INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

**Offenders' Perceptions of Factors Related to Outcome (Success or Failure)
Upon Release From Prison**

by

Heather C. Burke, B.A. (Hons.)

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of**

(Master of Arts)

Department of Psychology

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
December, 1997**

**©copyright
1997, Heather C. Burke**

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-26951-5

The undersigned recommend to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research acceptance of this thesis

**“Offenders’ Perceptions of Factors Related to Outcome (Success or Failure)
Upon Release From Prison”**

submitted by Heather C. Burke, B.A. (Hons.)
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Psychology

Carleton University
December, 1997

Abstract

This study explored releasees' perceptions of the factors related to their success and failure on release. The perceptions of the releasees were compared with objective risk and need assessments. The relation between psychopathy and risk/needs was also investigated. Participants were 58 male federal releasees on day parole, full parole, or statutory release: 29 successful releasees (completed their sentences or were in the community for at least 2 years) and 29 unsuccessful releasees (revoked or recommended for revocation). Risk and needs were assessed using the Level of Service Inventory-Ontario Revision (LSI-OR; Andrews et al., 1984) and the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale (CRNMS; Motiuk & Porporino, 1989). Psychopathy was assessed using the Psychopathy Checklist –Revised (Hare, 1991). Releasees reported similar factors related to release outcome as found by risk/need instruments. Successful releasees were more likely to report employment, significant other, friends, and parole officers as related success on release. Unsuccessful releasees tended to attribute their parole failure to aspects of their release and corrections and unemployment or dissatisfaction with employment. Both groups tended to recognize the importance of employment to their success on release, but failed to appreciate the effects of substance use. Psychopathy was positively correlated with risk and needs. Psychopathy was related to higher need scores on all areas of the LSI-OR except antisocial associates, and to employment pattern, drug usage, and attitude on the CRNMS. The results have implications for supervision and management of offenders.

Acknowledgments

There are many people that I wish to thank for their much appreciated assistance with this thesis. It was with their help that this study was possible.

Thank you to Ms. Rosemary O'Brien and Dr. Sharon Kennedy at the Ottawa Parole Office, Ms. Joann Blais at Kingston Parole Office, Dr. Tony Glover at Millhaven Institution, and Dr. Larry Gauzas and Dr. Catherine Grant at Ottawa Carleton Detention Centre for their support of this project. I am grateful to the parole officers at the Ottawa and Kingston Parole Offices who were key in the recruiting releasees in the community and for lending their offices to Heather and I for the interviews. Thank you also to Jeanne, Rosemary, and Elaine at Millhaven Institution for assisting me in recruiting participants and for sharing their work space.

Thank you to my committee members, Dr. Adelle Forth, Dr. Sharon Kennedy, Dr. Don Andrews, Dr. Katherine Kelly, and Dr. Bob Zacharko for their thoughtful comments and suggestions on the prospectus as well as for the final version of this thesis.

Thank you to Graduate Studies at Carleton University and Dr. Adelle Forth for their financial assistance in conducting this research. Thank you to Dr. Sharon Kennedy for her assistance in getting accommodations for the interviews in Kingston.

I also want to thank all the participants at the parole offices and institutions who gave their time and for their willingness to share their experiences.

I am also grateful to Heather Vamplew who assisted with interviewing, file reviews, and assessments, and generously came with me to Kingston to assist with the research.

I particularly grateful to Dr. Adelle Forth, my academic advisor, for her support and guidance over the past three years.

Thank you to my friends, Janice and Marlo for their feedback at various stages of the thesis and for their kindness and thoughtfulness.

Finally, I would like to thank my partner Neil for his love, support, and data entry skills.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	ix
List of Appendices	xi
Introduction	1
Literature Review	2
Glossary of Terms	3
Principles of Risk and Need	5
Static and Dynamic Predictors of Recidivism	6
The Level of Service Inventory - Ontario Revision	11
The Community Risk Needs Management Scale.....	13
Offenders' Perception of Criminogenic Needs	16
Psychopathy	23
A Brief Historical Background	23
Construct and Assessment	24
Psychopathy and Criminal Behaviour	25
Psychopathy and Recidivism.....	25
Rationale for Present Study	26
Purpose and Hypotheses.....	28

Method.....	30
Participants	30
Selection Criteria	30
Recruitment Process.....	30
Response Rates.....	31
General Demographics	32
Release Status and Release Outcome	36
Design.....	37
Measures.....	37
Hare Psychopathy Checklist - Revised (PCL-R)	37
Community Risk/Needs Management Scale (CRNMS)	38
The Level of Service Inventory - Ontario Revision (LSI-OR)	39
Offenders' Perceived Factors Related to Release Outcome (OPF)	40
Self-Monitoring to Prevent Relapse (SMPR)	41
Coping Situations	42
Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR).....	43
File Review	43
Semi-structured Interview	43
Procedures.....	44
Feedback to Participants	45

Results	45
Data Screening	45
Missing Data	45
Outliers.....	46
Normality	47
Reliability of Measures	47
BIDR Results.....	50
Criminal History.....	50
Current Offence.....	51
Offender Type Classifications	54
Current Release	56
Comparing Groups on the PCL-R, LSI-OR and CRNMS.....	58
Coping Efficacy and Adequacy.....	60
Positive and Negative Factors on Release	61
Positive Factors	61
Group Differences in Positive Factors.....	62
Negative Factors	64
Group Differences in Negative Factors.....	66
The Effects of Various Factors on Release	66
Criminogenic Risk/Needs and Release Outcome	71
Psychopathy, Release Outcome, and Risk/Needs.....	74
Exploratory Analyses: Self-monitoring to Prevent Relapse	78

Discussion	81
Descriptives of Measures	81
BIDR and Study Variables	83
The Relation Between LSI-OR, CRNMS and Release Outcome	83
The Relation Between Specific Criminogenic Needs and Release Outcome	84
Releasees' Perceptions of Release.....	85
Positive Factors Reported by Releasees	86
Negative Factors Reported by Releasees	89
Releasees' Perceptions of Specific Factors on Release.....	92
Coping Efficacy and Adequacy.....	93
The Relation Between PCL-R and Release Outcome.....	93
PCL-R Factor Scores and Specific Need Areas.....	94
Self-Monitoring to Prevent Relapse.....	95
Limitations of the Present Study	97
Conclusions.....	99
Directions for Future Research	100
References	103
Appendices	109

List of Tables

Table 1:	Meta-Analysis of Effect Sizes of Predictors of Recidivism.....	10
Table 2:	Response Rates for Releasee Groups	33
Table 3:	Distribution of Age and Education Level (in years)	34
Table 4:	Distribution of Ethnicity and Marital Status	35
Table 5:	Inter-rater Reliability of Measures	48
Table 6:	Cronbach's Alphas and Mean Inter-item Correlations for Measures....	49
Table 7:	Criminal History for Releasee Groups.....	52
Table 8:	Current Offences for Releasee Groups	53
Table 9:	Offender Type by Releasee Groups	55
Table 10:	Current Release Type for Releasee Groups	57
Table 11:	PCL-R, LSI-OR, and CRNMS Scores for Releasee Groups	59
Table 12:	Positive Factors on Release for Releasee Groups	63
Table 13:	Negative Factors on Release for Releasee Groups	65
Table 14:	Impact of Various Factors on Release for Releasee Groups.....	68
Table 15:	Impact of Various Factors on Release For Successful Releasees	69
Table 16:	Impact of Various Factors On Release For Unsuccessful Releasees	70
Table 17:	One-tailed Pearson Correlations Between LSI-OR Scores and Release Outcome	72
Table 18:	One-tailed Pearson Correlations Between CRNMS Scores and Release Outcome	73
Table 19:	Pearson Correlations (One-tailed) Between PCL-R Scores and CRNMS and LSI-OR Scores.....	75

Table 20:	Pearson Correlations Between PCL-R Scores and LSI-OR Scores	76
Table 21:	Pearson Correlations Between PCL-R Scores and CRNMS Need Ratings	77
Table 22:	Criminogenic Needs Reported Closest to Relapse	80

List of Appendices

A:	Psychopathy Checklist - Revised (PCL-R)	109
B:	Community Risk/Needs Management Scale (CRNMS).....	110
C:	Level of Supervision Inventory - Ontario Revision (LSI-OR)	112
D:	Semi-structured Interview: Offenders' Perceived Factors in Success or Failure on Release (Successful Releasees)	116
E:	Semi-structured Interview: Offenders' Perceived Factors in Success or Failure on Release (Unsuccessful Releasees)	121
F:	Semi-structured Interview: Self-Monitoring to Prevent Relapse.....	126
G:	Coping Situations Questionnaire	129
H:	Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding(BIDR) Version 6- Form 40.....	135
I:	Coding Manual	137
J:	Semi-structured Interview - LSI-OR and PCL-R	145
K:	Informed Consent	166
L:	Consent to Audiotape Interview	167
M:	Consent For Access to Parole Files (Successful Releasees)	168
N:	Consent For Access to Institutional/Parole Files (Unsuccessful Releasees)	169
O:	Debriefing	170
P:	List of Contacts (Successful Releasees)	171
Q:	List of Contacts (Unsuccessful Releasees)	172
R:	Variables Transformations	173
S:	Positive Factors on Release for Successful and Unsuccessful Releasees	176
T:	Negative Factors on Release for Successful and Unsuccessful Releasees	178

Close to 7,000 male federal offenders were supervised on conditional release in Canada during 1996-97 (Correctional Services Canada, 1997). Previous research shows that the majority of these offenders will successfully complete their sentences in the community (Correctional Services Canada, 1986; 1993). Over half (54%) of male offenders on mandatory release served their sentences in the community without reoffending or revocation for technical violations (over a five year period; Correctional Services Canada, 1986; 1993). Moreover, recent evidence (Grant, Motiuk, Brunet, & Lefebvres, 1996) indicates that three of every four federal offenders released on day parole complete their release without revocation.

While these numbers are far from idyllic, it does show that most offenders successfully serve their sentences in the community. Considerable empirical evidence has been obtained about objective risk and need factors associated with recidivism. From this perspective, we know that offenders that succeed on release are generally lower risk and need individuals than unsuccessful offenders (Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Grant et al., 1996; Motiuk & Brown, 1993).

Predictors of recidivism and release failure have been identified, such as procriminal or antisocial attitudes and substance abuse. While extensive research has been conducted based on objective assessments of these factors, useful insight may be gained by exploring offenders' perceptions of the factors related to their success and failure while on supervision in the community, particularly from those who succeed on release. While a less objective approach, this may add to the knowledge of what is already known about factors related to recidivism and release outcome.

To investigate these issues, offenders' perceptions of their release and what was related to the outcome of their release was examined in both successful and unsuccessful releasees. Both groups of releasees were contrasted for their perceptions of their release. Finally, offenders' perceptions were compared with objective assessments of the factors related to the release outcome.

Psychopathic offenders recidivate more frequently and faster than other offenders (Hart, Kropp, & Hare, 1988; Serin, 1996; Serin & Amos, 1995). However, little is known about the risk and needs of psychopathic offenders. Given psychopaths' chronic offending patterns, it would be useful to see if offenders with psychopathic traits score higher on risk and needs and if they differ from other offenders in their criminogenic needs.

Literature Review

The literature review is organized as follows. First, principles of risk and need are described. Second, research on predictors of recidivism and release failure are reviewed including studies using the Level of Service Inventory - Ontario Revision (LSI-OR; Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 1995) and the Community Risk Needs Management Scale (CRNMS; Motiuk & Porporino, 1989a). Presented next is an investigation of offenders' perceptions of their criminogenic needs and how this is related to recidivism. Finally, the construct of psychopathy and its assessment will be briefly described followed by a discussion of the criminal behaviour of psychopaths. As well, the factors related to recidivism for this group of offenders will be explored.

Glossary of Terms

Before beginning the literature review, it may be helpful to define some technical terms used in this thesis.

Conditional Release Programs

There are three types of conditional release programs in Canada which allow offenders to be released from prison to serve part of their sentence in the community: day parole, full parole, and statutory release. During the conditional release period, conditions are placed on residency and behaviour which are legally binding in addition to the general condition of remaining law abiding.

Day parole. This form of release is granted for a relatively short period of time, generally six months. Its completion does not coincide with the expiry of the prison sentence. The purpose of day parole is to prepare the offender for full parole or statutory release. Offenders must reside in a correctional facility (i.e., a prison or halfway house) or report to this facility at regular intervals. Day parole eligibility is six months before full parole eligibility.

Full parole. Offenders are eligible for full parole at one-third of their sentence or after serving seven years, whichever is shorter. Offenders on full parole are released into the community to serve the remainder of their sentence.

Statutory release. This type of release replaced mandatory supervision in the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* which came into effect on November 1, 1992. Statutory release allows an offender to be released to the community after serving two-thirds of a fixed term sentence. Offenders serving life or indeterminate sentences are

not eligible for statutory release.

Release Conditions. When released, offenders must abide by certain release conditions. Standard conditions for all offenders include for instance, reporting regularly to their parole officer. Additional conditions are specific to the offender and may include, for example, curfews, prohibitions on substance use, and prohibitions on associating with certain people (such as criminals, former victims, etc.).

Suspension. An offender's release is suspended for violating release conditions, committing a new offence, or when the risk of the offender being in the community is deemed as unmanageable. If the transgression was relatively minor, the offender may be detained and released back to the community with or without new release conditions. If the reasons for the suspension are deemed serious, the offender may remain in custody and be recommended for revocation by the supervising parole office.

Revocation. Revocation or termination of conditional release occurs after an offender's release is suspended (i.e., receives a suspension). The offender may then be returned to prison and recommended for revocation by the supervising parole office. The National Parole Board makes the final decision whether to revoke the offender's release. Revocation results in the offender staying in prison to serve his sentence. The offender is usually released at two-thirds of this remaining sentence on statutory release into the community.

Success on Release. Success on release, unless otherwise stated, is the completion of conditional release without revocation.

Recidivism. Recidivism occurs when new offences are committed subsequent to

a prior conviction within a specific period of time (adapted from McWhinnie & Andrews, 1996). Often the specified time period is the duration of the offender's conditional release.

Principles of Risk and Need

This research follows the principles of risk and need first elucidated by Andrews, Bonta, and Hoge (1990). According to the risk principle, criminal behaviour can be predicted, and treatment should be matched to the offender's risk level (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). For the high risk offender, this orientation suggests that intensive treatment be used, while for the low risk offender, minimal or no intervention is advised. Research has borne out the risk principle by demonstrating that intensive treatment reduced recidivism for high risk offenders, but had a minimal or negative effect on low risk offenders (see review, Andrews & Bonta, 1994).

The need principle states that criminogenic needs (also known as dynamic predictors or needs) are the dynamic attributes of the offender that, when modified, are associated with changes in the probability of recidivism. These dynamic characteristics are a subset of the offender's risk level that includes dynamic predictors and static predictors (e.g., criminal history). Static predictors are also sometimes referred to as risk factors. Noncriminogenic needs are factors that are also dynamic and changeable but are not associated with the probability of recidivism. Using this perspective, criminogenic needs (e.g., antisocial attitudes) should be targeted in treatment to reduce the probability of recidivism (Andrews & Wormith, 1984).

