was a valid measure to help clinicians determine who was more resilient (i.e., adapting) after stressful events (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007). However, the individual's present state of mind influenced responses; thus, more research was needed (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007).

Although some African Americans faced many challenges such as violence and poverty, some could be more resilient than others facing similar circumstances (Brown, 2008). Researchers have attempted to identify (protective) factors that made African Americans more resilient. Brown (2008) found that racial socialization and social support helped African Americans to be resilient. Racial socialization was "behaviors, communications, and interactions between parents and children that address how African Americans ought to feel about their cultural heritage and how they should respond to the racial hostility or conform in American society" (Brown, 2008, p. 33). Racial socialization included information and actions that helped one to understand racial status and social relationships (Brown, 2008). Information about racial socialization could come from family members or peers; however, researchers have reported that racial socialization came from parents (Brown, 2008). Also, racial socialization could impact an individual's psychologically (e.g., self-esteem) to educational success (Brown, 2008). Researchers have also indicated that positive racial socialization, where information instilled pride and cultural education, increased positive results academically and psychologically (Brown, 2008).

Social support included family, churches, and "play" family members that are described as people that are close but are not blood-related (Brown, 2008). The people who made up social networks for African Americans were a part of their culture that helped individuals deal with adversity (Brown, 2008). Brown (2008) found that social networks acted as a buffer when dealing with stress. For example, the extended family gave support in the form of advice or information (Brown, 2008). Also, individuals with extended families dealt better with daily stress (Brown, 2008). Furthermore, the role of the church played an important part in the lives of African Americans. Researchers have reported that church acted as a role model for children and was also a place for inspiration and healing (Brown, 2008). Thus, social networks helped African Americans develop coping skills, which increased resiliency (Brown, 2008).

Additional research was conducted to determine the effects of racial socialization and social support on African Americans. Research has indicated that racial socialization and social support positively correlated with an individual's perception of resiliency (Brown, 2008). Positive racial messages such as cultural pride, also influenced an individual's perception of resiliency (Brown, 2008). Also, social support from non-immediate family members or a specific person influenced an individual's resiliency (Brown, 2008). Thus, receiving positive messages and support from individuals within the community (e.g., extend family, church) helped to foster coping and resiliency (Brown, 2008).

Eschleman, Bowling, and Alarcon (2010) found that hardiness was described as those characteristics that made one resistant to the effects of stress while adapting and

coping positively with environmental demands. Hardy people felt they were in control of what occurred in their lives, and saw misfortune as a challenge (Eschleman et al., 2010). Hardiness consisted of commitment, control, and challenge (Eschleman et al., 2010). Commitment was how entrenched the individual was in one's life (Eschleman et al., 2010). Commitment also represented social support, and it gave the individual a sense of purpose that was an important facet of hardiness (Eschleman et al., 2010).

Control, a component of hardiness, posited that an individual influenced what occurred in their life (Eschleman et al., 2010). Control prepared the individual on how they might deal with stress; therefore, the less control a person felt, the greater the stress (Eschleman et al., 2010).

Eschleman et al. (2010) defined stressors as circumstances that caused adaptation and could cause illness. Stressors included events such as divorce or day-to-day events (Eschleman et al., 2010). Strains were the effects of stress on the individual's well-being such as physical or psychological illness (Eschleman et al., 2010). Research has indicated that hardy (i.e., resilient) people could be inherently protected from environmental stress (Eschleman et al., 2010). For example, hardy individuals who work in high-stress environments with high demands felt stress differently than those who were less hardy (Eschleman et al., 2010).

Another aspect of hardiness was social support. Researchers have indicated that having strong social support decreased the effects of stress, therefore increasing hardiness (Eschleman et al., 2010). Because hardy individuals have strong social networks (e.g., family, work), they are more prone to receive support overall (Eschleman et al., 2010).

Also, researchers have reported that hardy individuals have active coping skills. Active coping skills are those skills that changed how stress was viewed by changing stressors into "benign experiences" (Eschleman et al., 2010, p. 282). Hardy individuals performed well under stress, therefore, limiting any adverse effects of stress (Eschleman et al., 2010).

Finally, Eschleman et al. (2010) found that hardiness, commitment, control, and challenge did act as buffers to stress. Also, researchers have reported that there was a correlation between hardiness and social support (Eschleman et al., 2010). As mentioned before, research has indicated that hardy people have more coping skills (Eschleman et al., 2010). Furthermore, hardy individuals have more control over their lives and environment, which could cause them to face stressors more readily (Eschleman et al., 2010). Thus, the aim of the present study was to determine if there were any racial differences in resilience (i.e., hardiness) and locus of control that contributed to or impacted recidivism. I also examined the complexity of recidivism by analyzing the various challenges ex-offenders faced while on parole.

Solutions

Restorative reentry programs and policies helped the community successfully reintegrate offenders into society (Hass & Saxon, 2011). Creating these types of programs and policies helped meet the needs of victims and offenders by creating a pathway to success (Hass & Saxon, 2011). Researchers have reported that these types of programs needed four main parts: (1) focus on community; 2) reparation; (3) decreased social stigma; and (4) citizenship with fewer restrictions (Hass & Saxon, 2011). Focusing

on community resources instead of strict supervision (e.g., parole, probation) could increase social capital by allowing offenders to reintegrate into society successfully (Hass & Saxon, 2011).

Community-focused type programs helped offenders feel connected and accepted which fostered success (Hass & Saxon, 2011). Community-focused programs helped change the identity of the offender, to one that was more positive and allowed them to embrace their new role in the community (Hass & Saxon, 2011).

Reparation was another important part of restorative reentry programs because it restored the community after a criminal act was committed (Hass & Saxon, 2011). For reparations to be successful, they must be voluntary (Hass & Saxon, 2011). Hass and Saxon (2011) found that punitive reparations caused fear in offenders because of the strict conditions of their release. Also, reparations were viewed more as a punishment or perceived as the offender owed a debt (Hass & Saxon, 2011). Reparations could cause resentment and reduced the success of offenders reintegrating into the community.

Last, restorative reentry programs allowed offenders to become citizens once again (Hass & Saxon, 2011). Allowing offenders their rights and privileges as citizens could help them reintegrate into society more successfully (Hass & Saxon, 2011). Continued labels such as convict or criminal, as well as restrictions, limited the success of reentry into society and contributed to recidivism (Hass & Saxon, 2011). However, Hass and Saxon (2011) found that restorative programs were designed to help offenders return to society, not necessarily be accepted by society.

Hass and Saxon (2011) found that restorative reentry programs lacked comprehensive plans supported by research. Also, current programs focused on a variety of topics ranging from the overall program to sentencing (Hass & Saxon, 2011). Some programs focused more on the relationship between the criminal justice system and community before the release and parole of offenders (Hass & Saxon, 2011). However, researchers have indicated that offenders wanted to be more self-reliant while atoning for their crimes within the community (Hass & Saxon, 2011). This focus on self-reliance was more of a strength-based approach where returning to society helped the offender rebuild skills that they were lacking or were of concern (Hass & Saxon, 2011). A strength-based approach could help society be more accepting of offenders by removing the negative stigma of "criminal," increasing offenders' positive perception of themselves, and fostering positive behavior changes (Hass & Saxon, 2011).

To further encourage the success of offenders, community reparative boards served to monitor offenders' progress within the reentry program (Hass & Saxon, 2011). The board was responsible for creating a plan for offenders once released, while also serving as a form of social control in place of criminal justice agencies (Hass & Saxon, 2011). Furthermore, these boards put offenders in contact with community leaders and helped foster positive relationships and accountability (Hass & Saxon, 2011).

The label of convict or offender acted as a barrier to successful reentry into society because of the stigma associated with it (Malott & Fromader, 2010). This stigma significantly decreased resources such as treatment or employment that offenders needed to decrease their chance of recidivating (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Researchers have

identified several areas in which programs needed to focus on that helped decrease offenders' chances to recidivate: counseling, education, and work (Malott & Fromader, 2010). For example, Family Life Education programs aided in changing the attitudes of offenders for them to have better familial and social relationships (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Research has indicated that developing healthy relationships with family lowered recidivism (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Also, researchers have reported that employment decreased criminality (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Malott and Fromader (2010) found that offenders recidivated less when they went through drug courts rather than criminal courts. Recidivism decreased because drug courts offered rehabilitative services that traditional court did not (Malott & Fromader, 2010).

Offenders who can work and earn wages were less likely to recidivated because they increased their economic opportunities (Malott & Fromader, 2010). However, imprisonment decreased the offenders' opportunity to be successful because of the negative stigma of being labeled "criminal" (Malott & Fromader, 2010). The label of "criminal" limited the types of jobs and the earning potential of the offender (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Also, without economic opportunities, this increased unemployment and the likelihood of recidivism (Malott & Fromader, 2010). For example, in comparing offenders to non-offenders for the same job, research has indicated that offenders earned roughly 7% less (Malott & Fromader, 2010).

In a study conducted by Malott and Fromader (2010), they found that most of the participants in their study felt they would receive emotional support from their families upon their release. Also, participants determined the need for support in combating stress

and how to appropriately communicate their needs (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Participants also perceived that their criminal record could pose a barrier to getting employment upon their release (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Researchers have reported that imprisonment resulted in offenders having limited job opportunities that could contribute to their likelihood of recidivating (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Malott and Fromader (2010) found that less than 50% of their participants believed they would find a job upon their release (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Also, participants felt that having a job decreased their chances of recidivism (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Malott and Fromader (2010) found that there were mixed findings regarding counseling, rehabilitation, and caseworkers effect on reducing recidivism (Malott & Fromader, 2010). However, the ineffectiveness of caseworkers reducing recidivism could be related to the adverse attitudes towards caseworkers overall (Malott & Fromader, 2010). Although Malott and Fromader (2010) had a small sample size, their findings are in line with previous research. Having resources (e.g., jobs, rehab) reduced the likelihood of recidivism (Malott & Fromader, 2010).

