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Abstract

Rising rates of recidivism and broader recognition of the psychosocial factors involved in desistance from crime have led to an increase in reintegrative discourse and policy in western correctional circles. However, unlike other sentencing objectives, reintegration requires active participation of the community. Building a sense of community ‘readiness’ to support and be actively engaged in an initiative is widely acknowledged as essential to facilitate effective change. The community, as gatekeepers, creates both barriers and opportunities for reintegration. With this condition in mind, this thesis explores community ‘readiness’ to support ex-prisoner reintegration.

The study draws from perspectives such as labelling theory, reintegrative shaming, forfeiture and moral inclusion, rehabilitation, and desistance. It is theorized that these processes underpin community support for reintegration. In addition to measuring support for reintegration as a sentencing objective, the study explores the following features of the system: the link between knowledge of the CJS, instrumental (fear of crime victimization and crime salience) and expressive (beliefs about community confidence in the criminal justice system) concerns; attributions of crime causation (locus of causality, stability and controllability); characteristics of a depicted offender; and, community preparedness to be personally involved in ex-prisoner reintegration as well as in more abstract support for reintegrative policy.

Using survey data from 2,522 members of the Victorian public, the findings indicate an openness within the Victorian community to support the reintegration process. Reintegration was rated lowest as a goal of sentencing, behind incapacitation, deterrence (general), punishment, deterrence (specific), denunciation, and rehabilitation. However, the level of participant support for reintegration was promising. Certain conditions maximised support, with participants indicating greater preference for: abstract support for reintegrative policy over personal involvement in ex-prisoner reintegration; ex-prisoners who demonstrate an ability to be ‘redeemed’; and non-stereotypical ex-prisoner-types.

Results indicate conditional community support for reintegration. Notions of desistance and redeemability, moral inclusion, eligibility and forfeiture, risk, and
economic and social impacts of ex-prisoners on one’s neighborhood underpin support for reintegration. Stability attributions was the strongest predictor of public support for reintegration, although knowledge of the CJS, instrumental and expressive attitudes and crime causal attributions were also influential. In the eyes of the community, successful reintegration is more likely for ex-prisoners who the community perceives does not embody the stereotypical offender, but rather retain characteristics of community members and who demonstrate either a desire, or the ability to be restored to the status of a law-abiding citizen.

It is anticipated that future research will continue to explore factors that influence community support for ex-prisoner reintegration, as a means of gaining greater understanding of how initiatives may best support both the community and the ex-prisoner to actively engage in the reintegration process.
Overview

Across the past two decades, there has been a significant increase in prisoner populations within Australia and other Western jurisdictions, including New Zealand, The United Kingdom, Canada, and America. Crime trends and imprisonment statistics indicate that repeat offenders are over-represented within prisoner populations. At the same time, of those who reoffend, many do so within a short time after release. Together, these statistics indicate that current justice responses, which focus on the punishment and rehabilitation of offenders, are inadequate in terms of effectively addressing recidivism. Recognizing the above limitations, recent correctional foci has begun to acknowledge holistic approaches to offender rehabilitation, which take into consideration the influence of the offender’s environment on his or her offending behavior. Alongside this conceptual approach to reintegration, a focus on those factors seen to support offender desistance from crime has emerged.

The current thesis argues that reintegration represents a criminal justice initiative that supports efforts to reduce recidivism and support desistance from crime. I propose that reintegration is an end-of-sentencing option that, when used in conjunction with criminal sanctioning (whether that be traditional punishment and/or rehabilitation), may address the limitations in current correctional ability to control crime. Reintegration takes an ecological perspective, it is the vehicle through which ex-prisoners may embrace and be embraced into the communities to which they return post-incarceration. Distinct from front-end sanctioning which focuses primarily on the offender, reintegration adds the missing puzzle piece in correctional crime control by considering the wider social environment of the ex-offender. Specifically, reintegration considers how the social environment of the ex-prisoner – the community – impacts on recidivism and desistance from crime.

Theorists such as John Braithwaite and Shadd Maruna have highlighted the impact of reintegrative experiences of ex-prisoners on recidivism, with many encountering obstacles to this process. However, it is argued in this thesis that the role of the community has been largely overlooked in contemporary discourse about reintegration. Accordingly, this thesis aims to explore community views toward the process of reintegration, to investigate community attitudes toward reintegration.
and explore the types of factors that impact on community support for reintegration.

This study represents the first exploration of community attitudes toward reintegration. Prior research has investigated community attitudes toward other crime and justice initiatives, however reintegration has been overlooked. Other research has explored reintegration experiences of ex-prisoners, but largely ignored the role of the community. This thesis therefore represents an important contribution to the literature, by exploring community attitudes toward reintegration. Furthermore, by exploring factors that impact on community reintegration support, the study provides insight into the conditions under which the community is more or less likely to support reintegration. This has practical value for ex-prisoners returning to the community, but also policy value, by highlighting possible factors that can be targeted by initiatives aiming to increase community support for ex-prisoner reintegration.

The first four chapters present the theoretical framework for this thesis. The first chapter provides an overview of re-offending within the context of current criminal justice practices. Special attention is given to the rationale of punishment and the historical context of the various goals of sentencing. Included in this discussion is the emergence of the sentencing objective of rehabilitation, and its rise to and fall from favour in the latter years of the 20th century, culminating in Martinson’s ‘nothing works’ review (Martinson, 1974). The chapter subsequently outlines the re-emergence of contemporary rehabilitation under the ‘what works’ movement (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000), and the introduction of evidence-based rehabilitation programs, including the Risk-Need-Responsivity model (Andrews & Bonta, 2010a, 2010b) and the Good Lives Model of offender rehabilitation (Ward, 2002). The chapter concludes by considering recent movements within the field of corrections towards consideration of the experiences of offenders pre- and post- rehabilitation and incarceration; along with this paradigm shift, the introduction of desistance theory, and the re-emergence of reintegration is also explored. Central to the discussion of Chapter One is the importance of critiques within the field of corrections of traditional goals of sentencing, early rehabilitation, and finally current correctional practices. These critiques are reflective of current limitations...
within corrections to respond to rates of re-offending, and are, as discussed in Chapter Two, applicable to contemporary reintegration.

Chapter Two begins with a review of early criminological theory including Labelling Theory (Becker, 1973; Lemert, 1948), Degradation Ceremonies (Garfinkel, 1956), Reintegrative Shaming (Braithwaite, 1989), and Desistance Theory (Maruna, 2001) all of which, it is argued, provide the context for contemporary reintegration. Next, the chapter reviews literature relating to contemporary reintegration. It is argued that contemporary ex-prisoner reintegration has become a popular term in both corrections and rehabilitation. There exists a lack of clarity in boundaries between rehabilitation and the processes of desistance and reintegration, as well as confusion over definitions, conceptualisations, and implementation of contemporary ex-prisoner reintegration. Paralleling this conceptual disorder is a lack of authoritative guidance within legislation, policy and/or practice. To address these limitations, Chapter Two proposes a definition of contemporary reintegration.

The chapter then explores both symbolic and practical notions of reintegration, with emphasis on two domains of social inclusion – accommodation and employment. In concluding, the chapter returns to the question of the place of reintegration within the current correctional context.

Chapter Three considers two models that relate to contemporary ex-prisoner reintegration; The Three-Part Ecological Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners (Graffam & Shinkfield, 2012) and the Community Readiness Model (Oetting, Donnerneyer, Plested, Edward, Kelly, & Beauvals, 1995; Plested, Smitham, Jumper-Thurman, Oetting, & Edwards, 1999). The chapter reviews the contribution of each of these two models to contemporary reintegration, as it is defined in Chapter Two. The Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance is subsequently presented as a conceptual framework within which to understand the role of the community in the ex-prisoner reintegration process.

The literature presented in Chapters One to Three indicates that despite widespread adoption of reintegration within correctional rhetoric, corrections and academia are only beginning to fully conceptualise and understand this process. Importantly, no prior research has considered the role of the community in this process. In line with
the Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance, this thesis argues that community readiness to engage in ex-prisoner reintegration is fundamental to the success of this process. Yet, no prior research has explored community attitudes toward reintegration.

To gain a better understanding of community support for ex-prisoner reintegration, Chapter Four provides a review of the literature related to community attitudes towards crime and justice initiatives. The chapter begins by reviewing factors shown to influence community support for crime and justice initiatives, specifically knowledge of the criminal justice system, instrumental and expressive attitudes, and crime causal attributions. The chapter also considers the potential impact of community member’s social categorization of an ex-prisoner on its support for ex-prisoner reintegration.

Chapter Five summarises the literature reviewed in chapters One to Four and provides a rationale for the study, study aims and hypotheses. Chapter Six outlines the methodology of the study, including details of participants, the procedures, the survey instrument and the analyses applied to the data, and Chapter Seven presents the results of the study. Chapter Eight summarises and examines the key findings of the study, and concludes with a discussion of the implications in relation to the theoretical conceptualization, and the model of reintegration proposed in the thesis.
CHAPTER ONE: RE-OFFENDING WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF CURRENT CRIMINAL JUSTICE PRACTICES

Across the past two decades there has been a significant increase in prisoner populations in Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2004; 2014b). Criminal justice statistics reveal a 52-percent increase in the ten year period from 1990, and a 37-percent increase in the ten year period from 2000 (ABS, 2001; 2010a). The steady rise in prison populations from 1990 to 2013 is displayed in Figure 1.01. Gelb (2011) reported an increase in Victorian imprisonment rates, from 69.9 adults per 100,000 in 1990 to 105 adults per 100,000 in 2010. This translates to a 50.9-percent increase in imprisonment rates in this 20 year period (Gelb, 2001). More recent statistics indicate continued increases in imprisonment rates since 2010, with Victorian imprisonment rates of 111.7 prisoners per 100,000 yearly (ABS, 2013). This is reflective of a broader trend throughout Australia, with reports of a 3.6-percent increase in prisoner populations across Australian between 2010 and 2013 (ABS, 2013).

Inevitably the vast majority of prisoners return to the community (Petersilia, 2000; Travis, Solomon, & Waul, 2001; Reitan, 1996). However, research suggests that ex-offenders are ‘recycled’ through our justice system, with many released prisoners failing to establish a desistant lifestyle post-imprisonment. In line with this argument, Australian statistics indicate that the number of prisoners re-entering prison is higher than those entering prison for the first time (Weatherburn, 1

---

1 It is acknowledged that major increases in the number of individuals held in custody on remand has contributed to the increase of imprisonment rates in Australia. In the ten years from 2004 to 2014, the number of unsentenced prisoners in Australia has almost doubled from 4,935 to 8,209. Unsentenced prisoners now represented approximately one quarter of all prisoners (up from approximately one fifth in 2004) (ABS, 2014).

2 Victoria is a State within Australia, and is the geographic focus of the current thesis.

3 It is noted that the examination of Indigenous Australian ex-offenders and their communities are not the focus of the current thesis. Indigenous Australians represent a noteworthy sub-population of offenders, and as a minority group are over-represented in corrections, making up 27% of the prisoner population (ABS, 2014).

4 See also, Cunneen, Baldry, Brown, Schwartz, Steel, & Brown (2013) for a thorough exploration of penal culture and practices within Australia.
Froyland, Moffat, & Corben, 2009). As of June 2012, 55-percent of Australian adult prisoners had served at least one prior prison term in an adult prison (ABS, 2013). Data for the number of prisoners in Australia who have served a prior prison sentence compared to those imprisoned for the first time are displayed in Figure 1.1. Several longitudinal studies have reported high rates of reoffending among post-custodial offenders, and the majority of re-offending occurs within two years of being released from custody (Auditor General Victoria, 2003; Drabsch, 2006; Jones, Hua, Donnelly, McHutchison, & Heggie, 2006)⁵.

![Figure 1.0. Number of Prisoners in Australia, change in prisoner populations from 1996 to 2013 (ABS, 2001; 2002; 2003; 2004; 2005; 2006; 2007; 2008a; 2009; 2010a;2011b; 2012;2013).](image)

⁵ It is important to acknowledge that re-offending also occurs within populations of offenders who are placed on community dispositions or diversionary programs. Few research studies have addressed recidivism rates among these populations, and the research that does exist tends to focus on the efficacy of supervision of parolees post-incarceration (see for example, Andrews, Kiessling, Russell, & Grant, 1979). A study by Trotter (1993) reported between 17-28% of offenders on community-based orders or parole received offence-related breaches within one year of receiving the order. While reintegration does apply to all offenders regardless of the type of disposition they receive, the focus in this thesis will be on ex-offenders who have served custodial sentences.
Figure 1.1 Number of prisoners in Australia according to historic imprisonment status (ABS, 2001; 2002; 2003; 2004; 2005; 2006; 2007; 2008a; 2009; 2010a; 2011b; 2012; 2013)
High rates of imprisonment, in the context of high rates of re-offending and subsequent correctional re-entry, suggest current justice responses do not adequately deter individuals from re-offending. Against this backdrop, the current chapter explores historical and current criminal justice approaches to offending. Specific attention is given to rehabilitation, because this sentencing objective is most closely aligned to reintegration (and indeed rehabilitation discourse has influenced contemporary conceptualisations of reintegration).

The chapter begins by providing an overview to the history of correctional responses to criminal behaviour, including a discussion of the limitations of retributive aims of punishment. This discussion will outline the six sentencing goals currently contained in Victorian legislation. The chapter will then turn to consideration of a contemporary approach to crime control; rehabilitation. Evolving historic support for and against rehabilitation will be discussed, and two major contemporary rehabilitation frameworks will be presented; The Risk-Need-Responsivity Model and the Good Lives Model. The chapter will then explore recent ecological perspectives that take into account the experiences of offenders pre- and post-incarceration. It will be argued that exploration of post-incarceration ex-prisoner experiences represents a paradigm shift in corrections, to consider factors that promote desistance from (rather than cause of) crime, and acknowledges the social world to which ex-prisoners return. Contemporary reintegration emerged within this paradigm shift.

The first thesis chapter outlines the correctional context within which reintegration has emerged. This is important for several reasons. First, the chapter identifies that current punishment and rehabilitation approaches have limited impact on re-offending, therefore providing justification to pursue reintegration as the missing ‘puzzle piece’ in crime control. Second, rehabilitation discourse has largely been used to conceptualize contemporary reintegration, thus it is important to identify the historical roots of this correctional aim. Thirdly, rehabilitation has, and still is, subject to several criticisms that - it is argued by this author - are relevant to contemporary reintegration. The chapter identifies these criticisms, as rationale for a study that seeks to better conceptualise reintegration, primarily via exploration of community support for this correctional objective.
The Philosophical ideology of Correctional Punishment

Punishment is a philosophical ideology that drives criminal justice responses to criminal behaviour. One philosophy of punishment argues that any sanction, including imprisonment, serves the dual purpose of punishing the individual for wrongdoing and through this punishment, preventing further crime (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007; Rush, 1997).

The method of formally punishing criminals has changed throughout history. Correctional support for certain sanctions has been influenced by changing legal, criminological and psychological conceptualizations of both crime and its causation (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007; Cullen & Gilbert, 2012; Wilkinson, Bucholtz, & Siegfried, 2004). Shifting social and political ideals about criminal justice policy and solutions to the crime problem have also influenced correctional aims throughout history (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007; Cullen & Gilbert, 2012; Mauer, 2001 Mauer, 2005; Oppenheimer, 1931; von Hirsch, Ashworth, & Roberts, 2009), as have economic pressures to reduce crime via cost-effective means (Mauer, 2001 Mauer, 2005; Oppenheimer, 1913).

Six ‘goals of sentencing’ have emerged as philosophical justifications for punishment: retribution, denunciation, general deterrence, specific deterrence, incapacitation, and rehabilitation (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007; Ministry of Justice, 1997; von Hirsch et al., 2009). To one degree or another, each of these goals has held and maintained a place in punishment rhetoric.

However, balancing each goal of sentencing is difficult in practice, because of their conflicting missions and different approaches to reducing crime (Craig, 2004; Wilkinson, et al., 2004). This is reflected in contemporary sentencing legislation, which frequently lists sentencing aims without providing direction as how judiciary should prioritise each goal (Bartholomew, Carvalho, & Andrews, 2012, November).
All six goals currently exist in sentencing legislation throughout Australia. For example s. 5(1) of the Sentencing Act 1991 (Vic) states:

“The only purpose for which sentences may be imposed are:

a) to punish the offender to an extent and in a manner which is just in all of the circumstances; or

b) to deter the offender or other persons from committing offences of the same or a similar character; or

c) to establish conditions within which it is considered by the court that the rehabilitation of the offender may be facilitated;

d) to manifest the denunciation by the court of the type of conduct in which the offender engaged; or

e) to protect the community from the offender; or

f) a combination of two or more of those purposes” (italics added).

Retribution justifies punishment according to the ‘just desserts’ philosophy: the offender must receive punishment in order to redress the social imbalance caused by his or her crime (Packer, 1968; Rush, 1997; von Hirsch, et al., 2009). Punishment, as a direct response to the criminal act, should match the severity of the crime and be delivered in short temporal proximity to the criminal act (von Hirsch, et al., 2009). Denunciation seeks to condemn the offender’s behaviour as a means to re-establishing the distinction between what is considered law-abiding and that which is deemed criminal behaviour (Lacey, 1988; Ministry of Justice, 1997; Young, 1982). Denunciation confirms the individual’s criminal behaviour as deviant from the community, and therefore worthy of punishment (Walker, 1991; Warr & Stafford, 1984). The third goal, deterrence, seeks to reduce the appeal of criminal behaviour through the act of punishment to both the individual offender (specific deterrence) and the common citizen at large (general deterrence) (Packer, 1968; Roberts & Gebotys, 1989; von Hirsch and Ashworth, 1992). By witnessing

---

6 Legislation that relates to the goals of sentencing throughout Australian jurisdictions is as follows: s. 5(1) of the Sentencing Act 1991 (Vic); s. 3A of the Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999 (NSW); s 9(1) of the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 (Queensland); s. 5(1) of the Sentencing Act 1995 (NT); s. 7(1) of the Crimes (Sentencing) Act 2005 (ACT); s. 3(a)(e) of the Sentencing Act 1997 (Tas); s. 10(1)(1b) of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 (SA)
the punishment of an offender, the other members of the community are deterred from similar acts so as to avoid similar punishment (general deterrence). The offender, in being punished, is deterred from future acts to avoid repeated punishment (specific deterrence). Incapacitation physically removes the criminal from the community so as to eliminate any future opportunities for offender behaviour, thereby protecting the community (Packer, 1968; von Hirsch, et al., 2009; Warr & Stafford, 1984). Finally, rehabilitation seeks to restore or reform offenders by eliminating features of an offender that are believed to produce criminal behaviour. Rehabilitation is based on the theory that offenders are malleable and amenable to reform (Packer, 1968; von Hirsch, et al., 2009; Warr & Stafford, 1984). Factors targeted through intervention are the individual’s attitudes, values and beliefs.

Justifications of punishment as far back as the Middle Ages have incorporated, to some degree, principles aligned with the current aims of retribution, deterrence, incapacitation, and denunciation (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007; Oppenheimer, 1913; Zimring & Hawkins, 1995). In comparison, rehabilitation has emerged over the past 50 years in Western jurisdictions (see, for discussion, Cullen & Gilbert, 2012; Ward & Maruna, 2007). 7

From Retribution to Rehabilitation and Back Again

A correctional surge in the use of rehabilitation programs to respond to offending occurred during the later parts of the 20th century. Cullen and Gendreau (2000) identify two forces that contributed to widespread popularity and implementation of rehabilitation within the criminal justice system (CJS) and ultimately to its acceptance as a goal of sentencing. These were, “the marriage of the ‘new penology’ and ‘positivistic psychology’ [which] resulted in the creation of the

7 It is acknowledged that contemporary conceptualisation of incapacitation is the product of changes in correctional ideology throughout the late 19th and early 20 centuries (Simon, 2012; Zimring & Hawkins, 1995).

8 In actual fact, rehabilitation notions existed in corrections as far back as the late 18th and mid-19th centuries, in the religious and other reformer movements (Robinson & Crow, 2009). Rehabilitation was also a key principle underpinning the establishment of parole services in the early 20th century.
‘rehabilitative ideal’ (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000, p. 116). The ‘new penology’ originated from the National Congress on Penitentiary and Reformation Discipline, where key representatives from the correctional field defined the aim of prison discipline as the reformation of the criminal and not the infliction of retributive suffering (see for discussion, Cullen & Gendreau, 2000; Gutterman, 1992). The individual’s reformation and not the passing of time, they argued, should measure a criminal’s sentence. This led to the implementation of indeterminate sentences (Travis, 2005; Wilkinson, et al., 2004). Under this approach, individuals could indirectly impact their sentence length through their willingness to address and change their offending lifestyle. Indeterminate sentencing emphasised the importance of the offender actively working toward productive pro-social reconnection with society through self-improvement (Travis, 2005).

The second influence resulted from the application of Freudian psychotherapy to offenders in the 1960s (Gendreau, 1996). This was driven by the concept of identifying ‘criminal types’ and targeting these in treatment to remove criminal propensities. In actuality, the focus on the individual is best credited to Lombroso’s positive school of criminology (see for example, Lombroso, 1876), which viewed crime as caused by scientifically discoverable factors impacting on the individual in a deterministic manner. The incorporation of Freudian psychotherapy and Positivistic psychology into correctional thinking re-conceptualised offending behavior as the product of pathological deficiency or sickness that required treatment (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007; Cullen & Gilbert, 2012). Classical theory, which considered offending as a risk-benefit analysis (Cavadino & Gidman, 2007), was replaced by the positivistic view that offenders are sick and therefore could be cured through therapeutic treatment (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000)9.

The rehabilitative ideal led to a paradigm shift in correctional responses to offenders that would hold sway for nearly seven decades into the 20th century.

9 It is acknowledged that classical, positivist accounts of offending and rehabilitation have been critiqued. The critical criminology movement has provided many challenges to positivist theories of crime and offending, including: the impact of power; and, discrimination and criminalisation of people based on gender, mental illness and cognitive disability, and ethnic and cultural background (for example see, Cohen, 1985; Coyle, 2005; Garland, 2001; Hannah-Moffit, 2007; Scraton, 2007; Stern, 1998; Valverde, 2008).
(Wilkinson, et al., 2004). Crime was conceptualized as the product of interacting psychological and social factors, unique to each offender. Rehabilitation identified these factors, then targeted them in treatment, which was customized for the offender according to professional discretion (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000).

An array of rehabilitation programs emerged during the 1960s and 1970s in which a range of individualized foci and treatment methods were adopted. Consistency, transparency and accountability did not occur, and treatment included: behavioural modification programs; counselling; biomedical assistance; vocation-related psychotherapy; and, social skills training (Andrews, 1995; Gendreau & Ross, 1979; Lipsey, 1995; Lipton, Martinson, & Wilks, 1975; McGuire & Priestly, 1995; Morris & Braukman, 1987).

Supporting the emergence of rehabilitation was a body of research highlighting the high economic cost, yet limited effectiveness, of retribution and deterrence-based models in reducing crime and re-offending (Bagaric, 2001). Consequently, the 1960s and 70s saw large-scale governmental support (both politically and economically) for initiatives that purported to rehabilitate criminal propensities (for discussion see Gendreau & Ross, 1979; Lipton et al; 1975 Martinson, 1974; Palmer, 1975).

The widespread implementation of rehabilitative programs soon resulted in a research focus on the way in which rehabilitation might impact on re-offending. A number of infamous evaluations in the 1970s resulted, for example, Lipton, et al., 1975; Martinson, 1974; Whitehead & Lab, 1989). Perhaps the most influential was a meta-analysis conducted by Martinson (1974) that criticized the effectiveness of rehabilitation. Martinson published a comprehensive review of prison rehabilitation programs by drawing together data from 231 studies evaluating a wide range of offender rehabilitation programs. The central question of the review was: ‘what works in prison reform?’ Martinson concluded that “with a few and isolated exceptions...the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism” (p 25).

Martinson is often credited with rehabilitation’s fall from popularity. Although influential, Martinson’s paper cannot be viewed in isolation. Rather, the force of the ‘nothing works’ movement resulted from a paradigm shift in correctional
thinking away from rehabilitation (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000; Day & Howells, 2002). Indeed, Martinson was not the only one to reach such a conclusion. Thirty years earlier, Kirby had claimed that, ‘most [rehabilitation] treatment programs are based on hope and perhaps informed speculation rather than on verified information” (Kirby, 1954, p 373; Cullen & Gendreau, 2000).

The ‘nothing works’ movement was fuelled by a number of criticisms against rehabilitation that research had highlighted. These included: the absence of a coherent theoretical basis to explain rehabilitation’s impact on offending outcomes (Andrews et al., 1990; Andrews, 1995; Petersilia, 2004); the lack of sound research that linked treatment foci with offending behaviour (Emery & Marholin, 1977; Quay, 1977); the variation in levels of professional training and skill within rehabilitative programs (Quay, 1977; Ross & McKay, 1978); the lack of an agreed definition of what rehabilitation actually means (Wright & Dixon, 1977); the lack of support for rehabilitative ideals in correctional settings (Gunnison & Helfgott, 2010; Ward & Brown, 2004); and, insufficient attention being given to questions relating to treatment timing, intensity, dosage, and eligibility (Andrews & Dowden, 2005; Wilkinson, 2005).

In correctional practice, the effectiveness of rehabilitation was criticised. Rehabilitation was too individualist and reductionist, leading to improper use of discretion (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000; Cullen & Gilbert, 2012; Day & Howells, 2002). It did not align with other goals of sentencing (Blumstein & Cohen, 1979). Finally, following two decades of therapeutic rehabilitative practices, high crime rates and prison populations clearly demonstrated the ineffectiveness of rehabilitation at reducing recidivism (Cullen & Gilbert, 2012).

Political movements also critiqued rehabilitation. The use of discretion was seen to be unjust. Conservatives believed that the criminal justice system (CJS) was too lenient on offenders; treatment coddled rather than punished the offender, while discretionary powers given to the judiciary and parole boards allowed for soft sentencing and early release of dangerous criminals back into the community (van de Haag, 1982; Wilson, 1975). The liberals saw discretion as the means of furthering inequality and the coercive powers of the State, who became ‘agents of social control’ (Bayer, 1981; Cullen & Gilbert, 2012) Rehabilitative treatment was
inhumane, providing for the degradation of offenders (Allen, 1981), while removing consistency in punishment and providing for instances of net-widening\(^{10}\) (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000).

Backed by social, political, academic and correctional support, the ‘nothing works’ movement had sufficient momentum. Neither subsequent reviews challenging Martinson’s methodology, or Martinson’s own rejection of his conclusions, had little success in halting the movement away from the rehabilitative treatment of offenders (Brody, 1976; Martinson, 1979; Thornton, 1987, in Day & Howells, 2002). The 1980s saw a reduction in interest in rehabilitative initiatives across western correctional systems (Gendreau, 1996; Howells & Day, 1999; Simon, 1998).

Rehabilitation funding was also reduced. It remains uncertain whether this was a result of less than positive reviews of correctional treatment programs, the broader climate of economic pressures, governmental awareness of both the economic and political benefits of reducing expenditure of socially deviant populations, the broader tendency of correctional agendas cycling in and out of public and government favour, or a combination of all the above (Andrews et al., 1990). Rehabilitation, it appeared, was irrevocably tainted and was no longer a viable correctional aim. The community looked to an alternative, and the ‘justice model’ – or ‘law and order’ approach – (see for discussion, Cullen & Gilbert, 2012) emerged as a dominant goal of sentencing. The justice model was fuelled by reinvention of retributive aims where offenders received their ‘just deserts’ (Cavadino, & Dignan, 2007; Cullen & Gendreau, 2000; Hudson, 1987). Sentencing aims replaced professional discretion with the surety that the severity of penalties would reflect the seriousness of the offence (von Hirsch & Hanrahan, 1978). Discretionary powers of the judiciary, correctional officers and parole boards to mitigate the harshness of criminal sanctions were eroded. Hudson (1987) argues that the justice

\(^{10}\) Net-widening refers to justice responses to criminal behaviour other than incarceration, often diversionary programs that direct offenders away from courts and prisons. Net-widening has also been used to describe instances where the inclusion of alternative sentencing options results in increased offender populations, as those who would otherwise have not received punishment are assigned alternative penalties, and those who would have been imprisoned continue to be incarcerated. The latter description of net-widening is used in the current thesis.
model gained support because it offered all things to all people. For the liberal, discretion was replaced with the consistency of the proportionality principle; for the conservative, ‘swift and sure punishment’ replaced leniency in the system (Hudson, 1987; Cullen & Gendreau, 2000).

However, support for rehabilitation was not completely lost. The progression of large-scale statistical analysis, through the development of meta-analytical procedures, produced refined evaluations of rehabilitation programs (Lipsey, 1992; Gendreau & Ross, 1979; McGuire & Priestly, 1995; Petersilia, 2004; Petresino, 2005; Wormith, Althouse, Simpson, Reitzel, Fagan, & Morgan, 2007). Subsequent reviews argued that the decisive ‘nothing works’ conclusion overstated the true complexity of rehabilitation programs (Gendreau, 1996; Gendreau & Ross, 1979; Grendreau & Ross, 1987; Lipsey, 1995; Lösel, 1995; Palmer, 1975; Thornton, 1987). A number of published meta-analytic reviews demonstrated a significant between- and inter-group variation when psychological interventions to reduce re-offending were compared to non-treatment groups (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000). It appeared some rehabilitation methods were effective.

The few remaining rehabilitation programs allowed evaluators, adopting much more robust designs than in the past, to undergo more informed assessments of efficacy (Lipsey 1995; Petrosino, 2005). Interventions were found to have a positive net gain on re-offending outcomes, with some intervention programs resulting in lower re-offending outcomes than others (Andrews, Zinger, Hodge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990; Antonowicz & Ross, 1994; Day & Howell, 2002; Lipton, Pearson, Cleland, & Yee, 1997). Empirical reviews reached broadly similar conclusions. Hollin (1999) estimated an average variation in effectiveness of rehabilitation programs between 5-percent and 18-percent. McGuire (1995, 1996, 2000) reviewed 10 meta-analytic studies of rehabilitation programs conducted between 1985 and 1996, resulting in a cumulative sample of 50,000 offenders. Positive effect sizes (+0.10 to +0.36) in recidivism were reported across all studies (McGuire, 2000).

The identification of effective rehabilitation within certain contexts led to a shift from the ‘nothing works’ position towards identifying which program factors predicted positive intervention outcomes (Day & Howell, 2002). A large body of
research emerged that asked, ‘what works for whom, where and when?’ (also known as the ‘what works’ movement). The outcome of this investigation was a set of empirically supported ‘principles of effective intervention’, said to maximise the efficacy of rehabilitation interventions, and a re-emergence of rehabilitative ideals (Andrews, 1995; Andrews & Bonta, 2010a).

In the meantime, the justice model demonstrated limited impacts on reoffending rates (Applegate, 1997). It is likely that initial limitations of the sentencing objective were never addressed, but rather retribution regained correctional favour as it provided a punishment alternative in stark contrast to rehabilitation. A number of limitations in the model emerged (see for example, Cullen & Gilbert, 2012; Hudson, 1987, 1993, 1996). The shortcoming of the justice model include: the economic burden of increasing imprisonment rates, alongside evidence of high recidivism following release, and dramatic increases in prison populations in the two decades since the 1980s (Applegate, 1997); lengthy and mandatory imprisonment terms with little room for discretion, leading to a ‘one size fits all’ approach; erosion of human rights under indeterminate sentencing, and post-sentence supervision and detention legislation; a return to classical retribution ideology, without consideration of the initial shortcomings of this approach; failure to take into account the complexity of criminal behavior; and, the increasing trend for government justification of justice-based policies, based on the reductionist argument that incarceration is effective in controlling crime (rather than incarceration being a justifiable punishment for offenders). (Cullen & Gilbert, 2012; Hudson, 1987)

The ideology of the justice model remains in contemporary justice policy and practice (Cavadino & Dignan, 2006; Cavadino & Dignan, 2007; Cullen & Gendreau, 2000). This is particularly evident in the political and populist push toward the ‘new punitiveness.’ This approach justifies punishment, in particular incarceration, as effective in crime control (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007).¹¹ At the

¹¹ This is perhaps best reflected in legislation and policy changes in response to highly publicized heinous sexual offences, which include: the United State Congress’ amendment to the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act, 1994, for community notification of sexual offenders—commonly known as ‘Megan’s Law’ (Levenson,
same time, the reintroduction of rehabilitation under the ‘what works’ movement has led to an uneasy dual-focus on punishment and rehabilitation in sentencing practices, with little direction within legislation (Bartholomew, et al., 2012, November). The thesis will now turn to the discussion of rehabilitation under the ‘what works’ movement. Following this, criticism levelled against contemporary rehabilitation (the modified expression of rehabilitation discussed thus far) will be considered.

The Risk-Need-Responsivity Model

Rehabilitation re-emerged under the ‘what works’ movement, which argued that those rehabilitation programs that adhered to empirically supported principles – known as the ‘best practice principles’ – did in fact significantly reduce recidivism (Andrews, 1995; Andrews & Bonta, 2010a, 2010b; Andrews & Dowden, 2005; Lipsey, 1992; Cullen & Gendreau, 2000). Appropriately designed intervention programs in line with the best practice principles have been shown to produce an average reduction in recidivism of over 50%, compared to those ‘inappropriate’ interventions which do not adhere to the principles of best practice that, in many cases, actually lead to increased recidivism (Day & Howell, 2002).

The empirically derived principles include: multi-level assessment of risk; identification of an offender’s criminogenic needs; and, consideration of factors that may affect an offender’s responsiveness to treatment endeavors, and program integrity, among others (Andrews, 1995; Andrews & Bonta, 2010a, 2010b). These principles are considered below.

The principles of effective intervention, specifically those of risk, need and responsivity, form part of the Psychology of Criminal Conduct (PCC) (Andrews & Bonta, 2010a). The PCC is an approach to the study of variability between individuals in their propensity to commit criminal behaviour and through this, a study of criminal conduct itself. The PCC is not a theory of criminal conduct, but

D’Amora, & Hern, 2007); and, the almost total suspension of parole board powers in Victoria in response to the murder of Jill Meagher by a previously convicted sexual offender (Callinan, July 2013; Victoria Sentencing Advisory Council, March 2012).
rather encompasses several theories of criminal behavior, including Psychodynamic and Control, Social Location, Differential Association and Personal Interpersonal Community-Reinforcement perspectives (Andrews & Bonta, 2010a). Neither is it purely an approach to the assessment of criminal factors, or a treatment directive; rather it encompasses all these. Andrews and Bonta (2010a) define the PCC as:

“...an approach to understanding the criminal behaviour of individuals through (a) the ethical and humane application of systematic empirical methods of investigation, and (b) the construction of rational explanatory systems.

“...the ethical application of psychological knowledge and methods to the practical tasks of predicting and influencing the likelihood of criminal behaviour (p. 2).”

The approach allows for the identification of principles of rehabilitation that are empirically supported as best practice, and at the same time can be conceptualised into a model of intervention to address those factors supporting criminal conduct. Accordingly, Andrews, Bonta and Hodge (1990) identify three principles of rehabilitation; risk, need and responsivity. Together, these become the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) model of offender rehabilitation (Andrews, et al., 1990; Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2006). The RNR model acknowledges that not every offender sub-group would respond to having the same issues ‘rehabilitated’ (Andrews, et al., 2006; Andrews & Bonta, 2010a; Day, Bryan, Davey, & Casey, 2006; Day & Howells, 2002). It identifies key characteristics of those intervention programs shown to be effective in reducing recidivism (Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Bonta & Andrews, 2007). This is achieved via the risk, need, and responsivity principles.

‘Risk’ refers to the individual’s likelihood of engaging in criminal behaviour. Risk is measured in terms of ‘criminogenic factors’ (i.e. factors that contribute to offending). Two types of factors are identified: ‘static factors’, including age of first arrest, number of previous arrests, current age; and dynamic factors, including accommodation, employment, substance use, and antisocial attitudes (Ogloff & Davis, 2004). Unlike stable factors, dynamic factors are considered amenable to
change. Risk can be measured using actuarial or clinical means (although it has been argued that the latter is significantly less reliable) (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Ward & Maruna, 2007). Risk factors are believed to vary across individuals and situations (McGuire, 2000; Ward & Maruna, 2007).

An offender is considered ‘high’ risk, if he or she is identified to have a number of criminogenic factors. According to the principle of risk, medium- to high-risk offenders should be targeted for intensive treatment programs (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Day & Howell, 2002). These individuals possess more criminogenic factors, which can be targeted and reduced in treatment. As such, they are more likely than ‘low’ risk offenders to benefit from intervention (Andrews & Bonta, 2003).

A criminogenic need represents a deficiency or abundance within the offender’s life, which contributes to an individual’s criminal behaviour(s). Criminogenic needs include attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviours of the offender that support, deviance, negative attitudes toward authority and offending behaviour (Andrews & Bonta, 2010a; Day, 2005). Examples include poor problem-solving abilities, impulsiveness and substance-abuse problems (Ward & Maruna, 2007). The second principle, ‘need’, asserts that treatment programs should address the ‘criminogenic’ needs of the offender (Andrews & Bonta, 2010a, 2010b).

The third principle of RNR, responsivity, refers to the way the individual reacts to, or interacts with treatment. This principle has implications for the way rehabilitation should be delivered (Bonta & Andrews, 2007; Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2006), as maximum treatment effects will result when treatment delivery is adjusted to suit the individual characteristics of the offender (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Ward & Maruna, 2007). That is to say, the responsivity principle acknowledges that not all offenders are the same, and therefore treatment should be tailored to the individual. Responsivity is further divided into general and specific responsivity. General responsivity refers to the use of treatment modalities that are effective. Social learning processes and CBT-based interventions are emphasised (Dowden & Andrews, 2004; Gendreau, French & Gionet, 2004; Gendreau & Ross, 1987; Lipsey, 1999; MacKenzie, 2000; Palmer, 1995). Specific responsivity refers to individual factors that may limit the effectiveness of treatment interventions. These individual factors include, motivation, individual learning styles, language
and cultural influences, and mental health issues (Cullen, 2002; Day & Howell, 2011). These individual factors are often conceptualised as non-criminogenic needs, that likely impact on the individual’s ability to engage in treatment (Ogloff & Davis, 2004).

According to several authors (Andrews & Bonta, 2010a, 2010b; Andrews & Dowden, 2006; Lipsey, 1992; Howells, Day, Bryne, & Bryne, 1999; Hollin, 1999; Taxman, Thanner, & Weisburd, 2006), extensive empirical research has demonstrated that reduced recidivism rates are the direct result of treating offenders according to the three principles underlying the RNR model. For example, Andrews and Bonta (2006) report a reduction in recidivism between treated (RNR) and non-treated offenders in residential/custodial and community settings (17% and 35%, respectively). Other authors point to meta-analyses that have demonstrated that offender rehabilitation programs, aligned with the RNR-model, report higher effect sizes than those that do not address the three principles of RNR (Andrews & Bonta, 2010a, 2010b; Andrews & Dowden 2006; Hollin, 1999; Lipsey, 1992, but see for discussion, Hollin, 1999).

The RNR model currently represents the prevalent framework for offender rehabilitation in the United States, Canada, England, Australia and New Zealand (Howells, et al., 1999; Ogloff & Davis, 2004). Research supports the effectiveness of RNR-based programs. Reviews report reductions in recidivism that range from 10- to 30-percent (depending on source, offender type, definition of recidivism, and length of follow-up) (Bonta & Andrews, 2007; Hansen et al., 2002; Lösel & Schmucker, 2005; Schmucker, & Lösel, 2008). Bonta and Andrews (2007) report that, when rehabilitation programs adhere to the three principles of RNR, the reduction in recidivism is at best between 17- and 35-percent (custodial and community settings respectively). These represent statistically significant reductions in reoffending (Marshall & McGuire, 2003). Further, Bonta and Andrews (2007) note that RNR-based programs compare favorably to other justice interventions (such as police clearance rates) and even widely accepted pharmacological treatments such as aspirin, chemotherapy (for breast cancer) and bypass surgery (for cardiac event) (also see, Andrews, et al., 2007; Andrews & Bonta, 2010a; Lipsey & Wilson, 1993).
Nevertheless, RNR-informed approaches to rehabilitation are not without their critics. A number of critiques have originated from a variety of correctional and academic sources. These include: critique of the theoretical underpinning of the RNR model and PCC thesis; criticism of the key principles within the RNR approach; emerging evidence of low adherence to the principles of RNR in practice; prevalence of high recidivism rates despite widespread adoption of the RNRs tenets; questioning of the utility of seeking to identify factors that cause crime (when these may have no bearing on the achievement of desistance); and, objections to RNRs underlying deficit-based or medical focus (Bartholomew, Pearson, Doroc, Andrews, & Brookstein, 2011, October; Birgden, 2004; Birgden, 2008; Farabbee, Prendergast, Cartier, Wexler, Knight, & Anglin, 1999; Lipsey, 1999; Ogloff & Davis, 2004; O’Leary & Carson, 2009; Purvis, Ward, & Willis, 2011; Taxman & Bouffard, 2000; Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Stewart, 2003a, 2003c; Ward, 2002; Ward & Brown, 2002; Ward, Day, Howells, & Birgden, 2004; Ward & Gannon, 2006; Ward & Maruna, 2007; Ward, Malser, & Yates, 2007; Ward & Stewart, 2003a; 2003c). Critiques are discussed below.

To begin, the theoretical assumptions of the RNR model have been critiqued (Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward, Melser, & Yates, 2007; Ward & Stewart, 2003c). The risk, need and responsivity principles originated from empirical evaluations that identified factors common to treatment programs shown to be effective in reducing recidivism. As such, the principles of best practice were not founded on theory. While the PCC draws on a number of psychological and criminological theories in its explanation of differential criminal construct, it is essentially the “application of systematic empirical methods of investigation, and… the construction of rational explanatory systems” (Andrews & Bonta, 2010a, pp. 4). Thus, the PCC cannot provide a strong theoretical basis for the RNR approach. Furthermore, Ward and colleagues (2007) highlight that the PCC is concerned with factors that cause crime, and this does not align with contemporary correctional emphasis on factors that support desistance from crime.

The principles are deficit-focused and fail to consider the offender holistically (Ward & Brown, 2004). In practice, treatment focuses on the removal of factors or characteristics within the offender which promote crime, but does not also promote...
the development or implementation of positive, pro-social factors that support desistance. For example, Ward (Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Maruna, 2007; Ward et al., 2007; Ward & Marshall, 2004) identified the following as positive factors that should be included in rehabilitation intervention: healthy living and functioning; skills development; pursuit of hobbies; relatedness (social connectedness); and, spirituality.

The three key principles of the RNR model – risk, need and responsivity – have been criticized. There are numerous critiques of the principle that ‘high risk’ offenders be prioritised in treatment. First, identification and classification of offender ‘risk’ is premised on the availability of empirically supported assessment tools that, importantly, are applicable to various offender types and sensitive to individual characteristics (such as age, gender, race, culture). In practice, there are limited actuarial tools available. Further, very few actuarial measures are developed which reliably reflect the differences of these sub-populations of offenders (see for discussion, Barrera, Castro, & Biglan, 1999; Dawson, 1999, October; Kane, Bechtel, Revicki, McLaughlin, & McCall, 2011).

It has been argued that high risk offenders have greater potential than low risk offenders to demonstrate appreciable results from intervention. This is because high risk offenders by their selection naturally have more chronic offending patterns (Bonta & Andrews, 2007). Essentially, there exists a selection bias. Furthermore, evaluative studies that exclude ‘drop out’ offenders – those that are high risk but do not complete treatment – may overlook limitations in RNR’s ability to treat a subsample of high risk offenders (Willis & Ward, 2010). On the other hand, some studies have reported a sub-group of ‘natural desisters’ – that is, offenders who desist from crime without any ‘treatment’ (Willis & Ward, 2010). This subgroup may elevate efficacy results.

Critics of the criminogenic needs and responsivity approach argue that these principles represent a return to the individualised treatment approaches of early rehabilitation (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007). Empirical studies have demonstrated that divergence from the standardization of the RNR undermines the effectiveness of interventions. Additionally, both principles are limited by the lack of available empirical knowledge, particularly when referring to sub-populations (e.g. minority
ethnic groups). In fact, contrary to individualizing treatment, assessments and interventions have often given lip service to the criminogenic needs and responsivity factors of an individual offender, and have applied a ‘one size fits all’ approach to rehabilitation (Farabee et al., 1999; Taxman & Boulfard, 2000; Ward, 2007; Ward, et al, 2007). Furthermore, there is limited theoretical underpinning to the distinction between criminogenic and non-criminogenic needs. While criminogenic factors have been identified as contributing to recidivism, the construct is influenced by social norms (via the determination of what is legal versus illegal).

Application of the RNR model to correctional practice has encountered difficulties (Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward et al., 2007). Systematic reviews of rehabilitation programs have revealed that a limited number of active programs, between 10- and 40-percent, actually adhere to the principles of RNR (Bonta, Rugge, Scott, Bourgon, & Yessine, 2008; Morgan Flora, Kroner, Mills, Varghese, & Stefan, 2007; Gendreau, Little & Goggin, 1996; Smith, Gendreau & Swartz, 2009). In one study (Morgan et al., 2007, cited in Day, Ward & Shirley, 2011), less than 1-percent ($N=6$) of the forensic mental health services documentation reviewed made reference to targeting criminogenic needs, while over half of the programs reviewed (61% of $N=230$) failed to reach a basic adherence to the principles of RNR. A similar study found only 10-percent of rehabilitation programs reviewed satisfactorily adhered to the principles of best practice (Gendreau, Little & Goggin, 1996).12

The efficacy of RNR to reduce recidivism has also been critiqued13. It was noted earlier that RNR-based programs report reductions in recidivism that range from 10- to 35-percent. (Bonta & Andrews, 2007; Hansen et al., 2002; Lösel & Schmucker, 2005; Schmucker, & Lösel, 2008). While a 100-percent reduction in

---

12 Low adherence of rehabilitation programs to the RNR model led Andrews and colleagues to incorporate a fourth principle that emphasised the importance of program integrity (Day & Howells, 2002; Dowden & Andrews, 2004). However, Andrews and Bonta (2010a, p. 46) acknowledge the limitations of RNR applications; “unfortunately, in the ‘real world’ of routine correctional practice, adhering to the principles is a challenge.”

13 It is noted that alongside the challenges to contemporary rehabilitation noted in text, much of the RNR research findings are based on American samples, which have limited applicability to Australia (also see, Cunneen, et al., 2013).
recidivism would be unrealistic, critics argue that the application of RNR alone is a narrow approach to addressing recidivism. Rather, alternative initiatives should be explored, as these in conjunction with RNR may result in greater reduction in recidivism.

Critics have argued that the RNR model is too narrow in its conceptualisation of the offender. While targeting criminogenic needs is necessary in rehabilitation, this approach is insufficient if it fails to consider the offender from a broader perspective (Craig, 2004; Ward & Gannon, 2006). The RNR model is a deficit model in that it considers the offender only in terms of those characteristics that directly relate to criminal behaviour. These include: the “reduction of maladaptive behaviours, elimination of distorted beliefs, removal of problematic desires, and the modification of emotions and attitudes that promote offending” (Ward & Brown, 2004, p. 245). Of note, these philosophies are inconsistent with other justice system positions that ascribe agency to offenders, and punish them accordingly (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007; Hudson, 1987). A doctrine of offending behavior, as driven by empirically supported patterns of psychological deficits and abundances, essentially throws into question many of the correctional system’s practices that assume volition. Consequently, rehabilitation sits at odds with other sentencing objectives.

The narrow focus on high risk offenders neglects the wider psychosocial context of the offender, both prior to criminal behaviour and post-release, and fails to consider the offender holistically (Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Stewart, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c) For example, research indicates a high over-representation of the uneducated and unskilled, mentally ill, minority cultures and those of low socioeconomic status within offender populations (Petersillia, 2004). Ward and Stewart (2003c; Ward, Yates, & Willis, 2011) and others (Ellerby, Bedard, & Chartrand, 2000; Maruna, 2001) argue effective treatment interventions should incorporate a strengths-based perspective, and focus on the skills and resources required by individuals to function in the particular contexts into which they are likely to be. Intervention should address external factors that may constrain the ability of offenders to desist from re-offending, such as opportunities, resources and social identities (Ward & Maruna, 2007).
Critiques aimed at the deficit-focus of RNR reflect the limitations of rehabilitation more generally. Correctional rehabilitation approaches have a narrow focus on treatment factors that are seen to directly associate with offending (see Palmer, 1983, for a review), and do not consider the wider context of the offender, nor those positive factors within the offender and his or her environment that have the potential to be maximized to assist desistance from crime (Craig, 2004). Craig (2004) argues that much of the offender treatment research has focused on “the characteristics and/or outcomes of the study population…rather than on social factors (i.e., prison social structure, therapeutic community social structure, etc.) that may also influence outcome” (2004, p. 107S).

The critiques levelled against contemporary rehabilitation are relevant and worth consideration. Those identified above highlight areas of improvement in current correctional rehabilitation practices. This is not to argue for a return to the ‘nothing works’ ideology. Rather, what is presented is the introduction of supplementary approaches to responding to offending.

**Beyond the Deficit Model: Re-conceptualizing the Offender within an Ecological (Psychosocial) Perspective**

The RNR model has contributed to the reduction of recidivism, although critics argue that this contribution is limited. It wasn’t long before research began to focus on how to maximize the ‘leftover’ recidivism that resisted RNR interventions. This research focused on enhancing the impact of therapeutic-based interventions. In addition to the improvement of the RNR model itself and the expression of the various principles encompassed within the model, two other initiatives – parallel yet opposite in focus – emerged. The first was a ‘looking back’ orientation that considered offender readiness for treatment. The rationale here was to prepare clients better for RNR-based treatment and to ensure that only ‘treatment amenable’ clients graduate from readiness-based programs to RNR-based treatment programs (Ward et al., 2004; Ward, Day). In actuality, this focus was not new; rather, it was revitalized by models such as the Multifactor Offender Readiness Model (Ward et al., 2004).
The second initiative was a ‘looking forward’ orientation that considered the impact of various factors contributing to offenders’ experiences after treatment completion. This included both the experiences of offenders returning to the community and attempting to gain housing, employment and social relationships (to name a few), but also a reframing of the recidivism focus from etiology to desistance from crime. Desistance Theory (Maruna, 2001), the Good Lives Model (Ward, 2002a; 2002b), and Ex-prisoner Reintegration14 fall under this second approach. The Good Lives Model is discussed below. Desistance Theory and Reintegration are introduced in Chapter Two.

The Good Lives Model of offender rehabilitation.

According to the Good Lives Model (GLM; Ward, 2002a; 2002b; Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Stewart, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c), all human beings aspire to live a fulfilling, satisfying and meaningful life. The GLM defines this as a ‘good life’. In the pursuit of a good life, individuals seek out certain types of ‘human goods’ (Ward & Maruna, 2007; Ward & Stewart, 2003a, 2003c). ‘Primary’ goods are based on a person’s basic psychological needs; they are actions, characteristics, experiences, and states of mind that are intrinsically beneficial to human beings. ‘Secondary’ or instrumental goods, on the other hand, provide concrete ways of achieving primary goods, and include family and social networks, employment and recreational activities (Ward, Vess, Gannon, & Collie, 2006). The GLM argues that well-being is enhanced when an individual is equipped with the capabilities to achieve his or her needs and interests (Purvis, 2010; Purvis, et al., 2011; Ward & Maruna, 2007). As such, the GLM is “essentially a capabilities or strength-based approach…to equip individuals with the necessary internal and external conditions (capabilities) to secure primary human goods in socially acceptable and personally meaningful ways” (Ward & Stewart, 2003c, p. 356).

14 It is acknowledged that many offenders and ex-offenders do not come to the attention of the CJS or receive sanctions that do not involve imprisonment. Nevertheless, as noted previously (footnote 5) the current thesis focuses primarily on ex-prisoner reintegration. This terminology has been used throughout, except where it is more accurate to refer to ex-offenders as a larger subpopulation.
It is claimed that offending behaviour occurs when individuals are not able to achieve these primary needs via legitimate means (Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Maruna, 2007). It follows that movement away from criminal behaviour will occur when the individual is given the knowledge, skills, resources and opportunities to attain a ‘good life’ via legitimate means. Thus, the GLM supports desistance from crime (Ward & Maruna, 2007).

The GLM adopts an ecological framework in relation to human behavior, as it recognizes that a number of environmental factors work to restrict the offender from achieving human needs (Ward & Maruna, 2007). This is in line with the Ecological Systems Theory proposed by Bronfenbrenner (1979). According to the Ecological Systems Theory, humans are embedded within their environments – or ‘nested structures’. An individual and his or her environment are theorised to impact and influence one another in a bidirectional manner. Three levels or systems were identified by Bronfenner: the microsystem (the individual); the exosystem (e.g. interpersonal connections, such as the family which surrounds the individual); and, the macrosystem (e.g. sociocultural norms and institutions). The microsystem is theorized to be embedded within the exosystem, which in turn is embedded within the macrosystem.

Ecological Systems Theory is holistic, and identifies the importance of the environment in human behavior. The approach assumes that human behavior can be (at least in part) explained by the environment in which an individual is located. Similarly, the GLM assumes that offenders achieve a ‘good life’ via their connectedness and interactions with their environment (Ward & Maruna, 2007). Achieving a ‘good life’ occurs when an individual is situated within a community that provides, among other things, emotional support, material resources and education. From this perspective, reoffending is the result of negative interactions between the individual and his or her community (for thorough discussion of the GLM, see Purvis et al., 2011).

Limited evidence supports the GLM’s effectiveness in supporting desistance or reducing reoffending. This is due to the new emergence of the GLM approach to rehabilitation and its application within an RNR-based paradigm. Furthermore, the model’s psychosocial premise almost prevents testing (how does one measure
constructs such as connectedness?), and ecological nature limits standardization or manualisation across offender groups. Nevertheless, early evaluations are positive. The GLM has been incorporated in various offender interventions worldwide, including American, Canada, England, Australia and New Zealand (Ward & Maruna, 2007). Offender programs that reflect the principles of the GML have been linked with lower rates of recidivism and positive treatment outcomes (Barnett, Manderville-Norden, & Rakestrow, 2014; Harkins, Flak, Beech, & Woodhams, 2012; Ward & Maruna, 2007; Willis & Ward, 2014). For example, the ‘Make It Work’ program in Victoria (Graffam, Edwards, O’Callaghan, Shinkfield, & Lavelle, 2006) promotes positive lifestyle changes in young offenders. Alternative (non-criminal) models of living are established through mentoring and vocational training. Lower rates of re-offending, as well as reduced drug and alcohol problems, and improved housing, employment and social relationships have been shown in individuals completing the program (Ward & Maruna, 2007).

There are challenges to the GLM doctrine. First, the GLM is founded on a belief of individual self-determination; an individual via his or her own rational choice seeks out ‘human goods’ via anti-social means (where pro-social means of achieving ‘human goods’ are unachievable or undesirable to the offender). This is a throwback to classical criminological theory of rational-choice approaches to offending (or re-offending) behaviour (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007; Cullen & Gendreau, 2000), which sit in contrast to the RNR-based pathological and deficit-based rhetoric (Ogloff & Davis, 2004). However, consideration of the offender’s environment is counter to self-determinism. Differences in philosophy and logic between RNR and GLM-based approaches lead to confusion in the implementation of any rehabilitation initiative incorporating both approaches (Ogloff & Davis, 2004). Second, the GLM’s emphasis on primary and secondary goods suggests a treatment focus incorporating non-criminogenic factors such as self-esteem and wellbeing. Such broad foci look similar to treatment programs predating the ‘what works’ movement that has been shown to have negligible effects on re-offending rates (Andrews, et al., 1990; Andrews, 1995; Andrews & Dowden, 2005; Petersilia, 2004; Wilkinson, 2005). Finally, although incorporating an ecological perspective, the GLM continues to focus almost exclusively on the offender. This narrow focus
Chapter Summary

Chapter one aimed to outline the context within which contemporary reintegration has emerged. The chapter identified historical and contemporary approaches to crime control, with emphasis on rehabilitation as a dominating ideology of correctional punishment. In doing so, the chapter provided a rationale for looking beyond punishment and rehabilitation to approaches that, in conjunction with current responses, may promote desistance from crime. It was argued that reintegration represents one such approach. Thus, the chapter provided a rationale for exploring the correctional objective of reintegration.

The chapter began by identifying current trends of high imprisonment and reimprisonment rates in Australia. It was argued that this is the result of limitations within the CJS to respond effectively to crime and recidivism. The six current goals of sentencing were presented; retribution, general deterrence, specific deterrence, denunciation, incapacitation, and rehabilitation. These sentencing goals provide differing justification for punishment. As such, the differing goals are rarely applied in unison; the different goals of sentencing have received varying degrees of support throughout history, according to varying social, political, and economic climates, which has resulted in the popularity in application of one goal of sentencing over the others.

The goal of rehabilitation was discussed. This discussion was important, as rehabilitation is the goal of sentencing most aligned to reintegration. RNR-based rehabilitation is distinct from the other ‘traditional’ goals as it represents a movement away from the classical conceptualization of crime as a purely rational choice. Under the GLM, rehabilitation takes into account the ecological perspective of offending, which is a primary principle of reintegration.

The introduction of rehabilitation into correctional policy resulted in increased psychological thinking and research in this area. This, in conjunction with
criticisms levelled against early rehabilitation, led to a strong emphasis on empirically supported intervention in contemporary corrections, which underlies the rationale of the current study. An alternative rationale of punishment – reintegration in the current study – should, in its development, be founded on empirical research. Reintegration should also draw from the lessons of early rehabilitation in order to avoid a similar fate within correctional policy and practice.

The return of rehabilitation did not eliminate the ‘get tough on crime’ movement. Rather, contemporary correctional practices include a dual model of punishment that incorporates both punitive and rehabilitative ideals. While there is a strong emphasis on imprisonment as a response to crime, offenders are expected to return to the community as reformed citizens. However, this is not occurring in practice (Petersilia, 2000, 2009). Under the Good Lives Model of offender rehabilitation (GLM; Ward, 2002a; b; Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Maruna, 2007; Ward & Stewart, 2003c), the ecological perspective of the offender is taken, with consideration of the impact of environmental and social forces on offending and desistance. It was argued that the GLM represents a shift in correctional ideology, to consider the offender holistically and promote factors that support desistance from crime. Under this new paradigm, contemporary reintegration has emerged.

Current crime control approaches have limited impact on re-offending. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider alternative or complementary approaches to more effectively promote desistance from crime. Ex-prisoner reintegration was proposed as a complementary approach to punishment, which can assist ex-prisoners to desist from crime via positive re-engagement with their communities.

Chapter Two will explore the re-emergence of reintegration, influenced not only by its criminological origins, but also the desistance paradigm within which it has returned, as well as dominating rehabilitation thinking.
CHAPTER TWO: DEFINING REINTEGRATION

Chapter Overview

The previous chapter outlined current correctional responses to high rates of recidivism. Limitations of the justice model as well as RNR-informed rehabilitation were presented and discussed. Criticisms of both these correctional responses to crime and recidivism were outlined. In particular, the need was established for correctional responses that are evidence-based, transparent, accountable, and cost-effective. Special attention was paid to the limitations of the RNR model of rehabilitation. It was argued that this model is overly narrow and deficit-focused. In response to these limitations, movement has occurred within corrections but also academia, towards viewing the ex-offender within a wider psychosocial context.

The Good Lives Model (GLM; Ward 2002a; 2002b; Ward & Stewart, 2003a, 2003c) was discussed as an example of the changing focus within rehabilitative and correctional practice. The GLM is seen to provide a broader lens through which the offender is conceptualised. The GLM acknowledges the impact of interactions between the offender and his or her community that contribute to criminal behaviour (Purvis, 2010; Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Marshall, 2004; Ward & Maruna, 2007). Consideration of the psychosocial context has also led to theories which consider the potential for the community to engage in the process of desistance from crime to be incorporated into correctional responses to crime (Maruna, 2001; Maruna, 2006; Maruna & King, 2004).

This re-framing of the offending process within a broader psychosocial context, has led to a renewal of interest in a correctional objective that occupied a prominent place in the rhetoric and practice of western jurisdictions throughout the mid- to late-20th century – reintegration (Travis, 2005; Wilkinson, 2002). The origins of reintegration can be traced to criminological theories in the late 20th century (Braithwaite, 1989; Becker, 1973; Garfinkel, 1956; Lemert, 1951).

Renewed interest in reintegration has been marked by an explosion of literature on the subject, including numerous debates over which party has responsibility for the delivery of reintegration and how reintegration is best defined. A plethora of
correctional programs purported to encompass reintegrative aims, and justice policies promoting reintegration have emerged.

Chapter Two aims to identify the origins of reintegration, and outline the emergence of contemporary reintegration within current correctional rehabilitation-dominated discourse and practice. The chapter will consider current limitations of contemporary reintegration, particularly the lack of clarity and consensus as to what constitutes reintegration. To address these limitations, a comprehensive definition of reintegration will be developed. The sites or ‘domains’ in which reintegration can be said to occur will be presented and discussed. Chapter Two will conclude by discussing the location of reintegration in correctional practice and criminal justice legislation.

**Origins and Development of Reintegration**

Reintegration as a criminological perspective is best credited to John Braithwaite, and his theory of ‘reintegrative shaming’ (1989). Reintegrative shaming is concerned with the processes that occur post-punishment that support reintegration and desistance from crime. The notion of reintegrative shaming was built on contributions made by early theories of secondary deviance, including labelling theory (Becker, 1973; Lemert, 1948) and degradation ceremonies (Garfinkel, 1956). The unique contribution of reintegrative shaming, however, is its focus on the processes that assist an offender’s return to pro-social behaviour post-punishment, and obstruct the tendency to re-offend. The theoretical frameworks of labelling theory, degradation ceremonies, and reintegrative shaming are considered below.

**Labeling theory.**

Labelling theory (or social reaction theory) views ‘deviance’ as the creation of social groups rather than as behaviour that is intrinsically deviant (Becker, 1973). According to Becker (1973), deviance is simply rule-breaking behaviour that is labelled as deviant by persons of authority. The theory is concerned with the
maintenance of deviant behaviour, rather than its origins. As such, it is not concerned with why an individual decides to offend. Rather the theory considers the ways in which patterns of deviant behaviour, deviant roles, and deviant identities (within certain social contexts) can develop as a consequence of defining persons as deviant and attempting to punish, treat, or otherwise control them (Petrunik, 1980).

Deviance is bifurcated into primary and secondary deviance (Becker, 1973; Lemert, 1948; Pittaro, 2008). Primary deviance refers to characteristics, experiences, beliefs, or behaviours regarded as departures from social norms (Lemert, 1948). Of key importance to labelling theory is that the individual who engages in primary deviance is caught and labelled deviant by a person or persons of authority (Becker, 1973). ‘Positions of authority’ may be formal social agencies, including the criminal justice system (CJS), but also informal agencies, including members of the public, peers, and so forth (Lemert, 1948). This response of labelling forms the basis of secondary deviance, whereby deviation from social norms is transformed into a major social role or identity of the individual.

Secondary deviance occurs when the individual accepts the label of deviant (Becker, 1973; Lemert, 1951). As the individual comes to perceive themselves as deviant, and believes that others also hold this perception, he or she come to internalise this identity (Lemert, 1951; Maruna et al., 2004; Petrunik, 1980). Secondary deviance is a reaction to the subjective experience of being labelled deviant, such that the labelling experience “serves to recast individuals in their own eyes as well as in the eyes of others” (Paternoster & Iovanni, 1989, p. 378). Once identification with the deviant label occurs, the individual takes on this label and becomes an outsider to his or her social environment (Becker, 1973). The individual begins to engage in further deviant behaviour “as a means of defense, attack, or adjustment to the overt and covert problems created by the societal reaction to [the primary deviance]” (Lemert, 1951, p. 76). They become in a sense a ‘self-fulfilling prophecy’ (Maruna et al., 2004).

According to labelling theory, criminal justice sanctions are formal processes whereby socially regarded authority figures (such as the judiciary) apply the label of ‘offender’ to the individual. If the individual identifies with the label of offender,
he or she will maintain this identity post-release, resulting in secondary deviance. Re-engagement behaviour is the result of the individual acting within his or her identity (as ‘offender’) and reacting against mainstream perceptions of them as a deviant (Kaplan & Damphouse, 1997; Maruna et al., 2004). According to Wakefield (2006), when society stigmatizes, segregates, and excludes ex-offenders, these individuals have limited opportunities to achieve mainstream lives. In response, “they join subcultural groups of similarly stigmatized outcasts” (p.145).

Meisenhelder (1977) proposed the process of ‘de-labelling’. Similar to labelling, de-labelling occurs when the individual undergoes a formal process whereby the label of deviant or offender is removed and a new, or perhaps the original label of citizen (or conformist) is re-instated. This process is theorised to promote desistance from crime. Labelling theory argues that the transition of offender to non-offender is not adequate without formal recognition, both by the justice system and the community. It follows that the process of de-labelling requires a formal and ongoing process of acknowledging that the identity of the returning ex-offender has transformed from ‘offender’ to ‘citizen’ (Schmalleger, 2006, cited in Pittaro, 2008). Without a formal process, it is unlikely that the identity of offender will be discarded (Braithwaite, 1989; Maruna et al., 2004). Unfortunately, no such ritual or ceremony occurs in Western jurisdictions.

In addition to the actual (non-symbolic) process of de-labelling, it is argued that a symbolic process of the communication of reintegration occurs. Within this symbolic process, the ex-offender is allowed to transition from the “other/offender” label to “one of/citizen” via symbolic communications between the offender and his or her community including those of redemption and forgiveness. The symbolic nature of reintegration is considered in detail later in this chapter.

**Degradation ceremonies.**

Garfinkel (1956) termed the process of formal labelling ‘status degradation ceremonies’ (p. 420). According to Garfinkel, social ceremonies of degradation occur when a deviant actor is named an ‘outsider’ and his or her total identity is transformed into that of a lower social type. Applied to the criminal justice domain,
the processes of sentencing and imprisonment act as degradation ceremonies (Braithwaite, 1989). The initial label ‘citizen’ is removed and replaced with that of ‘offender’, and the label of ‘offender’ becomes synonymous with that of ‘outsider’ (Maruna, 2011). The process of removing offenders from the community (imprisonment) further communicates the label of ‘outsider’ or ‘other’ to the offender and wider community. Social acceptance that the individual is an ‘offender’ and therefore ‘outsider’ is an important aspect of degradation ceremonies. Yet, Braithwaite argues that in sharp contrast with visible and formal degradation, the criminal justice system is ineffective in the use of ceremony to mark the de-labelling of the offender\textsuperscript{15}, and by extension the recognition that the individual has once again become an ‘insider’.

Braithwaite (1989; 2000; Braithwaite & Mugford, 1994) further developed the concept of degradation ceremonies by distinguishing between two ways of communicating the shamefulness of a crime to produce either stigmatisation or reintegration. The first relates to the shame applied to an offender in the process of degradation ceremonies. This shaming is stigmatizing and consequently increases crime through re-offending (via secondary deviance). Stigmatizing shaming threatens an individual’s identity by excluding him or her from opportunities to function in mainstream society – or, in other words, to lead Ward’s ‘good life’ (Maruna, et al., 2004). Braithwaite (2000) theorised that the stigmatized individual may respond to this threat by rejecting the rejecters, and in doing so is attracted to subcultures of similarly stigmatized individuals (Braithwaite, 2000; Maruna, et al., 2004). Shaming that is stigmatizing involves “all social processes of expressing disapproval which have the intention or effect of invoking remorse in the person being shamed and/or condemnation by others who become aware of the shaming” (Braithwaite, 1989, p. 100). Shaming is therefore not restricted to the actions of the state, but also occurs within society, the community, peers, and the family. Shaming, then is not a uniform sanction but can be done in a variety of ways and contexts (McAlinden, 2005).