Static and Dynamic Predictors of Recidivism

Several longitudinal studies have identified individual predictors and correlates of recidivism (Farrington, 1995; Knight & West, 1975; Rand, 1987). It is from investigations such as these and others that actuarial scales were developed. Actuarial scales generate a score which reflects a combination of factors that is predictive of some event (e.g., recidivism). Some longitudinal research in this area is now reviewed.

In a prospective longitudinal study called the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development, 411 South London males were followed from age 8 to 32 (Farrington, 1995). In general, those who were more deviant at age 18 tended to be more deviant at age 32, despite a general decrease in deviance. For example, adult social dysfunction at age 32, as assessed on a 9-point scale, was related to whether the adult was classified as a desister, an adult onset offender, or a persistent offender. The scale included quality of accommodation, cohabitation history, success with children, employment history, fighting, substance abuse, psychiatric disorder, and self-reported and official offending over the previous five year period. While 87% of unconvicted men were living quite successful lives according to this composite measure, this was true of 67% of desisters, 59% of adult-onset offenders, and only 44% of persisters.

Farrington (1995) also found that getting married, as opposed to staying single, led to a decrease in offending. Furthermore, an enduring marriage was negatively correlated with offending and seemed to act as a protective factor. Both separation from a wife and conceiving a child outside marriage predicted later offending (between ages 27 and 32) independently of all other variables. In addition, other factors which

influenced offending were being employed as opposed to unemployed, and moving out of London. Results indicate desistance from offending generally coincides with an improvement in other life circumstances.

Knight and West (1975) utilized a subsample of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development youth. They selected the most delinquent fifth based on self-reports and official delinquency ($N=81$). There were 33 desisters age 18-19 that had acquired no additional convictions or self-reported offences since age 17, and 48 persistent delinquents that had either acquired one or more adult criminal convictions or self-reported offences as adults.

Persistent delinquents tended to have more juvenile convictions than those who eventually desisted from crime. The desisters, but not the persistent delinquents, frequently reported that they had stopped associating with male companions as they did when they were younger. Delinquents who desisted cited that they had committed criminal acts for enjoyment rather than for instrumental goals such as material gain. In addition, the desisters hardly ever committed the offences alone without the support of the delinquent group. The desisters cited that the main reason for desistance was the potential consequences of getting caught.

Rand (1987) examined transitional life events in desistance from criminal behaviour in adolescence to adulthood. The factors investigated were marital and parental status, educational level, military service, and gang affiliation. The sample consisted of a subsample of the Philadelphia birth cohort of 1945 comprised of 9,945 males residing in Philadelphia between 10 and 18. Rand's sample consisted of 106

violent and nonviolent offenders.

Marriage had no effect on the number of offences committed or on age of desistance. Surprisingly, offenders who lived with a woman persisted in their criminal careers almost four years longer, and were responsible for a greater proportion of offences than single males. The high school graduates committed fewer offences. However, having a diploma was not related to offence seriousness or the age of desistance. Gangs members committed more offences during their affiliation with gangs, as expected. Gang membership was also positively related to the age of desistance. Fatherhood, military service, vocational training, and college education were unrelated to offending or desistance.

A recent meta-analysis of 131 studies measured predictors of adult offender recidivism and provides a strong summary of research in this area (Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996). The analysis indicated that dynamic predictors performed as well as static predictors ($r = .15$ versus $r = .12$, respectively). Table 1 displays the effect sizes for the predictors in this meta-analysis. For static factors, the best predictors were criminal history/history of antisocial behaviour, age/gender/race, and familial factors. By contrast, the strongest dynamic predictors were antisocial personality, antisocial companions, and antisocial attitudes.

In addition, similar criminological factors were found for predicting nonsexual recidivism of sex offenders (Hanson & Bussière, 1996), and recidivism of mentally disordered offenders (Bonta, Law, & Hanson, in press). However, for sex offenders, sexual recidivism was best predicted by measures of sexual deviance (e.g.,

phallometry) and to a lesser extent, by general criminological factors (e.g., age, total prior offences, marital status; Hanson & Bussière, 1996).

After identifying individual predictors in the research, actuarial scales were developed that examined a combination of predictors and provided a composite score. The first to be developed was the Salient Factor Score in United States designed to predict success on release (Hoffman, 1983). The Salient Factor Score has been demonstrated to be predictive of recidivism (Hoffman, 1983).

Actuarial scales were also developed in Canada in 1980s: the Statistical Information on Recidivism Scale (SIR; Nuffield, 1982) and the Level of Supervision Inventory (Andrews, 1982). The SIR scale classified offenders into five risk categories based on a total score of 15 items. Recent research has confirmed that the SIR has predictive validity for general recidivism (Bonta, Hann, Harman, & Cormier, 1996; Motiuk & Porporino, 1989b) and release outcome (Motiuk & Porporino, 1989b) in federally released offenders.

Almost all of the items of the SIR are based on relatively static factors such as those involving the criminal history of the offender. Hence, the risk level assessed by the SIR remains quite static. Therefore, to demonstrate changes in offenders' risk level due to, for example, treatment, it became necessary also to identify dynamic factors (i.e., needs) that if ameliorated would reduce the probability of future offending.

The following section reviews literature on the Level of Service Inventory and the Community Risk Needs Management Scale. Both instruments assess dynamic factors as well as static factors. The following discusses research for both scales in more detail since they were utilized in the present research.

Table 1.

Meta-Analysis of Effect Sizes Of Predictors of Recidivism

Variable	Mean r	k^a
Static Factors		
Criminal History	.18	164
Age	.15	56
Family Rearing Practices	.15	31
Juvenile Antisocial History	.13	119
Race	.13	21
Family Criminality	.12	35
Family Structure	.10	41
Gender	.10	17
Intellectual Functioning	.07	32
Socioeconomic Status	.06	23
Dynamic Factors		
Antisocial Personality	.18	63
Antisocial Companions	.18	27
Antisocial Attitudes	.18	67
Interpersonal Conflict	.15	28
Social Achievement	.15	168
Substance Abuse	.14	60
Personal Distress	.05	66

Note. adapted from Gendreau et al. (1996).

^a k is the number of effect sizes

The Level of Service Inventory – Ontario Revision

The Level of Service Inventory – Ontario Revision (LSI-OR; Andrews et al., 1995) is used to predict recidivism. The LSI-OR also identifies criminogenic needs to be targeted in treatment, and aids in management of resources. Former versions of the Level of Service Inventory (LSI-OR) were called the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI). The LSI-OR examines eight general risk/need areas and categorizes each as low, medium, or high: criminal history, education/employment, family/marital, leisure/recreation, procriminal attitudes/orientation, substance abuse, and antisocial pattern.

The results of the meta-analysis by Gendreau et al. (1996) demonstrated that that the Level of Supervision Inventory was correlated .35 with recidivism. Zamble and Quinsey (in press) compared LSI scores in federal recidivists and nonrecidivists. Recidivists scored significantly higher on total LSI scores than nonrecidivists ($\underline{M}$ =28.2 versus $\underline{M}$ =19.2, respectively).

According to McWhinnie and Andrews (1996), probationers were classified as very low, low, moderate, and high risk using the LSI. Recidivism was related to increases in risk classification. Recidivism for the risk levels were as follows: 9% for the very low group, 20% for the low group, 48% for the moderate group, and 73% for the high group. Similarly for violent recidivism, the rates increased with risk level: 0% for the very low group, 2% for the low group, 8% for the moderate group, and 22% for the high group. The number of new offences were also positively related to LSI scores.

In a study by Bonta (1989) 52 Aboriginal and 72 non-Aboriginal provincial offenders were assessed using the LSI. At the one year follow-up, LSI scores were correlated .51 with release violation for Aboriginals and .46 for non-Aboriginals. The LSI was also correlated with reincarceration (for a new offence or release violation) and was stronger for non-Aboriginals than for Aboriginals (.50 and .35, respectively). For Aboriginals, criminal history, education/employment, and substance abuse were related to reincarceration. Whereas for non-Aboriginals, criminal history, education/employment, procriminal attitudes/orientation, substance abuse, and antisocial pattern were correlated with reincarceration.

One study (Bonta & Motiuk, 1990) conducted a one year follow up of 106 provincial offenders released to the community. The LSI was correlated .39, with reincarceration. In a second study, Bonta and Motiuk (1990) followed up 244 provincial offenders released to the community including some low risk offenders (as determined by the LSI) who were diverted to halfway houses. At one year after release, the LSI was correlated .31 with reincarceration.

Recently, Rowe (1995) investigated the relation between the LSI and several outcome variables in 521 provincial releasees including both general and violent recidivism, as well as revocation. Rowe found that LSI scores significantly differed between successful releasees and unsuccessful releasees ($M=21.25$ versus $M=28.81$, respectively) and were correlated .25 with revocation. Revocation was significantly related to criminal history ($r=.25$), companions ($r=.15$), and substance abuse ($r=.16$). Moreover, the LSI was correlated .42 with general and .34 with violent recidivism.

Loza and Simourd (1994) investigated the LSI in federal male offenders. The offenders were classified as violent ($n=104$) or nonviolent ($n=57$) and contrasted on the LSI. Violent offenders were defined as offenders with at least one (current or past) major (murder, manslaughter, assault, kidnapping, forcible confinement) or serious offence (robbery, sexual offences). Violent offenders scored significantly higher than nonviolent offenders on the emotional/personal needs than nonviolent offenders. To a lesser degree, violent offenders also scored higher on family/marital, leisure/recreation, alcohol/drug needs, and total LSI scores relative to nonviolent offenders.

The Community Risk Needs Management Scale

The Community Risk/Needs Management Scale (CRNMS; Motiuk & Porporino, 1989a) is used by the Correctional Service of Canada to assess risk of reoffending, needs of offenders, and other factors which might affect successful reintegration into the community (Motiuk & Brown, 1993). The CRNMS is comprised of 12 offender risk and need areas: academic and vocational skills, alcohol usage, drug usage, antisocial attitude, behavioural and emotional stability, antisocial companions and significant other, employment pattern, financial management, health, living arrangements, stability of marital and family relationships, and mental ability.

Motiuk and Porporino (1989b) investigated risk and needs in 103 offenders on parole and 118 on mandatory supervision who had either completed their release successfully or had their supervision revoked during 1985. Forty-three of the offenders on parole and 56 on mandatory supervision were revoked. Risk was determined using the risk classifications of the SIR scale (Nuffield, 1982), however the five categories

were collapsed to three (low, medium, and high). The need areas examined were employment, financial management, marital/family relationships, living arrangements, companions, alcohol usage, drug usage, emotional stability, and attitude.

Need level, determined by number of need areas requiring intervention, was related to failure. Only living arrangements, companions, alcohol/drug usage, and attitude differed between release successes and failures. By contrast, employment, financial, marital/family relationships, and emotional stability were not significantly different for the two groups. Outcome on release was best predicted by knowledge of both risk and need levels.

Later that year, these researchers (Motiuk & Porporino, 1989a) piloted the Community Risk/Need Management Scale. Participants were 453 male offenders assessed for the 12 current need areas and followed up after 6 months. Risk ratings were based on either the SIR scale, National Parole Board assessments of risk, or the judgment of criminal history risk based on a thorough review of the offender's criminal record. Mental ability and health were not significantly to outcome on release (i.e., suspension or revocation), however, the other ten need areas were significantly related to outcome. Need ratings, based on judgment of case managers, and risk ratings as described above were rated to conditional release outcome at six months.

A six month follow-up of federally released offenders (573 males and 31 females) also assessed risk and needs using the CRNMS (Motiuk & Brown, 1993). Offenders were classified as high or low risk, and low, medium, or high needs. Risk and need levels were related to type of conditional release; high risk and medium to

high need cases were more likely to be on mandatory supervision, and low risk and low to medium need on full parole. Both risk level and need levels predicted suspension. The higher the risk level or need levels, the greater the rate of suspension. However, risk and need levels together were most predictive. There was a four-fold increase in the likelihood of having been issued a suspension warrant for those assessed as high risk-high need cases relative to low risk-low need cases (37% versus 9%, respectively).

Substance abuse, employment, and marital/family were the needs most often identified. Almost two-thirds of offenders were rated as multi-need. Employment, marital/family, associates/social interaction, substance abuse, community functioning, personal/emotional orientation, and attitude were significantly related to suspension warrants within the six-month follow-up period. As expected, offenders that were rated as less motivated in accepting treatment were more likely to be suspended on conditional release.

Grant et al. (1996) also examined risk and needs using the CRNMS for 937 male offenders on day parole. Seventeen percent were revoked for a technical violation and 8% were revoked for a new offence. Risk designations, need classifications, and risk-need levels differentiated those revoked for either a technical violation or a new offence and those who were not revoked. However, these classifications did not differentiate between those who were revoked for a technical violation and those revoked for a new offence.

The areas that were most frequently identified by parole officers were employment pattern, financial management, companions and significant other,

academic and vocational skills, marital and family relationships, and behavioural and emotional stability. Problems with substance abuse were the mostly commonly associated with revocation on day parole (i.e., a violation or a new offence). However, when a new offence was committed, the antisocial companions and employment areas were the areas most often identified by parole officers.

Often the highest risk cases did not have CRNMS assessments because, in many cases, these offenders recidivated before the assessments could be completed on them. Hence, the ability to predict revocations for new offences using the CRNMS was difficult to assess due to a selection bias in those who actually had assessments performed on them.

In summary, the strongest dynamic factors or needs related to recidivism are antisocial personality, antisocial associates, and antisocial attitudes. For static factors, the best predictor of recidivism is criminal history. Both the CRNMS and the LSI-OR assess factors that are predictive of recidivism. Offenders with the highest risk and need levels are at greatest risk for recidivism.

Offenders' Perceptions of Criminogenic Needs

Some studies have investigated the perceptions of criminals who desisted about their reasons for desisting. In a cross-sectional study, Irwin (1970) interviewed 15 male exoffenders who had been out of prison for many years and who appeared to have successfully reintegrated into mainstream society. Irwin consistently found two themes in the successful nonrecidivists: having an adequate and satisfying relationship with a woman usually in the family context and being involved in extravocational or

extradomestic activities. These men attributed their success in the community to a fear of further prison time, being weary about prison life, reduced expectations financially and in finding a significant other.

Jolin and Gibbons (1987) interviewed male offenders, 19 exoffenders and 30 inmates matched on criminal history. The mean age of the exoffenders was 47 as compared with 45 for the inmates. The exoffenders had been released from correctional supervision for at least five years and had been crime free for at least five years. The interview assessed social background, criminal history, life satisfaction, adult development, and social desirability.

The exoffenders were more likely to be married and not divorced, have some college education, be professionally employed, and earn adequate incomes. However, exoffenders and inmates were not markedly different in the number of children they had. Ratings of job satisfaction, self-esteem, and satisfaction with marriage were similar. Both exoffenders and inmates were more depressed and anxious than comparable middle-aged males in other research cited by the authors, but assessed using the same measures.

