A STUDY OF COMMUNITY-BASED CORRECTIONAL

NEEDS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts Department of Correction

John O. Boone
Commissioner

June, 1972

Final Report of GCLE Project # 69-26,29:
"A Study of Community-Based Correctional Needs"

Project Director: Murray Cohen, Ph.D
                 Psychology Department
                 Boston University

Research Staff: James Brady
                 Richard Grelotti
                 Marian Hyler
                 James Smith

Project Coordinator: William Dawber
                     Assistant to the
                     Commissioner

<u>PREFACE</u>

This study is the final report of the federally-funded project "A Study of Community-Based Correctional Needs in Massachusetts"(Governor's Committee on Law Enforcement, #69-26,29), with several sections deleted. The principal investigator was Dr. Murray Cohen of the Boston University Psychology Department and of the Sex Treatment Center at M.C.I., Bridgewater. The report explores in detail the needs of men upon release, and analyzes problems in the present delivery of pre-release and post-release services. In the process it documents the clear deficiencies of the existing "system" of releasing men from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions to the community. The study was conducted in early 1971 with the purpose of providing guidance to managers and planners responsible for developing community-based correctional programs. However, its findings will also be of direct relevance to other correctional staff as well as to legislators, volunteers, press and members of the general public.

The findings were derived from two sources. First, clinical-style interviews were conducted with four groups of men: 79 men about to be paroled, 15 men paroled within the previous three months, 17 men paroled a year previously, and 20 men recently returned on parole revocations. The interviews focused on the needs and problems of these men, and on agencies, groups and services designed to meet these needs. Second, contacts were made with agencies and groups serving offenders just prior to and after release. The methodology of the study was of neccessity exploratory. Correspondingly, the findings should not be regarded as definitive.

The report covers three major areas. The first is a description of the <u>extent and type of need in eleven need areas</u>. The need areas examined were: occupational training and placement, educational, financial, counseling, social-recreational, family relationships, living arrangements, alcohol control, drug control, medical, and legal. These need areas are explored both for the pre-parole group and for the three month parole, one year parole, and revocation groups. Such findings about various need areas, of course, imply the extent to which programs focused on each need area should be developed, as well as the appropriate types of programs.

The picture presented is one of men with multiple needs. 91% of the men interviewed had serious problems in two or more need areas, and the average man had serious problems in five of the eleven need areas. While the findings about offender needs do not lend themselves to brief summary, a few of the more striking results for the pre-parole group will be presented here: 85% of these men had employment needs, and such needs were much less frequently for job procurement than they were for vocational training, planning and adjustment. 66% had needs for personal, supportive help ("counseling"). 60% had social-recreational needs; these were problems of social isolation more than of anti-social influences. Alcohol was more of a problem than drugs. Not only did more men have alcohol problems than drug problems, but men with alcohol problems were less likely to admit the problem and less likely to seek help than were men with drug problems.

The second area covered -- for both the pre-parole group and the parole and revocations groups -- is an analysis of <u>problems in the delivery of services</u>. The major findings for the pre-parole group were as follows: Over half of these men were seen as highly unlikely to make use of services, and only 15% as highly likely to make use of services. This was a function not of hostility to social institutions, but, rather, of ignorance of services and of a subcultural life style which discouraged their use. As for which agencies they would feel most comfortable in using, the primary issue was whether the agency would "deliver" -- not whether it was in the local community, designed specifically

for ex-inmates, formal or informal, etc. The single exception was some preference for agencies staffed by ex-inmates. Parole officers were perceived as "unwilling to help" much more than as punitive. A large majority of this group about to be released was without "emotional-supportive" relationships, and an even larger majority was without "helping and guiding" relationships.

The implicit assumption of the report is that unmet needs are related to return to prison and that providing services will lower the return rate. Two findings should be mentioned in this connection. The one year successful parole group had unmet needs in fewer areas than the other groups, while the revoke group had unmet needs in more areas than the other groups. 75% of the parole groups, but only 20% of the revoke group, had some contact with service agencies after release.

In the final, recommendations section of the report, Dr. Cohen suggests ways in which existing resources and structures can be more effectively used, and argues that the delivery of pre-release and post-release services can be best organized around a "case manager" who can provide personal support and continuity during the period of transition back into the community. The major faults that he located in the ineffective use of existing resources are as follows: Structures exist wich do not serve the functions they were designed to serve. Most offenders do not know how to make use of services. Services not specifically designed to serve ex-inmates are ill-prepared and often antagonistic to serving such clients. Services are structured to deal with only one problem while most ex-inmates have multiple problems. There is inadequate coordination of service agencies. Many agencies cannot live up to their potential because of staff shortages, financial problems or opposition from correctional and parole staffs. Dr. Cohen here takes the viewpoint that the need is not so much to develop new resources as to more effectively use existing resources.

The outline of the report is presented in the table below:

This abbreviated version of the final project report leaves out several sections of that report. These consist of sample interviews, the clinical interview schedule, the background variables on which data were collected, and a proposal written by one of the project staff members. Copies of the complete final report are available at the Department of Correction.

-- Carroll T. Miller
   Acting Social Science
   Research Specialist

I. INTRODUCTION

This study was designed to contribute to the planning in the development of community-based correctional programs. The specific concern was with the needs of the offender as these needs relate to the problem of reintegration within the community following his incarceration. A secondary concern was with the groups, formal and informal, public and private which attempt to offer some service to the offender in the reentry period. These groups and their services form the potential resources from which a community-based program can be created.

II. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A. Offenders

1. Samples. Four groups of offenders were studied. The largest group was comprised of men who had been given a parole date and were awaiting release from the state correctional institutions at Walpole, Concord or Norfolk. This is the pre-parole group.

The second group of inmates were men who had been on parole and had been returned to the institution on a parole revocation. This group included all of those who had been returned within one month of the time this aspect of the study was begun.

The remaining two groups were made up of men on parole -- a three month group of men who had been released within the past three months, and a one year group of men who had been released one year prior to the study. For these two groups only men released to the Boston or Worcester areas were included.

2. Method. Each inmate or ex-inmate was given an open-ended interview, which had a slightly different focus for each of the four groups.