\textsuperscript{15} In Australia there are several restorative-based initiatives, such as diversionary programs, drug and Koori courts that establish ceremonies of offender de-labelling (Larsen, 2014).
**Reintegrative shaming.**

In contrast to shaming that creates stigma, Braithwaite theorised that ‘reintegrative shaming’ encourages the offender to desist from criminal behaviour (Braithwaite, 2000; Braithwaite & Mugford, 1994). Reintegrative shaming involves a process by which the criminal act is shamed or denounced, while the deviant offender is reintegrated into a community network of support (Braithwaite, 2000; Braithwaite & Mugford, 1994). Throughout the shaming process, bonds of love and respect are established, maintained and strengthened between the individual being shamed and those persons doing the shaming (including the wider social network). Shaming is followed by a formal gesture or ceremony of acceptance and forgiveness (Braithwaite, 1989; Braithwaite & Mugford, 1994; McAlinden, 2005) such that the outcome of reintegrative shaming is a (renewed) connection between the offender and his or her community.

Reintegrative shaming theory emphasises the importance of contexts of shaming (Braithwaite, 1989). The impact of shaming on the individual varies depending on who applies the shame (Braithwaite, 2000). Those people closest to the offender, and whom the offender cares most about are more likely to produce remorse than a judge or corrections officer who, according to Braithwaite, are viewed by the offender as separated from his or her social context. Likewise, gestures of forgiveness and acceptance will be more beneficial coming from the offender’s family, friends and community than an outside source (McAlinden, 2005).

Thus, according to both de-labelling theory and reintegrative shaming theory, social recognition and communication of the re-labelling of the individual from offender to ex-offender and citizen, is as important as the individual’s internal identify shift. Social de-labelling enhances the individual’s internal transition from offender to citizen, and thus supports his or her personal commitment to desistance from crime.
Contemporary Conceptualizations of Reintegration: Reintegration within Rehabilitation Discourse and a Desistance Paradigm

It was noted in Chapter One that reintegration sits within a desistance paradigm of correctional discourse. This shift was largely driven by three forces: the acknowledgement of the social and structural impacts on criminal behaviour under an ecological framework; an appreciation of the impacts of post-treatment and post-incarceration contexts on offender re-offending; and, finally, an increasing recognition of those factors which enhance desistance from crime (and that these may differ from those that support crime aetiology). Paralleling these processes was the emergence of Desistance Theory (Farrall & Bowling, 1996; Maruna, 2001; Maruna et al., 2004; Sampson & Laub, 2003).

Desistance Theory.

Desistance theory is the study of how and why people stop offending. It studies factors that contribute to reformed ex-offenders’ (including ex-prisoners’) desistance from crime (Maruna calls these ‘desistors’). ‘Desistance’ under the theory, refers broadly to the movement away from criminal behaviour. More accurately, desistance is the process of ceasing criminal behaviour by a person who has been an offender. Laub and Sampson (2001) conceptualise desistance as processes that cause and support termination of offending behaviour. Maruna (2001) argues that desistance is not the ‘termination point’ at which offending ceases, but an ongoing, dynamic and interactional process (Maruna, 2001; Maruna & King, 2004; 2009; Maruna, Immarigeon & LeBel, 2004).

Conceptualisation of desistance as a process is common in the literature (Laub & Sampson, 1993; Maruna, 2001; Maruna et al., 2004; Sampson & Laub, 2003; Willis, Levenson & Ward, 2010)16. Laub and Sampson (2001; Sampson & Laub, 1993) propose a theory of desistance that takes a life-course perspective of age-

16 Several authors have criticised desistance theory. Challenges primary note that the theory applies to white males, yet other offender sub-populations including females, minorities, people with disability and cultural minorities, have been largely overlooked (see for example, Baldry, 2010; Giordano, Cernkovich, & Rudolph, 2002)
graded informal social control. The authors distinguish desistance from the absence of recidivism. Absence of recidivism takes a narrow view of the offender and their criminal behaviour in isolation. However, desistance has a broader understanding of the offender as an actor within his or her social context. The authors note that their life-course framework emphasises “the need to examine desistance as a process consisting of interactions between human agency, salient life events, and historical context (p. 4).

Perhaps the most notable study of desistance is Maruna’s (2001) ‘Liverpool Desistance Study’ which explored the narratives or desistance scripts of 50 ex-prisoners (30 desistors and 20 re-offenders). Maruna identified that those ex-prisoners who were engaged in a desistance process were actively undergoing their own identity reformation, from offender to non-offender (Maruna, 2001). Maruna described this process as a self-narrative, in which the desistor took in a ‘redemption script’; redeeming themselves of “their past and [asserting] a meaningful future” (p. 575). In contrast, those that returned to offending undertook a ‘condemnation script’. This self-narrative, according to Maruna, was characterised by “a lack of personal agency, a sense that they had nothing left to lose, and a focus on the pursuit of happiness through consumption and material gain” (p. 575).

Desistance theory draws on theories of delabelling and reintegrative shaming. According to Maruna and colleagues (Maruna et al., 2004), the ‘making good’ process incorporates both primary and secondary desistance (but also see Laub & Sampson, 2003, for theories of desistance incorporating stages of change). ‘Primary desistance’ refers to any period of time when the offender engages in crime-free behaviour. This is desistance at its most basic level, corresponding to an absence of re-offending. Like labelling theory’s secondary deviance, ‘secondary desistance’ is distinguished from the behaviour of non-offending, in that it involves a ‘taking on’ of an identity of a ‘changed person.’ Under secondary desistance, the offender and his or her community recognises and acknowledges that the offender as a person has changed (Maruna, et al., 2004).

In addition to the self-narrative of the offender, desistance encompasses the offender’s broader social context. As Laub and Simpson (2001) highlight, “both
persistence in and desistance from crime… [has an]…explicit focus on the unfolding of lives in social context” (p. 4). These social interactions, or “turning points” (Sampson & Laub, 1993; 2003), enable the offender to turn away from his or her life of offending and towards a life of integration in their community (Maruna, 2001; McNeill, 2006; McNeill, Batchelor, Burnett, & Knox, 2005; Sampson & Laub, 1993; 2003). Often, social recognition is communicated through a formal process, such as ‘legal re-biographying’ or ‘reintegration rituals’ (Maruna, 2011; Maruna, 2006; Maruna & Immarigeon, 2004; Maruna et al., 2004).

The Emerging Reintegration

The previous discussion identified criminological reintegration as an outcome of the de-labelling process that supports desistance from crime. Given the relationship between desistance and reintegration, it is not surprising that reintegration would re-emerge within the current desistance paradigm. Indeed, contemporary discourse links rehabilitation, desistance and reintegration both conceptually and by definition. This has at times resulted in the relationship between these processes being poorly articulated. For example, the terms reintegration and desistance have been used interchangeably (“successful reintegration means no return to crime” (Wormith et al., 2007)).

It would be misleading to describe the recent correctional interest in offender experiences post-incarceration as a ‘re-emergence’ of pure criminological theories of reintegration. Rather, it is reasoned here that the movement referred to as ‘reintegration’ in contemporary corrections is more of an amalgamation of traditional criminological reintegration theory, with a desistance focus, emerging from within rehabilitation discourse. As a result, contemporary reintegration does not necessarily carry with it the same definitional or theoretical underpinnings as its traditional counterpart. Rather a more pragmatic and bureaucratic interpretation has occurred. This has undoubtedly contributed to confusion over definitions, conceptualisation and implementation of reintegration within correctional practice and contemporary academic discourse. These complexities will be discussed below.
The chapter will now turn to an exploration of contemporary reintegration. Having explored reintegration, consideration of how reintegration may be fostered or undermined will be undertaken through discussion of the ‘domains of social inclusion’. It is anticipated that the discussion of reintegration in Chapter Two will lay the foundations for the presentation of a model of reintegration (in Chapter Three), through which ‘community readiness’ to support reintegration can be conceptualised. ‘Community readiness’ is fundamental to the present study, as the central question of this thesis relates to whether, and under what circumstances, is the public willing to support ex-prisoner reintegration.

As the discussion following will highlight, a universal definition of reintegration does not exist. Where definitions have been provided, these diverge on a number of levels including: the context of reintegration; its relationship to other processes including rehabilitation and re-entry; the key stakeholders involved and their role in reintegration; and, how reintegration is achieved, or hindered (Baldry, McDonnell, Maplestone, & Peeters, 2003; Griffiths, Dandurand, & Murdoch, 2007; Rosenthal & Wolf, 2004; Maruna, 2006; Petersilia, 2004; Reitan, 1996; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009; Visher & Travis, 2003).

The absence of clarity and consistency in defining reintegration, however, has not hindered the introduction of ‘reintegrative’ objectives within correctional discourse, nor the establishment of many programs – both within and beyond corrections – that purport to be ‘reintegrative’ (Borzycki, 2005). In light of this context, it becomes even more important to engage in the task of determining exactly what reintegration is, and how reintegration is achieved in practice. This undertaking is important for a number of reasons: firstly, to clarify a concept (or process) that appears frequently in correctional and academic discourse and which is purported to be undertaken in a number of programs for ex-prisoners; secondly, to establish guidelines as to what the process of reintegration is anticipated to look like; and, thirdly, to move towards the determination of those factors at play within the reintegration process, in order to maximise successful return of ex-prisoners to the community while minimising unsuccessful return.

An analytical review of the literature relating to ex-prisoner reintegration is provided below. In assembling this literature, the focus is upon reaching a succinct,
holistic, empirically supported, and practically relevant definition. As such, the 
following review presents the literature in sections relating to the key components 
of the definition of reintegration developed herein. At the conclusion of this review, 
a full definition of reintegration will be proposed.

A contemporary definition of reintegration

The verb ‘to reintegrate’ is defined by the Oxford dictionary as “to restore 
(elements regarded as disparate) to unity” (Oxford, 2013). In essence then, a 
correctional approach to reintegration is the process of assisting or supporting an 
ex-prisoner’s movement back into ‘unification’.

However, the term ‘reintegration’ has been described as misleading, as it assumes 
that a degree of initial community integration existed before criminal behaviour 
(Baldry et al., 2003; Griffiths, et al, 2007; Muntingh, 2005; Reitan, 1996; Van Ness 
& Strong, 2003). Perhaps more appropriate is the term ‘integration.’ Emphasis on 
integration acknowledges that the process at hand is more than the geographical 
movement from prison (separation or dis-integration) to community (re-
integration). Geographic movement into the community is important. However, 
other factors are likely to have greater influence on achieving reintegration. These 
include the attitudes, beliefs and behaviours of both the ex-prisoner and the 
community.

In practice, it is likely that the reintegration process actually involves many micro-
forms of reintegration and, conceivably, some of these will represent areas where 
the ex-prisoner was previously integrated (say, family or work) and other largely ‘disintegrated’ areas (i.e. pro-social society). The returning process is complex and, 
above all, individual. As a result, no one term will perfectly reflect the process.

From another perspective, the act of removing an offender from the community or 
limiting his or her involvement in community (in the case of community-based 
disposition) creates a necessity for re-integrating the offender post-punishment. 
Here re-integration may be conceptualised as going beyond the initial level of 
integration, to assist the ex-prisoner in achieving a functional and fulfilling life 
(Reitan, 1996). As Reitan (1996) argues, in so far as punishment is involved in
breaches in community or an absence of community, it necessarily is involved in
restoring community; “the justifying purpose of punishment is to help restore
community at the breach or establish community where it is absent” (p. 58).
Therefore, it is argued that: reintegration is the establishment or restoration of
unity between an ex-prisoner and his or her community.

Within this tenet is the assumption that reintegration primarily involves the
offender and the community. Certainly, the ex-prisoner is involved in the
reintegration process. It is this individual, after all, who is undergoing in some way
a transition or reframing, and who is most directly impacted by the success or
failure of this undertaking (Maruna, 2001; Petersilia, 2003; Shinkfield & Graffam,
2009). However, the literature differs as to whether the offender undertakes this
process alone, or in concert with other parties.

It has been argued that it is the responsibility of the State, in removing citizenship
of the offender as a means of punishment, to reinstate this ‘community’ post-
punishment (Muntingh, 2001; Reitan, 1996; Travis & Visher, 2005). Travis (2005)
and Travis and Visher (2005) emphasise this point in their discussion of ‘re-entry’,
a process similar to reintegration. Travis (2005) argues, “as a society we send
people to prison, but fail to recognize the reality that (with few exceptions) they all
return,” and further, “every sentencing proposal, whether retributive or
rehabilitative, should include consideration of the realities of re-entry – ‘but’ they
all come back” (p. xxvi).

According to Wilkinson, et al., (2004), re-entry emerged as part of the justice-
rehabilitation paradigm shift identified in Chapter One. This involved a shift away
from preparing offenders for release into the community at the end of their
sentence. Rather, the emphasis has moved toward a “seamless transition of
accountability and resources at the outset of one's entry into the system through to
the completion of any post-release supervision and beyond” (Wilkinson, et al.,
2004, p. 3). Similarly Travis (2000) argues, “the overarching goal of re-entry, in
my view, is to have returned to our midst an individual who has discharged his or
her legal obligation to society by serving his or her sentence and has demonstrated
an ability to live by society’s rules” (p. 24). Under these definitions, re-entry does
not simply include the State, it is the State’s responsibility (Wilkinson, 2002; Wilkinson et al., 2004).

Reintegration therefore is an inevitable consequence of incarceration. Since the State removes the offender, the State also has a responsibility to reintegrate the offender post-imprisonment. Muntingh (2001) similarly reasons, if it is accepted that the purpose of punishment is to prevent further offending, “for 95% of offenders this means that reintegration into society is a prerequisite.” According to Muntingh, reintegration is the purpose of State-led punishment.

The theoretical perspectives of labelling and de-labelling, degradation ceremonies, reintegrative shaming and desistance theory emphasise the importance of the social context. The community plays an important role in the process of shaming and labelling (or re-labelling and welcoming) an offender. In this way, the community facilitates or blocks ex-prisoners from returning to mainstream society (or undertaking their ‘redemption script’).

Consideration of the role of the community within reintegration is limited due to the heterogeneous nature of ‘community.’ Indeed the conceptualisation and measurement of ‘community’ is rife with limitations and criticisms within psychological, sociological and criminological literature (Lawthom & Whelan, 2012; Tyler, 2006). Much like reintegration, various definitions of community have been presented, leading to a great deal of contention as to what is community. There are also many theories underpinning the formation, development and sustainment of community, stretching from Tonnies’ gesellschaft (association or society) and gemeinschaft (tightly bound community) and Putman’s ‘social capital’; to post-modern and cosmopolitan concepts of community (in which ‘community’ has defied commentators and endured despite the great upheaval of the industrialisation and more recently globalization); and, in more recent times the theory of virtual community (Delanty, 2003; Lawthom & Whelan, 2012). At the same time, ‘community’ has found its way into lay discourse, such that the term can be used to describe any number of structures of people and/or places, with the average person (apparently) readily understanding its application (Cohen, 1985).

Community represents a difficult construct to conceptualise, and it is beyond the scope of the current study to address this limitation. Several conceptualisations of
Community are, however, worth noting. Cohen (1985) argues toward a ‘reasonable’ interpretation of community as encompassing two key themes: a group of people that has a common interest with one another, where this interest serves to distinguish the group from those said to be ‘outside’ the community. This view of community emphasises the idea of boundaries, which by their existence serve to differentiate those within and outside of community. Community in this sense is fluid: boundaries exist and move depending on the frame of reference. For Cohen (1985) boundaries provided the clearest picture of what is a community, by providing at the boundary of one community and another a contrast between what is inside and what is outside. Emphasis on boundaries is of interest in discussing reintegration, as returning from custody highlights movement across the boundary between custody and freedom, as well as an opportunity for ex-prisoners to move away from symbolic exclusion, other-ness and outsider, and by way of crossing boundaries, being integrated with individuals (i.e. the public) to which they previously had limited or no access.

Bruhn (2005) argues that communities are important spaces of power; those in community exert power by drawing boundaries which determine who is included and who is excluded. This concept of community fits with concepts of social inclusion and exclusion, and assumes that at some level there exists a shared set of morals, values and behavioural norms underpinning a community (Cohen, 1986; Grech & Azzopardi, 2012). This conceptualisation of community is relevant to reintegration, as the latter is also theorised to be influenced by symbolic notions of social inclusion and acceptance (which will be explored later in this chapter).

A further theory of community is that of ‘communities of practice’ (Wegner, 1998 cited in Lawthom & Whelan, 2012). A community of practice is defined as “a group of people uniting to mutually engage in a joint enterprise, who together develop and share a common repertoire of resources (Lawthom & Whelan, 2012, p. 18). Inherit in this definition are themes of engagement, participation, shared practice, and a collective process of learning. This definition of community also has applications for reintegration. It is argued in this thesis chapter that participation between offenders and individuals is integral in order to say that an ex-prisoner is ‘part of the community’. At the same time resources are important in defining
community inclusion and exclusion; an ex-prisoner who cannot access accommodation, employment or social supports may be seen to be excluded from community. Finally, power and resources are linked; community support for reintegration may be impacted by the availability of resources in the community and whether those in power are willing to share these resources with returning ex-prisoners.

Geographical location has also been considered in defining community. The term ‘community’ is often applied interchangeably with words such as neighbourhood, suburb, town or country (Oldenberg, 2006, cited in Grech & Azzopardi, 2012). For example, community shops are geographically anchored. This definition allows for community to be small or large in scope, and may range anywhere between a few people who likely know each other, to a mass of people unlikely to ever meet one another. This latter definition of community is problematic as it does not account for why some people within geographic limits may form strong bonds, while other may not. Despite this limitation, it is helpful to identify geographical groups of individuals who support or don’t support reintegration. Indeed, public attitude studies frequently use this approach to explore support for various crime and justice initiatives. This information would be helpful when determining locations to establish support services (e.g. accommodation) for ex-prisoners.

One researcher has attempted to conceptualise community relative to a reintegrative theory of punishment. Reitan (1996) presents a theory of reintegration which encompasses symbolic and non-symbolic notions of inclusion between an ex-offender and a community of ‘good citizens’. According to Reitan (1996), within any establishment of social interaction, be that a nation, a neighborhood, or a friendship, there exists at least a modest sense of belonging and mutual concern, and an understanding between its members about the way each will act (Reitan, 1996). Where each member anticipates that the other will act in line with the customs and rules of that community, individuals collectively can be understood as a community of ‘law-abiding citizens’. Such a community allows for varying degrees of feeling or behaving for one another in a mutually concerning manner, but establishes a threshold of morality; citizens do not steal from one another or abuse one another, they assist one another and express gratitude for assistance
rendered. Such a threshold allows for the exclusion of some persons from the community of ‘good citizens’. Reitan (1996) emphasizes the importance of mutual concern within such a community; it is not enough that one member demonstrates concern for another because this concern must be reciprocated to be mutual. Thus it follows that, although the community of good citizens is understood to be ‘good’ to one another, its members are not necessarily good towards those who are perceived not to belong. Furthermore, Reitan (1996) argues that the community of ‘good citizens’ in part defines itself by opposition to those who are seen not to belong to it – that is, the lawbreakers, the outsider, the ‘bad’. Under Reitan’s (1996) theory any individuals who perceives him or herself to be a moral and law-abiding citizen is ‘in community’ with other law-abiding individuals. Perception is likely important here; an individual who engages in minor rule breaking, such as illegal downloading or jaywalking, is still likely to see him or herself as within community. Importantly, when rule breaking is formally recognized (e.g. labelling as an offender, imprisonment, or a criminal record), the individual becomes excluded from Reitan’s community.

Common themes emerge from the various theories of community presented above. Community involves a group of people, linked via social connection, capital and/or power; it may be defined in terms of geography, and; community appears as much to be about who is within the boundaries of inclusion as who is excluded from those boundaries. The symbolic aspects of community (including inclusion and exclusion) will be explored in more detail later in this chapter.

The broad overview to community given in the above paragraphs is designed to highlight the difficulty in operationalising this construct when discussing reintegration. Stating that reintegration necessarily involves the ex-prisoner and the community raises the question as to what or who is the community in relation to an ex-prisoner. A majority of ex-prisoners originate from marginalised social groups that may be for them ‘community’, including suburbs or towns with low socioeconomic status, but also groups of people that are disenfranchised, and over-represented in mental health, substance use issues, and antisocial behaviours (Gibbons & Katzenbach, 2006; Herivel & Wright, 2003; Petersilia, 2003; Shenson). Many offenders move fluidly in and out of these social groups as they
enter and exit custody, and for some these social groups or ‘communities’ exist within custody. Thus, it is possible or perhaps even likely that ex-prisoners are integrated into certain specific communities.

At the same time, it can be argued that ex-prisoners are not integrated into other social groups, which might also be called ‘communities’. These include (although are not limited to) communities of pro-social, law abiding citizens and/or enfranchised individuals (for example, individuals with stable employment, accommodation, and financial security). The assumption is made herein that ex-prisoners are not socially connected with these latter groups of people. However, the event of leaving custody presents a unique opportunity to support integration between two disintegrated groups: the ex-prisoner and the non-offender; the disenfranchised and the enfranchised (including integration between those in the community with power and resources and the ex-prisoner). It is theorised that the creation of a form of ‘community’ between these groups of people will support desistance from crime, by engendering inclusion and acceptance, but also promoting the sharing of power, resources and social learning between individuals. For example, by integrating ex-prisoners and individuals willing to support ex-prisoners, opportunities for pro-social interaction, and access to social structures (e.g. employment, accommodation) are supported, in turn promoting stability across other domains (e.g. stable employment supports financial security) for ex-prisoners, and achievement of a ‘good life’.

Perhaps as a way of tackling the constrains of defining community, re-entry and reintegration literature has looked to identifying key ‘stakeholders’ or ‘professionals’ involved in these processes (Graffam, Shinkfield, Lavelle, & McPherson, 2004; Hardcastle, 2006; Lea, Auburn, & Kibblewhite, 1999). Presumably stakeholders are representatives of ‘a community’, however the nature of defining characteristics of this ‘community’ has largely remained ambiguous. This line of enquiry does however highlight another limitation regarding community. Often research explores the attitudes of key stakeholders and professionals (or, outside of reintegration, the general public), all of whom it can be argued are not in community with ex-prisoners.
Nevertheless, it is still helpful to explore stakeholder and professional’s support for reintegration. It is also worthwhile identifying the general public’s support for reintegration. While the latter group may have limited interaction with ex-prisoners, investigation here is a valid beginning point to understanding the process of ex-prisoner reintegration (especially given little research has gone beyond exploring ex-prisoners’ experiences of this process). Graffam, et al., (2004) identify professionals involved in reintegration as the criminal justice system, accommodation, employment support, and rehabilitation program services providers. Similarly, in her study of the employability of ex-offenders post-incarceration, Hardcastle (2006) identified employers, employment service providers and correctional personal as fundamental to the reintegration process (alongside ex-offenders). It is logical that these key service providers would play an important role in the reintegration experiences of ex-prisoners. Their location as gatekeepers or facilitators to the interaction between ex-prisoners and members of the community (for example, employers) provides these ‘professionals’ with insights into the important factors which help or hinder reintegration experiences. The role of the broader public (beyond professionals or stakeholders) in reintegration has received limited attention in the research literature. Yet, as reintegration in many cases involves an opportunity for the ex-prisoner to move into social groups of empowerment and live alongside the general public (rather than a subgroup is disadvantages individuals), then the reintegration process, by extension, must involve both the ex-prisoner and the individuals they can be said to assimilate into (i.e. his or her ‘community’). Academics have defined reintegration in relation to areas or domains that are seen to signify ‘community-ship’ and assimilation, for example employment and housing (see Anderson-Facile, 2009; Baldry, et al, 2003; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009). Accordingly, on a theoretical level, the role of the ‘community’ in reintegration is acknowledged, although in practice little is known of how this process occurs, what group of people represent ‘community’, or to what degree this community (or these communities) is influential in this process. For the purposes of this thesis, ‘community’ is used herein to refer to members of the broader social and geographical landscape (i.e. the general public) with whom an ex-prisoner is not integrated. It is assumed this
‘community’ is representative of middle-class individuals who have access to various social structures or resources, including employment and housing, and generally can be thought of as leading stable, pro-social lives. This image of community is of course problematic. However, ‘community’ is intended to represent a group of people who hold power within the broader social world into which an ex-prisoner returns post-incarceration, and thus a group of people who, via positive interaction with an ex-prisoner (aka. integration), may support ex-prisoner desistance by promoting inclusion, social capital, stability and achievement of a good life.\footnote{The attentive reader may note that the definitions of reintegration used within the current literature review refer to ‘community’ without defining this construct. The author believes that the conceptualisation of community given here corresponds with the use of ‘community’ within these definitions.}

Four parties then, have a claim on the process of reintegration: the ex-prisoner, the State, the professionals, and the wider community (or perhaps better put, the general public). The ex-prisoner was considered briefly above, and the reintegration experiences of this group are not the focus of our discussion here.\footnote{The interested reader may like to read the following articles about ex-offenders’ perceptions of re-entry and/or reintegration: Benson, Alarid, Burton, & Cullen (2011) and Winnick and Bodkin (2008).} The State, professionals and the community are considered in turn below. First, reintegration might be regarded as a State-led process, delivered through institutional punishment (i.e. incarceration) and services provided by professions (Petersilia, 2003; 2009; Wilkinson, 2002). However, such definitions often make use of the term ‘re-entry’ and not reintegration. This is an important distinction, as it is argued here that re-entry and reintegration are related, yet distinct processes. Second, reintegration may be a process led by professionals, notwithstanding that professionals have been located within rehabilitation. Indeed, Maruna (2006) argues that reintegration is beyond the scope of professional work. With the exclusion of the State and the professionals, the individual offender and the wider community are left to undertake reintegration. Thus, the second key component of
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reintegration holds that: *reintegration may involve many stakeholders, but primarily it occurs between the ex-prisoner and their wider community.*

Let us consider the role of the State and the term ‘re-entry’ in further detail. To a large extent, there is considerable conceptual overlap between reintegration and re-entry. However, close examination of the literature supports subtle differences between definitions of the two processes. It is argued here that distinguishing the two will promote better realisation of each in practice. Petersilia (2003; 2009) defines re-entry to include “how [offenders] spend their time during confinement, the process by which they are released, and how they are supervised after release” (2003, p. 3). Further, it is seen as “all activities and programs conducted to prepare ex-convicts to return safely to the community and to live as law-abiding citizens” (2009, pp. 3). Travis (2000) notes the process of re-entry involves “managing the transition from the status of “imprisoned offender” to the status of “released ex-offender” (pp. 1). Similarly, Travis and Visher (2005) argue that “every aspect of correctional operations and programs conceivably (and in some ways, accurately) affects the prospects of offender re-entry.” Wilkinson (2002) writes:

“re-entry…depends largely on integrating a continuum of services … beginning at sentencing and admission to prison through confinement to discharge from parole or post-release control. The manner in which these linkages are formed must, of necessity, support the maintenance of offenders’ social and community ties even during the period of imprisonment” (p. 1).

For Anderson-Facile (2009) re-entry involves “the process of reintegrating post-release prisoners into the communities in which they will live, the family structure which they left, and the world of employment.” These authors define re-entry as a State-led initiative that does not involve the general public. Re-entry is a process

---

¹⁹ This premise does not preclude the State from being involved in reintegration. In actuality, reintegration is often supported via government agencies, or government funding for agencies who assist ex-offenders to access accommodation, employment, financial assistance, support and so forth. It is acknowledged that the State have a role to play in reintegration, but the purpose of this thesis is to investigate the role that the general public have to play in reintegration, thus the latter is the focus.
that both prepares the offender for release and maintains State-control over the offender during their transition into community living (or transition out of custody, since the term ‘community living’ is a lay term that does not necessarily relate to community as defined above). Interestingly, and importantly for the current discussion, this process of preparation involves only the individual, and does not acknowledge any involvement or impact of the offender’s social context in the success of re-entry.

Furthermore, definitions of re-entry fail to specify how release preparation differs from traditional rehabilitation approaches. Perhaps re-entry is better conceptualised as the preparation of the offender for transition from one level of State control to another, as well as the discrete geographical transition. In line with this, Bartholomew, et al., (2011, October) define re-entry as a term that “can be used to describe any number of discrete movements to lower levels of correctional supervision, not simply the re-entry to society from prison.” Re-entry refers to the experience of an offender who, having received rehabilitation, transitions from incarceration to the community. Subsequent to re-entry, the offender begins the process of reintegration. Importantly, it is argued here that re-entry does not involve an achievement of unity between the offender and individuals who might be said to be ‘community’ post-release. Nor is re-entry interested in formal re-labelling of the offender as citizen; rather, its use of continued control and surveillance is contradictory to this aim.

Defining re-entry lends understanding of what reintegration is not; reintegration is not a purely-State-led process by which an ex-offender transitions into a lower form of supervision (the lowest being freedom). It is argued here that reintegration goes beyond re-entry and considers the process of integrating through social interactions. Thus, a distinguishing feature between re-entry and reintegration is the latter’s emphasis on involvement of individuals of the public such that social inclusion forms.

Griffiths et al (2007) define ‘social reintegration’ as the support given to (ex-) offenders as they re-enter society following imprisonment. Similarly, Willis (2009) defines reintegration as the process of re-joining the community (the public) following a period of incarceration. Baldry et al., (2003) further elaborates,
describing reintegration as “the introduction/return of the ex-prisoner to functional, personally fulfilling and responsible participation in wider society” (pp. ii). A key aspect of these definitions of reintegration is the inclusion of individuals within society. Drawing from definitions of community as groups of social inclusion, it is argued that community involvement distinguish re-entry from reintegration.

The definitions provided by Griffiths et al., (2007), Willis (2009) and Baldry et al., (2003) speak of a released offender actively involved in re-connection with a seemingly passive wider society. However, it is argued here that reintegration is an active and recursive process occurring between the released offender and their community. In line with this definition, Reitan (1996, p 64) argues that reintegration involves “uncoerced participation of all parties” in (re-)establishing mutual concern for one another and thus (re-)establishing community. Van Ness and Strong (2003, p 103) define reintegration as the return of ex-prisoners into “community life as whole, contributing, productive persons.” Reintegration occurs when “the victim or offender can become active and productive parts of their communities.” Importantly, according to Van Ness and Strong, ex-prisoners accomplish reintegration through assimilation with a community that provides: “(1) mutual respect for one another, (2) mutual commitment to one another, and (3) intolerance for – but understanding of- deviant behaviour” (Van Ness & Strong, 2003, p 104).” This understanding of community involvement is aligned with Braithwaite’s (1989) criminological reintegration. Further, Van Ness and Strong argue that “reintegration places unusual demands on communities, for it requires that [the community views] others as a complex mixture of good and evil, injuries and strengths” (p. 104).

In line with the definitions of reintegration provided by Braithwaite (1989), Van Ness and Strong (2003), and Reitan (1991), it is argued here that reintegration is a process of on-going reciprocal interactions between the ex-prisoner and the community into which they are released. Reintegration plays out in both the actual (non-symbolic) and symbolic daily interactions between the ex-prisoner and members of this community, when these interactions produce positive and (subjectively) meaningful experiences.
‘Reintegration’ is often used interchangeably with terms such as ‘re-entry’, ‘re-settlement’, ‘transition’, ‘throughcare’ and ‘aftercare’ (Borzycki, 2005; Borzycki & Baldry, 2003; Fox, Khan, Briggs, Rees-Jones, Thompson, & Owens, 2005; Petersilia, 2004; Wright & Cesar, 2013). These terms, however, represent quite different understandings, processes and policy positions. For example, the term ‘re-entry’ was previously defined as the single moment in time when a prisoner is released from custody; the process by which offenders move at the end of incarceration to community. Maruna (2006) argues that reintegration is distinct from re-entry and resettlement, as both re-entry and resettlement acknowledge the physical movement from incarceration to community that all released offenders must undergo; however, they say nothing of the process involved in this movement. Put another way, these terms offer nothing beyond the image of an ex-prisoner living within, but not a part of the community (also see Johnson, 2002). It is argued here that true reintegration goes one step further, in recognizing that this process involves interaction between the ex-prisoner and his or her community.

Regardless of whether reintegration involves the State or not, acknowledgement of the role of the community within the reintegration process necessarily partitions reintegration from initiatives including throughcare and aftercare, which are purely State-run. In fact, several authors have argued that the State should not be involved in reintegration at all (Maruna, 2006; Taxman, Young, & Byrne, 2004; Wilkinson, 2002). Maruna (2006, p.4) writes:

“The state can be said to be in the business of “rehabilitating” or “reforming” offenders. The state, however, cannot be said to be in the business of “re-integrating” individuals. Professionals cannot re-integrate anyone no matter how much training they have. Ex-offenders can re-integrate themselves and communities can re-integrate ex-offenders. But the most that the State can do is to help or hinder this process…re-integration happens “out there”, when the professionals go home.”

Maruna does not necessarily preclude the State from any involvement in the process of transition; in fact, he gives leave for the State, and professionals, to partake in initiatives such as re-entry, transition, throughcare and aftercare.
Through such initiatives, the State may be seen to indirectly impact on reintegration. Indeed, it is argued that the State plays an important role in offender reintegration in guiding and responding to public perceptions and attitudes about reintegration, desistance and recidivism, and by establishing reintegration policy through social services, organisational funding, and legislation. Thus, the third key component of the reintegration definition holds that: reintegration is separate from other correctional aims of re-entry – throughcare, aftercare and resettlement.

On the other hand, reintegration is often seen as synonymous with rehabilitation, although the two are separate correctional objectives. As was argued in Chapter One, RNR-based rehabilitation has a distinct and narrow focus on individual deficits or ‘criminogenic needs’. The GLM, while taking an ecological perspective, is primarily focused on the offender, and not the involvement of the wider community. The broader psychosocial focus of reintegration, together with its emphasis on community involvement, distinguishes reintegration from rehabilitation. Furthermore, the exploration of goals of sentencing in Chapter One highlighted that while rehabilitation has been incorporated into Australian legislation, there is no mention of reintegration as a sentencing objective. Rehabilitation can be located within the aims of offender sentencing and therefore, the State can be seen to ‘do’ rehabilitation. The same is not necessarily true for reintegration. Rather, it is argued here that reintegration is not synonymous with rehabilitation. Importantly then, reintegration is not conceptualized as an element of rehabilitation. Nor is rehabilitation conceptualized as a part of reintegration. The two are distinct, yet related, processes. Accordingly: the reintegration process is distinct from the rehabilitation process.

Reintegration can also be defined in terms of the characteristics of the social interactions that it involves. The ex-prisoner and members of his or her wider community have the potential to engage in a number of social interactions in the course of their daily lives (e.g. in interactions with one’s local community, or work colleagues). Interactions that establish or communicate the existence of community ties between the ex-prisoner and his or her community is seen to be reintegrative interactions (the opposite being disintegrative interactions).
Social interactions may be formal or informal, and may involve aspects of both actual, non-symbolic inclusion (e.g. secure housing, adequate income, supportive interpersonal relationships), and symbolic inclusion (e.g. self-esteem and a sense of belonging). Further, interactions may occur on a number of levels. At the micro-level, social interactions occur on a daily basis between neighbours, family members, friends, and colleagues, and even strangers. Interactions also occur within informal social structures, such as families, community groups, sporting groups and religious groups. Finally, interactions occur within formal social structures, such as within employment organizations, housing and social support agencies. These levels vary according to the proximity of the community and the offender within the interaction. At the lowest level, the offender interacts on a personal level with a member of the community, such as in a face-to-face interaction between work colleagues. At the highest level, the offender interacts with the wider community on an abstract level, for example, when an offender is ineligible to apply for certain employment based on legislation prohibiting a person with a criminal history to work in a particular field. In considering a definition of reintegration then, the sites and levels of reintegration must be considered; *reintegration can occur through formal and informal interactions, and at varying levels of engagement, from the abstract and removed, to the personal level.*

Shinkfield (2006; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009) proposed that interactions occur within several domains, which hold particular importance in the success of the reintegrative process (also see Anderson-Facile, 2009; Baldry, et al., 2003). These include housing, employment, education, skills and vocation training, and family and social supports (Shinkfield, 2006). These domains are sites of community bonding, which foster within an ex-prisoner a sense of inclusion. Furthermore, these domains reflect areas of basic human need (Ward & Stewart, 2003a; 2003c), and therefore, if accessible, promote the achievement of a satisfying life that is crime-free for the ex-prisoner. When an ex-prisoner has access to these domains, this signifies the establishment of a positive community interaction, and thus engagement in the process of reintegration. The domains relevant to reintegration are considered later in this chapter.
Enabling an ex-prisoner to access all domains of reintegration, however, will not necessarily result in successful reintegration, although it signifies that the potential for reintegration has been established. This is because reintegration involves meaningful social interactions, and thus a subjective element. An ex-prisoner disinterested in reintegration will not achieve this aim, no matter how supportive his or her community. Similarly, one ex-prisoner may not require the establishment of meaningful peer relationships to feel reintegrated, yet another ex-prisoner may. In this way, professionals may support access to reintegration domains, but they cannot influence the next step. This next step necessarily involves the ex-prisoner and the community.

While access to the domains of reintegration does not necessarily signify reintegration, the opposite – that is, no access – does signify a lack of reintegration. Typically, released offenders experience challenges in accessing these domains. When access is denied, these domains may create barriers to successful reintegration (David, Bahr, & Ward, 2012; Shinkfield, 2006; Holzer, Raphael, & Stoll, 2003a, 2003c; Brown, Deakin, & Spencer, 2008). Accordingly it follows that a definition of reintegration acknowledges that: reintegration occurs within domains of interaction between the ex-prisoner and his or her community, including (though not limited to) housing, employment, education, and, family and social supports.

To be ‘reintegrated’ suggests a temporally fixed event that can be achieved. Yet, the above aspect of reintegration – social inclusion – is not conceptualized as a having a set time point, but rather as being communicated within every interaction. Similarly, desistance, which is linked with reintegration, is conceptualized as a process and not a “termination event” (Maruna, 2001, p. 22). Indeed, Muntingh (2005, p. 8) describes reintegration as a "process [sic] rather than a once-off intervention” and “the ability of an ex-prisoner to function in society and manage situations … in such a manner that avoids … further conflict with the law.” This description of reintegration portrays an ongoing process, echoing Maruna’s (2001) argument that, even after death, the conclusion that an ex-offender desisted from crime remains questionable.
Reintegration or desistance cannot be understood as ever being fully achieved, but rather as an ongoing and dynamic entity. Van Ness and Strong (2003) include, in their definition of reintegration, the movement of victim or offender towards becoming active and productive members of their communities:

“When we speak of reintegration we mean re-entry into community life as whole, contributing, productive persons. This means more than being tolerant of the person’s presence; it means acceptance of the person as a member. It requires action on the community’s part, but also on the part of the offender and/or the victim involved.” (Van Ness, & Strong, 2010, p.103)

It is argued here that reintegration is better conceptualised as a maintenance process, which relies on reciprocal interactions between the ex-prisoner and the wider community. An ex-prisoner may be accepted within community at one point in time and rejected at another (e.g. an ex-prisoner may be faced with community suspicions following an increase in crime in a neighbourhood several years after his or her release from prison).

Furthermore, reintegration may occur to varying degrees in different domains. An ex-prisoner may feel reintegrated within their family immediately following their return home, yet they may feel disintegrated from their peers and the wider community. Another may be rejected from every job and rental application because of their criminal record, but accepted into their local church group. Another still may be greeted with friendliness by some neighbours and treated with suspicion and fear by others. It is impossible to say to what degree each or any of the above hypothetical ex-prisoner s are ‘reintegrated’. The final constituent in the current definition of reintegration acknowledges this complexity of the reintegration process; reintegration is an ongoing, reciprocal process

Reintegration is defined here as an active, ongoing, subjective and reciprocal process occurring between the ex-prisoner and their community that may or may not involve access to one of many domains of social inclusion. In line with this conceptualisation of reintegration, and taking into account the various definitions
of reintegration discussed above, Bartholomew, et al., (2011, October) proposed the following definition of reintegration:\(^{20}\)

“Reintegration is...an ongoing psychosocial process whereby opportunities for the offender to construct functional, personally fulfilling, and responsible participation in wider society are sought, presented, and/or obstructed. This dynamic process involves the individual and the community to equal levels. In a productive bi-directional interaction, the community is ready and able to allow the offender to participate at an equivalent level to other law-abiding citizens, and the offender is subjectively ready and able to participate in society as a law-abiding citizen.”

The above discussion outlined the context in which contemporary reintegration can be said to have re-emerged. It was argued that because of its place in rehabilitation and desistance discourse, current reintegration theory and practices do not reflect the ‘purist’ criminological origins of the process. In support of this argument, several differing conceptualisations and definitions of reintegration were presented, alongside other similar initiatives, including re-entry. It was argued that contemporary reintegration is distinct from rehabilitation and other State-led initiatives, including re-entry, throughcare and aftercare. It was also argued that the wider community plays an important, active role in reintegration. However, the wider community is often overlooked in the literature. The section concluded by providing a definition of reintegration. This will serve as a foundation from which the writer will develop a model of reintegration. In the next section the symbolic nature of reintegration is considered.

\(^{20}\) It is noted that this definition (and the broader discussion of contemporary reintegration presented in this chapter) distinguishes ex-prisoner reintegration from restorative justice. The latter has been defined as, “a process whereby all parties with a stake in a particular offence come together to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offence” (Larsen, 2014, p. vi). Restorative justice is an alternative to sentencing that primarily focuses on the offender and victim, and is informed via (formal) programs. Conversely, reintegration occurs after punishment, primarily involves the offender and community, and involves both formal and informal interactions. This point is explored in more depth in Chapter Four (see page 150).
Communicating Reintegration: The Symbolic Nature of Reintegration

Reintegration is communicated through the formal and informal reciprocal interactions that occur between the ex-prisoner and members of their community. It is the claim of this thesis that the communication of an overt reintegration message can occur through the medium of words and behaviours, or covertly through attitudes, values and other symbolic messages perceived and interpreted by the community and the ex-prisoner. It is this symbolic element of reintegration that informs social interactions; it denotes attitudes about moral inclusion, shame, redeemability, eligibility, forfeiture, forgiveness, and risk. The symbolic element of reintegration delivers, variously, the labels of ‘outsider’, ‘other’ and ‘offender’, but also ‘insider’, ‘same’ and ‘one of’. As such, the symbolic nature of reintegration reflects the processes outlined in labelling theory, discussed earlier in this chapter. The symbolic nature of reintegration is very important, as it likely drives the actual (non-symbolic) interactions between the ex-prisoner and members of his or her community. Further, the symbolic nature of reintegration occurs in parallel with processes such as de-labelling and reintegrative shaming, as it is through the communication of symbolic reintegration that the offender and community communicate the transition from ‘other’ or ‘offender’ to ‘one of’ or ‘community member.’ Below, the symbolic nature of reintegration is discussed.

Shame and moral inclusion.

Braithwaite (1989) highlighted the ritual process by which an offender is labelled and denigrated in society in response to their criminal behavior. This process of shame is integral to judicial punishment; the ritualistic process of the court proceeding involves shaming through the handing down of the label of ‘offender’, condemnation of both the action and the actor, and sanctioning that, in many cases, removes citizenship from the offender.

However, a parallel ceremony that recognizes the completion of punishment and the return of the offender to society does not exist (Braithwaite, 1989). In theory, reintegrative restoration is communicated to the ex-prisoner through a formal ritual of reunification and acceptance into their community that resembles, yet opposes
the initial disintegrative process (Braithwaite, 1989). Maruna (2011, p.4) argues that the reintegrative process involves an aspect of ritualistic practices; for reintegration to be meaningful, “this process presumably involves more than just physical resettlement into society after incarceration (e.g. a place to stay, a source of income – as important as those are), but also includes a symbolic element of moral inclusion.” Moral inclusion can be communicated informally within the ‘everyday’ interactions between the ex-prisoner and the community. The unspoken acknowledgement within an interaction is that each party is ‘one of’ rather than ‘other’, and treated accordingly.

Reintegrative punishment, theorized by Reitan (1991) includes the concept of moral inclusion. Reitan (1991) argues that the criminal act signifies a breach in unity and mutual concern between the offender and members of their community. To regain mutual concern, reintegration, as a form of punishment, must symbolically reassert the community’s concerns for the offender, and the offender’s concerns for the community. According to Reitan:

“…punishment, in short, must be presented to the criminal as the means to reintegrate. It must serve as an invitation to community: ‘By accepting this punishment, internalizing it, and making it your penance, you will be reintegrated into the community of good citizens and your life will be richer and more satisfying as a result (1991, pp. 73).”

For the community,

“punishment should be inflicted with a clear message of its purpose…the need to show respect entails that the punishment must be restrained…[and][be] clear to the recipient of punishment that those who impose the punishment share at least vicariously in the suffering of the one punished (1991, pp.76).”

Here reintegration involves communication of symbolic messages about respect and inclusion. The community and the offender, in delivering and accepting the punishment, acts in accordance with the belief that the punishment serves the function of reuniting both parties.
It is argued here that reintegration involves a moral position. Moral inclusion necessarily involves concepts of right and wrong. Reintegration, as a process of moral inclusion, thus involves “atonement, forgiveness, redemption and reconciliation” (Maruna, 2011, pp. 4). This moral position stems from the criminal act; the offender is seen to have made a choice in committing the criminal act and is held responsible. The offender must accept responsibility before reintegration can occur. Yet, as reintegration is the ultimate goal for the community, responsibility must be borne in a way that enables reintegration into the community “as a whole, contributing, productive member” (Van Ness, 1997, p. 2). Punishment does not achieve this aim. Rather, it results in moral exclusion through the gesture of shaming. Conversely, reintegrative shaming communicates the messages, “you are a person who can contribute to our community, even though what you did was bad” (Van Ness 1997, p. 2). Disintegration is communicated through the formal ceremony of court. However, it is argued here that ceremonies of reintegration can be communicated formally, but also informally via any gesture of re-acceptance, such as a smile or an invitation.

The opposite of inclusion is exclusion. On a symbolic level, moral exclusion forms the basis of the “us” versus “them” mentality towards offenders, and is best located in media, political and public discourse about offenders which labels them ‘others, ‘deviant’, ‘outsiders’, even ‘monsters’ (Pittaro, 2008; Rollo, 2002). Travis (2005, p. 74) highlights the movement in the latter part of the 20th century towards a symbolic or ‘invisible’ form of punishment for offenders that affects their reintegration. He writes, “the new forms of invisible punishment … are particularly disturbing because they exacerbate the division between “us”, the law-abiding, and “them,” the law-breakers. Travis locates the expression of symbolic exclusion through the American Congress’ reforms to the welfare system, and the dismantling of services for the poor; “Congress has determined that the poor with criminal histories are less deserving than others” (p. 74). Travis’s argument suggests that exclusion need not be direct and observable, but can stem from covert messages of disintegration between the offender and the community. It is argued here that this symbolic exclusion is developed from the community’s judgment about the morality and justifiability of an offender choosing or resorting to
offending within the current social climate. This moral judgment, it is contended, is linked to community beliefs about the forfeiture of offender rights, including the right to inclusion, as well as the eligibility of offenders to return to the community.

**Forfeiture and eligibility in ex-prisoner reintegration.**

*The principle of least eligibility.*

It is argued that both Travis’ (2005) ‘invisible’ exclusion of ex-prisoners and the symbolic moral argument believed to drive community responses to reintegration, are consistent with the principle of least eligibility. The principle of least eligibility (Clear, Cole, & Reisig, 2013) is credited to *The Poor Law Amendment Act* of 1834 in England. According to the principle, “prisoners, having been convicted of wrongful behavior, should be the least eligible of all citizens for social benefits beyond the bare minimum required by law” (Clear et al., 2013; Sieh, 1989).

The principle of least eligibility is considered herein as a symbolic notion that drives moral inclusion. It is the belief that ex-prisoners should be considered the least eligible of all persons for social supports and benefits, beyond the bare minimum. Released ex-prisoners should be considered last, behind any other citizen who requires housing, employment, skills building or social supports. This seems a logical argument, since those in need of support who have not offended deserve more than those who are in need of support due to their offending. However, it is contended that this argument is overly simplistic. To begin, research clearly indicates that as a population, offenders are among some of the most disenfranchised peoples, prior to offending (Gibbons & Katzenbach, 2006; Herivel & Wright, 2003; Petersilia, 2003; Shenson, Dubler, & Michaels, 1990; Teplin, 1990; Teplin, Abram, & McClelland, 1997; Van Ness & Strong, 2010). Indeed, research indicates that offending is associated with poverty, low socio-economic status, limited educational achievement and employment stability (Herivel & Wright, 2003; Petersilia, 2003). Additionally, there is a high prevalence of mental health concerns, substance abuse and historic trauma in offender populations (Petersilia, 2003; Teplin, 1990, 1994; Teplin, et al., 1997). It is more likely that this
population required support prior to offending, and certainly require support post-offending.

In an American report, ‘Confronting Confinement: A Report of The Commission on Safety and Abuse in America’s Prisons’, Gibbons and Katzenbach (2006, p 394) highlight the general trend for the American government to pass “tough-on-crime policies that have swelled America’s prisons and jails, filling them with poor, undereducated, and unhealthy individuals.” Prisons are “expected to provide medical and mental health care for millions of people every year, most of whom are poor and many of whom have serious health needs that were not appropriately treated before incarceration” (Gibbons & Katzenbach, 2006, p. 441). The report identified the mass imprisonment of underprivileged groups within America, including the poor, mentally ill, and those of ethnic minorities. For example, the report cites laws that “have the consequence of incarcerating one in every three or four African-American men in some neighbourhoods” (Gibbons & Katzenbach, 2006, p. 536).

Applegate (2001) explored community attitudes toward the eligibility of prisoners for services that those in the wider community must pay to receive (e.g. access to a gym, entertainment). Two hundred residents of Orange County, Florida were surveyed regarding their support or opposition to 26 prison programs, services and amenities. The study found respondents supported the retention of the majority of programs, services and amenities (19 of the 26). Recreational and entertainment privileges were among the amenities least supported by respondents, compared to programs and services designed to provide educational, vocational, psychological, legal and healthcare assistance; for example, 5-percent and 9-percent of respondents supported, respectively, the elimination of psychological counselling and job training, while 36.5-percent and 45.7-percent supported, respectively, the elimination of basic television and weight-lifting equipment. Interestingly, the study found that respondent decisions about prisoner eligibility for programs, services and amenities were impacted by the utility of these facilities. Where access was deemed to be useful to prisoner management and rehabilitation, retention of the service was supported. Respondents were also more supportive of prisoner access to services if prisoners contributed to the funding of these services. Finally,
support was also influenced by respondents’ perceptions of what prisoners ‘deserved’, such as the use of a reward-based system.

A study conducted by Nygel (2002) also supported the impact of perceptions of least eligibility in community support for prisoner’s access to amenities in prison. Nygel’s study found respondent’s support for prisoner access to amenities ($N=180$) depended on the party responsible for paying for the amenity. Respondents were most supportive when inmates were responsible for funding access to a service or amenity, compared to tax-payers funding the amenity.

Clear, et al. (2013, p. 351), in summarising public ambivalence toward correctional programs, stated that “surveys consistently find that citizens support rehabilitation as part of correctional policy. Yet the public also does not want programs that seem to reward criminal conduct, and it resists paying for programs that seem extravagant.” It appears that strong public doubt and criticism of correctional programming, including rehabilitation and reintegration, results from community perceptions that offenders and ex-prisoners have less eligibility to access community resources than other groups perceived as more deserving. Further, it appears the community endorses the belief that, when limited resources are available, these should not be allocated to offenders.

A parallel concept to that of eligibility is forfeiture. Forfeiture holds that offenders, in choosing to violate the law and community bonds, forfeit their rights to be part of the community. Forfeiture is a fundamental aspect of correctional punishment. In offending against the community, an offender is seen to have rejected the social rules of that community (Reitan, 1991). As punishment, the offender forfeits their citizenship rights via imprisonment (including freedom, voting rights, and access to community resources).

Importantly, forfeiture may be an implicit narrative. Additionally, it may be viewed by the community as a stable or unstable construct. The completion of punishment may signify the termination of the offender’s forfeiture from citizenship, after which the individual is permitted to return as ‘one of’ rather than remain ‘other’. Alternatively, where the community believes forfeiture is permanent, once an individual has forfeited his or her rights to be part of the community, the ex-prisoner cannot re-engage with the community. Here reintegration becomes
irrelevant. The extent to which the community perceives forfeiture and eligibility to be fixed events from which an offender cannot return, or limited to the infliction of punishment, is currently unknown.

Unfortunately, as community attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration have not been previously studied, it is not possible to determine the role of symbolic judgements about eligibility and forfeiture in community support for reintegration. In the absence of direct literature on this topic, it is useful to draw from research in another field that has investigated the concepts of eligibility and forfeiture. One such field is that of organ and tissue transplant eligibility. It is reasoned that public attitudes about a patient’s eligibility to receive organ transplants based on their past behaviour is similar to public attitudes towards eligibility of ex-prisoners to reintegrate, based on their past behaviour.

In America and Australia, current practices for transplant eligibility are centred around the placement of a person in need of a transplant on a wait list. Wait lists are generally long, due to gaps between organ and tissue donation and demand (Centre for Bioethics, 2004). For example, a report conducted by the Centre for Bioethics, University of Minnesota (Centre for Bioethics, 2004) reported that between one half and one third of all people on transplant waiting lists die before a transplant organ is found.

Given the fatal impacts of not being listed on the organ waitlist, together with high demand for organs, it is argued that symbolic notions of eligibility and forfeiture are critical to the decision-making process for organ donation eligibility. Certain potential recipients have a history of risk-taking behaviour that increases (or is perceived to increase) their risk of failure, which has the potential to impact their eligibility for a donor organ. Transplant literature may thus shed some light on the application of the principles of eligibility and forfeiture within ex-prisoner reintegration.

Transplant Literature.

The sensitive nature of organ and tissue transplants requires that a medical board make judgments as to the eligibility of patients to first be placed on the wait list,
but also to their eligibility for an organ, should one become available. According to The Transplant Society of Australia and New Zealand (TSANZ) (2010, p. vi), organs should be “allocated fairly, following specific processes for each type of organ or tissue as well as criteria for matching the donation to the recipient.” The document provides clear inclusion and exclusion criteria for organ and tissue eligibility. Liver eligibility exclusion criteria, for example, exclude “those conditions or circumstances that would make a post-transplant survival rate of >50% at 5 years unlikely” (2010, p. 9). Kroeker, Bain, Shaw-Stiffel, Fong, and Yoshida (2008) similarly note that, in America, historic alcohol abusers are not excluded from organ transplant eligibility, provided they can demonstrate current abstinence (usually for the preceding six months).

It is noteworthy that documentation as to the eligibility of organ recipients specifically addresses the issues of past behaviour. This may be indicative of concerns authorities have that decision-making will be influenced by eligibility and forfeiture beliefs. Indeed, research has demonstrated widespread discrimination in organ eligibility decision-making, at least historically (Alexander & Sehgal, 1998; Kjellstrand, 1988; Koch, 2002; McCauley et al., 1997; Wittenberg, Goldie, Fischhoff, & Graham, 2003; Young & Gaston, 2000).

One area of research interest is the belief that recipients forfeited their organ eligibility due to historic engagement in lifestyle practices that pose a harm to health. These include dietary intake resulting in diabetes, or alcohol and other drug consumption (Chaplan, 1995; Cohen, Benjamin, & Arbor, 1991; Wittenberg et al., 2003). Cohen and colleagues (1991) consider this point. The authors contend that widespread unwillingness to consider patients for liver transplant as a result of alcohol cirrhosis is driven by one of two arguments – the moral argument or the medical argument. The moral argument is of interest to the current discussion. Briefly, the medical argument contends that patients with a history of alcohol abuse would be ill-equipped to maintain a lifestyle that will preserve their new liver. Therefore available organs should go to those patients who will have (presumably) better transplant outcomes.

The moral argument for exclusion is based on the belief that patients with alcohol cirrhosis are blameworthy for the onset of their condition (also see for discussion,
Chaplan, 1994; Hewes & Toriello, 1998). Cohen et al. (1991) note the moral argument is distinct from other ethical arguments of providing medical assistance to patients whose illness or injury is a result of their own conduct because, in the case of organ transplants, demand is higher than availability.\(^{21}\) In the search to distinguish the eligibility of one patient over another, the conduct of the patient is taken into consideration, and the moral argument becomes influential.

Cohen et al., (1991, p. 1299) argue that the basis of this judgment is a belief that “heavy drinking – unlike smoking or overeating, or failing to wear a seat belt – is widely regarded as morally wrong.” Despite alcoholism being classified as a disease or disorder (Hewes & Toriello, 1998), the moral argument clearly locates the cause of liver disease in the patient’s weakness of will. It follows that an alcoholic’s need for an organ transplant is the result of his or her own irresponsibility, and it is only fair to consider this blameworthiness as a criterion for ineligibility (Cohen et al., 1991).

A study conducted by Wittenberg et al. (2003) found support for the theory of forfeiture caused by one’s behaviour. In this study, respondents (\(N=310\)) were asked to assign health care resources to hypothetical cases. Four hypothetical scenarios were described, involving patients who: developed liver disease due to alcohol consumption; developed liver disease due to genetic factors; developed asthma due to in-home air pollution (smoking); and, who developed asthma due to outdoor air pollution. Respondents assigned less resources to hypothetical patients who developed medical conditions due to personal choices (alcohol-induced liver disease and in-home air pollution), compared to patients who developed their condition due to uncontrollable factors (inherited liver disease or asthma from outdoor air pollution).

\(^{21}\) To explain further: a car accident victim may receive medical assistance in a sense independent from other patients, as there are enough resources within the community (a hospital, doctors, medical instruments and drugs) to provide for a large number of patients. Whether the car crash was caused by the victim’s blood alcohol level or not does not impact on their access to western medicine. However, a person receiving a liver transplant necessarily ensures the people under them on the transplant list do not receive the organ. Here, the behaviour of the patient receiving the organ comes into question, because their behaviour (e.g. alcohol abuse) impacts on the lives of other people.
Drawing from the transplant literature, it may be theorised that the community makes judgments about the eligibility or ineligibility of an ex-prisoner to return to community, based on the latter’s responsibility for engaging in criminal behaviour. Further, community decisions are impacted by community perceptions about finite resources within the community which include housing, employment, and social services. This is in line with the theory of least eligibility. In communities where resources are limited, the community will resist the provision of these resources to individuals, including ex-prisoners, who are seen to have forfeited their equal rights to these resources. Rather, it is argued here that the community will support the dissemination of available resources first to other groups deemed more eligible, such as the poor, disabled, or mentally ill. Therefore, in communities where limited social and economic resources exist and an ex-prisoner’s past criminal behaviour is deemed a sign of forfeiture, reintegration will not be supported.

**Redeemability.**

Another symbolic message linked to eligibility and forfeiture beliefs is that of redeemability; that is, whether an ex-prisoner possesses the ability to return to community as an active, contributing member. Restoration can only occur where there exists a belief that the ex-prisoner can transgress the boundary between ‘other’ and ‘one of.’ Inherent in restoration, therefore, is a belief in the ex-prisoner’s redeemability. Redeemability is an attribute, which people assign to others (Maruna, 2009).

According to Attribution Theory (Brickman, Rabinowitz, Coates, Cohn, & Kidder, 1982) (discussed in Chapter Four), attributions involve not only an assignment of blame, but also the belief about who (or what) has the power to change the problem. An attribute state may be either stable or unstable. Belief in redeemability refers to the belief that a criminal may desist from criminal behaviour and live a pro-social life (the opposite being that criminality is essentially fixed and unchangeable.

‘Belief in redeemability’ is an individually driven process (Brickman, et al., 1982). At either end of the spectrum will be those who believe some individuals are
inherently criminal and ‘fixed’, and those that believe that even the worst criminal can be helped to lead a pro-social life (Maruna & King, 2004). If the community believes ex-prisoners are redeemable (can desist from crime), it is more likely that it will communicate symbolic reintegration to ex-prisoners. Conversely, if a community views criminal behaviour to be static, it is unlikely it will support the reintegration attempts of an ex-prisoner. Additionally, an ex-prisoner’s belief about their redeemability will also impact on his or her reintegration and desistance from crime. In practice, beliefs about redeemability are likely to play out also through behaviours and support for re- or disintegrative practices. These may occur on an individual level, such as parole board members’ beliefs about redeemability (Carroll, 1978a; 1978b; Carroll, Galegher, & Weiner, 1982; Carroll, Weiner, Coats, Galegher, & Alibrio, 1982). Redeemability beliefs may also impact reintegration on an abstract level, such as public support for government funding for reintegrative initiatives. The conceptualisation of redeemability as a process driving support for reintegration is considered in Chapter Four of this thesis.

Community willingness to be involved in the reintegration process: ‘not in my backyard’ and risk.

Community support for reintegration may be influenced by the level of personal involvement each member of the community are required to provide in support of this initiative. Two broad ‘levels’ of engagement exist. The first refers to personal engagement. This is best defined as the preparedness of individuals within the community to be personally involved in the reintegration of ex-prisoners. A member of the community enters into an interpersonal relationship with an ex-prisoner promoting the latter’s integration. Examples of personal engagement include socialising with a neighbour or work colleague who has a criminal record, or being a member of a community or sporting group alongside an ex-prisoner. Personal level support also encompasses scenarios where personal interaction is supported, though not necessarily sought out. Examples of this include a willingness to have transitional accommodation apartments or a drop-in centre established within one’s neighbourhood.
The second level refers to abstract engagement in reintegration. It is best defined as community support for reintegrative policy. At this level, community does not actively engage in reintegration, but rather it passively supports allocation of community resources to assist ex-prisoner reintegration. Examples of support for reintegrative policy include community support for government funding toward the establishment of reintegration programs, or development of transitional accommodation within the broader community, but not one’s neighbourhood.

The distinction between ‘personal’ and ‘abstract’ level community support has been demonstrated in studies of community support for crime and justice initiatives. These include community members’ support for prison development and rehabilitation programs within their neighborhood. Martin and colleagues (Martin, Champion, & Gibney, 2002; Martin & Myers, 2005) demonstrated that the community supports the building of new prisons; however, it will oppose the establishment of a prison within its own community. The authors note the distinction between personal and policy support, naming this the “not in my backyard (NIMBY) phenomenon (Lober, 1995; Martin & Myers, 2005; Sieh, 1989). According to Martin and Myers (2005, p. 44), NIMBY is defined as “social rejection of facilities, infrastructure and services location, which are socially necessary but have a negative connotation.” The public recognises the necessity for certain environmental and social services to be established within communities. However, due to the negative image the community holds about these services, it opposes their establishment within its own neighborhood (Lober, 1995; Pol, Masso, Castrechini, & Vidal, 2006).

In their study, Martin and Myers (2005) investigated the attitudes of 3,795 residents of southwest Pennsylvania. Variables of interest included: awareness and knowledge of a proposed prison in the community; concerns about crime and safety; and, perceptions about the economic impact and quality-of-life aspects of building a prison in the community. The results demonstrated that beliefs about personal level involvement significantly impacted respondents’ support for prisons. Residents living in close proximity of the proposed prison were more likely to expect future crime increases and lower safety compared to those living further away from the proposed prison site. These findings were supported in subsequent
studies (Courtright, Hannan, Packard, & Brennan, 2006; Courtright, Packard, Hannan, & Brennan, 2009). Courtright et al. (2009) argue that NIMBY responses are driven by beliefs about risk that prisons will bring to communities, presumably from the escape or release of offenders. Communities are also concerned about the impact of prison development on property values. Pol et al. (2006, p. 44) similarly writes,

“Different factors can generate a NIMBY effect, especially fear of loss of the perceived quality-of-life status and economic value of property. The NIMBY effect could be considered ‘normal’ due to perceived risk and nuisances associated with some social and environmental facilities. It includes fear of both objective and subjective risks (attributed risks), fear of loss of achieved well-being and quality-of-life status; and fear of loss of the economic value of property.”

Similar results have been reported for other justice initiatives. Brown (1999) investigated public support for sex-offender rehabilitation programs in a sample of UK residents (N=312). The study found 51-percent of participants support rehabilitation programs for sex offenders; however 64-percent opposed the establishment of a rehabilitation facility within their community.

It may be theorised that the public will display similar NIMBY responses to ex-prisoner reintegration. Perceptions of risk and fear of loss are fundamental to the NIMBY phenomenon. Ex-prisoners carry connotations about the risk of re-offending and civic incivilities, negatively impacting property values. This population also places greater demands on community resources, including accommodation, employment and other support services. It is likely this population will activate community NIMBY responses.

The community objects to and challenges the establishment of prisons in its neighbourhood, yet supports the building of more prisons in general (at an ‘abstract’ level). Likewise, it objects to rehabilitation programs occurring in its community, yet supports the establishment of rehabilitation programs in prisons not in its neighbourhood (and run by professionals, not the community). In a similar way, it is reasoned that the community will object to and challenge the
reintegration of ex-prisoners into its own community, yet will be more willing to support the practice of reintegration at an abstract level, for example, in government funding for reintegration programs.

This thesis argues that reintegration is communicated between the ex-prisoner and the community via both symbolic and non-symbolic messages of inclusion or exclusion. This above section explored the symbolic nature of reintegration. It was argued that the symbolic component of reintegration is important as it influences the actual (non-symbolic) interactions between an ex-prisoner and members of his or her community. Symbolic inclusion was discussed with reference to moral inclusion, eligibility, forfeiture, redeemability, and the NIMBY phenomenon.

Consideration of the symbolic nature of ex-prisoner reintegration is critical. While the State may instigate formal reintegration ceremonies (in much the same way as current practice utilises formal disintegration ceremonies), it is argued in this thesis that messages of reintegration are more potent and successful when communicated between the ex-prisoner and members of their community, within every-day reciprocal interactions. Both the community and the ex-prisoner’s notions of moral inclusion, eligibility, forfeiture, redeemability, and risk influence these every-day interactions.

The remainder of the chapter will be devoted to exploring contexts (or sites) of reintegration. These are sites where symbolic notions of inclusion or exclusion are communicated between the ex-prisoner and their wider community. Literature in this area conceptualises these sites as ‘domains’ of reintegration. This literature will be discussed in the coming pages. Having explored what reintegration is, the chapter will conclude by returning to the discussion of contemporary reintegration in the criminal justice system; in particular, the question of whether reintegration should be a sentencing objective will be discussed.
Domains of Reintegration and Social Inclusion

As previously noted, reintegration is achieved when the ex-prisoner and members of their community communicate inclusion through both formal and informal interactions. These interactions occur within a number of ‘domains’ of everyday life. Examples include gaining employment or becoming involved in community groups. Literature has identified a number of domains as influential on the post-incarceration experiences of ex-offenders. These include housing, employment, education, skills and vocational training, and family and social supports (Shinkfield, 2006; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009).

Domains are often conceptualised as barriers that ex-prisoners face and struggle to overcome post-incarceration (e.g. Brown, et al., 2008; Shinkfield, 2006; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009). This is an accurate, although perhaps unhelpful, way to view the reintegration process. Desistance and reintegration are promoted when an ex-prisoner has access to these domains, and ultimately achieves the broader goal of community acceptance and participation. It is argued here that it is better to conceptualize these sites of interaction as opportunities for reintegration and desistance to be promoted, rather than barriers. Thus, these are labelled here as ‘domains of reintegration and social inclusion.’ This alternative formulation fits within the current desistance framework of corrections, where the focus is on what promotes desistance (or human needs under Ward’s Good Lives Model) (Ward & Maruna, 2007), and not what promotes re-offending.

Research supports the importance of offenders gaining access to the domains of reintegration and social inclusion. Access has been linked to desistance and reduced recidivism. For example stable employment (Schram, Koons-Witt, Williams, & McShane, 2006), closer family relationships, and greater family support (Cullan, 1994; La Vigne et al., 2004) are associated with decreased rates of re-offending. Empirical research also supports the link between access to the domains of reintegration and social inclusion, and subjective well-being, quality of life, and effective functioning in the general population (Diener & Ryan, 2009; Sirgy, Tao, & Young, 2008). Yet, ex-offenders too often experience difficulty in accessing, and maintaining access to, these domains of reintegration (see for
The two domains of housing and employment have received a considerable amount of research attention in comparison to the domains of education and social supports. Housing and employment have been linked to recidivism when not accessed, and desistance from crime when accessed by ex-offenders (e.g. Graffam, Shinkfield, Mihailides, & Lavelle, 2005; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005; Zample & Quinsey, 1997). Hammett, Roberts, and Kennedy (2001) argue that housing forms the basis of reintegration needs, as it is stable accommodation that provides a ‘safe base’ for ex-prisoners. From this base, presumably, ex-prisoners can develop skills and resources to access other domains of social inclusion, including accessing local services and benefits, psychological and medical treatment, and searching for employment.