Nearly all of the exoffenders felt socially connected, however three-quarters said they would like to have more friends as compared to 37% of inmates. Exoffenders also stated that their friendships had changed, "real friends are more important (now) than just people to hang out with" (p. 249). In addition, they also self-reported fewer alcohol and drug problems than inmates.

Both inmates and exoffenders were asked about their attitudes and behaviours

and how they differed from when they were younger. Both suggested that a mid-life transition had occurred that included a reappraisal of their future and changing their negative behaviour. When Jolin and Gibbons compared the offenders with other middle-age males, offenders reported similar mid-life changes to nonoffenders. Thus, it appears that mid-life transition occurs in both offenders and nonoffenders, however its link to desistance from crime is not clear from these findings.

Meisenhelder (1977), in a retrospective longitudinal study, interviewed 20 noncareer property offenders about an earlier time in their lives when they had temporarily desisted from offending. These offenders cited their motivation for desisting was caused by a fear of doing more prison time and a desire to have a more successful life. Meisenhelder concluded that the desistance resulted from forming a meaningful bond to social convention and symbolic endorsement by a nonoffender that the offender was considered essentially noncriminal. Unfortunately, these men returned to criminal activity and the reasons for their re-engagement in crime was not investigated.

Waller (1974) investigated the experiences of 423 male offenders released from prison: 213 offenders who were released after the end of their sentence (releasees) and 210 offenders who were released on parole (parolees). The offenders were interviewed about their experiences at about one month, six months, and one year after release.

When the offenders were asked "Of the realistic concerns you had before release, which were the most important?". Close to two-thirds (64 %) of the offenders mentioned family as their first concern, while 10 % said was their second concern.

Employment was mentioned by 30% of offenders as their primary concern with about the same (33%) rating it as their second more important concern. For parolees, employment was the most highly ranked concern followed by family. For releasees, finding employment followed by finances were the most important concerns.

At one month after release, 38% of the releasees and 39% of parolees experienced at least one of the following difficulties adjusting to life in the community: anxiety, trouble talking to people, loneliness, insomnia, depression, difficulty getting used to things, and fear of looking like an “ex-con”. After six months in the community, 19% experienced depression, 19% anxiety, 12% loneliness, and 10% had a hard time talking to people. At 12 months, the proportion that felt depressed and anxious remained the same, both at 16%, however, symptoms of loneliness and trouble talking to people each decreased to 6%. It seems that most adjustment difficulties improved over time, but depression and anxiety tended to persist.

Another investigation (Shover, 1983) retrospectively examined subjective changes in self, ties to relationships, and jobs as factors in desistance in 36 noncareer property offenders comparing them with life histories of other offenders. During their late 30s and early 40s, Shover noted that most of the men began to take stock of their lives and began to view their youthful behaviour as “self-defeating, foolish or even dangerous” (p. 211). Shover also noticed that the desisters were increasingly aware of the limited existence of time and their goals and aspirations shifted away from material attainment and recognition. Moreover, the desisters grew tired of the problems and consequences associated with their criminal involvement. Many found a fulfilling

relationship with a woman and employment to which they attributed their desistance.

Zamble and Porporino (1988) examined the effects of incarceration and coping in 133 offenders. In addition to this primary focus, the investigators also examined lifestyle, behaviour, and coping of the offenders in the community prior to their current incarceration. Seventy-two percent of the sample had been previously incarcerated. The following outlines the typical lifestyle of the offender in the community as observed by Zamble and Porporino. "The average pattern was one of casual, unplanned days, with greater dependence on friends than family or work, little focus, and no goals" (p. 47).

This research also revealed that offenders reported an average of 3.8 problems in the community. Conflicts with a significant other were the most common and were mentioned by 59% of the offenders. Half reported financial problems while 39% reported problems with friends, 34% dissatisfaction with current lifestyle, 24% police or release inquiries or restrictions, 23% loneliness or depression, 20% problems at work, 14% drug or alcohol use, 12% unemployed or unsuitable employment, and 8% lack of future direction or goals. With the exception of police or release inquiries or restrictions, the authors note that, "Although we do not have comparable data for other populations, the most frequently cited categories seem common and ordinary. They are the sort of problems in living that we might expect to encounter in clinical practices, or, in less severe forms, to find in our own lives" (p. 53).

Offenders, on average, reported 2.6 episodes of anger and depression, 3.4 episodes of anxiety, and 2 episodes of feeling guilty per week in the community. Close

to a third said they never felt angry, while another third reported that they had never felt depressed. Close to a third also denied ever feeling anxious.

Zamble and Porporino found the offenders' coping efficacy was generally inadequate. Their responses were generally unplanned, disorganized, and impulsive. Furthermore, they often used the same coping responses even when it was apparent that their responses were ineffective. Moreover, about two of every three offenders used substances to cope with problems. Roughly half engaged in avoidance, escape, or palliative (i.e., using a pleasant event to reduce emotional distress other than drugs or social support) responses. Notably, the offenders lacked insight into the causes of their problems and their maladaptive ways of dealing with them.

Zamble and Quinsey (in press) investigated dynamic predictors in recidivists and nonrecidivists who had previously served at least one year in prison. Recidivists had also committed a new offence within one year of release which was serious enough to warrant a federal term ($n=311$). The nonrecidivist group ($n=36$) had to have additional criminal history dating back to before their minimum one year prison term. Nonrecidivists also had to have at least one year on release without being charged for a new offence. According to the researchers, this criteria was later eased due to the difficulty of finding suitable participants, however this final criteria was not specified.

Interview measures included the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI; Andrews, Kiessling, & Kominos, 1983) and questions about the six month period in the community preceding the new offence. For nonrecidivists, there was a parallel interview of the previous six months before the interview.

At first inquiry, 88% of recidivists mentioned that they had problems when they were released as compared with 39% of nonrecidivists. Recidivists were more likely to respond that interpersonal conflict and substance abuse and to a lesser extent, financial difficulties were problems they encountered after release. In contrast, nonrecidivists cited that work, school, and unemployment were problems on release. Recidivists mentioned almost twice as many problems and rated these problems as more serious than nonrecidivists.

The recidivists also had poorer coping skills. In particular, the largest difference between the two groups was in the handling of an interpersonal conflict with a spouse. Recidivists also had poorer coping adequacy than nonrecidivists. Coping adequacy was defined as a ratio of coping efficacy to the number of problems reported.

Violent prior offenses, ratings of hobbies, criminal socialization, isolation from others, concerns about their life, and global ratings of quality of life were worse for recidivists, even after controlling for age and criminal history. Recidivists rated substance abuse, physical/emotional health, relationships with wife or family, release supervision, friends, and constructive use of time as more serious problems for them than the nonrecidivists. The recidivists also reported using alcohol more, and taking drugs. These trends still existed after violent prior offences and social desirability were controlled.

In summary, the primary factors perceived by offenders in their desistance were having a stable relationship with a woman and being employed. A re-evaluation of goals and aspirations, being tired of the consequences of criminal involvement, and a

fear of doing more prison time were also perceived reasons for desistance from crime.

Psychopathy

In the next section, the construct of psychopathy and its assessment are briefly described. This will be followed by a discussion of the criminal behaviour of psychopaths. Finally, the factors related to recidivism for this group of offenders will be reviewed.

A Brief Historical Background. The construct of psychopathy originated with a French psychiatrist, Phillippe Pinet in 1809 (as cited in Pichot, 1978) who described some patients as exhibiting "mania sans delire" (mania without delirium). Patients with this condition were described as violent and impulsive, however were different from others with the same behavioural manifestations since they were completely cognizant of their actions. This general disorder became known by a number of labels such as psychopathy, sociopathy, antisocial personality, dysocial personality, and moral insanity (Hare, 1991; 1996). The vast number of terms for this disorder and inconsistent usage of these terms have somewhat complicated understanding of psychopathy.

All the terms emphasize socially-deviant behaviour in their diagnostic criteria. However, some fail to measure the affective and interpersonal characteristics that have historically been considered essential to diagnosis of this disorder. The terms sociopath and antisocial personality disorder, for example, are almost completely dependent on behavioural criteria which makes this diagnosis almost synonymous with criminal behaviour (Hare & Hart, 1995).

Construct and Assessment. There is generally consensus among most researchers and clinicians on what constitutes the construct of psychopathy. Affectively, psychopathic individuals are unable to form lasting bonds with others, display shallow and short-lived emotions, are lacking in empathy, and have a general disregard or lack of remorse for their actions. Interpersonally, psychopaths are egocentric, manipulative, glib, and dominant. Behaviourally, psychopaths are sensation-seekers, impulsive, and irresponsible (Hare, 1991).

Meanwhile, there is considerably less agreement on the assessment of psychopathy. Some of the instruments used to assess psychopathy are the Psychopathic Deviate (Pd) and Hypomania (Ma) subscales from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; Dahlstrom & Walsh, 1960), the Socialization Scale from the California Psychological Inventory (CPI; Gough, 1969), Antisocial Personality Disorder from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV; American Psychiatric Association, 1994) and the Psychopathy Checklist (PCL; Hare, 1980; PCL-R; Hare, 1991).

One such instrument, the Psychopathy Checklist (PCL; Hare, 1980) and its revision (Revised Psychopathy Checklist, PCL-R; Hare, 1991), measures both antisocial behaviours and the personality characteristics that traditionally have been important in assessing psychopathy (Cleckley, 1976). Approximately 20-30% of adult male offenders are diagnosed as psychopathic using the PCL/PCL-R (Hare, 1991). By contrast, the prevalence for Antisocial Personality Disorder using DSM III/DSM III-R criteria is much higher between 60-80% (Hare, 1991).

Psychopathy and Criminal Behaviour

Psychopathic offenders have quite distinct offending patterns. These offenders are younger at their first offence (Wong, 1985), commit more nonviolent offences (Kosson, Smith, & Newman, 1990), and are more versatile in their offending, committing a greater number and variety of offences (Hare & Jutai, 1983; Hare & McPherson, 1984; Kosson et al., 1990) than other offenders. Psychopathic offenders commit a disproportionate amount of violent crime in communities and institutions (See reviews by Hare, 1991; Hare, Forth, & Strachan, 1992; Hart & Hare, 1997). Moreover, the violent offending of the psychopath does not “burnout” and persists over the psychopath’s lifespan (Hare, McPherson, & Forth, 1988).

Psychopathy and Recidivism

Psychopathy has good predictive validity for both general (Hart et al., 1988; Serin, Peters, & Barbaree, 1990; Wong, 1985) and violent recidivism (Harris, Rice, & Cormier, 1991; Hart et al., 1988; Rice, Harris, & Quinsey, 1990; Serin, 1991). Research with male offenders also shows that violent recidivism occurs more frequently and rapidly in psychopathic offenders than nonpsychopathic offenders (Serin, 1996; Serin & Amos, 1995). Despite considerable knowledge about risk and needs related to recidivism in the general offender population, little remains known about the relation between psychopathy and risk/need factors.

Two studies examined psychopathy and factors related to recidivism. Hart et al. (1988) assessed 231 male inmates using the PCL prior to their release from prison on parole and mandatory supervision. Psychopathic offenders were three times as likely to

violate parole and mandatory supervision. Moreover, they were almost four times as likely to commit a violent offence than nonpsychopaths. Parole reports were also used to classify behaviour exhibited during release. Hart et al. found that psychopathic offenders were less likely than nonpsychopathic offenders to have stable employment and relationships during their release.

Rice and Harris (1995) investigated the relationship between psychopathy, alcohol abuse, and violent recidivism in adult male mentally disordered offenders in maximum security. Out of a sample of 618 offenders, 51 % were diagnosed with an alcohol problem and 22 % were classified as psychopaths. Psychopathic offenders were much more likely to have a problem with alcohol than other offenders (65 % versus 46 %, respectively). Alcohol abuse, however, was only related to violent recidivism in the nonpsychopaths. Nonpsychopaths may experience the disinhibitory effects of alcohol, thus increasing their propensity for violence. In contrast, psychopaths already display poor behavioural controls. As a result, alcohol use may not have the same disinhibitory effects on psychopaths and hence, may not increase the likelihood of violence for these offenders.

Psychopathic offenders are chronically antisocial individuals who present a high risk of general and violent recidivism. Despite the persistent nature of the psychopaths' offending, little is known about risk/need factors for this group of offenders.

Rationale for Study

After quite extensive research using risk/need assessments, results clearly indicate a distinct pattern of risk and needs that are related to recidivism. The higher

the risk and need level, the greater the probability of recidivism. Specific criminogenic needs associated with recidivism have been identified that may be targeted in treatment to reduce the risk of reoffending. Objective assessments of risk and needs are performed so management and treatment strategies may be developed.

It is possible that some additional factors may be identified by exploring offenders' perceptions of the factors related to their success and failure on release, particularly in successful releasees. Little is known about why the offenders themselves perceive they succeed or fail in the community. The research that has been conducted, for the most part, focuses on male offenders. It is for this reason that this exploratory research will be conducted with males so that the results can be contrasted with the findings of other investigations.

Certain needs may be perceived by releasees as important to their outcome on release. These perceptions may make the offenders more amenable to treatment and may indicate motivation to address these needs. Motivation with respect to criminogenic needs has been linked to success on release (Motiuk & Brown, 1993).

As well, there may be certain factors offenders typically recognize as related to the outcome of their release (e.g., interpersonal conflicts and substance abuse), but other factors which they fail to see as related (e.g., association with antisocial friends). Meanwhile, all of these needs measured by risk assessment instruments such as the LSI-OR and CRNMS have been shown to be empirically related to recidivism. Knowledge of offenders' perceptions may aid in supervising offenders and in working with offenders to reduce their criminogenic needs.

This research will also investigate the degree to which psychopathy is related to related to risk and needs. Specific criminogenic needs and psychopathy will also be explored to examine if offenders with psychopathic traits differ from other offenders. These issues have implications for the treatment and management of this group of offenders.

In addition, this research will explore what strategies are employed by nonrecidivist offenders to stop them from carrying out crimes. Perhaps these strategies may be used in treatment to teach other offenders what to do when they are experiencing similar feelings to offset their offending.

In addition, CRNMS and LSI-OR risk/need assessments were also conducted so that the results of this study could be contrasted with existing research.

Purpose and Hypotheses

The primary focus of this research was to investigate offenders' perceptions of factors related to release outcome. Secondarily, the purpose was to examine association between psychopathy, release outcome, and criminogenic needs. The following hypotheses were developed to explore these issues:

- 1) Releasees that succeeded in the community should have fewer problems which are less serious than unsuccessful releasees.
- 2) Employment and relationship with a significant other should be the factors that successful releasees perceive as most related to their success in the community.
- 3) Unsuccessful releasees should perceive interpersonal conflicts, substance abuse, and financial problems as the factors most related to their failure on release.