Racial impact statements are tools that tell lawmakers how present laws or policies impacted minorities in the criminal justice system (The Sentencing Project, n.d.). The statements provided statistical data about the possible racial disparity of a policy before its implementation (The Sentencing Project, n.d.). Statistical data did not guarantee that policies would not be carried out if they affected minorities. The policy's greater purpose was to reduce disparities (The Sentencing Project, n.d.).

Every state or agency does not use racial impact statements. Currently, around 21 states and the District of Columbia used sentencing commissions that examined racial implications (The Sentencing Project, n.d.). Also, budget and fiscal agencies (i.e., state legislative analysis) also used racial impact statements (The Sentencing Project, n.d.). The Department of Corrections, consisting of state and federal systems, used racial impact statements to forecast racial data of prison populations (The Sentencing Project, n.d.). Although few states used racial impact statements, it was increasing in use. For example, in 2008, Iowa passed a bill that required data analysis of sentencing and parole by race (The Sentencing Project, n.d.). Connecticut also required racial impact statements to be used for bills to determine how they affected offenders (The Sentencing Project, n.d.). In a study conducted in 2009, researchers have indicated that both Texas and Oregon imposed the use of racial impact statements with sentencing laws (The Sentencing Project, n.d.).

Although research has indicated that racial impact statements are useful, some argued that there should not be a racial component when implementing public policy (The Sentencing Project, n.d.). The goal of racial impact statements was to use the information to help create policies that are practical and equitable (The Sentencing Project, n.d.).

Offenders with felonies find themselves with limited rights. With the changes and growth of the United States' criminal justice system, creating stricter laws further disenfranchised offenders, limiting their voice socially and politically (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Currently, 48 states and the District of Columbia, do not allow those

imprisoned with felonies to vote (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Ex-offenders are authorized to vote only in the states of Maine and Vermont (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Paroled individuals cannot vote in 35 states whereas 31 states do not allow those on probation to vote (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Seven states forbid voting rights based on crime and others allowed voting after a waiting period that could take 2 years or longer (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Since there are no universal checks and balances for voting rights, each state was responsible for deciding which offender could vote (The Sentencing Project, 2013). However, many ex-offenders did not to take advantage of the restoration process because it was too challenging and complex (The Sentencing Project, 2013).

Nearly 5.85 million people within the United States have lost their right to vote (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Research has indicated that most of those without voting rights are African American, approximately 7.7% (The Sentencing Project, 2013). However, among non-Black offenders (i.e., Caucasian, Hispanic), only 1.8% have lost their rights to vote (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Also, researchers have reported that the states with the highest disenfranchisement rates are Florida (23%), Kentucky (22%), and Virginia (20%). Furthermore, researchers have indicated that around 40% of African American men would lose their voting rights (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Although roughly 2.6 million people have paid their debt to society (i.e., time served), nearly 45% of those that are disenfranchised have no voting rights (The Sentencing Project, 2013).

Some states have changed their policies. For example, in 2003 Alabama allowed some individuals with felonies to vote after they have completed their sentences (The

Sentencing Project, 2013). In 2013, Delaware removed the 5-year waiting period allowing some ex-offenders with felonies to vote after they were released (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Also in 2013, Virginia restored the voting rights of nonviolent offenders without the need to apply to vote (The Sentencing Project, 2013).

The Texas legislature created new policies (e.g., HB1711, HB2161) regarding the reentry of offenders (TDCJ, 2012b). For example, in 2008, 1 in 22 people in Texas was under supervision as a condition of the Texas criminal justice system (TDCJ, 2012b). Nearly 651,000 offenders made up the Texas criminal justice system, making Texas the state with the largest number of offenders in the United States (TDCJ, 2012b). The creation of HB1711 addressed the reentry process by creating a Reentry Task Force (RTF) to meet the growing needs of offenders (TDCJ, 2012b). The RTF was a multidisciplined approach that increased from eight agencies to twenty-two and included agencies ranging from the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles to the Urban County Commissioner (TDCJ, 2012b). The purpose of the RTF was to provide help (e.g., housing, drug treatment) to offenders after release, and to work with existing reentry programs to meet the needs of offenders in urban and rural communities (TDCJ, 2012b).

Providing satisfactory housing to offenders was a challenge because of limits placed by local housing authorities making it almost impossible for those with criminal records to live (TDCJ, 2012b). Housing limitations led to offenders being homeless and increased the likelihood of recidivism (TDCJ, 2012b). One recommendation that addressed the housing issue was to offer tax incentives to rental companies who rented to offenders (TDCJ, 2012b).

To address the employment challenges of offenders, Texas started Project Rio which helped provide job training (TDCJ, 2012b). However, in 2011, the 81st legislative session removed the program (TDCJ, 2012b). Also, the occupational code limited the types of jobs offenders could have (TDCJ, 2012b). Research has indicated that employment decreased recidivism by providing stability and increasing self-esteem (TDCJ, 2012b). One recommendation to increase job opportunities for offenders was to remove some of the limits placed by the occupational code (TDCJ, 2012b). Another recommendation was to provide incentives (i.e., tax) to companies that employed offenders (TDCJ, 2012b).

Research has indicated that there was a lack of psychological services (e.g., mental health, addictions) for offenders transitioning back into society (TDCJ, 2012b). Without proper treatment, these individuals are at risk to recidivate (TDCJ, 2012b). One recommendation to address those needs was to fund evidence-based treatment programs (TDCJ, 2012b). Also, the TDCJ (2012b) determined there remained a need for better communication regarding who needed treatment or additional services. Also, to combat the cost of treatment, creating ways to expand Medicaid could increase the number of offenders who received treatment with current state funding (TDCJ, 2012b).

Another area of support for offenders was teaching basic life skills such as decision-making skills, not only while imprisoned but upon their release (TDCJ, 2012b). Allowing community services to partner with agencies that supported offenders, gave offenders greater access to needed services (TDCJ, 2012b). Also, helping offenders gain pro-social support (e.g., family, community) upon their release could assist them to

transition back into the community more successfully (TDCJ, 2012b). People involved in pro-social support could act as mentors that encouraged offenders to become productive citizens within the community. This collaboration could foster positive attitudes and decrease criminal behavior (TDCJ, 2012b).

Other ways to assist reentry programs to become more efficient could be to improve how multiple agencies received information (TDCJ, 2012b). For example, information may be duplicated or not received between agencies, which reduced their effectiveness (TDCJ, 2012b). Also, it could be useful to cross-train employees in multiple areas to better serve offenders who are reentering society (TDCJ, 2012b).

Although other agencies were willing to aid, agencies were hesitant because of existing problems (TDCJ, 2012b). For example, the Social Security Administration (SSA) offered assistance in obtaining social security cards for offenders; however, because of the multitude of incorrect information, the SSA declined to provide further help (TDCJ, 2012b). Also, the Veterans Administration (VA) used to give help by identifying veterans within the criminal justice system (TDCJ, 2012b). However, because of policy changes, it was the offenders' responsibility to inform the criminal justice system of their veteran status (TDCJ, 2012b). Once identified, the VA assisted in locating resources for offenders upon their release (TDCJ, 2012b).

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice-Texas Correctional Office on Offenders with Medical or Mental Impairments (TDCJ-TCOOMMI) conducted a 3-year study that compared the recidivism rates of those in and out of the program. Research has indicated that the recidivism rates were lower for those in TCOOMMI (13.9%) than those

released with supervision (22.6%), discharged from prison (23.3%), and those discharged from state jail (31.1%) (TDCJ, 2012a). Also, research has indicated that the recidivism rates for those on probation (17.6%) and parole (4.2%) decreased (TDCJ, 2012a). Research have reported that after 1-year, rates for probation were 12.6% and 2.9% for those paroled (TDCJ, 2012a).

The TCOOMMI program focused on dedicating resources for offenders identified as high risk (TDCJ, 2012a). Through the identification of offenders who needed the Medically Recommended Intensive Supervision (MRIS), there was a 5.2% decline in offenders going to probation and parole boards, and a 7.7% decline in supervision than the previous year (TDCJ, 2012a).

Although there are more offenders identified by the mental health authority within the Texas CJS, 278 more cases in 2012, there are 113 fewer offenders that needed probation (TDCJ, 2012a). However, this increase in overall cases revealed that more work needed to occur regarding diversion programs (TDCJ, 2012a).

Pew (2011) found that policy and lawmakers wanted to impose changes in the criminal justice system that addressed recidivism and public safety. Research has indicated that several states have made changes in four areas: staff and program costs, operating efficiencies, sentencing and release policies, and recidivism reduction strategies (Pew, 2011).

Thirty-two states had placed hiring freezes or removed staff to cut costs, and 22 states had removed much-needed programs (Pew, 2011). Limited the space in prisons, closing prisons, and making prisons more energy efficient were ways some state officials

were reducing costs and spending that increased prison efficiency (Pew, 2011). Lawmakers were examining existing policies on the sentencing of offenders (Pew, 2011). State officials were also examining the criminal offenses and changing policies that could lower the number of offenders imprisoned by offering alternatives (Pew, 2011). Last, state officials were analyzing ways that improved policies, as well as working with other agencies to help stop the cyclical nature of recidivism (Pew, 2011).

Research has indicated that to reduce recidivism, creating and using programs that used evidence-based practices (EBP) helped lower recidivism by 50% (Pew, 2011). For example, Arizona had a 31% decrease in recidivism (i.e., new convictions) by using EBP and policy changes (Pew, 2011). Using data from 2004, Pew (2011) found that if states lowered recidivism by 10%, this could result in roughly $635 million savings in the first year. The objective was using EBP not only in prisons but in every area that affected the offender; from supervision to the community (Pew, 2011).