In light of the above note, the current study chose to consider the impact of community support for ex-prisoner reintegration in the domains of housing and employment only. As such, research relating to these two domains of social inclusion is discussed below22. Generally the literature reports ex-prisoners are disadvantaged educationally compared to the general population (Fletcher, 2001; Shinkfield, 2006). Further, offenders lack pro-social and stable social support networks, including family supports (Baldry, et al., 2003; Helfgott, 2007; La Vigne, et al., 2004)

22 The interested reader may wish to review the following literature as it relates to educational opportunities for ex-offenders (Bearing Point, 2003; Fletcher, 2001; Graffam et al., 2005; Griffiths, et al., 2007; Metcalf, Anderson, & Rolfe, 2001). The following literature relates to social support available to ex-offenders post-incarceration (Anderson-Facile, 2009; Burchfield & Mingus, 2012; Fontaine, Gilchris-Scott, Denver, & Rossman, 2012; Petersilia, 2003; 2004; Travis, 2000; 2005; Visher & Travis, 2003), and the positive impact of social supports post-incarceration (Cullen, 1994; Fontaine, et al., 2012; Harding, Wyse, Dobson, & Morenoff, 2001; La Vigne, Visher, & Castro, 2004; Martinez & Abrams, 2013; Naser & La Vigne, 2006; Pager, 2003; 2005; Petersilia, 2003; Spjeldnes, Jung, Maguire, & Yamatani, 2012; Solomon, Johnson, Travis, & McBride, 2004; Travis 2000).
Accommodation.

Released offenders face challenges in finding and maintaining housing (Baldry, et al., 2006; Cowan & Fionda, 1994; Helfgott, 2007). Often this is a result of ex-prisoners’ limited ability to rely on family or friends for long-term accommodation, limited State-supported housing, and ex-prisoners’ limited financial resources to access private accommodation options (Baldry et al., 2006; Vinson, 2001).

Limited data are available relating to actual rates of housing and homelessness in returned offender populations (Baldry et al., 2006; Petersilia, 2009; Travis, et al., 2001; Willis, 2004). Willis (2004, p. 9) cites a South Australian Department of Correctional Services survey which estimated about 10-percent of clients under community-based supervision were without safe, secure, and stable housing.

Baldry and colleagues (2006) conducted a ground breaking large-scale longitudinal study of ex-prisoners’ accommodation post-release. In total, 339 ex-prisoners from New South Wales and Victoria (Australia) were interviewed pre-release, and at 3- and 6-months post-release. Prior to incarceration, 20-percent (NSW) and 16-percent (Victoria) reported accommodation consistent with homelessness, including living in squats, on the streets, or in institutions. Sixteen percent expected to return to this type of accommodation post-release, while 36-percent hoped to move into family accommodation. A staggering 73-percent of NSW participants and 58-percent of Victorian participants reported they had received no information of any kind about accommodation or support prior to release. At 2-months post-release, 21-percent of the sample were homeless, with as many as 20 individuals who had been housed prior to incarceration finding themselves homeless at the 3-month post-release mark. At 6-month post-release, up to 50-percent of the participants had experienced episodes of homelessness, with many respondents who were in unstable or transient housing (e.g. sleeping on a friend’s couch) unlikely to label themselves homeless.

Similar challenges in accessing stable accommodation have been reported in American studies (La Vigne et al., 2004; La Vigne & Kachnowski, 2003; La Vigne & Mamalian, 2003; La Vigne & Thomson, 2003; Visher, La Vigne, & Farrell, 2003). Greenberg and Rosenheck (2008) found 9-percent of American adult State and Federal prison inmates reported an episode of homelessness in the 12 months.
prior to incarceration. American Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that 12-percent of U.S. offenders were homeless immediately prior to incarceration (Langan & Levin, 2002). A study conducted by the California Department of Corrections (1997) found 30- to 50-percent of parolees sampled were homeless (see for discussion, Roman & Travis, 2004).

A series of longitudinal studies carried out by the Urban Institute as part of the ‘Returning Home’ study in America found many interviewed offenders identified housing as critical to post-release success (Visher et al., 2003; Visher, La Vigne, & Travis, 2004; Visher, La Vigne, & Castro, 2003). While the majority of offenders anticipated living with family members, many were concerned about being able to maintain this arrangement in the longer term (La Vigne et al., 2004; Visher, La Vigne, & Castro, 2003).

Parole officials recognize the challenges ex-prisoners face in finding and maintaining accommodation. Petersilia (2009) reported that finding housing was rated by parole officers as the biggest challenge for ex-prisoners, even more difficult and more important than finding employment. As Bradley, Oliver, Richardson, & Slayter (2001, p. 7) concludes in a Massachusetts report of housing for ex-prisoners:

“For the returning prisoner, the search for permanent, sustainable housing is more than simply a disagreeable experience. It is a daunting challenge – one that portends success or failure for the entire reintegration process … Housing is the linchpin that holds the reintegration process together. Without a stable residence, continuity in substance abuse and mental health treatment is compromised. Employment is often contingent upon a fixed living arrangement.”

Several factors are likely to contribute to the unsuitability of maintaining housing with family or significant others long-term. Family and friends are likely to experience difficulty in re-uniting with and accommodating the returned offender (Anderson-Facile, 2009). Lynch and Sabol (2001) attribute longer prison stays to a decline in family visits and other forms of communications, resulting in reduced preparedness of family members to accommodate offenders upon release.
In certain instances, parole conditions can prohibit ex-prisoners from returning to pre-imprisonment residences or neighbourhoods, or living or associating with others who are suspected of ongoing criminal involvement (Petersilia, 2009). This may include family members and other supports, which would otherwise have been willing to provide stable housing for the ex-prisoner. In other instances, certain laws may restrict an ex-prisoner from taking up residence with supports willing to provide accommodation, such as sex-offender laws that limit the distance from certain child-related institutions, such as schools (if say, the family home was down the road from a primary school (Serious Sex Offenders (Detention and Supervision) Act 2009 (Vic) ss. 15-17).

Beyond relying on family or friends, ex-prisoners must look to government-assisted housing or the private housing market. State prisons often house prisoners a considerable distance from their return destination, which likely impinges on opportunities for offenders to begin the process of securing housing prior to release (Baldry et al., 2006; Petersilia, 2009). Searching for houses, rental properties and fulfilling inspection and paperwork requirements become virtually impossible. In most instances, offenders will have to rely on service providers to be the crucial go-between in finding and securing accommodation in the lead-up to release.

It is unlikely that many ex-prisoners will have enough financial independence to move into a private rental property, meaning that the private rental market is not a viable option (Petersilia, 2009; Vinson, 1999). In those instances where an ex-prisoner could afford a private rental property, criminal record, background and employment checks conducted by rental agencies likely result in ex-prisoners being passed over in favour of more reliable and (presumed) more trustworthy applicants (Petersilia, 2009; Holzer, 1996). Helfgott (1997) investigated property owners’ attitudes towards released offenders. More than half of property managers surveyed said they enquire about criminal history on rental applications, and the majority indicated that they would reject an applicant with a criminal history. However, the researchers here did not enquire as to how many property managers had actually rejected applicants with a criminal record.

The majority of ex-prisoners who are unable to reside indefinitely with family or friends and cannot afford private rental properties are left to seek government
housing. In most cases, released offenders are eligible for specialist short-term housing assistance, although these are often in limited supply. In Victoria, for example, of the total households projected to be available in 2010, private tenancy represented 22.5-percent (or 82.54-percent) of total tenant households. In contrast, 3.6-percent was made up of Office of Housing properties (or 13.12-percent of total tenant households), which includes public housing, community housing, disability support accommodation, and other supportive accommodation for persons in need (ABS, 2010b; ABS, 2011a).

Since 2009, there has been, under the Transitional Housing Management Program (DHS, 2011), a total of 20 funded organisations providing transitional housing for clients in Victoria experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness. In the 2010-11 period, these organisations assisted 52,146 clients. Government housing wait lists can be as long as two or three years, and re-offending during this time usually results in loss of place (DHS, 2012). The Summary of Housing Assistance Programs 2010-11 Report (DHS, 2012), reported that at June 30 2011, there were 38,244 applicants on the Victorian waiting list for rental housing assistance (long-term rental housing assistance). In the previous financial year 2009-10, 13.86-percent of rental housing applicants on the waitlist were allocated to rental properties within this 12-month period – that is, 5,683 allocations to rental properties, down from a total of 41,017 applicants on the wait list (DHS, 2012).

In addition to the systemic issues outlined above, many community members object to having a released offender as a neighbour (Brown, Spencer and Deakin, 2007; Helfgott, 2007; Lee, Weil, & Shihadeh, 2007). Research has indicated the offence-type does impact the degree of community opposition to housing ex-prisoners, with sexual offenders receiving the most opposition (Brown, 1999; Willis, et al, 2010). At best, community appears to tolerate the presence of ex-prisoners, with the majority of respondents indicating that they would not welcome or socialize with ex-prisoners (Helfgott, 2007). These data are consistent with themes such as NIMBY, risk, forfeiture and redemption, developed earlier in this chapter.
Stable housing and desistance.

Stable housing has been shown to directly relate to reduced rates of re-offending, whereas transient housing has been linked with increased rates of re-offending (Anderson-Facile, 2009; Baldry, et al., 2003; 2006; Roman and Travis, 2006). Baldry et al., (2006) reported a clear association between unstable housing and re-arrest and re-imprisonment, with transient accommodation (i.e. moving often) being a significant predictor of re-incarceration. Roman and Travis (2006) similarly found ex-offender re-arrest has a positive relationship with the number of residential changes.

Secure accommodation has also been linked to other factors that may contribute to desistance (or, in the case of unstable or no housing, recidivism). For example, stable housing is a critical element in securing employment (Bradley et al., 2001), while unstable housing can exacerbate pre-existing barriers to employment faced by ex-offenders (Western, Kling, & Weiman, 2001). Parole violations can result from homelessness, disrupting the ex-prisoner’s contact with correctional officers, treatment agencies, and other support networks. One study that followed a cohort of 50,000 New York State offenders post-release, found those ex-prisoners who became homeless post-incarceration were more likely to be re-incarcerated (Metraux & Culhane, 2004).

Employment.

Employment challenges for released ex-prisoners are multifaceted. Ex-prisoners have been found to have lower rates of pre-incarceration employment, are disadvantaged in acquiring and maintaining stable employment, and are disadvantaged in the jobs they do acquire (Holzer, et al., 2003a, 2003c; Western, et al., 2001). Additionally, research has demonstrated that employers hold certain negative attitudes towards ex-prisoners, and are overwhelmingly unwilling to hire applicants when a criminal history is revealed (Holzer, 2007; Holzer, Raphael, & Stoll, 2002a, 2002c, 2003c; Pager, 2003). Finally, ex-prisoners are barred from a number of specialist occupations, and increasingly compete with other
marginalized groups within society for low-skilled positions (Holzer et al., 2003b, 2003a; Ihlanfeldt & Sjoquist, 1998)

Current rates of employment or unemployment in released offender populations are under-researched (Petersilia, 2009). Of the data that do exist, there is a clear trend toward lower employment opportunities in ex-prisoner populations. In America, unemployment of ex-prisoners has been estimated at between 25 and 40-percent (Finn, 1998). A study conducted by Kinner (2006) of 160 prisoners in Queensland pre- and post-release, reported that 50-percent of respondents had been unemployed prior to incarceration, while 30-percent had arranged employment, education or training in preparation for their release. A larger percentage (44%) anticipated they would ‘realistically’ receive unemployment benefits upon release (38% of males, 58% of females). Unfortunately, Kinner’s study did not report actual employment rates at the follow-up time periods. Baldry et al.’s (2006) Australian study reported 84-percent of respondents (N= 238) were unemployed at 3-month follow up.

Reduced opportunities for employment for ex-prisoners.

According to Petersilia (2009), most experts and ex-prisoners alike believe that finding and maintaining stable employment is critical to successful reintegration (but also see Graffam et al., 2004). Employment helps ex-prisoners to establish financial independence and security. Employment provides a source of structure in their lives, enabling ex-prisoners to be productive, establish a sense of achievement and develop valuable life skills (Naylor, 2011; Petersilia, 2009). Employment also strengthens ex-prisoners’ social contact, social skills, connectedness and self-worth (Graffam, et al., 2004; Naylor, 2011; Petersilia, 2009).

Despite the obvious advantages of employment on the wellbeing and desistance outcomes of released offenders, many face barriers in accessing employment. Rather, ex-prisoners have been shown to have limited resources alongside increased financial burdens associated with unemployment (La Vigne, et al., 2004). Many unemployed released prisoners rely heavily on family and friends to provide financial assistance (La Vigne et al., 2004).
Limited qualifications, work skills, employment contacts and employment histories have all been associated with released offenders (Brown, et al., 2007; Fletcher, 2001; Webster, Hedderman, Turnbull & May, 2001). Holzer et al. (2002c, 2003a) report a number of barriers to ex-offender employment. These include: very low levels of education and low levels of previous work experience; substance abuse and other mental health issues; residential locations which are associated with areas of low employment stability and removed from geographical areas of job growth; and a lack of motivation for, alienation from and distrust of engagement in traditional work.

It is also noted that, for many released ex-prisoners, attainment of employment, or active job-seeking is often seen as a condition of parole. Petersilia (2009) notes, however, that this condition is unreasonable for the 18 to 21-percent of offenders who have a mental or physical condition that limits their ability to work.

Ex-offenders have also reported reduced earnings relative to workers with comparable skills (Western, 2002; Western et al., 2001). Western et al. (2001) found that the ‘ex-offender’ status imposes a significant, immediate ‘wage penalty’ on criminal offenders and alters long-term earnings trajectories by restricting access to career jobs. The authors estimate that when ex-offenders do secure employment, they earn 10- to 30-percent less than individuals with the same characteristics who do not have a criminal history.

In a study of employment opportunities for released sex offenders, Brown, et al., (2007) found that among those offenders who did access employment, many were in positions that were low paying and/or below their skill level. The majority of these obtained their position through personal contacts\(^{23}\). Evidence suggests that the effects of arrest and incarceration on finding a job likely decease over time; however, the effects of incarceration on earnings appears to be sustained (Petersilia, 2009). Released offenders have also reported experiencing discrimination in employment (Helfgott, 2007).

\(^{23}\) It is acknowledged that use of contacts to access employment is not specific to ex-offender populations, and actually is very common among those without a criminal record.
Where ex-prisoners may gain access to entry-level positions, research has demonstrated that employers are sometimes unwilling to advance them to positions of responsibility (Petersilia, 2009). Presumably, this relates to beliefs about company and employee security and the inherent assumption of untrustworthiness of the ex-prisoner (see Metcalf, et al., 2001).

**Barriers and workplace restrictions.**

In general, it is illegal for employers to impose exclusionary criteria against hiring ex-offenders (i.e. individuals with a criminal record) (Petersilia, 2009). Nevertheless, factors that increase the temptation of employers to informally pass over employment applications of ex-offenders do exist. Additionally, there are laws mandating that certain ex-offenders be restricted from gaining employment for certain occupations, or require background checks to be completed prior to hiring an applicant (Petersilia, 2009).

In Australia, there is no general statutory obligation to disclose voluntarily a criminal history. However, there are some specific exceptions that apply to professions and certain occupations for professional registration and licensing purposes. These include: teachers (s.2.3.9 Education and Training Reform Act 2006 (Vic)); doctors (s.6 Health Professions Registration Act 2005 (Vic)); lawyers (s.2.3.3 Legal Profession Act 2004 (Vic)); security guards and crowd controllers (s.25 Private Security Act 2004 (Vic)); second-hand dealers and pawnbrokers (s.6(2)(a) Second-Hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 1989 (Vic)); introduction agents (s.14(c) Introduction Agents Act 1997 (Vic)); taxi drivers and bus drivers (s.132, 132D Transport (Compliance and Miscellaneous) Act 1983 (Vic)); and aged care workers and volunteers in aged care facilities (s.63-1A Aged Care Act 1997 (Cth)). The existence of these banning laws means that in some instances, ex-prisoners are barred from working in positions they legally held prior to incarceration (Petersilia, 2009). Additionally, licencing requirements for some professions (e.g. psychologist, lawyer, defence forces, criminal justice-related positions) contain broad enough standards of competency, honesty and trustworthiness that exclude ex-offenders, although these standards are not necessarily based on the existence of a criminal history (Petersilia, 2009).
Perhaps the most notable and publicised employment restrictions apply to registered sex offenders. An increasing number of occupations and volunteer positions which involve working with children and other vulnerable people require that the applicant have no prior sexually based offence(s) (Naylor, 2011; *Working With Children Act 2005* (Vic)).

Furthermore, a number of occupations previously open to relatively unskilled ex-prisoners now require criminal history checks (Naylor, 2011). For example, in Victoria, accreditation is required for persons who drive a bus or taxi. Accreditation can be denied on the basis of a range of previous serious offences or traffic offences (ss. 132, 132D *Transport (Compliance and Miscellaneous) Act 1983* (Vic)). Finally, Naylor (2011) notes that while some occupations do require a clear criminal history, others simply state that a criminal history check should be conducted, without clarifying what the employer should look for if a criminal history is revealed. In many instances without clear directions, employers may interpret any criminal history as means of ineligibility for the job.

*General practices resulting in barriers to employment.*

Beyond the specific exclusions discussed above, research has demonstrated that a large number of employers routinely conduct criminal record checks on prospective employees where these are not required, and are unwilling to hire applicants when a criminal history is revealed (Hardcastle, 2006; Petersilia, 2009; Western, et al., 2001). One study found that employers were less likely to hire ex-offenders than

---

24 In Australia the most relevant check for employers relating to sex offenders is the *Working with Children Check* (WWC Check; Victoria, under the *Working with Children Act 2005* (Vic)) or equivalent. The Victorian Working with Children Check “creates a mandatory minimum checking standard across Victoria. The WWC Check helps to keep children safe by preventing those who pose a risk to the safety of children from working with them, in either paid or volunteer work” (Department of Justice, Victoria, 2014). Those individuals who fail to obtain a WWC Check are restricted from gaining employment in several fields including: childcare, coaching and tuition, counselling (for children), education services, photographic services (for children), entertainment or party and gym or play facilities, children’s services, foster care, and youth justice (Department of Justice, Victorian, 2014).
those applicants who produced no information about past convictions (i.e. leave the item blank) on employment applications (Western, et al., 2001).

While in most instances it is illegal for employers to use blanket ‘no hiring’ policies for ex-offenders, employers may legally consider an applicant’s criminal history when making hiring decisions (Petersilia, 2009). Naylor (2011) notes that in Australia, without a national human rights charter, legislation, or procedural document protecting the privacy rights of ex-offenders, the only legal authority that can inform issues relating to criminal history checks is the common law ‘principle of legality.’ This principle relates to the basic human rights of the individual, stating that actions are not illegal unless explicitly stated as such in law (translated as ‘no crime without law’). In the absence of any legal restriction, then, employers can ask for and take account of any information they choose when making a hiring decision (Naylor, 2011). In addition to the legality principle, Naylor (2001) notes that employers are protected by the principle of freedom of contract that allows individuals to freely enter into a contract with each other as equal citizens. In theory, an employer can require that any potential employee have no criminal history when entering into an employer-employee contract; the employee can accept the contract or seek employment elsewhere (Naylor, 2011).

In many Australian jurisdictions, employers are able to access a potential employee’s criminal record directly. Privacy laws (Privacy Act 2000 (Cth)) dictate that personal information, including criminal records, can only be accessed with the individual’s consent. In many cases this simply means prospective employees are required to provide consent within the application process. Victoria is the only Australian jurisdiction that does not allow criminal records to be directly accessed by the employer. This ensures the applicant received the document and therefore has control over what their employer sees (Naylor, 2011).

An issue with serious implications is what happens to criminal records once these are provided to employers. In many jurisdictions (e.g. Victoria and NSW), the

---

25 In Australia, the police in each jurisdiction hold criminal records. These records include information pertaining to court appearances, court convictions, findings of guilt without conviction, good behaviour bonds, charges, matters awaiting hearing or under investigation, police intelligence, and traffic infringements (HREOC, 2004)
police charge includes a caution for employers, stating that information in the document is protected, should not be disclosed to any other party, and should be used and stored appropriately (Naylor, 2011; also see HREOC, 2004: 49). This caution may result in filing the check with an employee’s files. However, the future accessibility and use of this information within an agency is likely to be guided purely by company policies where these do exist, and employers’ discretion where these do not.

Data indicate that employers are increasingly seeking criminal history information in Australia (CrimTrac, 2010; Naylor, 2011). For example, the national criminal records agency, CrimTrac, processed around 2.7 million criminal history checks in 2009-10, which is an 11-percent increase since the period 2000-03 (CrimTrac, 2010: 58). This represents 13.5-percent of the total Australian population (2.1 million of a total population of 20 million) checked in a one-year period.

Ex-prisoners may also be excluded from employment opportunities based on missing documentation (Petersilia, 2009). Aside from vital documents such as driver’s licenses for select qualifications (e.g. forklift license, construction cards), ex-prisoners also must explain gaps in employment history, lack of references, past transient employment or sudden termination. These are all associated with past criminal behaviour, incarceration, difficulties in gaining employment and dismissal based on discovery of a criminal history. Additionally, in instances where an applicant has failed to disclose a criminal history or misrepresented this information, an employer may legally fire the individual should this information come to light. In Australia, an employee’s failure to answer queries about a criminal history truthfully can justify dismissal, not on the basis of the criminal record but of dishonesty (HREOC, 2004).

Employers’ unwillingness to employ ex-offenders.

Empirical investigation has generally indicated employer unwillingness to hire ex-offenders (that is, individuals with a criminal record, although not necessarily ex-prisoners) (see for discussion, Cerda, Stenstrom, & Curtis, 2014; Hardcastle, 2006; Metcalf et al., 2001). Several factors impact on this unwillingness, including details
about the ex-offender’s forensic history, their potential for future offending in the workplace, and their employment skills.

The type of offence committed is influential, with those committing more serious offences (e.g. violent or sexual offences and fraud) viewed more negatively (Cerda, et al., 2014; Conalty & Cox, 1999; Helfgott, 1997; Metcalf, et al., 2001). The type and length of the imposed sentence is also influential. Ex-offenders with histories of repeat offending, or recent offending, are viewed more negatively by employers (Metcalf, et al., 2001). Employers also report a fear that ex-offenders will offend against the company or other employees (Holzer, 1996; Holzer et al., 2002b, 2002c; Wirthlin Worldwide, 2000). Finally, employers appear to take into account the skills of the ex-offender, with higher skilled or educated ex-offenders more likely to be employed (Albright & Denq, 1996), although not always (Holzer, 1996; Holzer, et al., 2002c).

Although many employers require a criminal record check for all applicants, evidence suggests that this information is primarily used to make judgment about the general character of the applicant, rather than the nature of the past criminal behaviour relative to specific work requirements. Studies examining employers’ reasons for not hiring ex-offenders have also found employers referenced concerns about the basic or human skills of the ex-offender. For example, employers do not believe ex-offenders are trustworthy, reliable, honest, and punctual, have good social skills, or are able to relate positively to other employers and customers (Holzer et al., 2002c; 2003a; HREOC, 2004; Metcalf et al., 2001). Metcalf et al., (2001) found potential employment recruiters appeared to make decisions against hiring ex-offenders based on their criminal record per se, and not the potential relationship between their past offending behaviour and type of offence most likely to occur at work. For example, recruiters viewed past offences of dangerous driving as a greater indication of untrustworthiness as an employee than past offences more relevant to employment such as Health and Safety offences or criminal damages – 71% versus 55% and 50% respectively (Metcalf, et al., 2001).

Australian studies have found employers are becoming increasingly conscious and wary about employing ex-offenders (Naylor, 2011; Pager, 2007). This research indicates that employers are primarily concerned with the risk of re-offending, but
also consider ex-offenders to be unreliable or challenging employees (Graffam et al., 2004).

Ex-offenders represent one sub-population within a competitive job market and often compete with other marginalized groups to gain employment (Petersilia, 2009). Petersilia (2009) highlights current legislation in America that promotes welfare clients engaging in employment. In Australia, similar initiatives such as ‘work for the dole’ and disability benefits promote employment (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2011). Increasingly, other marginalized groups are seeking employment, and in line with the principle of least eligibility, may be viewed by employers as more deserving of employment than ex-offenders (Graffam et al., 2004; Holzer, 1996). Graffam and colleagues (2004) surveyed seven Australian employers (alongside 13 additional professionals from the criminal justice, accommodation and housing, and rehabilitation services sectors), and asked them to rate the employability of ex-offenders alongside other disadvantaged groups, including those with chronic illness, physical disabilities, communication difficulties, and intellectual impairment and psychiatric illnesses. Ex-offenders were rated as less likely to obtain employment compared to all other groups, except those with intellectual impairment and psychiatric illnesses.

Hardcastle (2006) compared the ratings of employers (N= 596) and employment service providers (N=176) of ‘job potential’ across different disadvantaged groups, including: those with chronic illness (e.g. epilepsy, chronic and severe asthma); physical or sensory impairment (e.g. facial scar, use a wheelchair, vision impairment); communication disorders (e.g. difficulties with English language, severe stutter); forensic history (i.e. at least one prior conviction); and, intellectual or psychiatric disability (e.g. difficulties in remembering, periods of intense depression). Employment service providers and employers rated ex-offenders as

26 It is also acknowledged that several initiatives in Australia exist that assist ex-offenders to gain employment exist. These include government led initiatives such as Job Services Australia (funded by the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations), an Australian-wide system that provides mainstream and specialist employment services for which ex-prisoners and offenders are eligible. Non-for-profit organisations also provide assistance, such as WISE Employment who provide services in Victoria and New South Wales.

The United States Government offers tax benefits (the Work Opportunity Tax Credit) for employers employing ex-offenders (U.S. Department of Labor, 2008).
the second least favourable population (intellectual/psychiatric disability being the lowest). This effect was consistent regardless of whether respondents had no prior and some prior employment experience with forensic populations. Studies conducted in America have similarly reported employers are hesitant or unwilling to hire an employee with a criminal record, and are more willing to hire other disadvantaged workers (e.g. welfare recipient, unemployed for at least one year) over an ex-offender (Holzer, 1996; Holzer et al., 2002c; Wirthlin Worldwide, 2000). One study concluded that employers are “much more reluctant to hire ex-offenders than any other group of disadvantaged workers.” Furthermore, “employers fear the legal liabilities that could potentially be created by hiring offenders, and they view their offender status as a signal of lack of reliability and trustworthiness” (Holzer, 2002a, p 10).

One common, and accurate, concern of employers relates to what has been referred to as ‘negligent hiring’ (Glynn, 1988; Holzer et al., 2002a; Naylor, 2011). Negligent hiring refers to employer liability for loss, pain, and suffering caused by the offending of an employer (ex-offender) against their co-workers. In the current context, the employer may be liable for the employee’s criminal acts (Petersilia, 2003). Petersilia notes that in most American cases, negligent hiring does not hold as legal grounds. However, in Australia, employers can be found to be legally liable for failure to disclose relevant criminal history information (Naylor, 2011; Naylor, Paterson, & Pittard, 2008). This often falls under vicarious liability, which imposes liability on an employer for the wrongdoing of an employee, in the absence of fault on the employer's part. For example, in Monie v Commonwealth (2007), the court found an employment service liable in negligence for failure to inform a prospective employer that the prospective employee was an ex-offender. In Ffrench v Sestili (2007) the South Australian court held the employer, Direct Personal Care Services, was vicariously liable for her employee’s fraud against Ms Ffrench. Petersilia (2009) notes that, even in cases where knowledge of a criminal record is not enough to warrant negligent hiring, most employers are unwilling to take the chance.
Employment and desistance from crime.

The link between employment instability and re-offending has been empirically supported (Bushway & Reuter, 2002; Farrington, Gallagher, Morley, Ledger, & West, 1986; Helfgott, 2007; Lipsey, 1995; McGuire, 2002; Schram, et al., 2006; Sarno, Hearden, & Hedderman, 2000; Simon & Corbett, 1996), although the nature of the relationship has been debated (Bushway, 2000; Uggen, 2000; Vennard & Hedderman, 2009). It has been argued that determining a direct causal relationship between unemployment and re-offending is difficult because of the impact of other mediating or moderating factors (Bushway, 2000).

Farrington et al. (1986) found unemployment increased criminal behaviour as a means of achieving material gain; however this was mediated by age, with the relationship being significant for young people only. Uggen (2000) analysed data from 3,000 individuals with official arrest histories and reported employment to be a ‘turning point’ for ex-offenders aged 28 years and over, but not for younger offenders. Lipsey (1995) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of nearly 400 studies from 1950 to 1990 and reported a positive link between employment and reduced recidivism, with employment being the single most effective factor in predicting reduced re-offending.

The Australian researchers, Graffam, et al., (2004), identified employment as an important factor in ex-prisoner desistance and reintegration. The researchers note that the Office of Correctional Services in Victoria “estimates that approximately 60-70% of people who re-offend are unemployed at the time that they re-offend” (Graffam et al., 2004, p 151).

Maruna (1999) identified an inconsistency in research examining desistance and employment. On one hand, research has demonstrated a correlation between desistance from crime and finding employment (Bahr, Harris, Fisher, & Armstrong, 2010; Mischkowitz, 1994; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Shover, 1985). For example, Tripodi, Kim and Bender (2010) reported that employment was associated with a 17-percent reduction in recidivism in a sample of 250 parolees released from custody between 2001 and 2005, although this finding was not statistically significant. The researchers did find a significant difference in time between initial incarceration and re-incarceration between the two groups, with parolees who were
employed post-incarceration remaining out of custody for longer than those who were not employed. A number of other studies have reported high rates of desistance (measured via recidivism) in ex-prisoners who are employed (Rahill-Beuler & Kretzer, 1997; Soothill & Holmes, 1981). On the other hand, researchers have argued that the difference in desistance is “small, non-existent, or even in the wrong direction” between employed and unemployed ex-prisoners (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; pp. 138-139).

Studies investigating the reintegration experiences of ex-prisoners in the key domains of social inclusion.

Shinkfield and Graffam (2009; also see Graffam, Shinkfield, & Hardcastle, 2008) conducted research into a variety of variables influencing ex-prisoner reintegration. Accommodation, employment, education and skills development, and social supports were among the variables of interest. Participants were found to engage in minimal paid employment following release, at both a post-release (1-4 weeks) and at 3-4 month follow-up. This population was able to maintain stable housing and reported high levels of social supports across the two time periods.27

The above examination of literature on ex-prisoners’ experiences in the domains of housing, employment, education and social supports post-incarceration indicate that, in many instances, access is restricted on a number of levels, including government and agency policies, public attitudes and individual discretion. At the same time, the literature highlights that access to these areas is vital for reintegration, to allow ex-prisoners opportunities to reconnect with community, establish a pro-social lifestyle and ultimately desist from crime. Conversely, barred access has been shown to impact on re-offending.

Ex-prisoners returning to community recognises the importance of accessing these domains, particularly the domains of employment and housing. Yet to a large extent, literature has not considered the degree to which the community appreciates

27 Research conducted by Shinkfield, Graffam and colleagues (Graffam & Shinkfield, 2012; Graffam, et al., 2009; Graffam, et al., 2004; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009; 2010; Graffam, et al., 2008) is discussed further in chapters three and four.
the impact of these domains as barriers to reintegration (and desistance). The following chapters will explore what is known about community attitudes in relation to barriers to reintegration. Before turning to the community’s role in reintegration, a final point should be made in relation to reintegration’s place within the CJS.

**Reintegration within the criminal justice system**

Thus far, the current discussion of reintegration has neglected a critical aspect of this correctional objective. This relates to whether reintegration may in fact be considered a correctional objective. At the conclusion of the previous chapter, the benefits of considering a broader psychosocial conceptualization of the offender and offending process was discussed, and approaches such as the Good Lives Model (Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Maruna, 2007) were discussed as initiatives that have been widely accepted and incorporated into correctional practice. The same is not necessarily true for reintegration.

The past five years has seen the production of a plethora of correctional programs that have been described as ‘reintegrative,’ while reintegration and re-entry appear extensively in correctional discourse (Borzycki, 2005, Borzycki & Baldry, 2003; Department of Justice Tasmania, 2011). Nevertheless, implementation of reintegration remains limited, particularly as a result of lacking agreement as to what defines this process, who is involved and what it should look like. No doubt, reintegration is consistent with utilitarian correctional objectives (Maruna, 2011; Reitan, 1996). Reitan (1996) argues that punishment within a reintegrative framework achieves community between the offender and members of the larger society (these he terms the ‘community of good citizens’), This is seen as good for the society and therefore punishment can also be seen to satisfy many of the utilitarian concerns underlying both the deterrence and incapacitation theories of punishment. Furthermore, Reitan (1996) argues that the process of reintegration, as a means of punishment, provides a number of advantages over other ‘rival’ theories (or goals) of punishment. Perhaps the best evidence of this argument is the abovementioned set of limitations in the ability of the traditional theories of
punishment to adequately impact on reoffending (Day & Howell, 2002). Additionally, several scholars, including Reitan and Muntingh (2001), provide a convincing argument for the limitations in the conceptualization of traditional theories of punishment (see for discussion, Muntingh, 2001).

Punishment, rehabilitation and reintegration need not to be considered correctional objectives that are incompatible. Rather these objectives can be complementary. It may be argued that as reintegration takes a broader psychosocial perspective than the traditional deficit-focus of rehabilitation, it may contribute to greater reduction in recidivism above rehabilitation [17- to 35-percent] (Bonta & Andrews, 2007). According to Reitan’s (1996) ‘Reintegration Theory of Punishment’, neither rehabilitation nor punishment will work unless both sentencing aims are accompanied by efforts to (re)-establish social bonds between the offender and their community:

“…punishment may be necessary for integrating a criminal into the community of good citizens, but it is not necessarily sufficient. Should other barriers continue to be in place, then the purpose of punishment is thwarted, and punishment is rendered useless. This fact suggests that punishment is only justified in a context in which there is a concerted effort to remove other barriers to community, such as racism and economic elitism” (Reitan, 1996, p. 10).

Reintegration then is a useful process to consider within broader offender punishment. Yet, the central question as to whether reintegration is even to be conceptualised as a goal of sentencing has not yet been considered. Bartholomew, et al., (2012, November) conducted an analysis of Australian legislation to determine the extent of legislative support for reintegrative aims. The paper highlighted the absence of guidance in the literature in relation to reintegrative practice and policy, legal authority, and program delivery. Guidance from within Australian legislation was of particular interest to the authors. Following an audit of all Australian legislation relating to criminal law, the authors reported that, despite reference made in Australian legislation to the reintegration of ex-prisoners as a sentencing objective, specifically in relation to access of domains including employment and education, clear guidance as to how to achieve reintegration is not
present. Importantly, this challenge makes reintegration vulnerable to the critiques of early rehabilitation. One striking finding of the study was a clear lack of distinction between reintegration and rehabilitation in legislation, with legislation reporting support for ‘rehabilitation’, then listing reintegrative aims, or reporting support for ‘reintegration’, then listing rehabilitative aims. For example, the Sentencing Act 1991, Vic s 57B(1)(a)(b) cites a ‘rehabilitation’ permit may be issued to an offender for the purposes of: “physical fitness and education of the prisoner,” or to “take in a program…that is designed to facilitate the maintenance of the prisoner’s family ties.” The Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999 NSW s. 106B cites “the objectives of compulsory drug treatment are to provide a comprehensive program of compulsory treatment and rehabilitation…to promote re-integration of those persons into the community.”

It appears that legislation does not provide guidance as to what constitutes reintegration. The discussion at the beginning of this chapter identified that academic discourse similarly does not provide guidance. However, lacking State and professional guidance may not necessarily be problematic. As previously noted, certain proponents of reintegration argue that this process does not involve either of the above parties. According to Maruna (2006, p.4), reintegration “happens ‘out there’, when the professionals go home.” The current thesis argues that the community is more influential in this process than the State or professionals.

Despite conceptual limitations, a number of ‘reintegrative’ programs currently exist. Yet, the degree to which such programs could achieve reintegration seems limited when a collective definition or conceptualization of what reintegration actually is remains elusive. This is further hampered by a lack of investigative research into what is actually offered by programs under the umbrella of reintegration. In Australia, only one comprehensive study of reintegration (or re-entry) programs exists. This study, conducted in 2005 by the Australian Institute of Criminology, assessed the current state of interventions for prisoners returning to the community. The project researched international trends in the delivery of rehabilitation and community reintegration interventions for offenders (Borzycki, 2005). As part of this undertaking, the project developed a questionnaire “to elicit
information concerning post-release intervention services, and programs. It was intended for all potential service providers catering to adult and young people leaving detention, both government (i.e. State-based correctional) and non-government, in Australia” (p. 120). The project provided definitions for re-entry, transition, and reintegration similar to that outlined earlier in this chapter28. Of note, while the study provided inclusion guidelines to assist service providers to determine if their programs fell under ‘post-release intervention’, ultimately service providers decided on the relevance of programs in relation to the broad aims of the study. Thus, it is difficult to determine the exact degree to which surveyed programs intended to directly assist reintegration, and not other correctional goals such as rehabilitation. Brozycki warns against viewing the survey as exhaustive, rather describing the results as “broadly descriptive of a cross-section of the types of interventions that are currently available in Australia” (p. 125).

In total, 64 correctional service providers responded to the survey. These providers were found to service a total of 162 Australian post-release intervention programs. A total of 35 agencies were State-led adult or juvenile correctional services; 19 classified under the custodial arm of corrections, and 16 within the community. Fourteen agencies identified as non-government organisations (NGO), and a further 15 as both government and non-government. Agencies were queried about the broad aims of programs, the range of services offered as part of their programs, as well as the general content of programs. All of the government agencies prioritised community safety as their general mission. In contrast, NGO responses were varied, with the majority offering: advocacy (86%), followed by AOD/social support/family support and contact (71%).

The majority of programs indicated content areas for specific post-release interventions as transitional and promoting reintegration (18%). This area was followed by alcohol and other drug use (14%) and cognitive skills (12%). Interestingly, both drug use and cognitive skills are areas identified as factors relevant to an ex-prisoner’s individual re-entry success (Graffam et al., 2004;  

28 For example, Re-entry was defined as “a single moment in time when a prisoner is released from custody”, transition was defined as “the process of re-entry”, and re-integration/resettlement were defined as “independent and productive communityship” (p. 11).
Shinkfield & Graffam, 2010). However, these don’t reflect the broader community-involvement definition of reintegration, and it is argued here that these programs are better classified as rehabilitative.

Discrepancy was found between identified program aims and program content. For example, 12-percent of programs identified employment as a program aim (*provide employment*), while 9-percent listed content covering employment. Similarly, 10-percent identified housing as a program aim (*provide housing*), while 7-percent included housing in program content. Finally, 24-percent of programs listed *reintegration* as an aim, while 18-percent contained content to assist with transition and promotion of reintegration for ex-prisoners (*transitional and promoting reintegration*).

The above findings highlight a number of points. First, a number of programs exist within Australia that locate themselves within the transitional gap between incarceration and community. Further, many of these programs see themselves as providing for reintegration or transition, with a number including these as specific aims of their programs (although there is great variability in both the broad aims of programs and the program content).

Importantly, those programs that do identify themselves as reintegrative appear to deliver limited content which actually assists ex-prisoner reintegration. While the majority of programs (18%) identified transition and reintegrative content, many of these also listed traditionally rehabilitative or therapeutic content, such as provision of alcohol and other drug (AOD) counselling, cognitive skills, reducing offending and supporting mental and physical health (14%, 12%, 5% and 2% respectively). Importantly, for many of these content areas, there are no empirical data indicating they are associated with ex-prisoner reintegration (e.g. physical health or offence-specific treatment). The majority of programs listed broad aims for specific interventions that align with traditional rehabilitative ideals, such as ‘reduce reoffending and/or relapse prevention’ (27%) and ‘instil cognitive and/or coping skills’ (20%). In contrast, only 8-percent listed ‘build client’s community networks’ as an aim, while fewer still listed their intervention aim as ‘reintegration’ (7%).

Findings from Brozycki’s (2005) study suggest that many programs are seen to ‘do reintegration’ or at least hold a stake in the post-release process, which the
literature demonstrates is critical for reintegration success. However, there is great variation as to what reintegration actually looks like in service delivery, with many of these services confounding rehabilitative and reintegrative efforts. It is argued here that, while many services purport to assist ex-prisoners with reintegration, if the majority is actually an informal continuation of correctional control and rehabilitative interventions, then very few services actually exist on the ground to promote an ex-prisoner’s community reintegration. This confusion is identified by Brozycki (p. 156):

“A number of programs aimed to bridge the period of transition between custody and the community, although only around half of government correctional agencies explicitly endorsed a post-release regimen built on throughcare. A throughcare ethos informs general programming (as is suggested by the thumbnail sketch of policy), but this is not necessarily evident in all practice.”

This is not, however, reason to turn against reintegration efforts. As the report notes (p. 158):

“The growing interest from authorities in post-release services and throughcare bodes well for the likelihood of lessened offending and increased reintegration, but there are still aspects of throughcare delivery that are not well developed. Areas of throughcare that need further examination or elaboration include… 1. [the] compilation of a comprehensive register of post-release and throughcare services delivered by all organisations in Australia, including State-based custodial, State and Australian Government non-custodial, and non-government faith-based and not-for-profit agencies…6. the education of the broader community about the active role community can play in the reintegration of offenders.”

Finally, the report acknowledges that the variety of challenges facing ex-prisoners returning to the community was beyond the scope of the corrective service authorities alone. Brozycki (2005, p. 159) writes, “Given the diverse disadvantages experienced, coordinated actions are required from the whole of the community, which in turn must stem from a whole-of-government approach.” This
is in line with the current argument, which posits that the community must be involved in ex-prisoner reintegration, but the government may support community efforts via clear and consistent policy and legislation.

The ‘nothing works’ in reintegration

The discussion above, in conjunction with the literature review at the beginning of Chapter Two, highlights the current lack of conformity, clarity and consistency in contemporary efforts to achieve ex-prisoner reintegration. Definitions and terminology in the literature are inconsistent, and often confound reintegration with related but distinct processes, including desistance and rehabilitation. Exploration of Australian legislation identified references to reintegration; however, these guidelines lacked clarity as to how reintegration was to be implemented, and confounded the distinction between reintegration and rehabilitation. Further, the review conducted by Brozycki (2005) highlights the existence of numerous and various programs and services that self-identified as reintegrative, yet many did not have aims clearly aligned with reintegration, nor did programs appear successful in delivering reintegration services in line with their own broad aims. This finding is reflective of an absence of clear correctional frameworks as to how reintegration is to be implemented.

What the current review of reintegration has exposed is the vulnerability of contemporary reintegration to the criticisms of early rehabilitation under the ‘nothing works’ movement. Taken from Chapter One, the criticisms of rehabilitation included:

1. Absence of a coherent theoretical basis to explain rehabilitation’s impact on offending outcomes,
2. Lack of sound research that links treatment foci with offending behaviour,
3. Variation in levels of professional training and skill within rehabilitative programs,
4. Lack of an agreed definition of what rehabilitation actually means,
5. Lack of support for rehabilitative ideals in correctional settings, and
6. Insufficient attention being given to questions relating to treatment timing, intensity, dosage, and eligibility.

In a similar vein, reintegration may be criticised. There exists a lack of a coherent theoretical basis explaining the link between successful reintegration and desistance from crime; and a lack of a sound research basis, linking service delivery with successful reintegration. There is variation in the understanding of which professionals are and should be involved in reintegration, and the degree to which the community is seen to be involved in reintegration. In academia, corrections and current legislation, there is the lack of an agreed definition as to what reintegration is, and how this term differs from that of rehabilitation, transition, re-entry, throughcare and aftercare. Furthermore there exists a lack of support for reintegrative ideas in legislation and correctional settings. Finally, insufficient attention has been given in research and practice to questions relating to service timing, intensity, dosage and eligibility, as well as a lack of conceptual or practical efforts to establish a ‘gold standard’ in effective reintegration (if this is even possible).

This critique is not to say that reintegration should undergo the same fall from favour that rehabilitation experienced. Rather, the purpose of highlighting the current confusion in contemporary reintegration is to move toward the establishment of a coherent, consistent and empirically validated understanding of this process. To this end, the chapter proposed a definition of reintegration. In the next chapter, a model of reintegration will be presented which hopes to conceptualise the reintegration process. It is hoped that via these efforts, a full conceptualisation of reintegration will be achieved. With this foundation, the current study will then investigate the role of an under-researched, yet central, component of reintegration; the community.

**Summary of Chapter Two**

Chapter Two aimed to identify the origins of reintegration, and outline the emergence of contemporary reintegration within current correctional rehabilitation-dominated discourse and practice. In doing so, the chapter reviewed current
confusion within academic discourse, corrections and legislation as to what is reintegation. Via this discussion, the chapter hoped to arrive at a clear conceptualisation of reintegation, so as to form a foundation for the study of community attitudes towards this process. To this end, a definition of contemporary reintegration was provided.

The chapter also aimed to explore the application of reintegration including the sites where reintegration can be said to occur. It was hoped that this would inform the current study as to where the community is likely to enact reintegration (or prevent reintegration), but also what symbolic process might impact community reintegration. The conceptual exploration of Chapter Two will inform the process of investigating community involvement in reintegration undertaken in this study. Chapter Three will build on Chapter Two in proposing a model of reintegration, whereby community readiness is essential to the reintegration success. Chapter Four will build on Chapter Two by operationalising symbolic notions of reintegration into factors that may impact community support for reintegration, with the latter forming the aims and hypothesis of the study.

Chapter Two began by outlining the criminological origins of reintegration. Contributions from labelling theory, degradation ceremonies, and reintegrative shaming were discussed. The influence of desistance theory on contemporary reintegration was also explored. The chapter then undertook the task of presenting contemporary definitions of reintegration. Limitations in relation to definition, conceptualization and implementation of reintegration were acknowledged and effort was taken at synthesising the literature to arrive as a single definition of reintegration. Limitations in the conceptualisation of community was also considered in this discussion, and drawing from reviewed literature, a conceptualisation of the ‘community’ involved in reintegration was provided.

In exploring the application of reintegration, it was argued that reintegration is communicated between ex-prisoners and their community via symbolic and non-symbolic acts of inclusion, while disintegration is communicated via acts and gestures of exclusion. A number of theories and processes were theorised as influential in community perceptions about and support of ex-prisoner
reintegration, including moral inclusion, less eligibility and forfeiture, redeemability, risk, and the Not In My BackYard (NIMBY) response.

The chapter subsequently explored the domains of reintegration and social inclusion. It was highlighted that released ex-prisoners face a number of challenges in accessing and maintaining access to these domains, in particular accommodation and employment. Ex-prisoners have difficulty accessing suitable and stable accommodation, and are economically disadvantaged. Literature identified that access to stable accommodation and employment promotes desistance from crime. Accordingly, the chapter provided a rationale for supporting ex-prisoner reintegration in the domains of housing and employment particularly. This also provided a rationale for exploring the current climate of community support for reintegration in these two domains.

The chapter concluded by considering reintegration within the CJS. Two main conclusions were determined; both raise concerns that contemporary reintegration parallels early rehabilitation. First, a review of the legislation indicated that while the term reintegration and notions of reintegration are present in Australian legislation, these are poorly articulated, resulting in a lack of clear guidelines as to what reintegration is, and how it is to be implemented in practice. Second, many services and programs purport to ‘reintegrate’ ex-prisoners, yet these distinctly lack clarity as to how to achieve this aim. It was argued that unless reintegration acknowledges current limitations and addresses these, it will be vulnerable to the same critiques of effectiveness as early rehabilitation. Research into this correctional objective is therefore important. The current study contributes research in the areas of reintegration, by exploring the role of the community in this process. Despite the integral role that community plays in reintegration, it has largely been forgotten in literature exploring the field of reintegration. With this point in mind, we turn to Chapter Three, which explores several models of reintegration.
CHAPTER THREE – MODELS OF REINTEGRATION

Chapter Overview

Chapter Two provided an overview of the origins of reintegration and the re-emergence of reintegration within contemporary rehabilitation and desistance discourse. The chapter argued that, currently, there is a lack of consensus between different stakeholders as to what constitutes reintegration, and who is responsible for effecting it. In the absence of a uniform approach to contemporary reintegration, there have emerged numerous and wide-ranging attempts within both State-led and non-government agencies to assist ex-prisoners with reintegration. Many of these programs look different from one another, and in some instances lack clear distinction from rehabilitative approaches. These programs and the associated literature acknowledge (at least in part) three key players within the reintegration process – the ex-prisoner, the community and the State. While the ex-prisoner and the State have received attention in the literature, little research has addressed the role of the community in the reintegration process. Yet, as was argued in the previous chapter, the community is integral to successful reintegration.

The current chapter addresses this limitation, by focusing on the role that the community plays within the ex-prisoner reintegration process. The chapter will first consider the Three-part Ecological Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners (Graffam, et al., 2004), a model that has been proposed to conceptualize the reintegration process of ex-prisoners. Whether or not the community can be adequately conceptualized within this model will be discussed. Next, the Community Readiness Model (Oetting et al., 1995) will be presented as a conceptual framework to aid understanding of the role of the community in ex-prisoner reintegration. Finally, the chapter will present a model of reintegration – the Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance.29

29 Chapter Two considered limitations in conceptualising community. Community is discussed in this chapter as defined previously (see page 66), except when considering the Community Readiness Model, as this model defines community in terms of key stakeholders.
The Three-Part Ecological Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners

Graffam, Shinkfield and colleagues (Graffam & Shinkfield, 2012; Graffam, Shinkfield, Hardcastle, Lavelle, & O’Callaghan, 2009; Graffam et al., 2004; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009, 2010) conceptualise ex-prisoners’ reintegration experiences in the Three-part Ecological Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners (hereafter referred to as the ‘three-part model’). The authors propose that reintegration is a complex and dynamic process that is best understood contextually. To this end, the model draws heavily on ecological theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), and argues that the success (or failure) of ex-prisoner reintegration is the culmination of the influence of a number of ecological domains (overlapping with the domains of social inclusion, presented in Chapter Two). Similar to Desistance Theory (Maruna, 2001) and the Good Lives Model (Ward & Brown, 2004), discussed in Chapter One, the three-part model is concerned with experiences that enhance ex-prisoner desistance from crime.

The three-part model identifies what Shinkfield (2006, p. 44) terms ‘ecological domains’, consisting of real-life variables that influence the reintegration process for ex-prisoners. Three ecological domains of reintegration are identified: intra-personal conditions, subsistence conditions and support conditions. These, in turn, are made up of a number of variables influencing ex-prisoner reintegration experiences (for further discussion, refer to Graffam et al., 2004). The three-part model’ is presented in Figure 3.0.
Figure 3.0. The Three-Part Ecological Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners. Adapted from Shinkfield (2006).
Importantly, the three-part model conceptualises reintegration from the perspective or experiences of the soon-to-be, or released ex-offender. The ecological domains are specific to the ex-prisoner. Thus, although the model is situated within an ecological framework, only the context according to the ex-prisoner is considered in the model. The current thesis is concerned with experiences and impacts of community participation. From this perspective, the three-part model provides limited ability to conceptualize the experiences of community, and therefore fully examine the wider context of the ex-prisoner reintegration process.

The ecological domain of intra-personal conditions (note this domain varies from that of ‘personal conditions’ utilised by Graffam et al., 2004) incorporates the variables of physical health, psychological health, substance use, emotional state, age, education and skills, marital status, and gender. Subsistence conditions incorporate housing, employment and finance. Finally, support conditions incorporate social support, support services and criminal justice support. As is illustrated in figure 3.0, these three domains are inter-dependent; success or failure in one domain can affect success or failure in the others (Shinkfield, 2006). This feature promotes the interactive, dynamic nature of the reintegration process, and is consistent with the definition of reintegration provided in Chapter Two.

**Literature supporting the Three-Part Ecological Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners.**

Research has demonstrated the ability of the three-part model to account for reintegration experiences of ex-prisoners (Graffam et al., 2004; 2009; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2010). Graffam et al., (2004) found ex-prisoners and key stakeholders (CJS professionals, housing and accommodation support professionals, employment support professions and rehabilitation program professionals) both identified a number of conditions identified in the three-part model as influential in the reintegration process. These included: offender ‘readiness to change’; stable housing; compliance with CJS requirements; succeeding at drug rehabilitation; and addressing basic education and training needs. Conversely, social isolation and boredom were perceived to hinder ex-prisoners’ positive lifestyle changes.
Shinkfiled and Graffam (2009) undertook a study of offenders going through the early stages of transition back to community post-incarceration to explore the type and degree of change in the reintegration variables identified by research. These included finances, employment, stable housing, substance use, and social supports. The study collected self-report feedback from 79 adult prisoners (54 male; 25 female), of their experiences within these domains across three time-periods: one month prior to release; 1-4 weeks post-release; and 3-4 months post-release. Across the three time-periods, participants self-reported: stable housing; stable (although minimal) employment; stable (although minimal) supports; low finances; and, increased substance use. Higher ratings of physical health and lower ratings of psychological health across 1-4 weeks post-release points were also reported. The latter, the authors argue, might relate to the distress ex-prisoners experience during the initial reintegration experience (Shinkfiled & Graffam, 2009).

The findings highlight the complexity and multiplicity of variables affecting the reintegration process. Additionally, the study identifies those areas best targeted in reintegration assistance, through the isolation of variables that actually challenge ex-prisoners’ experiences of reintegration. Of relevance to the current study, these findings point toward areas where the community, in addition to the offender, is best assisted to engaging in the reintegration process.

The three-part model addresses reintegration from the perspective of the ex-prisoner. As a result, the model identified conditions that are relevant to the ex-prisoner in their reintegration experiences. Some of these conditions, while important in reintegration, relate to the ex-prisoner and cannot be directly impacted on by the community (such as ‘readiness to change’ and ‘mental health’). As the focus of the current thesis is on the interactions between the ex-offender and his or her community, only those factors which relate to this interaction process are emphasised. The three-part model highlights the importance of social connectedness, accommodation, and employment (and finances) in successful reintegration. These areas necessarily include the community, and therefore understanding of the experiences and role of the community in these areas is important.
Limitations of the Three-part Ecological Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners.

The three-part model provides a novel approach to conceptualising reintegration. The model moves away from correctional conceptualisations of a ‘transitional’ process incorporating reintegration (i.e. re-entry, throughcare and aftercare), which looks more like the continuation of State intervention than attempts to assist the ex-prisoner to (re)-establish themselves within and as part of the community. The three-part model views reintegration as a unique process through which an ex-prisoner must navigate. The model identifies areas of vulnerability in this process. Ultimately, government policy may target these domains to better support desistance from crime. The three-part model has contributed to understanding of the reintegration experiences of ex-prisoners, particularly in highlighting those factors that are important in the first 3-4 months post-release.

Despite its contributions there are a number of limitations of the three part model noteworthy to the current study. First, there appears to be a lack of distinction within the model between rehabilitation and reintegration. For example, Shinkfield (2006, p. 252) refers to the overarching process (which the writer would call reintegration) as “rehabilitation-reintegration.” This lack of distinction is confounded, within the research supporting the model, by a focus on a limited temporal timeframe in which reintegration is said to be achieved. Specifically, the longest timeframe of measurement is 3-4 months follow-up (Graffam et al., 2004; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009; 2010. While it is acknowledged that this timeframe is likely impacted by research methodology, it is argued here that, for many ex-prisoners, post-incarceration conditions (including parole) often last longer than four months post-release. Thus, the study fails to discriminate between processes including re-entry, rehabilitation and reintegration. While one may argue rehabilitation efficacy can be investigated at a four-month post-release time-point – perhaps around the time that an offender’s parole period is coming to an end and rehabilitation services cease – the same cannot be said about the ongoing nature of the reintegration process. Reintegration is better conceptualized as an ongoing process, much like desistance.
Most importantly for the current discussions, the three-part model is limited as it focuses primarily on the experiences of reintegration perceived by ex-prisoners themselves. The experiences of ex-prisoners throughout the reintegration process are important, and no doubt highlighted through investigation of success and failure at distinct time-points. However, the model does not consider the experiences of the community within the process of reintegration. It is acknowledged that Shinkfield (2006, p. 242) denotes the primary purpose of the three-part model as follows: “identify and elaborate the respective roles of intra-personal subsistence, and support variables in community reintegration outcomes for ex-prisoners.” Shinkfield and Graffam (2009, p. 39) acknowledge that “the community-related impacts of imprisonment and release [were] not measured directly” under the model. Thus, community is beyond the scope of the model’s focus. However, neglecting the community in the model does not remove its importance within the reintegration process.

It is argued here that the three-part model supplements an all-encompassing model of ex-prisoner reintegration that also considers the role of the community. In any case, a model is needed that considers the variables that impact both the ex-prisoner and the wider community’s engagement in and support for reintegration.

The three-part model supplies information regarding the experiences of the ex-prisoner; however, what is not known is the experiences of the community. Thus, in building upon current knowledge of the reintegration process and attempting to resolve the current narrow focus of reintegration solely on ex-prisoners, this thesis is devoted to exploring the experiences, motivations, attitudes and engagement of the community in the reintegration process.

In turning now to consider the role of the community in reintegration, it is noted that there is little, if any, research investigating the role of the community in the reintegration process (this will be considered in Chapter Four). Certainly, community attitudes toward different goals of sentencing have been investigated thoroughly. However, such knowledge has limited contribution as the community has little role to play in the sentencing objectives of retribution, incapacitation, denunciation, deterrence or rehabilitation.
On the other hand, some research has investigated the community’s engagement in other interventions that occur within the community, and are therefore seen to involve the community. One such line of investigation is that of ‘community readiness’ (Pentz, 1991, cited in Edwards, Jumper-Thurman, Plested, Oetting, & Swanson, 2000) to engage in community-based interventions and approaches to maximizing community engagement. Community readiness might be thought of in much the same way that ex-prisoner readiness has been conceptualized in the literature i.e., in relation to offender readiness to engaging in treatment programs (Howells & Day, 2002; Ward et al., 2004) and ex-prisoner readiness to change toward a positive lifestyle (Graffam et al., 2004). Ex-prisoner readiness is based on the premise that increased readiness will result in better outcomes (Ward et al., 2004). In much the same way, community readiness to engage in reintegration is likely to increase the success of reintegration interventions that occur within the community and rely on the community. As such, consideration of the degree to which the community may be said to be ‘ready’ to engage in reintegration is of significant importance to the current thesis.

The Community Readiness Model and the Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners

Community Readiness theory is a research-based approach that seeks to understand intervention processes within communities, as a means of better assisting them to implement successful interventions (Donnermeyer, Plested, Edwards, Oetting, & Littlethunder, 1997; Edwards et al., 2000; Jumper-Thurman, Plested, Edwards, Foley, & Burnside, 2003). According to the theory, ‘readiness’ is a social action process, formed by overlapping interests among individuals within a community concerning local issues. Locating a community’s level of readiness informs intervention planning, implementation, and maintenance. Here the principal aim is to increase community readiness to take ownership of, and respond accordingly, to an issue. Under community readiness theory, any group of people relevant to the target and seen to be connected with it may be regarded as ‘community’ (Edwards et al., 2000).
Under the CRM, community readiness is similar to group readiness, and therefore is inclusive of “shared norms and values, group decision-making and the dimension of leadership” (Jones, 2009, p. 56). However, as Jones (2009, p. 56) notes, many individuals who would be considered part of the community fail to engage in community-related tasks; “they do not vote, do not show up for public forums, do not attend council meetings, or sign petitions, and do not join volunteer groups.” Due to the lack of active involvement of certain community members, the CRM uses key stakeholders to gauge community readiness, such as local leaders and professionals.

The theory conceptualizes community readiness as located along a developmental continuum relative to a specific issue or problem occurring within the community. Any approach to the implementation and maintenance of a community-based effort that is ‘effective and sustainable’ requires “community mobilization … based on involvement of multiple systems and utilization of within-community resources and strengths.” (Jumper-Thurman et al., 2003, p. 27). Engaging community resources and strengths first requires an understanding of where the community sits relative to the issue at hand. Similar to the Stages of Change (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983), community readiness theory conceptualises ‘levels’ of community readiness to engage in a given initiative. According to the model, a community may sit within any one of nine levels of readiness.

Each community is unique. Any initiative seeking to mobilize the community on a given issue must recognize that each community will have different knowledge and understanding of the issue, beliefs about its ability to respond, as well as willingness to respond to a given issue. Community readiness, therefore, is a byproduct of community-specific attitudes, beliefs, resources, and strengths of a given community. Members of communities will vary considerably in their readiness to accept an initiative. That said, it is intended that an overall level of readiness representative of the community is established. Successful implementation of an initiative relies on the formation of a model of community-specific intervention that is relevant to the community’s overall level of readiness to respond effectively and productively to the intervention. At the same time, the model must account for the unique features of the issues being targeted, such that
issues related to a community’s readiness and ability to engage in the initiative are relative to the larger context in which the issue exists, but are also outside of that community (Donnermeyer, et al., 1997; Edwards, et al., 2000).

The community readiness model (CRM, presented in Figure 3.1) was originally constructed as a means of understanding why certain communities accept drug and alcohol interventions while others do not (Donnermeyer et al., 1997). The authors propose that the implementation of new initiatives depends on the community reaching a critical level whereby it has accepted the existence of the problem and has undergone a (implicit) period of planning for an ‘intervention’. Implementation of a program when the community is not ready will result in resistance and/or program failure (Donnermeyer et al., 1997; Edwards et al., 2000). Research supporting the Community Readiness theory has demonstrated that programs introduced in communities where the community has reached a critical level of acceptance of, and willingness to address the problem have been successful (Edwards, et al., 2000).

Donnermeyer et al.’s (1997) study reported support for the model in measuring community readiness to support drug and alcohol initiatives. Subsequent studies have found the CRM to be useful in identifying and explaining a community’s acceptance or otherwise of an intervention, including Hispanic participation in breast cancer prevention trials (Lawsin, Borrayo, Edwards, & Belloso, 2006), drug use prevention in rural communities (Plested, Smitham, Jumper-Thurman, Oetting, & Edwards, 1999), and in identifying issues of community concerns and courses of action to facilitate community-level change in Mexican communities (Scherer, Ferreira-Pinto, Ramos, & Homedes, 2001) (for further discussion of successful implementation of the CRM, see Vernon & Jumper-Thurman, 2002).
Figure 3.1. The Community Readiness Model. Adapted from Oetting et al. (1995)
The CRM identifies specific community characteristics related to different levels of problem awareness and readiness to change, corresponding to nine possible developmental levels of readiness. Ultimately, a community must reach a critical level of readiness in order to engage in a particular initiative. The progression from one level to another is conceptualized as linear, thus a number of levels must be reached in order for a community to reach a threshold of ‘readiness.’ The CRM identified nine stages of readiness: (i) no awareness, (ii) denial/resistance, (iii) vague awareness, (iv) pre-planning, (v) preparation, (vi) initiation, (vii) stabilization, (vii) confirmation/expansion and, (viii) high level of community ownership.

The CRM also incorporates nine steps of intervention, which may be applied at each stage of community readiness to aid community in succeeding to the next level (Donnermeyer et al., 1997; Edwards et al., 2000). Thus, once the level of readiness of a community has been identified, specific interventions can be utilized to support an increase in the community’s readiness level.

Drawing from the CRM, to achieve community readiness to support and engage in ex-prisoner reintegration, the stages may be described as follows. First, the community needs to be aware of issues associated with ex-prisoner reintegration and recidivism, and it must believe that something needs to be done to address this issue (stages i-iv). The community also needs to have an understanding of the contexts in which reintegration occurs, and be driven toward assisting reintegration to be successful at these sites of interaction (stages iv-v). This includes both the domains of reintegration and policies and programs relevant to reintegration. Third, the community must recognise that it plays a key role in reintegration, including the ways in which it may create barriers to accessing resources in various ‘domains of reintegration’, and in its support for reintegrative policy. It is only when the community reaches this level of readiness that it will be able to actively engage in the process of successful reintegration. Once this threshold of readiness is reached, the community must actively engage in ex-prisoner reintegration in a supportive manner (stage vi). Finally, the community needs to commit to continued efforts to assist reintegration, as well as review its
current practices and adapt these to be more supportive of ex-prisoner reintegration (stages vii-viii).

Identifying a community’s level of readiness towards reintegration will provide valuable information to support this initiative. Premature implementation of reintegrative initiatives unlikely to be supported would be avoided. Conversely, communities high on readiness can be identified for reintegration initiatives. Furthermore, once a ‘snapshot’ of readiness is determined, initiatives can be implemented aimed at increasing community readiness to support reintegration.

The implementation of numerous offender readiness programs within corrections demonstrates the importance of offenders reaching a critical level of ‘readiness’ before participating in treatment interventions. In much the same way, it is argued here that community readiness is fundamental to the reintegration process. According to Edwards et al. (2000) community readiness is assessed via auditing members about the issue of interest. To date, no study has directly examined the public’s readiness to support reintegration.

The CRM provides a framework that may assist exploration of community responses to ex-prisoner reintegration. In particular, the model indicates that community knowledge is important in its support for a community initiative. Thus, community knowledge about reintegration may impact community support for reintegration. The remainder of the chapter will be devoted to the presentation of a model of reintegration that recognises the complex, dynamic and interdependent nature of reintegration – the Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance (MIReDe). This model has been developed by the author together with a number of research colleagues (Bartholomew et al., 2011, October).

**Conceptualizing Community Readiness to Engage in Ex-prisoner Reintegration: the Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance**

The Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance (MIReDe) is now presented. This model was developed by the writer and colleagues (Bartholomew, et al., 2011, October). The model conceptualises the processes of reintegration and desistance within a broader ecological context. The MIReDe is built on a
number of key premises and principles relating to reintegration, including desistance theory and the definition of reintegration presented in Chapter Two.

Reintegration under the MIReDe is described as a process that necessarily requires dynamic and interactive contact between the ex-prisoner and his or her community, in which both parties feel ready and able to work toward reintegration. Several ‘domains of social inclusion’, including housing, employment, education/training, and quality family/interpersonal relationships, may assist the ongoing efforts of the ex-prisoner to desist and reintegrate. Yet, the ex-prisoner faces obstacles to access these domains of social inclusion at the policy, proximity and professional/organizational levels, which themselves are premised on symbolic notions of eligibility, risk and redemption.

The number and nature of these obstacles is an indicator of the community’s ability and readiness to play its role in the reintegration and desistance process. The process of reintegration parallels the process of desistance concurrently. While desistance is affected by and predictive of reintegration, reintegration is affected by and predictive of desistance. Essentially then, the two processes become mutually protective factors for one another (Bartholomew, et al., 2011, October).

The MIReDe is provided in Figure 3.2. The model is briefly discussed below. However, it is noted that many key elements and propositions of the model have been previously established in Chapter Two.
Figure 3.2. The Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance (MIReDe).
**Reintegration is a process, pathway or transition.**

The MIReDe conceptualises reintegration as a process, transition or pathway which is undergone by both the ex-prisoner and the broader community. As noted in Chapter Two, reintegration involves an ongoing relationship between the ex-prisoner and his or her community, in which the transition from prisoner to citizen is negotiated and renegotiated again and again over time. Reintegration involves the return to “participation in wider society” (Baldry, McDonnell, Maplestone, & Peeters, 2002, p. ii). In the MIReDe, the ongoing nature of the reintegration pathway is noted by the progress of arrows downwards from ‘reentry’ to the final box encompassing reintegration, but importantly also the backwards-feeding arrows that highlight the reciprocal relationship between ex-prisoner and community.