- 4) Successful releasees should have greater coping skills and will be better able to cope with their problems than unsuccessful releasees.
- 5) Criminal history, antisocial attitudes, antisocial associates, and antisocial personality are expected will be the most strongly risk/needs related to release outcome.
- 6) Successful releasees should be less psychopathic than those who are unsuccessful on release.
- 7) Psychopathy should be positively related to criminogenic needs and criminal risk.
- 8) PCL-R Factor 1 scores (the affective and interpersonal component) is expected will positively related to difficulties with a significant other and family.
- 9) PCL-R Factor 2 scores (the behavioural component) is expected to be positively related to difficulties with employment and substance abuse.

In addition, factors related to release outcome and strategies employed by successful releasees to prevent themselves from offending or violating the conditions of their conditional release will be explored.

Method

Participants

Participants were 29 successful releasees and 30 unsuccessful releasees.

Selection Criteria. Releasees in the successful group were selected from men who were supervised through Ottawa and Kingston Parole Offices. Releasees were asked to participate in the study if they were currently on federal release and would reach warrant expiry within the interview period or were on release for 2 or more years without revocation. Releasees reaching warrant expiry were on release for a minimum of 8 months.

Releasees in the unsuccessful group were selected from incarcerated inmates at Millhaven Assessment Unit (MAU) and Ottawa Carleton Detention Centre (OCDC). These releasees were on federal conditional release and had been revoked by the National Parole Board or recommended for revocation by the supervising parole office (i.e., reincarcerated pending National Parole Board decision). Offenders with PCL-R assessments on file were selected over other offenders for which no PCL-R assessments were available.

Recruitment Process. Successful releasees were recruited through the parole officers. Potential participants were identified using a master list of releasees and their release information (length, type, etc.). The parole officers were each given a list of potential participants on their caseload. Parole officers were then asked to contact the releasees on the list. Parole officers also added any additional releasees to the list who met the selection criteria.

Parole officers explained to the releasees the purpose of the study and asked if they would be willing to speak to the interviewer about the possibility of their participating in the study. Releasees who agreed to be contacted were phoned or met with during their subsequent visit to the parole office. During this contact, the purpose and task requirements of the study were explained and the releasee was invited to participate in the study.

Unsuccessful releasees were identified in two ways. Inmate lists at MAU were used to identify potential participants, releasees who were revoked or were recommended for revocation. The second way of identifying potential participants was through the Kingston and Ottawa Parole Offices. Releasees who were revoked or recommended for revocation through these offices were incarcerated at MAU and various other institutions including OCDC.

Potential participants were individually invited to meet with the interviewer and asked to participate in the research.

Response Rates. Table 2 displays responses rates for successful and unsuccessful releasees. Overall, 91 releasees were approached and the participation rate was 65 % ($n=59$). The participation rate was lower for successful releasees than unsuccessful releasees (58% versus 73 %, respectively). Over 90 % in each group consented to the interview, self-reports, and file review.

For the refusals among successful releasees, five of 25 successful releasees refused because of concerns about confidentiality. Nine releasees gave no particular reason for their refusal. Other reasons for refusal included moving, work, wanting to

get on with life, and not getting anything out of participating. Also, three releasees lived outside the Ottawa area and four had health problems that did not allow them to come into the parole offices. These seven were not counted as refusals.

Eleven of the potential participants for the unsuccessful group refused, two refused because they thought they were “too negative”. Two declined after their parole hearing and court appearance, two were due to confidentiality concerns, and another said he had completed too many assessments. Three potential participants gave no specific reasons for their refusal.

General Demographics. Table 3 and 4 present the demographics of all the releasees and the releasee groups. Comparing unsuccessful releasees and successful releasees, the unsuccessful releasees were about 10 years younger at release than the successful releasees. Ethnicity and educational attainment of the groups did not differ significantly. With respect to marital status, the unsuccessful releasees were twice as likely to be single and never married as compared with successful releasees.

Table 3.

Distribution of Age and Education Level (in years)

Variable	Releasee Group						t
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Age (at release)	36.24	11.10	41.59	11.60	30.90	7.56	4.16***
Age (current)	39.14	14.15	46.77	15.17	31.78	8.04	4.69***
Education Level	10.79	2.44	11.21	3.18	10.38	1.35	1.30

Note. Two-tailed tests between successful and unsuccessful releasees. df range from 55 to 56 for t-tests. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4.

Distribution of Ethnicity and Marital Status

	Releasee Group						
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
Variable	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	χ^2
<hr/>							
<u>Ethnicity</u>							
Caucasian	45	78	21	72	24	83	.04
Asian	1	2	0	0	1	3	1.30
Black	3	5	0	0	3	10	4.00
Native	3	5	2	7	1	3	.48
Other	3	5	3	10	0	0	4.69*
Unknown	3	5	3	10	0	0	
 <u>Marital Status</u>							
Single or never married	17	29	5	17	12	41	4.17*
Married or common law	18	31	10	34	8	38	.32
Other ^a	23	40	14	48	9	31	1.81

Note. ^a Separated, divorced or widowed. Percentages do not sum to 100 due to rounding. Two-tailed tests between successful and unsuccessful releasees. df for chi-squares range from 55 to 58. * $p < .05$.

Release Status and Release Outcome. In the successful group, 31 % ($n=9$) reached warrant expiry by the end of the interview period after a minimum of 8 months on release. Sixty-nine percent ($n=20$) did not reach the end of their sentence, but were on release for two or more years and therefore, met the selection criteria. Of these 20 releasees, 9 were serving life sentences for murder or attempted murder.

Suspensions, self-reported violations of conditions and reoffending of successful releasees during their release were recorded. For successful releasees, over half (55 %) were violation-free, they had no suspensions and did not self-report any violations or new offences. Over a third (38 %) of the successful group had incurred a suspension. Fifty-five percent of these suspensions were for technical violations and 45 % were for new charges or for suspicion of new charges. One of the successful releasees also self-reported reoffending during release.

In the unsuccessful releasee group, 48 % ($n=14$) had been revoked. Thirty-four percent ($n=10$) were recommended for revocation, but no National Parole Board decision had yet been made. A further 17 % ($n=5$) were recommended for revocation by the supervising parole office, but the National Parole Board had decided not to revoke, so these offenders were released. Of the 14 revocations, 10 were for technical reasons and 4 were for reoffences. Of the 10 remaining offenders recommended for revocation, 8 were for technical violations and 2 were for new charges. Finally, of the 5 releasees who were released back to the community, 3 had been originally recommended for technical violations and 2 were for new offences.

Design

The design was correlational. The variables were offenders' perceptions of what most contributed to their release outcome (success or failure), degree of psychopathy, coping efficacy and adequacy, LSI-OR Total and subscale scores, and CRNMS risk ratings and need ratings, as well as criminogenic needs.

Measures

The variables were assessed via a semi-structured interview, self-reports questionnaires, and a file review.

Hare Psychopathy Checklist –Revised (PCL-R). The Hare Psychopathy Checklist – Revised (Hare, 1991) was designed to assess both the behavioural and affective/interpersonal facets of psychopathy. The PCL-R consists of 20 items that are scored on a 3-point scale; 0 indicates that the symptom definitely does not apply to the individual; 1 indicates that the item applies only in some circumstances; and 2 indicates that the item definitely applies. A list of the PCL-R items are found in Appendix A. Total scores can range between 0 and 40, with higher scores dimensionally representing higher degrees of psychopathy. Evidence demonstrates that the PCL-R score is composed of two correlated factors (Hare et al., 1990). Factor 1 is comprised of affective and interpersonal traits such as selfishness, callousness, and lack of remorse for actions. Factor 2, by contrast, examines the behavioural traits of psychopathy, a chronically antisocial, unstable, and socially deviant lifestyle.

Considerable research with male forensic populations indicates that the PCL-R is both reliable and valid (Hare, 1991, 1996; Hare et al., 1990; Hart & Hare, 1989;

Wong, 1985).

The PCL-R was scored on the basis of information obtained from file review and from a semi-structured interview. PCL-R assessments were available from psychology files at MAU for 12 unsuccessful releasees. These scores were recorded and no PCL-R assessments were completed for these participants.

Community Risk/Needs Management Scale (CRNMS). The Community Risk/Needs Management Scale (Motiuk & Porporino, 1989a) is used by the Correctional Service of Canada to assess risk of reoffending and needs of the offender, as well as other factors that may affect successful reintegration into the community (Motiuk & Brown, 1993). The CRNMS is comprised of 12 offender risk/need areas: academic and vocational skills, alcohol usage, attitude, behavioural and emotional stability, companions and significant other, drug usage, employment pattern, financial management, health, living arrangements, marital and family relationships, and mental ability. In addition, special needs are assessed, such whether the offender is a sex offender, mentally disordered or has other special needs (see Appendix B).

The scoring for each area is assessed on a three or four point scale. The four point scale categories generally are as follows: an asset to community adjustment, no immediate need for adjustment, some need for improvement, or considerable need for improvement. Since not all of the need categories merit a rating of asset to community adjustment, some need areas are assessed on a three point scale (e.g., alcohol usage). The offender is rated as low, medium, or high risk, and as low, medium, or high needs based on professional judgment.

The CRNMS has demonstrable predictive validity in predicting recidivism for offenders on conditional release (Grant et al., 1996; Motiuk & Brown, 1993; Motiuk & Brunet, 1991).

CRNMS assessments were completed for all participants. The time period for assessing the CRNMS for the successful group was the time of the interview. For the unsuccessful group, the period for assessment was for the time on release just before they were reincarcerated.

Level of Service Inventory - Ontario Revision (LSI-OR). The Level of Service Inventory - Ontario Revision (Andrews & Bonta, 1995; Andrews et al., 1995; see Appendix C) is used to predict recidivism, identify criminogenic needs, and manage resources effectively. The first section of LSI-OR examines eight general risk/need areas: criminal history, education/employment, family/marital, leisure/recreation, procriminal attitudes/ orientation, substance abuse, and antisocial pattern. In Section A, each risk/need area has a series of items that are scored as either a 1 (present) or 0 (absent). The Total LSI-OR score is the sum of all items.

In Section B, specific risk/need factors are separated into two subsections: other personal problems with criminogenic potential and a history of various problematic behaviours. Section C summarizes the total score, total strengths, total personal problems, and narratives of strengths and concerns. Section E illustrates the risk/need profile by subscales and the total. On the basis of the total subscale score, offenders are classified as low, medium, or high on the risk/need area. Section F deals with other client issues such as social, health, and mental health. Section G outlines special

responsivity considerations such as motivation, low IQ, etc. Section D, Institutional Factors was for institutional use only and Section H Program/Placement Decision was not needed and hence, these sections were not included in this study. Only Section A was analyzed in the present study.

Information for assessment of the LSI-OR was obtained through the semi-structured interview and file information. The time period in question was the last time the unsuccessful releasee was in the community just before reincarceration and for the successful releasee at the time the interview was conducted. File information on the entire release was reviewed to assess the risk and need areas for the specified time period.

Research with probationers has shown that the LSI/LSI-OR has acceptable internal consistency (coefficient alpha $\underline{r}=.72$), inter-rater reliability ($\underline{r}=.94$), 3-month test-retest temporal stability ($\underline{r}=.80$), convergent validity (Andrews, 1982; Andrews, Kiessling, Mickus, & Robinson, 1986), and predictive validity (Bonta, 1989; Rowe, 1995). Though research has primarily focused on provincial offenders, the LSI/LSI-OR demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties and convergent validity with measures of relevant criminogenic constructs with federally incarcerated offenders (Loza & Simourd, 1994).

Offenders' Perceived Factors Related to Release Outcome (OPF). The Offenders' Perceived Factors Related to Release Outcome (OPF) section of the semi-structured interview for successful releasees is found in Appendix D and in Appendix E for unsuccessful releasees.

The OPF section of the interview begins with open-ended questions. The first open-ended question asked releasees if they found anything to be helpful on their release. In the second open-ended question, the releasees were asked if they found anything to be problems for them on their release. In the subsequent part, releasees rate 17 specific factors (e.g., significant other) for their impact on their release. The scale was as follows: -4 (great negative effect) to +4 (great positive effect). A rating of zero denotes a factor that had no effect on the releasee's community supervision.

For the successful group, five additional factors were rated: growing up or becoming more mature, treatment in the community or in prison, impact of potential crime on victims, and a startling or disturbing event, such as death of a friend or relative, or having an illness or near death experience. The unsuccessful group were also asked to rate five additional factors: didn't think I would get caught, crime is exciting or fun, victim(s) deserved it (the offence to be perpetrated against them), wanted revenge, and did the offence on a whim or impulse.

Self Monitoring to Prevent Relapse (SMPR). The SMPR section of the semi-structured interview developed to identify when the successful releasees felt closest to relapsing (violating conditions of their release or reoffending) on their release and what strategies were employed to prevent the relapse from occurring (see Appendix F).

More specifically, the releasee was asked to indicate on a timeline representing his release when he felt closest to relapse similar to what was done by Zamble and Quinsey (in press). The releasee was to rate how close he was to actually committing the offence, from zero to 100%, and what action he considered taking. The offender

was asked to recall what was happening in his life that may have precipitated these feelings. These responses were then coded into need areas. Finally, the releasee was asked what stopped him from relapsing.

Coping Situations. The Coping Situations Questionnaire (Zamble, 1989) is a self-report questionnaire designed to assess coping efficacy using five common situations: conflict with spouse over housework, being asked to work harder at work, running out of money, being invited to a party on a work night, and being lonely. In each case, the offender was asked to imagine that the situation is actually happening to him and how he feels about it and how he would deal with it (See Appendix G).

Feelings about the situations, how well the releasee feels he can deal with a situation, and how much a situation bothers the releasee were rated on a likert scale: range from 1 not at all to 7 very much. This data was not analyzed in the current study. Coping efficacy is assessed for each situation by rating the benefits and costs of each coping strategy given by the releasee (Palmer, 1996). Benefits were assessed on a scale from 1 to 5 and costs were rated on a scale of 0 to 3. Coping efficacy for each strategy was computed by summing benefits and costs. Overall coping efficacy was computed by summing all coping efficacy scores for the strategies. Coping adequacy was computed by dividing coping efficacy by the number of problems the releasee reported. Coping efficacy and adequacy were analyzed in this research.

While this assessment instrument has not been standardized, it has been used successfully in the past (see Zamble & Quinsey, 1991).

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR). The BIDR (Version 6-Form 40A; Paulhus, 1991) is a self-report questionnaire that was used as a means of detecting self deception and impression management during the interview (see Appendix H). This scale is a 40 item questionnaire scored on a 7-point likert scale from 1 not true to 7 very true. There are two subscales impression management (IM) and self-deception (SD) comprised of 20 items each. Before tabulating subscale scores, even items 1 to 20 and odd items 21 to 40 were reverse scored. One point was given for every 6 or 7 on each item. Self-deception was a sum of items 1 to 20. For impression management, items 21 to 40 were summed. Scores on each scale range from 0 to 20.

The BIDR has been used successfully in a number of studies and its construct validity has been supported (See Paulhus, 1991). The BIDR has also shown adequate internal consistency ($r = .70$) and test re-test reliability ($r = .81$) (Paulhus & Reid, 1991).