Another way to reduce recidivism was by focusing on offender needs, while also setting goals (i.e., performance) for prisons that rewarded improvement (Pew, 2011). Focusing on the needs and prison goals could help change offenders and prison culture (Pew, 2011). For example, Arizona, California, Illinois, and South Carolina have all created an incentive program to lower recidivism while offenders are on probation (Pew, 2011). Arizona offered up to a 40% refund "to counties that cut revocations to prisons" (Pew, 2011, p. 28).

Properly preparing and planning for offenders' release from prison also reduced recidivism (Pew, 2011). Planning should start as soon as the offender entered prison by

using assessment tools that identified the needs of the offender (Pew, 2011). Identifying needs allowed case managers to offer help and resources not only while imprisoned but, upon their release (Pew, 2011). Case managers helped offenders successfully reenter society and reduced recidivism by giving offenders proper supervision and placement in programs that addressed their needs (Pew, 2011).

Research has indicated that another way that reduced recidivism was to impose progressive sanctions (Pew, 2011). Progressive sanctions created accountability but also allowed the offender to succeed instead of immediately sending them back to prison for technical violations (Pew, 2011). However, if offenders were violated, the punishment should be appropriate to the crime (Pew, 2011).

Last, creating an incentive or rewards system for offenders could reduce recidivism by creating motivation for them to keep trying to succeed and follow the rules (Pew, 2011). Incentives encouraged positive behavior, especially among low-risk offenders (Pew, 2011). Also, using incentives such as earned-time credits could decrease offenders' probation time (Pew, 2011). Using these types of incentives could help reduce the number of cases that probation and parole officers had, allowing them to concentrate on newly released or higher risk offenders (Pew, 2011).

Drake et al. (2009) found that many evidence-based practices aimed at reducing crime so that lawmakers could make cost-effective decisions on which programs to establish. Both adult and juvenile programs were examined for their effectiveness in reducing recidivism, prevention, as well as taxpayer costs (Drake et al., 2009). Drake et

al. (2009) found that programs that lowered recidivism rates also resulted in less victim and taxpayer funds going towards the criminal justice system.

Drake et al. (2009) examined program costs per person, as well as the long-term savings because of crime reduction. For adults, one of the most effective programs that reduced crime was the Intensive Supervision: Treatment-oriented programs (Drake et al., 2009). After examining 11 similar studies, this programs reduced recidivism by 17.9%, reduced crime costs to victims by roughly $16,239, and saved taxpayers more than $10,235 (Drake et al., 2009). Also, the program costs around $7,356 per person but, would save $19,118 (per person) in long-term crime reduction (Drake et al., 2009).

Another cost-effective program was cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) in prison or communities. Drake et al. (2009) examined 25 programs and found that CBT reduced recidivism by 6.4%, reduced crime costs to victims by $10,234, and saved taxpayers $5,235 (p. 184). CBT cost $107 per person and saved $15,361 (per person) in long-term costs (Drake et al., 2009). However, not all programs reduced crime or recidivism. Drake et al. (2009) examined 11 jail diversion programs for mentally ill offenders and found that those programs increased crime by 5.3%. Also, those programs cost victims nearly $4,831 and taxpayers $3,045 with no long-term cost savings or crime reduction benefits (Drake et al., 2009). Some programs do not reduce recidivism nor lowered costs to victims and taxpayers; however, long-term savings on imprisonment or court costs, existed (Drake et al., 2009). For example, using electronic monitoring to offset jail time had long–term savings (Drake et al., 2009). Drake et al. (2009) found that jail costs, in

Washington state, was around $2,227 and to monitor offenders the cost was $1301 (per person), thus, leaving a deficit of $-926 but, long-term it also saved $926.

Around 18 states had started the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) to find ways that decreased the growing prison population and costs (Austin et al., n.d.). The JRI not only addressed imprisonment and public safety but determined ways to put money back into disadvantaged minority communities that were most affected (Austin et al., n.d.). Unfortunately, the JRI had no effect on lowering the prison population nor did it reinvest money back into minority communities (Austin et al., n.d.).

Austin et al. (n.d.) found that one problem with the JRI was it had become a term with unclear meaning. Also, the JRI focused on legislation that did nothing to decrease admissions or sentencing within the criminal justice system (Austin et al., n.d.). Furthermore, reinvestment money was seized by other agencies (i.e., law enforcement) and not the communities that needed it (Austin et al., n.d.).

For JRIs to take effect in the criminal justice system, state and local governments needed to create more efficient policies (Austin et al., n.d.). The policies should reduce unnecessary arrests (i.e., drug crimes), remove unnecessary pretrial detention, and reclassify some drug and other crimes (Austin et al., n.d.) Additional suggestions for policymakers are to remove mandatory minimum sentences which impact minorities, eliminate revocations to prison for probation and parole violations, and require racial impact statements (Austin et al., n.d., p. 17). These policies would significantly impact the entry and reentry issues within the criminal justice system. Also, reducing the length of stay, even by months, decreased the prison population (Austin et al., n.d.). For

example, the average duration of stay in prison was 29 months (Austin et al., n.d.). In reducing the length of stay by roughly 8 months, the overall population would decrease by more than 400,000 (Austin et al., n.d.). Research has indicated that length of stay cost each state around $10 billion each year (Austin et al., n.d.).

Although some states' legislators have attempted to change laws to address mass incarceration, they lacked aggression to truly impact (i.e., lower) the prison population (Austin et al., n.d.). State legislators that have attempted to address sentencing reform have concentrated on policies such as mandatory sentencing, especially concerning drug offenses (Mauer, 2011). For example, New York's 1973 Rockefeller Drug Laws that worked in conjunction with the "War on Drugs" was one major change at sentencing reform (Mauer, 2011). Also, the focus has been on more offenders receiving parole and changing strict policies that caused offenders to have their probation revoked (Mauer, 2011). Changes have occurred for nonviolent offenders in states such as Colorado and Kentucky, who increased parole eligibility by 2 months (Mauer, 2011).

Parolees faced a particular challenge because of strict rules and policies. Many returned to jail or prison because of technical violations based solely on the parole officers' decision (Mauer, 2011). Also, many agencies use graduated sanctions that give clear consequences for behavior and do not depend on the parole officer's discretion to address the problem of technical violations (Mauer, 2011).

At the federal level, fewer changes occurred because nearly 13% of offenders make up the federal prison population (Mauer, 2011). However, changes on a federal level could impact state policies garnered national attention and offered (financial)

incentives (Mauer, 2011). Mauer (2011) found that in 1994, of the $30 billion meant to address federal crime, $8 billion was for building more state prisons. States could not receive this money without enforcing the "truth in sentencing" policies (Mauer, 2011).

There are many barriers to reforming the United States' criminal justice system. It was difficult getting lawmakers and politicians to fight for changes because they feared being labeled as "soft on crime" (Mauer, 2011). Also, some felt that focusing on changing the system, meant one was fighting for the offenders (Mauer, 2011). Fighting for offenders was perceived negatively, especially when considering the victims (Mauer, 2011). Also, most politicians who have fought for changes have been House Democrats that were African American (Mauer, 2011). Mauer (2011) found that the last outspoken Caucasian representative to speak about these issues was Senator Paul Simon (IL) in the 1990s.

Mauer (2011) found that the main barrier to reforming the United States' criminal justice system was changing the attitudes of policy makers so they could be more receptive to change. In other words, alter the focus of the debate from offenders and jail, to how to make better and safer communities (Mauer, 2011). Also, focusing on race caused division and lacked support to make effective changes (Mauer, 2011). Researchers have indicated that this was true, especially for Caucasians (Mauer, 2011). Removing the racial focus was challenging; however, getting conversations started needed to occur not only by African Americans but everyone (Mauer, 2011). Thus, the aim of the present study was to determine if there were any racial differences in resilience (i.e., hardiness) and locus of control that contributed to or impacted recidivism. This

study examined the complexity of recidivism by analyzing the various challenges ex-offenders faced during parole.

Methodology

The methods used for this mixed methods study was a sequential explanatory design where quantitative data collection occurred first (see Creswell, 2009). Quantitative data collection occurred by giving the Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CD-RISC) and the multidimensional locus of control scales (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Levenson, 1974). Data gained from these questionnaires was analyzed.

Qualitative data collection consisted of interviews of randomly selected participants focusing on their lives and experiences in the criminal justice system. Once data were collected, interpretation of both the quantitative and qualitative studies was analyzed. A further detailed explanation occurs in Chapter 3.

Summary

There are many challenges offenders faced that contributed to recidivism. Because of stricter policies, legislation, and rigid rules during supervision, recidivism continues to be a concern. Solutions remain unclear and may take a multidisciplinary approach to alleviate the problem.

This study filled the gap in research by determining if there were racial differences among paroled offenders concerning resilience and locus of control, and how their experiences and opportunities differ racially. Racial differences could help identify specific barriers and needs not only in the criminal justice system, but the community as

well. Addressing these barriers and needs could help offenders become more successful and resilient, so the revolving door stays closed.

Chapter 3 discusses the methodology (i.e., mixed methods) of the study, the measures used (e.g., CD-RISC, multidimensional locus of control scales), as well as the participant criterion and selection. Finally, Chapter 3 discusses my role, potential issues within the study and how they are addressed, as well as the protection of participants and data collection.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

It is unclear if there are any associations between race, resilience, locus of control, and recidivism among former drug offenders. The purpose of this mixed methods study was to determine if there are racial differences among former offenders regarding resilience and locus of control that may contribute to or affect recidivism. The study consisted of two parts. For the quantitative portion, I used the Connor-Davidson Resiliency scale (CD-RISC) and the multidimensional locus of control scales, using the total scores of the CD-RISC and the scores from the subscales internality, powerful others, and chance for the multidimensional locus of control scales (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Levenson, 1974). The qualitative part consisted of participant interviews to gain an understanding of resilience and the challenges that may contribute to recidivism. Together, both portions of the study provided information on how individuals perceive resilience, locus of control, and the challenges faced by ex-offenders.