Reintegration and desistance are processes, not outcomes. Each must be maintained and are influenced by the ongoing interactions between the ex-prisoner and members of the broad community (or public), communicating ability, readiness, obstacles and access. In the MIReDe, the ongoing nature of reintegration and desistance are conceptualized though open boxes, and feedback arrows.

**Reintegration occurs after release and re-entry.**

The MIReDe differentiates between reintegration and re-entry. In line with the definition of reintegration proposed in Chapter Two, reintegration sits after re-entry in this model. Thus, re-entry is reflected in the time-point quantifying a step down in correctional control, named ‘release’.
Reintegration involves the ex-prisoner and the broader community.

Chapter Two argued that reintegration is a process that occurs between the ex-prisoner and the broader community to which they return. The model particularly highlights the important role that community plays in this process under the boxes ‘community ability’ and ‘community readiness’.

Being able to approach reintegration relies on both parties having available resources to support a positive outlook on reintegration. Such resources are likely to differ between the ex-prisoner and the broader community. Several resources can be seen as relevant to community perceptions of ability. On a practical level, a good economy and allocation of government funding (for example to assist ex-prisoners to achieve housing) will support a community’s ability to engage in reintegration. Likewise, low unemployment will result in more employment opportunities for ex-prisoners. Naturally, these will vary between and within communities. As the theory of less eligibility notes, a community will only look favorably to the distribution of resources to those less eligible – in this case ex-prisoners – when other more eligible populations are being supported. It follows then, that a community that is economically stable will be more able to support reintegration.

Community ability also rests on a perception within the community of its capacity to effectively impact on the process of reintegration. A community that believes it can effectively engage in reintegration, and has available evidence of effective reintegration and/or desistance will perceive itself as more able within this process. Conversely, a community that perceives high recidivism rates, is fearful of ex-prisoners, and supports policies aimed at segregating ex-prisoners will not perceive itself as able to engage in the reintegration process.

Like the community, an ex-prisoner must also believe him or herself able to engage in reintegration. He/she may believe they have the skills to engage in the workforce, the social supports to avoid delinquent peers, a period of abstinence from illicit drugs, or simply the commitment to desist from crime. Perhaps the

30 See page 61 onwards for a discussion of the limitations in conceptualising community, and page 66 for conceptualisation of community as used in the current thesis.
most important factor to influence the ability of an ex-prisoner to engage in reintegration is the completion of re-entry. It is difficult for reintegration to begin whilst an ex-prisoner is incarcerated or on a community disposition, although not strictly impossible.

The ex-prisoner and the broader community must also be ‘ready’ to participate in the reintegration process. According to the CRM, a community may sit at different points along a continuum of ‘readiness’ to engage in an initiative. Readiness is a subjective element of engagement in reintegration. As a result, an ex-prisoner with high levels of readiness to engage in reintegration may find himself amongst a community that has low levels of readiness, or vice versa. Nevertheless, both ability and readiness must be established by both the ex-prisoner and the broader community for optimal conditions supportive of reintegration to exist.

Readiness and ability to engage in reintegration are conceptualized as dynamic and continuous processes. It is likely that each differs across sites (or domains) of interaction between the ex-prisoner and community, and will differ across time. Nevertheless, for the process of reintegration to begin or be maintained, certain thresholds of perceived ability and readiness must be reached by both the community and the ex-prisoner. In this a way, it is possible for ‘good enough’ reintegration to occur where both parties meet a minimal threshold of both ability and willingness to come together to support the reintegration process.

*Reintegration occurs within domains of social acceptance which are subjective in nature.*

The central requirements and thresholds for an ex-prisoner to feel ‘ready and able’ to work on his or her reintegration are subjective; however, there are a number of common sites where reintegration may be supported. These are labeled ‘domains of social inclusion’ – that is, domains that can assist the ex-prisoner in his or her ongoing efforts to desist and reintegrate. Domains of social inclusion include housing, employment, access to education and/or training, and family and/or interpersonal relationships. Research (much of which was summarized in
Chapter Two) indicates the importance of accessing these domains for ex-prisoners. In the MIReDe, domains of social inclusion are conceptualized as sites where community readiness and ability to engage in the process of reintegration is communicated to the ex-prisoner, and thus impact the ex-prisoner’s perceptions of domain access. Domains of social inclusion are, however, also impacted by obstacles to reintegration.

**The community may act as an obstacle to reintegration.**

The MIReDe distinguishes between domains of social inclusion and obstacles to reintegration. This is achieved by placing obstacles to reintegration above the domains of social inclusion in the model.

It was noted in Chapter Two that the level of community support (or rejection) of reintegration may be impacted by the level of personal involvement required to support this initiative. According to the Not In My Backyard (NIMBY) response, the community is more supportive of abstract-level justice initiatives, than it is prepared to be personally involved in these initiatives. The MIDReDe captures this personal/abstract level distinction within the obstacles to reintegration. The various obstacles to reintegration are likely to be impacted by process of inclusion/expulsion discussed in Chapter Two, including NIMBY, as well as eligibility, forfeiture, risk and redemption.

**Reintegration and desistance are parallel and co-dependent processes.**

Reintegration and desistance are parallel processes. Reintegration is both predictive of desistance and affected by it. Desistance is both predictive of reintegration and affected by it. For some people, desistance is possible with a minimum of reintegration, and for others, reintegration can occur without desistance. Yet, they are seen to be mutually protective factors. Where reintegration exists, desistance will be supported. Where desistance exists, reintegration will be maximized. In the MIReDe, the reciprocal arrows between each process highlight the parallel and interactive nature of desistance and reintegration.
Chapter Summary

Chapter Three further explored the role of community in reintegration. The aim of the chapter was to develop a model that not only acknowledges the role of the community in reintegration, but also theorises how the community influences successful reintegration.

Utilising the Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance (MIReRe), research can explore the reintegration process from an evidenced-based perspective. The MIReDe is novel, as it orientates the focus of research toward the role of the community; an area, it was argued, that has been largely neglected within the reintegration field to date. The MIReDe identifies the importance of ‘community readiness’ to support reintegration. The current study will draw from this model, and aims to identify factors that impact community support for reintegration.

The chapter began by presenting two models that, it was posited, are relevant to reintegration. These were the Three-Part Ecological Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners, or three-part model (Graffam & Shinkfield, 2012; Graffam et al., 2004; Graffam et al., 2009; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009, 2010), and the Community Readiness Model (Donnermeyer, et al., 1997; Edwards, et al., 2000; Jumper-Thurman, et al., 2003; Oetting, et al., 1995).

The Three-Part Ecological Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners was presented as a model of ex-prisoner reintegration which acknowledges the social context into which an ex-offender is returned post-incarceration. The model identifies three domains; intra-personal conditions, subsistence conditions, and support conditions, which are seen to be influential in the reintegration process. The three-part model has received empirical support (Graffam & Shinkfield, 2012, Graffam, et al., 2009, Graffam, et al., 2004; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009, 2010). However, a number of limitations of the model were also noted. Most importantly, the model does not address the role of the wider community in the reintegration process.

The chapter then turned to a theoretical conceptualisation of community readiness to support initiatives established within the community. The Community
Readiness Model (CRM) was presented as a framework relevant to the ex-prisoner reintegration process, specifically to the role of the community in supporting this initiative. The CRM theories that a community must be able as well as willing to accept the introduction of an initiative into its community for this initiative to be sustainable. Community readiness refers to a social action process, formed via overlapping interests of members of the community who identify a concern within the community. A community must internalize a belief in its ability to respond to this concern, as well as a willingness to support and be part of initiatives designed to respond to the concern.

Finally, the community must actively demonstrate a willingness to take ownership over the maintenance and review of the initiative. Readiness is conceptualised as a continuum, incorporating nine levels (Figure 3.1). Movement between levels is achieved by increasing awareness and ownership of the community issue. This is impacted by community attitudes and beliefs about the issue and any initiative designed to respond to the issue. According to the CRM, knowledge of the target issue is an important part of this process.

Finally, the Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance (MIReDe) was presented. Each of the key tenets of the model was outlined and justified. These include: the ongoing and interactive nature of the reintegration and desistance processes; the role of the wider community and the ex-prisoner in promoting or hindering both reintegration and desistance processes; and, finally, that the fact that, beyond being able to affect reintegration and desistance, both the wider community and the ex-prisoner must be ready to engage in these processes.

Drawing from the MIReDe, it is argued that active, ongoing engagement of the community in ex-prisoner reintegration depends upon community readiness to support and engage in this process. At the same time, CRM research indicates that community readiness to support reintegration will be influenced by its knowledge, attitudes and beliefs relative to offenders’ incarceration and reintegration. Yet, little is known about community knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about ex-prisoner reintegration.

To address this limitation, the next chapter will explore a number of factors that this study hypotheses will contribute to community readiness to engage in the ex-
prisoner reintegration process. These factors will inform the empirical investigation of community support for ex-prisoner reintegration, and thus will form the variables of interest in the current study.
CHAPTER FOUR: FACTORS DRIVING COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR REINTEGRATION

The previous chapter presented contemporary models of reintegration, including the Three-part Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-prisoners (Graffam, et al., 2004). Chapter Three also drew from the Community Readiness Model (Donnermeyer, et al., 1997; Oetting, Jumper-Thurman, Plested, & Edwards, 2001), which theorises that communities must reach a threshold of ‘readiness’ to engage in the reintegration process. Subsequently, the Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance (MIReDe; Bartholomew, et al., 2011, October) was presented. This model was presented as a holistic model of ex-prisoner reintegration, which incorporates the important contribution of the wider community in the reintegration process. Furthermore, it was highlighted that community ‘ability’ and ‘readiness’ to support reintegration are important features of successful reintegration.

Of interest to the current study is the wider community’s current level of readiness to support ex-prisoner reintegration. Additionally, of interest are those factors that influence the level of community readiness. It is argued here that it is first important to explore what factors may contribute to community readiness to engage in ex-prisoner reintegrating, prior to establishing reintegration initiatives.

A logical starting point to investigating readiness to support reintegration is to explore first the existence and nature of community members’ attitudes toward reintegration. Does community endorse positive or negative attitudes about reintegration? The next step is to identify and investigate factors that support a shift of attitudes toward reintegration. This second step can assist initiatives to increase support for reintegration, and thus is a more helpful line of inquiry that what factors are influential in the formation of attitudes toward reintegration (and indeed the latter will not be considered herein).

To this end, the current chapter will explore a number of factors identified in the literature as influential in predicting community attitudes and beliefs about crime and justice. The aim is to identify factors that may impact on community attitudes
toward ex-prisoner reintegration. Due to limited research directly addressing community or public support for reintegration, broader crime and justice literature, including attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation, is used. Reintegration is however distinct from other sentencing objectives (including punishment and rehabilitation) specifically because of the role that the community plays in reintegration. It is acknowledged, therefore, that community attitudes toward reintegration will differ from attitudes toward other justice initiatives. This latter point contributes to the rationale for the current study. Nevertheless, the study will draw from the literature reviewed below to explore the possible factors that impact on community support for reintegration.

As a beginning point, the chapter will first address what research indicates the public does know about crime and justice initiatives, that is, public knowledge of the CJS. The chapter will then present current literature relating to public attitudes toward crime and justice. There currently exists a vast amount of literature relating to this topic area. As a means of organising this literature in a way relatable to reintegration and the aims of this thesis, three key theoretical perspectives as to what influences justice-related attitudes and attitude change will be used. These are: expressive and instrumental attitude function; crime causal attributions; and social identity theory. Unsurprisingly, consideration of expressive and instrumental attitude function, crime causal attributions, and social identity theory represents a new line of inquiry within the ex-prisoner reintegration area. Nevertheless, as the literature review that follows will demonstrate, there is evidence supporting the influence of these on public attitudes toward crime and justice initiatives. This literature review will form the basis of the hypotheses developed in Chapter Five.

**What the public know about crime and justice initiatives**

Currently no research has investigated community knowledge of reintegration as a correctional objective. This is not surprising given that contemporary reintegration has only recently become a focus within the correctional field. It is argued here that the community is most likely aware that for many offenders,
return to the community post-incarceration is a reality. As such, members of the community may understand the importance of successful reintegration, if only from a recidivism reduction or risk perspective. Conversely, it is acknowledged that community may ascribe to a model of punishment that does not support reintegration, in which case, the community would not support ex-prisoner reintegration at all. At the extreme, this theoretical stance is illustrated in the colloquial expression, ‘lock them up and throw away the key.’ Interestingly, for the community, the ‘issue’ at hand is unlikely to be the role of the community in assisting returned ex-prisoners to reintegrate, but rather the very practice of allowing ex-prisoners to return to the community. In the absence of literature directly addressing this question, research exploring community knowledge of the CJS in general is explored below.

*Community knowledge of crime and recidivism rates.*

Research has investigated community knowledge of the CJS and recidivism, with findings indicating that the public over-estimate crime and recidivism rates. A recent survey undertaken by the NSW Sentencing Council and Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research reported limited NSW community knowledge of crime and justice issues, alongside significant misperceptions about trends in crime, conviction and imprisonment rates (Butler & McFarlane, 2009).

The public has been found to over-estimate crime rates, including specific types of crimes such as violent offences (Davis & Dossetor, 2010; Paulin, Searle, & Knaggs, 2003; Roberts & Indermaur, 2009; Roberts & Stalans, 1997). A recent report by Davis and Dossetor (2010) summarised public opinion of crime, as follows: despite an overall decline in crime statistics between 1998 and 2007, the Australian community perceived crime rates to be increasing. This trend is not isolated to Australia, but has been reported internationally (Doob & Roberts, 1983; Mayhew & Reilly, 2007; Paulin, et al., 2003; Warr, 2000). For example, Roberts, Stalans, and Indermaur (2002) reviewed beliefs about crime rates across five countries – the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The majority of respondents indicated a belief that crime rates were
escalating, contrary to statistical evidence demonstrating stable or declining crime rates in all five countries from the mid-1900s into the 2000s.

The public also holds misconceptions about recidivism rates (Doob & Roberts, 1983; Gleb, 2006; 2007; Paulin, et al., 2003; Roberts & White, 1986; Roberts & Stalans, 1997; Weatherburn & Indermaur, 2004). Doob and Roberts (1982) reported respondents from a Canadian public survey over-estimated re-conviction rates for first-time offenders. Doob and Roberts (1983) reported an over-estimation of the likelihood of re-offending for first time property and violent offences in a Canadian sample. Forty-five percent and 34-percent of the sample overestimated property and violent offence recidivism, respectfully. A smaller proportion (12-percent for violent offences; 21-percent for property offences) correctly estimated recidivism rates. Paulin, et al., (2003) found almost half (46-percent) of their New Zealand community sample ($N=1,500$) overestimated the reconviction rate for ex-incarcerated prisoners within two years, although a third (32-percent) correctly estimated the number of actual reconvictions within the 2 year period from 1995-1997.

An association between community perceptions about crime rates and support for harsher criminal justice practices has been reported (Hough & Roberts, 1999; Roberts & Indermaur, 2009). Roberts and Indermaur (2009) found a significant positive correction between desire for stiffer sentencing and beliefs that crime was increasing, and perceptions of the number of violent crimes reported to the police.

Research also suggests that the community perceives criminality to be a stable and unchangeable behaviour. This may further support its belief in high recidivism rates.

**Community knowledge of the traditional goals of sentencing.**

Support for reintegration may be associated with broader knowledge of the CJS. Research investigating community knowledge of broad correctional objectives (i.e. goals of sentencing) indicates that the community has a limited knowledge of objectives aimed at reducing re-offending. The majority of this research has focused on knowledge of alternative sentencing objectives and community
support for punishment versus rehabilitation. A brief review of the literature on community support for differing goals of sentencing is provided below. Subsequent discussion about the impact of knowledge on support for ex-prisoner reintegration will draw on this research.

Research investigating public support for different approaches to sanctioning offenders has yielded inconsistent findings, suggesting that the public does not consistently support one sanctioning option over others (Innes, 1993; Roberts & Hough, 2002; Roberts & Indermaur, 2009; Turner, Cullen, Sundt, & Applegate, 1997; Walker, Collins, & Wilson, 1987). These findings are limited however by an over representation of studies investigating community support for the two sentencing aims of punishment and rehabilitation. This focus predominantly conceptualises community support as a dichotomy between punitive or lenient correctional options. As such, this research does not delineate community knowledge of, or attitudes across, all sentencing goals.

Research has generally supported an inverse association between knowledge and punitive attitudes, with those demonstrating limited knowledge of the CJS being more supportive of harsher sentencing, increased use of incarceration, and punitive sentencing practices such as three-strike laws and the death penalty (Roberts & Indermaur, 2009; O’Connor, 1984; Roberts & Gebotys, 1989; Roberts & Stalans, 1997; van Dijk, Kesteren, & Smit, 2007; Warr & Stafford, 1984). These attitudes may be linked to underlying beliefs held by community as to the goals of the CJS, and how sentencing and incarceration are used to achieve these goals. It is theorised that those with limited knowledge of the CJS fail to appreciate the complexities of the sentencing process in achieving a balance between multiple goals of sentencing (Hutton, 2005). Research appears to support this stance; a community with limited knowledge of the CJS, particularly sentencing practices, tends to endorse punishment as the sole goal of sentencing. Conversely providing participants with more information about sentencing alternatives has been shown to increase support for other goals alongside punishment, including rehabilitation (Hough & Park, 2013; Hutton, 2005; Turner, et al., 1997; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997; Cullen et al., 2000).
The community has been shown to support punishment-based sanctioning aims (O’Connor, 1984; Roberts & Gebotys, 1989; Roberts & Stalans, 1997; Warr & Stafford, 1984). Roberts and Gebotys (1989) investigated public support for different goals of sentencing, as well as support for different sentencing practices. The majority of respondents supported punishment-based sentencing goals, with general deterrence and just deserts (retribution) receiving the highest mean importance ratings. Additionally, when asked to assign a sentence to an offender vignette, seriousness of the offence was the most important factor used to determine sentence severity, which Roberts and Geboyts argue, reveals underlying support for just deserts sentencing principles.

A positive aspect of the study by Roberts and Gebotys (1989) is that it did encompass a number of sentencing goals. However, the study suffered from a number of methodological limitations. The small sample size (N=70) limited generalization of the findings as representative of the community population without supporting research. Additionally, respondents were limited to imprisonment sentencing options, which may have resulted in response bias favouring punishment-based sentencing aims, and may therefore not have considered post-imprisonment impacts of sentencing, such as offender rehabilitation or reintegration.

Applegate, Cullen, Turner and Suntd (1996) conducted a study of public support for three-strike life-sentencing laws in America. The majority (52-percent) of respondents supported mandatory life imprisonment for repeat offenders (N=237). Additionally, when asked to provide a sentence in response to a vignette of a repeat offender, the majority of respondents endorsed imprisonment sentences of five to 15 years duration. However, this study was limited in the sanctioning alternatives available for punishment, as respondents were only able to choose between no punishment, parole or imprisonment. As such, support for imprisonment over other sanctioning options, such as rehabilitation, cannot be inferred.

Alternatively, research has reported community support for rehabilitation alongside or in preference to punitive responses (Cullen, Cullen & Woznick, 1988; Cullen, Skovron, Scott, & Burton, 1990; Cullen, Wright, et al., 1998;
Hutton, 2005; Turner, et al., 1997). Cullen and colleagues (1990) conducted a telephone survey of public support for correctional treatment in two major metropolitan areas in Ohio – Cincinnati and Columbus. Respondents were asked, “What do you think should be the main emphasis in most prisons?” and provided with a choice between punishment and rehabilitative responses. Rehabilitation was endorsed as the main emphasis of prisons.

Research conducted by Doble and Green (2000) and Hough and Roberts (1998) (but for discussion see Stalans, 2007) has reported public support for the alternative justice initiative of restorative justice. Although there is limited research in this area, available research indicates that when the public is informed of restorative justice (RJ) sanctioning options, it is more willing to support these justice approaches than traditional punishment (including incarceration). This is true especially for juvenile and first time offenders, and offences that are considered low severity (much of the research has focused on burglary). Conversely, severity and number of prior offences matters, with the public shown to decline in support for RJ under these conditions (Roberts & Stalans, 2004; Stalans, 2007). Drawing from this research, the public may support reintegration under certain conditions. However, as reintegration occurs post incarceration the findings by Stalans (2007) may indicate the community will not be supportive of reintegration, as it may make judgements about the severity of criminal behaviour that resulted in the offender being imprisoned.

In the context of limited knowledge of actual crime rates and criminal justice sentencing practices, strong community support for punitive approaches is perhaps not surprising given strong political and media emphasis on ‘tough on crime’ approaches (Casey & Mohr, 2005; Roberts, Stalans, Indermaur, & Hough, 2003). In line with this reasoning, many studies have highlighted the complexity of public sanctioning attitudes (Cullen et al., 2000; Hutton, 2005; Stalans, 2002; Turner, et al., 1997). It is possible that the community supports more than one goal simultaneously. It would be logical that the community may wish for offenders to be both punished and rehabilitated.

Interestingly, research suggests that when given two options, the community still prefer punitive responses. Stalans (2002) notes several findings support the idea
of a punitive public demanding longer prison terms, yet at the same time an image has emerged of a merciful public that supports rehabilitation, community-based sentences and less severe sentences than the law allows. Indeed, in Stalans (2002) review, the author argues that public opinion polls misrepresent public opinions due to weak methodological designs. Broad, superficial questions frequently paint a punitive public, however, “the public’s response often depends on the manner in which the question is asked and the context in which it is located” (Stalans, 2002, p. 16). More careful, systemic research has shown a merciful public that supports alternatives to retribution-based sanctions.

Cullen et al., (2000, p. 9) argue that the community is ‘punitive but progressive’, whereby it is willing to consider less severe sentencing practices, but only when provided with a good enough reason to do so:

“The central tendency in public opinion is to be punitive and progressive – to endorse the use of a balanced response to lawbreakers, which includes an effort to do justice, protect society, and reform offenders. When the full body of survey data is taken into account, it thus appears that with regard to punishment and corrections, the public is more rational than irrational in the policy agenda it embraces.”

Indeed, research indicates that when a community is given more information about the CJS, its punitive attitudes decrease. Turner, et al., (1997) found 51.7-percent to 57.9-percent of respondents preferred incarceration to other community-based sanctions for offenders convicted of robbery or burglary (N=237). Respondents were also asked which of the ‘lesser’ sanctioning alternatives they would ‘tolerate’. Results indicated that, although respondents prefer imprisonment, many would tolerate community-based sanctions, such as house arrest. Similarly, Cullen and colleagues (2000) report public willingness to substitute severe sentences for less severe alternatives (such as the death penalty to life imprisonment), especially for non-violent offenders.

Hutton (2005) investigated public support for different sanctioning options based on an offender vignette of a first time young offender. The survey data were drawn from a larger survey exploring Scottish public attitudes towards crime and
justice (see for discussion, Anderson, Ingram, Hutton, 2002). A range of sanctioning options was supported, with 35-percent of respondents selecting community-based sentencing, 29-percent selecting compensation, 21-percent probation and 20-percent imprisonment (multiple responses were permitted) ($N=786$). Hutton’s findings may be the result of differences in public attitudes towards different types of offenders. Research suggests that the public is more willing to support rehabilitative or restorative ideals for first time and young offenders (Gleb, 2006; Stalans, 2007). Conversely, the public supports severe sanctioning options for repeat and violent offenders (Hough, Roberts, Jacobson, Moon, & Steel, 2009; Hutton, 2005; Stalans, 2007). These results are further supported by studies showing that the community considers aggravating and mitigating factors when making sentencing decisions (Gleb, 2006; Hough, et al., 2009).

The literature reviewed above indicates that the community supports a number of sentencing objectives, yet its decisions are based on the amount of knowledge that the community possesses in relation to different sentencing objectives. Other factors also impact on support, including offender characteristics such as type of offence, age, ethnicity, gender, and first versus repeat offender. The type of sentencing options may also be important, such as the punishment/rehabilitation dichotomy or a gamut of punishment options (e.g. fine, community based order, 1 month imprisonment, 1 year imprisonment alternatives) (Gleb, 2006; Indermaur, 1990; Tufts, 2000).

Literature focusing on the punishment/rehabilitation dichotomy highlights that the community is more likely to support punishment. However, when given more information regarding rehabilitative sentencing objectives, it is willing to support alternatives. Of all the sentencing objectives, rehabilitation is most aligned with reintegration. Building on this research, it is theorised here that community support of reintegration is impeded by a lack of knowledge about reintegration as a correctional goal. The type of offender and offence in question may also impact support. An alternative theory is that community supports reintegration alongside harsher aims such as punishment. It is likely the public applies criteria of moral inclusion, eligibility and forfeiture when forming its attitudes towards prisoners.
and ex-prisoners. Further, the community may determine eligibility for initiatives such as rehabilitation and reintegration only after the debt caused by the offender’s crime has been paid through the application of punishment.

In the absence of literature directly investigating community knowledge of reintegration, the association between knowledge of reintegration and support for this as a correctional aim remains unknown. Drawing from the Community Readiness Model (CRM) (Edwards, et al., 2000; Oetting, et al., 1995), it is possible to conclude that, without knowledge of reintegration as a potential response (or ‘solution’) to recidivism, the community is unlikely to be ready to engage in reintegration. Whether or not knowledge increases readiness to engage, and to what degree, is yet to be explored.

Importantly, the current thesis argues that the community is not involved in punishment, rehabilitation or any other sentencing objective. The only exception is reintegration. This personal involvement requirement for reintegration may differentially impact community attitudes in a way that cannot be seen in the other goals of sentencing.

One body of literature that might be argued to relate to reintegration is that of restorative justice. Restorative justice (RJ) is an alternative sanctioning option that seeks to repair the damage resulting from a criminal act. Primarily this occurs via three processes: promoting the interest of the victim, encouraging the offender to accept responsibility for his or her actions, and reconciliation between the victim, offender and in certain instances the community (Stalans, 2007; Wilson, Bates & Völlm, 2010). Frequently these aims are achieved via restorative conferences (victim-offender meetings) and medication or diversionary programs (Larsen, 2014; Stalans, 2007). The first two aims can be achieved when the victim, offender and select representatives (usually a justice representative, and victim and offender supports) meet; the victim communicates the impact of the offenders’ behaviour, the offender apologises and agrees to make amends for his or her behaviour (often repairing the damage caused) (Johnstone, 2011). A term of community service frequently achieves to third aim (Stalans, 2007). Larsen (2014) noted that in Australia, the most common forms of RJ programs are
“victim-offender mediation, conferencing (for both adult and young offenders) and circle sentencing” (p. vi).

Contemporary reintegration and RJ take origin from Braithwaite’s (1989) reintegrative shaming (noted in Chapter Two). Like reintegration, RJ contains symbolic notions of acceptance, inclusion and exclusion, and redeemability. Furthermore RJ is an initiative that involves the community and the State. However, it is argued here that RJ and contemporary reintegration are distinct processes. At best, it might be said that RJ is one expression of reintegrative shaming, and as such, cannot fully explain the complexity of a larger process that is contemporary reintegration (see for discussion, Johnstone, 2011).

Nevertheless, literature exploring public support for RJ may contribute to hypothesis regarding public support for reintegration. Accordingly, RJ research has been included in the reviews of literature below.

31 Two arguments motivate this stance. First, ‘community’ and ‘State’ involvement is not the same across these initiatives. RJ involves key stakeholders, including a criminal justice representative, the victim or a specially selected ‘community member’ (who are generally selected because they hold key positions of power or influence within the community). In contrast, reintegration involves everyday interactions between undefined members of the public and ex-offenders. RJ primarily involves the State and the offender, the State provides the diversionary tactics (e.g. police restorative cautioning), and a structure for conferences between the offender and victim, acting as a kind of mediator. Ultimately, justice representatives make the end decision as to whether restoration was successful, and in this way act as gatekeepers; diverting offenders into or out of the CJS. Consequently, the resolution reached will impact any further action taken by the State in punishing the offender; the offender must take responsibility for their behaviour. In contrast, reintegration primarily involves the offender and the public (and often not the victim), and the State is only seen to be involved in so far as it supports interaction between these two primary parties (e.g. State funding for housing). Furthermore, unlike RJ which is seen to incorporate ‘punishment’ for the criminal act (the necessity of taking responsibility for the criminal act, completing community service) (see for discussion of RJ as ‘alternative punishment’, Daly, 2000), reintegration occurs after punishment.

Second, the two initiatives differ in structure. RJ has a specific structure. Certain people are invited to attend, and the meetings follow a type of ‘agenda’. There is an end point for RJ; one can say at the meeting’s conclusion whether ‘restoration’ was achieved or not. In contrast, reintegration has no structure. Chapter Two took pains to outline the nature of reintegration as occurring ‘after the professionals go home’. No particular individuals are involved, rather the process is achieved via fluid, dynamic, informal, everyday reciprocal interactions; it is ongoing and occurs across contexts and time points.
Community Attitudes Toward Crime and Justice

In psychology, the study of attitudes is generally used in an attempt to predict or explain certain social behaviours. Attitudes have been used to explain negative behaviours toward other individuals or groups of people, such as discrimination, prejudice, and avoidance (see for discussion, Bowers, 2002; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975, 2001). Allport (1935, p. 80) defines an attitude as “a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related.” Attitudes have also been defined as “a latent disposition or tendency to respond with some degree of favorableness or unfavorableness to a psychological object” (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2001, p. 76). Thus, attitudes are evaluative in nature – specifically, a representation of an individual’s evaluation of an issue, object, event, or person (Day & Marion, 2011; Eaton, Majka, & Visser, 2008; Pratkanis, Breckler, & Greenwald, 1989).

Attitudes are acquired over time and are socially constructed and influenced (Antonak & Livneh, 2000; Tregaskis, 2000). Attitudes are believed to develop through a number of processes, including direct experience with the attitude object, exposure to the attitude object, instrumental conditioning, socialisation and social learning, and observational learning or modelling (Bowers, 2002).

Much of the attitudinal literature in relation to CJS initiatives and policy, has been concerned with identifying which public punitive attitudes and public support for different sanctioning options (for example, see Bowers, 2002; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Olson & Zanna, 1993). As previously noted, research has not directly explored public support for reintegration.

One line of investigation has distinguished between instrumental and expressive attitudes toward crime and justice initiatives (Jackson & Bradford, 2008; Miller & Vidmar, 1981; Sprott & Doob, 2009; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997; Vidmar & Miller, 1980).
Instrumental and expressive attitude functions, and public support for crime and justice initiatives.

Instrumental and expressive theories of attitude fall within the area of functional theories of attitude (Eagly & Chaiken, 1998; Franc & Brkljačić, 2005). Functional approaches to attitude focus on the relationship between underlying psychological mechanisms that seek beneficial outcomes for the individual from his or her environment, and the individual’s attitudes towards certain target objects. This conceptualisation can be linked back to classical theories, including Bowers’ (2002) and Katz’s (1960) functions of attitude. Contemporary approaches to attitude function (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene, & Haugen, 1994; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998) have built on the classical theories, distinguishing five main functions of attitudes: object appraisal, instrumental, value-expressive, social adjustive and defensive functions. Two of these functions, instrumental and expressive, have received particular research attention in relation to crime and justice (for a discussion of the five functions, see Eagly & Chaiken, 1998; Franc & Brkljačić, 2005). For example, Tyler and Boeckmann (1997) theorised that attitudes towards crime and justice are driven by instrumental and expressive functions. Each attitude function is considered below.

Instrumental attitude function (also referred to as the ‘utilitarian’, ‘rational’ or ‘experience’ function) serves to maximise the rewards and minimise the punishments that an individual obtains from their environment. Instrumental functions are based on the direct personal consequences of an attitude object, or encompass personal interests related to an attitude object. Instrumental responses are theorised to be driven by personal or self-serving motivations (Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997) Personal judgements about the severity of crime and the risk of being impacted by criminal behaviour – to the individual, their family, community and/or society – underlie judgement toward offenders.

The value-expressive function (also referred to as the ‘relational,’ ‘symbolic,’ or ‘emotional-expressive’) is based on the relationship between attitudes and values. According to this function, attitudes are the vehicle through which individuals express personal values, and establish and communicate personal identity (Eagly & Chaiken, 1998; Franc & Brkljačić, 2005). The value-expressive function...
incorporates symbolic notions of power, status and values about crime, and the relationship between rule-breaking and social structures (Freiberg, 2001; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997). Relational judgements about the nature and quality of social bonds within groups – beliefs about the strength of social bonds - underly judgement toward offenders.

**Instrumental attitude functions.**

According to Tyler and Boeckmann (1997) the instrumental approach holds that the individual’s concern for CJS initiatives stems from a belief that crime represents a tangible threat to themselves and the community, and thus individuals are motivated to protect themselves. In response to experienced or perceived threat of crime victimization, individuals seek sanctioning responses that alleviate emotional arousal. Under the instrumental model, offenders are punished because they are viewed as dangerous and may re-victimize members of the community (Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997). Measures of instrumental approaches to crime and justice include fear of crime victimization and prior crime victimization, as well as a belief that crime is prominent or increasing in one’s community. Under the instrumental model, individuals may be more supportive of ex-prisoner reintegration when the justice system is seen to effectively address emotional responses to crime, such as tackling crime rates.

**Fear of Crime.**

Fear of crime has been conceptualised as an instrumental attitude function (Maruna & King, 2004; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997). It is assumed that when the public fears it will be victimized, it will endorse punitive attitudes. Following from this assumption it could be argued that high fear of crime will result in low support for ex-prisoner reintegration. An individual may fear that he or she will be directly victimized by an ex-offender (in the process of their re-offending) or may be negatively impacted indirectly via increasing crime rates within their social sphere (such as their neighbourhood).
However, the assumed positive association between fear of crime and punitive attitudes has receive limited research support, with contemporary research indicating a more complex relationship. The majority of available evidence suggests that victimization or concerns about crime salience within one’s community have little impact on individual responses to sanctioning attitudes. These findings align with studies investigating the impact of instrumental attitudes on sentencing attitudes, with results generally indicating that other factors, including value-expressive attitudes, have a stronger association with public sanctioning attitudes (Maruna & King, 2004).

Reintegration, unlike other crime and justice aims (including punishment and rehabilitation), represents a sanctioning aim that places the offender and the community in direct contact. Increased potential for the public to be personally impacted by crime may result in a unique relationship between fear of crime and support for reintegration. It is therefore of interest whether existing research relating to public attitudes and fear of crime remain consistent when exploring community attitudes toward ex-prisoner reintegration. The subsequent section will present current literature relating to fear of crime and public sanctioning attitudes.

Fear of crime refers to anxiety or worries about crime, and a lowered sense of trust and safety within one’s community and between community members. Fear of crime can result in lowered quality of life (Hale, 1996) and has been linked in the literature to low confidence in the CJS, as well as punitive attitudes towards offenders (Pfeiffer, Windizio, & Kleimann, 2005; Indermaur & Roberts, 2005; Sprott, 1999). Fear of crime has often been cited in the literature as a causal factor in community attitudes toward criminal justice practices (Roberts & Indermaur, 2009). Early research indicated that high fear of crime was associated with community support for punitive practices. This led to the theory that a fearful community will support any justice measures to preserve and advance community safety (Dowler, 2003; Gleb, 2006; Snell, 2001; Sprott & Doob, 1997).

However, the relationship between fear of crime and attitudes towards offenders is complex, and often impacted by the construct (fear of crime, fear of victimization, crime salience) under investigation. Dowler (2003) investigated the
effects of media consumption and fear of crime on attitudes toward crime and justice. Drawing from the National Opinion Survey on Crime and Justice (NOCJS, 1995), Dowler investigated respondents’ fear of crime (N=1,005) using a 4-point Likert scale measuring responses to seven crime scenarios. Analysis revealed fear of crime was a significant predictor of respondents’ punitive attitudes. Of note, however, fear of crime was the fourth strongest predictor of punitive attitudes, behind race, education level, and income factors (respectively). Sprott and Doob (1997) reported similar results in their analysis of 10,285 Canadian participants drawn from the 1993 General Social Survey. The authors of this study found a positive relationship between fear of crime and punitive justice attitudes.

Public beliefs that crime is increasing has also been found to be a significant predictor of its belief that court sentences are too lenient and a preference for harsher penalties (Pfeiffer et al., 2005; Indermaur & Roberts, 2005; Sprott, 1999). Stinchombe, Adams, Hiemer, Scheppele, Smith, and Taylor (1980) reported fear of crime as a significant predictor of punitiveness. In fact, fear of crime mediated the influence of race, gender, age, education, and being the victim of a violent crime, on a degree of punitiveness. However, fear of crime became insignificant when causal attributions, that is, beliefs about what causes people to commit crime, were added to the analyses. Interestingly, Stinchombe et al.,’s (1980) findings contrast with those of Dowler (2003), who found race and education were stronger predictors of punitiveness than fear of crime.

Several authors have argued that the impact of fear of crime on support for correctional punishment is dependent on the type of crime committed (Mirrlees-Black & Allen, 1998; Warr, 2000; Haghhighi & Sorensen, 1996). For example, Haghhighi and Sorensen, (1996) note an over-emphasis on fear of personal victimization of violent crimes, rather than non-violent property offences. These foci in research, it is noted, are counter to crime statistics indicating that people are more likely to be victims of property crimes (Snell, 2001).

Recent research has highlighted confounding effects of earlier methodologies which failed to delineate between rational (or factual) and emotional responses to crime salience (Ditton & Farrall, 2007; O’Mahony & Quinn, 1999). It now
appears that increased fear of crime is only modestly correlated with increased punitiveness, if at all (Baron & Hartngel, 1996; Cullen, Clark, & Wozniak, 1985; Cullen, Fisher & Applegate, 2000; Ditton & Farrall, 2007; Maruna & King, 2004; Ouimet & Coyle, 1991; Tseloni, 2007; Tseloni & Zarafonitou, 2008).

For example, Baron and Hartngel (1996) investigated the punitive attitudes of 499 participants according to their agreement or disagreement (using a 7-point Likert scale) with a number of statements, including: ‘curfew for children under 16 is a good idea’; ‘young offenders who commit a second offence should be tried in adult courts’; and, ‘youth courts have become too lenient with young offenders’. Analysis revealed that respondents overall were very punitive towards juvenile offenders; for example, mean level of agreement with the statement, ‘young offenders who commit a second offence should be tried in adult courts’, was 5.32. However, fear of crime did not significantly impact punitive attitudes; rather participants’ level of conservativeness was a significant predictor of punitiveness.

Fear of crime and perceptions of crime salience.

A second instrumental attitude function related to public sanctioning attitudes is that of crime salience. Crime salience has been defined as concern about crime, beliefs about crime, and seriousness of crime (Cullen, Clark, & Wozniak, 1985). Although it is noted that other literature has defined fear of crime as part of crime salience (for example, see Hogan, Chiricos & Gertz, 2005; Stinchcombe, et al., 1980). Studies directly exploring an association between crime salience and punitive attitudes has generally reported no relationship, however other literature has linked satisfaction and/or concern about crime rates with sanctioning attitudes. As with fear of crime, nothing is known about the relationship between crime salience and support for reintegration. Nevertheless, it could be theorised that an individual’s beliefs that crime rates are increasing in their neighbourhood or society, or that crime rates represent an important social issue, may undermine their readiness to support reintegration. Literature relating to crime salience is briefly considered below.
Cullen, et al., (1985) reported no relationship between salience or victimization and support for either punitive responses to offenders, rehabilitation, or the death penalty. On an individual level, victims of crime are not more punitive than non-victims, while communities with high crime rates have not been shown to be more punitive than those with lower crime rates.

Stinchcombe, et al., (1980) conducted a review of the literature to explore the theory that members of the public who had suffered victimisation or worried about crime would want the State to be harsher on offenders. The review highlighted the complex relationship between fear and punitiveness; available research was unable to demonstrate a significant relationship. The authors also reported a weak if not non-existent relationship between the two factors, crime salience and fear of crime.

Crime salience can be linked to theories such as The Community Concern Model and the Disorder Model (Snell, 2001). These theoretical approaches argue that fear of crime will increase as concerns about one’s neighbourhood increase. According to Taylor and Hale (1986), people reporting less satisfaction with their neighbourhood also reported higher fear of crime than their more satisfied counterparts. It follows that individuals who perceive more signs of disorder and incivility in their immediate environment feel more vulnerable to disorder and, by extension, to crime. According to Snell (2001) signs of disorder and incivilities include public drinking, drug use, fighting and arguing, litter, graffiti, abandoned lots, and vacant housing. O’Mahony and Quinn (1999, p 234) argue that the locale for fear of crime, specifically the “lived community” of the individual is an important consideration in measuring fear of crime. According to these authors, defining and exploring the influence of ‘community’ on fear of crime is important.

Fear of crime victimization is likely to result when the community is aware that crime is a salient social issue, and yet believes it is incapable of responding effectively to this issue, while also believing it is personally vulnerable to crime. In line with this theory, recent research has focused on the relationship between perceptions of incivilities in one’s community and fear of crime. According to the Incivilities Thesis, disorder within the community results in an emotional response
to perceived vulnerability, in turn leading to an increased fear of crime (LaGrange, Ferraro, & Supancic, 1992; Perkins & Taylor, 1996; Robinson, Lawton, Taylor & Perkins, 2003; O’Mahony & Quinn, 1999). Supporting this hypothesis, Roberts and Indermaur (2009) found a moderate significant relationship between respondents’ perceptions of civil incivilities and fear of physical/street crime, and a weak relationship (but significant) between civic incivilities and fear of identity-related crime. Interestingly, the majority of respondents in this study reported incivilities in their community to be not a big problem or not a problem at all, as follows: rubbish/litter (76.4-percent); graffiti (71.3%); unsupervised groups of young people (63.2%); drunk people (72.6%); and, drug dealing (63.2%). Unfortunately, the study did not investigate the relationship between perceived incivilities and support for harsher criminal sanctioning.

Expressive attitude functions.

The expressive model relates to the symbolic meaning of law-breaking (Garland, 2001; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997). It holds that rule-breaking challenges the social and moral values of the community. Thus, individuals interpret criminal behaviour as a symptom of the breakdown of social cohesion, and punish offenders as a means to re-assert the social norms and social bonds within the community (Miller & Vidmar, 1981; Vidmar & Miller, 1980). According to Jackson (2004, p. 946), expressive responses to crime explain broader social concerns “regarding the cultural meaning of crime, social change and relations, and conditions conducive to crime.” Unlike instrumental responses, expressive responses are independent of actual threats to the individual. Measures of expressive responses to crime and justice typically include knowledge of and confidence in the CJS (Doroc, 2013). Under the expressive model, individuals may be more supportive of reintegration when the justice system is perceived as successful in upholding and re-asserting social norms (or laws), or put another way, when the public are confident in the CJS. Below, literature relating to the impact of knowledge of, and confidence in the CJS, and attitudes toward crime and justice is summarised.
Confidence in the criminal justice system.

Research addressing community confidence in the CJS and the relationship between its confidence and support for sentencing policy is limited. Further, no research to date has directly investigated the relationship between confidence in the CJS and community support for reintegration. Drawing from the available literature, it is theorised that, where the community endorses little or no confidence in the ability of the CJS to respond effectively to crime and offenders, reintegration will not be supported. If the community does not believe that the CJS is effective in punishing or rehabilitating offenders, it is not likely to support an initiative that supports ex-prisoners returning to the community. Additionally, if the community does not see the CJS as effective in general, it may perceive an additional correction initiative (reintegration) as similarly ineffective. In the current study it is theorised that communities with less confidence in the CJS will sit lower on the continuum of community readiness to engage in reintegration, than communities that endorse more positive beliefs about the CJS’s ability to reform offenders and support desistance.

Longitudinal data of Australian public attitudes towards crime and justice, draw from the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA), has shown variation in the public’s confidence in the ability of the Australian government to control crime (Roberts & Indermaur, 2009). In Robert and Indermaur’s (2009) study (using the AuSSA 2007 data), respondents (N= 2,652) indicated varying levels of confidence in the ability of the government to control crime. Approximately one-third (32.4%) of respondents reported that the government was successful in controlling crime; just over one-third (38.2%) reported that the government was neither successful nor unsuccessful; and, just under one-third (28.4%) reported that the government was not successful in controlling crime.

The study also investigated community confidence in the CJS across the police, courts and prison system (Roberts & Indermaur, 2009). The majority of respondents (N=5,187-5,222) indicated that they had ‘quite a lot of confidence’ to ‘a great deal of confidence’ in police to solve crime (74-percent), respond quickly
to crime (54.4-percent) and act fairly (73.7-percent). Respondents were least confident in police ability to prevent crime (48.3-percent) (Roberts & Indermaur, 2009).

Similar to that of confidence in government, there was variation in respondents’ confidence in the courts. The majority of respondents indicated that they had ‘quite a lot of confidence’ to ‘a great deal of confidence’ in the courts’ regard for defendants’ rights (66.9%) and in their ability to deal with matters fairly (51.5%). Conversely, the majority of respondents indicated little to no confidence in the courts’ regard for victims’ rights (52.9%), and ability to deal with matters quickly (77.9%). The majority of respondents indicated a desire for harsher sentences, with 71.2-percent of respondents agreeing with the statement ‘people who break the law should be given stiffer sentences’ (Roberts & Indermaur, 2009).

Of particular interest to the current thesis, respondents indicated the least confidence in prisons. The majority indicated ‘none at all’ or ‘not very much confidence’ in prison’s ability to rehabilitate prisoners (87.7%), as a form of punishment (59.2%), to deter future offending (84.7%) or in teaching prisoners skills (63.8%) (Roberts & Indermaur, 2009). These researchers hypothesised that differences in respondents’ confidence in police, courts and prisons may account for the wide variability given for confidence in the CJS overall.

Overall, the results from the study indicate that the Australian community has varying degrees of confidence across the government and CJS, with the community indicating the most confidence in police abilities, and the least confidence in prisons (Roberts & Indermaur, 2009). It appears that the public does not perceive prisons as able to effectively succeed in responding to offenders. These findings are consistent with other research that has generally indicated that individuals who feel that sentencing practices are too lenient generally support more critical views of sentencing authorities (for example, judges being too lenient) (Hough & Robert, 1999; 2004; Mattinson & Mirrlees-Black, 2000).

Importantly for the current discussion, Roberts and Indermaur’s (2009) study investigated the relationship between community confidence in courts and support for punitive criminal justice practices. Using Spearman’s rho corrections, the
report found a significant negative association between confidence in courts and desire for harsher sentences (rho = -.025, \( p < .001 \)) (Roberts & Indermaur, 2009). Unfortunately the study did not also investigate the relationship between confidence in prisons and desire for harsher sentences. However, the direction of the relationship between public support for harsher sentencing and low confidence in courts may be interpreted to indicate that when the community similarly has low confidence in prisons it is likely to support harsher responses to offenders. Support for reintegration may be negatively impacted by a belief that corrections do not adequately address offending behaviour (it is also possible that low confidence stems from a belief that the CJS is corrupt, which may result in a different relationship with support for reintegration.

Support for instrumental and expressive approaches in understanding community attitudes towards crime and punishment.

Instrumental and expressive attitudes have been investigated in several studies examining: community confidence in policy (Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Jackson, 2004; Jackson & Bradford, 2008; Jackson, Bradford, Hohl, & Farrall, 2009; Jackson & Sunshine, 2007; Reisig & Parks, 2000; Sprott & Doob, 2009; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997); punitive attitudes (Sprott & Doob, 2009; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997); and support for the death penalty (Ellsworth & Gross, 1994; Stack, 2003; Tyler & Weber, 1982; Vollum, Longmire, & Buffington-Vollum, 2004; Vollum, Mallicoat, & Buffington-Vollum, 2009). Available research indicates that public attitudes toward sentencing and offender punishment are informed by attitudes about actual or perceived threats (instrumental) and social cohesion and moral order (expressive). Furthermore, perceptions about the breakdown of social cohesion (expressive) are more influential in public endorsement of punitive sentencing practices, and satisfaction with the police, but not the courts.

The relationship between instrumental and expressive attitudes and public support for reintegration is unknown, as is the relationship between these attitudes and
support for a similar sentencing objective: rehabilitation. One study reported a relationship between satisfaction with the courts and instrumental attitudes (Sprott and Doob, 2009), however extrapolating these results to indicate support for reintegration should be done cautiously, as little is known as to whether the public perceives the courts to be responsible for reintegration (or rehabilitation for that matter). Below, the literature relating to instrumental and expressive attitude functions and public attitudes toward crime and punishment is summarised.

Jackson et al. (2009) addressed the relationship between instrumental and expressive attitudes towards policing, and public confidence in police. The authors outlined interesting trends in public opinion towards: policing in the UK; increasing levels of direct and indirect experiences of crime and justice, including the impacts of mass media; raising community beliefs about the salience of crime; and, a decrease in public perceptions that crime rates are increasing (which mirrors actual decreases in crime rates in the UK between 1994 and 2006). The authors note that previous theory and current police initiatives are aligned with the theory that public confidence in the police is impacted by instrumental attitudes functions, specifically fear of crime victimization. However, the data presented do not support this approach. Rather, the authors argue that confidence in the CJS is linked to expressive attitude functions, including neighbourhood stability and breakdown. As Lofthouse (1996, p 44) argues, the “police are not just the simple protectors of the community, it is constantly and actively engaged in the construction and reconstruction of the moral and social order.” Drawing from data from the 1982 British Crime Survey, the authors reviewed 80,270 participant responses between the years 1988 to 2005/6 in relation to: confidence in policing; endorsement of instrumental attitudes (worry about crime); and, expressive attitudes (concern about disorder and concern about social cohesion). In a hierarchical multiple regression, the authors found both instrumental and expressive attitudes to be significant predictors of public confidence in policing. However, when both attitudes were added to the model, expressive attitudes explained approximately three quarters of the effect of instrumental attitudes of confidence in the police.
In a follow-up study of 1,879 respondents surveyed between 2005/6 and 2006/7, the authors again tested the predictive effect of instrumental (worry about crime and concern about the crime problem) and expressive attitudes (concern about social cohesion, concern about collective efficacy and concern about disorder) on public confidence in police (Jackson et al., 2009). Again, both instrumental and expressive attitudes were significantly predictive of confidence in policing. However, when all factors were added to the model, the instrumental attitude, concern about the crime problem, was no longer significant, and the effect size for worry about crime was considerably reduced. Conversely, three expressive factors maintained significant and strong predictors in the model. Jackson et al. (2009) conclude that the two studies support the hypothesis that expressive functions of attitudes, specifically concern about disorder, cohesion and social control are more influential in public confidence of police, than worry (or fear) about crime.

Jackson et al.’s (2009) research suggests a strong link between public perceptions of the responsibility of police to maintain and assert social and moral order. Yet, research is less conclusive when addressing public perceptions about the role of the courts to do the same (Shearing & Brodeur, 2005; cf. Sprott & Doob, 2009). The latter investigated a sample of 17,898 Canadian adults living in urban areas. Dependent measures included respondent satisfaction with police and the courts. Independent measures included: demographics (age, gender, income, and ethnicity); perceptions of crime increasing or decreasing in last 5 years in neighbourhood (crime salience); fear and personal safety and previous victimization; perceptions of crime in neighbourhood compared to other areas in Canada; and perceptions of disorder in the neighbourhood (expressive attitudes). They found a significant effect of all independent variables on satisfaction with the police; additionally, perceptions of disorder in the neighbourhood in the second step did not show a reduction in the effect size of perceptions of crime increasing or decreasing in last 5 years in neighbourhood, fear and personal safety and prior victimization, or of perceptions of crime in neighbourhood compared to other areas in Canada. However, the logistic regression of participant evaluations of the courts revealed a significant effect for perceptions
of crime increasing or decreasing in last 5 years in neighbourhood, and for fear and personal safety and prior victimization. That being said, perceptions of disorder in the neighbourhood compared to other areas in Canada were not a significant predictor in the model. The findings suggest that community perceptions of court’s success is impacted by instrumental, but not expressive attributes. As the authors conclude (2009, p. 359), “with respect to evaluations of the courts, there was a relationship between views of crime increasing and negative evaluations of the courts. Thus, it could be that people do broadly hold the courts responsible … however on a more specific level, when people are thinking about problems within their neighbourhoods, they no longer see the courts as the responsible agency.”

Findings by Jackson et al., (2009) contrast with findings of previous research carried out by Tyler and Boechmann (1997). The latter reported public support for both instrumental and expressive attitudes towards crime and punishment (N=166). Factors investigated included: participant judgements about both their social world, including local community, family and population diversity; and their social values, including authoritarianism, dogmatism and liberalism. While both instrumental and expressive explanations were found to significantly predict support for punitive attitudes, expressive factors (social cohesion) were found to predict punitive attitudes more than instrumental factors (concerns about crime and safety).

Vollum et al. (2009) investigated the relationship between instrumental and expressive factors and support for the death penalty in 927 university students in Texas (N=495) and California (N=432). The study conducted a series of regression analyses testing for the predictive values of participant demographics (gender, race, political orientation, education level, religious background, and location), expressive attitudes, and retribution support orientation, on support for the death penalty. Of interest was the relationship between expressive attitudes and support for the death penalty, but also changes in attitudes as a result of provision of information. The study found overall support for the hypothesis that death penalty attitudes reflect underlying central values of the individual, and “to the degree that they do [reflect expressive attitudes], they appear more robust and
resistant to change in spite of information challenging its fairness and efficacy” (Vollum et al., 2009, p. 234). That is, despite the majority of respondents (over 70%) being receptive to information challenging the use of the death penalty, only a small minority (at most one third across conditions) indicated it would change its support for the death penalty as a result of the information provided.

Maruna and King (2004) investigated the influences of instrumental and expressive attitudes on public support for ex-offender desistance from crime in a sample of 941 respondents from a postal survey of rural and urban residents in England and London. The authors analysed a hierarchical model to investigate the effects of instrumental and expressive attitudes on public punitive attitudes. Instrumental variables included past victimization, fear of crime, and crime salience (local). Expressive variables included collective efficacy and trust, anxiety about youth, economic pressure and crime salience (global). Additionally, the authors investigated the effect of core beliefs and values (including crime causal attributions), and demographic variables (class background, gender, education level, income, race and age) were included as controls.

Results indicated that fear of crime was the only instrumental attitude with significant contribution to respondents sanctioning attitudes (Maruna & King, 2004). Fear of crime was a significant negative predictor both independently and in conjunction with the expressive, and core beliefs and values variables. Three of the four expressive variables were significant in addition to fear of crime: collective efficacy and trust, anxiety about youth, and crime salience (global). The addition of expressive predictors reduced the predictive value of fear of crime by almost half, indicating the strength of expressive attitudes on sanction attitudes. Additionally, these predictors remained significant after the addition of core beliefs and values. Overall, in relation to instrumental and expressive attitudes, the findings of Maruna and King’s (2004) study suggest a stronger predictive value of expressive factors on public support for ex-prisoner desistance and reintegration than of instrumental factors.

32 Results from Maruna and King’s (2004) study relating to crime causal attributions will be addressed later in this chapter.
Drawing from these findings, it is theorised that community knowledge of and confidence in the ability of the CJS to effectively respond to crime will impact public support for reintegration. That is, expressive attitude functions will be more influential in determining community attitudes toward reintegration.

Unfortunately, research conducted by Tyler and Boechmann (1997), Jackson et al. (2009), Vollum et al. (2009), and others has focused primarily on functions attitudes and policing or front-end justice objectives (i.e. sentencing, death penalty). This research is limited, as reintegration is conceptualised as a post-punishment objective. Maruna and King’s (2004) study considered community attitudes toward probation. This study found redeemability (crime causal attribution) was a stronger predictor of support for sentencing. This finding indicates that crime causal attributions may be as (if not more) influential on community attitudes toward reintegration. As such, these are considered in the next section.

The next section will consider an alternative approach to considering why the public endorses certain crime and justice attitudes. Crime causal attributions theorise that individuals’ attitudes towards punishment, rehabilitation and other forms of sanctioning are influenced by their explanations as to why people commit crimes. Put simply, the way society deals with criminals depends on why society believes they offended in the first place.

**Crime Causal Attributions**

Research has previously demonstrated a relationship between attributions about the causes of crime and public attitudes towards criminal justice initiatives, as well as ex-offender desistance from crime (Carroll, Clark, Cullen, & Mathers, 1985; Cullen, Clark, Cullen, et al., 1985; Maruna, 2001; Maruna & King, 2004; 2009). This body of research highlights the importance of perceiver attributions (in this case, the community) regarding target individuals (an ex-prisoner) in its attitudes and beliefs. The cause of the offending behaviour, the person responsible for the offending behaviour, and the stability of the offending behaviour over time.
(and therefore the possibility for desistance from crime) have been shown to be influential.

Cochran, Boots, and Heide (2003a) argue that “although much of the research on public attitudes has attempted to explain public support for the death penalty as a function of respondents’ philosophies of punishment (i.e. retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, and rehabilitation), this approach fails to explain how these attitudes originate” (p. 66). These authors chose to use attribution theory to understand community preferences for punishment, specifically the death penalty, and other sentencing objectives for juvenile offenders, and offenders with mental illness or mental retardation. The results of the study provided support for explanations of public sanctioning choices involving attribution, with attribution factors fully or substantially mediating the effects of other correlates including age, income, and fear of crime and victimisation (Cochran, et al., 2003a), indicating this is an important factor to consider in exploring community support for ex-prisoner reintegration.

The following section is devoted to providing an overview to attribution theory, and its applicability in the exploration of the influence of attributional judgements made by the community on its support for ex-prisoner reintegration. A literature review of research investigating attributions in support for CJS-related initiatives will be provided. The section will outline the three primary attributional dimensions that have been proposed, and argue for a holistic approach in exploring the impact of attributions along each causal dimension in working toward understanding of community level of support for ex-prisoner reintegration.

**Causal attribution theory.**

Attribution theory relates to the process by which a social observer uses information to arrive at a causal explanation for an outcome or event. The theory questions how and why ordinary people explain events in the way they do, and differentially act according to the way an event is perceived. To address these questions, attribution theory primarily examines what information is gathered by
an observer and how it is combined to reach a causal judgment (Fiske & Taylor, 2008).

Attribution theory is largely credited to the founding work of Heider (1958), whose work on linking event outcomes with perceived causes laid the foundations for later influential work by Rotter (1966), Jones and Davis (1965), Kelley (1967) and Weiner (1979; 1982; 1986). Heider defined attribution as “the linking of an event with its underlying conditions” (p. 89). Under this definition, an event is perceived by an individual as linked to a behavioural cause. Two possible behavioural causes were identified: “factors within the person” or “factors within the environment” (p. 82). Heider argued that this distinction between internal and external causality results in the perceiver attributing event responsibility to either the person or the environment; if the outcome “‘belongs’ to the person, then the person is felt to be responsible for its occurrence; conversely if the event belongs to the environment, then the environment is held accountable” (p. 56).

Weiner (1979; 1982; 1986) challenged this one-dimensional conceptualisation of attribution theory in his ‘Theory of Motivation’, which delineated attributional causes among several dimensions. In addition to Heider’s (1958) dimension of internal versus external cause (termed, by Weiner, the ‘locus of causality’ dimension), Weiner proposed the two dimensions of stability and controllability. Stability, according to Weiner, distinguishes whether the cause is perceived as temporary or relatively enduring (temporal generalizability; stable or unstable characteristic of the individual), while controllability determines whether the cause is the subject of volitional influences (controllable or uncontrollable by the individual).

According to Weiner’s (1979) model, the process of attributing cause of a particular event is distinct for each dimension of locus, stability and controllability. All three may be influenced by antecedent conditions, but once the observer perceives a particular cause of an outcome, a direct linkage is made from cause to primary effect, according to the causal dimension(s) to which the perceived cause belongs.
Attribution theory in the study of public support for criminal justice system initiatives: punishment, rehabilitation and the death penalty.

The causal attribution of locus of causality has been comprehensively investigated in predicting public attitudes towards crime and justice policy and practice. This is especially the case in relation to public opinions toward sentencing practices. These studies have suggested that causal attributions play an important role when the public makes decisions about punishment, rehabilitation, and other sentencing outcomes. Recently, research by Maruna (2001) and others (Connolly et al., 1997; Meyer & Mulherin, 1980; Weiner, 1979, 1980a, 1980b; Weiner et al., 1982) has demonstrated that, in addition to locus of causality, the two dimensions of stability and controllability may also contribute to attitudes towards sentencing, and may even hold stronger predictive power for support for one sentencing objective, such as punishment, over another, such as rehabilitation. In light of Weiner’s (1979) theory of the link between attributions and primary effects, it is logical that the dimensions of controllability and stability may in fact be more relevant to public decision-making with regard to crime and justice initiatives including reintegration. This is due to the relationship between these dimensions and the concepts of morality, redemption, forgiveness, and willingness to engage in helping behaviours.

Available research indicates that when the public endorses crime causal attributions of external locus of causality, non-controllability and instability, it is likely to be more lenient in its support for sentencing practices for offenders. Conversely when the public attributes crime to internal locus of causality, controllability and stability, it is likely to support punitive sanctions. Drawing from this research, it is argued that the community will be more lenient towards an offender who is perceived to: have offended as a result of environmental pressures; have little control over his or her environment; and, to have demonstrated an ability to change or ‘redeem’ his or her law-abiding citizenship. In contrast, less leniency will be afforded to an offender who is perceived to have: offended as a result of his or her own desire; control over his or her choice to offend; and, demonstrated little willingness to change his or her offending ways.
Additionally, it was noted that the research has overwhelmingly focused on attributions as these apply to front-end justice system responses. With the exception of Maruna (2001; Maruna & King, 2004; Maruna et al., 2004) and Carroll (1978a, 1978b; Carroll & Burke, 1990; Carroll, Galegher, et al., 1982; Carroll, Wiener, et al., 1982), all of the studies discussed herein explored public support for sentencing practices. Maruna and Carroll’s work indicates that attributions are also relevant to community decisions about offenders’ post-punishment, particularly to offender desistance and reduction in risk. As discussed in chapters one and two, this point is particularly relevant as the community has little, if any, role to play in punishing or rehabilitating offenders. Conversely, the community plays a critical role in ex-prisoner reintegration. While no research has explored the contribution of crime causal attributions in community support for reintegration, a theory may be developed based on the literature reviewed. It is likely that the public draws on attributions of crime causality in making its decisions about the reintegration of an offender; where the offender demonstrates internal locus of casualty, control and stability, it is likely the public will view this person as unable and unwilling to desist from crime, and thus the public is unlikely to contribute resources to support the reintegration of this offender. In contrast, an offender who demonstrates external locus of causality, non-control and instability may be viewed by the public as willing and able to desist from crime, and as a result, the public may be more willing to contribute resources to support this offender’s reintegration.

One cause of crime, or many?

Much of the early research investigating the effect of causal attributions on attitudes towards the CJS focused either solely on the dimension of locus of causality, or asked respondents open-ended questions to determine the various beliefs the public holds as to why individuals commit crime. This second, broader, line of inquiry found that the public supports many explanations for the causes of crime. These include social and structural causes, such as: inadequate parental guidance and criminogenic home conditions (Robert & Stalans, 1997); individual factors, including rational choice (Cullen, Clark, Cullen, et al., 1985);
drug and alcohol use (Haberman & Sheinberg, 1969); and, individual factors beyond the individual’s control, such as biological and psychological deficits (Hollin & Howells, 1987).

Similarly, research suggests that the public often attributes a number of causes to crime (Carroll, 1979; Sims, 2003). For example, Carroll (1979) conducted a survey of parole board members’ beliefs about crime causation. Three-quarters of all crimes were attributed to ten major causes; drugs, alcohol, greed, need for money, victim participation, being drunk, influences of associates, lack of control, mental problems, and domestic violence. Likewise, in an Australian study investigating public perceptions of violent criminals, respondents endorsed seven explanations as to why [criminals] act as they do: alcohol/drug problems (48.8-percent); family history of vice and crime (44.1-percent); increasing amount of violence in the media (37.7-percent); member of a delinquent/criminal gang (35.1-percent); inner drives/mainly psychological reasons (33.6-percent); grudge against society (31.0-percent); and, poor parent-child relationship (30.7-percent) (O’Connor, 1984).

**Locus of causality.**

Other researchers have specifically investigated public sanctioning attitudes in terms of the predictive contribution of locus of causality attributions on crime (Applegate, Cullen, Fisher, & Vander Ven, 2000; Carroll, et al., 1985; Carroll & Payne, 1977; Carroll, Perkowitz, Lurigio, & Weaver, 1987; Furnham & Henderson, 1983; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Hawkins, 1981; Roberts & Stalans, 2004; Sims, 2003; Young, 1991). This research has generally supported a strong link between individuals’ beliefs about why people commit crime, and their support for justice responses to offenders. As Cullen, Clark, Cullen, et al. (1985, p. 310) note, “how people explain crime will affect what they want done about it.” Generally, when the public attributes crime to individual agency, it is more likely to support punitive responses, whereas attributions to structural or social causes lead to more support for rehabilitation, less severe punishment, and community-based sentences (Carroll et al., 1987; Cullen, Clark, Cullen, et al., 1985; Roberts
& Stalans, 2004). Cullen and colleagues (1985) investigated the association between positivist and classical beliefs about crime causation and attitudes towards criminal sanctioning. The study surveyed the attitudes of 156 respondents towards various aspects of criminal sanctioning. A positivist orientation (the belief that crime results from factors largely outside the control of the individual) was positively associated with support for rehabilitation, and negatively related to support for a general punishment philosophy as well as capital punishment. Likewise, members of the public who endorsed causal attributions that linked crime to situational factors (external locus, uncontrollable) were more likely to demand less punishment, or in some cases, no punishment at all. Conversely, individuals who attributed drug and alcohol use to moral weakness or behavioural control (internal locus, controllable) were more likely to hold the substance user responsible (Orcutt & Cairl, 1979). Carroll et al. (1987) reported similar findings; individuals who endorsed internal causality beliefs supported tough, punitive responses to crime, while those endorsing situational causality beliefs supported a rehabilitative stance.

The association between narratives of crime causation and support of different sanctioning outcomes is also seen in studies of judges and parole board offices (Carroll, 1978a, 1978b; Carroll & Burke, 1990; Carroll, Galegher, et al., 1982; Carroll, Wiener, et al., 1982). Hogarth (1971) found the individual sentencing philosophy of judges to be related to their belief about the causes of crime. In his study of the explanations of crime offered by parole board members, Carroll (1979) found that when offenders’ crimes were attributed to causes internal to the individual, these offenders were less likely to be recommended for parole than those whose crimes were attributed to external causes. These results were supported by a subsequent study (Carroll, Galegher, et al., 1982), which investigated five parole board members of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole across 201 parole hearings. After each hearing, members answered the open-ended question, Opinion on underlying cause of offense committed. Responses were coded into five attribution categories: person, money, drugs, alcohol, and environment. Analysis found causal attributions were significantly
more predictive of the willingness to grant parole of parole board members’ than prognoses for rehabilitation and risk of future offending.

Sims (2003) investigated the relationship between causal attributions and level of public positiveness in a sample of 1,085 participants. To measure crime causal attributions, Sims developed 48 questions based on criminological and psychological theories of crime causation including: classical; biological; psychological; social; disorganisation; strain; subcultural; social learning; social control; and, labelling theory. Alongside causal attributions, the study investigated the predictive power of demographic characteristics including: age; gender; ethnicity; education level; income; confidence in the justice system; and, fear of crime. A measure of punitiveness was developed using four items. Results indicated that respondents endorsing a situational view of crime causation (e.g. “going awry in the social structure”) were more likely to demand less punishment, and in some cases, no punishment at all for offenders. Conversely, those endorsing dispositional attribution beliefs supported more severe punishment for offenders. Furthermore, crime causal attributions were found to be predictive of punitiveness when controlling for demographic, confidence and fear of crime factors.