File Review. Variables such as the releasee's age at release, marital status at release, ethnicity, education level, criminal history, current and previous release history were recorded from file review. For the successful releasees, parole office files were utilized. For unsuccessful releasees at MAU, institutional and psychology files were used. However, for three of the unsuccessful releasees at OCDC, parole office files were used, because the institutional files did not contain the data required for the research. The coding manual for the study is found in Appendix I.

Semi-structured Interview. As outlined earlier, the first section of the interview explored offenders' perceived factors in success and failure on release. The second

section was used to obtain information for the LSI-OR and the PCL-R. This second section of the interview is contained in Appendix J.

Procedures

Each of the participants were asked to meet with the interviewer individually in a specified room either in the parole office for the successful releasees or in the institution for unsuccessful releasees. There, the purpose and the tasks involved were explained to the releasee verbally and in writing. The participants were then asked to read and sign the consent forms.

There were two versions of the consent forms, one for the successful releasees and the other for the unsuccessful releasees. The consent forms for the successful releasees were as follows: participant informed consent (see Appendix K), consent to audiotape the interview session (see Appendix L), and consent for access to parole files (see Appendix M). For the unsuccessful group, the same informed consent and consent to audiotape the interview session were used (see Appendix K & L). A consent form for access to institutional/parole files for unsuccessful releasees was also used (see Appendix N).

After obtaining consent, the interviews were conducted. Interviews lasted between 90 to 360 minutes. In addition, successful releasees completed the section on self-monitoring to prevent relapse. After the interview, the self-report questionnaires BIDR and Coping Situations were administered. The order of administration of the questionnaires was counterbalanced for each releasee group, respectively.

In some cases, the self-reports were administered before the interview or

separately from the interviews. Some interviews were conducted over more than one session because of institutions' or releasees' schedules or because the releasee felt tired.

Feedback to Participants. The releasees were debriefed after the tasks were completed and thanked for their participation. They were told that the intention of the study was to identify factors that help people like themselves succeed in the community and were given a written debriefing form (see Appendix O). They were also given a list of contacts if they had any questions regarding the study or felt distressed about anything during the interview or self-reports (refer to Appendix P for successful releasees and Appendix Q for unsuccessful releasees).

Understandably, some of the releasees were emotional about their experiences on release. Some were angry and others were quite tearful in recalling their experiences. All releasees, particularly those who were emotional, were encouraged to contact someone (their parole officer, a psychologist at the institution, or family or a friend) to talk if they were upset.

The participants were also given an opportunity to request a summary of the results of the study. All names and addresses of requesters were recorded.

Results

Data Screening

Prior to analysis, all variables were checked through SPSS for accuracy of data entry, missing values, and normality.

Missing Data. Six cases with 10% or more overall missing data were identified. For five out of the six cases, participants either did not complete the self-

reports and/or did not complete the section on self-monitoring to prevent relapse. Since, the self-reports and SMPR were not the primary foci of this research, these cases were retained. For the sixth case, it was not possible to complete the assessments because the releasee did not consent to the file review. Consequently, no collateral information for the assessments or criminal history data were available. As a result, this case from the unsuccessful releasee group was deleted from the analyses.

The amount of missing data for each assessment instrument was also assessed. Data for almost all instruments was at least 90% complete. There was one exception, the Coping Situations Questionnaire. It had six cases that had 10% or more missing data. Coping Situations was, however, retained for analyses, but these six cases were not used for analyses involving this instrument.

Cases with more than 10% missing on a particular instrument were also excluded from analyses with the instrument. Missing data was not prorated or replaced with means for any variables. Sample sizes were reported for all analyses.

Outliers. Univariate outliers were identified for successful releasees and unsuccessful releasees using box plots and descriptive statistics. An univariate outlier was defined as three or more standard deviations from the mean on a given variable. Three univariate outliers were located. Case 6 had 5 suspensions due to technical reasons. This value after logistic transformation was .78 and was changed equal to the closest value on this variable, .60 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).

Revenge, one of the various factors to be rated for its impact on release by unsuccessful releasees, had two outliers; one offender rated this factor as having a great

negative impact (-4), whereas the other case reported that revenge had a small positive impact on his release (+2). All other offenders rated revenge as having no effect on their release. The variable revenge was deleted from all analyses. Multivariate outliers were defined as having standardized residuals greater than 3.3 standard deviations. Investigations for multivariate outliers were conducted through regression (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). No multivariate outliers were found.

A total of 58 cases remained; 29 unsuccessful releasees and 29 successful releasees were available for analysis.

Normality. Several variables were transformed to reduce their skew and kurtosis to more closely fall within acceptable parameters (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996; see Appendix R). For transformed variables, transformed data was used to compute all inferential statistics. Untransformed data is reported for all descriptive statistics.

Reliability of Measures

Results for inter-rater reliability for all measures are presented in Table 5. Inter-rater reliability was acceptable for all measures, however was slightly lower for CRNMS needs. Table 6 shows the Cronbach's alphas and mean-inter-item correlations for the instruments. As shown, Cronbach's alphas and mean-inter-item correlations for the PCL-R Total and Factor scores were slightly below those previously obtained (see Hare, 1991). The LSI-OR was acceptable on these measures. BIDR Total and impression management were also acceptable on Cronbach's alpha, however had a relatively low mean inter-item correlation. Self-deception demonstrated a low Cronbach's alpha and mean inter-item correlation.

Table 5.

Inter-rater Reliability of Measures

Variables	Inter-Rater r
PCL-R Total	.96 ^{***}
PCL-R Factor 1	.94 ^{***}
PCL-R Factor 2	.90 ^{***}
LSI-OR Total	.94 ^{**}
CRNMS Risk	.87 ^{**}
CRNMS Needs	.62 ^{**}

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table 6.

Cronbach's Alpha and Mean Inter-item Correlations for Measures

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean Inter-item r
PCL-R Total	.76	.15
PCL-R Factor 1	.76	.28
PCL-R Factor 2	.65	.18
LSI-OR Total	.81	.40
BIDR Total	.84	.11
IM	.82	.18
SDE	.61	.08

Note. IM - Impression Management; SDE - Self-Deception

BIDR Results

The mean BIDR Total score for the total sample was 13.28 ($SD=6.88$), while the mean score for impression management was 6.79 ($SD=3.85$) and for self-deception was 6.48 ($SD=3.88$). The successful and unsuccessful releasees did not significantly differ in BIDR Total, impression management, or self-deception ($p.s > .05$).

Pearson correlations (two-tailed) between BIDR Total, impression management, and self-deception were computed for all self-reported variables and the Bonferroni Correction was utilized for each group of variables: positive factors on release $.05/39=.001$, negative factors on release $.05/27=.002$, coping $.05/2=.025$, coping for individual situations $.05/15=.003$, and effect on release ratings $.05/17=.003$.

Of all the self-report variables only BIDR Total was related to the strength of feelings evoked for coping with financial problems ($r=.41$, $p<.003$) and ease in coping with financial problems ($r=.44$, $p<.003$). The only significant association with impression management was ease of coping with finances ($r=.48$, $p<.001$).

Criminal History

The unsuccessful releasees were almost twice as likely as successful releasees to have had prior contact with the criminal justice system as adults (90% versus 52%; $\chi^2(1, N=58)=7.68$, $p=<.05$). Table 7 displays nonviolent and violent convictions and age onsets for both types of offending in the total sample, and for successful and unsuccessful releasees. The unsuccessful group were convicted for a greater number of nonviolent offences than the successful group. Unsuccessful releasees also received

more violent convictions than successful releasees, but this difference was not statistically significant.

Unsuccessful releasees received their first nonviolent conviction typically about three years earlier than successful releasees. The difference between age onsets for violent convictions was even more dramatic. Unsuccessful releasees were first convicted of a violent offence at about age 21, unlike successful releasees who were convicted for violence almost 8 years later, at age 29.

In summary, unsuccessful releasees were more likely to have previous contact with the criminal justice system as an adult. Unsuccessful releasees were also convicted of a greater number of nonviolent but not violent offences and received both types of convictions earlier than the successful releasees.

Current Offence

The current offence for releasees were grouped into five classifications: nonviolent, drug, sex, violent, and mixed. Results for current offence are shown in Table 8. Nonviolent offences were any combination of nonviolent offences. Drug offences consisted of only drug offences and sex offences were only sex offences. Violent offences were any combination of violent offences. The mixed category consisted of at least one violent offence of any type, along with drug or nonviolent offences.

Thirty-eight percent of current offences for releasees were mixed. Nearly one third of the offences were violent. Twelve percent of current offences were for drugs,

Table 7.

Criminal History for Releasee Groups

Variables	Releasee Group						t
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Nonviolent Convictions	15.28	16.03	11.28	16.98	19.28	14.20	-2.75**
Violent Convictions	5.76	6.38	4.72	5.01	6.79	7.45	-1.16
Age Onset							
Nonviolent Conviction	19.72	6.50	21.91	8.44	18.00	3.77	2.10*
Age Onset							
Violent Conviction	24.84	7.20	28.58	7.39	20.96	4.52	4.61***

Note. Two tailed t-tests between successful and unsuccessful releasees. df range from 45-56. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table 8.

Current Offence for Releasee Groups

Offender Type	Releasee Group						χ^2
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
	(N=58)		(n=29)		(n=29)		
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	
Nonviolent	6	10	1	3	5	17	3.22
Drug	7	12	4	14	3	10	.16
Sex Offender	6	10	5	17	1	3	3.22
Violent	17	29	13	45	4	14	7.10*
Mixed	22	38	6	21	16	55	7.53*

Note. Two-tailed chi-squares and fisher exact tests between successful and unsuccessful releasees. df=58. *p<.05.

10% were sex offences, and 10% were nonviolent offences. Comparing successful and unsuccessful releasees, the current offences for successful releasees were more likely for violent offences (45 % versus 14 %, respectively). One-third of the successful group received convictions for murder or attempted murder which likely accounts for this result. Current offences for successful releasees were also less likely to be mixed offences (21 % versus 55 %, respectively) than unsuccessful releasees.

Offender Type Classifications

Offenders were classified using their offence history into five similar offender classifications: nonviolent, drug, sex offender, violent and a mixed group. Offenders were classified as nonviolent if they had no violent convictions. Drug offenders were offenders whose offences were related to drugs. Sex offenders were convicted only of sex offences. Violent offenders were convicted only of violent offences and no other types of offences. The mixed group consisted of offenders who were convicted of a violent offences and at least one other type of offence.

Table 9 displays the number and percentage of each offender type for both releasee groups as well as for the total group. Over half of the total sample (55 %) were classified into the mixed group. Comparisons between successful and unsuccessful releasees were analyzed using chi-squares and fisher exact tests, where the number of cases per cell was less than 5. Comparing the two groups, unsuccessful releasees were twice as likely as successful releasees to be in the mixed group (72 % versus 38 %, respectively). There were no significant group differences in those who were classified as nonviolent, drug, sex, or violent offenders.

Table 9.

Offender Type by Releasee Groups

Offender Type	Releasee Group						χ^2
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
	(N=58)		(n=29)		(n=29)		
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	
Nonviolent	7	12	2	10	4	14	.16
Drug	4	7	3	10	1	3	1.21
Sex Offender	6	10	5	17	1	3	3.22
Violent	8	14	7	24	1	3	5.56
Mixed	32	55	11	38	21	72	7.13*

Note. Two-tailed chi-squares and fisher exact tests between successful and unsuccessful releasees. df=58. *p<.05.

Current Release

Table 10 presents the number of releasees in each group on different types of release. Slightly over half of releasees were on full parole, while 40% were on statutory release. Few were on day parole.

Unsuccessful releasees were more likely to be on statutory release than successful releasees, who were more likely to be on full parole. There were no group differences in who was more likely to be on day parole. No successful releasees were on day parole due to the study's selection criteria. Successful releasees were required to be reaching warrant expiry within the interview period (after a minimum of eight months on release) or were successfully on release for two years.

Successful releasees (excluding lifers) were released to serve nearly three times as many months in the community ($\underline{M}=62.43$, $\underline{SD}=12.62$ versus $\underline{M}=24.34$, $\underline{SD}=5.15$; $t=3.97$, $df=46$, $p<.001$) than the unsuccessful releasees. This is likely because many successful releasees were released earlier in their sentences on full parole. At the time of the interview, many successful releasees had been on release for over five years ($\underline{M}=64.11$, $\underline{SD}=66.10$), as compared with unsuccessful releasees who were out in the community for almost one year ($\underline{M}=10.62$, $\underline{SD}=12.64$; $t=4.28$, $df=55$, $p<.001$). Unsuccessful releasees were interviewed on average within two months of revocation or recommended revocation ($\underline{M}=1.36$, $\underline{SD}=.78$).

Table 10.

Current Release Type for Releasee Groups

Release Type	Releasee Group						χ^2
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
	(N=58)		(n=29)		(n=29)		
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	
Statutory Release	23	40	5	17	17	59	10.99**
Full Parole	32	55	24	83	8	28	18.96***
Day Parole	4	7	0	0	4	14	5.84

Note. Two-tailed fisher exact tests between successful and unsuccessful releasees.
df=58. **p<.01. ***p<.001

Comparing Groups on the PCL-R, LSI-OR and CRNMS

The unsuccessful group scored significantly higher on almost all measures than the successful group, as can be seen in Table 11. The groups did not differ significantly on PCL-R Factor 1.

The most dramatic differences were on the LSI-OR Total and CRNMS risk and need ratings which were almost twice as high for the unsuccessful releasees as for the successful releasees. Ratings for the LSI-OR also significantly differed between the two groups. On average, unsuccessful releasees were high risk unlike successful releasees who were low to medium risk.

With respect to CRNMS risk ratings, unsuccessful releasees were medium to high risk. Successful releasees, on the other hand, were low to medium risk. Similar results were found with CRNMS need ratings. Generally, unsuccessful releasees were rated as medium to high needs, whereas successful releasees were low to medium needs.

The two groups also differed on the PCL-R Total and Factor 2 scores. Unsuccessful releasees exhibited more psychopathic characteristics than successful releasees. Given the nonsignificant result with PCL-R Factor 1, it appears that the significant difference in PCL-R Total scores may be due primarily to the effect of Factor 2 on Total scores.

Table 11.

PCL-R, LSI-OR, and CRNMS Scores for Releasee Groups

Variables	Releasee Group						t
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
PCL-R Total	19.05	7.32	16.26	7.55	21.84	5.98	3.12**
PCL-R Factor 1	6.60	3.62	5.90	4.07	7.31	5.90	-1.50
PCL-R Factor 2	9.12	4.22	7.09	3.77	11.15	3.66	-4.15***
LSI-OR Total	19.28	8.67	13.55	6.70	25.00	6.35	-6.68***
LSI-OR Rating	3.33	1.25	2.55	.99	4.10	.98	-6.03***
CRNMS Risk	2.11	.85	1.48	.70	2.71	.46	-6.57***
CRNMS Needs	1.98	.85	1.41	.64	2.54	.64	-7.75***

Note. Two tailed t-tests between successful and unsuccessful releasees. df range from 53-56. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Coping Efficacy and Adequacy

Coping efficacy was assessed by examining the benefits and costs of coping strategies of the releasees. Coping adequacy was computed as a ratio of coping efficacy to the number of problems reported by the offender. The entire group had a mean coping efficacy of 14.98 (SD=5.35) and a mean coping adequacy of 26.97 (SD=15.98).