In this chapter I explain the methodology I used for participant selection, the study design, and my role as researcher. I also discuss quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis techniques, and the research questions I designed to give focus to the study.

Setting

The present study took place at a parole office where I recruited and interviewed participants. This setting was relevant to the study because it targeted ex-offenders who were currently on probation or parole and had prior experience being under supervision.

It was emphasized to participants that neither this study nor I had any association with the criminal justice system, the probation/parole office, or its employees. Additionally, obtaining participants who met the criterion for the study (i.e., drug offenders) was more readily available in this particular setting. Furthermore, the probation/parole office offered a wide variety of racial participants because of the number of ex-offenders who were currently under supervision and thus, obtaining help from probation/parole officers or administration for guidance made seeking appropriate participants easier.

Research Design

There have been numerous studies done regarding recidivism and resilience. However, no researchers have attempted to use a mixed-methods study to determine if there are racial differences in resilience and recidivism. In this study, I used a sequential explanatory design consisting first of quantitative data collection and second, of qualitative data collection (see Creswell, 2009). The quantitative study consisted of MANOVA statistical interpretations to determine if there were racial differences among offenders using the total scores of the CD-RISC and the scores from the subscales internality, powerful others, and chance for the multidimensional locus of control scales (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Levenson, 1974). A randomly selected convenience sample of 126 male parolees ($N = 126$) participated in this portion of the study.

The qualitative aspect of the study consisted of interviewing parolees. Their answers helped me understand the challenges that contribute to recidivism. I used a randomly selected sample of 12 parolees ($n = 12$) who volunteered for the quantitative portion of the study.

Role of Researcher

My role was to obtain informed consent from the participants' parole/probation office, as well as the parolees. In addition, I administered the questionnaires, performed interviews, and collected, analyzed, interpreted, and reported all data results. I had no prior association with any participants, and did not currently work in the field of psychology with ex-offenders.

Additionally, researcher bias was limited because the subjects volunteered randomly without my prior knowledge. I informed study participants that they could withdraw at any time during the study in order to address potential power relationships or ethical concerns. Furthermore, I informed the participants that I had no affiliation with the probation/parole office, its employees, or the criminal justice system.

Methodology

Participant Selection

The participants in the study were previously recidivated male parolees separated into three racial groups: African American, Caucasian, and Hispanic. These racial groups were the focus of the study to determine if there are any racial differences regarding resilience and locus of control. These variables are important because McGovern et al. (2009) found racial differences in recidivism. Therefore, I aimed to discover if these same racial groups have differences in resilience and locus of control as well. Since this study was focused on adults, the age requirement for participants was 18 or older. In addition, each participant must have had prior drug offenses and have been on probation or parole. This requirement was also a focus because it allowed participants to give

information regarding their experiences (e.g., recidivism) while previously on probation/parole.

The total sample size (N = 126) was obtained using G*Power analysis with the following criteria: a MANOVA with 3 racial groups and 4 scales, medium effect size (n = .063), alpha of .05, and power of .80 for three racial groups. For the qualitative study, I interviewed 12 participants (n = 12). Saturation was obtained from the sample size of the qualitative portion of the study where redundancy or common themes had been identified. Finally, prior to the administration of the questionnaire and interview, I obtained verbal (i.e., implied) informed consent.

Recruitment

Recruitment of participants occurred through flyers placed within the parole office indicating the dates of the study. Again, criteria must be met for study participation. I was on-site to administer surveys and conduct interviews to interested participants in individual sessions. Those participating in the survey and are interested in being interviewed was rescheduled at a later date. In addition, created and assigned an alphanumeric code prior to handing out questionnaires. These same numbers were used to match participants for the qualitative portion of the study. Compensation for participants, in the form of a $5 gift card, was discussed with parole supervisor before the study was conducted.

Protection of Participants

Participant identification occurred by using an alphanumeric code that was created to ensure confidentiality. All data obtained was secured and accessed only by me.

I obtained written informed consent prior to the study. I reminded participants that they are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. All data obtained from the study participants such as tapes, transcripts, surveys, or questionnaires, was secured and accessible only to me. Five years after the study, I will destroy all data. The study was approved by Walden University's Institutional Review Board 05-16-16-0137974 and parole officials prior to its conduction.

Research Questions

This project increased understanding of the barriers that may contribute to the United States' recidivism problem. The study provided information on how to better address the challenges parolees face when returning to their communities. Also, the study provided a greater understanding of why parolees are re-incarcerated so soon after their release. By using a multidisciplinary approach to combating barriers and understanding predictors of resilience, this study could have a positive impact on parolees, the community, and the criminal justice system. Hopefully, a multidisciplinary approach will ultimately create social change in the form of state and government policy reform.

Quantitative RQ: What racial differences are evident in resilience and locus of control scores among parolees?

H_0: There are no racial differences in resilience and locus of control scores among parolees.

H_1: There are racial differences in resilience and locus of control scores among parolees.

Qualitative RQ: How do parolees explain their recidivism?

The participants in this study did not need any special training or classes. The study took approximately seven weeks to conduct due to the number of participants and the activities within the parole facility. Each group was separated racially (e.g., African American, Caucasian, and Hispanic) for both aspects of the study.

Qualitative Components

Upon completion of the CD-RISC and the multidimensional locus of control scales, four participants from each racial group was interviewed and recorded via audio (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Levenson, 1974). Verbal (implied) informed consent was obtained prior to the interview. Participants was selected from the quantitative portion of the study by asking if they would be interested in being interviewed. Each participant received instructions that they were to answer each open-ended question honestly. The interview allows greater understanding of their experiences while on probation or parole, challenges they face, and possible contributors to recidivism. Each participant was identified by an alphanumeric ID code. The ID code was the same used in the quantitative part of the study. Finally, content validity was established by transcribing the interview responses verbatim to identify significant themes or differences among participant responses.

Quantitative Components

The participants of the quantitative portion of the study answered the CD-RISC and the multidimensional locus of control scales; the total scores of the CD-RISC and the scores from the subscales internality, powerful others, and chance for the multidimensional locus of control scales was used (see Connor & Davidson, 2003;

Levenson, 1974). Participants consisted of 42 individuals, in three different racial group, totaling 126 participants overall. The reason for the study and informed consent was explained prior to the administration of the questionnaires. Again, an alphanumeric code that I had created, was assigned to ensure confidentiality.

Demographic data. Information obtained for each participant consisted of general demographic information such as race, gender, age, marital status, and socioeconomic class. This information was accessible only to me. I will destroy all data 5 years after the study's completion.

Quantitative Instruments. The Connor-Davidson Resilience scale is a 25-item self-report questionnaire used to determine resiliency (Connor & Davidson, 2003). The CD-RISC is also used to show the results of psychological treatment with or without medication, stress management, and certain changes in the brain (CD-RISC, n.d.). The answers are on a Likert scale ranging from *not true at all* (scored as 0) to *true nearly all the time* (scored as 4). Scores range from 0 to 100, and higher scores suggest greater resilience (Connor & Davidson, 2003). For example, the CD-RISC may ask questions such as when you are stressed, do you have access to help, or do challenges or adversity make you work harder? The questionnaire takes approximately 5-10 minutes to complete. I obtained permission to use the CD-RISC from the developers.

Connor and Davidson's (2003) original study of the U.S. general population (n = 577) had an internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of 0.89 (p. 79). Validity of the same study sample (e.g., US general population) was 80.7 (CD-RISC, n.d.). The CD-RISC is used in a variety of settings and conditions. Validity was consistent in settings and

conditions such as primary care (71.8), psychiatric outpatient (68.0), generalized anxiety (62.4), and PTSD (47.8 and 52.8).

The multidimensional locus of control scales is a 24 item self-report questionnaire used to measure locus of control using three scales—internality, powerful others, and chance (Levenson, 1974). Each scale consists of eight questions, using a Likert score ranging from *strongly disagree* (scored as -3) to *strongly agree* (scored as +3). Total scores for each scale ranging from 0 to 48 (Levenson, 1974). Higher scores indicate what area of locus of control the individual has either external (e.g., chance, powerful others) or internal (Levenson, 1974). For example, the multidimensional locus of control scales may ask questions such as, are you able to solve problems effectively, or do you believe life is made up of circumstances? The questionnaire takes approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete. I obtained permission to use the multidimensional locus of control scales from the developer.

The multidimensional locus of control scales measure was found to have a moderately high internal consistency and correlated well with Rotter's original locus of control I-E scale (Levenson, 1974). Kuder-Richardson reliabilities for the internal (I) scale was $r = .64$, $r = .77$ for powerful others (P scale), and the chance (C) scale was $r = .78$ (Levenson, 1974). Split-half reliabilities for the IPC scales were as follows: $r = .62$, .66, and .64 consecutively (Levenson, 1974). Test-retest reliabilities for the IPC scales after one-week were $rs = .64$, .74, and .78 (Levenson, 1974).

Data Analysis

Data collection and analysis of this study was a mixed-methods approach. Quantitative analysis helped identify differences and predictors of resilience among offenders by race. Qualitative analysis aligned with the resilience theory and the social disorganization theory. These theories helped in understanding the depth of the barriers these individuals face and how they have impacted their lives (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013 and Kingston et al., 2009). As previously indicated, the study aimed to answer the following research questions:

Quantitative RQ: What racial differences are evident in resilience and locus of control scores among parolees?

H0: There are no racial differences in resilience and locus of control scores among parolees.

H1: There are racial differences in resilience and locus of control scores among parolees.

Analyses: A 3 (African American x Hispanic x Caucasian) x 4 (CD-RISC, internality, powerful others, and chance) MANOVA using the CD-RISC scale scores and the locus of control subscale scores as the dependent variables.