For the pre-parole group, the interview was concerned with the offender's needs as he anticipated them to be on release, his knowledge of available services and his experiences and attitudes towards such services.

For the revoke group, the interview attempted to determine whether the absence of some particular need satisfaction was related to the parole failure.

The interviews of the two parole groups were identical but special attention was given with the three month group to the problems of post-release adjustment.

3. Eleven <u>need areas</u> were investigated: Occupational Training and Placement, Educational, Residential, Financial, Social-Recreational, Drug Control, Alcohol Control, Family Relationships, Counseling, Legal, and Medical.

4. <u>Sample Description.</u>

a. Pre-parole group. Seventy-nine (79) men were interviewed. The mean age of this group was 28 years; 49 of the men were white and 30 were black; with regard to education, the mean grade completed was the eighth grade; the average number of prior incarcerations was 3; the average number of months incarcerated was 45; and the mean age at first conviction was 19 years; 65% were single, 16% were married, 16% had been married but were now separated or divorced, and 3% had been married and were now widowed.

b. Revoke group. Twenty (20) men were interviewed. The mean age of this group was 32 years; 13 of the men were white and 7 were black; the mean grade completed was the eighth grade; the average number of prior incarcerations was 6.5; the average number of months incarcerated was 76; and the mean age at first conviction was 18.5; 75% of the men were single and 25% had been married but were now separated or divorced.

c. Three month group. Fifteen (15) men were interviewed. The mean age of this group was 26 years; 8 men were white and 7 were black; the mean grade completed was the eighth grade; the average number of prior incarcerations was 2.4; the average number of months incarcerated was 43; and the mean age at first conviction was 17.8; 67% of the men were single, 7% were married, and 26% had been married and were now separated or divorced.

d. One year group. Seventeen (17) men were interviewed. The mean age of this group was 31 years; 10 of the men were white and 7 were black; the mean grade completed was the eighth grade; the average number of prior incarcerations was 2.5; the average number of months incarcerated was 51; and the mean age at first conviction was 18.5; 60% of the men were single, 23% were married, and 17% had been married but were now separated or divorced.

To summarize this description of the sample: One hundred and thirty-one (131) were interviewed; 61% of the men were white; the average age was about 28; for almost all of the men this was not their first incarceration; and for more than half of the men, their first conviction was as a juvenile; only a third of them had married and in less than half of the group that had married was this marriage currently intact.

In contrasting the four groups, it is noted that the revocation group is quite different from the other three groups on a number of variables, whereas the other three groups appear quite similar to each other. In this study the revokee is more apt to be older, white, single, previously incarcerated, and to have spent more time in prison. One expected finding was not supported by the data. There is no difference between the revocation group and the one year successful parolee group in regard to the age at first conviction variable.

B. Resources for Needs.

1. A secondary goal of the study was to learn about the mechanics and problems of the delivery of services to the offender. As in the study of the offender himself, the concern here was also with two points in time -- services available immediately prior to release and services following parole release. These services include planning groups, referral groups, and those offering direct services; private, civic and religious groups; state and federal groups; volunteer and ex-inmate groups.

No effort was made to make a comprehensive study of all available resource groups nor to make contact with all groups known to be available.

2. The methods of learning about these groups and agencies were varied: personnel were rather formally interviewed; project staff attended meetings and conferences; a staff member spent time with parole officers in their field work ; informal discussions were held with key personnel; telephone conversations served in instances where personal contact was not feasible.

3. Following is a listing of the agencies, groups, services or personnel contacted by the project staff:

Alcoholics Anonymous
Brooke House
Cambridge Community Center
Cooperative Aid Committee (Norfolk)
Correctional Officers
Directors of Treatment - Walpole, Norfolk, Concord.
Division of Legal Medicine
Federal Employment Counselor
Governor's Committee on Law Enforcement
Institutional Case Officer
Institutional Community Officer
Institutional Parole Officer
Joint Correctional Planning Commission
Libra
Neighborhood Employment Service
New Careers
Norfolk Inmate Council
OJA
Parole Officers
Parole Senior Supervisor
Parole Supervisors
Project 50
Project Turnabout
Roxbury Concerned Citizens
Roxbury Multi-Service Center
Self Development Group
Special Service Parole Officers
Technical Development Corporation
The Fellowship
Walpole Pre-Release Project
Walpole Work Release Project
YMCA (Boston)

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Pre-Parole Group. The focus of these data is the assessment of the needs of the offender during the period immediately prior to his release. The data represent an evaluation of what the inmate told the interviewer. They cannot be thought of as needs experienced by the offender. The data reflect largely experienced needs, but represent also the interviewers' interpretations and judgments based on the overall assessment of the individual which emerged in the interview.

A. Hierarchy of Needs. Table I presents a ranking of areas in which a need existed.

TABLE I

AREA	% OF INMATES EVIDENCING NEED
Employment	85%
Counseling (Personal Adjustment)	66%
Social-Recreational	60%
Financial	59%
Educational	40%
Alcohol Control	39%
Family Relationship (natal family)	35%
Drug Control	26%
Medical	24%
Legal	13%
Living Arrangements	10%

A-1 Employment

What is most obvious is the predominance of offenders who have some problem in the occupational area. This area includes the needs for skill and aptitude assessment, job training, and job placement. This is added confirmation, if such is needed, of the attention that should be given to the occupational area for release-related services.

A more detailed breakdown of this area is given in Table II.

TABLE II

OCCUPATIONAL NEED	% OF INMATES EVIDENCING NEED
Vocational Training	70%
Vocational Planning	66%
Work Adjustment Aid	60%
Job Procurement	35%

This sample of men presents the typical picture of men with little or no vocational skills available. They qualify only for menial, unskilled, low-paying jobs which provide neither material satisfaction nor stimulation. Furthermore, such jobs provide no source of self-esteem, self-worth, or vehicle for sublimation which is so critical for these men.

It is noteworthy that job procurement is the least common occupational need. Yet, job procurement is the occupational need presently given primary emphasis by both the Parole Board and formal and informal service agencies. One-third of the sample shows need in this area, while in each of the other three occupational need areas at least 60% of the men about to be released have some serious need for help and attention.