One-tailed t-tests revealed no significant differences between successful releasees and unsuccessful releasees on coping efficacy (M=15.42, SD=5.54 and M=14.64, SD=5.35, respectively; $t=-.50$, df=47, ns). There were also no significant differences between the two groups on coping adequacy (M=29.33, SD=16.05 and M=24.72, SD=15.97, respectively; $t=.92$, df=39, ns).

Two-tailed t-tests were conducted to assess group differences for coping efficacy on each of the five situations. A familywise alpha (.05/5) was utilized for all tests. Test results indicated no significant differences in coping efficacy between successful and unsuccessful releasees for the five situations.

In addition, the successful and unsuccessful group did not differ in the strength of their emotional reaction, ease of handling a situation, and the degree of distress for each of the five situations. The Bonferroni correction was utilized (familywise .05/5 = .01). There was a nearly significant difference between successful and unsuccessful releasees in the extent to which marital problems would bother them. Marital problems bothered the successful releasees more than unsuccessful releasees (M=3.08, SD=1.87 and M=2.03, SD=1.20, respectively; $t=2.45$, df=51, $p=.02$).

Positive and Negative Factors on Release

The mean number of factors that releasees found helpful on release was 3.41 ($SD=2.62$), as compared with a mean of 2.48 ($SD=1.69$) factors which were considered problematic. Successful releasees cited more than twice the number of factors they found helpful on release than unsuccessful releasees ($M=5.17$, $SD=2.04$ and $M=1.66$, $SD=1.86$, respectively; $t=7.20$, $df=56$, $p<.001$; two-tailed). The unsuccessful releasees also reported more problems on release than successful releasees ($M=2.86$, $SD=1.68$ and $M=2.10$, $SD=1.63$, respectively; $t=-1.74$, $df=56$, $p<.05$; one-tailed).

Positive Factors. The frequency of responses to the question “Was there anything you found to be helpful on release?” were tabulated for the total sample. Table 12 shows the positive factors reported on release for the groups (also see Appendix S for a more extensive list of the positive factors reported). Totals for each factor domain (e.g., social support) were the number of releasees reporting one or more factors contained within that domain. Half of the releasees reported social support, 47% reported corrections, and 40% cited internal factors were beneficial to their release.

For individual factors, employment was found most helpful by the sample with one in three releasees reporting this factor. Nearly one-third of the sample cited their significant other as assisting them on release. Friends ranked third and was mentioned by about a quarter of sample. Parole officer ranked as the fourth most frequently cited.

The frequency of responses for each positive factor within each releasee group

were examined. For the successful releasees, about three-quarters recalled that social supports and internal factors were helpful for them, while 59% cited corrections. Employment was cited by the most releasees as a positive factor with over half reporting it. Friends, parole officer and significant other were second, third, and fourth, respectively. Similarly, unsuccessful releasees reported employment and significant other most often as positive factors on their release, although these factors were mentioned about half as often as with the successful releasees.

Group Differences in Positive Factors. Chi-square analyses and fisher's exact tests were performed to analyze differences reported between the groups on the positive factors. These results are also reported in Table 12. Significantly more successful releasees reported social supports, corrections, and internal factors as positive for them on release than unsuccessful releasees.

Successful releasees mentioned several positive factors (i.e., factors that were helpful on release) more frequently than unsuccessful releasees: friends (48% versus 3%), children (31% versus 0%), parole officer (41% versus 7%), an internal decision to stop crime (28% versus 3%), a positive attitude (24% versus 0%), and a fear of or not wanting to return to jail (28% versus 0%).

Table 12.

Positive Factors on Release for Releasee Groups

Variable	Releasee Group						χ^2
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
	(N=58)		(n=29)		(n=29)		
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	
<u>Social Supports</u>							
Significant other	17	29	11	40	6	21	2.10
Children	9	16	9	31	0	0	14.14**
Parents	9	16	7	24	2	7	3.54
Siblings	9	16	5	17	4	14	.13
Friends	15	26	14	48	1	3	17.44***
Total	29	50	21	74	8	28	12.08**
<u>Corrections</u>							
Parole officer	14	24	12	41	2	7	10.22**
Halfway house	9	16	6	21	3	10	2.41
Treatment	9	16	6	21	3	10	1.02
Total	27	47	17	59	10	35	3.43
<u>Internal</u>							
Decision to stop	9	16	8	28	1	3	7.20*
Fear/not wanting							
to return to jail	8	14	8	28	0	0	12.38**
Positive attitude	7	12	7	24	0	0	10.67*
Total	23	40	22	76	1	3	37.15***
<u>Criminogenic Needs</u>							
Employment	23	40	16	55	7	24	2.78
Recreation/leisure	7	12	6	21	1	3	4.45

Note. Only factors reported by at least 12 % (n=7) of the total sample are shown. Two-tailed chi-squares and fisher's exact tests. df =56. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

Negative Factors. Table 13 presents the frequency of responses that were mentioned in response to the question “Was there anything you found to be not helpful or problems on release?” (See Appendix T for a more extensive table). For each factor domain the number of releasees citing one or more factors contained within that domain were reported. Fifty-nine percent of the releasees reported some aspect of corrections as adversely affecting them in the community. With respect to individual factors, structure and restrictions associated with release and employment (i.e., dissatisfaction with employment or unemployment) tied for the most mentioned negative factors. Parole offices and the system, being forced to reside at a halfway house, and finances were the next most frequently mentioned problems on release. In general, factors associated with corrections were most frequently reported of the negative factors.

The frequency of responses for the negative factors on release within each releasee group were tabulated. In total, corrections-related factors were negatively reported by almost three-quarters of unsuccessful releasees. Moreover, the most frequently reported negative factors for unsuccessful releasees was the structure and restrictions imposed on them by their release (28%) and employment (28%). The next most reported was being forced to reside at a halfway house (27%) and a poor relationship with their parole officer (24%).

Overall, forty-five percent of successful releasees reported interpersonal difficulties and corrections-related problems in the community, respectively. The factors most reported by successful releasees were difficulties with significant other (21%), the structure and restrictions on release (17%), and unemployment or dissatisfaction with employment (17%).

Table 13.

Negative Factors on Release for Releasee Groups

Variable	Releasee Group						χ^2
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
	(N=58)		(n=29)		(n=29)		
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	
<u>Interpersonal Difficulties</u>							
Significant other	6	10	6	21	0	0	9.01*
Friends	6	10	3	10	3	10	0.00
Total	20	35	13	45	7	24	2.78
<u>Corrections</u>							
Structure/restrictions	13	22	5	17	8	28	.90
Parole officer	9	16	2	7	7	24	3.45
The system	8	14	3	10	5	17	.59
Forced to reside at halfway house	7	12	1	3	6	27	4.45
Halfway house far from family/friends	5	9	0	0	5	17	7.40
Program timing	5	9	0	0	5	17	7.40
Total	34	59	13	45	21	72	4.62
<u>Emotional States/Coping</u>							
Anxiety	6	10	2	7	4	14	.76
Total	17	29	10	35	7	24	.75
<u>Criminogenic Needs</u>							
Employment	13	22	5	17	8	28	.90
Financial situation	7	12	4	14	3	10	.16
Alcohol/drugs	5	9	2	7	3	10	.22

Note. Only factors reported by at least 9% ($n=5$) for the total sample are shown. Two-tailed chi-squares and fisher's exact tests between successful and unsuccessful releasees. $df = 56$. * $p < .05$.

Group Differences in Negative Factors. In terms of problems on release, successful releasees reported difficulties with their significant other more frequently than unsuccessful releasees (21 % versus 0 %, respectively). There were no other significant group differences for the releasee groups

The Effects of Various Factors on Release

After the open-ended questions, all of the releasees were asked about specific factors and their impact on the release from having a great positive effect (+4) to having a great negative effect (-4). The impact of various factors on release for the groups are presented in Table 14. As in the previous tables, totals reflect the number of releasees reporting one or more factors within a particular domain.

In terms of the total impact of factors on release, the mean score was 9.98 for the entire group (SD=13.64; possible range from -68 to +68). The positive score indicated offenders felt their release experience was more positive than negative. Comparing the groups, the impact of all the factors together was nearly four times as positive for successful releasees than unsuccessful releasees (M=15.86, SD=8.99 versus M=4.11, SD=15.05, respectively; $t=3.55$, $df=54$, $p<.001$; one-tailed)

The two groups were each asked additional questions about different factors that were thought may impact their release. The successful releasees were asked to rate whether growing up or becoming more mature, treatment in the community or in prison, impact of potential crime on victims, and a startling or disturbing event, such as death of a friend or relative, or having an illness or near death experience had an impact on their release. By contrast, unsuccessful releasees were asked to rate whether

the factors didn't think I would get caught, crime is exciting or fun, victim(s) deserved it (the offence to be perpetrated against them), and did the offence on a whim or impulse had am .

Overall, for entire group the most positive factor on release was a change in expectations. Educational or vocational skills were perceived by releasees as the second most positive factor on their release. The most negative factors for releasees were substance use and depression.

Each group was investigated separately for the factors (see also Tables 15 and 16). For successful releasees, the most highly rated factors were getting older or becoming more mature, parole officer, changed expectations and living arrangements. For unsuccessful releasees, the most severe problems were with alcohol and drugs followed by anger, depression and anxiety, while the most positive were their changed expectations and vocational skills.

Results of one-way anovas were conducted to test differences between successful and unsuccessful releasees on the factors, using age and number of convictions as covariates. These results are shown in Table 14. Trends, though nonsignificant after the Bonferroni correction, indicated that successful releasees found their parole officers, living arrangements and friends were more helpful than for unsuccessful releasees. Unsuccessful releasees experienced significantly more negative emotional states particularly anger and had greater difficulties with substance abuse than successful releasees. Depression and anxiety were also greater, albeit not significantly (after correction), in successful releasees.

Table 14.

Impact of Various Factors on Release for Releasee Groups

Variable	Releasee Group						F
	Total (N=58)		Successful (n=29)		Unsuccessful (n=29)		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
<u>Social Supports</u>							
Significant other	1.78	2.54	1.72	2.49	1.83	2.63	.64
Parents	1.72	2.08	1.59	2.08	1.86	2.10	.41
Siblings	1.83	2.10	2.10	1.74	1.55	2.41	.01
Children	1.81	2.21	2.00	2.20	1.62	2.24	.00
Friends	1.66	2.50	2.41	1.92	.90	2.81	1.63
Total	8.63	6.17	9.83	5.07	7.39	7.02	1.51
<u>Corrections</u>							
Parole officer	1.34	3.11	2.69	2.02	.00	3.44	4.62*
<u>Emotional States</u>							
Anger	-.34	2.11	.93	1.58	-1.62	1.78	16.89****
Depression	-.55	2.18	.38	2.21	-1.48	1.72	6.26*
Anxiety	-.38	2.39	.62	2.03	-1.38	2.34	8.38**
Total	-1.28	5.30	1.93	4.11	-4.48	4.36	5.97****
<u>Internal</u>							
Values	1.91	2.13	2.17	1.89	1.66	2.35	.33
Expectations	2.45	1.90	2.59	1.90	2.31	1.93	1.62
Jail deterrent	1.16	2.50	1.66	2.48	.66	2.45	3.19
Total	5.51	4.10	6.41	3.96	4.62	4.11	1.69
<u>Criminogenic Needs</u>							
Employment	1.84	2.92	2.21	2.51	1.48	3.28	.06
Vocational skills	2.19	2.38	2.31	2.27	2.07	2.52	.02
Finances	1.29	2.73	1.34	2.58	1.24	2.91	.97
Living							
arrangements	1.57	2.89	2.52	2.34	.62	3.11	3.84**
Alcohol/drugs	-.63	2.45	.61	2.08	-1.83	2.19	15.27****

Note. One-way anovas controlling for age and number of convictions (covariates). df (3, 54) * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .003$ (familywise .05/17). **** $p < .001$.

Table 15.

Impact of Various Factors on Release for Successful Releasees

Factor	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Treatment	2.48	2.02
Growing up or becoming more mature	2.83	1.47
Impact of potential crimes on victims	1.93	1.77
Moved away	.97	2.13
Startling or disturbing event	.41	2.18

Table 16.

Impact of Various Factors on Release for Unsuccessful Releasees

Factor	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Didn't think I would get caught	-.31	2.09
Crime is exciting or fun	-.14	1.68
Victim(s) deserved it	-.28	1.83
Did offence on a whim or impulse	-.61	1.37

Criminogenic Risk/Needs and Release Outcome

One-tailed Pearson correlations between LSI -OR scores and release outcome are displayed in Table 17. A familywise alpha (.05/8) was utilized for all the correlations. As shown, LSI-OR Total scores were correlated .67 with release outcome. The risk/needs most strongly related to release outcome were criminal history, education/employment, antisocial pattern and antisocial attitudes. Less strongly associated needs were antisocial companions, substance abuse, and leisure/recreation. Family/marital was not significantly related to release outcome.

Table 18 displays one-tailed correlations between CRNMS scores and release outcome using a familywise alpha (.05/12). As the table indicates criminal risk ratings were most related to release outcome. The CRNMS need areas most associated with release outcome were employment pattern, alcohol usage, behavioural /emotional stability, drug use, and attitude. Less related were academic/vocational skills and living arrangements. Financial management, marital family relationships, companions/significant other and health were not significantly related to release outcome.

To summarize, the results indicate that criminal history, employment, and antisocial attitudes were most strongly related to release outcome for these releasees.

Table 17.

One-tailed Pearson Correlations Between LSI-OR Scores and Release Outcome

LSI-OR Scores	r
LSI-OR Total	.67****
Criminal History	.62****
Procriminal Attitudes/Orientation	.48****
Antisocial Pattern	.54****
Antisocial Companions	.38***
Employment/Education	.56****
Family/Marital	.19
Leisure/Recreation	.28*
Substance Abuse	.41***

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .006$ (familywise .05/8). **** $p < .001$.

Table 18.

One-tailed Pearson Correlations Between CRNMS Scores and Release Outcome

CRNMS Scores	r
Risk Rating	.73****
Needs Rating	.67****
Attitude	.41**
Companions/Significant Other	-.14
Academic/Vocational skills	.30*
Employment Pattern	.49****
Financial Management	.01
Alcohol Usage	.46****
Drug Usage	.42***
Behaviour/Emotional Stability	.46****
Living Arrangements	.23*
Marital/Family Relationships	.07
Health	-.09
Mental Ability	.13

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .004 (familywise .05/12). ****p < .001.

Psychopathy, Release Outcome, and Risk/Needs

The relation between release outcome and psychopathy was assessed using Pearson correlations. Release outcome was correlated .38 with PCL-R Total and .49 with Factor 2. Release outcome, however, was not significantly related to Factor 1 scores.