Similarly, Cochran, et al., (2003) investigated the impact of attribution styles on public attitudes towards the death penalty for juveniles, the mentally incompetent, and the mentally retarded. The authors surveyed a sample of 697 respondents called for jury service in Florida, USA. Attribution style was measured via responses to eight questions assessing the degree to which respondents believed that crime was the result of various internal/dispositional (internal locus) characteristics of the offender, versus external, environmental or situational (external locus) characteristics of the offender, using a Likert scale. Additionally, the authors designed two multidimensional factorial vignettes to directly measure public opinion for the death penalty. Logistic regression analysis for effect of attribution style on support for the death penalty (for Likert scale questions) revealed significant positive effect for dispositional attributions for adult, juvenile, mentally retarded and mentally incompetent offenders. Situational attributions had a significant negative effect for adult and juvenile, but not
mentally retarded or mentally incompetent offenders. Logistic regression of the vignette revealed similar results. Respondents’ beliefs in dispositional attributions had significant positive effect on support for the death penalty, while belief in situational attributions had a significant negative effect on support for the death penalty.

The above research indicates that crime causal attributions do impact on subsequent community decisions about offender punishment. However, a criticism of this research is its primary focus on the dimension of locus of causation or, when other dimensions are considered, these are confounded with the dimension of locus (for example see Carroll et al., 1985). On the other hand, limited research has addressed the remaining two dimensions of attribution, stability and controllability in public attitudes toward crime and punishment. Nevertheless, recent research has highlighted that the two dimensions of stability and controllability provide as much, if not more, predictive power in public support for crime and justice initiatives than that of locus of causality. These two dimensions are considered below.

**Stability and redeemability.**

It is argued here that, as reintegration is concerned with the assumption that a released offender is able to return to his or her community and integrate as a law-abiding citizen, causal attributions of stability form an important factor to be considered for the current thesis. In line with Weiner (1979), if it is the case that the community attributes offending to a stable cause, then the outcome expectancy in relation to a released offender is that of re-offending. Similarly, if the community attributes failure of desistance to stable causes, then it will express an increased certainty regarding failure to desist in the future. This certainty will

33 Interestingly, the analysis also included fear of crime (an instrumental attitude), which was found to be a significant predictor for support for the death penalty for adult and juvenile (15 years and under) and actual victimization, which was non-significant across all offender categories (Cochran et al., 2003).

34 In this second analysis, fear of crime and victimization were non-significant predictors of support for the death penalty (Cochran et al., 2003).
be further reinforced when the community repeatedly receives messages of re-offending and failure to desist, which further reinforce the expectancy outcome. However, it is theorised that where feedback of desistance from crime is provided, the community will likely attribute the outcome – no criminal behaviour – to an unstable cause. The community may continue to assume that the majority of ex-prisoners will re-offend, while the desisting offender may be seen as a ‘once-off’ or special occurrence.

Research conducted by John Carroll (1978a, 1978b; Carroll, Galegher, et al., 1982) lends support to the above argument. Carroll (1978a) investigated the effect of attribution dimensions on parole board recommendations for offender parole eligibility. Three dimensions of attributions were investigated: locus (internal versus external); stability (stable versus unstable); and intentionality (intentional versus unintentional). Using multiple regression analysis, Carroll (1978a) found a main effect for all three attribution dimensions, although the strongest predictor was that of stability, accounting for 4.1-percent of the variable in parole recommendations. More stable attributions resulted in less favourable recommendations made by the parole board. Further, neither locus nor intentionality remained significant when stability was included in the regression model. The only subjective variable in the analysis that controlled for the impact of stability on parole decisions was that of risk of subsequent offence. Carroll (1978a) argued that his findings indicated that stability affects judgements about the future risk of an offender, that is whether he or she will remain an offender (stable) or desist from crime (unstable or redeemable); this in turn affects the decisions of board members to release an offender.

One scholar that has contributed significantly in the study of stable/unstable crime causal attributions is Shadd Maruna (Maruna, 2001; 2006; 2011; Maruna & King, 2004; Maruna et al., 2004). As was discussed in Chapter Two, Maruna’s (2001) Liverpool Desistance Study presented a unique theory of desistance, a dynamic process that is achieved through ex-offender narratives of ‘going straight’ by redefining the past offending and moving towards a crime-free lifestyle. Maruna (2001) investigated the ‘redemptive scripts’ of 30 desistors and ‘condemnation scripts’ of 20 re-offenders in his desistance study.
In developing his theory of desistance, Maruna (Maruna, 2001; Maruna & King, 2004) argued that what determines an ex-offender and the public’s perception as to the ability of the former to desist from crime, depends not on attributions of locus of causality, but that of stability/instability of the offender’s identity and behaviour as an ‘offender’. Maruna argued that an attribution of instability, that is, a belief in the ability of an offender to be ‘redeemed,’ is an important dimension in supporting desistance and reintegration initiatives.

In subsequent studies, Maruna and King (2004; 2009) considered the public perspectives of redeemability on attitudes towards ex-offenders. Building on attribution theory, Maruna and King theorised that the dimension of stability/instability would predict public attitudes towards ex-offender desistance. Here, stability was conceptualised as constancy in the offender’s criminal behaviour over time. In contrast, instability – or what Maruna and King (2004, p. 95) term “belief in redeemability” – is the perception that an offender can change his or her criminal behaviour and move towards desistance from crime. Empirical analysis has supported this theory.

Maruna and King (2004) investigated the predictive value of the attributions of redeemability as well as the belief that crime is a choice (the author’s term dispositional\(^\text{35}\)) on public pro-community sanctioning attitudes (\(N=941\)). The study drew on survey data gathered as part of the Cambridge University Public Opinion Project (CUPOP). In total, 941 British households were surveyed on their: level of punitiveness; disposition attributions (crime is a choice, or locus of causality, i.e., belief that crime results from internal characteristics of the individual or their environment), belief in redeemability; instrumental variables (direct victimization, crime salience (local), and fear of crime); expressive variables (collective efficacy and trust, anxiety about youth, economic pressure, and crime salience (global)) and, socio-demographic characteristic (class background, gender, university, income, race, age, unemployment).

\(^{35}\) In light of the discussion above regarding lack of clarity distinguishing the causal attributions of locus and controllability, it is difficult to determine if ‘crime is a choice’ is better categorised as an internal/external locus attribution or a controllable/uncontrollable attributions.
In their analyses, the authors added causal attributions in the fourth step of a hieratical multiple regression, following demographic factors (controllers), instrumental attitudes, and expressive attitudes. The addition of causal attributions was found to add significant variance to the model ($R^2$ change = .112), with both *crime is a choice* and *belief in redeemability* attributions found to have a significant and unique effect on respondents’ pro-community sanctioning attitudes. Further, the addition of these variables led to a slight decrease in the strength and significance of several variables, including: *crime salience (local)* (instrumental); *collective efficacy; anxiety over youth and crime salience (global)* (expressive), although all of these remained significant in the final model.

Maruna and King’s (2009) subsequent analysis of the data identified four different public views about offenders, those that believe: (i) offenders are pushed into crime as a result of external forces; (ii) criminal offending results from environmental pressures, but offenders become ‘hardened’ criminals as a result of their environment; (iii) crime is a choice that offenders make for their own benefit; and, (iv) offending is a choice, but offenders cannot change their ways – rather, ‘once a criminal always a criminal’. Unsurprisingly, the first group reported the lowest punitive measures, while the last group reported the highest.

*Controllability.*

The final dimension is that of controllability. Prior research has generally supported the theory that, when a negative outcome is perceived as controllable by the actor, then the perceiver is less likely to provide assistance for, or display pity or sympathy towards the actor (Weiner, 1980a, 1980b; Weiner et al., 1982). It is theorised here that if the public views an offender’s criminal behaviour as resulting from decisions within the control of the offender, the public is likely to support more punitive measures and reintegration is less likely to be supported. Conversely, where offending behaviour is attributed to uncontrollable factors, the public may be more likely to support reintegration and hold the belief that an offender may desist from crime.
This theoretical perspective can be seen to be supported in research related to helping behaviour, and the attribution of control that the perceived other has in the resultant requirement of assistance (Barnes, Ickes, & Kidd, 1979; Ickes, Kidd, & Berkowitz, 1976; Simon & Weiner, 1978). Simon and Weiner (1987, cited in Meyer & Mulherin, 1980) measured participants’ willingness to help a fellow student when the dimensions of control and locus were manipulated – that is, whether participants would share their study notes with a fellow student, when the student’s need was attributed, variously, to internal controllable, external controllable, internal uncontrollable or external uncontrollable factors. Helping behaviour was reported as relatively equal, except in the condition of internal and controllable factors, where assistance was unlikely to be given.

In a similar vein, Weiner (1977; cited in Weiner, 1979) investigated the role of controllability in evaluative attributions. This research focused on evaluations of reward versus punishment for students, based on the characteristics of effort, ability and performance on an exam. The results indicated that evaluative attributions are influenced by the perceived controllability of the outcome. The perceived controllability of the other over their success or failure determines the allocated judgement of reward or punishment of the perceiver. Where effort is seen as under volitional control of the actor, the perceiver assigns harsher judgement to the outcome of failure. Weiner (1977, p 508; cited in Weiner, 1979, p 17) explains: “effort attributes elicit strong moral feelings – trying to attain a socially valued goal is something that one ‘ought’ to do.” Controllability, then, is mediated by evaluations based on judgements of moral obligations (the ‘ought’).

Again, Weiner puts this succinctly: “there is a pervasive influence of perceived controllability or personal responsibility on interpersonal judgements” (Weiner, 1979, p. 17).

Controllability attribution research has investigated the impact of this dimension in public beliefs about sexual offenders. This focus may be due to the strong themes of power and control in sexual assault theory (Darke, 1990; Polaschek & Ward, 2002). Connolly, Hudson, and Ward (1997) investigated the attributions of crime causation for sexual offenders of social workers and social work students using Benson’s Attribution Scale (Benson, 1989). This scale rates attributions
across the four dimensions of internality (locus), stability, controllability, and globality\textsuperscript{36}. The study was particularly interested in the predictive value of attributions of sexual offending causation of participants when giving reasons as to why men sexually offended against children. The authors found social workers endorsed attributions of child sexual abuse as controllable and more internal than did social work students. No difference between groups was found within the dimensions of stability and globality. A strong gender interaction effect was found in the study, with male social workers attributing less internal causes than male social-work students, and female social workers attributing more internal cause than female social-work students. Similar findings were reported in a study by Beling, Hudson and Ward (2001).

Reviewed literature indicates that public beliefs about why people commit crime does influence its beliefs about the how the CJS should respond to rule breakers. It was theorised that the community may make decisions about the reintegration of ex-prisoners based on the reasons underlying the ex-prisoner’s criminal behaviour. On the other hand, it is possible that the public does not link the motivations toward criminal behaviour with reasons for or against allowing ex-prisoners to cross the boundary into ‘community’. Group processes, including notions of inclusion and exclusion, may play a more powerful role. The concept of shared identity theorises that individuals’ social identity influences their interactions and reactions toward members of in- and out-groups. Social identity theory may influence community attitudes toward offender reintegration.

**Social Identity Theory and Support for Ex-prisoner Reintegration**

Social identity theory can be broadly understood as a process of intergroup relations – that is, the ways in which individuals “think about, feel about, act towards, and react to others on the basis of different social group memberships”

\textsuperscript{36} Globality was proposed by Weiner (1979) as a subordinate causal dimension. Empirical studies support the existence of this dimension (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978). However, globality has not been previously investigated within crime and justice research. Thus, it was excluded from the current study.
Literature drawn from Social Identity Theory (SIT) indicates that individuals form categories of their social world that include both self-categorisation and other-categorisation within a range of in-group and out-group memberships. Social identity in turn influences an individual’s self-esteem, which ultimately leads individuals to promote the good of the in-group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Often this has been researched via exploration of in-group bias.

Unlike attribution theory, little research has specifically explored the impact of group processes on public sanctioning decisions. Certain researchers (Reitan, 1996; Schmid, Hewstone, & Al Ramiah, 2011) have argued, from a theoretical perspective, that group processes are relevant to crime and justice attitudes in the formation of beliefs about ‘us’ versus ‘them.’ According to Reitan (1996), the community may view itself as members of a category of ‘law-abiding citizens’, and prisoners and ex-prisoners as members of an ‘other’ out-group. Successful reintegration fosters the ability for prisoners to transition from ‘them’ back to ‘us’ – or as Reitan (1996) theorises, from ‘offender’ back to the ‘community of good citizens’. Thus it is possible that social identity theory will influence community attitudes toward reintegration.

It is argued here that as a result of ‘us versus them’ categorisation, in- and out-group processes of positive and negative bias will play out in interactions between members of the community and the ex-prisoner. Additionally, and in line with SIT, the community will respond to ex-prisoners according to stereotypes it holds of ‘typical’ offenders/prisoners, informed predominantly from media and other social messages. The limited research in the area of offender stereotypes indicates that offenders are generally viewed as male, young, dangerous, repeat offenders, and sentenced for serious offences (Doob & Roberts, 1983; Gleb, 2006; Sprott, 1996). In contrast then, a hypothetical offender whose personal characteristics violate this typicality effect may challenge a community member’s stereotypes of ex-prisoners, and this may result in greater willingness on the part of the community to engage in the reintegration process. These offender characteristics may include; first time offender, low risk to the community, remorseful for their offending, and completing programs to reduce re-offending, such as education,
work skills training and rehabilitation. Literature relating to SIT is provided below.

**Social identity theory.**

The basic premise that individuals arrange their social world according to differential, fluid and contextual group memberships, both intra- and inter-group, is a fundamental theoretical underpinning of social psychology. Categorisation enables people to organise and achieve meaning in their world quickly with minimum resources (Allport, 1958; Bruner, 1957; Rhodes, 2013; Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986). Social identity theory (SIT), developed by Tajfel and Turner (Tajfel, 1969, 1978, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986) and Bruner (1957), is a theoretical perspective that seeks to explain inter-group phenomena, including how and why individuals categorise themselves and others into social groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

Individuals hold a mental model of social groups. When they interact with another person, individuals assume that the other holds membership of a certain group (or multiple groups), and will therefore hold similar characteristics and act in accordance with that particular group (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Further, relative to the group membership of the perceived other, the individual will also self-categorise as belonging to a particular group. For any individual, certain groups will be classified mentally as ‘in-groups’ and others as ‘out-groups’. It is theorised that in-groups are perceived as desirable, and thus the perceiver will treat members of these groups positively. In contrast, out-groups are perceived as undesirable, and individuals perceived as being part of an out-group will be treated negatively (Amiot & Bourhis, 2005; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Thus these theoretical perspectives offer explanations for relational differences for inter- and intra-group attitudes, such as in-group favouritism, and intergroup bias and discrimination.

SIT conceptualises intergroup and intragroup behaviour as deriving from the value and meaning that an individual achieves from identification with a group within any particular social context. Social identity theory is “that part of the
individual’s self-concept which derives from his or her knowledge of membership to a social group (or groups) together with the value and the emotional significance attached to it (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255).

There are two key aspects of SIT. The first posits that individual self-esteem is enhanced through identification with an in-group and promotion of group status. Self-identification with a group results in cognitive, emotional and connotative (value and behavioural intentions) actions that promote the group with which the individual identifies. In-group favouritism is functional, fulfilling the need for differentiation from the out-group and contributing to group members’ positive social identity (Perreault & Bourhis, 1998; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Successful intergroup bias creates or protects relatively high in-group status, thereby providing a positive social identity for in-group members and satisfying their need for positive self-esteem (Amiot & Sansfaçon, 2011; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

The second key aspect of SIT follows from the first; insofar as SIT concerns the behaviour of the individual towards other members of their in-group, it also concerns inter-group relations. Intergroup relations impact on the ways in which individuals perceive, think about, feel about, act towards, and react to others on the basis of different social group memberships.

It is noted that the theoretical approach of SIT is distinct from that of personal identity, in that the theory argues that it is the group/intergroup processes which influence behaviours within interpersonal processes, and not that of individual processes or characteristics. Thus, according to SIT, when an individual is primed within a social context, he or she will not act according to their individual needs and wants, but rather the needs and wants of their identified in-group. Thus, SIT is not merely concerned with the formation of social groups or the distinction between one social group and another. Rather, the theory explains why group members are regarded in terms of stereotypes rather than as unique individuals, both for in-groups and out-groups.

It is the process of group categorisation on the part of self and others that forms social stereotyping, whereby assumptions are based on group meaning and not simply differences in the actual characteristics of different people. Stereotyping, however, is not limited to out-group members. According to SIT, the perceiver is
also categorised, or depersonalised, in much the same way as targeted individuals, to form part of the in-group.

Research has supported the relationship between out-group bias and positive social identity (Brewer, 1999, 2001; Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996; Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002); however, other research has indicated that this relationship is more complex (see Amiot & Sansfaçon, 2011; Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998). In actuality, the effect of identifying with one’s in-group can have either positive or negative consequences depending on the context, including the relative group size and status (Amiot & Sansfaçon, 2011; Ellemers, Kortekaas, & Ouwerkerk, 1999).

Generally, in-group bias is seen as resulting in both in-group favouritism and out-group derogation (Otten & Wentura, 1999). People are more helpful toward in-group versus out-group members (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 1997) and are more cooperative and trustful of in-group versus out-group members (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Voci, 2006). A prime example of this is the minimal group paradigm, which found that participants, assigned at random to groups, acted in accordance with in-group benefit (e.g. assigning actual or symbolic resources to the in-group) without any further salient information except for their group membership (Abrams, 2012; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). However, this experimental design has been criticised, as participants may be cued to act in accordance with in-group favouritism in the absence of any further information, meaning group affiliation is the only social cue that may be used by participants to guide their behaviour towards other participants (Ellemers et al., 1999).

Alternatively, it has been argued that intergroup bias can be understood largely as a form of mild favouritism for one’s in-group, rather than out-group derogation (Amiot & Sansfaçon, 2011). Ellemers et al. (1999) argue that, in natural social contexts, people may feel limited commitment to social groups despite acknowledging their membership of these groups. The authors argue that other factors, including group status and size, and whether group assignment was self-selected, determine the degree of identification with a particular group. In support of their theory, the authors conducted a study of participants (N=119) allocated to groups. They found in-group categorisation was influenced by relative group size,
while group self-esteem was only influenced by group status. Finally, commitment to the group was impacted by both group status and group assignment of participants, whereby increased commitment resulted from higher group status and self-categorisation to the group.

Drawing from the literature on intergroup bias, it is suggested here that, when individuals within the community perceive that they have personal membership to the group of ‘law-abiding citizen’s (in-group), have self-selected membership, are of higher status, and that the group of ‘law abiding citizens’ is a majority in comparison to the group of ex-prisoners (out-group); self-categorisation with the in-group will be stronger. Where community has strong emotional responses to ex-prisoners (out-group) – for example, where it interprets out-group members to represent threat (such as it would if it endorses beliefs about fear of crime victimization) – it may respond against ex-prisoners, thus being unlikely to support ex-prisoner reintegration. In line with theories of eligibility and forfeiture, the community may favour in-group members to receive limited community resources (such as crisis housing) over the out-group (ex-prisoners). Finally, the community, whose members belong to the in-group, is less likely to be forgiving of ex-prisoners as out-group members, and more likely to attribute the criminal behaviours of the out-group as dispositional. This out-group bias is dependent on the community member’s categorisation as a law-abiding citizen being activated. If another category was activated (for example, gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and so forth), different group categorisation may occur, diminishing or distinguishing the community member’s negative emotional responses toward the ex-prisoner.

Several analyses have argued that the constraints normally in place that limit intergroup bias and in-group favouritism are lifted when out-groups are associated with stronger emotions (Brewer, 2001; Doosje, Brancombe, Spears, & Manstead, 1998; Mackie & Smith, 1998; Mummendey & Otten, 2001). Emotions help explain individuals’ reactions to social groups and their members (Smith, Seger, & Mackie, 2007). To the extent that individuals identify with a social group, this identification forms part of the individual psychological self. Thus, threat to the group results in threat to the individual, and may result in group-level emotional
reactions against the out-group. Emotions such as fear, hatred, disgust or threat can be important causes of people’s overall reactions to groups. Weaker emotions imply only avoidance, but stronger emotions imply movement against the out-group, and these emotions could be used to justify out-group harm that extends beyond in-group benefit (Brewer, 2001; but see Amiot & Sansfaçon, 2011). Thus, in relation to community support for ex-prisoner reintegration, where members may perceive threat to the in-group, such as when individuals have strong concerns about crime victimization, it is theorised that members will react against out-group members and be less willing to support reintegration efforts.

Further, people appear to be more generous and forgiving in their behavioural attributions of in-group versus out-group members (Hewstone, 1990; Pettigrew, 1979; Worchel, Rothgerber, Day, Hart, & Butemayer, 1998). Positive behaviours and successful outcomes of in-group members are more likely to be attributed to stable, internal characteristics, whereas negative behaviours and unsuccessful outcomes are more likely to be ascribed to the external dispositions of out-group members (Hewstone, 1990; Hornsey, 2008). Furthermore, people generally anticipate that out-group members will behave less positively than in-group members and will share their attitudes and values less than will in-group members (Robbins & Krueger, 2005). This supports the general bias toward in-group members and against out-group members.

Research has demonstrated in-group bias in the justice arena, with in-group wrongdoers being given more lenient sentences in comparison to out-group wrongdoers (Graham, Weiner, & Zucker, 1997; Kerr, Hymers, Anderson, & Weathers, 1995; Sommers & Ellsworth, 2000). Individuals have been shown to support restorative sanctioning options for in-group members, and retributive options for out-group members (Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather, & Platow, 2008). Gromet and Darley (2009) theorise that shared identity, via SIT, with an offender results in public support for restoration in response to offending.

However Vidmar (2002) has argued that people will react more punitively against individuals of the in-group who violate group rules and laws. In support of this approach, van Prooijen (2006) found individuals were more punitive to in-group members when their guilt was certain (but less punitive when uncertain).
compared to the out-group. These findings may highlight that violation of in-group laws communicates a violation to shared identity, leading to stronger punitive reactions.

Drawing on the theoretical premises of SIT, it is argued here that members of the community will respond to ex-prisoners as a social category, distinct from its own category of non-offenders, or citizens. This is in line with research by Reiten (1996), discussed in Chapter Two, who argues that the community may be conceptualised as a normative group of ‘law-abiding citizens.’ Insofar as individuals self-identify as law-abiding citizens, they will respond to perceived in-group members positively, and out-group members negatively, or at least less favourably than toward the in-group. Thus it is theorised that other law-abiding citizens will be categorised as in-group members, and ex-prisoners as out-group members. Furthermore, it is theorised that out-group categorisation of ex-prisoners will undermine community support for reintegration.

Social categorisation and the typicality effect.

Social categorisation holds that people categorise others to regulate and structure the social environment in meaningful ways and, in doing so they also categorise themselves into groups. Subsequently, group members are seen to share some qualities that are qualitatively different from other groups. When a particular social identity (group membership) is salient, people categorise themselves as group members, and they become aware of the stereotypic in-group norms through the behaviours and attitudes of other group members. Through a process of referent informational influence, these are then in turn cognitively represented and assigned to the self in a process referred to as ‘self-stereotyping’. As a consequence, behaviours and attitudes are guided by shared normative standards.

Thus, category membership of both the in-group and out-group involve perceptual depersonalisation. Just as categorisation can result in depersonalized stereotyping of out-group members, it can also result in category members categorising themselves in terms of in-group characteristics and attributions. Self-categorisation as an in-group member entails assimilation of the self to the in-
Group category prototype and enhanced similarity to other in-group members (see Turner & Reynolds, 2001; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetheell, 1987). Thus the in-group is cognitively included in the self (e.g. Smith & Henry, 1996).

Social identity theory holds that in-group and out-group prototypes are derived through social comparisons that maximise the meta-contrast ratio – that is, the intergroup differences relative to the intragroup differences. An in-group prototype, namely the psychological representation of the in-group, depends on which other groups it is compared with and the dimensions (or attributions) on which the groups are compared by the individual (Hornsey, 2008; Oakes, Turner, & Haslam, 1991).

Research supports the theory that people see members of an out-group as generally similar to one another. This is commonly referred to as the ‘out-group homogeneity effect’ (Dovidio et al., 2012) or the ‘typicality effect’ (Hilton & von Hippel, 1996). Linville and Fisher (1993) argue that perceptions of the out-group as homologous are driven by the fact that people know more in-group members than they do out-group members, and thus have fewer examples to mediate their judgements. Individuals are more likely to generalise behaviour of one out-group member with the behaviour of another out-group member, and with the behaviour of the entire out-group as a whole. Henderson-King & Nisbett (1996) argue that this generalizability is likely to be applied to the entire out-group for negative, stereotypic behaviours. In turn, the negative, stereotypic behaviours are perceived to be inherent in the character of the out-group and all its members.

According to the typicality effect, when an individual encounters a member of a social category about which they hold a strong social categorisation, the individual will assume that the person will be similar to their mental model of a typical person within that category (Hornsey, 2008). Yet, as the individual interacts with the person more, they will learn more about the individual characteristics of the person. It is theorised here that this interaction may result in a number of possible outcomes; one is that the interaction may both confirm the person’s (perceiver’s) categorisation, and in turn strengthen the perceiver’s group categorisation and belief in the ‘typical’ group member for that category. Conversely, the individual characteristics of the person being perceived may not
conform to the assumptions of the category to which they are seen by the perceiver to belong. In this case, the perceiver may respond by re-categorising the individual. Alternatively, they may acknowledge the atypicality of the individual compared to their category membership, and change their behaviour toward this individual (but not the group) (Linville & Fischer, 1993). Thus, the typicality effect will inform a perceiver’s behaviour, to the extent to which a group member conforms to what is perceived as typical to that group. According to this process, it is possible for group members who violate the typicality of that group to undergo social mobility; thereby, they are able to be re-categorised by a perceiver as part of a different category, in which they better conform as a typical member of the group (Linville & Fischer, 1993).

The impact of stereotypical judgements about out-groups on prejudicial results has been reported in studies investigating intercultural interactions (Wiseman, Hammer, & Nishida, 1989), and avoidance of people with a disability (Au & Man, 2006; Cãstaneto & Willemsen, 2006; Daruwalla & Darcy, 2005; Fichten, Schipper, & Cutler, 2005; Noonan, Barry, & Davis, 1968).

Hardcastle (2006) theorised that employers’ attitudes towards the employability of ex-offenders may be influenced by their stereotypical judgements about ex-offenders, resulting in discrimination in employment. This is in line with previous research that has evidenced discrimination against ex-offenders in the area of employment (Fletcher, 2001; Gill, 1997; Heinrich, 2000; Helfgott, 1997; Metcalf et al., 2001). Hardcastle’s study found employers (N=596) indicated low employability of ex-offenders, ranging between a poor and fair chance of accessing and maintaining a job. Furthermore, ex-offenders who had multiple convictions were rated as less employable than those with single convictions, while ex-offenders who had committed non-violent and drug-related offences were rated more employable than those guilty of petty theft or burglary. The results lend support for the argument that the community views ex-prisoners who conform to the image of a stereotypical offender (committed multiple, violent offences) less favourably than those ex-prisoners who demonstrate deviation from the stereotypical group characteristics (single conviction, drug and non-violent offences).
Drawing from SIT, it is possible that the community will categorise and make judgements about ex-prisoners according to prototypical characteristics of offenders. Research indicates that the public often has limited knowledge of offenders or ex-offenders (Davis & Doosetor, 2010; Roberts & Indermaur, 2009; Roberts & Stalans, 2007), and are misinformed with regard to rates of recidivism and desistance (Door & Roberts, 1983; Roberts & Stalans, 2007; Weatherburn & Indermaur, 2004). As a result, assumptions that ex-offenders are untrustworthy, unreliable, unskilled, and likely to re-offender are common (Hardcastle, 2006). In defining an offender as an out-group member, the individual will simultaneously self-categorise into the in-group – in this case, a law-abiding citizen. This process is likely to create greater polarity between the individual as a community member and the offender as an outsider, thus minimizing the individual’s consideration of their own historic violation of the law (such as undetected minor offences including jay walking, employment theft, and traffic infringements) as they transition towards the prototype of a ‘law-abiding citizen.’

Limited research has investigated community perceptions of a ‘prototypical offender.’ Of the research that does exist, it is generally supported that the public believes offenders will re-offend, have limited motivation or the ability to change their offending behaviour, and when they do re-offend, these offenders will commit violent offences (Doob & Roberts, 1983; Gleb, 2006). For example, Gleb (2006, p. 21) argues: “In the abstract, people tend to think about violent and repeat offenders when reporting that sentencing is too lenient.”

The use of stereotypical judgements in public punitiveness has been investigated by asking respondents first to indicate their level of punitive attitudes (e.g. support for punitive sentencing), then asking respondents to indicate what kind of offender they were thinking about when answering the prior question (Doob & Roberts, 1983). Across three studies, Doob and Roberts (1983) found respondents (N=116) consistently reported that they were thinking of a violent and repeat offender when stating that sentences are too lenient, and when giving their views on sentences as a whole. For example, in one study, over half of the respondents (57%) reported thus. Research by Sprott (1996) found similar results when asking respondents about juvenile offenders.
Schissel (1997) argued that the public develops perceptions of offenders based on media messages. Overwhelmingly, these media messages distort the image of an offender as dangerous. For example, Boulahanis and Hultsley (2004) examined how an over-representation of atypical crimes in news media can skew individual perceptions of offenders and re-offending rates. The study investigated the accuracy of public information about juvenile homicide in the local area. The authors concluded (2004, p 295) that “although the total number of homicides involving juvenile offenders has declined in a relatively linear fashion since 1994, the number of cases receiving newspaper coverage mostly increased during the same time period.” The findings of this study indicate that the publicising of extreme criminal offending within the community results in the development of community stereotypes of offenders as being at high risk of re-offending.

Schissel (1997) identified media messages that create an image of an offender as young, residing or coming from a low socio-economic status geographic area, and of indigenous or ethno-cultural background. The stereotyping of offenders as members of ethnic minority groups has been supported in research (Dabney, Dugan, Topalli, & Hollinger, 2006; Graham & Lowery, 2004; Pager, 2003; Peffley & Hurwitz, 2007), and linked to increased punitive responses. For example, Peffley and Hurwitz (2007) found white respondents (N=603) actually increased their support for the death penalty after they were informed that the correctional penalty discriminated against ethnic minorities, particularly black offenders.

Stalans (1993) argued that individuals who receive their justice information primarily from the media are more likely to report incorrect offence stereotypes, including harms resulting from robberies, than those who receive information from both media and interpersonal sources (family and friends). Research conducted by Stalans and colleagues (Diamond & Stalans, 1989; Stalans & Diamond, 1990; Stalans & Lurigo, 1990) has reported a relationship between types of offence and offender characteristics recalled and public beliefs that sentencing is lenient. Stalans and Lurigo (1990) found the public, in comparison to parole officers, is more likely to endorse beliefs that offenders carried a weapon, had longer juvenile and adult records, and had a greater propensity for
serious violent offending in the future. Stalans and Diamond (1990) found the majority of their public sample and two fifths of their juror sample incorrectly endorsed the belief that a typical burglar has committed at least four prior offences.

Research conducted by Stalans and colleagues indicates that the public responds to justice questions with a ‘typical’ offender in mind, however this perceived ‘typical’ offender actually represents characteristics of atypical offenders. In explanation of this phenomenon, Diamond and Stalans (1989) argue that the public recalls serious, extreme offences when considering crime and justice practices (including sentencing leniency) and generalise these atypical offences to all of offending behaviour.

Stereotypes have also been reported in relation to sexual offenders. A study by Sanghara and Wilson (2006) found participants (N= 71) who were inexperienced with sex offender treatment were more likely to perceive individuals with characteristics conforming to sex offender stereotypes as more guilty than individuals not fitting those stereotypes, as compared to professionals who work with sexual offenders (N=60). The stereotypical characteristics of the hypothetical sex offender in the study fell into six broad categories: (i) lower intellectual functioning male (builder versus professor), (ii) dirty old man (46-year old versus 16-year old), (iii) sexually frustrated single man (single, unmarried versus married with two children), (iv) sexually obsessed man (sex shop owner versus book shop owner), (v) familiarity of offender to victim (stranger versus victim’s father), and (vi) psychotic offender (mental illness versus no mention of mental illness). In all six categories, uninformed respondents relied on stereotypical characteristics of the hypothetical suspect to determine guilt.

Accordingly, it is argued here that, when asked questions about an ex-prisoner, community will respond with a prototypical offender in mind. Research suggests this prototypical offender is likely a young male, from an ethnic minority, has committed a serious offence, and will re-offend. The impact of the typicality effect is likely to be particularly evident when the public is asked questions about ex-prisoners in a general sense. However, according to the typicality effect, if the community is provided with additional information that violates the general
characteristics of the prototypical offender, it may respond in relation to the characteristic of the individual offender and not the prototypical offender. Under this context, the community may be more open to the social mobility of a non-prototypical ex-offender – that is, it may be more willing to accept re-categorisation of an ex-prisoner from offender to law-abiding citizen, and thus be more supportive of reintegration.

**Chapter Summary**

Chapter Four considered factors that may play a role in community attitude formation and attitudinal responses to the reintegration of ex-prisoners. The purpose of the chapter was to outline factors that may impact on community responses to reintegration initiatives. This aim is important as it goes beyond identifying whether the community supports reintegration, to explore why certain communities may be more of less supportive of certain types of reintegration for certain types of ex-prisoners.

The chapter explored a number of factors that may impact on community support for reintegration, including knowledge of the CJS, instrumental and expressive attitudes toward crime and justice initiatives, crime causal attributions and social identity theory. The current study will explore whether these factors do actually influence public support for reintegration.

The chapter began by reviewing attitude theory. Attitudes are theorised to be complex multidimensional processes of evaluations, stored in memory (Allport, 1935; Pratkanis & Greenwald, 1989). It was identified that attitudes are theorised to drive behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), thus providing a rationale for the current study’s investigation of community attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration.

The chapter next considered crime and justice literature in relation to public knowledge of the CJS, and instrumental and expressive attitude functions. The literature review identified complex relationships between public support for sanctioning options and punitiveness, and: knowledge of the CJS, fear of crime, crime salience beliefs and confidence in the CJS. Support for alternative
sanctioning options was shown to increase with public knowledge of these options (Applegate, et al., 1996; Roberts & Gebotys, 1989). Fear of crime literature indicated that the public endorses concerns about crime salience; however, the research appears to indicate that this fear is influenced by concern about the breakdown of social order and social incivilities in one’s neighbourhood (LaGrange, et al., 1992; O’Mahony & Quinn, 1999; Snell, 2001). Finally, the research presented indicated low public confidence in the CJS, particularly in relation to the court’s ability to punish offenders appropriately for the crime, and the prison system’s ability to punish and deter and rehabilitate offenders (Roberts & Indermaur, 2009).

Instrumental and expressive attitude functions reflect beliefs about social cohesion and concern about crime; these, in turn, impact support for sentencing objectives. Reintegration is an initiative that directly relates to social cohesion and notions of risk, forfeiture and eligibility. Thus it is likely that expressive and instrumental attitudes towards crime and justice will impact community support for reintegration.

The chapter next reviewed literature relating to crime causal attributions. This body of literature indicated that the dimension of stability/instability (redeemability) and controllability may be more influential than community beliefs about the offender’s locus of causality (Maruna & King, 2004). Reintegration incorporates the notion of ex-prisoner redeemability, which represents a crime causal attribution. Community beliefs about what caused an offender to commit crime, whether criminal behaviour is controllable, and whether an offender is redeemable (stability) are likely to impact its support for an initiative that involves interaction between the community and ex-prisoners.

Finally, literature relating to Social Identity Theory (SIT) was presented. SIT identifies the function of in- and out-group processes, which relate to notions of social inclusion, eligibility and forfeiture. Emphasis was placed on outlining the ‘typicality’ effect. It was theorised that beliefs about stereotypical ex-offenders as the out-group, and the community as the in-group will impact public support for reintegration. The community may make judgements about offenders and ex-prisoners based on characteristics of a stereotypical offender (the typicality effect;
Hilton & von Hipple, 1996; Turner & Reynolds, 2001). When the out-group stereotype is violated, community members may be more supportive of social mobility of the ex-prisoner from out-group to in-group via reintegration.

The introductory chapters have provided a context for the emergence of contemporary reintegration within the current correctional paradigm which emphasises punishment and rehabilitation as a means of crime control, but also acknowledges factors that support desistance from crime. The chapters presented a definition of reintegration and a model of reintegration, both of which emphasise the role of the community in supporting this process.

The introductory chapters aimed to identify the need to explore correctional options alongside retribution- and rehabilitation-based responses, to better support desistance from crime. The chapters also aimed to identify the importance of the community in reintegration, and provide a rationale for studying the role of the community, which until now has largely been overlooked in reintegration literature. Finally, the introductory chapters aimed to conceptualise how the community may respond to reintegration, and identify a number of factors that may impact on when and why the community will support reintegration. The thesis now turns to the current study. Chapter Five will review the literature covered in chapters one to four of this thesis, explore limitations of prior research, and provide the rationale for the current study.
CHAPTER FIVE – REVIEW AND STUDY RATIONALE

Chapter overview

Chapter One and Two of this thesis presented an overview of current practices and correctional thinking in relation to the punishment of offenders and the emergence of a viewpoint that considered the transitional experiences of ex-offenders post-incarceration. Chapter One began by presenting current crime reporting, victimization and imprisonment statistics, which indicate a strong correctional, social and political emphasis on incarceration and prisoner return to incarceration, disproportionate to actual crime figures. The chapter focused primarily on the historical rationale for punishment of offenders and the introduction of a number of goals of sentencing, including retribution, denunciation, incapacitation, specific deterrence, general deterrence, and rehabilitation. The rise and fall of rehabilitation was reviewed, with special attention paid to: the early criticisms of this sentencing objective; the return of rehabilitation under the approaches of the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR; Andrews & Bonta, 2010a; Bonta & Andrews, 2007) and Good Lives Models (GLM; Ward, 2002a; 2002b; Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Maruna, 2007); and, contemporary criticisms of rehabilitation. In particular, the chapter highlighted that the current ‘best practice’ rehabilitation approaches have been shown to reduce recidivism by 17 to 35-percent (Bonta & Andrews, 2007); this, it was argued, leaves scope for the introduction of alternative sentencing objectives that may target the remaining unaffected recidivism, or better yet, promote desistance from crime directly. Reintegration was introduced here as a viable addition to current correctional practices, moving beyond the narrow, deficit-based rehabilitation approaches to consider broader, ecological factors that impact on an ex-offender’s context post-incarceration.

Chapter Two began by locating reintegration correctional aims within both traditional criminological, and contemporary rehabilitation-desistance ideology. It was argued that contemporary reintegration is influenced by criminological theories including Labeling Theory (Becker, 1973), Reintegrative Shaming
(Braithwaite, 2000; Braithwaite & Mugford, 1994), Desistance theory (Maruna, 2001), as well as the rehabilitation-focus context into which it emerged. The chapter highlighted a lack of clarity, consistency and guidance in contemporary conceptualizations of reintegration. Confusion over definitions, terminology, and key stakeholders was identified, particularly in the implementation of reintegration services for ex-prisoners. To address this limitation, a definition of reintegration was developed which identified the dynamic, reciprocal nature of reintegration between the ex-prisoner and his or her community. This definition distinguished reintegration from rehabilitation, re-entry, transition and throughcare. A number of ‘domains’ that are empirically supported as fostering or hindering reintegration were presented and discussed, including: housing, employment, education and work skills, and family and social supports. It was highlighted in this discussion that the domains of employment and housing are perceived by both ex-prisoners and key stakeholders to be the two most influential domains in communicating reintegration to ex-prisoners and enabling successful reintegration.

Chapter Two also contended that efforts to implement a number of initiatives and programs that purport to be ‘reintegrative’ have been undermined by a lack of clarity and universality, within research, legislation and corrections, as to what constitutes reintegration. To achieve ‘best practice’ in reintegration, and avoid many of the criticisms leveled against early rehabilitative programs, a better understanding of the reintegration process and guidance from government policy, legislation, and/or the literature is required.

Importantly, in the development of a definition of reintegration, Chapter Two highlighted the important role of the community in this process, and noted that despite reintegration being the sole aim of sentencing reliant on the community, to the virtual exclusion of the State, little theoretical or empirical progress has been made in understanding the community’s role in reintegration or its willingness to be involved in this process.

In addressing this issue, Chapter Three explored current models of reintegration and community readiness. Two models, the Three-part Ecological Model of Community Reintegration of Ex-prisoners (three-part model; Graffam &
Shinkfield, 2012; Graffam, et al., 2009; Graffam, et al., 2004) and the Community Readiness Model (CRM; Donnermeyer, et al., 1997; Jumper-Thurman, et al., 2003) were presented and critiqued. It was argued that the three-part model, while informative, is narrow as it does not consider directly the role of the community in reintegration nor the interactions between the ex-prisoner and his or her community. The CRM was presented as a possible framework from which a new model of reintegration incorporating the role of the community could be developed. Importantly, the CRM points to the importance of community attitudes under ‘readiness’ and ‘ability’ to accept and support or reject and oppose the implementation of community-based initiatives. The Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance (MIReDe) was presented as a model that is broader in scope than the three-part model; while complementing the latter, the MIReDe considers also the role of the community. This model, in order to communicate and support both reintegration and desistance as ongoing processes, takes into consideration both the degree to which the community may be seen as both ready and willing to be involved in reintegration, and the readiness and willingness of the ex-prisoner.

In Chapter Four, the literature relating to community attitudes towards crime and justice initiatives was reviewed as a means of identifying factors relevant to community support for reintegration. As little research has specifically addressed community attitudes toward reintegration as a criminal justice initiative, the chapter undertook to draw broadly from attitude literature, and specifically literature relating to public attitudes toward crime and justice issues. It was intended that via this comprehensive exploration, a number of hypotheses may be developed with regard to underlying factors driving community attitudes toward reintegration. The chapter began by exploring the distinction between cognitive- and emotion-based attitudes in public support for sanctioning decisions. This literature highlighted: limited public knowledge of the criminal justice system (CJS) and beliefs about crime rates; limited knowledge and support for sentencing options including alternatives to retribution-based punishment; and, the limited impact of educating the public to ameliorate community crime and justice knowledge. At the same time, emotion-based attitudes, including fear of crime
victimization and crime salience (belief that crime is increasing in one’s community) were shown to be strong predictors of public support for offender sentencing outcomes.

In addition to identifying the current community climate with regards to support for ex-prisoner reintegration (that is, whether it supports reintegration or not), of interest to the current thesis are those mechanisms that might be seen to contribute to community attitudes towards reintegration. Thus, Chapter Four considered three theories in the literature that contribute to attitudes towards certain target groups. These were: expressive and instrumental explanations of the function of public attitudes to crime and justice, crime causal attributions, and social identity theory. Under expressive and instrumental attitude functions, community support for reintegration may be either influenced by public beliefs about crime threat, specifically fear of crime victimization and crime salience (instrumental), or the ability for the CJS to re-assert violated social and moral norms, specifically confidence in the CJS (expressive). Under crime causal attributions, support for reintegration may be influenced by community attributions as to the locus of causality for crime, the control an offender holds over his or her criminal behavior, and their stability as an offender over time. Under social identity processes, community may respond to ex-prisoners in line with a prototypical concept of an offender, and its support for ex-prisoner reintegration may be influenced by the degree to which the ex-prisoner in question conforms to or violates the typicality effect.

Chapter Five will summarize current knowledge in relation to ex-prisoner reintegration and highlight the limitations of previous research. From this discussion, the rationale for the current study will be developed. Justification of the research design, the sample population selected and key study variables will also be provided. The chapter will conclude by outlining the aims and hypotheses of the study.
Key Issues and Limitations of Prior Research

It has been established in the introductory chapters of this thesis that current criminal justice practices of punishing and rehabilitating offenders have limited success in re-offending rates. Despite historic transitions within corrections from retribution-based and rehabilitation-based punishment ideology, recidivism remains an issue in contemporary society. It was argued that reintegration as a justice response, may complement more traditional approaches in addressing high re-offending and correctional re-entry rates.

However, as was noted in the previous chapters, limited research has directly addressed ex-prisoner reintegration. Rather, an overwhelming amount of research in the field of crime and justice has focused on public attitudes towards sanctioning practices which the general public has no impact on, or role to play in administering, including retribution, incapacitation, rehabilitation and capital punishment. In contrast, to this author’s knowledge, no study has investigated public attitudes towards a justice practice that relies heavily on community involvement and support – that is, reintegration.

There are a number of critiques of the limited crime and justice research that has considered reintegration. Not the least of these is the lack of clarity around what reintegration is, and its distinction from other initiatives including re-entry, rehabilitation, aftercare and throughcare. A significant amount of research has considered reintegration and re-entry together which, it was argued, confounds the distinction between a primarily State-led initiative and that of a primarily community-led initiative. Similarly, the literature has discussed reintegration within a rehabilitation paradigm. This theoretical approach, in addition to confounding two distinct approaches to offenders and ex-prisoners, undermines any efforts to define reintegration, consider fully reintegration’s place in corrections, and create guidelines, policy, legislation and ultimately ‘best practice’ in relation to reintegration. It was argued in Chapter Two that the refusal to conceptualize reintegration as its own unique and distinct process contributing to crime and/or desistance, opens reintegration up to the very same criticisms that were leveled against early rehabilitation.
Research conducted by Graffam, Shinkfield and colleagues (Graffam, et al., 2004; Shinkfield 2006; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2010) has attempted to address the limitations highlighted above, and develop a model of reintegration. This model, presented in Chapter Three, considered the ex-prisoner’s reintegration experiences within three spheres; intra-personal conditions, subsistence conditions, and support conditions. These, it was argued, correspond closely to empirically supported domains of reintegration. However, the three-part model is limited as it does not fully develop the role of the community in the reintegration process; rather focusing primarily on the ex-prisoner’s experiences. Accordingly, it is of primary importance to the current study, in promoting clarity and holistic conceptualization of reintegration, that research consider first the level of community support for reintegration, and secondly those processes that may influence the level of community support for reintegration.

The Study

The current study draws from data collected as part of a broader study investigating community attitudes towards ex-offenders (specifically, individuals with a criminal record). The central goal of this larger study was to explore who within the community is supportive of what types of reintegrative initiatives for what types of offenders (i.e. for whom). In drawing from these data, the study will first investigate the level of community readiness to support ex-prisoner reintegration, and will consider in particular the impact of underlying processes, including knowledge of the CJS, instrumental and expressive attitudes, crime causal attributions, and social-identity process, on community readiness to engage in the ex-prisoner reintegration process. This study represents the first Australian investigation into community views towards the reintegration of ex-prisoner.

37 The study specifically enquired about support for the reintegration of an individual with ‘a criminal record’. As such the term ex-offender will be used with reference to the survey data rather than ex-prisoner, as public support reintegration the latter cannot be inferred from the data.
The literature presented in Chapter Two and Three of this thesis provides a justification for undertaking research into the role that the community plays in the ex-prisoner reintegration process. Specifically, the role of the community has been largely overlooked in research. A review of current reintegration programs (Brozycki, 2005) within Australia indicated a strong focus on agency and correctional intervention to assist reintegration, while again, largely neglecting the community. Finally, research conducted by Bartholomew, et al. (2012, November) highlighted that, in Australia particularly, legislation does not provide adequate guidance for defining and applying reintegration in practice.

It is evident that a better understanding of the role that the community plays in the reintegration process is required. To date, no literature provides this guidance. In addressing this gap in research, the study undertook to locate a sample of ‘community’ relevant to an ex-offender returning from custody. ‘Community’ was operationalised by sampling attitudes of the general public, specifically individuals who reside within the State of Victoria, Australia.38 It was anticipated that by investigating the attitudes toward reintegration of a sample population of the Victorian public, this thesis may enhance academic understanding of ‘community’ support for ex-prisoner reintegration.

The primary aim of the study is exploratory; to investigate community attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration as a means of gaining preliminary understanding of the complex, numerous and dynamic factors that contribute to community attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration. Specifically, the study will investigate the degree to which the community is willing to support reintegration, relative to the other ‘traditional’ goals of sentencing. Further, and in line with the Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance (MIReDe), the study will focus on community readiness to support reintegration across two identified key domains of social inclusion; employment and housing. The study

38 It is acknowledged that there exists a distinction between the sample (the ‘public’) and the ‘community’ as conceptualised in Chapter Two. As such, while the community is the conceptual focus of the thesis, the terms ‘public,’ ‘respondents’ and ‘participants’ will be used in the subsequent chapters to distinguish between the attitudes of those who participated in the current study, and the theoretical attitudes of the broad community to which an ex-offender returns post-incarceration.
will also investigate community readiness to support reintegration across two levels of involvement – support for reintegrative policy (the abstract level), and preparedness to be personally involved in reintegration (the personal level).

The study will also investigate different processes that may influence public attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration. It is hoped that this explorative aim will provide understanding as to what factors are associated with community support for reintegration. To achieve this broad aim, the study will investigate the association between respondent characteristics and support for reintegration, and the association between ex-prisoner characteristics and support for reintegration.

It is acknowledged that a number of factors may contribute to community attitudes toward ex-prisoner reintegration. As was noted in Chapter Four, the choice of factors to be explored in the study resulted from reviewing the available literature relating to ex-prisoner reintegration and public attitudes toward crime and justice policies. This thesis does not argue that the factors chosen are the sole contributors to community attitudes toward reintegration. What the thesis does argue, however, is that the exploration of these factors will assist in gaining a better understanding of the nature of community attitudes towards reintegration. As such, the exploratory analysis of contributing factors undertaken in the current study is a starting point for the investigation of ex-prisoner reintegration, not the end point.

In outlining this argument, a comment regarding the study of demographic variables is warranted. The current study does not consider the role of demographic factors in community attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration. The overall goal of this study is to aid understanding of attitude function and change. Demographic variables may be understood as largely stable factors; age, gender, cultural background, religious beliefs, and socioeconomic status cannot be manipulated in order to increase community support for reintegration. Conversely, the factors included in this study may be targeted by initiatives. Respondents’ knowledge of the CJS, fear of crime victimization, beliefs about crime salience, confidence in the CJS, and beliefs about the success of the CJS are changeable. Consistent with this argument, research has demonstrated that demographic factors are mediated by other variables, such as knowledge of the
CJS, fear of crime, and prior experience with offenders (see for example, Applegate, et al. 1996; Sims, 2003; Stinchcombe, et al., 1980). Furthermore, literature reviewed in Chapter Four provided a rationale for the theory that dynamic factors, such as those included herein, do influence public support for reintegration.

This is not to say demographic variables do not contribute to community attitudes toward ex-prisoner reintegration; in fact, it is likely that these do. However, demographic factors are not the focus of this thesis. In actuality, the impact of demographic factors on public attitudes has been studied extensively in the literature. However, synthesizing this data is difficult. There exists discrepancy in relation to the variables of focus, the research methodology – including sample populations, sample sizes, and measurement methodology – as well as inconsistency in the findings reported. Frequently, demographics are presented as descriptive, and are not grounded in theory. Appendix 4 summarizes a number of studies investigating the contribution of demographic variables to public attitudes toward crime and justice initiatives. A perusal of the table demonstrates the wide variation in research in this area.

Given that demographic variables are not the primary interest of the study, the decision was made to exclude these from the study in favour of exploring the variables outlined in Chapter Four. The current study aims to aid understanding of attitude function and change. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that this thesis is concerned primary with the community, yet little is known about community factors for support of reintegration. It is warranted to explore the types of community characteristics which may support reintegration policies. As such, analyses of the impact of demographic variables on support for reintegration, and an associated discussion have been included in Appendix 5.

To achieve the broad aims outlined in the current research, the study will utilize a random sample of the Victorian public to investigate attitudes in the areas of reintegration outlined above. As has been argued extensively in Chapters Two and Three, the community plays a key role in the reintegration process and can be seen to impact on both successful reintegration and desistance from crime. Without empirical study of the readiness of the community to engage in the
reintegration process, it is difficult to reach an understanding as to the degree to which the community supports reintegration. Put another way, in line with the Community Readiness Model, without proper investigation, it is not possible to establish at which point, on the community readiness spectrum, the Victorian public sits in supporting any initiative that aims to promote ex-prisoner reintegration. It is only after arriving at an understanding of the public’s current level of readiness to support reintegration that it is possible to form services in the community to, firstly, support ex-prisoner reintegration (where high public support is discovered), and to implement strategies to increase community readiness within those areas where public support for ex-prisoner reintegration is currently low.

**Study Aims**

Aim One: To measure the degree of respondents support for ex-prisoner reintegration as a goal of sentencing, and to compare the difference between respondent support for traditional goals of sentencing (retribution, deterrence, incapacitation, and denunciation), rehabilitation, and support for reintegration.

Aim Two: To examine the degree of respondents’ support for reintegrative policy in the domains of housing (housing policy) and employment (employment policy). To examine the degree of respondents’ preparedness to live near an ex-offender (housing personal) and work with an ex-offender (employment personal).

Aim Three: To identify respondent factors that predict public support for reintegration (housing policy, employment policy, housing personal, employment personal) in order to build a predictive model.

Aim Four: To explore whether respondents’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate offenders predict respondent support for reintegration.

\[39\] From here onwards, unless otherwise stated, ‘support for reintegration’ will refer to participants’ support for reintegration across the four variables; housing personal, housing abstract, employment personal, and employment abstract.
Aim Five: To identify ex-offender characteristics that predict respondent support for reintegration.

Figure 6.0 provides a graphical summary of the study aims.
Figure 6.0. Graphical summary of the study.

- **Housing domain**
  - Support for reintegrative housing policy (the abstract level)
  - Personal preparedness to live near an ex-offender (the personal level)

- **Employment domain**
  - Support for reintegrative employment policy (the abstract level)
  - Personal preparedness to work with an ex-offender (the personal level)

- **Ex-offender characteristics**
  - Stereotypical: Committed multiple crimes, served whole of sentence in prison
  - Non-stereotypical: Committed single crime, served sentence in community, is remorseful, completed rehabilitation programs, completed work/skills training program

- **Respondent characteristics**
  - Instrumental and expressive attitudes about crime and justice initiatives
  - Crime causal attributions

- **Beliefs**
  - Beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate offenders
  - Belief about the success of the CJS to reintegrate ex-offenders

- **Respondent 'readiness' to engage in ex-prisoner reintegration**

Difference between personal preparedness to live near an ex-offender and support for reintegrative housing policy.

Difference between personal preparedness to work with an ex-offender and support for reintegrative employment policy.

Ex-offender characteristics:
Research Hypotheses

To address the first aim, the initial analysis investigated how the respondents prioritises the goals of sentencing, with particular focus on respondents’ preference for reintegration compared to rehabilitation. The literature reviewed in Chapter One indicated that the ‘traditional’ goals of sentencing – retribution, denunciation, incapacitation, general deterrence, and specific deterrence – have held a prominent place in correctional rhetoric, and punitive approaches (such as retribution) are favorable by the public alongside rehabilitative approaches under contemporary neo-rehabilitative ideology. However, research reviewed in Chapter Four indicated that the public often favours punitive sentencing goals over rehabilitation when asked general questions about the aims of sentencing. Additionally, retribution appears to be the most accessible sentencing objective for the public, receiving overwhelming support in attitude research.

As was noted in Chapter Two, reintegration is not formally considered a goal of sentencing in Victorian or Australian legislation. This, together with reintegration’s relatively recent appearance in correctional rhetoric and practice, indicates that it is unlikely the public will consider this a goal of sentencing. Accordingly it was hypothesised that:

a. *When asked to rank the goals of sentencing, participants would prioritize first retribution, then the other ‘traditional’ goals of sentencing, before rehabilitation.*

b. *Participants would assign reintegration the lowest priority as a goal of sentencing.*

To address the second aim, analyses investigated differential respondent support across the two levels of community involvement in reintegration – preparedness to be personally involved (the ‘personal’ level), and support for reintegrative policy (the
Personal and abstract support was investigated in two domains of social inclusion, that is, housing and employment.

It was argued in Chapter Two that accessing stable housing and employment is an important step toward desistance from crime. Yet, ex-offenders often encounter obstacles in accessing these domains, in part due to public opposition. Drawing from literature relating to the Not In My Backyard (NIMBY) phenomenon, risk, and forfeiture, it was argued that the community is more supportive of policy to assist ex-offenders to access employment and housing than it is willing to be personally involved in reintegration initiatives (live near, or work with, an ex-offender).

It was also theorized that the public will be more supportive of reintegration in the domain of employment because employment represents a more socially-removed domain of social inclusion than housing, and therefore holds less risk or threat to community. Additionally, there are more community resources supporting employment than housing.

Accordingly it was hypothesised that:

- **c.** Participants would be more supportive of reintegration housing and employment policy (the abstract level), than personally prepared to live near or work with an ex-offender (the personal level).
- **d.** Participants would be most supportive of reintegration employment policy (employment policy), followed by: reintegration housing policy (housing policy); personally prepared to work with an ex-offender (personal employment); and personally prepared to live near an ex-offender (personal housing).

In addressing the third aim, the analyses explored the contributions of respondent’s characteristics to their support of ex-offender. Respondent characteristics were grouped according to theoretical perspectives outlined in Chapter Four. These were:

- Respondents self-reported knowledge of the CJS (knowledge)
- Instrumental attitudes: respondents’ fear of future crime victimization (*fear of crime*) and beliefs about whether crime has increased in Victoria (*beliefs crime has increased*),
- Expressive attitudes: respondents’ beliefs about people’s confidence in the CJS (*confidence*), and
- Crime causal attributions: respondents’ beliefs about the major causes of crime in their community.

According to the CRM, public knowledge of an issue is important in determining at what level the community current sits, in readiness to support initiatives targeted at addressing that issue. The CRM theorises that increasing public knowledge of the issue will lead to increased support for initiatives to address the issue (Donnermeyer et al., 1997; Edwards et al., 2000).

Instrumental and expressive attitudes to crime influence public support for the sanctioning of offenders. Research conducted by Jackson et al. (2009), Tyler and Boeckmann (1997), Vollum et al. (2009), and Maruna and King (2004) suggests that expressive attitudes may be more influential in public support for police and offender punishment. Conversely, Sprott and Doob (2009) argue that instrumental attitude functions are important in public confidence in the courts. Accordingly, it was hypothesised that:

\[ e. \text{ Participants’ knowledge and instrumental and expressive attitudes will predict support for reintegration.} \]

The literature reviewed in Chapter Four indicated the degree to which the public perceives criminal behavior as internal or external (locus of causality) to the offender, stable or unstable (redeemable), and controllable or uncontrollable will impact on its support for sanctioning outcomes.

Literature present in Chapter Four identified three dimensions of crime causal attributions: locus of causality (internal/external); controllability; and stability. All
three dimensions have been shown to predict public attitudes toward crime and justice (Carroll, 1979; Carroll, Galegher, et al., 1982, Carroll, Wiener, et al., 1982b; Connolly, et al., 1997; Maruna & King, 2004, 2009; Sims, 2003). Researchers Maruna and King (2004; 2009) argue that the dimension of stability (or ‘redeemability’) is more influential on public support for the sanctioning of offenders, than the dimension of locus of causality. According to Maruna (2001; Maruna & King, 2004), for the ex-offender and the community, ‘redeemability’ is important because it refers to post-offending behaviour change, rather than focusing on the origins of criminal behaviour. Accordingly it was hypothesised:

\[
\text{f. Participants’ beliefs that crime is caused by internal or external factors (locus attributions), and controllable or uncontrollable (controllability attributions) will predict support for reintegration. Participants’ beliefs that offending behaviour is caused by unstable factors (stability attribution) will predict support for reintegration.}
\]

The fourth aim investigated whether public beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate offenders predicts community support for reintegration.

It is theorized that the public is more supportive of initiatives that it believes are effective. Research indicating a negative association between public beliefs that the CJS is lenient and confidence in the CJS lends support for this theory. Research also indicates a negative association between confidence in the CJS’s ability to respond effectively to offenders and punitive attitudes. Drawing from this research, it is theorized that, if the public believes the CJS is successful in rehabilitating and reintegrating ex-offenders, it may be more supportive of reintegration itself. Accordingly, it is hypothesised:

\[
\text{g. Participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate (success rehabilitate) and reintegrate (success reintegrate) (ex-) offenders will predict support for reintegration.}
\]
The study was also interested in investigating as a mediating variable, respondents’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to respond to those who offend; that is, respondent beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate ex-offenders may influence the strengths of association between respondents’ instrumental and expressive attitudes, crime causal attributions, and support for reintegration. Accordingly, it was hypothesised:

\[ h. \ \text{Participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate offenders will mediate the relationship between participants’ knowledge, instrumental and expressive attitudes, and support for reintegration. Participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate offenders will mediate the relationship between participants’ stability, locus, and controllability attributions and support for reintegration.} \]

Finally, to address the fifth aim, the analyses explored whether respondents’ support for ex-prisoner reintegration differs according to the unique characteristics of the ex-offender. The following ex-offender characteristics were included:

- Served whole of sentence in prison
- Served community-based sentence only
- Convicted of multiple crimes
- Convicted of a single crime
- Completed offence-specific rehabilitation program
- Completed a vocational education or training program
- Is remorseful about his/her offence/s

In line with literature relating to risk and forfeiture, it is theorized that the public will be less supportive of reintegration of offenders who have engaged in more crime and are deemed to be a greater risk to the community. Conversely, the public will be more supportive of offenders who are first-time offenders, due to a perceived lower
risk, as well as those who have made efforts to address their offending behaviour, by up-skilling and/or expressing remorse. Accordingly it was hypothesised that:

i. *Participants would be more supportive of reintegration for an ex-offender who is a first-time offender, served their sentence in the community, has completed a rehabilitation program, and has completed a work-related education or training program, than an ex-offender who has committed multiple crimes, and completed their entire sentence in prison.*

The study was also interested in exploring whether the public makes decisions about reintegration according to their stereotypical beliefs about characteristics of offenders. Research reviewed in Chapter Four indicated that the public responds to target groups according to stereotypes of common features or characteristics of ingroup members. According to the ‘typicality effect’, if a person encounters a member of a stereotyped group (in this case, an ex-offender) who conforms to the stereotypical elements of the group, the individual will continue to respond to the ex-offender in a stereotypical manner. In contrast, if the ex-offender violates elements of the stereotypical group, the individual is forced to consider the unique characteristics of the ex-offender and, in response, either change their stereotypical perceptions or change the ex-offender’s group-categorization (Henderson-King & Nisbett, 1996; Hilton & von Hippel, 1996).

Research supports the theory that the public responds to questions about crime and justice initiatives with a ‘stereotypical offender’ in mind (Doob & Roberts, 1983; Gleb, 2006). Doob and Roberts (1983) found that respondents who reported sentences as being too lenient were overwhelmingly thinking of stereotypical offenders (repeat offenders). Of interest to the study was whether the respondents will be more supportive of reintegration when informed that the offender does not conform to characteristics of a ‘stereotypical’ offender. Thus, it was hypothesised that:
j. Participants will indicate more support for reintegration of an ex-offender who demonstrates non-stereotypical characteristics than they will support reintegration of an offender who demonstrates stereotypical characteristics.
CHAPTER SIX – METHOD

Method

Participants.

A total of 2,629 participants from the State of Victoria\(^{40}\) participated in the study. Ages ranged between 18 and 93 years of age, with a mean age of 52.42 years (\(SD = 15.81\)) (\(Mdn = 53\)). There were 1,382 females and 1,245 males in the sample (two participants did not indicate their gender).

Potential participants were identified via the purchase of a commercial list of randomly selected names and corresponding addresses from the Australian electoral roll. A total of 12,000 residents’ addresses were selected in total. These potential participants were mailed a self-completion postal survey, which included an introductory letter and the questionnaire.

Demographic characteristics of the sample were derived from a number of questions. Specifically, these asked participants to indicate the following: age; gender; country of birth; main language spoken at home; highest level of education; employment status; occupation; average household income; and postcode. Table 6.0 provides a summary of the sample’s demographic characteristics compared to the Victorian population.

---

\(^{40}\) Victoria is a State within Australia. Melbourne, the capital city of Victoria, is one of the biggest cities in Australia.
### Table 6.00

*Sample characteristics compared to the 2011 Victorian Census data.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sample (%)</th>
<th>2011 Census data (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>48.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>51.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-54</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>56.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>14.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>18.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indigenous Australian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-indigenous</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>91.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $999 per week</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>41.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1000 – 1999 per week</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>30.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2000 or over per week</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>28.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10 or below</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>23.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11 or 12</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>57.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree or above</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>19.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Employment</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*The Australian education system is uniform across most States and Territories, with the exception of minor variations. The education system is split according to the following categories: Primary School – Preparatory through to grade six (ages 6-12 inclusive); Secondary School – Year seven through to Year 12 (ages 13-18 inclusive); University – Undergraduate through to post-doctoral degrees (ages 18 years and older); TAFE – Certificate I to Advanced Diploma (ages 17 years and older).*
Sample participants were found to be a good overall representation of the Victorian population. Some notable deviations were noted however. In comparison to the 2011 Census data\(^{42}\) (ABS, 2011c) the sample under-represented respondents aged between 18 and 24 years, and over-represented those aged 54 years and over. Additionally, participants with a Bachelor degree or above qualification were over-represented in the sample, while those with Year 12 education or below were under-represented, although the latter is not surprising given the minimum age cut off of 18 years. Participants earning $999 and below per week were over-represented in the sample, while those earning $2,000 per week and above were under-represented. Closer inspection of the data revealed 7.1% of respondents earned between $1 and $249 per week; 15.3% between $250 and $499 per week, and; 28.2% between $500 and $999 per week. Thus, respondents earning less than $500 were under represented in the sample. Of those employed full time (41% of sample), the sample was over-representative of those earning $1000-1999 per week (67.4% in total). The majority of full-time working respondents earned well in excess of Australia’s minimum wage of $640 per week (Fair Trade Ombudsman, 2014). These differences were considered in the interpretation of the results and limitations of the sample.

This thesis aims to explore community members’ attitudes toward ex-prisoner reintegration. In reaching this aim, it is important to acknowledge the unique characteristics of the participants sampled, to determine whether participants accurately represent ‘the community’ to which ex-offenders return. The study sample is representative of non-indigenous (white), middle to upper-class Victorians, highly educated, employed (with the majority employed full-time), and earning above minimum wage. It is noteworthy that this sample does not accurately represent ‘communities’ to which ex-offender frequently originate from, or return post-incarceration. It could be argued that the sample represents a subpopulation of society that hold social power and resources and, therefore, represent the members of

\(^{42}\) Census Data from 2011 was used as this was the most recent data available at the time of writing.
community who are in a unique position to promote reintegration (if indeed they supported reintegration). However, it is acknowledged that the participant characteristics suggest that, as a group, respondents are unlikely to come into interaction with ex-offenders, and therefore may have limited opportunities to enact support for, or communicate, reintegration. In order to accurately distinguish the theoretical ‘community’ (as defined in Chapter Two) from the current sample (which does not accurately represent the former), the term ‘public’ is used from this point forward to refer to survey respondents.

Materials.

The data for the current study were gained from a larger unpublished study conducted by Deakin University entitled: *Victorian community members’ views towards people with a criminal record*. The study explored Victorian public views about people with a criminal record and the ways both the criminal justice system (CJS) and society in general responds to crime.\(^{43}\)

Participants were provided with a plain language statement at the beginning of the survey (PLS) (see Appendix 3), which outlined the purpose of the study, information about confidentiality and anonymity, and relevant details should the participant wish to contact the researcher.

The questionnaire proper was made up of five sections: Section A included questions concerning participants’ demographic characteristics; Section B included questions about the participants’ knowledge and experience with crime and the CJS; Section C explored participants’ attitudes about the employment of a person with a criminal record; Section D explored participants’ attitudes about housing of a person with a criminal record; and Section E included a number of questions relating to

\(^{43}\) This study was designed and implemented in 2009. The current author was provided access to the survey and study data in 2010 to use as part of the current thesis. As such, not all study data was used in the current thesis.
participants’ attitudes about the aims and successes of the CJS, and the system’s responses to, and treatment of, people with a criminal record in general. A complete version of the questionnaire is included in Appendix 2.