In the aspect of vocational training, we are all aware of the inadequacy of the correctional system in Massachusetts. Not only are there few opportunities for training, but only with rare exceptions does a man who is released obtain employment in the area in which he has been given training within the institution. He is simply not being trained in marketable skills. No systematic attention is given to the changing characteristics of the job market which might then reflect back to the institutional training program.

A somewhat separate, though related aspect is vocational planning. As noted, two-thirds of the sample have serious needs for help in planning their occupational futures at the time of release. This need is reflected in various ways:

      a. Thirty-five percent were still having difficulty getting work at the time of the interview. This makes it likely that either their release will be delayed or they will be released without a job.

      b. As large as the above figure is, there is further evidence of planning instability. Although 65% of the men had a prearranged job, two-thirds of this group (45% of the total) considered the job unsatisfactory, having accepted it only for parole requirements, and planned to quit soon after release. Thus, only 20% of the men had any sense of job stability before release.

c. The source of the dissatisfaction is most frequently a mismatch between the interests of the offender and the job. Of the group with prearranged employment, 1/4 felt that the job was very different from what they desired, 1/2 felt less than satisfied, and the remaining 1/4 (10 men) felt the job fitted their interests and abilities. Some of the men were realistically frustrated with the assistance given them in planning. In other cases, this dissatisfaction reflected unrealistic expectations, aspirations and demands concerning work. Regradless of the reason (realistic or not), the data indicate a need for better inmate evaluation and counseling and more effective job procurement.

In the aspect of work adjustment, 60% of the men show a need for help in work attitudes -- accepting supervision, getting along with fellow workers, and working a full eight-hour day. These factors involve not only social-cultural attitudes towards work, but also the change of life style required in moving out of the prison institutional work patterns.

A-2 Counseling.

The counseling need area represents both judgments by the interviewer and direct statements by the inmate of a need for some kind of support person during the transition period. This does not refer to the need for psychotherapy. The interviewers were not trained to assess the need for therapy. What is spoken to here is the need for some kind of supportive counseling and guidance around issues related to the transition into the community. The needs seem to fall into four categories, approximately equal in the frequency with which they were expressed:

a. Counseling in specific problem areas such as family and marital problems, drug and alcohol control, sense of isolation, etc.

b. Personal, supportive help in making plans for release and assistance in implementing these plans.

c. Personal, supportive help in dealing with the anxiety and insecurity of the reentry period. A large number of men are consciously aware of their fear, and others poorly defend against such feelings.

d. Personal, supportive assistance related to the change in life style. Issues of responsibility, sharing, trust, mutuality, and motivation for social adjustment frequently appeared in the interviews.

Two things should be made clear about this need area: First, there is no single, clearly implied form of counseling indicated. Indeed, the term "counseling" may be misleading. The general need is for the support, assistance, caring, reality-reflecting and even controlling force of a decent human relationship. This may sound emotional or, even worse, obvious and banal. Nevertheless, the need is unequivocal.

In certain cases, something in the direction of traditional counseling seemed indicated. Frequently, something more along the lines of one-to-one big brother, or case manager, or advocate seemed implied. What is clearly needed is more thinking and exploration of a variety of forms, and of a variety of kinds of people to provide supportive relationships in the release period.

The second essential point is that what was observed seemed to represent transition issues, and that a critical aspect of this need area was for a relationship throughout the transition time. That is, though increased pre-release

counseling and increased post-release counseling would certainly be helpful,
what was most strongly indicated was the need for some kind of counseling
or supportive relationship which bridged the gap between inside and outside.
Here the model would not be crisis intervention or search for specific service,
but clearly one that involved continuity.

A-3 Social-Recreational Needs.

In sixty percent of the sample we found problems in the area of social-
recreational needs and services. Two types of problems appeared. One-third (1/3)
of these men needed help with respect to avoiding anti-social influences. That
is, friends, neighbors and family seemed to represent pressures towards further
illegal involvements. A much greater need, however, found in the other 2/3
(40% of the total) concerns a serious lack of opportunities for relationships
and for recreational resources. These men were friendless,and lonely and
lacked the social skills to effect meaningful relations.

A-4 Financial Needs.

The finding of financial need in 59% of the inmates is slightly misleading
in that it underestimates the problem. The figure represents the number of
men who are released in desperate financial conditions -- i.e., either men
having no capital and no resource (family or friends) to turn to if any
unexpected financial exigency should occur, or those returning to a situation of
debt, child support demands, family responsibilities, etc. It does not reflect
the even larger number of men who are released with financial resources inade-
quate to even live a minimally satisfying and fulfilling independent life
on the outside.

The implications of this finding should be given more attention than the
simple documentation of the well-known plight of the released inmate.

     a. The forced economic dependence on family or friends may
either or both strain the families' already thinly stretched resources or
be a psychologically resentful situation for the parolee and for the family.

     b. It heightens the urgency of the employment problem and,
in the context of job instability and the high probability of poor work adjust-
ment, adds additional pressure during a time of very difficult adjustment problems.

     c. Financial desperation and its consequent anxiety vis-à-vis
survival is an exacting pressure towards illegal attempts at resolution. The
inmate is reentering society in the same situation (more likely even worse)
of deprivation of resources which may have contributed to his initial
criminal involvement.

A-5 Educational Needs.

The 40% figure represents those with deficiencies in basic educational
skills -- e.g., reading and writing. It also includes the Spanish-speaking
group where basic communication in the English-speaking society is an added
problem. The general picture was typical of the offender population -- average
grade attainment eighth grade. Although this study did not evaluate the
causative or historical factors producing the low educational level, other
studies have shown the complex interaction of psychological, sub-cultural
and family variables. This is mentioned only to indicate that the remedial
task is an extraordinarily difficult one.

A-6 Family Needs.

The 35% figure refers to problems with family which exist at the point of release which would (1) be critical to post-release adjustment, and (2) require some kind of outside help. This figure is felt to be an underestimate of the real frequency of the need. Interviewers felt that, on the whole, the men interviewed were less open about family problems than about other areas, perhaps, partly because of an inability to admit problems at a point in time when their families were their predominant, and frequently sole, resource. The extent and nature of family problems is clearly an area needing further careful exploration.

Needs for service among those with wives were not included in the overall need hierarchy chart because the number of married men was so small (16% of the sample). Even though the number of married men is small, it appears that a large proportion of them have marital problems. Sixty-two percent of those married show a serious need for help with marital problems.