Table 19 presents the association between the PCL-R and both the CRNMS and LSI-OR. PCL-R Total and Factor scores were significantly related to CRNMS risk and needs ratings and LSI-OR Total. The PCL-R was slightly more correlated with the LSI-OR than with CRNMS ratings. In general, LSI-OR and CRNMS measures were more strongly associated with PCL-R Factor 2 than PCL-R Factor 1 scores.

Individual criminogenic needs of both the LSI-OR and CRNMS were examined for their relations with PCL-R Total (see Tables 20 and 21). The PCL-R Total was most strongly related to LSI-OR antisocial attitudes, criminal history, education/employment, and antisocial pattern. For the CRNMS, employment pattern, drug use, and attitude were moderately associated with PCL-R Total.

Specific hypotheses with respect to individual need areas and PCL-R Factor scores were tested. Family/marital relationships on the LSI-OR and CRNMS were both not significantly related to PCL-R Factor 1. Employment on both measures was, however, strongly related to PCL-R Factor 2. As well, substance abuse on both the LSI-OR CRNMS were moderately related to PCL-R Factor 2.

Table 19.

Pearson Correlations (One-tailed) Between the PCL-R Scores and CRNMS and LSI-OR Scores

Measures	PCL-R Scores		
	Total	Factor 1	Factor 2
CRNMS Risk	.68 ^{***}	.49 ^{***}	.65 ^{***}
CRNMS Needs	.65 ^{***}	.42 ^{**}	.67 ^{***}
CRNMS Needs Total	.52 ^{***}	.26 [*]	.61 ^{***}
LSI-OR Total	.79 ^{***}	.45 ^{***}	.83 ^{***}

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 20.

Pearson Correlations Between PCL-R Scores and LSI-OR Scores

LSI-OR Scores	PCL-R Scores		
	Total ^a	Factor 1	Factor 2
Criminal History	.72 ^{****}	.37 ^{***}	.76 ^{****}
Antisocial Attitudes	.74 ^{****}	.60 ^{****}	.64 ^{****}
Antisocial Pattern	.60 ^{****}	.31 [*]	.63 ^{****}
Antisocial Companions	.30 [*]	.22	.34 ^{**}
Education/Employment	.72 ^{****}	.46 ^{****}	.76 ^{****b}
Family/Marital	.40 ^{***}	.18 ^b	.36 ^{**}
Leisure/Recreation	.43 ^{****}	.23	.40 ^{***}
Substance Abuse	.36 ^{***}	.12	.46 ^{****b}

^{a,b} One-tailed tests. Two-tailed tests. $df=55$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .006$ (familywise .05/8). **** $p < .001$

Table 21.

Pearson Correlations Between PCL-R Scores and CRNMS Need Ratings

CRNMS Need Ratings	PCL-R Scores		
	Total ^a	Factor 1	Factor 2
Attitude	.45 ^{****}	.35 ^{**}	.44 ^{****}
Companions/Significant Other	-.24 [*]	-.10	-.25
Academic/Vocational skills	.39 ^{***}	.18	.46 ^{****}
Employment Pattern	.55 ^{****}	.22	.66 ^{**** b}
Financial Management	.06	.18	-.03
Alcohol Usage	.27 [*]	.14	.37 ^{*** b}
Drug Usage	.46 ^{****}	.19	.54 ^{**** b}
Behaviour/Emotional Stability	.06	-.19	.26
Living Arrangements	.06	-.01	.14
Marital /Family Relationships	.21	.07 ^b	.22
Health	.13	.17	.04
Mental Ability	.18	.09	.16

^{a,b} One-tailed tests Two-tailed tests $df=55$. ^{*} $p < .05$. ^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .004$ (familywise .05/12). ^{****} $p < .001$.

PCL-R Factor scores associations with other individual criminogenic needs were also explored. PCL-R Factor 2 is more associated with virtually every individual criminogenic need area over PCL-R Factor 1. Factor 2 was related to criminal history, education/employment, antisocial attitudes, antisocial pattern, substance abuse, and leisure/recreation on the LSI-OR. On the CRNMS, PCL-R Factor 2 was significantly related to attitudes, academic/vocational skills, employment pattern, and alcohol and drug use. Overall, PCL-R Factor 2 appears to be related to antisocial attitudes, employment, and substance abuse.

In contrast, PCL-R Factor 1 was related to antisocial attitudes, education/employment and criminal history on the LSI-OR and attitude and criminal history on the CRNMS. In general, PCL-R Factor 1 seems to be related to antisocial attitudes and criminal history.

Exploratory Analyses: Self-Monitoring to Prevent Relapse

Releasees were asked when during their release they felt closest to relapsing (reoffending or violating release conditions). The releasees were then asked how close they were to actually relapsing (0-100%) and what they considered doing. The releasees were asked to recall what was happening at that time that may have precipitated these feelings. These were categorized into need areas. Finally, the releasees were asked what stopped them from actually relapsing/reoffending.

Out of 27 successful releasees, 15 said that they never felt close to relapse. Two said that they felt close to reoffending, but there was a 0% probability of relapse. Another ten admitted to being close to relapse at some point in their release. The mean

probability of relapse reported by the releasees was 22 % (SD=36.44).

Four releasees considered violating a substance abuse condition, two considered robbery, two considered assault, two considered drug trafficking, one considered theft and one considered driving while impaired (n=12). The 12 releasees typically felt closest to relapse at about one-third into their release (M=.31; SD=.23), or after about 28 months in the community (M=27.86; SD=34.87).

Successful releasees were asked what was happening in their life that made them feel like relapsing. The releasees reported a mean of one criminogenic need (M=1.18; SD=1.17; n=11). Four releasees did not report any needs as problematic at their high risk time. Three releasees reported one need, two reported two needs and two reported three needs. Responses by releasees were categorized into need areas and are displayed in Table 22. However, this is based on a very small number of releasees.

Table 22.

Criminogenic Needs Reported Closest to Relapse^a

Criminogenic Needs	<u>n</u>	%
Attitudes	1	9
Associates/Social Interaction	2	18
Employment Pattern	1	9
Financial Management	3	27
Substance Abuse	1	9
Behaviour/Emotional	1	9
Marital /Family Relationships	1	9

^an = 11

Discussion

The focus of this research was to examine factors related to release outcome by exploring offenders' perceptions. These perceptions were then compared with data obtained from risk/need instruments. The relation between psychopathy, release outcome, and risk and needs was also investigated.

This section begins with a discussion of descriptive statistics for the measures and social desirability. Second, the relation between LSI-OR and CRNMS including individual criminogenic needs and release outcome is examined. Third, releasees' perceptions of their release, what factors were perceived as positive and negative, and their perceptions of specific factors on their release are considered. The relationship between psychopathy, release outcome, and risk and needs are examined in the fourth section. The final section explores releasees' accounts of what prevented them from reoffending or violating the conditions of their release.

Descriptives of Measures

This section reviews descriptive statistics obtained on the LSI-OR, CRNMS, PCL-R, and BIDR scores and compares this to existing research. The mean LSI-OR Total score for the entire sample was 19.28 (SD=8.67). LSI-OR scores were higher for unsuccessful releasees ($M=25.00$) than successful releasees ($M=13.55$). These results are consistent with findings of Wormith and Andrews (1995). The mean LSI-OR score obtained for male probationers was 14, while for male provincial inmates, the mean was 23 (Wormith & Andrews, 1995).

According to the CRNMS, releasees were generally medium risk and needs. On average, successful releasees were low to medium risk and needs. Unsuccessful releasees that were classified as medium to high risk and needs.

Together, about one-third of releasees were classified in each of the low, medium, and high needs categories (low needs, 36%; medium needs, 29%; and high needs, 35%). These proportions are somewhat similar to Motiuk and Brown (1993; low needs, 28%; medium needs, 45%; and high needs, 27%). The contrasting lower proportion of releasees with medium needs obtained in the study may be due to the selection criteria that was utilized, which likely yielded more extreme groups.

For risk of reoffending using the CRNMS, 31 % were classified as low risk, 27 % medium risk, and 42 % high risk. The proportion of high risk offenders approximates findings of other research (Motiuk & Brown, 1993). These researchers obtained roughly equal groups of low and high risk offenders (47% and 53%, respectively) and did not have a medium risk classification. Risk classifications using the CRNMS are based on professional judgments rather specific cut-offs. However, if the low and medium risk groups combined are in the present research are equitable to low risk in Motiuk and Brown (1993), the proportions appear quite comparable.

As for PCL-R Total scores, releasees scored lower ($\underline{M}$ = 19.1) than other male offenders ($\underline{M}$ = 23.6; Hare, 1991). In fact, both releasee groups scored lower than has been shown in previous research (Hare, 1991). Comparing the groups, unsuccessful releasees were, as predicted, more psychopathic than successful releasees ($\underline{M}$ = 21.2 and $\underline{M}$ = 16.3, respectively). Shorter criminal histories and less deviant behaviour most

likely accounts for lower PCL-R Total scores in successful releasees. Indeed, median Factor 2 scores were lower for the successful releasees than among male prison inmates (see Hare, 1991).

BIDR and Study Variables

The descriptives for both components of the BIDR, impression management and self-deception, and their relations to the study variables were assessed. Mean impression management scores for the releasees were 6.8, indicating greater impression management by releasees than male college students ($M=4.3$; Paulus, 1988 as cited in Paulhus, 1991). Self-deception for the releasees, however, was similar to the college students ($M=6.5$ and $M=7.5$, respectively). Notably, the releasee groups did not differ markedly in impression management or self-deception.

Almost all of the self-reported variables were not significantly related to impression management and self-deception. The only exception was ease of coping with financial difficulties on the Coping Situation Questionnaire which was related to impression management. Releasees tended to overrate their ease in dealing with financial problems to create a more favourable impression.

The Relation Between LSI-OR, CRNMS and Release Outcome

LSI-OR scores and release outcome (i.e., success or failure) were strongly correlated, $r=.67$. Indeed, this correlation was more robust than found by others (Bonta & Motiuk, 1990). For example, Bonta and Motiuk revealed a r of .35 between LSI and release violations for half-way house releasees, 12 months after sentence completion. Though, similar relations were revealed for Aboriginal and non-

Aboriginal releasees ($r = .51$ and $r = .46$, respectively; Bonta, 1989). The stronger correlation revealed in this study may be partly because releasees were selected on the basis of their outcome.

Parole outcome was associated with risk and need levels on the CRNMS. Higher risk and need levels on the CRNMS were related to a greater likelihood of revocation affirming observations of other investigators (Grant et al., 1996; Motiuk & Brown, 1993; Motiuk & Porporino, 1989a, 1989b).

The Relation Between Specific Criminogenic Needs and Release Outcome

Correlational analyses between criminogenic needs and release outcome suggest that criminal history, antisocial attitudes, antisocial associates, antisocial pattern, and employment as measured by the LSI were most strongly related to release outcome. It was hypothesized that antisocial history, antisocial attitudes, antisocial associates, and antisocial pattern would be the strongest correlates of release outcome. Results with the LSI-OR mostly affirm this hypothesis and correspond to findings of a recent meta-analysis (Gendreau et al., 1996). Unexpectedly, however, employment was also among the needs most correlated with release outcome.

Conversely, correlations with the CRNMS did not provide the same support for this hypothesis. Instead, employment pattern, alcohol and drug usage, and behavioural/emotional stability, and attitude were most related to release outcome. Antisocial associates (i.e., companions/significant other on the CRNMS), however, was not significantly related to release outcome.

To summarize, support for the aforementioned hypothesis was mixed and

depended on which criteria was used to assess the criminogenic needs. Similarly labeled needs on different instruments were assessed by different criteria and do not necessarily reflect the same underlying need domain. Antisocial attitudes was correlated with release outcome on both measures. Likewise, employment was also related to release outcome and was generally more strongly associated than indicated by others (Gendreau et al., 1996).

Releasees' Perceptions of Release

With respect to the problems reported by releasees, unsuccessful releasees cited more difficulties than successful releasees in the community. Consequently, results provide support for the prediction that successful releasees have fewer problems on release than unsuccessful releasees. This is not surprisingly given that unsuccessful releasees have a larger number of criminogenic needs than successful releasees (Grant et al., 1996; Motiuk & Brown, 1993). Similarly, recidivists reported more problems on release than nonrecidivists (Zamble & Quinsey, in press).

However, there is another explanation which may partly account for releasee reports. The releasees recalled their problems retrospectively and may have been somewhat biased in their accounts to be more congruent with their outcome on parole. As a result, unsuccessful releasees may have reported more problems after their lack of success in the community to rationalize and justify the outcome of their release. Successful releasees, on the other hand, may have underestimated their problems in an attempt to account for their success.

Positive Factors Reported by Releasees

With respect to the positive factors on release reported by releasees, employment, friends, parole officers, and significant other were reported by the greatest number of successful releasees. It was expected that employment and significant other would be the most important factors to successful releasees on their release. For the most part, this hypothesis was supported.

The top most mentioned factor was employment as expected, which was reported by 55 % of successful releasees. Hence, releasees who succeeded in the community found employment as critical to their success on release. Similarly, evidence suggests that steady employment is a deterrent to criminal activity for some offenders (Shover, 1983; Waller, 1974).

Employment, as assessed by the LSI-OR and CRNMS, after criminal history, was the most associated with release outcome. Thus, it appears that perceptions of successful releasees regarding employment are quite accurate. They are quite cognizant of the importance of employment to their success in the community. Insight into the impact of employment on their release may make releasees more motivated for treatment in this area. Moreover, Motiuk and Brown (1993) found that motivation with respect to criminogenic needs has been linked to outcome for offenders on release.

A large number of successful releasees also mentioned their significant other as positively affecting their release. However, it did not rank as highly as hypothesized. Indeed, friends and parole officers were cited more frequently. There are two possible reasons that significant other was not mentioned more frequently. Significant other only

applies to those releasees who have partners. Consequently, 40% of successful releasees citing significant other is quite high when one considers that only a third of these were married or living common law. Thus, significant other may be central to success on release. Research (Shover, 1983; Waller, 1974) has indicated that the influence of significant other was important to offenders' desistance from crime.

Parole officers were mentioned favourably by 41% of successful releasees. This points to the considerable positive influence of this relationship. Parole officers provide tangible assistance to releasees and many give emotional support by, for example, listening to their concerns. In addition, parole officers may have modeled prosocial attitudes and behaviour. They may also have provided reinforcement for prosocial attitudes and behaviour demonstrated by releasees and disapproval or punishment when releasees displayed antisocial attitudes and behaviour (see Andrews and Bonta 1994).

However, this result may have been partially influenced by the recruitment process. Parole officers played an instrumental role in recruitment. Early on, it became evident that many releasees decided to participate after speaking to their parole officer, even before being approached by the researcher. Perhaps some releasees agreed initially to participate because of their rapport with their parole officer. In this way, more successful releasees with positive, rather than negative, regard for parole officers may have been recruited.