In order to avoid any unintended or systematic response patterns as a result of the order in which participants answered questions, a total of four versions of the questionnaire were developed. All four versions contained the same five sections; however, between versions, the order in which each section appeared in the questionnaire was varied.

Following the completion of the data collection stage, questionnaire responses were coded and recorded for analysis and interpretation. The response options and coding of each question for the purpose of analysis is further discussed in the Design section below.

**Measures.**

**Dependent variables.**

To measure respondent support for reintegration as a goal of sentencing, participants were provided a list of seven goals of sentencing and asked to prioritise the goals. Priority was given by numbering 1-7 in the box next to each goal; a ‘1’ indicated highest priority, while ‘7’ indicated lowest priority. Respondents were informed that they could assign the same number to more than one goal. This design was consistent with suggestions made by Maruna and King (2004), who argue that a ‘forced order’ format does not accurately reflect the complexity of public support for sentencing goals. The seven goals of sentencing contained in the survey roughly corresponded to the goals of sentencing outlined in Victorian sentencing legislation/previous research (Oetting, et al. 1995, Rush 1997, s. 5(1) Sentencing Act 1991 (Vic), as demonstrated in Table 6.01.
Table 6.01

Goals of sentencing, as listed in Victorian legislation and the study survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>As listed in survey</th>
<th>As listed in s. 5(1) Sentencing Act 1991 (Vic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retribution</td>
<td>to punish offenders</td>
<td>to punish the offender to an extent and in a manner which is just in all of the circumstances;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(punishment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrence</td>
<td>to deter the offender from committing further crimes</td>
<td>to deter the offender or other persons from committing offences of the same or a similar character;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(general and specific)</td>
<td>to act as an example, to deter others from committing crimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>to rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>to establish conditions within which it is considered by the court that the rehabilitation of the offender may be facilitated;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denunciation</td>
<td>to provide a measure of the seriousness of different crimes</td>
<td>to manifest the denunciation by the court of the type of conduct in which the offender engaged;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incapacitation</td>
<td>to make the community safer</td>
<td>to protect the community from the offender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>to help offenders live productive lives</td>
<td>N/A⁴⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴⁴ The seventh goal, reintegration, is not recognised as a goal of sentencing in Australian legislation (Bartholomew, et al., 2012).
For the four questions corresponding to respondents’ support for reintegration, a seven-point Likert scale was used, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

- To measure participants’ preparedness to work with an ex-offender (*employment personal*), participants were asked to indicate their level of comfort to work with a person with a criminal record.
- To measure participants’ preparedness to live near an ex-offender (*housing personal*), participants were asked to indicate their level of comfort to live near a person with a criminal record.
- To measure participants’ support for reintegrative employment policy (*employment policy*), participants were asked to indicate their level of support for government assistance to help people with a criminal record find and keep a job.
- To measure participants’ support for reintegrative housing policy (*housing policy*), participants were asked to indicate their level of support for government assistance to help people with a criminal record find and keep housing.

**Independent variables.**

In line with research by Connolly, et al. (1997), Roberts and Stalans (1997), Tyler and Boeckmann (1997), Sims (2003), Hardcastle (2006), Maruna and King (2009) and Maruna (2001), participant variables were divided into three main sections corresponding to instrumental and expressive explanations of attitudes towards reintegration, crime causal attributions, and social identity factors. Knowledge of the CJS was also included, as the CRM identified community knowledge of a social issue is influential on its support for a targeted initiative.

Knowledge of the CJS (*knowledge*) was measured via participant self-report. Participants were asked to rate their level of personal knowledge about the CJS on a 10 cm bar from ‘no knowledge’ to ‘a lot of knowledge’.
Instrumental factors included participant’s fear of future crime victimization (*fear of crime*) and beliefs about whether crime has increased in Victoria (*beliefs crime has increased*). To measure *fear of crime*, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “I fear I could one day be a victim of crime” on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Beliefs that crime has increased were measured by asking participants to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “Crime in Victoria has increased in the last two years” on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Expressive factors included participants’ beliefs about people’s confidence in the CJS (*confidence*). To measure *confidence*, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, ‘Most people have confidence in the criminal justice system’ on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

To measure participants’ crime causal attribution, the survey asked participants to respond to an open-ended question, ‘What do you think are the major causes of crime in our community?’ Qualitative data coding is considered below.

An additional variable was included as a measure of crime causal attributions *ad hoc*. The variable related to the crime causal dimension of stability (*stability attributions*) (or redeemability), and measured participants’ beliefs that offending behaviour can be changed through rehabilitation intervention (that is, that offending is unstable). To measure this variable, participants’ were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, ‘Rehabilitation programs can reduce a person’s re-offending behaviour’ using a seven-point scale response format (1=strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). This question measured participants’ beliefs that offending behaviour can be changed through rehabilitation intervention (that is, that offending is unstable).

Participants’ beliefs about whether the CJS is successful in rehabilitating offenders and reintegrating ex-offenders were measured via responses to the question “How successful do you think the criminal justice system currently is at achieving these goals?” To measure beliefs that the CJS is successful in rehabilitating offenders
(success rehabilitation), participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “To rehabilitate offenders” on a scale of 1 (not at all successful) to 7 (very successful). To measure beliefs that the CJS is successful in reintegrating ex-offenders (success reintegration), participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “To help offenders live productive lives after they have served their sentence” on a scale of 1 (not at all successful) to 7 (very successful).

Social identity processes were explored by measuring participants’ support for reintegrating different offender characteristics. Participants’ support for these ex-offender characteristics were measured in the domains of housing and employment, across the abstract and personal levels. Participants were asked to indicate their level of comfort in each domain at the abstract and personal levels, for the following offender characteristics: has served the whole of their sentence in prison; has been convicted of multiple crimes; has served a community-based sentence only; has been convicted of a single crime; has completed an offence-based rehabilitation program; has completed work-related education or training; and, is motivated not to re-offend. A seven-point Likert scale was used to measure respondent’s level of support, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Design.**

**Quantitative data coding.**

Quantitative data including demographic information was entered into the statistical software package, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0. A number of quantitative variables were coded in preparation for analyses, including the following demographic variables: Age; Country of Birth; Main Language Spoken at Home; and, Occupation. Participant responses to the following items were also coded: knowledge; success rehabilitation; success reintegration; Fear of crime; stability attributions; and, Goals of Sentencing.
The items Age and Highest Level of Education were recoded into categorical variables corresponding to the categories of the 2011 Census data (ABS, 2011c). For Age, four categories were established: 18-24, 25-54, 55-64, and 65 and above. Highest level of education was coded into five data categories: Year 10 and below; Year 11 and 12; Certificate; Diploma; and, Bachelor Degree or above. Additionally Average household weekly income (before tax) was re-coded to reflect the categories of the 2011 Census data. These were: $1-999 per week; $1000-1999 per week; and $2000 or more per week.

As mentioned above, participants indicated their personal knowledge of the CJS on a 10 cm bar from “no knowledge” to “a lot of knowledge”. Knowledge was measured in millimeters and re-coded into SPSS with a range from 0 to 100 (thus, an ‘average knowledge’ would be re-coded to 50).

The following variables were coded into SPSS on seven-point rating scales, according to the item rating as it appeared in the questionnaire: housing personal; housing policy; employment personal; employment policy; fear of crime; beliefs crime has increased; confidence; and, stability attributions. Thus, confidence was coded as 1 (‘not at all successful’), and as 7 (‘very successful’). Fear of crime and stability attributions were coded as 1 (‘strongly agree’), and as 7 (‘strongly disagree’).

The item Goals of Sentencing was coded to reflect the level of priority respondents gave for each goal of sentencing. Here, a ‘1’ denoted highest priority, and ‘7’ lowest priority.

Two additional variables were created in the coding process to reflect participants’ support for reintegration of ex-prisoners with stereotypical and non-stereotypical characteristics. The variable stereotypical characteristics was computed by adding participants’ responses to the offender characteristics of served the whole of their sentence in prison and been convicted of multiple crimes, and dividing by two.

The variable non-stereotypical characteristics was computed by adding participants’ responses to the offender characteristics of has served a community-based sentence
only, has been convicted of a single crime, has completed an offence-based rehabilitation program, has completed work-related education or training, and is motivated not to re-offend, and dividing by five. Due to placement within the survey, stereotypical and non-stereotypical characteristics were computed for each reintegration domain and level – that is, housing personal, housing policy, employment personal and employment policy.

Qualitative data coding.

Qualitative data came from the question regarding respondents’ beliefs about the major causes of crime in the community. In total, 92.5-percent (2,432) of respondents provided responses to this open-ended item.

Initially, qualitative data was transcribed into a Microsoft Word document, as a verbatim full-text record of each participant’s response. Data was subsequently coded according to thematic theory analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006), whereby common themes or categories in participants’ responses were identified by the researcher and three colleagues and used to generate common categories for beliefs about the major causes of crime. This analytical approach involves multiple stages of refinement in data categorization and consistent comparison between data and emerging categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Thus, categories were not determined a priori, but were determined through examination of the data.

Initially, 100 cases were analyzed by the researcher and two colleagues, using this open-coding approach (approx. 20.5% of responses), to identify categories present within the data. The coders then met to compare and discuss any discrepancies arising in the coding process. This process was repeated an additional four times, until a consistent understanding of the categories and corresponding responses was developed between coders. This resulted in 500 cases being initially coded. In total, 88 exclusive categories (e.g. Greed, Drugs and Alcohol, Lack of Education, Poor Parenting) were identified, falling into five broad factors: individual; family; structural/social; social response/services; and, media/entertainment. Once categories
were agreed upon, the remaining 1,932 cases (79.5%) were divided between the coders, with each coding 644 cases, respectively.

Inter-rater reliability was subsequently determined, whereby 10.3% (250 cases) of cases were randomly selected from the data set using the randomization function within Microsoft Excel. Each rater subsequently re-coded these 250 cases and these were assessed for inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability was calculated for each pair of raters (that is, rater 1 and rater 2; rater 1 and rater 3; rater 2 and rater 3) for each causal category, according to the following formula:

\[
\text{Total number of times the two raters agreed} \times 100 \over \text{Total number of cases coded}
\]

The average inter-rater reliability was 84.9%. Any category that achieved less than 50% inter-rater reliability was subsequently removed from the dataset, and was not used in any further analysis. This resulted in a total of 63 categories.

The 63 categories were subsequently further reduced in order to address the specific research aims of the study. Data were re-coded into four categories: ‘internal locus of control’; ‘external locus of control’; ‘controllable’; and. ‘uncontrollable’. These four categories correspond to two dimensions of causal attributions relating to locus of causation (internal and external) and controllability (controllable and uncontrollable).

Following initial data reduction, examination of the four categories revealed considerable overlap in the variables external and uncontrollable \((r = .830, \leq .001)\), and internal and controllable \((r = .873, p \leq .001)\). Small correlations were found for internal and uncontrollable \((r = .108, p \leq .001)\), external and controllable \((r = .017, p > .5)\), internal and external \((r = .06, \leq .01)\) and controllable and uncontrollable \((r = .007, p \leq .001)\).
High correlations indicate multicollinearity between categories, which may be suggestive of redundancy between categories. Additionally, high correlations between independent variables increases the risk of Type II errors. In order to maintain robust analyses for the data, a decision was made to further reduce the data into two categories: external locus/uncontrollable, and internal locus/controllable. This decision was based on particularly high correlations between attributions of external locus and uncontrollability, and internal locus and controllability within the data, as well as theoretical grounds reflecting these pairings (Weiner 1982, Tabachnick & Fidell 2007).

Responses to the item, ‘beliefs about the cause of crime’ were entered into SPS 20.0 as two new variables with three levels; (i) cause mentioned, (ii) cause not mentioned, (iii) missing data.

**Procedure.**

Prior to commencement, the study was granted Ethics Approval from the Deakin University Human Ethics Advisory Group – Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioral Science (HEAG-H 99/09). See Appendix 1 for details.

The study questionnaire was developed based on the research aims and current literature. Following development, the questionnaire was piloted using a sample of 50 participants, aged 18 years and over, recruited by the study researchers via the ‘snowballing’ sampling technique. The pilot study aimed to highlight and reduce any ambiguity within the questions, and ensure any issues with language and formatting were addressed prior to the formal research study.

The finalised questionnaire was mailed to 12,000 Victorian residences. Postal addresses were obtained from a database purchased by the researchers from a commercial agency. This database was sourced from publicly available data and the collector and purchaser of the data adhered to the requirements detailed in the National Privacy Principles released by the Privacy Commissioner. Prior to purchase, the database was ‘washed’, removing addresses of residents who had indicated
previously they did not want to receive unsolicited material. The number of records purchased was driven by the research study budget, as well as an anticipated response rate of 10%.

Each potential participant was mailed a copy of the questionnaire, a cover letter and Plain Language Statement (PLS) which explained the nature and purpose of the study, as well as requirements for the participants and contact details for the principle researchers, and a reply-postpaid envelope (see Appendices 2 and 3). Participants were invited to participate in the research by completing the questionnaire, and returning it using the reply-prepaid envelope. Participants were informed that participation in the study was voluntary, responses were anonymous, and informed consent would be indicated by the return of the questionnaire. A total of 2,629 questionnaires were returned, resulting in a response rate of 21.9-percent.
CHAPTER SEVEN: RESULTS

Restatement of Study Purpose

The general purpose of this study was to determine the levels of Victorian public support for the reintegration of ex-prisoners. This broad aim was achieved via exploration of respondents’ support for reintegration as a goal of sentencing. Respondent support for reintegration in the domains of housing and employment, at the abstract and personal involvement levels, was also explored. The study also explored a number of factors that were theorised to influence public support for reintegration. Specifically, the study investigated the relationship between respondent characteristics and ex-offender characteristics, and support for reintegration.

In accordance with this general purpose, a number of aims, sub-aims, and related hypotheses were developed. These were presented in the Method chapter of this thesis.

Organization of the Chapter

This chapter systematically presents the results pertaining to each aim and hypothesis. Within each section, the variables and statistical methods used to address the aim are first identified and described. The findings of the statistical analyses are then presented, and finally the results are summarised.

Data Handling

Preliminary data analysis.

Data were initially screened for responses that were outside the possible range of scores for each variable, and no abnormalities were identified.

In this initial screening process, it was discovered that fifteen cases has been entered incorrectly into SPSS, with several being assigned the same identification (case)
number. It was not possible to determine with certainty that the cases represented duplicates or unique cases, as data had been entered into SPSS by multiple people and consistency of case-naming was not maintained throughout this process; thus, two people may have entered different questionnaire results with the same case name, which coincidently had similar item responses. As such, a decision was made to delete all fifteen cases, which resulted in a sample of 2,614.

**Missing data.**

Prior to entering data into SPSS, the returned questionnaires were examined for the presence of a high number of incomplete questions. A small, but noteworthy, number of returned questionnaires had considerable amounts of information missing. Due to this, a decision was made by the researcher to exclude all questionnaires with greater than 80% missing data (that is, less than ten of a total of 47 questions answered in the questionnaire). This excluded the questions at the end of Sections C, D and E, which invited participants to provide additional optional comments; for example, Section C ends with the statement, “feel free to give reasons, or make further comments”. Ninety questionnaires were identified with greater than 80% missing information. These were excluded from the sample, leaving a total of 2,524 cases.

Descriptive analyses were run to determine the percentage of values that were missing from each variable. All but three variables had under 5-percent missing data. These were: employment personal; employment abstract; and, housing personal (5.2%, 6.3%, and 5.1%, respectively). Notably, these three variables had over five, but below ten percent missing data, with employment personal and housing personal only just exceeding 5-percent missing-ness.

To determine if there was any pattern to the missing data, the three variables with greater than five-percent missing data were analysed utilising SPSS Missing Values Analysis. Output indicated that the data were Missing At Random (MAR) (Little’s MCAR test, \( \chi^2 (9) = 18.920, p = 0.026 \)). As data were MAR, missing data for
analyses were excluded on a case-wise basis. As such, the number of participants in each analysis differed.

**Detection of outliers.**

The dataset was analysed for univariate outliers using standard z-scores. A number of outliers were identified for the following variables (z-scores greater than 2.29, or less than -2.29, \( p < .001 \)): knowledge (2.12\% of cases with z-scores < -2.29, \( p < .001 \)); employment personal - committed multiple crimes (z-scores > 2.29); housing personal (z-score > 2.29); housing personal - committed multiple crimes (z-scores > 2.29); goal of sentencing – punishment (z-scores > 2.29); goal of sentencing – make community safer (z-scores > 2.29); goal of sentencing – deter others (z-scores > 2.29); goal of sentencing – deter offender (z-scores > 2.29); goal of sentencing – rehabilitate (z-scores > 2.29); goal of sentencing – provide a measure of seriousness (z-scores > 2.29); success rehabilitation (z-scores > 2.29); success reintegration (z-scores < -2.29); beliefs crime has increased (z-scores < -2.29); fear of crime (z-scores < -2.29); confidence (z-scores > 2.29).

Exploration of these cases revealed that extreme scores were not the result of data entry errors. Low percentages of outliers within each case were observed (ranging from .55\% to 6.34\%)\(^{45}\). Descriptive analyses indicated minimal variance between 5-percent trimmed mean and mean values, indicating little influence of outliers on the variable mean scores. To investigate the potential impact of retaining the univariate outliers, independent sample t-tests were conducted twice, with outlier cases (the whole sample) and without outlier cases. Results were nearly identical, with analysis concluding no significant difference between means (\( p > .05 \)). Further, as the study explores participants’ attitudes in an area where extreme views are anticipated (that is, attitudes towards ex-offenders), the inclusion of outliers within the sample was

\(^{45}\) Percentage of outliers for each variable is provided in a table in the Appendix.
considered an accurate representation of the population attitudes. The decision was made to retain all univariate outliers (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007).

The dataset was also analysed for multivariate outliers using Mahalanobis Distance. Based on the distance of particular scores from the centre cluster of remaining cases, two multivariate outliers were detected ($p<0.001$) (cases RMK191 and EMA118). These multivariate outliers were examined for potential influence on the dataset. Exploration of each case did not reveal any extreme scores compared to the sample, with the exception of case RMK191 being at the upper end of the distribution for age (although below at maximum age of 93 years).

To ensure these multivariate outliers did not impact statistical analyses, variable means were compared with and without the cases; results were nearly identical. As such, cases were retained. Their potential impact was checked for each multiple regression analysis conducted (separate analyses run with and without the two cases). Where any notable difference in results occurred, this is recorded as a footnote.

**Examination of normality.**

The dataset was analysed for possible impacts of non-normality. The assumption of normality was first tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (K-S test), under the ‘Explore’ function in SPSS (which provides the K-S score that has undergone Lilliefors’s significance correction). The K-S test was significant ($p<.001$) for all of the independent and dependent variables of interest to the current study, indicating violation of the assumption of normality.

Further analysis of skew and kurtosis revealed the majority of variables fell within the acceptable ranges of $\pm 2$ for skew and $\pm 7$ for kurtosis (Curran, West, & Finch, 1996; Tabachnick & Fiddel, 2007). Moderate to extreme skew and/or kurtosis was observed in the distribution of eleven variables. These were: *employment abstract* (Skew/SEskew$=-11.19$); *housing abstract* (Skew/SEskew$=-4.36$, Kurtosis/SEkurtosis$=-9.418$); *goal of sentencing – to punish* (Skew/SEskew$=-.37.77$; Kurtosis/SEkurtosis$=26.41$); *goal of sentencing - to make the community safer* (Skew/SEskew$=-48.889$,
Kurtosis/SEkurtosis=57.50); goal of sentencing– to deter others (Skew/SEskew= -27.47, Kurtosis/SEkurtosis=11.14); goal of sentencing – to deter offenders (Skew/SEskew= -33.93, Kurtosis/SEkurtosis=24.30); goal of sentencing – to rehabilitate offenders (Skew/SEskew= -20.17); goal of sentencing – to provide a measure of seriousness (Skew/SEskew= -23.72); goal of sentencing – to help offenders live productive lives (Skew/SEskew= -15.83); success rehabilitation (Skew/SEskew= 3.64), and; success reintegration (Skew/SEskew= 7.91, Kurtosis/SEkurtosis= -9.12). Analyses of the normal Q-Q plots and detrended Q-Q plots similarly revealed violations of normality for these eleven variables. All extreme skew was observed to be negative with the exception of the two variables: ‘success rehabilitation’ and ‘success reintegration’. Negative skew corresponds to respondents’ rating low support for an item (for example, a 1 out of 7 on the Likert scale).

Literature has argued that for larger sample sizes (N>300), and samples where degrees of freedom are greater than 20, violations of normality as indicated by the K-S test can be ignored (Tabachnick & Fiddel, 2007). As these exception criteria apply to the current study, a decision was made not to transform the data set. However, caution was given to the interpretation of results given violations of normality. Two approaches were taken. First, the median was reported alongside the mean for all descriptive results. Second, non-parametric analyses, which do not assume normality, were conducted alongside parametric analyses. Any notable differences in results between parametric and nonparametric results are reported within the findings for each aim.

**Statistical Methodology**

The statistical analysis used for each aim is presented in the corresponding sections of the chapter that follow. As outlined in the method chapter, most of the data consisted of seven-point Likert-rated items. There is controversy in the literature about whether to treat these variables as continuous or categorical, and accordingly
whether to conduct analyses using parametric or non-parametric/discrete statistical methods. Due to the large sample size available in this study, and the general robustness of parametric methods to violation of assumptions, parametric analyses were chosen to address the aims. Parametric tests are advantageous in terms of communicating results in an understandable manner (e.g., comparing means). However, to ensure consistency, non-parametric rank tests or other suitable methods for ordinal data were also conducted. Substantive differences between the two methods (e.g., a statistically significant result in one method but not another) are reported as footnotes in this chapter. It should be noted that there were very few differences in findings between the statistical methods used and the overall trends observed were consistent between the parametric and non-parametric analyses. Table 7.00 summarizes the primary parametric and alternative methods used in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Parametric Analysis</th>
<th>Non-parametric/Discrete Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Repeated-measures ANOVA</td>
<td>Friedman’s analysis of variance by ranks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Repeated-measures ANOVA</td>
<td>Friedman’s analysis of variance by ranks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Linear multiple regression</td>
<td>Generalized linear regression; multinomial, cumulative logit link function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paired-samples t test</td>
<td>Wilcoxon signed rank test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bootstrapping tests of mediation</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Repeated-measures ANOVA</td>
<td>Friedman’s analysis of variance by ranks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the analyses involving comparison of multiple items with the same response structure, one-way repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. The multivariate results were interpreted (as opposed to the univariate output), due to the ample sample size, violation of sphericity, and the fact that different items were being compared. The non-parametric analogue used was the Friedman’s analysis of variance by ranks. When only two items were being compared, the parametric test used was the paired-samples t-test, and the nonparametric version was the Wilcoxon signed rank test.

The relationship between two variables was assessed using the Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients. Examination of the predictive relationship between two variables was accomplished using simple regression, while multiple regression was used for examination of the predictive relationship between multiple variables. Alternatively, the generalized linear model with the cumulative logit link function was used to assess the results given an ordinal/discrete response distribution. For aim five, bootstrapping tests of mediation were conducted. There was no suitable discrete analysis alternative available.

Due to the number of analyses being conducted and the large sample size, an alpha level of .01 was used as a decision point for statistical significance. Furthermore, Bonferroni correction of the alpha level was undertaken for multiple comparisons. All analyses were conducted using SPSS v.20.

**Addressing Research Aims and Hypotheses**

**Aim One.**

Aim One undertook to measure the degree of respondent support for ex-prisoner reintegration as a goal of sentencing, and to compare the difference between respondent support for traditional goals of sentencing (retribution, deterrence, incapacitation, denunciation, and rehabilitation), and support for reintegration.

Related hypothesis:
a. When asked to rank the goals of sentencing, participants would prioritise first retribution, then the other ‘traditional’ goals of sentencing, before rehabilitation.

b. Participants would assign reintegration the lowest priority as a goal of sentencing.

Variables and methods.
Respondents were asked to prioritise the seven goals of sentencing. These were to: punish offenders; make the community safer; act as an example and deter others from committing crimes; deter the offender from committing further crimes; rehabilitate offenders; provide a measure of the seriousness of different crimes; and/or, help offenders live productive lives. Priority 1 denoted the goal/s with the highest priority, Priority 2 the next highest, and so on. Respondents could assign the same number to more than one goal.

A repeated-measures ANOVA was used to compare the means for the seven goals, and to determine which means differed from one another. The Bonferroni correction was applied to the pairwise comparisons, using an overall nominal alpha level of .01.

Results.
The descriptive statistics for the goals of sentencing priorities are provided in Table 7.01. There was a range of values from 1 (highest) to 7 (lowest) for each goal of sentencing. However, the medians were at the lower end of the possible scale (1 or 2) for six of seven goals, indicating that, in general, respondents felt that most of the goals warranted a relatively high priority. The reintegration goal (“to help offenders live productive lives”) had the highest median of the set, with a median of 3 out of 7,

---

46 Participants were asked to score each goal of sentencing on a scale of 1-7. The author wished to analysis for a trend in response. As such, ANOVA was chosen, to test for differences in more than two group means. Repeated-measures was used as the groups are not independent.
indicating that the other goals of sentencing received higher prioritisation than reintegration.

The repeated measures ANOVA showed a significant overall effect, indicating that one or more of the means differed from one another, Wilks’ Lambda = .64, \( F(6,2504) = 230.44, p < .001 \). Pairwise comparisons of means using the Bonferroni correction was employed to determine which specific means differed from one another. The goals of sentencing priorities are also plotted in Figure 7.0, in descending order by their means. All means differed significantly except for the two goals: deter offender and punishment (\( p < .001 \)).

*To make the community safer* was the goal of sentencing with the highest mean priority. This was followed by the goals deter offender, punishment, deter others, provide a measure of seriousness, rehabilitate offenders, and finally help offenders live productive lives. Consistent with expectations, the five ‘traditional’ goal of sentencing were assigned higher priority before rehabilitation. Also consistent with expectations, reintegration was given the lowest priority as a goal of sentencing. Of note, median rating for reintegration as a goal of sentencing was three out of seven. Thus, although not given high priority, respondents are still willing to support reintegration as a goal of sentencing.
Table 7.01.

Descriptive statistics for goals of sentencing priorities and results of pairwise comparisons of means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min, Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make community safer</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter offender</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>(1.56)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter others</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>(1.53)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a measure of seriousness</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>(1.72)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>(1.76)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help offenders live productive lives*7</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Wilks' Lambda = .64, F(6,2504) = 230.44, p < .001. Following Bonferroni adjustment all means were significantly different from one another at p < .01, with the exception of deter offender and punishment.

*7 As noted in chapter 6, ‘to help offenders live productive lives’ was used to measure support for reintegration.
Figure 7.0: Mean assigned priority for goals of punishment, in descending order by their means. Blue coloured bars denote means that are not significantly different from one another (p < .01, with Bonferroni adjustment).
Aim Two.

Aim Two undertook to examine the degree of respondent support for reintegrative policy in the domains of housing (housing policy) and employment (employment policy). Additionally, Aim Two examined the degree of respondent preparedness to live near an ex-offender (housing personal) and work with an ex-offender (employment personal).

Related hypotheses:

- c. Participants would be more supportive of reintegrative housing and employment policy (the abstract level), than personally prepared to live near or work with an ex-offender (the personal level).
- d. Participants would be most supportive of reintegrative employment policy (‘employment policy’), followed by: reintegrative housing policy (‘housing policy’); personally prepared to work with an ex-offender (‘personal employment’); and personally prepared to live near an ex-offender (‘personal housing’).
Aim two variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal preparedness to live near an ex-offender ('housing personal')</td>
<td>D1. I would be comfortable living near a person with a criminal record</td>
<td>1 (Disagree Strongly) to 7 (Agree Strongly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for reintegrative housing policy ('housing policy')</td>
<td>D5. The government should help a person with a criminal record to find and keep housing</td>
<td>1 (Disagree Strongly) to 7 (Agree Strongly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal preparedness to work with an ex-offender ('employment personal')</td>
<td>C1. I would be comfortable working with a person with a criminal record</td>
<td>1 (Disagree Strongly) to 7 (Agree Strongly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract support for reintegrative employment policy ('employment policy')</td>
<td>C5. The government should help a person with a criminal record to find and keep a job</td>
<td>1 (Disagree Strongly) to 7 (Agree Strongly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Variables and methods.**

The variables for Aim Two are shown in table 7.02. The analysis was conducted using repeated measures ANOVA\(^48\).

**Results.**

The descriptive statistics for the four variables are reported in Table 7.03, with the variables listed in order of highest mean support, from the top of the table downwards. Repeated measured ANOVAs showed a significant effect, indicating that one or more of the means were significantly different from one another. Subsequent pairwise comparisons showed that each mean significantly differed from every other mean (\(p < .01\), with Bonferroni adjustment).

Consistent with expectations, participants indicated highest mean support for *employment policy*, followed by: *housing policy; employment personal*; and, *housing personal*. Median rating of all levels of support fell within the mid-range (3.31 to 4.74 out of a possible 7).

\(^{48}\)ANOVA was chosen because the author wished to test for differences in group means. Repeated-measures was used as the groups are not independent.
Table 7.03

Mean degree of respondent support for reintegration in the domains of employment and housing, at the policy and personal levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min, Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>2146</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>2146</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>(1.87)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>2146</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>(1.54)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>2146</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Wilks’ Lambda = .643, Multivariate F(3,2143) = 395.78, p < .001. Means are significantly different from one another, at p<.01, following Bonferroni corrections.
Aim Three:

Aim Three undertook to identify respondent factors that predict public support for reintegration in the two domains of housing and employment, at the policy and personal levels.

Related hypotheses:

e. Participants’ knowledge, instrumental and expressive attitudes will predict support for reintegration.

f. Participants’ beliefs that offenders are redeemable (‘offender redeemability’) will predict support for reintegration. Conversely, participants’ beliefs that crime is caused by internal or external factors (‘locus attributions’), and controllable or uncontrollable (controllability attributions’) will not predict support for reintegration.

Variables and method.

The independent variables used in Aim Three, as related to hypothesis ‘e’ are shown in Table 7.04. Table 7.05 outlines the independent variables that relate to hypothesis ‘f’. The dependent variables for both hypotheses were previously presented in Table 7.02. Information regarding coding of each of the variables of interest was outlined in the method section.

Knowledge, and instrumental and expressive attitudes.

The relationship between the two instrumental items fear of crime and believes crime has increased, was examined by calculating a Pearson correlation coefficient.

Regression analyses were conducted to examine the degree to which knowledge, fear of crime, beliefs crime has increased, and confidence predicted support for
reintegration in each domain (housing and employment) and at each level (abstract and personal). Each regression analysis was conducted separately\textsuperscript{49}.

\textit{Crime causal attributions.}

As outlined in the method chapter, the qualitative variable measuring participants’ beliefs about the major causes of crime in the community underwent a coding process. This resulted in two quantitative variables – \textit{internal/controllable attributions} and \textit{external/uncontrollable attributions}.

Regression analyses were employed to examine the relationship between support for reintegration and the independent variables – \textit{internal/controllable attributions}, \textit{external/uncontrollable attributions} and \textit{stability attributions}. Where applicable, the independent variables were entered simultaneously and each regression analysis was conducted separately.

\textit{Predictive model of respondent support for reintegration.}

Multiple regression analyses were employed to explore the relative contribution of each predictor variable of interest (self-reported knowledge of the CJS, instrumental and expressive attitudes and crime causal attribution) on participants’ support for reintegration.

\textsuperscript{49} Regression analyses were chosen as the author wanted to ascertain the causal effect of one variable (the predictor variable) upon another (the dependent variable). Separate analyses were initially used to explore the unique contribution of each predictor.
Table 7.04  

_Hypothesis ‘e’ variables._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Self-reported knowledge of the CJS (knowledge)</td>
<td>B4. Rate your personal knowledge about the CJS?</td>
<td>0 (no knowledge) to 100 (a lot of knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental attitudes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Fear of future crime victimization (fear of crime)</td>
<td>E15. I fear that I could one day be a victim of crime</td>
<td>1 (Disagree strongly) to 7 (Agree strongly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Belief about whether crime has increased in Victoria (beliefs crime has increased)</td>
<td>E15B. Crime in Victoria has increased in the last two years</td>
<td>1 (Disagree strongly) to 7 (Agree strongly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressive attitudes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Belief about people’s confidence in the CJS (confidence)</td>
<td>E15D. Most people have confidence in the CJS</td>
<td>1 (Disagree strongly) to 7 (Agree strongly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. IV = independent variable.
Table 7.05

Hypothesis ‘f’ variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Original Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Beliefs about the major causes of crime</td>
<td>E16. What do you think are the major causes of crime in our community?</td>
<td>Open-ended question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Participants’ attribution that crime is caused by unstable factors</td>
<td>E15a. Rehabilitation programs can reduce a person’s reoffending behaviour</td>
<td>1 (Disagree strongly) to 7 (Agree strongly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. IV = independent variable
Results.

Knowledge, and instrumental and expressive attitudes.

Descriptive statistics for knowledge, and instrumental and expressive variables are shown in Table 7.06. Respondents ranked knowledge in the mid-range (Mdn = 50; indicating 50% self-reported knowledge of the CJS). Respondents ranked both fear of crime and belief crime has increased high (Mdn = 5 and Mdn = 6, respectively) and confidence was ranked low (Mdn = 3).

The Pearson correlation coefficient between fear of crime and beliefs crime has increased was .051, indicating a small positive relationship between the two instrumental variables (Pearson r = .051, p = .000, N = 2494).
Table 7.06.

Descriptive statistics for instrumental and expressive factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min, Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>55.74</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>2493</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs crime has increased</td>
<td>2494</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>2501</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the multiple regression analyses are outlined below (Table 7.07 and Table 7.08). The standardized coefficients (beta values) for the two predictors of interest within each model are reported in the first two columns of each table, with asterisks denoting the significance of each predictor. As the two instrumental predictors and the two expressive predictors were essentially uncorrelated with one another, the analysis of the betas within each multiple regression is relatively straightforward. Predictors with larger (absolute) values indicate those that are more important to the solution. The overall model statistics are reported in the right side of each table. The F ratio, degrees of freedom, and significance values are reported. The adjusted R² value provides an indication of the effect size, or the proportion of variance in the dependent variable predictable from the model.

Knowledge.

Knowledge significantly predicted participants’ support for reintegration. Beta relationships were positive, indicating participants’ higher knowledge predicted greater support for: housing personal \((p<.001, \text{ Adj R}^2 = .04)\); housing policy \((p<.001, \text{ Adj R}^2 = .08)\); employment personal \((p<.001, \text{ Adj R}^2 = .04)\); and, employment policy \((p<.001, \text{ Adj R}^2 = .03)\). However, adjusted R² values indicate that at most 8-percent of the variability in support for ex-prisoner reintegration was predicted by fear of crime and ‘belief crime is increasing. Although predictions were supported, knowledge predicted a small amount of variance in participants’ support for reintegration. In large sample sizes, small variance explained in significant models may be indicative of a relationship between the independent and dependent variables in the dataset that is not reflective of a substantive relationship within the population of interest. As such, interpretation of the significance of these results is made with caution.
Table 7.07

*Simple regressions predicting support for reintegration variables from knowledge*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized coefficient (β)</th>
<th>Model Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>F (df)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>.100***</td>
<td>23.64 (2331)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1.207 (2381)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>.121***</td>
<td>34.47 (2337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>1.046 (2308)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01; ***p < .001. Significant results (p < .01) are in bold font.
Instrumental factors.

Instrumental attitudes significantly predicted the four primary dependent variables ($p < .001$). All relationships were negative, indicating high fear of crime and strong belief crime has increased predicted lower participant support for: housing personal ($p < .001$, Adj $R^2 = .06$); housing policy ($p < .001$, Adj $R^2 = .05$); employment personal ($p < .001$, Adj $R^2 = .05$), and; employment policy ($p < .001$, Adj $R^2 = .04$). However, adjusted $R^2$ values indicate that at most 6-percent of the variability in support for ex-prisoner reintegration was predicted by instrumental attitudes.

Low percentage variance explained is indicative of a reported significant relationship between the independent and dependent variables that does not represent a substantive relationship within the data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Thus, although predictions were supported, instrumental attitudes were found to explain only a small percentage of the variance in participants’ support for reintegration.
Table 7.07

**Multiple regressions predicting support for reintegration variables from instrumental factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized coefficient (β)</th>
<th>Model Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>Beliefs crime has increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>-.094***</td>
<td>-.163***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>-.109***</td>
<td>-.195***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>-.086***</td>
<td>-.151***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>-.091***</td>
<td>-.154***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (df)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>72.14 (2348)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>69.77 (2397)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>60.47 (2348)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>44.49 (2321)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01; ***p < .001. Significant results (p < .01) are in bold font.
Expressive factors.

Expressive attitudes significantly predicted participants’ support for reintegration. Beta relationships were positive, indicating participants’ higher knowledge and confidence predicted greater support for: housing personal ($p<.001$, Adj $R^2 = .04$); housing policy ($p<.001$, Adj $R^2 = .08$); employment personal ($p<.001$, Adj $R^2 = .04$); and, employment policy ($p<.001$, Adj $R^2 = .03$). However, adjusted $R^2$ values indicate that at most 8-percent of the variability in support for ex-prisoner reintegration was predicted by fear of crime and ‘belief crime is increasing. Although predictions were supported, expressive attitudes predicted a small amount of variance in participants’ support for reintegration. It is unlikely this prediction is reflective of a substantive relationship between expressive attitudes and support for reintegration.
Table 7.08

Multiple regressions predicting support for reintegration variables from expressive attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized coefficient (β)</th>
<th>Model Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>F (df)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Adj R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>.175***</td>
<td>75.01 (2372)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>.274***</td>
<td>196.85 (2420)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>.147***</td>
<td>52.52 (2370)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>.182***</td>
<td>80.43 (2343)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01; ***p < .001. Significant results (p < .01) are in bold font.
Crime causal attributions

Nature of participants’ beliefs about the major causes of crime.

A total of 2480 respondents provided codable responses to the question, “What do you think are the major causes of crime in our community?” Of these, half (50.2%) reported causes that fell within the internal/controllable domain. Fewer (39.0%) reported external/uncontrollable causes (see Table 7.09). Table 7.10 provides an example of participants’ responses to the open ended item and the subsequent category into which responses were coded.
Table 7.09

Descriptive statistics for variables assessing participants' belief in the major causes of crime in the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants' attributions that crime is caused by internal and</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>1245 (50.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controllable factors (internal/controllable attributions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants' attributions that crime is caused by external and</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>967 (39.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncontrollable factors (external/uncontrollable attributions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.10

*Examples of category coding for participants’ responses to item, “What do you think are the major causes of crime in our community?”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item response [corresponding case number]</th>
<th>Cause is internal or external to the individual?</th>
<th>Individual has control or no control over the cause?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Lack of self discipline [sic]...’ [Cmw07]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Doing what individuals want to do regardless of effect on others’ [Ad49]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...low moral standards’ [Bmj194]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...too lazy...’ [Bmj113]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...racial violence’ [Ad04]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...offenders [sic] belief that they are owed something...’ [Bmj79]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...a greedy mindset.’ ’ [Sp02]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...lack of responsibility and concern for others’ [Bg30]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...‘me’ism [sic]’ [Bmj147]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Disregard for other people.’ [Fml147]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...arrogance.’ [Cmw12]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...no respect for others or their property’ [Bmj177]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...lack of taking personal responsibility for their actions (criminal or otherwise)’ [Bg39]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...alcohol and drug use (not abuse, just use)’ [Ad02]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...people wanting to make money without working for it...’ [Bmj181]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Too many people with a gang mentality to run riot and attack people with knives, clubs etc.’ [Rf80]</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Controllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Unemployment leading to financial hardships and overcrowding.’ [Cmw14]</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Uncontrollable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The difficult circumstances that many people face during their childhood (poverty, a stable &amp; supportive home/family, sexual abuse, lack of education). [Cmw142]</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Uncontrollable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...economic disadvantage (homelessness...’ [Ad07]</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Uncontrollable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...underprivileged poor’ [Bmj139]</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Uncontrollable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...lack of power to make improvements in their lives...’ [Ad46]</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Uncontrollable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued over page*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External</th>
<th>Uncontrollable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘…children being left in families where serious crimes have been committed…’ [Cmw150]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘…people born into it and don’t know better.’ [Km34]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘…no guidance from their parents, parents on drugs and alcohol…’ [Cmw115]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Parents inability to set boundaries for their children due to many factors the main one being mothers working and not in traditional role of keeping the family in line. Parents being too tired to be bothered following through.’ [Cmw252]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Lack of parental control when children during their upbringing.’ [Km160]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Less opportunities in some areas and communities’ [Bg06]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alcohol available at all hours causing over consumption which the silly things are unable to cope with, thus doing stupid things, damaging property or brawling causing injury to innocent people.’ [Bmj62]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘…Far flung housing estates with poor public transport…’ [Ejsv30]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘lack of example from others, especially high profile people’ [Bmj136]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Lack of opportunity…recreational/sporting and other community opportunities’ [Bmj170]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘…teachers cannot punish-police cannot punish…’ [Bmj155]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Penalties are not severe enough and that is why there is so much crime’ [Ad43]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Lack of police presence in the community’ [Bmj109]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.11 presents the multiple regression analyses for the relationship between participants’ *internal/controllable attributions* and *external/uncontrollable attributions*, and support for reintegration. The beta values for each predictor are reported, as well as the F statistics for the full model and the Adjusted R² values.

Three of the four models were statistically significant. Contrary to predictions, participants’ *internal/controllable attributions* did not predict support for reintegration for any of the dependent variables. Also contrary to predictions, neither independent variable significantly predicted participants’ support for housing personal.

As predicted, *external/uncontrollable attributions* predicted participants’ support for: *housing policy* \((F(2397) = 6.94, p<.01, \text{Adj R}^2 = .005)\); *employment personal* \((F(2346) = 6.14, p<.01, \text{Adj R}^2 = .004)\); and, *employment policy* \((F(2321) = 6.09, p<.01, \text{Adj R}^2 = .004)\). Positive beta weights indicate a positive relationship, such that endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by external and uncontrollable factors resulted in greater support for reintegration (*housing policy*, *employment personal* and *employment policy*).

It is noted that the Adjusted R-squares for the three significant models were small, with no greater than .5% of the variance explained. As previously noted, small variance explained in significant models may be indicative of a relationship between the independent and dependent variables in the dataset that is not reflective of a substantive relationship within the population of interest.
Table 7.11

Multiple regressions for relationship between participants’ support for reintegration and beliefs about the major causes of crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients (β)</th>
<th>Model Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal/controllable attributions</td>
<td>External/uncontrollable attributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.069**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.072***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.068**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01; ***p < .001. Significant results (p < .01) are in bold font.
Stability attributions and support for reintegration

Descriptive statistics for the independent variable, stability attributions are presented in Table 7.12. The results of the simple regression analysis exploring the relationship between participants’ stability attributions and support for reintegration is presented in Table 7.13. The beta values for each predictor are reported, as well as the F statistics for the full model and the Adjusted R² values.
### Table 7.12

**Description of stability attribution variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stability attributions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min, Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2497</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7.13

**Simple regression predicting support for relationship between participants’ support for reintegration and belief that crime is caused by unstable factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients (β)</th>
<th>Model Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stability attributions</td>
<td>F (df)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>259.77 (2,368)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>595.98 (2,413)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>270.28 (2,364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>558.49 (2,336)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01; ***p < .001. Significant results (p < .01) are in bold font.
All four models of regression, were significant. As predicted, participants’ *stability attributions* were significant predictors of: *housing personal* ($p<.001$, Adj $R^2=.10$); *housing policy* ($p<.001$, Adj $R^2=.20$); *employment personal* ($p<.001$, Adj $R^2=.10$); and, *employment policy* ($p<.001$, Adj $R^2=.19$). Beta coefficients were positive, indicating that higher participant agreement with the statement, ‘Rehabilitation programs can reduce a person’s reoffending,’ was predictive of higher levels of support for ex-prisoner reintegration. 

It is noted that the adjusted $R^2$ for each model were modest (ranging from 10% - 20% variance explained). In comparison to the other independent variables investigated in Aim Three, stability attributions were the most substantive in explaining participants’ support for reintegration. That said, interpretation of this variable is substantive in explaining why public support for reintegration is met with caution.

---

*Relative predictive value of knowledge, instrumental and expressive attitudes, internal/controllable, external/uncontrollable and stability attributions on participant’s support for reintegration*

Four Hierarchical Multiple Regression analyses were run to explore the relative contribution of each predictor variable on respondent support for reintegration. Each regression contains six models. In the first model, the possible effects of demographic factors included (thereafter being control variables). In the second model, *knowledge* is added to explore the contribution of this variable. The third model includes measures of *fear of crime* and *belief crime has increased*, to test for the influence of instrumental attitudes. In the fourth model, the expressive attitude variable, *confidence* is added. The fifth model includes the crime causal attributions of *internal/controllable attributions*

---

50 It is acknowledged that participants’ responses to the item may reflect their beliefs that rehabilitation programs are effective in targeting and changing offending behaviour, rather than crime causal attributions of instability. This point will be considered in the discussion.
and external/uncontrollable attributions. Finally, the sixth model includes the variable stability attributions.

Housing Personal

Demographic variables (model 1) accounted for a significant 2.4% of the variance in participant’s support for housing personal, $F(4, 2078) = 12.84$, $R^2 = .024$, $p<.000$. Gender ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0069$), age ($p<.01$, $sr^2 = .0031$) and education ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0073$) emerged as significant predictors.

Knowledge (model 2) accounted for an additional .4% of the variance in participant’s support for housing personal, $F(5, 2077) = 11.91$, $R^2 = .028$, $p<.000$. Gender ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0060$), age ($p<.05$, $sr^2 = .0028$), education ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0063$), and knowledge ($p<.01$, $sr^2 = .0037$) emerged as significant predictors.

Instrumental attitudes (fear of crime and belief crime has increased) (model 3) accounted for an additional 4.6% of the variance in participant’s support for housing personal, $F(7, 2075) = 23.74$, $R^2 = .074$, $p<.000$. Gender ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0064$), age ($p<.01$, $sr^2 = .0039$), education ($p<.05$, $sr^2 = .00621$), knowledge ($p<.01$, $sr^2 = .0028$), fear of crime ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0075$), and belief crime has increased ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .015$) emerged as significant predictors.

Confidence (model 4) accounted for an additional 1.6% of the variance in participant’s support for housing personal, $F(8, 2074) = 25.64$, $R^2 = .090$, $p<.000$. Gender ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0065$), age ($p<.01$, $sr^2 = .0034$), knowledge ($p<.01$, $sr^2 = .0040$), fear of crime ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0056$), belief crime has increased ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .012$), and confidence ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .016$) emerged as significant predictors.

Crime causal beliefs (model 5) did not account for an additional variance in participant’s support for housing personal, $F_{change}(2, 2072) = .334$, $R^2 = .334$, $p=.716$, although the model was statistically significant ($p<.000$). Gender ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0066$), age ($p<.01$, $sr^2 = .0036$), knowledge ($p<.01$, $sr^2 = .0038$), fear of crime ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0057$), belief crime has increased ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .012$), and confidence ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .016$) remained significant predictors.
Stability attributions (model 6) accounted for an additional 6.8% of the variance in participant’s support for housing personal, $F(11, 2071) = 35.30$, $R^2 = .158$, $p<.000$. Gender ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0061$), age ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0054$), knowledge ($p<.05$, $sr^2 = .0026$), fear of crime ($p<.01$, $sr^2 = .0045$), belief crime has increased ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0093$), confidence ($p<.05$, $sr^2 = .0026$) and stability attributions ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .068$) emerged as significant predictors. See Table 7.14 for final standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$).

Table 7.14
Hierarchical multiple regression predicting support for housing personal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Housing personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.084***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.059**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.093***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.062**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>-.103***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime has increased</td>
<td>-.147***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>.131***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/ controllable</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External/ uncontrollable</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability attributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.000. Significant results ($p < .05$) are in bold font.
Inspection of the final model revealed an adjusted $R^2$ of .153, indicating that less than $\frac{1}{7}$th of the variability in participant support for housing personal is predicted by the independent variables (knowledge, fear of crime, beliefs crime has increased, confidence and stability attributions). Beta values ($\beta$) and semipartial correlations ($sr^2$) indicate that stability attributions provided the greatest significant contribution to the model ($\beta=.278$, $sr^2=.068$), followed by beliefs crime has increased ($\beta=-.116$, $sr^2=.0093$).

**Housing Policy**

Demographic variables (model 1) accounted for a significant 3.7% of the variance in participant’s support for housing policy, $F(4, 2121) = 20.626$, $R^2 = .037$, $p<.000$. Education ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .028$) emerged as a significant predictor.

Knowledge (model 2) did not account for any additional variance in participant’s support for housing policy, $F_{\text{change}}(1, 2120) = .000$, $R^2 = .037$, $p=.993$, although the model remained statistically significance ($p<.000$). Education ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .028$) remained a significant predictor.

Instrumental attitudes (fear of crime and beliefs crime has increased) (model 3) accounted for an additional 5% of the variance in participant’s support for housing policy, $F(7, 2118) = 28.906$, $R^2 = .087$, $p<.000$. Education ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .018$), fear of crime ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .0064$), and beliefs crime has increased ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .018$) emerged as significant predictors.

Confidence (model 4) accounted for an additional 4.5% of the variance in participant’s support for housing policy, $F(8, 2117) = 40.198$, $R^2 = .132$, $p<.000$). Education ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .014$), fear of crime ($p<.01$, $sr^2 = .0038$), belief crime has increased ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .011$), and confidence ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .045$) emerged as significant predictors.

Crime causal beliefs (model 5) accounted for an additional .2% of variance in participant’s support for housing policy, although the change was not statistically significant $F_{\text{change}}(2, 2115) = 2.79$, $R^2 = .134$, $p=.062$. Education ($p<.000$, $sr^2 = .013$),
fear of crime ($p < .01, \text{sr}^2 = .0039$), beliefs crime has increased ($p < .000, \text{sr}^2 = .011$), and confidence ($p < .000, \text{sr}^2 = .044$) remained significant predictors.

Table 7.15

Hierarchical multiple regression predicting support for housing policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.183***</td>
<td>.183***</td>
<td>.148***</td>
<td>.129***</td>
<td>.126***</td>
<td>.090***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>-.095***</td>
<td>-.073**</td>
<td>-.074**</td>
<td>-.060**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime has increased</td>
<td>-.162***</td>
<td>-.125***</td>
<td>.123***</td>
<td>-.114***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>.220***</td>
<td>.219***</td>
<td>.107***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Causal beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/ controllable</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External/ uncontrollable</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability attributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.050***</td>
<td>.045***</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.136***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .000$. Significant results ($p < .05$) are in bold font.
Stability attributions (model 6) accounted for an additional 13.6% of the variance in participant’s support for housing policy, $F(11, 2114) = 71.188, R^2 = .270, p<.000$. Education ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0064$), fear of crime ($p<.01, sr^2 = .0026$), belief crime has increased ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0090$), confidence ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0096$) and stability attributions ($p<.000, sr^2 = .136$) emerged as significant predictors. See Table 7.15 for final standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$).

Inspection of the final model revealed an adjusted $R^2$ of .267, indicating that less than $1/3$rd of the variability in participant support for housing policy is predicted by the independent variables (fear of crime, beliefs crime has increased, confidence and stability attributions). Beta values ($\beta$) and semipartial correlations ($sr^2$) indicate that stability attributions provided the greatest significant contribution to the model ($\beta=.395, sr^2=.136$), followed by beliefs crime has increased ($\beta=-.114, sr^2=.0090$) and confidence ($\beta=.107, sr^2=.0096$).

**Employment Personal**

Demographic variables (model 1) accounted for a significant 2.2% of the variance in participant’s support for employment personal, $F(4, 2085) = 11.78, R^2 = .022, p<.000$. Gender ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0081$), education ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0058$), and income ($p<.05, sr^2 = .0018$) emerged as significant predictors.

Knowledge (model 2) accounted for an additional .8% of the variance in participant’s support for employment personal, $F(5, 2084) = 12.72, R^2 = .030, p<.000$. Gender ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0067$), education ($p<.01, sr^2 = .0045$), and knowledge ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0076$) emerged as significant predictors.

Instrumental attitudes (fear of crime and belief crime has increased) (model 3) accounted for an additional 4.5% of the variance in participant’s support for employment personal, $F(7, 2082) = 24.135, R^2 = .075, p<.000$. Gender ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0074$), knowledge ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0061$), fear of crime ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0081$), and belief crime has increased ($p<.000, sr^2 = .014$) emerged as significant predictors.
Confidence (model 4) accounted for an additional 1% of the variance in participant’s support for employment personal, $F(8, 2081) = 24.021$, $R^2 = .085, p<.000$. Gender ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0076$), knowledge ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0074$), fear of crime ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0066$), belief crime has increased ($p<.000, sr^2 = .010$), and confidence ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0094$) emerged as significant predictors.

Crime causal beliefs (model 5) accounted for an additional .2% of the variance in participant’s support for employment personal, although the change was not statistically significant $F(2, 2079) = 2.32$, $R^2 = .087, p=.099$. Gender ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0077$), knowledge ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0067$), fear of crime ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0067$), belief crime has increased ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0098$), and confidence ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0092$), and external/uncontrollable attributions ($p<.05, sr^2 = .0020$) were significant predictors.

Stability attributions (model 6) accounted for an additional 7.1% of the variance in participant’s support for employment personal, $F(11, 2078) = 35.58$, $R^2 = .158, p<.000$. Gender ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0068$), age ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0023$) knowledge ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0052$), fear of crime ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0050$), belief crime has increased ($p<.000, sr^2 = .0091$), and stability attributions ($p<.000, sr^2 = .072$) emerged as significant predictors. See Table 7.16 for final standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$).

Inspection of the final model revealed an adjusted $R^2$ of .154, indicating that less than $1/7^{th}$ of the variability in participant support for employment personal is predicted by the independent variables (knowledge, fear of crime, beliefs crime has increased, and stability attributions). Beta values ($\beta$) and semipartial correlations ($sr^2$) indicate that stability attributions provided the greatest significant contribution to the model ($\beta=.287, sr^2=.072$), followed by beliefs crime has increased ($\beta=-.116, sr^2=.0091$).
Table 7.16

Hierarchical multiple regression predicting support for employment personal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Employment Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td><strong>.092</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td><strong>.083</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>.088</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>-.107***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime has increased</td>
<td>-.141***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>.102***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/ controllable</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External/ uncontrollable</td>
<td>.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability attributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.000. Significant results (p < .05) are in bold font.

Employment Policy

Demographic variables (model 1) accounted for a significant 3.5% of the variance in participant’s support for employment policy, $F(4, 2055) = 18.85, R^2 = .035, p<.000$. Age ($p<.000, r^2 = .011$), education ($p<.000, r^2 = .020$), and income ($p<.05, r^2 = .0023$) emerged as significant predictors.
Knowledge (model 2) accounted for an additional .1% of the variance in participant’s support for employment policy, although the change was not statistically significant, $F_{\text{change}}(1, 2054) = 2.23$, $R^2 = .036$, $p = .136$. Age ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0109$), education ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .020$), and income ($p < .05$, $sr^2 = .0024$) remained significant predictors.

Instrumental attitudes (fear of crime and belief crime has increased) (model 3) accounted for an additional 3.7% of the variance in participant’s support for employment policy, $F(7, 2052) = 23.18$, $R^2 = .073$, $p < .000$. Age ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0085$), education ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .013$), fear of crime ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0040$), and belief crime has increased ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .015$) emerged as significant predictors.

Confidence (model 4) accounted for an additional 1.6% of the variance in participant’s support for employment policy, $F(8, 2051) = 25.21$, $R^2 = .090$, $p < .000$. Age ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0094$), education ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .010$), fear of crime ($p < .05$, $sr^2 = .0026$), belief crime has increased ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .012$), and confidence ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .016$) emerged as significant predictors.

Crime causal beliefs (model 5) accounted for an additional .2% of the variance in participant’s support for employment policy, although this change was not statistically significant, $F_{\text{change}}(2, 2049) = 2.75$, $R^2 = .092$, $p = .065$. Age ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0084$), education ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0096$), fear of crime ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0028$), belief crime has increased ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0099$), and confidence ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .016$), and external/uncontrollable attributions ($p < .05$, $sr^2 = .0018$) were significant predictors.

Stability attributions (model 6) accounted for an additional 14.7% of the variance in participant’s support for employment policy, $F(11, 2048) = 58.45$, $R^2 = .239$, $p < .000$. Age ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0053$), education ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0046$), knowledge ($p < .05$, $sr^2 = .0020$), fear of crime ($p < .05$, $sr^2 = .0015$), belief crime has increased ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .0083$), and stability attributions ($p < .000$, $sr^2 = .15$) emerged as significant predictors.

See Table 7.17 for final standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$).

Inspection of the final model revealed an adjusted $R^2$ of .235, indicating that less than $1/3^{rd}$ of the variability in participant support for employment policy is predicted by the independent variables (knowledge, fear of crime, beliefs crime has increased, and
stability attributions). Beta values ($\beta$) and semipartial correlations ($sr^2$) indicate that stability attributions provided the greatest significant contribution to the model ($\beta$=.409, $sr^2$=.15), followed by beliefs crime has increased ($\beta$=-.109, $sr^2$=.0083).

Table 7.17

Hierarchical multiple regression predicting support for employment policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Employment policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.111***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.153***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.053*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>-.074***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime has increased</td>
<td>-.147***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>.133***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/ controllable</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External/ uncontrollable</td>
<td>.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability attributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.000. Significant results (p < .05) are in bold font.
The four hierarchical multiple regression analyses reveal at best a modest model fit, with variance explained ranging from 15.3% (housing personal) to 26.7% (housing policy). Overall the regressions indicate that the variables beliefs crime has increased and stability attributions are significant predictors of participant support for reintegration, with stability attributions providing the greatest unique contribution.\(^{51}\) Inspection of beta values (\(\beta\)) and semipartial correlations (\(sr^2\)) further support this findings. However, it is noted that the beta values and semipartial correlations of all significant predictors are small, \(^{52}\) meaning there is a small impact of the predictor variables on the independent variable.

In a larger sample size (as this study has) there is an increased chance of detecting a small relationships between variables (i.e. statistical significance). Thus it is important to consider practical significance when sample sizes are large (Tabacknick & Fidell, 2007). The results indicate that although the predictor variables have a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variables (housing personal, housing policy, employment personal and employment policy), practically this relationship is modest at best, and very small when stability attributions is removed from the analyses (i.e. when considering model 5 within each regression analysis).\(^{53}\)

Taking a cautious approach to Aim Three findings, the decision was made to remove the following variables from analyses relevant to Aim Four: knowledge, fear of crime,

\(^{51}\) Actually, when stability attributions is removed from the regression (model 5), adjusted \(R^2\) ranges from .082 (housing personal) to .13 (employment policy), indicating that the significant predictors explained approximately 10% of the variance in the dependent variable.

\(^{52}\) Beta values are measured in standard deviations. Thus, the greatest beta value (excluding stability attributions) of -.116 (crime has increased) indicates that a change in one standard deviation of the predictor variable (crime has increased) will result in a change of .116 standard deviations in the criterion variable (in this case, housing policy).

\(^{53}\) The point being made here is that if an initiative was to focus on public beliefs about crime rates and confidence in the CJS (drawn from the predictors beliefs crime has increased and confidence), the initiative would result in a minimal shift in public support for reintegration, such that the economic and social investment in the initiative is unlikely to outweigh the anticipated benefits. While findings do indicate a statistically significant relationship, it is actually more likely a different set of variables (not considered in this thesis) have a greater unique relationship with public support for reintegration, and therefore a great practical application to initiatives aimed at increasing public support for reintegration.
beliefs crime has increased, confidence, internal/controllable attributions and external/uncontrollable attributions. Stability attributions was retained. This decision is intended to direct attention to variables that may have practical significant (in addition to statistical significance).

**Aim Four:**
Aim Four undertook to explore whether respondent beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate ex-offenders predicted respondent support for reintegration in the two domains of housing and employment, across the abstract and personal levels.

In addition to exploring a prediction model, the aim set out to explore the mediating relationship of participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate ex-offenders on the predictive models outlined in Aim Three.

Related hypotheses:

- **g.** Participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate ex-offenders will predict support for reintegration.
- **h.** Participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate offenders will mediate the relationship between participants’ knowledge, instrumental and expressive attitudes, and support for reintegration. Participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate offenders will mediate the relationship between participants’ beliefs about offender redeemability, locus attributions, and controllability attributions.

**Variables and methods.**
As noted previously in Aim Three, statistical analyses revealed significant, yet non-substantive, relationships between participants’ support for reintegration (DVs) and the independent variables: knowledge; instrumental attitudes (fear of crime and belief crime has increased) and expressive attitudes (confidence); internal/controllable attributions;
and, *external/uncontrollable attributions*. 54 As a result, these variables were excluded from future analyses. 55

The remaining variable, participants’ *stability attributions*, was used for the mediation analyses (previously presented in table 7.05). The dependent variables for the analysis have been previously presented in Table 7.02. The independent variable for the prediction analysis and mediator variable for the mediator analysis are presented in Table 7.18.

A paired samples t-test was used to compare the degree of success in these two domains 56.

---

54 This was reported following reflection on the small variance explained by all models within the analysis (less than or equal to 8%), and small practical significant despite reported statistical significance.

55 To ensure accuracy in the decision to exclude mediation analyses on these variables, mediation analyses were run; any meaningful and statically significant results for excluded variables are reported in the footnotes of this chapter.

56 A t-test was used as the authors wanted to measure differences in means between two groups. Pair-sample t-test was chosen as the two variables (*success rehabilitation* and *success reintegration*) are related (same sample), and are therefore not independent.
Table 7.18

**Aim four mediator variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Belief about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>E14. How successful do you think the CJS currently is at achieving these goals?</td>
<td>1 (Not at all successful) to 7 (Very successful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(success rehabilitation)</em></td>
<td>To rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Belief about the success of the CJS to reintegrate ex-offenders</td>
<td>E14. How successful do you think the CJS currently is at achieving these goals?</td>
<td>1 (Not at all successful) to 7 (Very successful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(success reintegration)</em></td>
<td>To help offenders live productive lives after they have served their sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. M = mediator
Mediation explores the hypothesised causal chain in which one variable (the independent variable, X) affects a second variable (the mediator variable, M) that, in turn, affects a third variable (the dependent variable, Y). The total effects of X on Y may come to be through a variety of direct and indirect forces. In the simple mediation model, indirect effects are the effect of X on Y through M, whereas direct effects are the effects of X on Y independent of the pathway through M. The total effect is equal to the sum of the direct and indirect effects.

Of note, the existence of zero-order relationships among the variables must be established in order to run a mediation analysis (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Specifically, a significant direct effect is required (a significant relationship between the independent (X) and dependent (Y) variables). A significant relationship between the mediator and the independent variable, and the mediator (M) and the dependent variable is also required (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Where the conditions above were met, mediation was tested by using the ‘MEDIATION’ for SPSS macro, created by Dr. Andrew Hayes (2013). This program estimates the total, direct, and indirect effects of a set of variables (X) on an outcome variable (Y) through a proposed mediator (M) (Hayes, 2013).

A bootstrapping method was chosen to test the significance of the indirect effects in this study, as this has been shown to be a more accurate and powerful alternative than the causal steps approach or the product of coefficients approach (Hayes, 2009). Bootstrapping creates a representation of the sampling distribution of the indirect effects, by re-sampling (with replacement) a large number of times. Upon completion, the estimates provided from the bootstrapping procedure can be used to generate a confidence interval. This is accomplished by sorting the estimates from smallest to largest and calculating the lower and upper bounds based on the values in the respective ordinal positions. This confidence interval is then used to interpret the significance of the indirect effect (Hayes, 2009).

Indirect effects were estimated for the X variable, stability attributions, as well as an omnibus test of the indirect effect. The omnibus test of the indirect effect is
calculated from the product of two values: (1) the adjusted $R^2$ from the model estimating the mediator from the IVs and (2) the regression coefficient estimating the DV from the mediator. This index has an expected value close to zero if there is no partial association between X and M and/or between M and Y. Interpretation of the test is via the confidence interval; if the confidence interval does not contain zero, then one can claim an indirect effect of X (or a set of Xs) on Y through M (Hayes, 2013).

For these analyses, 99% bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals for indirect effects were generated based on 5,000 bootstrap samples. An indirect effect can be interpreted as different from zero with 99% confidence, if zero is outside of the confidence interval (Hayes, 2013).

Analyses were conducted separately using the variables ‘success rehabilitation’ and ‘success reintegration’ as potential mediators. Further, as suggested by (Hayes, 2013) and Baron and Kenny (1986), a separate analysis was conducted for the relationship between the independent variable, mediator, and dependent variable to ensure each model emphasised the unique effect of the mediator on the independent variable-dependent variable relationship.

**Results.**

*Participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate and reintegrate ex-offenders.*

The descriptive statistics for the two items measuring participant’s success in the CJS are shown in Table 7.19. The median for both items was 3 out of 7 and the means were 3.03 and 3.12 for *success rehabilitation* and *success reintegration*, respectively. Thus, overall, the respondents felt that the CJS was slightly unsuccessful in achieving these two goals (a neutral response would be 4 out of 7).

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to determine if the means of the two items differed. The mean for *success reintegration* was significantly higher than *success*
rehabilitation \((p < .001)\). Respondents felt that the CJS was slightly more successful in reintegrating ex-offenders than in rehabilitating offenders.

Participants’ beliefs about success of the CJS to rehabilitate offenders as a predictor of support for reintegration

As predicted, success rehabilitation was a significant predictor of participants’ support for reintegration (Table 7.20). Beta weights were positive for significant models. Thus, stronger beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate offenders predicted higher support for reintegration. It is noted, however, that adjusted R\(^2\) for all models are small (\(.7 - 2\%\) variance explained).
Table 7.19

*Descriptive statistics related to the variables, success rehabilitation and success reintegration.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>(Min, Max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success rehabilitation</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success reintegration</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $t(2297) = -3.63, p < .001.$
### Table 7.20

*Multiple regressions predicting support for dependent variables (reintegration) from the independent variable (success rehabilitation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized coefficient (β)</th>
<th>Model Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>0.101***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (df)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.17 (2,359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>0.141***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.71 (2,406)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>0.082**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.85 (2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>0.122***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.32 (2,330)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01; ***p < .001. Significant results (p < .01) are in bold font.
Mediation of participants’ belief about the success of the CJS in rehabilitating offenders.

The point estimate and upper and lower bounds of the 99% confidence interval for the effect of success rehabilitation as a potential mediator is shown in Table 7.21. The standard error for the indirect effect is produced as the standard deviation of the 5,000 bootstrap estimates (Hayes, 2013).

No significant indirect effects were found. Contrary to predictions, participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS in rehabilitating offenders did not mediate the relationship between stability attributions, and support for reintegration.57

Participants’ beliefs about success of the CJS to reintegrate ex-offenders as predictor of support for reintegration

As predicted, success reintegration was a significant predictor of participants’ support for reintegration for: housing personal, housing personal, housing policy, and employment policy (Table 7.22). Contrary to expectations, success rehabilitation did not predict employment personal.