The study began with the quantitative portion and consisted of administering the CD-RISC and the multidimensional locus of control scales questionnaires. A MANOVA determined any significant differences in resilience and locus of control among the three racial groups for the study. SPSS for Windows (current version) was the software product used for statistical analysis.

The last phase of the study consisted of the qualitative interview of participants individually, focusing on possible barriers to resiliency and recidivism. The interview was recorded and transcribed verbatim. Transcripts were reviewed and coded (e.g., alpha-numeric) in order to identify significant themes or differences between the racial groups.

Threats to Validity

Threats to validity were minimal for this study. Possible threats to external validity was testing reactivity, where participants did not act or respond as they normally would due to study participation. To address this, I instructed participants to answer all questions honestly and that there are no correct or incorrect answers. In addition, the overall generalizability of the qualitative portion of the study could not be ensured due to the small sample size (n = 12). However, data collection, analysis, and results allowed for a possible correlation or noticeable differences found among racial groups regarding resiliency and recidivism.

Threats to internal validity resulted from participant history and testing that could influence the outcome of the study. Events that I was not aware of could influence how the participant responds to the research questions. I advised participants that no response is “too bad” or “too good” to guarantee selection for the secondary study. In addition, possible experimental mortality could be a problem where there was a loss of participants at any point in the study. To address this, I ensured that each participant was aware that they could withdraw from the study at any time.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Credibility occurred twofold. The quantitative study had a moderate sample size ($N = 126$) with three racial groups to compare results. The qualitative study had an adequate ($n = 12$) sample size where participants were interviewed to allow for different racial perspectives to be given (e.g., triangulation). There was limited member checking due to the time constraints of the study. However, the interviews were taped to ensure the accuracy of participant answers.

Transferability was accomplished by allowing participants to give a thick description. A thick description allowed for greater detail about participant experiences within the criminal justice system and the context of how or why they became involved in the criminal justice system. Also, participant living situations (e.g., SES), and educational backgrounds were included. These descriptions were for each racial group in the study.

Having audit trails that explained in detail how data were collected and kept to ensure dependability. Providing a copy of the interview questions within the appendix of the proposal showed the accuracy of data analysis. Results included racial group analysis. In addition, triangulation was accomplished via the interview process by asking open-ended questions. Open-ended questions allowed each participant, by racial group, to give their personal accounts of their experiences within the criminal justice system.

In order to address conformability, review of data and overall findings ensured clarity and understanding. For the quantitative portion of the study, the results using the total scores from the CD-RISC and the multidimensional locus of control scales provided

data for each racial group and individual (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Levenson, 1974). For the qualitative study, the interview questions along with the verbatim answers provided data given by each participant and by racial group. Similarities among and within racial groups was reviewed and audited. Keeping an open mind and allowing participants to express their experiences within the criminal justice system addressed reflexivity. Reflexivity occurred without research bias.

Ethical Procedures

Ethical procedures start with procuring an agreement from administrators within the parole board/office allowing the research study to occur. A copy was provided to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) application. In addition, the treatment of human participants was in conjunction with the American Psychological Association's Code of Conduct Standard 8 for research and publication (APA, 2010). I provided all documentation and participant informed consent to the IRB, along with the appropriate approval numbers.

With regards to recruitment, ethical concerns were making sure that participation was voluntary and that they met the requirements for participation. Recruitment included working with parole officers to provide notification via flyers prior to the study, and creating an alphanumeric system accessible only by me. Taking these measures ensured the confidentiality of the participants.

Ethical concerns surrounding data collection was ensuring that participants would answer both instruments (e.g., CD-RISC, multidimensional locus of control scales) and the interview questions truthfully. To reduce the risk of early withdrawal from the study,

participants received information about the instruments and a copy of the interview questions. In addition, an approximate length of time was provided for how long each study would take. Incentives was discussed with parole officers regarding appropriateness to ensure participation. I reminded participants that they could withdraw from the study at any time without reprimand.

Only I had access to the information that the participants provided. Information included questionnaire answers, audio recorded interviews, and the alphanumeric coding of participants used in the final reporting of data collection. All information remained confidential and was stored in a locked cabinet accessible by me only. All data removal will occur after 5 years.

Other ethical concerns were the power differential in working with offenders or parolees. To address ethical concerns, I helped create an environment where participants can speak freely and ask questions as needed. I ensured that participants knew that any information obtained would only be accessible by me. Lastly, incentives were used where appropriate and with prior approval from administration.

Summary

This study consisted of both a quantitative and qualitative data analysis and collection. The focus of the study was to determine if there were any racial differences among parolees with regards to resilience and locus of control. Data interpretation occurred to determine if racial differences exist. A more detailed discussion of the results occurs in Chapters 4 and 5.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to determine if there are racial differences among former offenders regarding resilience and locus of control that may contribute to or affect recidivism. The study consisted of two parts. In the quantitative portion I used the Connor-Davidson Resiliency scale (CD-RISC) and the multidimensional locus of control scales using the total scores of the CD-RISC and the scores from the subscales internality, powerful others, and chance for the multidimensional locus of control scales (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Levenson, 1974). The qualitative part consisted of participant interviews to gain an understanding of resilience and the challenges that may contribute to recidivism. Together, both portions of the study provide information on how individuals perceive resilience, locus of control, and the challenges faced by ex-offenders.

Setting

I conducted this study at a parole office where I recruited and interviewed participants using flyers posted within the facility. This setting was appropriate for the study because it is frequented by ex-offenders who are currently on parole and have prior experience being under supervision.

Demographics

Information obtained for each participant consisted of general demographic data such as race, gender, age, marital status, and socioeconomic class. The participants of the

study were previously recidivated male parolees separated into three racial groups: African American, Caucasian, and Hispanic age 18 and older.

Data Collection

The quantitative portion of the study contained a sample of 126 ($N = 126$) participants, divided equally by racial groups (Hispanic, Caucasian, and African American), and I used 4 scales from the CD-RISC and multidimensional locus of control scales. The qualitative portion of the study contained a sample of 12 participants ($n = 12$) divided equally by racial group. Alpha-numeric coding was assigned to each participant and cross-referenced for participants again for the qualitative portion of the study.

Participants completed the CD-RISC and multidimensional locus of control scales, and I coded with each alphanumerically. I asked participants how they identified racially, and then coded them appropriately. No other information was collected. Upon completion, I asked participants if they were interested in participating in an interview, and, if they were interested, I set a later time to conduct the interview. Participants who agreed to be interviewed were asked to keep their alphanumeric code, which I also kept. I verified the alphanumeric before the interview was conducted.

Variations from the original data collection plan consisted of not collecting age or conviction information; however, the written consent did specify the requirement of a drug conviction, and I thus assumed that participants carried a drug conviction. I conducted data collection at the parole office with some participants who were first-time parolees. This did not mean that they had not previously recidivated or were on probation or parole in another county at another time. The recidivism requirement was also stated in

the informed consent, and I assumed that their answers were truthful. I recruited participants by posting announcements throughout the entire parole office facility in which scheduled parole meetings and re-entry drug offender classes were held. Both of the parole and re-entry offices worked together and were a requirement for parole conditions. Finally, NVivo was not used to analyze the qualitative results of this study. I reviewed, documented, and scored each audio recording.

Data Analysis

Quantitative Results

I conducted a 3 (African American x Hispanic x Caucasian) x 4 (CD-RISC, internality, powerful others, and chance) MANOVA using the CD-RISC scale scores and the locus of control subscale scores as the dependent variables. Participants were at least 18-years-old, identified racially as African American, Caucasian, or Hispanic, and had been previously on parole. I carried out preliminary assumption testing was to check for the following with no major violations found: normality, multicollinearity, linearity, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and univariate and multivariate outliers (see Pallant, 2013). There was no statistically significant difference between race and the combined dependent variables, F (8, 240) = .803, p = .60; Wilks' Lambda = .95; partial eta squared = .03. Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained; there were no racial differences in resilience and locus of control scores among the parolees.

Qualitative Results

I conducted interviews with each of the 12 participants (4 from each racial group) to glean information regarding how parolees explain their recidivism. The interview

questions asked about socioeconomic status with regards to the neighborhood before and after incarceration, education, employment, housing, family support, and training. Additional questions asked about the parolees' experiences in trying to get a job, housing, and challenges experienced while on parole (see Table 1).

Table 1

Demographic Data of Participants

PARTICIPANT	RACE	SES	EDUCATION	EMPLOYMENT
B4XONEH	African American	Poor	HS Diploma	Unemployed
C2VWBC4	Caucasian	Poor	GED	Employed
B8CP6OP	African American	Middle	GED	Unemployed
AX379DT	Hispanic	Middle	GED	Employed
C4QKMUR	Caucasian	Middle	GED	Unemployed
ALPHWKS	Hispanic	Middle	GED	Employed
CHTNCQS	Caucasian	Middle	GED	Unemployed
CIRHM7U	Caucasian	Upper-Middle	HS Diploma	Employed
APHFTCI	Hispanic	Middle	Diploma	Employed
A3N8BDA	Hispanic	Poor	GED	Employed
BQ9BIEZ	African American	Poor	GED	Employed
B1D3EIX	African American	Middle	HS Diploma	Unemployed

With regards to socioeconomic class, 60% (n = 6) of respondents came from middle-class environments, 30% (n = 4) came from poor settings, while only 10% (n = 2) came from upper-middle-class environments. In talking about the links between

gentrification and racism, one Hispanic participant who was transferred to Texas due to the interstate compact said:

> So, a lot of us have moved out and there was a lot of discrimination and I mean, it seemed like we just ended up having a big target on our back for any particular reason. Cause they knew the development was coming, they found very which way that they could get us out of there.