Although virtually all of those admitting problems in relationships with either parents or wife indicated that these problems were of long standing, virtually none of these men had received any help in dealing with these problems while in prison. None said that they had received adequate help, and only 5 out of the total of 43 with problems said that they had received any help at all.

A-7, A-8 Medical and Legal Needs.

At the time of release, the incidence of medical needs (24%) and legal needs (13%) is relatively low. However, when medical needs are present, these needs are quite severe and knowledge of resources inadequate.

A-9 Living Arrangements.

The finding of only 10% in this need area clearly underestimates the need. It indicates that some arrangement has been made for residence for the large majority of inmates. However, it does not involve any evaluation of the adequacy of the arrangements either in terms of stability or influence on the parolee. There is also some reason to believe that there is some denial or other misperceptions operating in many of the men who felt that their plan for a residence was no source of difficulty.

A-10, A-11 Alcohol and Drug Control.

The problems of alcoholism (39%) and drug addiction (26%), being somewhat special problem areas, are discussed separately and in more detail than other specific problem areas.

Alcohol: 39% of the sample had serious problems of alcohol use which required extensive help, as judged from the interview discussions with the offender and from his past records. One of the major problems at release, however, is that the offenders themselves tend to deny the problems. Only 10% of those with clear alcohol problems admitted the full extent of the problems, whereas 47% tended to deny it altogether. The remaining 43% admitted some problem, but it was underemphasized. Furthermore, this group was being released with little help or attention paid to the problem while in prison. Fifty-six percent (56%) of these men received no help at all, and though 44% of them did receive some help, in no cases could it be considered adequate.

This lack of attention to the problem by the institution undoubtedly supports the alcoholic's own tendency to deny the existence of the problem.

The knowledge of and relationship to outside service agencies is also discouraging. Only 1/3 of them are adequately aware of available service agencies, and 13% showed a total lack of knowledge; 55% were somewhat, but not fully, aware of available services. An even more serious problem with this group of offenders is their attitude toward these services. Forty-four percent (44%) have very little confidence in the ability of any agency to help, and an additional 34% are outright distrustful and negative. Only 3% were fully trusting and positive, with 19% having some, but not full, confidence in these agencies. Overall, the interviewers judged that 75% of these men were highly unlikely to make use of available services. They further judged that, while there was some chance that the remaining 25% would use available services, no men were seen as highly likely to make use of the services.

This is clearly a significant and difficult problem area. Dependence on alcohol affects 39% of the releasees, and the large majority of these men both deny alcohol as a problem and are seriously alienated from the existing service agencies.

Drugs: In contrast, the more "publicly" dramatic problem area of drug use offers a surprisingly hopeful picture. Twenty-six percent (26%) had serious problems with drug addiction (primarily heroin addiction). However, these men are more willing to admit the existence of the problem -- only 15% totally deny it, 55% admit it fully, and only 30% underplay it. They also have received more help while in prison. Thirty-seven percent (37%) have received no help at all; 16% were judged to have received adequate help; and the remaining 47% received some or minimal help. The men's greater willingness to admit to drug problems may, in part, reflect the prison's greater willingness to give attention to the problem.

This group of offenders also gives a somewhat more optimistic picture with respect to knowledge of and relationship toward service agencies. They seem somewhat more knowledgeable -- 50% are fully aware of available services, and only 15% lack any knowledge. As a group they also seem somewhat more positive and confident of help. Sixteen percent (16%) are trusting and positive, and 26% have some confidence in the ability of agencies to help. There is still a serious problem however, as 37% have little confidence, and 21% are downright distrustful and negative. The picture with respect to probability of utilizing available services is somewhat more positive than with alcoholics, but discouraging nonetheless. Forty-five percent (45%) were considered highly unlikely to make use of services, 30% were given some chance, and 25% were considered highly likely to utilize available services.

The overall picture demonstrates that addiction control is a serious need area and that problems exist in making use of available services. The comparison of drugs with alcoholism indicates clearly, however, that alcohol presents an even worse problem in terms of recognition and likelihood of adequate efforts.

B. Attitudes Toward Service Agencies.

The findings and issues discussed in this section we consider to be of
even greater importance than the data and discussion of specific need areas.
Much of the data on specific needs serve primarily to confirm what is already
well known. The data in this section have two important contributions:
First, they suggest how existing resources might be used more effectively
before going through the expense and complications of providing additional
services. Second, they suggest the appropriate nature and style of any new
services that are provided.

B-1 Likelihood To Use Services.

In each need area, the interview explored the probability of the inmates
making use of an existing service relevant to that need. The findings indicated
that such probabilities were highly consistent for each man across need areas.
Therefore, one overall judgment (except for drug and alcohol) was made.

Table III contains the results of this inquiry.

TABLE III

Probability of using services	Percent of inmates
Highly likely	15
Some likelihood	30
Highly unlikely	55

We see here that more than half of the men, despite having multiple needs,
are not likely to make use of existing services.

The data presented in Table IV suggest that only with a few men in the
pre-release group is the negative attitude toward using services a function of
hostility to social institutions. For the majority of the men, it is rather
a function of ignorance of services and a subcultural life style which discourages
their use.

TABLE IV

Attitudes toward agencies	Percent of inmates
Knowledgeable and favorable attitude	20
Knowledgeable and hostile	10
Unaware of services	42
Knowledgeable, but unwilling to use	28

The group defined in the table as "unwilling to use" is best described as
having a life style which precludes the seeking out or acceptance of services.
These factors seemed to be present in this group: (a) a passivity and fatalism
where the inmate feels himself to be a helpless victim -- "what will happen,
will happen;" (b) a resistance to the implied dependency of accepting help
from an agency; and (c) a life style which emphasizes reliance on family and
friends rather than public agencies.

B-2 **Type of Agency preferred.**

Table V presents type of agency the inmates felt they would be most
responsive to and feel most comfortable in asking for help.