Beta weights were positive for significant models. Thus, stronger beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitee offenders predicted higher support for reintegration. It is noted, however, that adjusted R² for all models are small (.2 – 1% variance explained

57 Mediation analyses revealed a significant indirect effect on the relationship between success rehabilitation and knowledge, and housing personal, employment personal, and employment policy. Mediation analysis revealed a significant indirect effect on the relationship between success rehabilitation and confidence, and housing personal, employment personal, and employment policy.
Table 7.21

Bootstrap estimates of the indirect effects of success rehabilitation as a mediator in multiple regressions predicting support for reintegration variables from stability attributions (X-M-Y)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stability attributions</th>
<th>99%CI</th>
<th>Omnibus Test</th>
<th>99%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>.0071 (.0047)</td>
<td>-.0058, .0193</td>
<td>.0017 (.0012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>.0126 (.0054)</td>
<td>-.0003, .0279</td>
<td>.0030 (.0014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>.0022 (.0050)</td>
<td>-.0109, .0159</td>
<td>.0005 (.0013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>.0076 (.0054)</td>
<td>-.0067, .0219</td>
<td>.0019 (.0014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized coefficient (β)</th>
<th>Model Statistics</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success reintegration</td>
<td></td>
<td>F (df)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Adj R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td><strong>0.10</strong>*</td>
<td>22.53 (2,195)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td><strong>.099</strong>*</td>
<td>21.90 (2,233)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>4.82 (2,188)</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>.050*</td>
<td>5.48 (2,166)</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01; ***p < .001. Significant results (p < .01) are in bold font.
*Mediation of participants’ belief that the CJS is successful in reintegrating ex-offender.*

The point estimate and upper and lower bounds of the 99% confidence interval for the effect of *success reintegration* as a potential mediator is shown in Table 7.23. One indirect effect was significant. The relationship between *stability attributions* and *housing personal* was mediated by *success reintegration*.58

58 Mediation analyses revealed a significant indirect effect on the relationship between success reintegration and confidence, and housing personal.

Mediation analyses revealed a significant indirect effect on the relationship between success reintegration and external/uncontrollable attributions, and housing personal and employment personal.
Table 7.23

Bootstrap estimates of the indirect effects of success reintegration as a mediator in multiple regressions predicting support for reintegration variables from stability attributions (X-M-Y)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stability attributions</th>
<th>Omnibus Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Est. (Se)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>0.0082 (.0037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>0.0064 (.0039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal</td>
<td>-0.0003 (.0034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policy</td>
<td>-0.0022 (.0038)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of findings for Aim Four.**

Contrary to expectations, all except one mediating relationship were found to be non-significant.

One mediation relationship was found to be significant; this is displayed graphically in Figure 7.1. It is noted that although significance in the mediating relationship was reported, the direct relationship between the dependent variable (Y; housing personal) and mediator (M; success reintegration) had small variance explained (1% variance explained). Thus, it is unlikely a non-substantive relationship between the two variables exists.

![Figure 7.1. Graphical summary of indirect effects of the variable success reintegration, and the relationship between instability attributions and housing personal. Arrows signify a significant relationship between variables.](image-url)
Aim Five:

Aim Five undertook to identify whether ex-offender characteristics predict respondent support for reintegration in the two domains, housing and employment, across the abstract and personal levels.

Related hypothesis:

i. Participants would be more supportive of reintegration for an ex-offender who is a first time offender, served their sentence in the community, has completed a rehabilitation program, and has completed a work-related education or training program, than an ex-offender who committed multiple crimes, and completed their entire sentence in prison.

j. Participants will indicate more support for reintegration of an ex-offender who demonstrates non-stereotypical offender characteristics than they will support reintegration of a generic offender. Participants will indicate more support for reintegration of a generic offender than an offender who demonstrates stereotypical characteristics.

Variables and methods.

Items relating to Aim Five are shown in Table 7.24. Of note, ex-offender characteristics were presented separately for each reintegration variable. Coding of the two variables, stereotypical characteristics and non-stereotypical characteristics, was previously discussed in the method chapter. The coding of stereotypical and non-stereotypical ex-offender characteristics is shown in Table 7.25.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex-offender characteristics</th>
<th>Response values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has completed an offence-related rehabilitation program</td>
<td>1 (Disagree strongly) to 7 (Agree strongly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has completed work-related education or training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has served the whole of their sentence in prison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has served a community-based sentence only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been convicted of a single crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been convicted of multiple crimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is motivated not to re-offend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.25

_Coding of variables, ‘stereotypical characteristics’ and ‘non-stereotypical characteristics’._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>Non-stereotypical ex-offender characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would be comfortable living near a person with a criminal record who:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has completed an offence-related rehabilitation program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has completed work-related education or training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has served a community-based sentence only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has been convicted of a single crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is motivated not to re-offend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stereotypical ex-offender characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would be comfortable living near a person with a criminal record who:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has been convicted of multiple crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has served the whole of their sentence in prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy</td>
<td>Non-stereotypical ex-offender characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The government should help a person with a criminal record to find and keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>housing when that person:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has completed an offence-related rehabilitation program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has completed work-related education or training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has served a community-based sentence only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has been convicted of a single crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is motivated not to re-offend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued over page*
Stereotypical ex-offender characteristics

The government should help a person with a criminal record to find and keep housing when that person:

- Has been convicted of multiple crimes
- Has served the whole of their sentence in prison

Non-stereotypical ex-offender characteristics

I would be comfortable working with a person with a criminal record who:

- Has completed an offence-related rehabilitation program
- Has completed work-related education or training
- Has served a community-based sentence only
- Has been convicted of a single crime
- Is motivated not to re-offend

Stereotypical ex-offender characteristics

I would be comfortable working with a person with a criminal record who:

- Has been convicted of multiple crimes
- Has served the whole of their sentence in prison

Continued over page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment policy</th>
<th>Non-stereotypical ex-offender characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The government should help a person with a criminal record to find and keep a job when that person:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Has completed an offence-related rehabilitation program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Has completed work-related education or training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Has served a community-based sentence only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Has been convicted of a single crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is motivated not to re-offend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical ex-offender characteristics</td>
<td>The government should help a person with a criminal record to find and keep a job when that person:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Has been convicted of multiple crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Has served the whole of their sentence in prison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted to address Aim Five\textsuperscript{59}.

ANOVA analyses were performed to explore the difference in participants’ support between *stereotypical characteristics* and *non-stereotypical characteristics* within each of the four reintegration areas. Preliminary tests of homogeneity of variance were violated (Fmax); however both Welch and Brown-Forsythe tests were significant (p< 0.001), indicating that the large sample size may have inflated Type I error.

**Results.**

*Investigation of ex-offender characteristics*

The results of the first set of ANOVA analyses are reported in Table 7.26. The means are also presented visually in Figure 7.2. In these analyses, the goal was to compare the rating of each ex-offender characteristic across the four reintegration areas.

\textsuperscript{59} Repeated-measures ANOVAs were chosen, as the author wished to analysis differences group means, for more than two groups, in a non-independent sample.
Table 7.26

Comparison of degree of community support for reintegration according to ex-offender characteristics (analysis by rows)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Housing personal</th>
<th>Housing policy</th>
<th>Employment personal</th>
<th>Employment policy</th>
<th>F-statistic (df)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed rehabilitation program</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>3.84 (1.59)</td>
<td>4.33 (1.84)</td>
<td>4.20 (1.58)</td>
<td>4.81 (1.77)</td>
<td>292.45 (3,2415)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed work-related education or training</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td>3.84 (1.58)</td>
<td>4.31 (1.82)</td>
<td>4.15 (1.59)</td>
<td>4.79 (1.76)</td>
<td>280.47 (3,2412)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served the whole of their sentence in prison</td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>3.17 (1.64)</td>
<td>3.98 (1.94)</td>
<td>3.44 (1.66)</td>
<td>4.37 (1.87)</td>
<td>368.19 (3,2402)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served the whole of their sentence in the community</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>3.68 (1.67)</td>
<td>4.01a (1.85)</td>
<td>3.96a (1.66)</td>
<td>4.44 (1.82)</td>
<td>182.46 (3,2379)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed a single crime</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>3.81 (1.69)</td>
<td>4.12a (1.86)</td>
<td>4.06 (1.68)</td>
<td>4.61 (1.80)</td>
<td>192.61 (3,2379)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed multiple crimes</td>
<td>2413</td>
<td>2.30 (1.52)</td>
<td>3.35 (2.00)</td>
<td>2.50a (1.58)</td>
<td>3.68 (2.02)</td>
<td>467.94 (3,2410)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is motivated not to re-offend</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td>4.31 (1.78)</td>
<td>4.65a (1.90)</td>
<td>4.63a (1.79)</td>
<td>5.09 (1.81)</td>
<td>185.20 (3,2381)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Multivariate F reported. Means within each row that have been denoted the same subscript were not significantly different at p < .01 (after Bonferroni correction).
Figure 7.2. Mean level of support for reintegration for each ex-offender characteristic.
It can be observed that regardless of the ex-offender characteristic under examination, the same pattern of results was obtained; the highest average support was observed for employment policy, followed by housing policy. Employment personal was the third highest mean rating, while housing personal received the lowest ratings.

There was some overlap for employment personal and housing policy, for the ex-offender characteristics of: having served a community sentence only; committed a single crime; and motivated not to re-offend.

It can also be observed that the support for reintegration differed according to the ex-offender characteristic of interest. To investigate this issue, the second set of repeated measures ANOVA analyses were conducted, but this time the seven ex-offender characteristics were compared. Analyses were repeated within each reintegration option. The results are shown in Table 7.27 and visually in Figure 7.4.

---

60 The means in Tables 7.26 and 7.27 differ slightly due to the different Ns in each comparison.
Table 7.27

Comparison of degree of respondent support for reintegration across ex-offender characteristics (analysis by columns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housing personal</th>
<th>Housing policy</th>
<th>Employment personal</th>
<th>Employment policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2403</td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>2432</td>
<td>2442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed rehabilitation program</td>
<td>3.83, (1.59)</td>
<td>4.32, (1.85)</td>
<td>4.19, (1.59)</td>
<td>4.82, (1.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed work-related education or training</td>
<td>3.83, (1.59)</td>
<td>4.31, (1.83)</td>
<td>4.13, (1.60)</td>
<td>4.80, (1.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served the whole of their sentence in prison</td>
<td>3.16, (1.64)</td>
<td>3.99, (1.94)</td>
<td>3.42, (1.66)</td>
<td>4.37, (1.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served the whole of their sentence in the community</td>
<td>3.67, (1.68)</td>
<td>4.00, (1.86)</td>
<td>3.94, (1.66)</td>
<td>4.46, (1.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed a single crime</td>
<td>3.80, (1.70)</td>
<td>4.13, (1.87)</td>
<td>4.04, (1.68)</td>
<td>4.62, (1.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed multiple crimes</td>
<td>2.31, (1.53)</td>
<td>3.37, (2.00)</td>
<td>2.51, (1.57)</td>
<td>3.70, (2.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is motivated no to re-offend</td>
<td>4.30, (1.79)</td>
<td>4.66, (1.90)</td>
<td>4.61, (1.79)</td>
<td>5.11, (1.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-statistic (df)</td>
<td>581.74 (6,2397)</td>
<td>232.85 (6,2400)</td>
<td>633.42 (6,2426)</td>
<td>275.59 (6,2436)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Multivariate F reported. Means within a column sharing the same subscript are not significantly different at p < .01 (after Bonferroni correction).
In Figure 7.3, the variables along the X axis are the ex-offender characteristics, sorted from highest to lowest means. Regardless of the reintegration option, the same pattern of means was observed. In line with expectations, participants were most supportive of the offender characteristics (in order from highest to lowest): motivated to not re-offend; completed a rehabilitation program; completed work-related education or training; committed a single crime; served a community sentence only; served a prison sentence; and, committed multiple crimes.
Figure 7.3. Mean level of support for reintegration for each ex-offender characteristic, by participants’ support for reintegration.
Within the reintegration options of housing personal, the same mean level of support was obtained for ex-offenders who have completed a rehabilitation program, completed work-related education or training, or committed a single crime. For housing policy, whether the offender completed a rehabilitation program or work-related education or training, the mean level of support did not differ significantly. Similarly, the mean support for having served a community or prison sentence did not differ.

Within the reintegration option, employment personal, all the ratings differed significantly from one another. For employment policy, the same mean support was obtained for having completed a rehabilitation program or work-related education or training.

**Impact of stereotypical and non-stereotypical ex-offender characteristics on support for reintegration.**

The descriptive statistics for the two calculated variables are shown in Table 7.28. Within each of the four reintegration options, the median support for the variable stereotypical characteristics is lower than the median support for non-stereotypical characteristics. These results generally indicate that participants were more supportive of reintegration of ex-prisoners who display characteristics that violate the stereotypical characteristics of an offender, than an ex-offender who endorses stereotypical characteristics.

---

61 In the non-parametric analysis of the offender characteristics within the reintegration option of employment personal, the ranks for having completed a rehabilitation or work related education or training program did not differ. Having committed a single crime did not differ from the rank for work-related education or training or from having served a community sentence only.

62 In the non-parametric analysis of the offender characteristics within the reintegration option of employment policy, the rank for having served a prison sentence or a community sentence did not differ.
Table 7.28

Descriptive statistics for the variables ‘stereotypical characteristics’ and ‘non-stereotypical characteristics’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min, Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing personal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-stereotypical</td>
<td>2417</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical</td>
<td>2453</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-stereotypical</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment personal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-stereotypical</td>
<td>2445</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-stereotypical</td>
<td>2444</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the ANOVA analyses are reported in Table 7.29. The means are also presented visually in Figure 7.5 and 7.6. In these analyses, the goal was to compare the rating of stereotypical characteristics and non-stereotypical characteristics across the four reintegration options.

It can be observed that, regardless of the reintegration option under examination, the same pattern of results was obtained. Consistent with predictions, non-stereotypical characteristics received the highest average support.

Of note, within the housing domain, participants’ were significantly more supportive of the reintegration option, employment personal, for non-stereotypical characteristics, than they were supportive of housing policy for stereotypical characteristics. The same pattern of results was found in the employment domain.
Table 7.29

Comparison of degree of participants’ support for reintegration across stereotypical and non-stereotypical characteristics, according to participants’ support for reintegration (analysis by columns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housing personal</th>
<th>Housing policy</th>
<th>Employment personal</th>
<th>Employment policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td>2.73 (1.44)</td>
<td>3.67 (1.87)</td>
<td>2.96 (1.46)</td>
<td>4.02 (1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-stereotypical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td>3.90 (1.50)</td>
<td>4.29 (1.74)</td>
<td>4.18 (1.50)</td>
<td>4.76 (1.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-statistic (df)</td>
<td>122.90 (2370)</td>
<td>250.62 (2373)</td>
<td>125.15 (2400)</td>
<td>231.44 (2409)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means within a column are significantly different at p < .01 (after Bonferroni correction).
As a further line of inquiry, mean support for the *generic ex-offender* (no ex-offender characteristics provided to participant) was also compared to mean support for *stereotypical characteristics* and *non-stereotypical characteristics*. ANOVA analyses revealed significant difference between mean support for the *generic ex-offender* and *stereotypical characteristics* and *non-stereotypical characteristics* for all reintegration options ($p<.001$) (Table 7.30 and 7.31). Mean support data for the variable *generic ex-offender* are also included in Figures 7.4 and 7.5.
Table 7.30

Comparison of degree of participants’ support for reintegration across generic offender and stereotypical characteristics, according to participants’ support for reintegration (analysis by columns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housing personal</th>
<th>Housing policy</th>
<th>Employment personal</th>
<th>Employment policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic offender</td>
<td>3.31 (1.55)</td>
<td>4.12 (1.87)</td>
<td>3.88 (1.54)</td>
<td>7.74 (1.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical characteristics</td>
<td>2.73 (1.44)</td>
<td>3.67 (1.87)</td>
<td>2.96 (1.46)</td>
<td>4.02 (1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-statistic (df)</td>
<td>221.79 (2349)</td>
<td>428.52 (2376)</td>
<td>244.87 (2346)</td>
<td>364.82 (2335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means within a column are significantly different at p < .01 (after Bonferroni correction).
Table 7.31

Comparison of degree of participants’ support for reintegration across generic offender and non-stereotypical characteristics, according to participants’ support for reintegration (analysis by columns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housing personal</th>
<th>Housing policy</th>
<th>Employment personal</th>
<th>Employment policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic offender</td>
<td>3.31 (1.55)</td>
<td>4.12 (1.87)</td>
<td>3.88 (1.54)</td>
<td>7.74 (1.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-stereotypical characteristics</td>
<td>3.90 (1.50)</td>
<td>4.29 (1.74)</td>
<td>4.18 (1.50)</td>
<td>4.76 (1.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-statistic (df)</td>
<td>325.96 (2292)</td>
<td>599.61 (2334)</td>
<td>351.75 (2320)</td>
<td>610.11 (2291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means within a column are significantly different at p < .01 (after Bonferroni correction).
Figure 7.4. Comparison of mean participants' support for reintegration in the domain of housing, across the policy and personal levels, for the generic offender, and stereotypical characteristics and non-stereotypical characteristics. All means are significantly different from one another (p < .01, Bonferroni adjustment.)
Figure 7.5. Comparison of mean participants’ support for reintegration in the domain of employment, across the policy and personal levels, for the generic offender, and stereotypical characteristics and non-stereotypical characteristics. All means are significantly different from one another (p < .01, Bonferroni adjustment.)
CHAPTER EIGHT: DISCUSSION

Chapter overview

The current chapter discusses the central findings of the analyses conducted in Chapter Seven, and links these to the broad aims of the study as well as the theoretical issues raised in the introductory chapters. The chapter will then explore the strengths and limitations of the study. Finally, the chapter will discuss practical and research implications that arise from the study.

Ex-prisoner reintegration: Revising the Context of the Study

Before discussing the results and implications of the study, a brief review of the issues relating to reintegration raised and discussed in the introductory chapters of this thesis will be provided.

An examination of crime and justice data in Australia and other western jurisdictions revealed a contradictory trend of steady or decreasing crime rates alongside sharp increases in prison populations and correctional-return rates (ABS, 2010a; 2013; Gleb, 2001; Weatherburn et al., 2009). In addition to high rates of re-imprisonment, it is increasingly recognised that prisoners face many challenges in returning to their community.

These two factors have led to increased scrutiny of correctional goals and programming. Six goals of sentencing are commonly cited in Australian legal discourse: retribution, denunciation, general deterrence, specific deterrence, incapacitation, and rehabilitation (Bartholomew, et al., 2012, November). Distinction exists between the five ‘traditional’ goals and rehabilitation, which has emerged as a sentencing objective in the past century.

Contemporary rehabilitation has received considerable empirical support in addressing recidivism, under the principles of effective intervention (Andrews, et al., 1990; Bonta & Andrews, 2007; Ogloff, & Davis, 2004). In an effort to further reduce recidivism, correctional responses have begun to look beyond rehabilitation intervention, to consider those factors post-incarceration and post-
rehabilitation that promote re-offending or conversely, support desistance. It is from this latter approach that theoretical movements, including Ward’s Good Lives Model (GLM; Ward, 2002a, b; Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Stewart, 2003a, 2003c) and Maruna’s (2001) Desistance Theory, have emerged. Together these approaches have come to take a prominent place in corrections, alongside the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model of rehabilitation (Andrews, 1995; Andrews & Bonta, 2010a; Andrews & Dowden, 2005).

It is also within this context that contemporary reintegration has emerged. Reintegration theory has its origins in the criminological theories, including labelling theory and reintegrative shaming (Becker, 1973; Braithwaite, 1989; Lemert, 1948;). Yet, contemporary reintegration is also heavily influenced by rehabilitation and desistance ideology and terminology. Importantly, while ex-prisoner reintegration exists within the same paradigm as rehabilitation and desistance, the former is unique from rehabilitation approaches, including RNR and the GLM, as it considers the broader perspective of the ex-prisoner, specifically the vital role that the community (to which the offender returns) plays in fostering or hindering the reintegration process.

It was argued that contemporary reintegration is limited by the paradigm in which it has emerged. Confusion exists in relation to the definition of reintegration, key stakeholders and players in this process, and the relationship between reintegration, re-entry and rehabilitation.

Contemporary reintegration is limited by: moving definitions, including poorly articulated distinctions between reintegration, re-entry and rehabilitation; the range of professional groups involved with reintegrative efforts; inconsistent operationalization; plurality in foci; and minimal evaluation practices linking reintegration to either desistance from crime or reduced recidivism. These limitations reflect the state of rehabilitation endeavours prior to Martinson’s ‘nothing works’ critique. Critiques must be addressed so that contemporary reintegration can avoid the fate of early rehabilitation.

Toward this broad goal, Chapters Two and Three presented a unified conceptualisation of reintegration. Reintegration was defined as:
“an ongoing psychosocial process whereby opportunities for the offender to construct functional, personally fulfilling, and responsible participation in wider society are sought, presented, and/or obstructed. This dynamic process involves the individual and the community to equal levels. In this bi-directional interaction, the community is ready and able to allow the offender to participate at an equivalent level to other law-abiding citizens, and the offender is subjectively ready and able to participate in society as a law-abiding citizen” (Bartholomew et al., 2011, October).

Additionally, reintegration was conceptualised as consisting of ‘symbolic’ notions of shame, moral inclusion, forfeiture and eligibility, redeemability and forgiveness, as well as risk. These are communicated between the ex-prisoner and community via formal and informal interactions, which commonly occur within key ‘sites’ of reintegration, also known as ‘domains of social inclusion’. A number of domains were identified, including accommodation, employment, education and skill acquisition, and family and social supports. Access to these domains is linked to increased desistance from crime. Conversely, failure to access these domains is linked to recidivism. A central goal of the current thesis is to address these limitations.

Finally, a model of reintegration, the Model of Interactive Reintegration and Desistance (MIReDe), was proposed. Inherent in this model is the relationship between the ex-prisoner and his or her community. Prior research, particularly that contributed by Graffam, Shinkfield and colleagues (Graffam & Shinkfield, 2012; Graffam, et al., 2009; Graffam, et al., 2004), explored the experiences of ex-prisoners within the reintegration process; however, the current study argued that a key deficit in understanding ex-prisoner reintegration was the lack of literature regarding the role of the community (or the general public) in that process.

Drawing from the Community Readiness Model (CRM) (Oetting et al., 1995), it was argued that to reach a level of support for any initiative, the community must reach a threshold of readiness and ability to engage in this initiative. Having
identified the importance of community readiness in the reintegration process, the study set out to investigate this construct.

This was achieved via a survey of the Victorian public’s support for reintegration. A number of questions relating to community support for reintegration were of interest: firstly, the study explored respondents’ support for reintegration alongside other goals of sentencing; secondly, of interest were the conditions that respondents place on their support for reintegration. Literature exploring public support for the goals of sentencing, especially retribution and rehabilitation, has demonstrated that public support for crime and justice initiatives is complex, dynamic, and context specific; it was theorised that the same is true for reintegration.

Thus, the study explored whether support for reintegration differed according to the level of public involvement in reintegrative initiatives. Support for reintegrative policy (the ‘abstract’ level) was compared to respondent preparedness to be personally involved in reintegration (the ‘personal’ level). Respondent characteristics were considered as predictive of support for reintegration, as were a number of ex-offender characteristics.

The study explored public readiness to support reintegration. It was anticipated that in addressing this aim, the study will pave the way for initiatives designed to promote ex-prisoner reintegration within the community.

The following section of the discussion interprets the results of the study and discusses the implications of the findings.

**Summary of findings**

The study investigated a number of hypotheses relating to public support for ex-prisoner reintegration. Key findings, as these relate to these, are provided below. These are considered in greater detail in subsequent sections of the chapter.

As predicted, when asked to rank the goals of sentencing, participants assigned reintegration the lowest priority, followed by rehabilitation. The ‘traditional’ goals of sentencing were assigned the higher levels of priority.
As predicted, participants were more supportive of reintegrative housing and employment policy (the ‘abstract’ level), than personally prepared to live near or work with an ex-offender (the ‘personal’ level). Also as predicted, participants were most supportive of reintegrative employment policy (employment policy), followed by: reintegrative housing policy (housing policy); personal preparedness to work with an ex-offender (employment personal); and, personal preparedness to live near an ex-offender (housing personal).

Consistent with predictions, participants’ self-reported knowledge of the CJS, instrumental and expressive attitudes did predict support for reintegration (housing policy, housing personal, employment policy, and employment personal). 63

Consistent with predictions, participants’ beliefs that offending behaviour is unstable (stability attributions) predicted support for reintegration. Contrary to predictions, participants’ beliefs that crime is caused by internal and controllable factors (internal/controllable attributions) did not predict support for reintegration, however external and uncontrollable factors (external/uncontrollable attributions) did predict support for reintegration. 65

As predicted, participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to rehabilitate offenders (success rehabilitation) did predict support for reintegration. Similarly, as predicted, participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to reintegrate ex-offenders (success reintegration) did predict support for reintegration. 66

63 Unless otherwise stated, ‘support for reintegration’ will refer to participants’ support for reintegration across the four variables; housing personal, housing abstract, employment personal, and employment abstract.

64 Although statistically significant, there was weak variance explained and thus it was noted that prediction models may not be substantive.

65 Although prediction models made a limited substantive contribution to understanding participant characteristics that influence support for reintegration.

66 However variance explained across all regression analyses was weak, indicating limited unique contribution of success rehabilitation and success reintegration on support for reintegration.
Participants’ beliefs about the success of the CJS to reintegrate ex-offenders did mediate the relationship between participants’ stability attributions and support for reintegration, but only in the domain of housing personal.67

As predicted, participants were more supportive of reintegration for an ex-offender with the following characteristics: convicted of single offence; served sentence in the community; completed a rehabilitation program; and completed a work-related education or training program. They were less supportive of an ex-offender with the characteristics: convicted of multiple offences, and, served sentence in prison.

Finally, as predicted, participants indicated more support for reintegration of an ex-offender who demonstrated non-stereotypical offender characteristics than they supported an ex-offender offender who demonstrated stereotypical offender characteristics.

The public support for ex-prisoner reintegration as a goal of sentencing.

A key finding of the study is respondent support for ex-prisoner reintegration as a goal of sentencing. This finding is noteworthy given the literature reviewed in chapter four indicated mixed public responses to sentencing options and public punitiveness (for example, a ‘punitive public’ (Cullen, et al., 1988; Hutton, 2005; Roberts, 1992, 1996; Roberts & Stalans, 1997), versus a lenient public (Roberts & Stalans, 2004; Stalans, 2007). The finding is also important as it supports the

67 Analyses also revealed significant indirect effects of success rehabilitation on: knowledge and housing personal, employment personal and employment policy; and confidence and housing personal, employment personal and employment policy.

Analyses also revealed significant indirect effects of success reintegration on: confidence and housing personal; and external/uncontrollable attributions and housing personal and employment personal.

However, it is noted that direct relationships between the dependent variables (Y; support for reintegration) and mediators (M; success rehabilitation or success reintegration) had small variance explained (1% or less variance explained). Thus, it is unlikely a non-substantive relationship between the two variables (M and Y) existed.
model of reintegration presented in the thesis, which argues that the community plays a substantial role in promoting successful reintegration.

A number of trends emerged from the findings. First, as noted above, reintegration was supported as a goal of sentencing. This was the case despite reintegration being presented alongside the other six goals of sentencing: punishment, general deterrence, specific deterrence, denunciation, incapacitation, and rehabilitation. It appears that the public is willing to support a range of sanctioning options. This finding is consistent with prior research (Cullen et al., 2000; Hutton, 2005; Stalans, 2007).

However, reintegration received the least support of all sentencing goals presented. Rather, participants’ assigned higher priority to punitive goals, including retribution, incapacitation and deterrence. This general pattern of preference for punitive sanctioning options is consistent with prior research (Applegate, et al., 1996; Roberts & Gebotys, 1989). In the current study, rehabilitation, the goal of sentencing most aligned to reintegration, was also endorsed. Yet consistent with expectations rehabilitation received the second lowest priority, favoured after ‘traditional’ sanctioning options.

These findings are consistent with prior theory, which argues that the ‘punitive public’ will reject more lenient sentencing objectives in preference for harsher sentences (Cullen, et al., 1988; Gleb, 2006; Roberts & Gebotys, 1989; Roberts, & Indermaur, 2007). Punitive public responses are frequently attributed to the occurrence of one of two conditions: when the public is provided with narrow sentencing options (punishment versus rehabilitation), or when it is provided with little or no information regarding the positives of alternatives to punishment (Cullen, et al., 2000). In contrast, research has shown that the public is supportive of rehabilitation and restorative options when provided with information about these options, including full descriptions of the sanction and how it can be implemented with offenders (Diamond & Stalans, 1989; Stalans & Diamond, 1990; Roberts, et al., 2003).

The current study presented all sentencing goals identified within Australian legislation (Bartholomew, et al., 2012, November), and reintegration. Each sentencing objective was provided as a descriptive rather than identified by its
goal name. For example, the description to make the community safer was provided rather than ‘incapacitation’. Descriptive were designed to identify what each goal of sentencing seeks to achieve (the rationale of each goal). As such, the study provided conditions conducive to participants considering a range of sentencing options. It is therefore noteworthy that reintegration was supported in addition to punitive sentencing goals (albeit prioritised lower).

On the other hand, it is acknowledged that the descriptive provided only a little amount of information about each sentencing goal. Thus, the study did not further educate the public about reintegration. Thus, the findings reflect individual’s current support levels for rehabilitation and reintegration. Rehabilitation and restorative justice research has shown that public knowledge of these options is low. It is promising then, that reintegration (and rehabilitation) was supported.

It is also acknowledged that respondents’ level of support was impacted by their interpretation of the wording used to describe each goal of sentencing. It is not necessarily the case that the public has a thorough understanding of sentencing objectives in order to recognise each goal of sentencing within the survey item. The wording chosen was intended to increase accessibility of each sentencing objective to respondents. Nevertheless, differences in interpretation should be considered. For example, make community safer may be interpreted as a global goal that encompasses many of the other goals, such as punishment, deter others, deter offender, and rehabilitate offenders. This may account for make community safer receiving the highest priority of all goals.

It is also possible that to help offenders live productive lives (reintegration variable) was interpreted from a rehabilitative perspective, such that this goal and that of rehabilitate offenders were perceived by respondents as linked. This may account for these two goals receiving similar rated priority. The survey did not enquire from respondents their reasoning behind the priority given to each goal. As such, it can only be concluded that the wider public endorses the principles underlying reintegration, namely to help offenders to live productive lives.

Nevertheless, findings indicate that the item measuring rehabilitation (rehabilitation offenders) was assigned a significantly higher priority that that
measuring reintegration (*to help offenders live productive lives*). Findings indicate a natural distinction within the general public between these two objectives. The descriptive attached to the terms ‘rehabilitation’ and ‘reintegration’ within the survey may have supported this distinction. Although, one could argue rehabilitation is the vehicle through which an offender is assisted to live a productive life.

Public perceived distinction between rehabilitation from reintegration is aligned with the definition of reintegration presented in chapter two, and Maruna’s (2006, p. 4) description of reintegration occurring in the community, “when the professionals go home.” Public support for reintegration, a sentencing objective it perceives to involve the community, is positive and promising, regardless of the current strength of this support.

It is also possible that the distinction between rehabilitation and reintegration found in the study reflects differences in public awareness and knowledge about these two correctional objectives. According to the CRM, low community awareness of an issue results in low success rates of initiatives implemented to address the issue (Donnermeyer, et al., 1997; Oetting, et al., 1995). In a similar way low public awareness of reintegration is likely to limit the degree of community support for this correctional objective, compared to rehabilitation.

Prior research indicates that knowledge of and education about sentencing objectives plays an important role of public support for alternatives to punishment (Gainey & Payne, 2003; Jayewardene, Lang, & Gainer, 1977; Lane, 1997; Mirrlees-Black, 2013). While ‘new,’ compared to ‘traditional’ sentencing objectives, research indicates substantial public awareness of offender rehabilitation (Cullen, et al., 1988). Reintegration has re-emerged in correctional rhetoric more recently than rehabilitation. The lack of direction surrounding reintegration as a correctional objective in sentencing authority, correctional policy or programs discussed in Chapter Two, likely reflects similar trends within the wider general public. Consistent with this argument, research indicates that

---
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the public has limited knowledge of crime and justice practice and trends (Doble, 2002; Gainey & Payne, 2003; Hough & Roberts, 1999; Payne, DeMichele, & Okafo, 2009; Roberts & Stalans, 1997). The public’s knowledge in this regard is comparatively lower than key stakeholders within the system, such as the judiciary and correctional workers (Stalans & Lurigio, 1990).

A key argument presented in Chapter Two was that reintegration is confused within corrections with rehabilitation. The origin of this confusion largely results from the re-emergence of reintegration within rehabilitation discourse. So, it is noteworthy that despite correctional language commonly using rehabilitation and reintegration interchangeably, this study found significant differences in support for rehabilitation and reintegration.

Why and how the public distinguishes between reintegration and rehabilitation was not a focus of investigation within the study. The study did not explicitly investigate public perceptions of the relationship, if any, between rehabilitation and reintegration. This signifies an area for future research. It has been determined here that the public is willing to support reintegration. Further research is needed to determine the unique relationship between support for rehabilitation and reintegration.

As such, the study is unable to provide direction as to whether the public perceives these two correctional objectives to be the same, similar or distinct. Despite clearly distinguishing between rehabilitation and reintegration in Chapter Two, and the MIReDe presented in Chapter Three, the study did not adequately investigate whether the community aligns with this distinction. This represents a limitation of the current study, and despite the argument presented in early chapters that reintegration is distinct from reintegration, notably because it involves the community, this was not operationalised within the study survey. Rather, because of the position taken by the thesis, of interest was the public’s nature of support for reintegration, as regardless of whether the public believes reintegration is separate from rehabilitation and therefore whether the public
believes it has a role to play in this process, reintegration does involve the wider community.  

It is also important to note that, regardless of priority rating, the findings indicate the public is willing to support all sentencing options that were provided in the study. Examination of participants’ endorsement of sentencing goals indicates that all goals were given a moderate to high priority. High rated priority of each sentencing goal (median rating ranged from 1 to 3 out of a possible 7) indicates that the public is willing to assign high support for all of the options given.

Participants, it seems, did not want to reject any option. Nor did they want to assign a low priority to any option; given seven possible sentencing goals, they endorsed them all. It was not unexpected that traditional retributive goals were highly prioritised, however it was unexpected that reintegration also received a high priority. The findings beg the question, why does the public endorse reintegration while prioritizing more punitive options?

Cullen et al. (2000, p. 9) theorise that the public is “more rational than irrational in the policy agenda it embraces.” The public, in recognising the needs of offenders to turn toward pro-social lives, is willing to at least consider this as a goal of sentencing. Support may be less about the unique value of reintegration per say, as support for any option given as a way to respond to offending behaviour. That is, the public is happy to support all possible CJS initiatives to respond to offending. Goals perceived to be effective may be given higher priority, but any correctional initiative is worthy of support. Findings relating to Aim Four provide additional insight into this trend; support for reintegration increased alongside beliefs about whether the CJS is successful in reintegrating ex-prisoners.

Regardless of its motivations for supporting reintegration, it is positive that the public does support this correctional objective. Furthermore, it supports reintegration even without prior knowledge of this sentencing objective. Chapter Three presented the Community Readiness Model (CRM; Edwards, et al., 2000;  

69 Nevertheless, it is possible the general public do not clearly distinguish between reintegration and rehabilitation as is argued under the MIReDe.
Oetting, et al., 1995) as a framework to assist understanding of the public’s level of readiness to support reintegration. Drawing from the CRM, these preliminary findings indicate the public is at least ready to support reintegration, even if it does not have the necessary resources or drive to put reintegrative initiatives into practice.

It would be beneficial for future research to further explore how the public perceives the relationship between rehabilitation and reintegration. Furthermore, it is of interest to directly explore whether the public believes it has a role in reintegration. Future research may wish to directly ask the public to describe the reintegration process, and to identify key stakeholders in this process. It is of interest whether the public identifies itself, and/or correctional professionals as stakeholders alongside ex-prisoners. If both were identified, the degree to which the community versus professionals is believed to be involved (and should be involved, or take responsibility for reintegration) would be a worthwhile line of investigation. The use of focus groups may be a beneficial study design to explore these research questions.

Regardless of the underlying motivations for respondents’ support for the sentencing objectives rehabilitate offenders and help offenders live productive lives or indeed, how they interpreted these descriptions, the current findings indicate a tendency for respondents to support reintegration. Regardless of whether the public would term this ‘reintegration’ as the correctional system does, or whether it believes the community to which an ex-prisoner returns is involved in this process, the public supports reintegration. It may be theorised that, in terms of support for reintegration and drawing from the CRM, the Victorian public sits at a point on the readiness scale between the stages of ‘vague awareness’ and ‘preparation’.

**Public support for ex-prisoner reintegration is conditional.**

Findings relating to Aims Two to Five reveal a trend of public support for reintegration that is conditional. Conditions include: the level of personal involvement required to support reintegration (the ‘policy’ versus ‘personal’
levels); public beliefs about the stability of offending; and, ex-offender characteristics. Each of these condition are considered below.

**Conditional support: differences between ‘policy’ and personal’ involvement in reintegration.**

Findings from Aim Two indicated significantly greater public support for ex-prisoner reintegration in the domain of housing than employment. Additionally, participants were more supportive of reintegrative policy (the ‘abstract’ level) than they were personally prepared to live near or work with an ex-offender (the ‘personal’ level). These findings indicate that public support for reintegration is not uniform but, rather, is conditional depending on the context in which reintegration is to take place.

Findings may be interpreted by drawing from theories including Not in My Backyard (NIMBY; Lober, 1995; Martin & Myers, 2005; Sieh, 1989), forfeiture, and eligibility. First, in line with NIMBY theory, the public is less supportive of reintegration at the personal level. NIMBY research suggests that the public is concerned with the economic outcomes of justice initiatives occurring within its neighbourhood. Pol et al., (2006) found perceived loss of quality of life, status, and economic value of property were important contributors to community rejection of social and environmental facilities within the community. In line with this research, current findings suggest the public recognises the need for ex-prisoner reintegration, but is less supportive of sharing community or neighbourhood resources with an ex-offender. The public will support policy for this community initiative, but it is less supportive of the initiative occurring in its own neighbourhood.

Low support for reintegration at the personal level may also be reflective of risk aversion. Personal interaction with ex-offenders may be perceived to increase risk of members of the public being victims of re-offending. For example, neighbours of an ex-offender may have concerns that they will be affected by increased criminal activity in the neighbourhood; such as having their house robbed by the
Participants were more supportive of ex-prisoner reintegration in the domain of employment. Employment represents a social sphere that overlaps with the personal lives of community members to a lesser degree than that of housing. One spends a great deal of one’s life at work; however, at work, one is protected by the structure of the work environment, workplace laws and policies, and expectations in terms of behaviour. Employees are encouraged not to meld their professional and personal lives; one is expected to act professionally at work. These formal and information structures act as buffers against personal risk of victimization at work. Furthermore, employees hold expectations that employers will protect them at work. Prior research demonstrates that employers feel this pressure when considering hiring people with a criminal record (Glynn, 1988; Holzer et al., 2002a, 2002c; Holzer, et al., 2003a, 2003c; Naylor, 2011).

Additionally, at work, there is the potential for more vigilance; desk draws can be locked, alarm systems are in place, and CCTV cameras may be in use.

In contrast, the home is symbolic of the personal sphere. There is less structure at home; people are presumed to be free to act as they wish behind closed doors. This carries with it a sense of vulnerability. People are not protected by formal rules and regulations in the home, not unless outside authority enters into this sphere. It is within the home that one goes to sleep at night; it is within the home that our most valuable possessions, our family members and/or pets reside. The public may be less supportive of reintegration in the housing domain because this represents greater risk, should individuals be victimized. Due to increased vulnerability, crime victimization in the home may be perceived to hold greater negative impacts than victimization in the work place.

Alternatively, the findings may reflect community beliefs about forfeiture and eligibility. The public may believe that there is more potential for allocation of resources within the domain of employment than that of housing. The public may be willing to let ex-prisoners have assistance to find jobs because it may think that ex-prisoners are doing the jobs that others in the community do not want to do. Conversely, everyone requires housing. However, it is impossible to say exactly
how much these symbolic notations impact on support for ex-prisoner reintegration without specifically investigating these.

A key distinction made within the study, to investigate the level of personal involvement the public would be willing to support toward reintegration, was between personal and abstract. This distinction, while useful to gain preliminary insights into the nature of public support for reintegration, represents a limiting conceptualisation of the true distinction between personal involvement and abstract support. That is, endorsing a high level of comfort in living next door to an ex-offender is not the same as actually living next door to an ex-offender. Intuitively, it might be argued that comfort would decrease where an individual is actually asked to live next door to an ex-offender. However, previous research suggests the opposite may occur (Cãstaneto & Willemsen, 2006; Daruwalla & Darcy, 2005; Fichten, Schipper, & Cutler, 2005). This research indicates that individuals typically respond negatively to target groups by endorsing negative stereotypes via survey designs, however display positive interactions with members of the same target group in person. Additionally, with further interactions with the target group individuals tend to endorse more positive attitudes towards members of this target group.

Research presented in Chapter Four relating to the typicality effect and decreases in avoidance of out-groups following positive socialisation with members of this out-group suggests that with experience, stereotypes are challenged and altered (Daruwalla & Darcy, 2005; Fichten, et al., 2005; Linville & Fischer, 1993). Out-group members become personalised. In some instances the negative reaction to the entire out-group may be altered, in others, the individual member of the out-group is re-classified (for example, “ex-offenders remain dangerous, but I don’t object to my neighbour John Smith who is an ex-offender, because I know he is a decent man/changed his ways”). However, this body of research has focused on attitudes towards people with a disability, who are likely perceived differently than ex-offenders.

One study has explored reported versus actual behaviour towards ex-offenders. Pager and Quillian (2005) found stronger discrimination toward ex-offender populations in person compared to attitudes endorsed in a survey. The researchers
compared self-reported versus actual hiring behaviours of employers, two target
groups were included; African American and ex-offenders (drug offence). The
study found employers were more likely to report that they would hire a
hypothetical ex-offender, than they did actually provide interview call-backs for
this population (60% compared to 17% (white) and 5% (black), respectively). It is
possible then that the public will be more opposed to actual acts of reintegration
in its neighbourhood or social environment than reported herein. In any case, the
research indicates the there is a difference between reported and actual behaviour,
and as such, this represents a beneficial line of inquiry for future research.

Current findings indicate that the public is more ambivalent toward personal
involvement with ex-offenders and more supportive of abstract reintegration.
Future research may wish to further explore this distinction in public support.
Insight may be gained from implementing a study design similar to that of Pager
and Quillian (2005). Respondents’ level of support endorsed within a survey, and
subsequently measure support following real life engagement with an ex-prisoner
may be measured and compared. Such a design carries with it complications.
Targeting employees working within organisations providing transitional support
for ex-prisoners may be beneficial. For example, potential respondents could be
surveyed as part of their induction to the organisation, then invited to participate
in a follow-up study 6- and 12-months post working with ex-prisoners.

While it would be insightful to explore the impact of direct engagement with ex-
prisoners on the level of community readiness to engage with ex-prisoner
reintegration, it remains the case that many members of the public have little, if
any, ongoing engagement with offenders. Furthermore, the reintegration process
needs to be supported prior to the development of personal relationships with
offenders, if the latter is ever to occur. That is to say, ongoing or regular
interpersonal engagement with ex-prisoners is likely to occur after the public
supports reintegration in its neighbourhood (or social settings). As such, current
findings offer relevant and beneficial insights into the current level of public
support for reintegration. Specifically, that the public is ambivalent or at best
slightly supportive of reintegration at both the personal or abstract level, and
much work is needed to increase current levels of readiness. In line with this
point, understanding what underlying factors influence support is of interest, and indeed was explored in the study.

**Conditional support: beliefs about whether offending behaviour is stable or unstable.**

A second finding related to the relationship between public beliefs about whether offending is caused by stable or unstable factors (*stability attributions*) and support for reintegration. This finding emerged from the four hierarchical multiple regression analyses run in Aim Three. The regressions explored which predictor variables contributed to participant support for ex-prisoner reintegration via the support for reintegration variables, *housing personal, housing policy, employment personal* and *employment policy*. Predictor variables included demographic variables (gender, age, education level and weekly income), *knowledge*, instrumental attitudes (*fear of crime* and *beliefs crime has increased*), expressive attitudes (*confidence*), causation attributions (*internal/controllable* and *external/uncontrollable*) and *stability attributions*. The multiple regression analyses were based on similar regression analyses conducted by Maruna and King (2004).

All four hierarchical models were statistically significant. The amount of variance explained is roughly comparable to that reported in Maruna and King’s (2004) study (although the variables included differ). As such, some comparisons between the two studies is applicable. However, it was noted in the results section that the variance explained by the four regression analyses was small. As the current study represents the first investigation into public attitudes toward ex-prisoner reintegration it is relevant to report the findings. However, it is noted that the unique contribution of each predictor variable was small, and it is possible (perhaps even probably) that other variables not investigated herein provide a better prediction of public support for ex-prisoner reintegration. This latter point is to a degree logical, as this thesis drew from studies that have investigated public options about sanctioning options and punitive attitudes (for example, Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997; Maruna & King, 2004, Sims, 2003), both of which relate to how offenders should be punished for their wrong-doing. In contrast, ex-
prisoner reintegration relates to how offenders should be returned to community post punishment; different factors will likely emerge as influential given this distinction. The discussion of findings presented below is offered cautiously, and with the acknowledgement that future research should further explore factors that predict community support for reintegration.

In comparison to the other factors investigated (demographics, knowledge, instrumental attitudes, expressive attitudes, locus of causality and controllability attributions), stability attributions were the strongest predictor of support for reintegration. The belief that crime is caused by unstable factors is theoretically linked to Maruna and King’s (2004) factor, ‘belief in redeemability.’ In their study, Maruna and King (2004) found belief in redeemability was a significant and unique predictor of respondents’ pro-community sanctioning attitudes. Carroll (1978a, 1978b, Carroll, Galegher et al., 1982) similarly found the dimension of stability was the strongest predictor of parole board recommendations, with increased belief in stable crime causal beliefs resulting in decreased recommendations of offenders for parole. This was consistent with research by Maruna and King (2004) and Carroll (1978a; 1978b; Carroll, Wiener et al., 1982) regarding participants’ beliefs.

Further, supporting the unique contribution of belief in redeemability, addition of this variable to the multiple regression analyses resulted in reduced strength and significance of other variables, including instrumental and expressive attitudes, and crime salience (specifically internal/external causal attributions) in the current study. Together, these findings indicate that when considering readiness to engage in ex-prisoner reintegration, individuals consider the ability of an ex-offenders to change his or her offending behaviour as most important. If offenders are able to change their behaviour, it follows that they can desist from crime and engage in pro-social behaviours.

These trends in the data are promising, as they suggest that the community to which an ex-prisoner returns is interested in reintegration when it believes that there may be benefit in this initiative; that is, it is more supportive of reintegration when the ex-prisoner can be redeemed. This conditional support further supports the broader trends in the findings that the public is willing to support.
reintegration; however, this is conditional on whether the community believes that it is likely to work, and if it does not feel the costs (risk, eligibility, NIMBY) outweigh the benefits of this initiative.

An alternative interpretation of the findings relating to stability attributions is possible. It is possible that the variable measuring participants’ belief that crime is caused by unstable factors actually measured participants’ beliefs in the effectiveness of rehabilitation. In line with this argument, participants’ beliefs about whether the CJS is successful in rehabilitating offenders was found to have a weak but significant association with support for reintegration. Public support for the return of ex-prisoners to community may depend on whether it believes offending behaviour can be targeted and changed via rehabilitation. Regardless of participants’ interpretation of the stability attributions variable, the findings indicate that the ability for an offender to change their behaviour is important when considering whether to endorse inclusion of an ex-offender into community. Support for reintegration is conditional, whether it depends on ex-offenders changing him or herself, or on the CJS being able to change offenders. Future research may wish to further explore the relative contribution of each of these beliefs on public support for reintegration.

The relationships between locus of stability and the other variables included in the hierarchal multiple regression analyses is also noteworthy. In the final model (model 6) of each analysis a number of factors remained statistically significant predictors, despite the addition of stability attributions. Conditional support, therefore, extends beyond just public beliefs about whether an offender can change. Nevertheless, beliefs about the ability for an offender to change was the greatest unique contributor to support for reintegration. The contribution of each variable to support for ex-prisoner reintegration is considered below.70

70 It is again noted that the variance explained by all four hierarchal regression models was small. Findings discussed are made with caution, and should be further explored by future research.
Demographic variables were included in the first model as control variables. It is notable that a number of demographic variables remained statistically significant after the addition of subsequent variables (knowledge, instrumental and expressive attitudes, crime causal attributions). No one demographic variable remained a statistically significant predictor across all reintegration options (housing personal, housing policy, employment personal, and employment policy). A number of demographic variables did however emerge as statistically significant across levels of involvement. Gender was a significant predictor at the personal level, while education level was a significant predictor at the policy level. These results indicate that being a male or female does not impact support for reintegration policy, however females are less likely to support reintegration at a personal level. The impact of involvement is possibly related to increased fear in female respondents about personal interactions with ex-offenders (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). In contrast, willingness to be personally involved in reintegration occurred irrespective of education level, but those with a higher attainment of education endorsed greater support for reintegration policy, potentially due to an increased appreciation for implications of reintegration for offenders and society. This is in line with prior research that has indicated that increase education is linked with openness to new information and less punitive attitudes (Lock, 1999). A lack of impact of education on support for personal involvement in reintegration (housing personal or employment personal) may indicate that an openness to consider the needs of ex-offenders is suppressed by the NIMBY response, such that individuals are more willing to support an initiative they perceive as important on an abstract level, than they are willing to have this initiative in their own neighborhood (Brown, 1999; Courtright, et al., 2006; Courtright, et al., 2009).

A further findings relating to demographic variables is notable. Several demographic variables initially emerged as statistically significant predictors, however these were suppressed when subsequent in subsequent models. These findings are positive, as they indicate the possibility for public attitudes to be changed. Demographic attitudes are generally considered static and therefore
difficult to target for change. In contrast, public beliefs and attitudes can be addressed via intervention.

Education level was a significant predictor for personal involvement in the housing and employment domains initially, but was suppressed after the addition of expressive attitudes (for housing) and instrumental (for employment). When it comes to preparedness to be personally involved one’s level of education is not as influential in predicting support for reintegration as other factors including an individual’s perceptions of threat to self and others and social bonds.

In the domain of employment, income level initially emerged as a statistically significant predictor, but was subsequently suppressed by the variables knowledge (personal) and instrumentals attitudes (policy). These findings indicate that income level is less important in predicting support for employment reintegration, than an individual knowledge of the CJS and perceptions of threat to self and others.

The second model in each hierarchical regression investigated the contribution of participant’s knowledge of the CJS. Knowledge was found to be a statistically significant predictor at the personal involvement level (across both housing and employment domains), but not at the policy levels. These results indicate that an individual’s beliefs about their knowledge of the CJS is influential on their preparedness to be personally involved in reintegration, with greater reported knowledge predicting increased support for reintegration. The impact of knowledge remained significant after the addition of all other potential predictors. It might be argued that an individual’s beliefs about his or her knowledge as to how offenders are punished and rehabilitated impacts his or her willingness to be involved in reintegration. This findings is particularly noteworthy as the CRM presented in Chapter Three identified that increased knowledge of the initiative, in this case reintegration, results in increased community support for the initiative. Current findings appear to support the role of knowledge in support for reintegration. Interesting this finding occurred at the personal involvement level only, suggesting knowledge impacts on an individual’s active involvement rather than their abstract support. The finding may also point to knowledge as a variable that neutralises the impact of NIMBY responses to support for reintegration.
Of interest to the study was the influence of instrumental and expressive attitudes on support for reintegration. Previous research has indicated that both expressive and instrumental attitudes are influential on public sanctioning and punitive attitudes, with expressive attitudes being a stronger predictor (Maruna & King, 2004; Tyler & Boechmann, 1997; Vollum, et al., 2009). Both instrumental and expressive attitudes were found to be statistically significant in two of the four regression analyses; both those relating to housing (housing personal and housing policy). Conversely, for the two analyses relating to employment (employment personal and employment policy), only instrumental attitudes were statistically significant predictors. Differences between past research and the current study may be a result in differences in the operationalization of the instrumental and expressive variables. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that results differed between domains. The findings indicate that both concerns about perceived threat to the individual and their community, and concerns about moral order and social bonds within one’s community impact on support for reintegration in the domain of housing. In contrast, only concern about perceived threat to the individual and community influence support in the domain of employment. The findings also indicate that the contribution of instrumental and expressive variables relates to the sites where reintegration may occur (domains) rather than the level of involvement in reintegration required (personal or policy support). Concern about social bonds and moral order may be influential at home, as home represents as a place of greater social connection; an anchor to one’s community, friends and family. Interactions at home are informal and determined by social convention and bonds. Conversely, workplaces are governed by policies and laws dictating appropriate behaviour. This may explain differences across domains. On the other hand, an individual can be a victim of crime at home or at their workplace, thus it would follow that instrumental attitudes would be influential across both these domains.

Of note, participant beliefs that crime has increased (beliefs crime has increased) was the second greatest significant unique contributor to the regression analyses across all reintegration conditions, after stability attributions. This result supports prior research, indicating that instrumental attitudes predict public support for
crime and punishment initiatives (Cullen et al., 1985; Snell, 2001; Stinchcombe, Adams, Heimer, Schepple, Smith, & Taylor, 1980). The results indicate that an individual’s concern about crime in his or her community or society (the question specified ‘Victoria’) influences his or her willingness to support reintegration, such that increased concern about crime predicted lower support for reintegration. Efforts to support reintegration should consider the perceptions of crime rates within a community targeted for reintegration. Future research may wish to explore whether individual’s beliefs about community resources to respond to crime interacts with the relationship reported herein.

The contribution of locus of stability causal attributions was discussed above. It is noteworthy that the other two causal dimensions explored, locus of causality and controllability did not add statistically significant variance beyond that contributed by the other variables in the models. This is counter to Maruna and King’s (2004) findings, which reported that the causal attribution ‘crime is a choice’ contributed statistically significant variance to the authors’ model beyond instrumental and expressive attitudes. It is very likely differences in results relate to the coding of the internal/uncontrollable and external/controllable variables in the current study. Maruna and King (2004) inquired specifically about the dimension of controllability (‘is crime a choice?’). In contrast, the current study asked an open-ended question about crime causation, resulting in a broader range of responses. A limitation of this approach was the emergence of considerable overlap between causation dimensions (e.g. locus of causation and controllability). External/uncontrollable attributions were statistically significant predictors in two regression analysis: employment personal and employment policy. However, significance disappeared after inclusion of the stability attributions predictor. Thus, whether an offender can change remains more important than why they initially offended.

Overall, the findings indicate that individual’s beliefs about why offenders commit crime are not influential on whether they are willing to support return of offenders to the community. Considered in light of the theory presented in Chapter Two, it would appear that the reasons behind an offender being labelled as such and excluded from community has little impact on their ability to be
included and return to ‘community’ post punishment; in fact the ability for an offender to change appears to be most influential.

*Stability attributions* was added to the final model of each regression. The unique contribution of this predictor has already been considered above. However, it is notable that for the two personal reintegration options (*housing personal* and *employment personal*), *stability attributions* suppressed the contribution of expressive attitudes to the regression. These findings indicate that at a personal involvement level, beliefs about an offender’s ability to be changed (via rehabilitation) is more important than concerns about moral order and social bonds. Intuitively these findings make sense; an individual’s concerns about the impact of criminal behaviour on the connectedness and moral order of their community can be offset if he or she believe that the individual who caused this breach initially can change their behaviour (and presumably will not cause a breach in social order in the future as a result of this change).

The hierarchal multiple regression analyses provide some insight into the impact of the public characteristics (demographics), as well as public attitudes and beliefs about knowledge of the CJS, threat of crime in the community, moral order and social cohesion, why offenders commit crime and whether offenders can change, on support for reintegration. This thesis argues that the results indicate a conditional public; willingness to support reintegration depends on a number of factors, with the most influential factor being whether it believes an offender can change. As such, public education about the role of reintegration, particularly reintegration as supporting ex-prisoner desistance from crime, may be a fruitful undertaking. Nonetheless, the results are preliminary, and conclusions emerging from the data are interpreted with caution due to weak variance explained across all regression analyses.

**Conditional support: ex-offender characteristics**

The concluding analyses of the study explored the influence of ex-offender characteristics on public support for reintegration; in particular, the impact of non-stereotypical ex-offender characteristics were investigated. Similar to
previous findings, the results indicated that reintegration support is conditional on specific ex-offender characteristics.

One trend from the data is that there is public support for ex-offenders whose characteristics reflect an ability to desist from crime. Across all reintegration options (*housing policy, housing personal, employment policy* and *employment personal*), participants were more supportive of ex-offenders who had completed an offence-specific rehabilitation program, completed a work-related education or training program, and were motivated not to re-offend. Further, more support was given to ex-offenders convicted of a single crime, and those who had served their sentence in the community; these are both conditions that portray an offender who has retained ties with the community. In contrast, those convicted of multiple crimes, and those who had served prison sentences were not supported for reintegration. This findings is consistent with research by Roberts and Stalans (2004) that has reported the public is less supportive of restorative sanctions for serious and violent offences.

The study investigated the impact of stereotyping in determining support for reintegration. This line of investigation is drawn from self-categorisation theory, which holds that individuals categorise their world as a means of quickly and efficiently making sense of their environment. It was theorised that the public draws from misinformed beliefs of ‘typical’ offenders (i.e. stereotypes) when asked general questions about their support for reintegration (Gleb, 2006; Hutton 2005; Zaller, 1992). Previous research indicates that the public tends to think about violent and repeat offenders when responding to general questions about offender sentencing, punishment and restorative sanctioning (Doob & Roberts; Doob & Sprott, 1996; Gleb, 2006; Hardcastle, 2006; Stalans, 1993; Stalans & Diamond, 1990). Drawing from this research, it was theorised that public attitudes towards crime and justice initiatives, including support for ex-prisoner reintegration, are impacted by stereotypical beliefs about an ex-offender. Additionally, research indicates that wrongdoers who express remorse, apologise, and make attempts to amend for their behaviour are perceived as more positive than those that do not (Darby & Schlenker, 1989; Gold & Weiner, 2000; Kirby & Johnson, 2005; Stalans, 2007).
Findings were consistent with the self-categorisation theory. Participants were significantly more supportive of non-stereotypical offender characteristics than those of the generic ex-offender. Furthermore, participants were significantly less supportive of the stereotypical than the generic ex-offender.

The most interesting results come to light when comparison is made between the stereotypical and non-stereotypical groups regarding support for reintegration at the policy and personal levels. Participants indicated significantly greater support for living near a non-stereotypical ex-offender than support for reintegrative housing policy for a typical ex-offender. Similar patterns were observed in the employment domain. These findings indicate that the characteristics of an ex-offender are very influential when the public makes decisions about its level of support for reintegration. Indeed, the impact of non-stereotypical ex-offender characteristics was strong enough to counteract NIMBY responses from the public.

These findings lend some preliminary support for the theory presented in Chapter Four – specifically, that the public may respond to questions regarding reintegration of ex-prisoners with a prototypical offender in mind (Henderson-King & Nisbett, 1996). The prototypical offender evokes group-based responses, including negative bias towards the prototypical offender, and simultaneous strengthening of ties with the in-group of law-abiding citizens (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; 1986). However, it is acknowledged that the study did not directly explore the typicality effect, and thus, further research is required.71 Specifically, future research may wish to pose the same questions regarding public support for ex-prisoner reintegration, then enquire as to the type of ex-prisoner respondents had imagined when answering the question. It would also be worthwhile exploring whether support for reintegration differed between respondents who had previous experience with ex-prisoners and those who did not, and whether this relationship mirrored the findings of the current study. That is, whether direct interactions with ex-prisoners impacted the typicality effect in a similar way as simply telling

71 The interested reader may consult Stalans and Diamond (1990) for an example of a study that examined the typicality effect on public support for restorative sanctioning.
respondents that an ex-prisoner holds non-stereotypical characteristics. Of course, such exploration depends on the characteristics of the ex-prisoner the respondents have engaged with, however it would be possible to enquire about this (was the ex-prisoner stereotypical or non-stereotypical in their characteristics), and group respondents according to these characteristics (actual ex-prisoner was stereotypical versus non-stereotypical) for comparison. Richer data will be collected from such a study design, particularly if qualitative data were collected. As current data suggests ex-prisoner characters do play a role in influencing public support for reintegration, this represents a valid area for future research.

Having discussed the study findings, the next section addresses the strengths and limitations of the study.

**Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

The current study represents the first large-scale investigatory research into public attitudes towards the reintegration of ex-prisoners. This represents a major step forward in current psycho-legal thinking in the field of ex-prisoner reintegration. The introductory chapters of the current thesis contextualised the study within contemporary rehabilitation discourse and desistance ideology, while noting the limitation in current conceptualisation, terminology and definitions regarding reintegration. In the first instance, the thesis undertook to establish a working definition of reintegration, and to build from this a model (the MIRede); the latter provided a conceptualisation of reintegration (and desistance), allowing for research to systematically investigate the reintegration process. In particular, the current study undertook to investigate an area hitherto poorly recognised in the literature; the community. This was achieved via investigation of attitudes toward reintegration of a sample of respondents from the Victorian public. In doing so, the study has identified areas where the public is seen to support reintegration, as well as identified a number of factors, including stability crime causal attributions and ex-offender characteristics, which influence or interact with public support for reintegration. Factors that do not appear to influence public support for
reintegration were also identified, including instrumental and expressive attitudes, and locus of causality and controllability crime causal attributions.

At the same time, there are a number of limitations associated with the study. These will be outlined and discussed in the following paragraphs. Limitations can roughly be divided into the following areas: limitations related to survey development and participant identification; limitations related to the sample distribution and associated characteristics; and, limitations in statistical analyses.

With regard to limitations in survey development, it is observed that the use of a predominantly quantitative survey to collect research data has been criticised in the literature (Gleb, 2006). Gleb argues that survey-based designs are unable to fully capture the dynamic, complex and nuanced nature of individuals’ attitudes towards a target object. Attempts, then, to measure a latent variable (attitudes) using a quantitative study design necessarily result in conceptual limitations regarding the degree to which the questions included in the study adequately and fully tapped into this latent construct, and thus whether true respondent attitudes are reflected in the data. Given the above-mentioned limitations in the conceptualisation of reintegration, and by extension, limitations in the conceptualisation of public attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration, a qualitative research design may have been more appropriate. Such a design, which utilises a constructivist perspective, allowing for themes, meanings, participatory experiences and perspectives, and for nuances within the data to drive theory construction and phenomena conceptualisation, may have been more appropriate for the current study (Creswell, 2003; Neuman, 2000).

There are, however, a number of positives associated with the study design chosen. The quantitative design is useful for dissemination to a large number of potential participants, and its relative ease in responding (circling a response) reduces the time and resources needed for participants to complete the survey, possibly increasing response rate. Quantitative design allows for precise, numerical data collection, and is relatively independent of researcher influence with regard to interpretation. It also allows for the generalisation of research findings to the wider population (Babbie, 1990).
The ‘best case scenario’ for the current study would have been a quantitative survey design, coupled with follow-up focus groups or semi-structured interviews to further explore themes and patterns that emerged from the data. As this approach was not utilised, the dynamic and complex nature of public attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration has not been fully captured in the current study. The current study has, however, been influential in establishing a starting point to understanding community attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration, from which future research can build. Future research may wish to build on the current study and research community support for reintegration taking a more in depth approach, such as focus groups. Inclusion of respondents that represent members of the ‘community’ into which ex-prisoners return will also support increased understanding of the role the community (as conceptualised in Chapter Two) in supporting reintegration and desistance from crime.

Additionally, the survey design utilised for the current study was transparent, such that respondents would have easily recognised the areas of interest of the researchers. The design allows for the impacts of social desirability bias in responding. Social desirability bias refers to the tendency of individuals to respond to self-report questionnaires in an inaccurate way; that is, they either attempt to portray themselves in a positive light, or to respond in the way that they believe the researchers desire them to respond (Fisher, 1993). This bias is theorised to occur particularly in relation to socially sensitive topics, of which ex-prisoner reintegration may be included. Social desirability bias represents a valid and concerning study limitation, as it can affect the validity of the experimental design and findings (Nederhof, 1985).

Despite the possible impacts of social desirability bias, the survey design was chosen for three reasons. First, given that the study represented the first Victorian (and indeed Western jurisdiction) study into public attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration, the focus was primarily exploratory driven, so as to better develop a conceptualisation of the reintegration process. As such, the decision was made by the researchers to develop a survey which focused on identifying a range of respondent attitudes toward reintegration, rather than on validating a known theory of reintegration. Further, as reintegration is a relatively innovative (or
refreshed) correctional objective, it was theorised that the public would know little of this sentencing objective. Deficits in respondents’ knowledge of ex-prisoner reintegration undoubtedly reduce the degree to which responses are tainted by socially appropriate responding. Finally, it was hoped that the anonymity of the survey would allow for honest responding.

A final limitation of the survey design relates to the length of the questionnaire. In total, the questionnaire contained twelve pages, including a number of repetitive questions, in order to tap into the two domains of housing and employment and the two levels of public involvement – personal and government policy. Lengthy questionnaires can result in reduced quality of data collected (Berdie, 1989). This is a result of high non-response, item non-response, and early break-off rates. Additionally, the length of the questionnaire can result in respondent fatigue, boredom and/or frustration, which negatively impacts the response style of the participant. In contrast to their shorter counterparts, longer questionnaires have lower response rates (Adams & Gale, 1982; Bean & Roszkowski, 1995; Dillman, Sinclair, & Clark, 1993).

Additionally, the questionnaire was paper copy mailed to potential participants, which may have increased effort required on the side of respondents to complete the questionnaire and return it to the researchers. The use of an online-based questionnaire would have eliminated the second point, although this would have presented different challenges in relation to participant identification.

Although the survey was long, and therefore time consuming, the range of questions asked was beneficial in achieving the broader aims of study; specifically, to explore the nature of community support for reintegration. As an alternative, each participant could have been provided with only one of the four reintegration domains/levels – that is, live near, government housing, work with, government employment – resulting in a split-questionnaire design. While this alternative presents a possible reduction in validity, this design approach also reduces the sample size considerably. It would also reduce the depth of the study by limiting intra-individual analysis that compares an individual’s response across all domains and levels, thus reducing the identification of patterns within the data.
The second main area of limitations relates to the sample distribution and associated characteristics. As noted in Chapter Six, the study data contained a large number of missing data. This limitation may be the result of the length of the survey, discussed above. A total of 90 questionnaires were returned to the researchers, containing less that 20-percent of completed responses – that is, less than 10 of the total 47 questions had been answered, excluding qualitative questions. Following data being entered into SPSS, a descriptive analysis revealed three variables with over five- but below 10-percent missing data. Although analysis revealed that missing data was ‘missing at random’, interpretation of the results should be carried out with caution. This is due to the potential for missing data to have been deleted in analysis (case-wise deletion was utilised), which in the true sample may have represented valid responses by participants – that is, their refusal to answer certain questions because of their particular beliefs or attitudes towards ex-prisoner reintegration.

A further limitation relates to the coding of the qualitative question, “What do you think are the major causes of crime in our community.” Unlike the quantitative questions, this question was coded according to themes and categories that the researchers identified as coming from the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Qualitative coding, by its nature, is subject to researcher and coder influence and biases, which can reduce the credibility of the data. In an attempt to limit bias, inter-rater reliability was utilized. Additionally, qualitative data are limited in its generalisability beyond the sample, and is therefore limited in prediction-based analysis. However, as previously noted, the current study was less concerned with predictions than with investigation. This, in addition to a number of strengths of qualitative designs, resulted in the decision to include a qualitative question in the survey. These strengths included the usefulness of qualitative data in: identifying participants’ own categories; describing complex phenomena; allowing for influences of participant’s own experiences and beliefs to be captured in the data; and, in exploratory data analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

The richness of the data collected in the qualitative question is reflected in the number of categories which emerged from the data. Although Attribution Theory clearly distinguished causation of internal and external, and controllable and
uncontrollable attributions, responses indicate that participants do not necessarily make causation judgements in such a clear-cut fashion. Indeed, there was a large degree of overlap across and within dimensions. If the question had reflected a force choice between internal or external, controllable or uncontrollable, stable and unstable, the data would not have truly reflected the complexity of respondents’ causal attributions. Future research may wish to return to a qualitative approach, to explore the themes that arose from the data, which were not fully explored in the current study.