Fifty percent of respondents (n = 6) said there were job opportunities in their neighborhood, while almost 45% (n = 5) of respondents said there were no job opportunities in their neighborhood. Around 5% (n = 1) of respondents identified as disabled and was therefore unable to work. Responding to a question about the difficulty of securing work while on parole, one Hispanic participant said, "Um, not really. It was just ah, ah basically go…uh, just the workforce more or less and uh, if you want to go to TCC, you can apply for TCC. That's it."

Of those respondents who said there were job opportunities, approximately 95% (n = 5) stated that they were qualified for the jobs available, while roughly 5% (n = 1) indicated that they were unqualified for the jobs. A Caucasian participant said, "Uh, I mean, I'm sure I qualify for a lot, but I'm not sure. I didn't really look for a job." Most of the jobs available were for skilled workers (e.g., construction, carpentry) and fast-food restaurants. Responding to a question about the types of employment available while on parole, a Caucasian participant said, "Um, I'm a carpenter. I found work as a, working at a sheet metal company."

Around 55% (n = 7) of respondents were currently employed, while approximately 45% (n = 5) were currently unemployed. Of those who were unemployed, almost 40% (n = 2) were disabled. Sixty percent (n = 3) of unemployed respondents indicated that their job search has been good with no challenges to date. Around 75% (n = 2) of those seeking employment have help or employment potential from a prior employer or a friend who can offer employment. A Caucasian participant who indicated that he had a good experience searching for employment said:

> Yes. Very well. I've got a guaranteed job working at Wendy's. A friend of mine on Facebook told me, he's the assistance manager at Wendy's. I got a job, but I'm going to look for something in carpeting because that's what I do. But, if it don't work out, I will go flip a burger.

Regarding education, approximately 70% (n = 8) had a GED, and around 30% (n = 4) graduated from high school. Of those with a GED, approximately 25% (n = 2) received a skilled trades certification (e.g. air conditioner, mechanical) while they were incarcerated. Responding to a question about certifications offered during incarceration, one African American participant said, “I have a GED and I have a Microsoft certification specialist skills trades, and mechanical trades.”

During their incarceration, approximately 50% (n = 6) of respondents received some training, while 50% (n = 6) did not. Of those who did not receive training during their incarceration, around 50% (n = 3) indicated that training was not offered, while the other 50% (n = 3) cited reasons for not receiving training as being a veteran, not being in

the facility long, or they were not interested. A Caucasian participant said, “I spent 4 1/2 years in school,” indicating how he spent his time while incarcerated.

Of those respondents who did receive training during incarceration, approximately 50% (n = 3) received training such as cooking or custodial work. Around 40% (n = 2) trained in some type of skilled working (e.g., brick masonry, AC technician), while approximately 10% (n = 1) received training in technology (i.e., computer software). However, roughly 95% (n = 5) were unable to utilize the skills they were trained for, while only 5% (n = 1) of respondents said they were working in a job that utilized their training. Of those not utilizing their training, approximately 45% (n = 2) of respondents stated that jobs were unavailable, 45% (n = 2) cited they were unable to utilize their training due to being recently released, and roughly 10% (n = 1) had an unknown reason for not using their training. Responding to a question about utilizing training received during incarceration, one African American participant said:

> I got a uh custodial technicians training. No I wasn't. I couldn’t find employment when I got out and then I went in another direction and I tried to find…well, I. This last time I got out, I just worked in another field. I got the trade while I was in prison, but I worked in another field when I got out.

Eighty percent (n = 10) of respondents indicated that they received some sort of assistance prior to their release from prison, while roughly 20% (n = 2) said they did not. Assistance was identified as receiving documents such as photo identification, social security cards, birth certificates, and community resource information to find clothing

and local food pantries. Responding to a question about assistance received prior to being released from prison, one African American participant said:

> Yes ma'am. Um, re-entry lady that was on the unit, she gave me uh, things for food pantry, peer support groups, NA/AA, clothing, uh she gave me a packet for that. And uh, they was providing me with uh my birth certificate and my Texas ID.

Approximately 80% (*n* = 10) of respondents were released to new neighborhoods, while approximately 20% (*n* = 2) of respondents were discharged to the same neighborhoods before their incarceration. Approximately 45% (*n* = 5) identified their new neighborhood as being poor, 45% (*n* = 5) identified their new neighborhood as being middle class, 5% (*n* = 1) identified their neighborhood as being upper middle class, while 5% (*n* = 1) was unknown, stating that the neighborhood was "more populated." An African American participant who was paroled to a new neighborhood said, "No, a different one, a different neighborhood. Well, it's alright, it's pretty good. It's like poor, but it's not drug infested."

With regards to job opportunities in the release neighborhood, approximately 95% (*n* = 8) of respondents said there were job opportunities, while roughly 5% (*n* = 1) were unsure of job opportunities as of yet. Approximately 90% (*n* = 7) of respondents felt they were trained for the jobs in their new neighborhood, while approximately 10% (*n* = 2) did not identify as being trained due to being a retired veteran or disabled. Responding to a question about the availability of jobs in their release neighborhood, one Caucasian participant said:

> They say there is. I haven't had time. I'm on a monitor so, I haven't been able to get out and move around yet, but I mean, I see there's work going on, so I'm sure there is. People coming and going on, there's jobs available.

Approximately 90% (*n* = 10) of respondents said they had family support during and after their incarceration. Responding to a question about family support, one Caucasian participant said, "Absolutely. They've been supportive of anything I needed and since being released, they've been my support team working with parole to meet all my obligations."

Approximately 10% (*n* = 2) of respondents did not have any support both during or after their incarceration. Approximately 55% (*n* = 6) of respondents received both financial and emotional support from their families and loved ones. Approximately 15% (*n* = 2) received only financial assistance such as commissary assistance, or money to assist after being paroled, 15% (*n* = 2) received only emotional support such as words of encouragement, and 15% (*n* = 2) did not get any family support. One Caucasian respondent who did not receive family support said, "They've got their own lives, they're living their own lives. Plus they, when I was incarcerated, they weren't even aware, they didn't even know."

One hundred percent (*n* = 12) of respondents had housing. Approximately 75% (*n* = 7) of respondents were living with family members, 10% (*n* = 2) rented their homes, 5% (*n* = 1) lived in a halfway house, 5% (*n* = 1) lived in a senior living facility, and 5% (*n* = 1) of respondents lived in a residence. One African American participant said he lived in a "House. Just a plain house," but did not clarify if it was with family, alone,

rented, or a halfway home. Approximately 20% (n = 2) of respondents found it challenging to find housing after their incarceration, while 80% (n = 10) had not tried to obtain housing because they were living with family, in a halfway house, or thought it was too soon for them to try to look for adequate shelter. An African American participant recounted his housing experience saying:

> Well, you know uh, being having uh, being a ex-felon a lot of places don't want to uh you know you can't find housing, but I was able to get uh, on housing and so that's what I'm doing now. Housing assistance program.

Seventy-five percent (n = 9) of respondents said their parole experience had been good or wonderful. Approximately 25% (n = 3) of respondents identified their parole experience as being challenging with reasons cited as being strict parole officers or limited ability to work due to an ankle monitor. One African American participant summed up his experience by saying:

> I don't like it. Cause they want me to do so many classes and uh, I feel like I don't need all them classes. At the same time, uh, even after I get a job they still want me to put those classes before my job and I feel like it’s unfair if I'm working. Like I told them, I don't mind doing peer support or NA class because I have a known drug problem though I was just selling drugs. So like I told, I asked them, I don't mind doing one or two of those every other week, but as far as me trying to complete 4 classes a week, plus work, plus pay child support, plus pay all my fees, plus take care of home, this and that, the third, I feel it’s unfair and there's no way out of it and they already told me it's ugly if I don't comply.

Finally, approximately 45% (*n* = 5) of respondents identified various challenges encountered upon their release such as restarting in society and limitations due to ankle monitoring. Approximately 25% (*n = 3*) identified finding employment as being a challenge. Approximately 20% (*n* = 2) of respondents said they did not have any challenges, while 5% (*n* = 1) identified financial difficulties as being a challenge, with another 5% (*n* = 1) identifying transportation as being a challenge. Responding to a question about the challenges encountered while on parole, one African American respondent said:

> For the people that was out here, I'm not moving fast enough for them. It's kind of pressure on me. Because I know how to get it other ways and it seems like when I got it the other way nobody tripped. But now that I'm doing it the right way it's taking longer and people are starting to get antsy, and uh, uh, it's, it's kind, kind of overbearing at times, but I'm surviving.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Credibility occurred twofold. The quantitative study had a moderate sample size (*N* = 126) with three racial groups to compare results. The qualitative study had an adequate (*n* = 12) sample size that were interviewed to allow for different racial perspectives to be given (e.g., triangulation). There were limited member checking due to the time constraints of the study. However, the interviews were taped to ensure the accuracy of participant answers.

There were no changes made regarding transferability. Participants were allowed to give a thick description, which provides greater detail about participant experiences

within the criminal justice system. However, participants did not indicate how or why they became involved in the criminal justice system. Also, participant living situations (e.g., SES), and educational backgrounds were given. These descriptions are for each racial group in the study.

There were no changes to dependability. Audit trails that explain in detail how data were collected and kept ensure dependability. Also, providing a copy of the instrument and interview questions within the appendix of the proposal shows the accuracy of data analysis.

There were no changes to confirmability. Review of data and overall findings occurred to ensure clarity and understanding. For the quantitative portion of the study, the results using the total scores from the CD-RISC and the multidimensional locus of control scales provided data for each racial group and individual (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Levenson, 1974). For the qualitative study, the interview questions along with the verbatim answers given by each participant were provided. Similarities among and within racial groups were reviewed and audited. Keeping an open mind and allowing participants to express their experiences within the criminal justice system addressed reflexivity.