TABLE V

Type of Agency	Percent of Inmates
Any agency which is helpful	50
Agencies staffed by ex-inmates	30
Agencies designed specifically for ex-inmates	7
Local agencies	5
Won't use any agency	8

These data have two implications. There does not appear to be a present
attitude among half of the group toward staffing pattern, clientele, or
formality of agency. The primary issue is whether the agency will "deliver".
There is, however, some reason to believe that the inmate is not entirely
accurate in predicting his response to the character of the agency. The style
of the agency and the people who staff it may well affect his comfort and sense
of trust in important ways that he is not anticipating.

The second observation is that to the extent a preference exists, there is
a choice for agencies which have ex-inmates on the staff. What is implied is
that continued effort should be expanded in developing training and placement
of ex-inmates as para-professionals in service agencies.

B-3 **Attitudes toward parole officer.**

Table VI presents data on the perception of the inmate regarding the
parole officer as an institution, i.e. not towards any specific parole officer.

TABLE VI

Perception of "Parole Officer"		Percent of Inmates
Helping agent, able and willing to assist		18
Disinterested and unwilling to help		60
Disinterested and punitive	(30)	
Disinterested but non-punitive	(30)	
Friendly but not a helper		7
Don't know what to expect		15

In terms of pre-release expectations this is not a very comfortable finding
in view of the fact that the parole officer is the only formal supervisory and
control agent. On the other hand, the finding that more than 2/3 of the group
do not see the role as punitive contradicts the prevailing notion or at least
indicates an exaggeration of it.

The fact that 60% regard him as disinterested in the inmates' welfare is
far more significant. This perception may underlie a more basic feeling of a
lack of trust that the officer will want to, or be able to, act in his best interest.
This in turn prevents the establishment of a relationship where direct services,
guidance and referral could be forthcoming.

This finding suggests that Parole must develop improved procedures to demonstrate
interest and concern toward the individual inmate. It seems apparent that these
procedures must occur prior to release.

B-4 Availability of supporting relationships

Two types of relationships were examined. The findings appear in Tables VII and VIII.

TABLE VII

Emotional-Supportive	Percent of Inmates
At least one clearly positive, stable emotional-supportive person available	10
Some relationships available; stability or value uncertain	30
Has no satisfactory person available	60

"Emotional-supportive" relationships refer to relationships involving family members, relatives, friends or girlfriends -- involving someone who cares, who can provide emotional support, someone who makes the effort of successful adjustment not only possible but worthwhile. The finding presented above -- that 60% were without such relationships while only 10% had such relationships -- could be regarded as rough estimates made from within the walls. However, the finding does indicate the expectations of men before release. These men felt alone and had little sense that anyone cared what happened to them.

TABLE VIII

Helping and Guiding	Percent of Inmates
At least one clearly effective and positive person available	7
Some persons available, but effectiveness and real availability uncertain	14
Has no satisfactory person available	79

"Helping and guiding" relationships refer to relationships involving someone (excluding the parole officer) who could be an effective helping agent for the inmate after release. This person can be a family member, friend, social worker, community worker, etc. There is no such person for almost 4/5 of the releasees. This lack is particularly important given that the period before and after release is one of significant stress, instability and unmet needs.

This finding gives added emphasis to the earlier finding that the parole officer is generally regarded as unwilling to help. In order for services to have any impact, or even to be truly delivered, a personal relationship must be part of the delivery system. The lack of such personal relationships must be considered one of the major needs unfulfilled by the existing release system.

C. Pre-release motivation

Any discussion of needs and services must take into account to some extent what the offenders own motivations and expectations are concerning desires and probabilities of going straight. One of the most general discoveries which comes with interviewing inmates at release time is how difficult it is for the inmate to anticipate his extra-mural life — how much he is going to care what happens and how successful he thinks he is going to be. Inmates are very aware of how different things can be on the outside, and how much their feelings can change. One very frequently encounters comments of the nature of, "Right now I am determined to make it and think I can, but I really don't know how I'll feel when I hit the streets," or "I really don't know how things will go when I get out; all I can do is hope for the best."

In addition to the huge uncertainty release presents to the inmate, an uncertainty created by overwhelming needs, ignorance and lack of contact with services, and a paucity of helping human relationships, the inmate in prison is living in an environment so different from the outside that it is impossible for him to know how effective or stable any changes in his attitudes or behaviors are going to be once he gets out. He may feel that his intentions are good — that he really wants to go straight — but is not in a situation where he can test out the reality of these intentions nor his ability to follow through on them. For this he must wait until he is released. It is the characteristics of this general prerelease situation which seem more important than the specific data which follows. This is because it suffers from the same uncertainty that the inmates face prior to release.

TABLE IX

Interest in going "Straight"	Percent of Inmates
Motivated and appear sincere	60
Interest primarily in not getting busted	23
Fatalistic regarding anti-social motives	17

Although the majority of men do appear motivated, for either social-ethical reasons or recognition of the self-defeatism in criminal life, only 22% have realistic alternatives to previous life styles.

It is of course difficult to evaluate this finding independent of precise data on support and opportunities for a crime-free adjustment. There appeared to be few who actually had plans to carry out a crime once free; there were many, however, who would turn to crime without much compunction if opportunities presented themselves and no alternatives existed. Although recidivism data lacks precision and accuracy, the available data support the above findings.

Summary:

The pre-parole findings can be summarized under two major points.

1. If one looks at educational and vocational skill levels, financial resources, availability and stability of jobs at release, availability of promising and supportive social and recreational outlets, the absence of an intimate and caring family, the release picture is not hopeful. Combined with widespread ignorance of available resources and a lack of organized coordinated pre-release assistance and preparation, the indications are that it is extremely unlikely that the parolee will be successful.

2. More important than the deficits in abilities and resources is the absence of personal, human relationships. This is true not only for someone to care and believe in the releasee, but someone who can function in a personal way as an effective helper. These men have become isolated from the human context of society, those very aspects which could support change and which would make the effort to change worthwhile. The very character of the release process is impersonal.

These first two points refer to the finding that the offender awaiting release is seriously deprived of both opportunities and incentives for changing his criminal relationship to society. There should not be surprise at the large return rate, but rather a question of how does any man succeed on reentry.

2. <u>Parole and Revocation Groups</u>.

In order to facilitate comparisons, the data for the two parole groups (3 months, n = 15 and 1 year, n = 17) and the revoke group (n = 20) will be presented together.