A related limitation to the above discussion is the separation of the stability/instability (or redeemability) questions from that of the other causal attribution dimensions. There were two reasons for choosing to separate redeemability. The first relates to the conceptualisation of redeemability. Maruna and King (2004; 2009) and Carroll (1978a; 1978b; 1979; Carroll & Payne, 1977) conceptualise redeemability as an attribution which is primarily focused on the ability of offenders to change their offending behaviour, or desist from crime. As such, it can be distinguished from the dimensions of locus of causation and controllability, as the latter two are focused on what drives offending behaviour and not desistance. Further, the link between redeemabiltiy and desistance has been established in the literature as influential to public attitudes in a different manner from that of the other two dimension (Maruna & King). The researcher was interested in the subtlety of redeemability – that is to say, whether the catalyst of redemption, measured via belief that offending is unstable, differentially impacted on public support for reintegration. This was considered important to explore, as reintegration depends on two primary stakeholders – the ex-prisoner and the community. It is possible that attributions of ex-prisoner redemption are influenced by the party seen to be the catalyst for this change; that is, that either corrections are responsible via rehabilitation programs, or the ex-prisoner is responsible via desistance from crime.

The wording of the stability attributions variable represents a limitation of the study. The variable that aimed to measure participant’s belief that crime is caused by unstable factors was measured via response to the statement, “rehabilitation programs can reduce a person’s reoffending behaviour.” It is possible that
respondents interpreted this question as a reflection on their belief in the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs. Thus, the question may have tapped into participants’ beliefs about rehabilitation, rather than the intended latent attribution that an offender’s behaviour can change, and is thus unstable. Future research may wish to study the relationships between stability crime cause attributions and support for reintegration, but perhaps draw from Maruna and King’s (2004) conceptualisation of ‘redeemability.’ This research would eliminate possible confusion between stability attributions and rehabilitation, and thus better explore the influence of public beliefs that offenders can change on support for reintegration.

The final broad area of limitations identified as relevant to the current study relates to the statistical analyses conducted. The first general limitation of this area is the large number of analyses conducted. Increase in analyses on the same variables impacts on the effects size and chances of inflated type I error (rejecting a true null hypothesis). To account for this, a conservative alpha level was used (.001), and Bonferroni correction was utilized for a number of analyses (Bland & Altman, 1995; Greenhalgh, 1997; Tukey, 1977).

The final two limitations relate to the variables chosen to be included in the study. First, demographic variables were not included in the study. This may have resulted in overlooking significant and practical relationships in the data between demographic variables and support for reintegration. Further, the exploratory nature of the study would warrant exploration of all potential factors which may influence reintegration support. However, as was argued in Chapter Five, the decision was made to exclude demographic variables because these variables are predominantly stable in nature; they therefore do not fulfil the end goal of the study, which is to explore the nature of community support for reintegration, such that effort can be made to increase support as required by targeting dynamic community factors. Additionally, prior research has indicated the limited contribution of demographic variables beyond that of instrumental and expressive attitudes, and causal attributions (Stinchcome, et al. 1980; Applegate, et al. 1996; Sims, 2003), with the exception of level of education and race/ethnicity (Sims, 2003).
The final limitation relates to the choice to focus on certain pre-determined ex-offender characteristics to determine support for either the stereotypical or non-stereotypical ex-offender. While this categorisation was informed by the literature (e.g. Gleb, 2006; Schissel, 1997), an assumption was made that respondents would group offenders in such a way. Furthermore, while specific ex-offender characteristics were grouped in the analysis to form ‘stereotypical’ ex-offender characteristics, this variable may have been confabulated with the ‘generic’ offender question utilized at the beginning of each section. Prior research indicates that respondents are typically imagining a stereotypical offender when asked broad, global questions about offenders (Doob & Roberts, 1983; Gleb, 2006; Sprott, 1996).

This limitation could have been avoided by asking participants to indicate the characteristics of the ‘generic’ offender they had been imagining when responding to the question (as was done by Doob & Roberts, 1983), and then promoting them to respond according to a typical offender and then a non-typical offender. To communicate typicality versus non-typicality, case vignettes could have been utilized in the survey.

**Implications and Conclusions**

The current study has implications for the theoretical and conceptual arguments put forward in the introductory chapters of this thesis. A number of key points can be made with regard to the theoretical perspectives of reintegration adopted herein: namely, the public plays a key role in ex-prisoner reintegration, yet it is ambivalent about its level of support for reintegration; symbolic messages of change and redemption appear to play an important role in public support for reintegration; and, ex-prisoner characteristics, particularly those that can be targeted by interventions are influential on public support for ex-prisoner reintegration. These are discussed below.

It was argued in Chapter Two of this thesis that the community plays a key role in the ex-prisoner reintegration process. Yet, no previous research has explored the degree to which the community is ready and able to support reintegration. Work
by Graffam, Shinkfield and colleagues (Graffam, et al., 2004; Graffam et al., 2009) has moved in this direction, however the current study represents the first research effort to directly investigate the role of the community (via the Victorian public) in reintegration. Of particular interest to the current study was community readiness to support and engage in reintegration. Findings indicate that the Victorian public is willing to support reintegration, however it is ambivalent as well as conditional with regards to the level and nature of support.

Meisenhelder (1982) argued that for desistance to be achieved, an ex-offender must accept conventional society, but conventional society must also accept the ex-offender72. The current study has gone some way to establishing that the public is at least willing to undertake this process of mutual (re-) acceptance, supporting reintegration as a sentencing aim, in policy and in person. It is noted that public support was not high in comparison to the other sentencing options. This is not surprising; rather, this finding sits consistently with research exploring ex-prisoners’ reintegration and desistance experiences, which overwhelmingly report that ex-prisoners experience difficulty accessing reintegration in the domains of employment and housing, amongst others (Cullen, 1994; Graffam et al., 2005; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005; La Vigne, 2006; Schram, et al., 2006; Shinkfield, 2006; Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009). The current findings are also consistent with research drawn from public attitudes towards rehabilitation, which indicate this sentencing aim is often supported less than its more ‘traditional’ counterparts (Cullen et al., 2000).

The community may be thought of as cautious when it comes to support for reintegration. In the first instance, the public appears either willing to consider or already perceives reintegration as a sentencing objective. More importantly, the public is willing to support abstract reintegration to a greater degree than it is willing to be personally involved in reintegration. Again, this finding is consistent

72 Of course, many offenders come from and return to disadvantages communities. Discussion in Chapter Two of ‘community’ highlighted that this construct is difficult to conceptualise and consequently measure. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the current study measured public attitudes, a sample which was overwhelmingly representative of white, middle-class individuals, and under-representative of the types of communities to which ex-offenders frequently return.
with ex-prisoner experiences. Often supports within the community are available; however, ex-prisoners report experiencing barriers to reintegration and desistance at the personal level (Helfgott, 2007; La Vigne et al., 2004).

Maruna (2001) argued that the process of communicating or ‘authenticating’ desistance is not easy for ex-offenders. This population, after all, has spent a significant amount of its life moving frequently between conventional and non-conventional society, frequently stating desistance and redemption, only to return to criminal activity. Consequently, for the public, when there is “little confidence in (its) own ability to discern between legitimate and illegitimate claims to personal reform, the safest option is to interpret any ex-offender’s claim to going straight as ‘phony, feigning, unbelievable or implausible’” (Maruna, 2001, p., 156; also see Lofland, 1969). It is not surprising, then, that the public is cautious in its support for ex-prisoner reintegration. A limitation of the current study is that the public was asked about interactions with ex-prisoners at a conceptual level (via survey), whereas research exploring ex-prisoners’ experiences usually explores direct experiences of the latter. Thus, while the current study offers valuable initial insights, much more can be done to better understand the complexity of public support for reintegration.

To begin, the findings of the current study indicate that the public is more willing to take the risk and believe potential illegitimate claims of reform; more accurately, it is willing to take the risk, at an abstract policy level, of supporting ex-offenders who may or may not be interested in reinstatement as a law-abiding community member. At an abstract level, while loss of money and resources may occur, it is likely that individuals deem this a more acceptable risk than personal loss or harm resulting from failed attempts to support ex-prisoner reintegration on a personal level. Similarly, more support is given in the domain of employment, where slip ups in the workforce and a return to offending may be perceived as less harmful than if these occur in one’s neighbourhood.

To some degree, the findings may not be problematic for the pursuit of correctional-based reintegration initiatives. As noted in Chapter Two, if reintegration is to be conceptualised as synonymous with re-entry, then this process is State-led, requiring only minimal community support. Indeed, Maruna
(2001) argues that rituals of redemption are most powerful when they are formal mechanisms, handed down by the same authority that labelled the offender deviant. According to Maruna, “the best (and most useful) recognition an offender could receive from the system is the chance to change his or her past” (p. 164).

It is possible the general public is not interested in being involved in reintegration. If this is the case, this presents challenges for an initiative that is theorised to rely on active and reciprocal support for the community to which an ex-prisoner returns.

A key contention of the thesis was that the community plays a more influential role in ex-prisoner reintegration – that, in actuality, reintegration is a distinct process from re-entry. While this argument cannot be addressed directly by the current study, the findings do indicate that if the community plays as influential role as theorised, then there is room to improve ex-prisoner reintegration. The Victorian public has a low level of readiness to support reintegration, and drawing from the Community Readiness Model, much can be done to increase this level of readiness.

In addressing this point, the current findings indicate that if initiatives undertake to increase public readiness to support ex-prisoner reintegration via the targeting of knowledge, instrumental and expressive attitudes, it is unlikely that levels of reintegration support would change greatly. Increased public knowledge of the CJS may increase support for individual personal involvement in reintegration; targeting fear of crime and beliefs about crime rates may impact housing reintegration support; and, addressing confidence in the CJS may impact reintegration across all domains and level of involvement. Nevertheless, initiatives targeting these crime and justice attitudes will likely have modest impacts on support for reintegration. Targeting the factors that cause offenders to engage in criminal activity is unlikely to impact on public support for ex-prisoner reintegration.

These findings go some way toward distinguish reintegration from punishment and rehabilitation sentencing objectives, as prior research has indicated that addressing knowledge, instrumental and expressive attitudes, and crime causal beliefs is very influential in decreasing punitive attitudes and increasing public
support for rehabilitation. Whether this means that the public perceives reintegration as distinct from punishment and rehabilitation however remains unknown, and represents an area for future investigation.

Rather, community readiness (as measured via public readiness) to support ex-prisoner reintegration appears to be communicated via symbolic notions of risk, forfeiture, forgiveness, redemption, and moral inclusion. The importance of symbolic messages of reintegration align with the process of desistance (Maruna & King, 2009). The public is less supportive of reintegration at a personal involvement level, and in the domain of housing; both are indicators of increased risk. These trends can be interpreted as indicating that the public is willing to forgive ex-offenders and will allow for the provision of community resources to this population (at a policy level), but is less likely to overlook ex-offender forfeiture of citizenship at a personal level; the public is not keen on having an ex-offender as its personal work colleague or neighbour.

The public was more supportive of reintegration when it viewed offending as an unstable characteristic that can be targeted by rehabilitation. Interestingly, the symbolic notion of potential for redemption was important; the belief that rehabilitation could change offending was influential on public support for reintegration. However, the findings may also indicate that the public links reintegration to successful rehabilitation.

Furthermore, those ex-offenders with characteristics deemed the safest, or which presented the least risk, received more public support: namely, the remorseful offender; the first time offender; the offender who has served their whole sentence in the community; and, the offender who has undertaken steps to improve their citizenship skills via rehabilitation or work-related training. Of interest, of the above ex-offender characteristics, when it came to public preparedness to be personally involved in reintegration, greater support resulted when ex-offenders possessed characteristics that demonstrated that they had actively made steps to move towards reintegration and/or desistance: that is, the remorseful offender; the offender who has completed rehabilitation; or, the offender who has completed work-related training. These findings are consistent with Reitan’s (1996) theory that reintegration is achieved through the symbolic re-assertion of social
inclusion. For the public, if an ex-prisoner is seen to have made efforts to repair the social bond fractured by their criminal actions, the public is more supportive of reintegration.

Maruna (2001) identified in the narratives of his Liverpool Desistance Study, that ex-prisoners’ narratives subscribe to conventional moral values; “during the interviews, participants tried to fit their past behaviours into this contingent value system and often told their life stories as “moral tales,” casting themselves as the protagonist or moral heroes” (p. 135). For the ex-prisoners of Maruna’s study, the inherent belief that they are decent human beings is evident in their narratives of offending and desistance. For the public, emphasis on the moral values of society also appear important in recognising and supporting ex-prisoner reintegration. Members of the public is concerned with the humanity of the ex-prisoner; where ex-prisoners can demonstrate an ability to return to moral society and live conventional community lives, then reintegration is more likely to be supported. The public, it appears, is also happy to accept the narrative of an ex-prisoner who, although engaging in criminal behaviour in the past, is ready and motivated to work towards reintegration into mainstream society. Braithwaite’s (1989) distinction between the sinner and the sin appears at work in public judgement about reintegration. Perhaps when faced with non-stereotypical offender characteristics, the public recognises the ‘citizen’ and not the ‘criminal’. Where distinction between the two is possible – that is, the sinner is remorseful and motivated not to re-offend, and willing to prove their desire for living in a moral community via long-term desistance from crime – then the public is willing to not only support their efforts to reintegrate, but also actively participate in this process. Further support for reintegration increases alongside beliefs that ex-prisoners can be redeemed; however future research specifically addressing the role of redemption on support for reintegration is required.

For Meisenhelder (1982), Braithwaite (1989), and Maruna (2001), rituals of recognising redemption are crucial in the ‘going straight’ of ex-prisoners. For example, in Maruna’s Liverpool Desistance Study, rituals of redemption are seen as powerful in the ex-prisoner’s interpretation of re-acceptance into community, and importantly recognition that “for what they claim is the “first time” in their
lives…they have some control over their own destinies” (p. 161). Perhaps, rituals of redemption are also important for the public. That is, to communicate a belief in the redemption of the offender, and establish moral inclusion, perhaps that community first requires a sign from the ex-prisoner that reintegration and desistance is desired. Alternatively, the public requires that the ex-prisoner has first successfully completed rehabilitation.

This thesis has provided more insight into current conceptualisations of ex-prisoner reintegration. In line with the definition of reintegration presented in this thesis, the study explored the role of the public in supporting or hindering reintegration (as a means to gaining understanding of the role the community to which an ex-prisoner returns plays in reintegration). Overall, the findings suggest that public support for reintegration varies across domains and levels of involvement, and is conditional. The public appears to be ambivalent toward reintegration, and this may be seen to mirror the confusion in correctional theory and practice identified in Chapter Two. Nevertheless the public does act as gatekeepers to reintegration, and as such it is worthwhile dedicating research to identifying ways to increase public support for reintegration.

It was hoped that in gaining a better insight into the role of the public in ex-prisoner reintegration, the academic community may move towards a better understanding of the role of the ex-prisoner reintegration process as a whole. This pursuit may assist in achieving ‘community’ between the ex-prisoner and the public (that is, ongoing reciprocal inclusion, sharing of community resources and social power), and more broadly. In turn, it is hoped that the findings of this thesis will assist academics, key stakeholders (including policy makers), the public, and the justice system in becoming better equipped at supporting ex-prisoners exiting the correctional system.

This study was exploratory, and has identified areas where additional research is required to arrive at a better understanding of this important correctional and community process. Furthermore, the thesis presented a model of reintegration that clearly identified the role of the community in this process. It is hoped that the study is the initial step towards addressing the echoes of Martinson’s critique.
of rehabilitation, so that reintegration does not experience the same fall from favour as early rehabilitation.
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Appendix 2: Plain Language Statement

Victorian community views about people with a criminal record

How a society responds to crime is important to everyone.

We are researchers from the Forensic Psychology Research Group in the School of Psychology at Deakin University. We are conducting a large study of the Victorian community’s attitudes to people who have been convicted of a crime.

You have been randomly selected from a large data base of Victorian citizens. You are invited to give your views about these important issues by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Your participation is entirely voluntary and we have no way of identifying you from your responses.

The questionnaire will take approximately 20–25 minutes to complete. Most items only ask you for a tick or a cross. There are some questions about you, and others that ask for your views about people with a criminal record. There are also some questions on sentencing and the justice system. There are no right or wrong answers.

When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it in the reply paid envelope supplied. We are interested in obtaining as many views as possible, so we will be sending a reminder card to everyone who has received the questionnaire.

Results of this project will be reported in a variety of ways, including reports to government, journal articles, media releases, conference papers and research theses. The data will also inform government policy in the important area of crime reduction. You will be able to access the outcomes of this project on the website provided at the foot of this page in November 2009, or by contacting the research team below.

We thank you for taking the time to help us with this research.

Sincerely

Dr Terry Bartholomew
Dr Lesley Hardcastle
Ms Matea Doroc

If you have been a victim of crime and believe that completing a survey about crime may be distressing, please do not complete the questionnaire. Assistance is available at Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal at http://www.vocat.vic.gov.au/ telephone (03) 9628 7855

If you have any further questions regarding the study, please contact Dr Lesley Hardcastle on (03) 9244 6486 or email lesley.hardcastle@deakin.edu.au

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research project, please contact the Secretary HEAG-H, Dean’s Office, Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioural Sciences, 221 Burwood Hwy, Burwood, VIC, 3125. Telephone: (03) 9251 7174, Email: hmhbs-research@deakin.edu.au

The outcomes of this project will be available at http://www.deakin.edu.au/hmhbs/psychology/research.php in November 2009.
Appendix 3: Questionnaire

Community views about people with a criminal record

SECTION A — About you

A1. How old are you (in years)?

A2. What is your sex? (tick) Female ☐ Male ☐

A3. Do you have any children? Yes ☐ No ☐

A4. What is the country of your birth? .................................................................

A5. What is the main language spoken in your home? ........................................

A6. Are you an Australian Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander? Yes ☐ No ☐

A7. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

☐ School Year 10 or below

☐ School Year 11 or 12

☐ Certificate

☐ Diploma

☐ Bachelor degree or above

A8. Are you employed at the moment? Yes – full time ☐ Yes – part time ☐ No ☐

A9. What is your usual occupation? (include “student” if applicable).....................

A10. What is the range of your average household weekly income (before tax is taken out)?

☐ $1 – $249 per week

☐ $250 – $499

☐ $500 – $999

☐ $1,000 – $1,999

☐ $2,000 or over

A11. What postcode do you live in?
SECTION B — The EMPLOYMENT of a person with a criminal record

In our criminal justice system, a sentence for a crime can be served in prison, in the community, or a combination of both. In the questions that follow, the term “person with a criminal record” means someone who has served a sentence in prison, in the community or both.

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about the employment of a person with a criminal record by circling a number from 1 (disagree strongly) to 7 (agree strongly).

Start here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. I would be comfortable working with a person with a criminal record</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions relate to things that might influence your answer to the last question, that is, your feelings about working with a person with a criminal record.

B2. I would be comfortable working with a person with a criminal record if that person’s offence was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>domestic violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraud or embezzlement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporate or investment crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession of drugs (marijuana)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession of drugs (heroin, cocaine, amphetamines)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing drugs (marijuana)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing drugs (heroin, cocaine, amphetamines)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson resulting in property damage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson resulting in injury to person/s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burglary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault involving physical contact with an adult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault involving physical contact with a child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessing child pornography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stalking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manslaughter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments: ..........................................................................................................................................................................................
B3. I would be comfortable working with a person with a criminal record who:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has completed an offence-related rehabilitation program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has completed work-related education or training</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served part of their sentence in prison and part in the community</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served the whole of their sentence in prison</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served a community-based sentence only</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been convicted of a single crime</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been convicted of multiple crimes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments .................................................................

B4. I would be comfortable working with a person with a criminal record who:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is aged 17 or under</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 18 – 30</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 31 – 40</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 41 or over</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is from a minority cultural group</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is female</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is male</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a parent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is motivated to not re-offend</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is remorseful about their offence/s</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments .................................................................

The government gives assistance to a number of groups in the community. The next questions ask about your views on the government helping a person with a criminal record to find and keep a job.

Start here

B5. The government should help a person with a criminal record to find and keep a job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B6. The **government** should help a person with a criminal record **to find and keep a job** if that person’s **offence** was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>domestic violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraud or embezzlement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporate or investment crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession of drugs (marijuana)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession of drugs (heroin, cocaine, amphetamines)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing drugs (marijuana)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing drugs (heroin, cocaine, amphetamines)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson resulting in property damage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson resulting in injury to person/s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burglary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault involving physical contact with an adult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault involving physical contact with a child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessing child pornography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stalking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manslaughter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments

B7. The **government** should help a person with a criminal record **to find and keep a job** when that person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has completed an offence-related rehabilitation program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has completed a vocational education or training program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served part of their sentence in prison and part in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served the whole of their sentence in prison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served a community-based sentence only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been convicted of a single crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been convicted of multiple crimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments
B8. The government should help a person with a criminal record to **find and keep a job** when that person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is aged 17 or under</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 18 – 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 31 – 40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 41 or over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is from a minority cultural group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a parent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is motivated not to re-offend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is remorseful about their offence/s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments

There are no more questions in this section. Please go to the next page.
SECTION C — Your knowledge and experience

C1. Have you, or a person you know well, ever been a victim of crime?

Yes ☐ — proceed to next question  No ☐ — miss the next question and go to C3

C2. What kind of crime were you (or a person you know well) the victim of?

Tick as many boxes as applicable

- The crime was violent (i.e. against a person)  Yes ☐  No ☐
  I was the victim ☐  Others I know well were the victim/s ☐

- The crime was property related (loss or damage)  Yes ☐  No ☐
  I was the victim ☐  Others I know well were the victim/s ☐


C3. Do you know, or have you known, a person who has committed a crime?  Yes ☐  No ☐

C4. How would you rate your personal knowledge about the criminal justice system? This knowledge may have come from the media (films, television, radio, newspapers), friends, work, study, participation in court proceedings, or other sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no knowledge</th>
<th>average level of knowledge</th>
<th>a lot of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There are no more questions in this section. Please go to the next page.
**SECTION D — Questions about the housing of a person with a criminal record**

The next questions ask you how you feel about living near a person with a criminal record.

**Start here**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. I would be comfortable living near a person with a criminal record</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions relate to things that might influence your feelings about living near a person with a criminal record.

**D2. I would be comfortable living near a person with a criminal record when that person's offence was:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>domestic violence</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraud or embezzlement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporate or investment crime</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murder</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession of drugs (marijuana)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession of drugs (heroin, cocaine, amphetamines)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing drugs (marijuana)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing drugs (heroin, cocaine, amphetamines)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson resulting in property damage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson resulting in injury to person/s</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burglary</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assault</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault involving physical contact with an adult</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault involving physical contact with a child</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessing child pornography</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stalking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manslaughter</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments  ........................................................................................................

........................................................................................................
D3. I would be comfortable living near a person with a criminal record who:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has completed an offence-related rehabilitation program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has completed work related education or training</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served part of their sentence in prison and part in the community</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served the whole of their sentence in prison</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served a community-based sentence only</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been convicted of a single crime</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been convicted of multiple crimes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments

D4. I would be comfortable living near a person with a criminal record who:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is aged 17 or under</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 18 – 30</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 31 – 40</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 41 or over</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is from a minority cultural group</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is female</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is male</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a parent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is motivated not to re-offend</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is remorseful about their offence/s</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments
The next questions ask what you think about the government helping a person with a criminal record to find housing.

**D5.** The government should help a person with a criminal record to find and keep accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D6.** The government should help a person with a criminal record to find housing if that person's offence was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>domestic violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraud or embezzlement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporate or investment crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession of drugs (marijuana)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession of drugs (heroin, cocaine, amphetamines)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing drugs (marijuana)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing drugs (heroin, cocaine, amphetamines)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson resulting in property damage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson resulting in injury to person/s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burglary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault involving physical contact with an adult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault involving physical contact with a child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessing child pornography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stalking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manslaughter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
D7. The **government** should help a person with a criminal record find housing when that person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has completed an offence-related rehabilitation program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has completed work related education or training</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served part of their sentence in prison and part in the community</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served the whole of their sentence in prison</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has served a community-based sentence only</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been convicted of a single crime</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been convicted of multiple crimes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments

D8. The **government** should help a person with a criminal record to find housing when that person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is aged 17 or under</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 18 - 30</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 31 - 40</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is 41 or over</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is from a minority cultural group</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is female</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is male</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a parent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is motivated not to re-offend</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is remorseful about their offence/s</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to give reasons, or make further comments
**SECTION E — What do you think about the justice system in general?**

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by circling a number from 1 (disagree strongly) to 7 (agree strongly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1. The government should provide education and work skills programs for offenders.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. When an offender receives a prison sentence, the whole of the sentence should be served in prison.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. There should be a process to extend the sentence of a violent offender if it is believed there is a risk of re-offending</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4. A person should be required to disclose their criminal record when applying for a job, irrespective of the nature of their offence.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5. A person should be required to disclose their criminal record when applying for a job, only if the offence is relevant to the job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6. After a period of time without further offending, a person’s conviction should be removed from their record, so they can start again with a “clean slate”.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7. Sex offenders should be registered for life and must inform authorities of any changes in personal circumstances (e.g. address, employment).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8. Members of the community should have access to information about the identity and whereabouts of sex offenders.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9. Statements submitted by victims should be given significant weight in court decisions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10. There should be an opportunity, if both parties are willing, for the person who has committed a crime to meet with the victim(s) and discuss ways of making up for the damage they have caused.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11. If a society removes someone from the community to serve a sentence, it has an obligation to assist that person’s re-entry into the community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E12. The minimum age at which a person can be charged with a criminal offence varies across states and countries. (For example, in Victoria it is 10 years of age.)**

What do you think is the appropriate minimum age of criminal responsibility? [ ]
E13. Which of the following goals of sentencing do you believe should have the highest priority? Write 1 for the goal/s that you believe should be given the highest priority, and so on. You may use the same priority number more than once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>1, 2, 3 etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To punish offenders</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make the community safer</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To act as an example, to deter others from committing crimes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To deter the offender from committing further crimes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide a measure of the seriousness of different crimes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help offenders live productive lives after they have served their sentence</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E14. How successful do you think the criminal justice system currently is at achieving these goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all successful</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Very successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To punish offenders</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make the community safer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To act as an example, to deter others from committing crimes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To deter the offender from committing further crimes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide a measure of the seriousness of different crimes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help offenders live productive lives after they have served their sentence</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E15. Please rate your agreement with the following general statements about the justice system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation programs can reduce a person’s reoffending behaviour</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime in Victoria has increased in the last two years</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fear that I could one day be a victim of crime</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people have confidence in the criminal justice system</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who commit crime have forfeited their right to community support</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E16. What do you think are the major causes of crime in our community?
Finally....

Do you have any other comments about any issues included in this questionnaire?

---

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your views are very important to the study. Please return it in the enclosed reply postage paid envelope.

Would you like to take part in a second study?

There is a follow-up study being planned, which will look more deeply at the issues raised in this questionnaire. We invite you to participate.

If you are interested in receiving information about the follow-up study, please contact the research team to provide your contact details. We will send you information only; you are under no obligation to participate. When you receive the information, you can then decide whether you wish to take part in the second study.

You can contact the research team by email or telephone.
Email: Lesley.Harcastle@deakin.edu.au
Telephone: (03) 9244 6486
Expression of Interest in follow-up study

Would you like to take part in a second study?

There is a follow-up study being planned, which will look more deeply at the issues raised in the questionnaire. We invite you to participate.

If you are interested in receiving information about the follow-up study, please contact the research team below to provide your contact details. We will send you information only; you are under no obligation to participate. When you receive the information, you can then decide whether you wish to take part in the second study.

You can contact the research team by email, telephone or post.

Email: lesley.hardcastle@deakin.edu.au

Telephone: (03) 9244 6486

Post: Community Views Study
c/o Dr Lesley Hardcastle
School of Psychology
Deakin University
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood Vic 3125

Your contact details will not be used for any purpose other than to provide you with information about the follow-up study.
Appendix 4: Table of Research into the Relationship between Demographic Factors and Community Attitudes Toward Crime and Justice Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Study findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender difference</td>
<td>Confidence in the criminal justice system</td>
<td>Roberts and Indermaur (2007): Females found to have slightly more confidence in the police. However there was no significant difference for confidence in courts or confidence in prisons (Australian public sample; $N = 8,133$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roberts and Indermaur (2007): Females scored significantly higher than males for fear of psychical/street crime and identity crime, however there was no significant difference by gender for perceptions of incivilities (Australian public sample; $N = 8,133$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level ‘Punitiveness’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roberts and Indermaur (2007): Males were found to be more punitive than female respondents (Australian public sample; $N = 8,133$). Welch (2011): Female respondents were more punitive than male respondents for juvenile offenders, however, no gender effect was found for adult offenders (American public sample, $N = 885$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Punitiveness’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kury and Ferdinand (1999): Male respondents were found to be more likely to favour the death penalty for convicted offenders than female respondents (East and West Germany public sample, $N = 4,306$). Kelley and Braithwaite (1990): Female respondents were less supportive of the death penalty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
penalty compared to their male counterparts. Females were also less punitive in general (punishment excluding the death penalty) than male respondents (Australian public sample; \( N = 3,012 \)).

| Support for American ‘three-strikes’ laws | Applegate, Cullen, Turner, and Sundt (1996): Gender was not found to be significantly related to support for 3-strikes laws, at a global or specific level (Ohio, USA residents sample, \( N = 237 \)). |
| Support for punishment as a sentencing objective | Applegate, Cullen and Fisher (2002): Female respondents were more likely to support offender treatment and less likely to support harsh punishment than male respondents (American college sample; \( N = 524 \)). |
| Causes of crime | Furnham and Henderson (1983): Found female respondents cited crime causal factors relating to ‘defective education’ and ‘parents’ (poor parenting) than males (UK sample of residents from London, Oxford and Sheffield, \( N = 370 \)). |
| Public support for goals of sentencing | Roberts and Geotys (1989): No gender differences found in respondents’ support for different goals of sentencing (members of the public attending the Ontario Science Centre, Toronto; \( N = 77 \)). Warr and Stafford (1984): Found no significant relation between respondents’ gender and their endorsement of primary goal of punishment (Seattle residents, \( N = 339 \)). Templeton and Hartnagel (2012): Found female respondents viewed each sentencing goal (incapacitation, retribution, specific... |
deterrence, rehabilitation), except for general
deterrence, as more important than male
respondents, although none of the correlations
were strong (Canadian public sample;  \( N = 1,006 \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of criminal behavior and recommended dispositions</th>
<th>Phillips and DeFleur (1982): Some evidence for impact of gender of hypothetical offender on respondents’ recommendation of dispositions, however type of crime was found to have a stronger relationship with recommended dispositions than gender (Washington State, USA sample;  ( N = 457 )).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Crime salience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in courts</td>
<td>Flanagan, McGarrell, and Brown (1985): Age was a stronger correlate with older respondents reported more negative perceptions of courts (American public sample;  ( N = 2,447 )).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for difference sentencing outcomes for offenders, by offence-type</td>
<td>Walker, Collins, and Wilson (1988): Differences in support for imprisonment, imprisonment for life and death penalty between respondents under 20 years of age and respondents over 60 years of age. The older age group (60+) endorsed the death penalty for heroin trafficking more than their younger counterparts, who primarily endorsed imprisonment (not for life). Respondents over 60 years of age were more punitive toward fraud-related offences than younger offences. Both age groups held similar views in relation to wife beating and tax evasion offences, and there was no significant age difference for stabbing-related offences (Australian public sample; ( N = 2,551 )).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of ‘punitiveness’</td>
<td>Roberts and Indermaur (2007): Increased punitiveness associated with being older (Australian public sample; ( N = 8,133 )).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerber and Engelhardt-Greer (1996): Punitiveness increases with age (American public sample; ( N = 1,000 )).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kury &amp; Ferdinand (1999): No consistent relationship between age and level of punitiveness (East and West Germany sample, ( N = 4,306 )).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for American ‘three-strikes’ laws</td>
<td>Applegate, et al., (1996): Age was not significantly related to respondents’ support for three-strike laws (global or specific) (Ohio, USA residents sample, ( N = 237 )).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Punitiveness’ including the death penalty</td>
<td>Kelley and Braithwaite (1990): No difference for age for supportive of death penalty or level of punitiveness as a general measure (excluding death penalty) (Australian sample; N = 3,012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public support for goals of sentencing</td>
<td>Warr and Stafford (1984): interaction between age and support for different goals of sentencing. Younger respondents were found to support a mix of goals of sentencing, including retribution, incapacitation, rehabilitation, or deterrence. However with increasing age, there is a clear &amp; dramatic shift toward respondents’ support for retribution as the primary goal of sentencing (American sample, N = 339). Templeton and Hartnagel (2012): Older respondents were more supportive for retribution as a primary goal of sentencing, and slighted less supportive of general deterrence compared to younger respondents (Canadian public sample; N = 1,006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about causes of crime</td>
<td>Furnham and Henderson (1983): Found interaction with age and certain causes of crime. Younger respondents were more likely to cite ‘no job opportunities and high unemployment’ than older respondents (UK sample of residents from London, Oxford and Sheffield, N = 370).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>Roberts and Indermaur (2007): Increased punitiveness was associated with being self-described as working class (Australian public sample; N = 8,133). Kury and Ferdinand (1999): Respondents with lowest income were found to be the least</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
punitive (East and West Germany sample, \(N = 4,306\)).

Dowler (2003): Respondents with lower incomes were found to be more punitive. (American public sample, \(N = 1,005\))

Hogan, Chiricos, and Gertz (2005): Examined role of economic insecurity and blame on public punitiveness. Blaming affirmative action, welfare & immigration for stagnating incomes over the previous 2 decades were significant predictors of punitiveness. (American public sample; \(N = 1,476\)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for difference sentencing outcomes for offenders, by offence-type</th>
<th>Support for American ‘three-strikes’ laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walker, et al., (1988): Respondents with higher income were found to have a negative correlation with level of punitiveness, being less likely than lower-income respondents to endorse imprisonment of offenders across offence-types. Correlations were moderate for all offence-types except for tax evasion. For tax evasion, there was a strong relationship between income and punishment for tax evasion, with those respondents indicating lower income more inclined to advocate imprisonment and less inclined to endorse fines, than respondents with higher income. The offender-type of fare evasion results in a significant income (Australian public sample; (N = 2,551)).</td>
<td>Applegate, et al., (1996): Average household income was not significantly related to support for three-strike laws (global or specific) (American college sample; (N = 524)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in courts</td>
<td>Flanagan, et al., (1985): Work-class respondents were more negative in their perceptions of courts, than non-working class respondents (American public sample; $N = 2,447$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>Gibson, et al., (2005): Respondents’ perceptions of crime tended to be more accurate as the post-secondary education of respondents increased, although this was not uniform across crime responses categories (crime ‘increased a lot’, ‘increased a little’, ‘stayed the same’, decreased a little’, or ‘decreased a lot’); the strongest effect of education level was observed for the crime ‘increased a lot’ category (Australian public sample, $N = 4,270$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime salience</td>
<td>Unnever, Cullen, and Applegate (2005): No relationship between education level and support for punitiveness, as measured by support for the death penalty and support for harsher penalties (American public sample; $N = 1,018$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of 'punitiveness'</td>
<td>Walker, et al., (1988): Lower levels of education were found to correlate with higher levels of punitiveness (Australian public sample; $N = 2,551$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roberts and Indermaur (2007): Level of punitiveness decreased as years of education increased (Australian public sample; $N = 8,133$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCorkle (1993): Negative relationship between education level and punitiveness, with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Level of ‘punitiveness’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dowler (2003): African-Americans are often found to be less punitive than Caucasian-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Americans (American public sample, $N = 1,005$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welch (2011): Race was not predictive of punitive attitudes toward juvenile offenders,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>however, White respondents were more punitive towards adult offenders, and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>punitive in general than respondent of minority racial groups (American public sample,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N = 885$).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Level of ‘punitiveness’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nock and Sheley (1979): African-American and Mexican-America responders indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
greater endorsement of lenient count treatment of offenders than Caucasian-Americans. Race was also found to be a significant predictor respondents’ attitudes towards court sentencing policy (leniency), with African-American respondents’ the most supportive of leniency in the treatment of offenders (American public sample; \( N = 5,277 \)).

<p>| Support for American ‘three-strikes’ laws | Applegate, et al., (1996): Race was not significantly related to respondents’ support for three-strike laws (global or specific) (American college sample; ( N = 524 )). |
| Cause of crime | Flanagan, (1987): Black respondents were more likely than white respondents to mention economic conditions as a major cause of crime and less likely to mention judicial leniency (American public sample, ( N = 2,347 )). |
| Religious orientation | Level of ‘punitiveness’ | Unnever, et al., (2005): Respondents with rigid religious beliefs (fundamentalism) were found to be more punitive, while those believing in compassion, forgiveness and with an image of a nurturing God were less punitive. Those involved in religious activity were less punitive. (American public sample; ( N = 1,018 )) |
| | | Roberts and Indermaur (2007): Respondents attending religious services at least once per month was associated with reduced punitiveness (Australian public sample; ( N = 8,133 )). |
| | | Grasmick, Cochran, Bursik, and Kimpel (1993): Found greater levels of punitiveness, including support for the death penalty for both |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political orientation</th>
<th>Level of ‘punitiveness’</th>
<th>Support for American ‘three-strikes’ laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of offenders</td>
<td>Olver and Barlow (2010): Respondents who identified as ‘no religious affiliation’ endorsed slightly higher beliefs in the ability to rehabilitate sex offenders, than respondents who identified as having a religious affiliation (Undergraduate students from the University of Saskatchewan; N = 78).</td>
<td>Applegate, et al., (1996): Conservatism was not significantly related to support (or opposition) for three-strike laws (global), however those who reported they were conservative were significantly more likely to sentence an offender to a three-strike punishment (specific). (American college sample; N = 524).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerber and Engelhardt-Greer (1996): Respondents who identified as Republicans and Conservatives were more punitive, than respondents who identify as Liberals and Democrat (American public sample; N = 1,000).</td>
<td>Roberts and Indermaur (2007): Endorsing a right-wing political orientation and being Liberal or National was associated with greater punitiveness (Australian public sample; N = 8,133).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

adult and juvenile offenders, harsher courts and stiffer laws, among respondents who identified as Evangelical/Fundamentalist Protestants, than respondents who identified as Catholic, Liberal/Moderate Protestant, or having no religious affiliation (Oklahoma City sample, N = 395)
<p>| Causes of crime | Furnham and Henderson (1983): Respondents who identified as ‘conservative’ viewed delinquency as a failure of socialization, while ‘labour’ voters perceived delinquency as a consequence of an unjust society (UK sample of residents from London, Oxford and Sheffield, (N=370)). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marriage Status</th>
<th>Level of ‘punitiveness’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dowler (2003): Married respondents were more punitive than unmarried respondents (American public sample, (N=1,005))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerber and Engelhardt-Greer (1996): widowed respondents were more punitive than those respondents who were married and not widowed (American public sample; (N = 1,000)).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley and Braithwaite (1990): Respondents who were not married were found to be least supportive of death penalty and least punitive as a general measure (excluding death penalty), compared to married respondents (Australian public sample; (N = 3,012)).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for American ‘three-strikes’ laws</td>
<td>Applegate, et al., (1996): Marital status was not significantly related to support for three-strike laws (global or specific) (American college sample; (N = 524)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location</td>
<td>Level of ‘punitiveness’ including support for the death penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley and Braithwaite (1990): No significant difference found for place of residence for supportive of death penalty or level of punitiveness as a general measure (excluding death penalty) (Australian sample; (N = 3,012)).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>Level of ‘punitiveness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch (2011): Respondents’ parental status increased support for punitive measures, for adult offenders, compared to non-parents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fathers were more punitive for adult offenders than mothers and males who were not fathers. (American public sample, $N = 885$).
Appendix 5: Analyses investigating the impact of demographic variables on support for reintegration

Aim One.

Aim One undertook to measure the degree of respondent support for ex-prisoner reintegration as a goal of sentencing, and to compare the difference between respondent support for traditional goals of sentencing (retribution, deterrence, incapacitation, denunciation, and rehabilitation), and support for reintegration. The role of demographic variables on support for different goals of sentencing was also investigated.

Variables and methods.

Details related to respondent prioritisation of the goals of sentencing was previous provided on page 238. Four demographic variables were used for the analyses. These were: gender, age, education level, and weekly average income.

To measure gender, participants were asked, ‘what is your sex?’ In response to the question, participants ticked either ‘male’ or ‘female’. To measure age, participants were asked, ‘How old are you (in years)?’ Participant ages were subsequently re-coded into groups corresponding to ABS groupings. These were: 18-24 years; 25-54 years; 55-64 years; and 65 years and older. To measure education level, participants were asked, ‘What is the highest level of education you have completed.’ Five options were provided: school, year 10 or below; school, year 11 or 12; certificate, diploma; or bachelor degree or above. To measure average weekly income, participants were asked ‘What is the range of your average household weekly income (before tax is taken out)?’ Five options were provided: $1-$249; $250-$499; $500-999; $1000-$1999, or $2000 or over.

The goals of sentencing variables were previously provided in Table 7.01. Frequency (sample %) of demographic variables were previously provided in Table 6.00.
Separate one way between groups MANOVAs were performed to investigate gender, age, education level, and average weekly income differences in the prioritisation of the goals of sentencing.

**Results.**

**Gender**

Assumption testing revealed that Box’s M was significant ($p < .01$), therefore Pillai’s Trace correction was used. Levine’s Test of Equality was also found to be significant (Make community safer, $p < .05$), as a result a conservative alpha value of .01 was applied.

There was no significant different between male and females on prioritisation of any of the goals of sentencing, Pillai’s Trace $= .007$, $F(7, 2498) = 2.441$, $p = .018$, partial $\eta^2 = .007$, indicating that males and females do not prioritise goals of sentencing differently. Table A5.01 and Figure A5.01 provide the means, standard deviation and medians for male and female support for the goals of sentencing.
Table A5.01. Means, standard deviation and median scores for the effect of gender on the prioritization of goals of sentencing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Male Mean</th>
<th>Male SD</th>
<th>Male Median</th>
<th>Female Mean</th>
<th>Female SD</th>
<th>Female Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make community safer</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter offender</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter others</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a measure of seriousness</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help offenders live productive lives</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A5.01. The effect of gender on prioritization of sentencing goal

Make community safer  Deter offender  Punishment  Deter others  Provide a measure of seriousness  Rehabilitate offenders  Help offenders live productive lives

Mean assigned priority (1st priority)
**Age**

Assumption testing revealed that Box’s M was significant \((p< .000)\), therefore Pillai’s Trace correction was used. Levine’s Test of Equality was found to be significant for the following goals of sentencing: make community safer \((p<.000)\), rehabilitate offenders \((p<.000)\), *provide a measure of seriousness* \((p<.000)\), *help offender live productive lives* \((p<.000)\). As a result a conservative alpha value of .01 was applied.

A significant effect of age groups on prioritisation of the goals of sentencing was found, Pillai’s Trace \(= .091, F(21, 7356) = 10.93, p = .000\), partial \(\eta^2 = .030\), indicating that there are differences between the way age groups prioritise the goals of sentencing. See Table A5.02 and Figure A5.02 for means, standard deviations and median scores.

Between subjects effects were inspected to determine which sentence goals may have been prioritised different amongst the age groups. No age difference was found for goal of sentencing: *punishment* and *deter offender*. Significant differences were found for the following goals; *general deterrence, make community safer, provide a measure of seriousness, rehabilitation, and help offender’s live productive lives*.

For the goal *general deterrence*, the 18-24 year old age group was found to be statistically different from all other age groups. Inspection of the mean scores indicated that those in the 18-24 year old group allocated a higher priority level (i.e. less support, 1 = 1\textsuperscript{st} priority) than any other age group.

For the goal, *make community safer*, the 18-24 and 25-54 year old group were found to be statistically different. Inspection of mean scores indicated that those in the 18-24 year old group allocated a higher priority (i.e. less support, 1 = 1\textsuperscript{st} priority) than those in the 25-54 age group.
Table A5.02. Means, standard deviation and median scores for the effect of age on the prioritization of goals of sentencing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal of Sentencing</th>
<th>18-24 Mean</th>
<th>18-24 SD</th>
<th>18-24 Median</th>
<th>25-54 Mean</th>
<th>25-54 SD</th>
<th>25-54 Median</th>
<th>55-64 Mean</th>
<th>55-64 SD</th>
<th>55-64 Median</th>
<th>65+ Mean</th>
<th>65+ SD</th>
<th>65+ Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make community safer</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter offender</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter others</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a measure of</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seriousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help offenders live</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productive lives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A5.02. The effect of age on prioritization of sentencing goals.
For *provide a measure of seriousness*, the 18-24 year old age group was found to be statistically different from all other groups. The 25-54 and 65+ year old age groups were found to be statistically different. Inspection of mean scores indicated that those in the 18-24 year old age group allocated a lower priority level of than any other age group. Furthermore, those in the 25-54 year old age group allocated a higher priority level (i.e. less support, 1= 1st priority) than those in the 65+ group.

For the goal *rehabilitation*, the 18-24 year old age group was found to be statistically different from all other groups. Those in the 25-54 and 55-54 where found to be statistically different from those in the 65+ year old age group. Inspection of mean scores indicated that those in the 25-54 and 55-54 year old age groups score *rehabilitation* as a higher priority (i.e. less support, 1= 1st priority) than those in the 65+ group, and those in the 18-24 year old age group scored rehabilitation as a higher priority than all other age groups.

For the goal *help offenders to live productive lives*, all age groups were found to be statistically different in their prioritisation of this goal. Inspection of mean scores indicated that the age group 18-24 gave the highest priority (i.e. less support, 1= 1st priority) to this sentencing goal, and the priority level increased significantly with each age group.

*Education level*

Assumption testing revealed that Box’s M was significant (*p*< .000), therefore Pillai’s Trace correction was used. Levine’s Test of Equality was found to be significant for the following goals of sentencing: *punishment* (*p*<.000), deter others (*p*<.000), *rehabilitate offenders* (*p*<.000), *provide a measure of seriousness* (*p*<.000), *help offender live productive lives* (*p*<.000). As a result a conservative alpha value of .01 was applied.

A significant effect of education level groups on prioritisation of the goals of sentencing was found, Pillai’s Trace = .064, $F(28, 9776) = 5.697, p=.000$, partial $\eta^2=.016$, indicating that there are differences between the way age groups
prioritise the goals of sentencing. See Table A5.03 and Figure A5.03 for mean, standard deviation and median scores.

Between subjects effects were inspected to determine which sentence goals may have been prioritised different amongst the education level groups. No difference across education level groups was found for goal of *sentencing make community safer*. Significant differences were found for the following goals; *punishment, general deterrence, deter offender, rehabilitate offender, provide a measure of seriousness*, or *help offenders to live productive lives*.

For the goal *punishment*, the bachelor degree or above education group was found to be statistically different from all other groups. Inspection of the mean scores indicated that those in the bachelor degree of above education group gave a higher priority (i.e. less support, 1 = 1st priority) to the goal *punishment* than all other groups.

For the goal *deter offender*, the year 10 or below education group was found to be statistically different that the bachelor degree or above group. Inspection of the mean scores indicated that those in the year 10 or below group allocated a lower priority (i.e. more support, 1 = 1st priority) for *deter offender* than those in the bachelor of above group.

For the goal *deter others*, the year 10 or below group was found to be statistically different from the diploma group. Those in the bachelor degree or above were found to be statistically different from all other groups. Inspection of the mean scores indicated that those in the year 10 or below education group scored *deter others* as a lower priority (i.e. more support, 1 = 1st priority) than those in the diploma group, and those in the bachelor degree or above group scored *deter others* a higher priority (i.e. less support, 1 = 1st priority) than all other groups.

For the goal *rehabilitate offenders*, the year 10 or below education group was found to statistically different from the year 11 or 12, diploma and bachelor degree or above education groups. Inspection of mean scores indicated that the year 10 or below group gave *rehabilitation* a lower priority (i.e. more support, 1 = 1st priority) than the education groups year 11 or 12, diploma and bachelor degree or above.
For the goal *provide a measure of seriousness*, the year 10 or below education group was found to be statistically different from the year 11 or 12 and diploma education groups. The bachelor degree or above education group was found to be statistically different from all other education groups. Inspection of mean scores indicated that those in the year 10 or below education groups gave lower priority (i.e. more support, 1 = 1st priority) to the goal *provide a measure of seriousness* than the year 11 or 12 and diploma education groups, and those in the bachelor degree or above group gave highest priority (i.e. less support, 1 = 1st priority) to the goal than any other education group.

For the goal, *to help offenders live productive lives*, the year 10 or below education group was found to be statistically different from the year 11 or 12 and diploma education groups. Inspection of mean scores indicated that those in the year 10 or below education groups gave lower priority (i.e. more support, 1 = 1st priority) to the reintegration goal than the year 11 or 12 and diploma education groups.
Table A5.03. Means, standard deviation and median scores for the effect of education level on the prioritization of goals of sentencing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A5.03</th>
<th>Year 10 or below</th>
<th>Year 11 or 12</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Bachelor or above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make community safer</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter offender</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter others</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a measure of seriousness</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help offenders live productive lives</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A5.03. The effect of education level on prioritization of sentencing goal
**Income**

Assumption testing revealed that Box’s M was significant \(p<.000\), therefore Pillai’s Trace correction was used. Levine’s Test of Equality was found to be significant for the following goals of sentencing: punishment \(p<.01\), deter others \(p<.01\), and *provide a measure of seriousness* \(p<.05\). As a result a conservative alpha value of .01 was applied.

A significant effect of weekly income groups on prioritisation of the goals of sentencing was found, Pillai’s Trace = .023, \(F(28, 9260) = 1.873, p=.000\), partial \(\eta^2= .006\), indicating that there are differences between the way age groups prioritise the goals of sentencing. See Table A5.04 and Figure A5.04 for mean, standard deviations and median scores.

Between subjects effects were inspected to determine which sentence goals may have been prioritised different amongst the weekly income groups. No difference across weekly income groups was found for goal of sentencing *make community safer, deter others, deter offender and rehabilitation*. Significant differences were found for the following goals; *punishment, offender, provide a measure of seriousness*, and *help offenders to live productive lives*.

For the goal of *punishment*, the group $2000 or more weekly was found to be statistically different from all other groups. Inspection of mean scores indicated that the group $2000 or over weekly gave a higher priority (i.e. less support, 1= 1st priority) to *punishment* than all other groups.

For the goal of *provide a measure of seriousness*, the group $1-249 per week was found to be statistically different from the groups $500-999, $1000-1999 and $2000 or more per week. The groups $250-499 and $500-999 per week was found to be statistically different from the group $2000 or more per week. Inspection of mean scores indicated that the group $1-249 per week gave a lower priority (i.e. more support, 1= 1st priority) to the goal *provide a measure of seriousness* than the groups $500-999, $1000-1999 and $2000 or more per week, and the groups $250-499 and $500-999 per week gave a lower priority (i.e. more support, 1= 1st priority) to the goal *provide a measure of seriousness* than the group $2000 or more per week.
Table A5.04. Means, standard deviation and median scores for the effect of average weekly income on the prioritization of goals of sentencing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$1-249 per week</th>
<th>$250-499 per week</th>
<th>$500-999 per week</th>
<th>$1000-1999 per week</th>
<th>$2000 or over per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make community safer</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter offender</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter others</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a measure of seriousness</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate offenders</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help offenders live productive lives</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A5.04. The effect of average weekly income on prioritization of sentencing goal
For the goal of help offenders to live productive lives, the group $2000 or more per week was found to be statistically different from all other groups. Inspection of mean scores indicated that the group $2000 or more week gave higher priority (i.e. less support, 1= 1st priority) to the goal than all other groups.

Aim Two.

Aim Two undertook to examine the degree of respondent support for reintegrative policy in the domains of housing (housing policy) and employment (employment policy). Additionally, Aim Two examined the degree of respondent preparedness to live near an ex-offender (housing personal) and work with an ex-offender (employment personal). As part of Aim Two, the role of demographic variables on support for reintegration (housing personal, housing policy, employment personal and employment policy) was also investigated.

Variables and methods.

Details related to respondent support for reintegration (housing personal, housing policy, employment personal and employment policy) was previous provided on page 244. Details for the four demographic variables was previously provided on page 453.

To investigate gender, age, education level, and average weekly income differences in the degree of respondent support for reintegration (housing policy, employment policy, housing personal and employment personal), separate one way between groups MANOVAs were performed for each demographic variable.

Results.

Gender

Assumption testing revealed that Box’s M was non-significant ($p = .927$), indicating no violation in the assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance
matrices. Levine’s Test of Equality was also found to be non-significant across all variables, indicating equality of variance.

A significant effect of gender on respondent support for housing personal, housing policy, employment personal and employment policy was found, Wilks’ Lambda = .020, $F(4, 2137) = 10.642$, $p=.000$, partial $\eta^2= .020$, indicating that there are differences between the way males and females supported reintegration across domains and level of involvement. See Table A5.05 and Figure A5.05 for mean, standard deviation and median scores.

Between subjects effects were inspected to determine which how males and females differed in their support for reintegration. Significant differences in gender were found in housing personal and employment personal. Inspection of the mean scores indicated that male were more supportive than females for reintegration across the domains for housing and employment at the personal preparedness level.
Table A5.05. Means, standard deviation and median scores for the effect of gender on the support for reintegration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live near</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government housing</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employment</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A5.05. The effect of gender on the support for reintegration
**Age**

A one way between groups MANOVA was performed to investigate age group differences in the degree of respondent support for reintegration across: housing policy, employment policy, housing personal and employment personal.

Assumption testing revealed that Box’s M was significant ($p<.000$), therefore Pillai’s Trace correction was used. Levine’s Test of Equality was found to be significant employment policy ($p<.000$). As a result a conservative alpha value of .01 was applied.

A significant effect of age group on respondent support for housing personal, housing policy, employment personal and employment policy was found, Pillai’s Trace $= .021$, $F(12, 6396) = 3.732$, $p=.000$, partial $\eta^2= .007$, indicating that there are differences between age income groups in support for reintegration across domains and levels of involvement. Table A5.06 and Figure A5.06 for mean, standard deviation and median scores.

Between subjects effects were inspected to determine which age groups differed in their support for reintegration across domains and levels of involvement. Significant differences across age groups was found for housing personal.

For housing policy, the 18-24 year old age groups was found to be statistically different from all other age groups. Inspection of mean scores indicated that the 18-24 year old age group indicated higher support for housing personal.
Table A5.06. Means, standard deviation and median scores for the effect of age on the support for reintegration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live near</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government housing</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employment</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A5.06. The effect of age on the support for reintegration
**Education level**

A one way between groups MANOVA was performed to investigate education group differences in the degree of respondent support for reintegration across: *housing policy, employment policy, housing personal* and *employment personal*.

Assumption testing revealed that Box’s M was significant (*p* < .000), therefore Pillai’s Trace correction was used. Levine’s Test of Equality was found to be significant employment policy (*p* < .000). As a result a conservative alpha value of .01 was applied.

A significant effect of education group on respondent support for reintegration was found, Pillai’s Trace = .062, *F*(16, 8504) = 8.310, *p* = .000, partial η² = .015, indicating that there are differences between education level groups in support for reintegration across domains and levels of involvement. Table A5.07 and Figure A5.07 for mean, standard deviation and median scores.

Between subjects effects were inspected to determine which education level groups differed in their support for reintegration across domains and levels of involvement. Significant differences across education groups was found for *housing personal, housing policy, employment personal* and *employment policy*.

For *housing personal*, the bachelor degree or above education group was found to be statistically different from year 10 or below, years 11 or 12, and certificate education groups. Inspection of mean scores indicated that the bachelor degree or above education group indicated greater support for *housing personal* than the other groups.

For *housing policy, employment personal* and *employment policy*, the bachelor degree or above education group was found to be statistically different from all other education groups. Inspection of mean scores indicated that bachelor degree or above education group indicated higher support than other education groups across the domains/level of involvement of: *housing policy, employment personal* and *employment policy*.
Table A5.07. Means, standard deviation and median scores for the effect of education level on the support for reintegration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 10 or below</th>
<th>Year 11 or 12</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Bachelor or above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live near</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government housing</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Government employment</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Live near
- Mean: 3.08
- SD: 1.56
- Median: 4

Government housing
- Mean: 3.77
- SD: 1.90
- Median: 4

Work with Government employment
- Mean: 3.78
- SD: 1.54
- Median: 4

Bachelor or above
- Mean: 4.59
- SD: 1.91
- Median: 5
Figure A5.07. The effect of education level on the support for reintegration
Income

A one way between groups MANOVA was performed to investigate income group differences in the degree of respondent support for reintegration across: housing policy, employment policy, housing personal and employment personal.

Assumption testing revealed that Box’s M was significant ($p< .000$), therefore Pillai’s Trace correction was used. Levine’s Test of Equality was found to be significant for the following: housing personal ($p<.01$), employment personal ($p<.01$), and employment policy ($p<.000$). As a result a conservative alpha value of .01 was applied.

A significant effect of income group on respondent support for reintegration was found, Pillai’s Trace = .021, $F(16, 8032) = 2.672$, $p=.000$, partial $\eta^2= .005$, indicating that there are differences between weekly income groups in support for reintegration across domains and levels of involvement. Table A5.08 and Figure A5.08 for mean, standard deviation and median scores.

Between subjects effects were inspected to determine which income groups differed in their support for reintegration across: housing personal, housing policy, employment personal and employment policy. Significant differences were found across all four reintegration options.

For housing personal, the $1-249$ was found to be statistically different from the $1000-1999$ and $2000$ or above income groups. Inspection of mean scores indicated that the $1-249$ per week income group indicated less support than other income groups for housing personal.

For housing policy, the $1000-1999$ per week income group was found to be statistically different from the $250-499$ per week group. The $2000$ per week income found to be statistically different from the $1-249$, $250-499$, and $500-999$ per week income groups. Inspection of group means indicated that the $1000-1999$ per week income group indicated more support for housing policy than the $250-499$ per week group, and the $2000$ or more per week income group indicated higher support for housing policy than all other groups.
Table A5.08. Means, standard deviation and median scores for the effect of average weekly income on the support for reintegration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$1-249 per week</th>
<th>$250-499 per week</th>
<th>$500-999 per week</th>
<th>$1000-1999 per week</th>
<th>$2000 or over per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live near</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government housing</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employment</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A5.08. The effect of average weekly income on the support for reintegration
For *employment policy*, the $2000 or over per week income group was found to be statistically different from the groups: $1-249, $250-499, and $500-999. Inspection of group means indicated that the $2000 or over per week income group indicated more support for *housing policy* than the other groups.

Discussion: The impact of demographic variables on support for reintegration.

The impact of demographic variables on prioritization of the goals of sentencing

The results indicated that the variables age, education level and average weekly income impacted on prioritization of the different goals of sentencing. Conversely, gender did not have an impact, indicating that there was not different in the way males and females prioritise the goals of sentencing. This finding is consistent with prior research that indicates no gender different in support for the goals of sentencing (Roberts & Gebotys, 1989; Warr & Stafford, 1984).

Mean assigned priority indicate a consistent pattern across age groups to assign higher priority to the goals of *make community safer, deter offender* and *punishment*, while higher priority (i.e. less support) was given for the goals of *provide a measure of seriousness, rehabilitation* and *help offenders to live productive lives*. Of note, across all age groups except 18-24 years, *rehabilitation* received the second highest priority (provide a measure of seriousness was second higher priority, with rehabilitation third highest for 18-24 year olds). Across all
age groups, reintegration (*help offenders live productive lives*) received the highest priority, indicating that reintegration was prioritised after all other sentencing options regardless of participant age.

Age was found to have a statistically significant impact on the way in which participants prioritised the goals of sentencing. Younger participants were found to prioritise the goals *general deterrence, make the community safer, provide a measure of seriousness, rehabilitate offenders, and help offenders to live productive lives* higher than those of other age groups (with a lower priority indicating higher important; 1 = 1st priority). No significant difference in age groups was found for the goals *deter offender and punishment*. These results indicate that while there is little difference between older and younger participants in prioritization of goals of sentencing that are retributive in nature (*punishment* and *deter offender*), there is some evidence to support older and younger participants differ in their support for alternative sentencing objectives, including rehabilitation and reintegration (*help offenders to live productive lives*). The findings indicate that older individual are willing to support rehabilitation and reintegration alongside more traditional sentencing options, while younger individuals tend to endorse traditional sentencing options first, following by rehabilitation and reintegration. This finding is not consistent with prior research that indicates that younger individuals support a range of sanctioning options, while older individuals endorse retribution as a primary sanctioning option (Templeton & Hartnagel, 2012; Warr & Stafford, 1984)

Education level was found to have a significant impact on prioritization of sentencing goals, with results indicating statistically significant difference between participants who have attained school year 10 or below than those who have attained a bachelor degree or above, for the goals *deter offender* and *rehabilitate*. In all cases, the year 10 or below group assigned lower priority to the goals *deter offender and rehabilitate* than other age groups.

For the goals, *rehabilitate* and *help offenders live productive lives* the year 10 or below and year 11 or 12 school attainment groups were found to be significantly different, with the latter group assigning a lower priority (i.e. more support).
Additionally, the bachelor degree or above group was found to be statistically different from all other education level groups for the goals *punishment* and *provide a measure of seriousness*, with the bachelor degree or above group assigning higher priority for the goals.

The results indicate that individuals with lower educational attainment tend to prioritise punishment as a primary goal of sentencing. This finding is consistent with prior research that report that individuals with less education attainment tend to be more punitive (Indermauer & Roberts, 2005; Templeton & Hartnagel, 2012). On the other hand, the findings indicate that individual with lower educational attainment are more supportive of alternatives to punishment, including rehabilitation and reintegration. This finding is consistent with the general pattern of prioritization observed. Mean assigned priority across sentencing options indicates that individuals with lower education level endorse the use of all sentencing options more so than individuals with high educational attainment, with the latter prioritizing traditional goals before they endorse reintegration.

Findings suggest that those with lower educational attainment are willing to support the needs of offenders via rehabilitation and reintegration. Lower educational attainment may reflect limited access to community resources (e.g. stable education). It is possible this group endorse more support for reintegration as they themselves have experienced social exclusion or disenfranchisement.

Participants who earned $2000 or move per week were found to assign a lower priority to the sentencing goals of *punishment, provide a measure of seriousness,* and *help offenders live productive lives,* compared to all other income groups. These results are interesting as they indicate that those with a higher average income differ from those with lower average income on both ‘extremes’; they were least likely to assign top priority to punishment *as well as* to reintegration compare to all other groups. Inspection of prioritization across sentencing goals indicates a general pattern whereby the $2000 or more group assigned higher priority to all the goals of sentencing. These findings indicate that those with higher income are less willing than those with lower income to assign a top priority to any sentencing goal. This findings can be viewed as consistent with that of Dowler (2003) and Walker, et al., (1988), who report less punitive attitudes.
among those with higher income levels. However, interestingly the current findings indicate that higher income individuals would also be less likely to support alternative sentencing options.

The impact of demographic variables on support for reintegration

Results indicated that there was a different in the way males and females endorse support for reintegration at the levels of housing personal, housing policy and employment personal, with males being more supportive than females. No gender difference was found for employment policy.

Gender difference reported here appears to conflict with prior research that has reported females as less punitive and more likely to support alternative sentencing options including rehabilitation (Applegate et al., 2002; Cullen et al., 2000; Kelly & Braithwaite, 1990). It is noteworthy that the gender different emerged at the personal involvement level across both domains. In contrast, prior research typically measured punitiveness in the abstract. Less female support at the personal level may reflect general concerns about safety, such as increased fear of crime and victimization in females (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Along similar lines, the domain of housing signifies more vulnerability than employment, which may provide some explanation as to why females were less supportive of housing policy than males, yet no gender difference was found for employment policy.

Age was not found to have an impact on support for the reintegration options of housing policy, employment personal or employment policy. Participants aged 18-24 years old were found to be more supportive of reintegration housing personal than any other age group. It is an interesting findings that the reintegration option that represents the highest level of involvement with ex-offenders, and perhaps the highest level of risk, was the option where age groups differed. These findings are consistent with prior research that has shown younger individuals are more supportive of alternative sanctioning options (Warr & Stafford, 1984).

Looked at another way, the results may not indicate so much that younger individuals support reintegration more, rather older individuals support reintegration less; at least when it comes to the highest level of involvement
This finding is consistent with prior research that indicates older individuals are more punitive. Interestingly, this research has distinguished elderly individuals (60 years and over) from adult-aged individuals (Gibson et al., 2005; Walker et al., 1988). However, the findings here indicate that when the conditions of support involve a high level of personal involvement (living next door to an ex-offender) individuals aged 25 years and over will be less willing to support than those ages 18-24 years old.

Education level was found to impact on support for reintegration across all options (housing personal, housing policy, employment personal; and employment policy). Individuals with a bachelor degree or above where more supportive of reintegration than individuals with lower educational attainment. This result is consistent with research reporting levels of punitiveness decrease with higher educational attainment (Kelly & Braithwaite, 1990; McCorkle, 1993; Roberts & Indermaur, 2007; Walker, et al., 1988).

Income level was found to impact on support for reintegration. At the personal involvement levels, those with lower average weekly income ($1-249 per week) endorsed less support for reintegration in the housing and employment domains. At the policy level, those with higher average weekly income ($2000 or more per week) endorsed greater support for reintegration compared to those with lower weekly income. The results are consistent with research indicating increased punitiveness among those with lower income (Dowler, 2003; Walker et al., 1988), although it is noted that other research has reported the opposite association (Kury & Ferdinand, 1999), or not effect of income (Applegate et al., 1996). The results indicate that those with greater economic capital are more likely that those with less to support government funding for reintegration, that is sharing of community economic resources, while those with less economic capital are less likely than those with more to be personally involved in reintegration.

Beliefs about forfeiture may relate to income differences in support for reintegration. Those with lower weekly income may themselves be reciprocates of community social services, and therefore less willing to support any resources going to those who have offended over disenfranchised people who have not offended.
The findings may also indicate that non-offending individuals who are economically disadvantaged in society may not support coming into contact with ex-offender as much as their more economically powerful counterparts, because they feel less able to respond to vulnerability or victimization that those with more economic resources.

Conclusions

The findings indicate that demographic variables do impact on public support for reintegration. In particular, age, education level and average weekly income were found to impact on support for the difference goals of sentencing. Although, it is noted that regardless of respondent characteristic, reintegration remained the sentencing option the received the highest priority (i.e. least overall support compared to other options).

The findings also indicated that gender, age, education level and average weekly income do impact on public support for reintegration. Overall the results indicate that males are more likely to support reintegration at a personal level; young adult (18-24 years) individuals are more likely prepared to live next door to an ex-offender; those with higher educational attainment are more likely to support reintegration; and, those with higher average weekly income are more likely to support reintegration than those with lower income, with higher income endorsing high government reintegration support, and lower income endorsing lower individual involvement in reintegration.

The findings highlight that there are differences within the Victorian community, in willingness to support reintegration, and give some indication as to which subpopulations of the public are more likely to support reintegration than others. This knowledge can inform initiatives that hope to back reintegration by identifying which pockets of the community are more likely to support certain reintegration initiatives.
Appendix 6: Univariate outliers identified in the data, including percentage of cases that are outliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>z-score (p&lt;.001)</th>
<th>Percentage of cases that are outliers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>&lt; 2.29</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment personal - committed multiple crimes</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal - completed a prisoner sentence</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing personal - committed multiple crimes</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of sentencing - punishment</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of sentencing - make community safer</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of sentencing - deter others</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of sentencing - deter offender</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of sentencing - rehabilitate</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of sentencing - provide a measure of seriousness</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success rehabilitation</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success reintegration</td>
<td>&lt; 2.29</td>
<td>.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs crime has increased</td>
<td>&lt; 2.29</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>&lt; 2.29</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>&gt; 2.29</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>