Summary

Chapter 4 gave the results of the mixed-methods study regarding resilience, locus of control, and potential reasons for recidivism from the parolees' perspective. Although there were no statistically significant differences in resilience and multidimensional locus of control scores racially, information obtained during the interviews suggest that

although parolees may feel optimistic about their release, they still face challenges with regards to employment, financing, housing, and education. Thus, these challenges offer a glimpse into the reality of parole and how difficult these challenges may become in the future. A more detailed exploration of the study findings is discussed in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to determine if there were racial differences among former offenders regarding resilience and locus of control that may contribute to or affect recidivism. The study consisted of two parts. In the quantitative portion, I used the Connor-Davidson Resiliency scale (CD-RISC) and the multidimensional locus of control scales using the total scores of the CD-RISC and the scores from the subscales internality, powerful others, and chance for the multidimensional locus of control scales (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Levenson, 1974). The qualitative part consisted of participant interviews to gain an understanding of resilience and the challenges that may contribute to recidivism. Together, both portions of the study provided information on how individuals perceive resilience, locus of control, and the challenges faced by ex-offenders.

Summary of Key Findings

The quantitative part of the study showed that there were no racial differences in how Caucasians, African Americans, and Hispanic ex-offenders viewed their resiliency. The same results were seen for locus of control; there were no significant racial differences in the overall multidimensional locus of control scales results. However, in the qualitative portion of the study, there were some noticeable trends expressed by the participants. Many of the participants reported having a GED and being employed; however, there were some racial differences. Of the four African American participants, only one was employed. Half of the Caucasian participants were employed, and all the

Hispanic participants were currently employed. Around 60% (n = 6) of the participants came from middle-class environments; however, half of the African American participants came from poor neighborhoods. Roughly 80% (n = 10) of the participants were placed in new neighborhoods upon their release from prison, with 90% (n = 10) of those participants being placed in neighborhoods described as poor or middle-class. With regards to family support, around 90% (n = 10) of participants did have family support, with approximately 55% (n = 6) receiving emotional assistance, financial assistance, or both to aid in their transition from prison.

Only half of the participants indicated that they received some training (e.g., education, trade) while incarcerated. Approximately 50% (n = 3) of the training received was for custodial work or cooking. Only one participant received some type of training to work with Microsoft Office products, and two participants received some skilled trades training (e.g., masonry, HVAC). Finally, 75% (n = 9) of participants described their parole experience as positive at this point. Challenges cited now while being on parole centered on employment, restarting their lives, financial strain, and transportation.

Interpretation of Findings

The qualitative findings extend the knowledge in the discipline by providing more information regarding the challenges that may impact and contribute to recidivism. Although 55% (n = 7) of the participants were employed, there were clear differences racially, with regards to African American participants. Previous researchers have shown that African American men were twice as likely to lack employment than Caucasian men (Teti et al., 2012). These findings were confirmed in this study, with approximately 75%

of African American participants being unemployed, while 50% of Caucasian men were unemployed. The findings also showed that half the African American participants come from poor neighborhoods, have limited education, and limited skills for viable employment. As one participant indicated, the challenges he faced was finding a job while trying to balance the demands of his family and the requirements of parole. Additionally, many of the participants were paroled to different neighborhoods, with half being classified as poor, where limited jobs existed. Kubrin et al. (2007) indicated that ex-offenders usually return to these same environments that help to create the cycle of criminality and recidivism.

All of the participants in the qualitative study were a part of a re-entry program in which drug offender classes were required as a condition of parole. While none of the participants indicated that they received drug offender or substance abuse classes during their incarceration, some effort was being made upon their release. However, the challenge remains; substance use and problems surrounding addiction may contribute to offenders' inability to follow the strict rules that are imposed during supervision (Kubrin et al., 2007). Additionally, the stigma of being an offender may cause further challenges while parolees are trying to reintegrate back into society with roadblocks surrounding housing, employment, and education (Kubrin et al., 2007). As one participant indicated, it was challenging finding accommodation in a retirement home due to his past criminal record. Also, the importance of family or social support is backed up in the literature and this study’s findings. Most of the participants had good social or family support, which research shows reduces the risk of recidivism (Martinez & Christian, 2009).

Finally, others factors that may impact the trajectory of recidivism are social barriers. Hass and Saxon (2012) indicated that the lack of appropriate skills such as education and employment are barriers that negatively impact how successful offenders are in society. These obstacles were also reported by participants, with the majority having only GEDs and limited employable skills beyond that of fast-food and custodial work. Furthermore, offenders are limited in the type of employment they can have due to a lack of education, training, and their criminal records, which further places a barrier in their socioeconomic attainment overall (Hass & Saxon, 2012).

Limitations

Although the findings offer some insight as to how parolees view their experiences and challenges, there were some limitations. One limitation is that the qualitative findings are not generalizable to all parolees because of the small sample size (n = 12). Also, the CD-RISC and multidimensional locus of control scale scores showed a snapshot in time and may not represent a significant portion of parolees. As time and challenges increase, resilience and locus of control may decline. As previous longitudinal studies showed, recidivism is most likely to occur within the first 3 years of release, especially for African American parolees (McGovern et al., 2009).

Another limitation of the qualitative study is that the participants may not have revealed their true experiences on parole. Although most described their experiences as being good, some felt that their experiences were challenging due to the strictness of the parole officer, familial or social pressure, and limited autonomy due to ankle monitoring.

These findings again are not generalizable to all parolees, who may express their experiences differently as more challenges occur during their parole time.

Recommendations

Future researchers should focus on longitudinal examinations of parolees' resilience and locus of control. As I noted in the previous section, resilience and locus of control are variable and may change as more challenges are encountered. It would be appropriate to garner additional information about these factors throughout the parole experience at certain intervals (e.g., 6 months, 12 months). Furthermore, future research could focus on how a combination of factors such as race, education, family support, and skill impact parolees' success or failure over time.

Implications

This study leads to positive social change at an individual, organizational, and societal level. Data obtained from the qualitative study can help parolees better understand how certain factors (e.g., lack of education, employment) may negatively impact their success on parole. At the organizational level, probation or parole officers and others working with parolees can learn how factors such as lack of skill, education, family support, neighborhood, and socioeconomic status can impact a parolee's success while on supervision. Being aware of these factors can help create programs to assist parolees to overcome some of these challenges, thus potentially impacting the recidivism rate. Last, on a societal level, understanding the challenges parolees face will help create positive social change by assisting with the implementation of programs that focus on education, employment, and housing to help support parolees, thereby increasing their

ability to successfully reintegrate back into society and decreasing their chance of recidivism overall.

Conclusion

Many factors impact an individual's success or failure while on parole. Racial disparities, education, socioeconomic status, skill, and family support all play a role in how successful an individual is or is not while under supervision. By understanding the immense challenges parolees face, those working with this population can better assist them in meeting these difficulties head on. By working together, organizations and society can create change by offering support and a second chance that may finally impact the recidivism rate.

References

American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (2010). Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/ethics/code

Austin, J., Cadora, E., Clear, T. R., Dansky, K., Greene, J., Gupta, V., …Young, M. C. (n.d.). Ending mass incarceration: Charting a new justice reinvestment. *The Sentencing Project: Research and Advocacy for Reform*. Retrieved from http://www.thesentencingproject.org

Banking on bondage: Private prisons and mass incarceration. (2011). *American Civil Liberties Union*. Retrieved from http://www.aclu.org

Bartone, P. T. (2007). Test-retest reliability of the dispositional resilience scale-15, a brief hardiness scale. *Psychological Reports, 101*(3), 943-944. doi:10.2466 /pro.101.3.943-944

Bellair, P. E. & Kowalski, B. R. (2011). Low-skill employment opportunity and African American-White difference in recidivism. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 48*(2), 176-208. doi:10.1177/0022427810391536

Biennial report of the Texas Correctional Office on Offenders with Medical or Mental Impairments. (2012a). Retrieved from http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us

Benda, B. B., Toombs, N. J., & Peacock, M. (2002). Ecological factors in recidivism: A survival analysis of boot camp graduates after three years. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *35*(1), 63-85. Retrieved from SocINDEX database. (27646221)

Bloom, S. L. (1999). Restorative vs. retributive justice. *The Psychotherapy Review, 1*(6), 259-260. Retrieved from http://www.sanctuaryweb.com

Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., Rooney, J., & McAnoy, K. (2002). An outcome evaluation of restorative justice alternative to incarceration. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *5*(4), 319-338. doi:10.1080/10282580214772

Brown, D. L. (2008). African American resiliency: Examining racial socialization and social support as protective factors. *Journal of Black Psychology, 34*(1), 32-48. doi:10.1177/0095798407310538

Campbell-Sills, L., & Stein, M. B. (2007). Psychometric analysis and refinement of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC): Validation of a 10-item measure of resilience. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 20*(6), 1019-1028. doi:10.1002/jts .20271

Cobbina, J. E., Huebner, B. M., & Berg, M. T. (2012). Men, women, and postrelease offending: An examination of the nature of the link between relational ties and recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency, 58*(3), 331-361. doi:10.1177 /0011128710382348

Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety, 18*(2), 76-82. doi:10.1002/da.10113

Connor, K. M., & Zhang, W. (2006). Resilience: Determinants, measurement, and treatment responsiveness. *CNS Spectrums, 11*(10), 5-12. Retrieved from http://www.cnsspectrums.com

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Diehl, M., & Hay, E. L. (2010). Risk and resilience factors in coping with daily stress in adulthood: The role of age, self-concept incoherence, and personal control. *Developmental Psychology, 46*(5), 1132-1146. doi:10.1037/a0019937

Drake, E. K., Aos, S., & Miller, M. G. (2009). Evidence-based public policy options to reduce crime and criminal justice costs: Implications in Washington state. *Victims and Offenders, 2*(4), 170-196. doi:10.1080/15564880802612615

Durose, M. R., Cooper, A. D., & Snyder, H. N. (2014). Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010. *U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs: Bureau of Justice Statistics.* Retrieved from https://www.bjs.gov