A. <u>Hierarchy of Needs</u>.

Table XI presents the basic data on the need areas for each group. It should be noted that these data, unlike the data reported above for the pre-parole group, refer to ungratified needs of problems in need gratification. It is one thing to anticipate what one's needs may be in the future and quite another to experience the frustration of failure to gratify a vital need.

TABLE XI

<u>Need Area</u>	<u>Percent of Men</u>		
	<u>3 month</u>	<u>1 year</u>	<u>Revoke</u>
Social-Recreational	67	64	85
Counseling	60	24	70
Financial	60	41	40
Vocational	53	47	80
Educational	40	18	50
Living Arrangements	33	41	45
Alcohol Control	27	18	55
Family Relationship	27	18	80
Drug Control	13	6	30
Medical	13	12	25
Legal	7	0	35

The most striking, and not surprising, finding is the higher overall need level in the revoke group. With the exception of financial need, a greater percentage of men in the revoke group had difficulties in all other need areas than the other two groups. Looking at the basic data from which the above table was derived, a second, related observation can be made. Of the total number of men interviewed, including the pre-parole group, only 11 men (less than 9% of the sample) had problems in no or only one need area. The remainder of the men have multiple needs. Table XII shows the median number of needs in the four groups.

TABLE XII

Group	Median # of Need Areas in Which A Problem Exists.
Pre-Parole	5.0
3 month parole	5.5
1 year parole	3.5
Revoke	6.5

The significance here is that the successful parole group (1 year) has the fewest number of unmet needs while the parole failure group has the highest. This finding is significant because it implies a definite relationship between unmet needs and the failure to maintain a socially acceptable extra-mural adjustment. Although the numbers are too small to warrant any statement with statistical confidence, a reasonable conclusion is that the support and opportunity for a social adjustment offered by the community was different for these two groups and this difference was telling.

Caution for such a conclusion is raised by noting that the revoke group was different from the other groups in regard to criminal history, age, and marital status.

Nevertheless, these men certainly had more unmet needs. The areas which seem most related to revocation include Social-recreation, Family relationship, Counseling, Vocation, Alcohol and Drug Control. The problem in the legal area seems to be a resultant of the revocation rather than (in any sense) causal.

A-1 Social-Recreational Needs.

In all three groups, more men showed problems in this area than in any other. Even among the men in the one year success group, this was the most frequent area of need. As in the pre-parole group, problems were more related to the absence of close interpersonal ties than with anti-social peers in the two parole groups, but this was not the case for the revoke group. For the latter group in the 2/3 of men showing difficulty in the social area this difficulty was related to anti-social contacts. And as indicated above, this was primarily true of the younger group of the revoked offenders.

For the remainder, the difficulty was more the absence of social contacts, a sense of loneliness, and feelings of anomie. No recreational outlets appear to be available to these men. The primary context for whatever social intercourse that does exist is the bar.

The problem in this area is also reflected in their marital status. Only five of the men in the revoke group had married and in each instance this marriage was no longer intact. In the two parole groups only 5 of the men were married and living with their partner at the time of the study.

Further, more than 1/3 of the men in the three groups were living alone in rooming houses or apartments.

A-2 Family Relationships and Living Arrangements.

These two categories are combined because they seem so interrelated.
Only in the one year group does there appear to be only few men with difficulties
in this area. This, however, is due primarily to the absence of open family
conflict. Only one of these men had a close warm relationship with his natal
family.

Table XIII gives a descriptive picture of both relationship and
living arrangement for the two parole groups.

TABLE XIII

Personal Quality of Living Arrangement	Number of Men	
	3 month	1 year
Living with wife; relationship good	1	4
Living with wife; relationship poor	0	1
Living with family, conflict present	3	2
Living with family, supportive, but no supervision	8	2
Living with a friend	2	0
Half-way House	1	1
Living at Fernald	0	1
Living alone	0	6

More than ½ of the 3 month group are currently living within the natal
family. In no instance however is there reason to believe that the relationship
will continue. Although none of this group is currently living alone, more than
1/3 of the 1 year group have such an arrangement.

For the revoke group, 80% of the men were having some difficulties with
their families and almost half had some serious residential problem. Two men in
the Wrentham program found it impossible to remain. The social and recreational
opportunities were limited and the atmosphere oppressive. Both had continuous
difficulties with finding stable living arrangements until their revocation.

Table XIV contains the type of family problems seen in the revoke group.

TABLE XIV

Type of Relationship	Percent of Men
Good Relationship	20
Serious Conflict	5
Rejection by Family	25
Serious family break	15
No Family	35

Again, there are important age differences. The older men have lost contact with their families; the younger men more typically describe a family that is disinterested or actively rejecting.

None of the revoke group had an ongoing marriage. The younger men had never married and the five older men who had been married were divorced or separated.

A-3 Vocational Need.

The attention that is given to this area in rehabilitation concerns is clearly warranted as the comparative data are reviewed. Only four of the men who were revoked had anything resembling a comfortable, stable, employment experience, whereas more that half of the 1 year group were so employed. However, even in this group, three men were unemployed at the time of the interview and two others were working under unsatisfactory conditions.

The situation with the 3 month groups is far more serious than the figure in Table XI would indicate. Only 1/3 of this group were fully satisfied with the type of work, conditions, salary, and future work goals; four men were unemployed, having left their pre-release job shortly after release, and seven men, though working, had some dissatisfaction with some aspect of the employment. No one in the group was in a work training program, although efforts had been made for such training.

More than half of the men in each of the parole groups were unskilled, while 3/4 of the revoke group were found to have no occupational skills.

What is most striking about the data in the vocational area is that despite the fact that this is the area of principal investment of pre-release referral and direct service, of principal concern to the Parole Board, and of primary importance as experienced by the offender, virtually no post-release attention was being given. Attention refers here to planning, training, and placement.

A-4 Alcohol and Drug Control.

A major feature of the revoke group is the high incidence of alcohol and drug addiction. Whereas only three of the 32 men on parole admitted to having some difficulty in controlling themselves with drugs, six of the 20 men in the revoke group were revoked because of drug use. There is even a greater difference in alcohol use. In the parole group, seven men admitted that alcohol abuse represented a problem. This is not a minor problem - 22% of the men. However, in the revoke group, 55% of the men admitted to excessive alcohol use.