Eschleman, K. J., Bowling, N. A., & Alarcon, G. M. (2010). A meta-analytic examination of hardiness. *International Journal of Stress Management, 17*(4), 277-307. doi:10.1037/a0020476

Felony disenfranchisement laws in the United States. (2013). *The Sentencing Project: Research and Advocacy for Reform*. Retrieved from http://www .thesentencingproject.org

Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Psychological resilience: A review and critique of definitions, concepts, and theory. *European Psychologist*, *18*(1), 12-23. doi:10 .1027/1016-9040/a000124

Golembeski, C. & Fullilove, R. (2005). Criminal (In)justice in the city and its associated health consequences. *American Journal of Public Health, 95*(10), 1701-1706. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2005.063768

Goodman, W. & Leggett, J. (2007). Locus of control in offenders and alleged offenders with learning disabilities. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35*(3), 192-197. doi:10.1111/j.1468-3156.2007.00455.x

Greene, R. R. & Greene, D. G. (2009). Resilience in the face of disasters: Bridging micro- and macro-perspectives. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 19*(8), 1010-1024. doi:10.1080/10911350903126957

Hass, A. Y. & Saxon, C. E. (2011). From the inside/out: Greene county jail inmates on restorative reentry. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 56*(7), 1037-1062. doi:10.1177/0306624X11418914

Herzing, R. (2005). What is the prison industrial complex? *Critical Resistance—Defending Justice: Political Research Associates.* Retrieved from http://www.publiceye.org/defindingjustice

Huntley, F. L., Palmer, E. J., & Wakeling, H. C. (2012). Validation of an adaptation of Levenson's locus of control scale with adult male incarcerated sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 24*(1), 46-63. doi: 10.1177/1079063211403163

Inderbitzin, M (2009). Reentry of emerging adults: Adolescent inmates' transition back into the community. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 24*(4), 453-476. doi: 10.1177/0743558409336747

Kingston, B., Huizinga, D., & Elliott, D. S. (2009) A test of social disorganization theory in high-risk urban neighborhoods. *Youth & Society, 41*(53), 53-79. doi: 10.1177/004418x09338343

Kormanik, M. B. & Rocco, T. S. (2009). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A review of the locus of control construct. *Human Resource Development Review, 8*(4), 463-483. doi:10.1177/1534484309342080

Kubrin, C. E., Squires, G. D., & Stewart, E. A. (2007). Neighborhoods, race, and recidivism: The community-reoffending nexus and its implications for African Americans. *SAGE Race Relations Abstracts, 32*(1), 7-37. doi: 10.1177/0307920107073250

Kubrin, C. E. & Weitzer, R. (2003). New directions in social disorganization theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 40*(4), 374-402. doi: 10.1177/0022427803256238

Kurlychek, M. C., Krohn, M. D., Dong, B., Hall, G. P., & Lizotte, A. J. (2012). Protection from risk: An exploration of when and how neighborhood-level factors can reduce violent youth outcomes. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 10*(1), 83-106. doi:10.1177/1541204011422088

Langan, P. A. & Levin, D. J. (2002). Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994. *Federal Sentencing Reporter, 15*(1), 58-65. doi:10.3886/ICPSR03355.v8

Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: A meta-analysis. *The Prison Journal, 85*(2), 124-144. doi: 10.1177/0032885505276969

Lee, S. Y. (2013). Testing psychometric properties and the cross-ethnic construct validity of the risk and resiliency checkup. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 11*(2), 165-177. doi:10.1177/1541204012460875

Levenson, H. (1974). Multidimensional Locus of Control Scales [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS. doi:10.1037/t04693-000

Mahmood, M. (2004). Collateral consequences of the prison-industrial complex. *Social Justice, 31*(1/2), 31-34. Retrieved from ProQuest database. (15053203)

Malott, M. & Fromader, A. (2010). Male inmate perspective on reducing recidivism rates through post-incarceration resources. *Internet Journal of Criminology*. Retrieved from http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com

Martinez, D. J. & Christian, J. (2008). The familial relationships of former prisoners: Examining the link between residence and informal support mechanisms. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 38*(2), 201-224. doi:10.1177/0891241608316875

Martinez Jr., R., Rosenfeld, R., & Mares, D. (2008). Social disorganization, drug market activity, and neighborhood violent crime. *Urban Affairs Review, 43*(6), 846-874. doi:10.1177/1078087408314774

Maschi, T., Gibson, S., Zgoba, K. M., & Morgen, K. (2011). Trauma and life event stressors among young and older adult prisoners. *Journal of Correctional Health Care, 17*(2), 160-172. doi:10.1177/1078345810396682

Mason, C. (2012). Dollars and detainees: The growth of for-profit detention. *The Sentencing Project: Research and Advocacy for Reform*. Retrieved from http://www.thesentencingproject.org

Massoglia, M., Firebaugh, G., & Warner, C. (2013). Racial variation in the effect of incarceration on neighborhood attainment. *American Sociological Review, 78*(1), 142-165. doi:10.1177/0003122412471669

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 227-238. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227

Mauer, M. (2011). Sentencing reform: Amid mass incarcerations—guarded optimism. *Criminal Justice, 26*(1), 27-36. Retrieved from http://www.thesentencingproject.org

McGovern, V., Demuth, S., & Jacoby, J. E. (2009). Racial and ethnic recidivism risks: A comparison of postincarceration rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration among White, Black, and Hispanic releases. *The Prison Journal, 89*(3), 309-327. doi:10.1177/0032885509339507

Mowder, M. H., Cummings, J. A., & McKinney, R. (2010). Resiliency scales for children and adolescents: Profiles of juvenile offenders. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 28*(4), 326-337. doi:10.1177/0734282910366838

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to using SPSS* (5th ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill.

Payne, Y. A. (2011). Site of Resilience: A reconceptualization of resiliency and resilience in street life—oriented black men. *Journal of Black Psychology, 37*(4), 426-451. doi:10.1177/0095798410394178

Pollock, J. M., Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Ross, J. I., & Sundt, J. L. (2012). A utopian prison: Contradiction in terms? *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 28*(1), 60-76. doi:10.1177/1043986211432194

Racial impact statements: Changing policy to address disparities. *The Sentencing Project: Research and Advocacy for Reform*. Retrieved from http://www.thesentencingproject.org

Richardson, G. E. (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58*(3), 307-321. doi:10.1002/jclp.10020

Ryon, H. S. & Gleason, M. E. J. (2014). The role of locus of control in daily life. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin 40*(1), 121-131. doi: 10.1177/0146167213507087

Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 15*(3), 194-200. doi: 10.1090/10705500802222972

Stahler, G. J., Mennis, J., Belenko, S., Welsh, W. N., Hiller, M. L., & Zajac, G. (2013). Predicting recidivism for released state prison offenders: Examining the influence of individual and neighborhood characteristics and spatial contagion on the likelihood of reincarceration. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 6*(40), 1-23. doi: 10.1177/0093854812469609

State of recidivism: The revolving door of America's prisons. (2011). *The PEW Center on the States: Public Safety Performance Project*. Retrieved from http://www.pewtruts.org

Strelan, P., Feather, N. N., & McKee, I. (2011). Retributive and inclusive justice goals and forgiveness: The influence of motivational values. *Social Justice Research*, *24*(2), 126-142. doi:10.1007/s11211-011-0132-9

Teti, M., Martin, A. E., Ranade, R., Massie, J., Malebranche, D. J., Tschann, J. M., & Bowleg, L. (2012). "I'm a keep rising. I'm a keep going forward, regardless": Exploring black men's resilience amid sociostructural challenges and stressors. *Qualitative Health Research, 22*(4), 524-533. doi:10.1177/10497323114422051

Texas Department of Criminal Justice: Reentry Update. (2012b). Retrieved from http://www.tdcj.tx.us

Trends in U.S. corrections. (2012). *The Sentencing Project: Research and Advocacy for Reform*. Retrieved from http://www.thesentencingproject.org

Umbreit, M. S., Vos, B., & Coates, R. B. (2006). Restorative justice dialogue: Evidence-based practice. *Center for Restorative Justice & Peacemaking*, 1-16. Retrieved from http://www.rjp.umn.edu

United States Census Bureau—QuickFacts (2011). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov

Wenzel, M., Okimoto, T., & Cameron, K. (2012). Do retributive and restorative justice processes address different symbolic concerns?. *Critical Criminology*, *20*(1), 25-44. doi:10.1007/s10612-011-9147-7

Windle, G., Bennett, K. M., & Noyes, J. (2011). A methodological review of resilience measurement scales. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 9*(8), 1-18. doi: 10.1186/1477-7525-9-8.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

Tell me about the neighborhood you lived in before this last arrest?

What were or were there any job opportunities?

(If yes) What type of jobs are you qualified for and were they available?

Are you currently employed?

(If yes) What type of job do you have?
(If no) What has your job search been like (e.g., won't hire, outside neighborhood)?

What type of education do you have?

During this last incarceration, did you receive any training (e.g., job, education, counseling)?

(If yes) What type of training did you receive?

(If yes) Have you been able to utilize these new skills?

(If no) Why not?

Before your release from prison, did you receive any assistance to prepare you for release (e.g., resource information within the community)?

Upon your release from prison, did you return back to the same neighborhood you lived in before your incarceration or is it a different one?

(If new) Can you describe your new neighborhood?
(If new) Are there any job opportunities? If so, are you trained for them?

What type of family support do you have?

Has your family been able to help you throughout your incarceration/probation/parole experience?

(If no) Why not?
(If yes) How?

Do you currently have a place to live?

(If yes) What type of housing (e.g., public assistance, halfway house, etc.)?
(If no) Why not?

What has been your experience in trying to obtain housing?

What has your current probation/parole experience been like?

What challenges, if any, have you encountered because of your incarceration (e.g., housing, employment)?