More discouraging is the finding that only one of the parole group who admitted to an alcohol problem was using AA or any other alcohol control agency. There is no evidence that any of the revoke group had sought out assistance in this area.

A-5 Counseling.

The evaluation of a counseling need is in terms of assistance in immediate adjustment problems and not historical or psychodynamic inquiry.

The data in Tables I and XI confirm an expectation. The pre-release period and the transitional period (represented by the pre-parole and the 3 month group respectively) are periods of anxiety and insecurity with a heightening of a need for advice and counsel. Perception of reality is distorted; unrealistic goals (which must necessarily result in frustration) become undifferentiated from realistic expectations. The need for some assistance is clearly much greater in these two groups (more than 60% of the men have such a need) than in the successful (1 year) parole group. Although even here almost $\frac{1}{4}$ of the men had such a need.

In the revoke group, 14 of the 20 men had a serious need in this area which, if available and used, could have had some effect on the eventual revocation.

B.   Relationship to Service Agencies.

There is a highly significant difference between the parole groups and the revoke group on the use of agencies. Whereas only 1/5 of the revoke group seemed to have made any effort to seek out or avail themselves of services, 3/4 of the parole group (24 out of 32 men) had had some agency contact.

In the revoke group there is a very persistent negative attitude to social agencies. Ignorance of available services is not the issue. Only 15% of this group showed attitudes of acceptance of the possible interest and utility of social institutions. The large majority (65%) overtly reject such institutions and the remainder, although not hostile, feel that the agencies would be of little service.

In the parole group only ¼ of the men stated that they were distrustful of, and actively avoid social agencies. However, an additional 25%, although having sought out assistance, failed to obtain the services needed.

C.   Relationship to the Parole Officer.

These findings are discouraging. Less than 1/3 of the parole group find the parole officer interested and helpful. The predominant attitude is "the less I see of him, the better I like it." These men describe their contacts with the parole officer as "five minutes once a month." Only four men, three of them from the 1 year group, describe a supportive, guiding, helpful relationship. For eight of the men, he is seen as a policeman, in the most negative sense A punitive, controlling figure.

The data are similar for the revoke group, although the number of technical violations would indicate more active contact than was seen in the men in the parole group.

Summary.

1.   The released offender has multiple needs which are unmet. These are basic needs, vital to survival and social adjustment.

2.   These unmet needs may be related to failure in parole adjustment.

3.   The revoke group are quite different from parole groups in higher incidence of needs in all need categories. Most significant in vocational, alcohol and drug control, counseling, and family relationships. They also have a more severe criminal history.

4.   In all groups, the needs for social, personal relationships are most unfulfilled and these are least attended to by available social institutions.

5.   Anti-social contacts are less a problem than absence of interpersonal ties.

6. Assistance in making use of services more an issue than the existence of services.

IV. GENERAL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Recidivism rates bear testimony to the ineffectiveness of the release process and reintegration efforts. The majority of the men, the large majority, are poorly equipped and inadequately supported in their efforts to maintain a comfortable and successful extra-mural life. Release plans are concerned in only the most perfunctory manner with a place to live and employment with little or no attention given to the dramatic social-psychological change from institutional life to self-responsibility in the community.

What is most disconcerting is the finding that the correctional process, the release procedure and the post-release parole system tends to enhance the difficulties by a preventing-controlling orientation and the impersonalization of the structures. For example, the offender lacks meaningful personal ties and the discontinuity of the helping persons from corrections to parole prevents the establishment of such ties; the offender has a deep sense of anomie and we direct him to impersonal, uncaring agencies; he is socially isolated and parole restrictions attend only to negative peer relationships; he has a low threshold for anti-social behavior and the stresses of the first six months of release -- financial, occupational, social -- are excessive and unmitigating.

2. A serious question is raised regarding the development of new or different resources to solve some of the problems noted. It appears that many resources are available and the structures of others exist. The major faults lie in the effective use of these resources and these faults are classifiable.

a. Structures exist which do not serve the functions they were designed or intended to serve. For example, the Institutional Case Manager and the Institutional Parole Officer represent two structures within the institution which reasonably could be expected to either directly serve or coordinate pre-release planning. They could provide not only personal, individual attention, but also provide continuity in the post-parole period. Insufficient and inadequately-trained personnel prevent effective functioning of these services.

b. Most offenders do not know how to make use of the variety of private, community, state and federal services. Their life style and social attitudes place them outside of the established social institutions and thus the "accessibility to legitimate opportunities in our society" is prevented (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960). The brochure which is given to the inmate, describing services for offenders, the names and locations of agencies misses the point entirely. He is ignorant of the availability of services not because of a lack of exposure to brochures or publicity, but because he lives his life in active avoidance of the social institutions which provide the services. Further, when not ignorant of the availability of services, he is suspect of the agencies; when not suspicious and not ignorant of availability, he is ignorant of the procedures for negotiating the complex or even simple methods for obtaining assistance.

The passive-dependent position he is placed in within the institution, where services are immediately available (when existent) and the method is the simple submission of a request slip, in no way revises the earlier life pattern with regard to social institutions nor prepares him for taking charge of his life on release.

c. Those private, community, state or federal resources which are not specifically designed to serve the ex-offender are not only ill-prepared to serve such a client, but are frequently antagonistic and actively or passively resistant. Their usual clients are inured to the endless 'red tape', delays of service, multiple referrals, waiting in line, etc. The ex-offender as a client cannot tolerate excessive delay for his relatively peremptory needs. The 'psychology' of the usual client includes a subservient, passive asking in a diffident manner. The ex-offender, typically, cannot accept such a posture and "comes-on" in a much more assertive, if not aggressive style.

The personnel of these agencies need training and support in serving such clients.

It seems appropriate here to comment on the frequently heard questions of the need for special services for offenders. That is, is there a need for agencies specifically designed to serve the offender or ex-offender, or are his needs no different from others in need in our society? It seems clear that his needs are in no way different from the needs of other poor or deprived or disadvantaged or disabled members of society. It is equally clear, however, that both social and psychological factors make the delivery of service to him a significantly different problem, requiring special knowledge and expertise. It does not necessarily follow that special agencies must be established. It does imply that service agencies that are going to be of any value to the offender - ex-offender have staff members with some training or at least awareness of the special problems these men offer.

d. Existing resources, both those established for offenders specifically and the general service agencies do not pay sufficient attention to the multi-need problems of the average ex-offender. He is treated as if he is a man-in-need-of-a-job or in-need-of-money, etc. The majority of the men studied are in need of many services, and these are usually interdependent. Integrated services are required. A number of cases were found in the sample where the lack of integration of services placed the parolee in an impossible situation vis-à-vis his adjustment. In some instances a home and a job were found for the parolee, but the two locations were geographically distant; public transportation was available but required a number of transfers and an excessive amount of travel time. In other cases employment was obtained, but effective functioning on the job itself required a driver's license which he could not obtain. Similar problems existed throughout the sample.

e. A related problem is the lack of coordination and communication among the multiple existing resource agencies. No systematic procedure exists for effective liaison among helping persons from different facilities. The result is not only redundancy of effort, but more damaging to the offender-client is the frequent cross-purposes or delayed or unimplemented referrals with the consequent experience of discouragement and disillusion. Such experiences only serve to reinforce the offender-client's sense of helplessness, hopelessness, and despair at a time - reentry - when the strains and pressures are at a maximum.

f. There are many citizen groups, community agencies, and ex-offender organizations made up of involved and dedicated people willing and capable of offering a variety of services. These agencies are usually understaffed and underfinanced. Although many have professional guidance and supervision, a number sorely lack not only expert advice, but lack even personnel experienced in correctional work.

But there is a more serious problem. Correctional and parole personnel are at best tolerant but non-supportive, and at worst antagonistic to the efforts of these groups. Both passive resistance and active preventive barriers serve to interfere with the delivery of services and inhibit the development of new and expanded services.

The major point of the discussion of the six issues raised above is to give some focus to the failures of the pre and post-release process. Before new structures or procedures are created, thought should be given to whether the available structures are intrinsically ineffective or simply operationally ineffective. Cognizance should be given to the inertia in established systems but certainly, it is not necessary to invent the wheel over and over again.

3. The study has shown that there are a variety of realistic needs that the offender is aware of and can articulate and many needs that he does not perceive or perceives in distorted ways, e.g. life goals, vocational plans. It would also appear that there exist multiple systems, agencies and structures which function to serve just these kinds of needs.

What is clearly missing is the solution or solutions of the logistical problem of delivery of services.

The overall impression from the research findings is that needs are more apt to be met - services delivered - when the offender has available some personal helping "agent", familiar with the community and its services and the precedures for negotiating within the community agencies for these services. Such a helping person fulfills a variety of functions. In the pre-parole group, the greatest need was for some helping, interested person. In the parole groups, successful extra-mural adjustment was directly related to the availability of such a "case manager."

The correctional system has no release system (for the majority of releasees) to aid in the transition from institution to society. Only a small percentage of men are in work release programs and this is the only problem directed by the system The institutional parole officer and the case manager simply doe not serve a pre-release function of any value for these men. The Fellowship program serves another small percentage of men, sponsored, but not directly, by the legally authorized system. The remainder of the men, the large percentage, are simply not served in any meaningful way. All of the data, from all recidivism research, indicate that the reentry period, the release period and the first six months, are the most crucial periods; and yet no special program is developed for this transition. Further, the concept of half-way house or pre-release center is obviously not the solution. This creates a structure, and perhaps an environmental change within a temporal period for very selected men - at most 5 - 10% of the men eligible for parole. But what of the remainder?

It appears obvious that the release system must be one that can accomodate the average releasee. Since 98% of all men currently incarcerated are going to be released, it is also obvious that the halfway house or pre-release center is not the solution for all releasees. Not only would this be economically unfeasible, it would make psychological nonsense. The author sees only 5% of all releasees as appropriate for, and acceptable to, such transitional programs. The criteria for who is acceptable to such programs, although never specified in a way to stand scientific scrutiny, tend to be so restrictive that one would predict successful adjustment for the acceptable releasees if they were placed in any kind of program. The pre-release or post-release residential center does not appear to be the answer to all the problems of transition from prison back into the community. Although no systematic research can be offered, it would seem that the case manager system should be given a high priority for action research consideration. To reduce it to the calculus: if every releasee were assigned to one specific community agent who could evaluate, listen, plan, assist, guide and direct each client with his own specific needs, and if such a helping person had all necessary resources readily available--then either of two outcomes would emerge. Recidivism rates would be reduced, or it would be made clear that anti-social behavior is less a function of personal needs and more a function of character.

The principal findings with regard to needs and services point to the necessity for personal assistance and care in the model of a case manager. Such a person would serve to coordinate and integrate evaluations, services and planning. As stated above, the crucial period covers approximately eight to ten months -- two to four months prior to release and six months following release. Studies of recidivism clearly indicate that considerably more men are returned during the early months after release. Just as clearly, the data from this study indicate the need for personal support and for continuity of support during the transition back into the community. The importance of a person to provide such continuing personal support is far greater than any other transitional or pre-release procedure. In fact, although not directly studied in this project, it would appear that whatever success these structured programs have is directly related to the presence of such a figure.

Whatever developmental, psychological or social factors may be associated with criminal or other anti-social behavior, the released offender is ill-equiped to effect an adaptation to either the complex or even simple demands of society. The great majority of releasees are characterized by some or all of the following social disabilities: little education; poorly trained in work skills; poor work habits along with a negative attitude towards work as a personal or social good; few if any intimate family ties; a lack of close, supportive personal relationships; limited social skills that would enable them to overcome their isolation; inadequate finances; no supportive recreational outlets.

It is recognized that such observations are not new. They are restated here only to accentuate the focus that must be given in the development of reentry programs. The community-based center, which has such current interest, only creates a structure for the possible implementation of an adequate reentry program.

It would appear that the case manager function is in some ways served by the parole officer. However, it has become clear that the focus of the parole officer's attention as a quasi-policeman is incompatible with the role of a service agent. The alternative, having two persons assigned to the care and supervision of a parolee, is not without serious problems of communication, coordination and cooperation. However, the experience with some halfway centers demonstrates that a multi-discipline approach can be carried out effectively.