Friends, unexpectedly, was the second most positive factor reported and was mentioned by nearly half of successful releasees. It appears, that the role of friends is

critical one for releasees. In fact, many offenders deemed friendships as more important than family relationships or work (Zamble & Porporino, 1988).

Findings by Waller (1974) may help in explaining the potential positive influence of friends. As revealed in this work, over a third of offenders released at the end of their sentence and two-thirds of parolees described their best friends as “Square Johns” as individuals who held jobs, did not steal, and had families. With friends like this, releasees could observe and emulate the prosocial behaviour of their friends. In addition, the friends may also provide advice and support in seeking employment and companionship for prosocial activities. Other evidence with adults (Jolin & Gibbons, 1987) and with adolescents (Mulvey & Aber, 1988) suggests that desisters also initiate closer friendships after desisting from criminal activity.

Successful and unsuccessful releasees were contrasted for the factors they found positive on release. Successful releasees reported more social supports. This is not surprising, given the evidence attesting to the importance of family, friends and significant other on crime and recidivism (Gendreau et al., 1996; Grant et al., 1996; Jolin & Gibbons, 1987; Motiuk & Brown, 1993; Shover, 1983).

Successful releasees reported internal factors more frequently, than unsuccessful releasees, as beneficial. Specifically, successful releasees were more likely to say that deciding to stop crime, not wanting to return to jail, and having a positive attitude aided them on release.

These internal changes may be related to offender burnout. Arrest rates indicate a sharp decline in arrests after adolescence to age of 25 where arrests continue to

gradually decline (Rutter, 1996). Successful releasees were on average 10 years older than unsuccessful releasees and the reason for this decline may be due to internal changes. Many successful releasees reported being tired of jail, stating that they did not want to return and had decided to stop their criminal activities.

Negative Factors Reported by Releasees

In terms of negative factors impacting release, almost one in four releasees reported problems with corrections or release and employment, respectively. Employment, as shown in a previous section, is related to release outcome, therefore, it is not surprising that many releasees report it as negatively affecting their release. The problems reported with corrections and release were not, however, anticipated.

About one in four unsuccessful releasees reported that the structure and restrictions imposed by their release, being forced to reside at a halfway house, their parole officer, and employment were difficulties they encountered on release. It was, however, hypothesized that interpersonal conflict, substance abuse, and financial problems would be most reported by unsuccessful releasees. As indicated by results, this hypothesis was not validated.

Interestingly, over half of unsuccessful releasees recalled that one or more aspects of their release or corrections had adversely effected them in the community. Perhaps, some unsuccessful releasees would have preferred less supervision because of their engagement in activities (i.e., criminal or in violation of release conditions), which if discovered, would have resulted in revocation of their release. In this sense, close supervision would be perceived as a potential threat to freedom.

Another possibility is that unsuccessful releasees may not have wanted to assume personal responsibility for their failures on release. Hence, to avoid responsibility, some may have externalized blame and projected it onto the "system". Recidivists as noted by Zamble and Quinsey (in press) had more negative views of their release supervision than nonrecidivists which may be related to or the result of failing to take responsibility for their activities on release.

Releasees' focus on the system of release and corrections may have stemmed from some releasees misinterpreting the purpose of the study as evaluation of the release system. In this way, releasees may have paid more attention to factors within the system rather than outside it such as family, etc. It is also likely that many releasees find conditional release somewhat unpleasant since it is inherently restrictive. Indeed, not only unsuccessful releasees reported some facet of their release or contact with corrections as detrimental. In fact, one-third of successful releasees reported some element of it as problematic for them in the community.

Another alternative is that perhaps releasees' critical views identify some valid concerns with the system. Some unsuccessful releasees, albeit few, reported that programs being offered during the day interfered with finding employment or in being available for work. In addition, a few releasees reported that treatment was denied or difficult to access. Notably, however, only unsuccessful releasees had these concerns. One possibility is that unsuccessful releasees may be receiving differential processing in the system as compared with successful releasees. A more plausible alternative is that the processing is fairly standard, but that the perceptions of the successful and

unsuccessful group differ for the reasons mentioned earlier.

Employment was mentioned by 28 % of unsuccessful releasees as difficult for them. In contrast to financial difficulties which were recalled by 10 % of these releasees. Unlike present findings, recidivists in another study (Zamble & Quinsey, in press) recalled more problems with finances than employment. Despite this, perceptions of unsuccessful releasees are in accordance with correlations obtained between risk and needs and release outcome. In summary, unsuccessful releasees seem to realize the differential impact of employment and finances on their release.

Substance use was not cited as adverse by many unsuccessful releasees. This is remarkable since the vast majority of revocations (and recommendations for revocation) were for technical violations involving the use of intoxicants. These results may also reflect the willingness of some unsuccessful releasees to displace responsibility onto the system. As well, it may indicate that some releasees do not realize the association between their substance use and criminal activity, and hence, may disregard their abstinence conditions. Unsuccessful releasees may also view their substance use as a way of coping with difficulties in their lives rather than as a problem in and of itself.

Few unsuccessful releasees mentioned interpersonal difficulties. It was expected that this would be a fundamental difficulty for this group. A lack of interpersonal difficulties may be attributed to fewer ties to family and friends. For instance, 41 % of unsuccessful releasees were single as compared with 17% of successful releasees. As well, unsuccessful releasees may have such poor interpersonal skills that they are unable to form close attachments. Having only superficial associations with others may

reduce the interpersonal conflict that is liable to arise.

Releasees' Perceptions of Specific Factors on Release

It was predicted that successful releasees would have less severe problems than unsuccessful releasees. This hypothesis was supported. Overall, successful releasees' experiences in the community were about four times better than unsuccessful releasees. The results are consistent with lower need ratings on the CRNMS and lower LSI-OR scores of successful releasees. Similar differences were obtained by Zamble and Quinsey (in press) in recidivists and nonrecidivists.

Differences between the groups' perceptions of the impact of various factors on release were analyzed. The largest differences were for substance abuse and anger. Unsuccessful releasees, relative to successful releasees, reported greater difficulties with substance abuse and anger in the community. Successful releasees, on the other hand, reported better living arrangements and relationships with their parole officers, and less anxiety and depression, although differences were not statistically significant.

Overall, unsuccessful releasees experienced more negative emotions on release. Other research has indicated that recidivists experienced more negative emotions before reoffence than nonrecidivists during a comparable period (Zamble & Quinsey, in press). Still, other evidence shows that negative emotions are common in releasees in general (Waller, 1974; Jolin & Gibbons, 1987) and in recidivists before reoffence (Zamble & Quinsey, in press; Zamble & Porporino, 1988). Hence, it appears that negative emotions are common in offenders, but may be more prevalent in recidivists and release violators than in nonrecidivists and successful releasees.

Coping Efficacy and Adequacy

Surprisingly, successful and unsuccessful releasees did not differ in coping efficacy or coping adequacy, nor did they did for coping efficacy in each of the five coping situations. It was originally expected that successful releasees would have greater coping efficacy and adequacy. As described, results fail to support this hypothesis. Zamble and Quinsey(in press) noted that nonrecidivists had superior coping efficacy and adequacy to recidivists. Perhaps the differences in coping between recidivists and nonrecidivists are more extreme and less different between release successes and failures.

The Relation Between PCL-R and Release Outcome

Release outcome was correlated .38 with PCL-R Total and .49 with Factor 2 and was not significantly related to Factor 1 scores . A similar pattern is evident in a reanalysis of data from Hart et al. (1988) cited in Hare (1991). These findings showed release outcome was correlated .33 with Total scores, .18 with Factor 1 scores, and .38 with Factor 2. Thus, release outcome appears to be more related to Factor 2 than Factor 1.

Unsuccessful releasees, as hypothesized, had more psychopathic features than successful releasees. Moreover, psychopathy was positively correlated with risk and needs; greater psychopathic traits were apparent in releasees who were higher risk and need than other releasees. The pattern of results were consistent: psychopathy, risk and needs, and release outcome were all positively associated.

It was predicted that all need areas of the LSI-OR and CRNMS would be associated to PCL-R Total scores. PCL-R Total scores were related to every LSI-OR need area. However, not all need areas for the CRNMS were to PCL-R Total scores. Unexpectedly, financial management, behavioural/emotional stability, living arrangements, stability of marital and family relationships, health, and mental ability were not significantly related to the PCL-R Total scores.

PCL-R Factor Scores and Specific Need Areas

Specific hypotheses were advanced to analyze the association between individual need areas and PCL-R Factor scores. Specifically, it was hypothesized that Factor 1, the affective and interpersonal component of the PCL-R would be related to interpersonal difficulties. Family/marital relationships on both the LSI-OR and CRNMS, however, were not significantly related to PCL-R Factor 1. Family/marital relationships may not be rated as high because offenders scoring high on Factor 1 of the PCL-R lack the emotional connection to other and experience emotions only superficially, therefore, relationship difficulties would be of little consequence to them.

Yet, results using PCL-R Total and Factor 2 scores were significantly related to family/marital relationships on the LSI-OR, but not on the CRNMS. As well, Hart et al. (1988) found that high psychopathy groups had more instability in relationships than those in the low psychopathy group. In all, it appears that Factor 2, not Factor 1, is related to marital/family relationships assessed by the LSI-OR.

Results confirm that employment would be related to PCL-R Factor 2. Employment on both measures, the LSI-OR and CRNMS, was strongly related to not

only Factor 2, but also to PCL-R Total and Factor 1. There was one exception; the association between CRNMS employment and Factor 1 did not reach statistical significance. The present findings add evidence to Hart et al. (1988) that a relationship exists between PCL-R Total scores and employment instability.

Substance abuse on both scales was moderately related to Factor 2. Moreover, there was also an association between PCL-R Total scores, however this was not the case with PCL-R Factor 1 and substance abuse. This finding resembles previous ones demonstrating an association between alcohol abuse and PCL-R Total scores (Hemphill, Hare, & Hare, 1994; Smith & Newman, 1990; Rice & Harris, 1995).

In summary, Factor 2 appears to be related to employment and substance abuse. Though, Factor 1 was not related to the family/marital component, significant associations were apparent for Factor 2. Factor 1, by contrast, was related to antisocial attitudes and to a lesser extent, antisocial pattern. Logically, this makes sense because those who display the affective interpersonal characteristics of psychopathy are also likely to demonstrate antisocial attitudes such as lack empathy and failure to accept responsibility. These are also part of the criteria for LSI-OR antisocial attitudes. In addition, offenders high on Factor 1 are also likely to be high on Factor 2, the behavioural facet of psychopathy. This would explain the association between Factor 1 and having a history or pattern of deviance.

Self-Monitoring to Prevent Relapse

From the results it appears that about 41 % considered reoffending/relapsing. Many releasees were adamant that they had never considered offending or violating

their conditions during release. It is difficult to believe that more than half had not even considered it. It may be that releasees thought “considering it” as being very close to actually acting on these thoughts and did not appreciate that even the briefest of thoughts represents a risk of following through, albeit small. One explanation may account for the reasons for releasees’ responses. During recruitment, successful releasees were told by parole officers they had been identified as “successes”. This may have biased releasee responses to preserve their “successful” image. In this instance, it would not be surprising that any possibility of reoffending/relapse would be denied.

It is also probable that repeat offenders are more likely to relapse and would be familiar with their relapse cycles. Hence, they would be more likely to report being close to relapse than first time offenders which comprised about half of the successful releasee group. Indeed, comparing first time and repeat offenders, thirty percent of first time offenders reported being close to relapse as compared with two-thirds of repeat offenders.

The reasons why some desisted who had considered offending or violating their release conditions was investigated. The reason most desisters gave for resisting their impulses was that they had considered consequences of acting on these impulses and had decided to desist. This finding demonstrates the importance of teaching offenders self-monitoring skills, to stop and think about the consequences of a particular action before taking action. While a promising finding, it is worth mentioning that the number of releasees answering these questions was very small ($n=11$).

In terms of needs present during this high risk time, two-third reported one or more needs, while about one-third reported that no needs were problematic for them. As compared with number of objective needs requiring intervention, the releasees tended to underestimate the number of needs they had at this time. In addition, no clear pattern emerged with respect to type of needs that were most prevalent during this time. This is most likely due to the small number of releasees who answered this set of questions.

Limitations of the Present Study

Before discussing the possible implications of these results, limitations of the research must be considered. First of all, the investigation utilized retrospective recall. The reliability and validity of this method, though, is unclear (see Widom & Shepard, 1996 for recent discussion). Releasees may also been biased by their outcome on release, knowing that they were successful or not successful. Hence, they perhaps responded in a way which justified their success or failure on release.

Self-serving attribution biases may have been operating. According to the self-serving attribution bias, successes tend to be attributed to internal factors and failures tend to attributed to external factors (Miller & Ross, 1975). Applying this, successful releasees may have been biased toward attributing their successes to their own internal factors such as having a positive attitude or wanting to change. Likewise, unsuccessful releasees may have been biased toward attributing their release failure to external factors, such as the release system itself, their parole officer, etc. In a similar vein, Henderson and Hewstone (1984) found that violent offenders were likely to explain

their violent offending, likely interpreted by the offender as a failure, to external rather than internal factors.

Moreover, the definition of release outcome was determined by revocation by the National Parole Board or recommendation for revocation by presiding parole offices. It may be argued that “successes” and “failures” were not true release successes and failures. In fact, some of the successful releasees were suspended on their release, which may be construed as a failure. In addition, some of the release failures were recommended for revocation but were not actually revoked and hence, were only suspended. These suspension cases were contained in both the successful and unsuccessful groups and may have obscured real differences between release successes and failures.

Lifers were over-represented in the current sample. One-third of the successful releasee group were serving life sentences. Factors relating to successful integration into the community may differ for lifers as compared with other offenders.

The sample may not have been completely representative due to the relatively low participation rate of the successful releasees. Only fifty-eight percent of successful releasees participated. Differences may exist between releasees who consented and those who refused. For example, the more successful releasees may have refused because they were working and could not take the time off work (Gendreau et al., 1996; Grant et al., 1996; Motiuk & Brown, 1993). It is also likely that the releasees who participated had more favourable views toward the system and corrections.

Not surprisingly, the groups differed on age and criminal history. Successful releasees were an average of 10 years older and had less criminal history than other releasees. When assessing the impact of various factors on releasees' release, number of convictions and age were controlled for.

Finally, the experimenters was not blind to the releasees' outcome. Consequently, the experimenters may have been influenced by this knowledge in making retrospective assessments of risk and needs.

Conclusions

Factors reported by releasees on release are similar to factors found by risk/need instruments such as the LSI-OR and CRNMS. In other words, reasons cited by releasees did not yield any "new" factors related to release outcome. Moreover, the pattern of results with the LSI-OR and CRNMS was consistent with other empirical work (Bonta, 1989; Gendreau et al., 1996; Motiuk & Brown, 1993). Higher risk and needs were associated with failure on release as expected.

Successful releasees were more likely to report employment, significant other, friends, and parole officers as more related to success on release than other factors. This points to the positive influence of social supports. Unsuccessful releasees tended to attribute their release failure to aspects of their release and corrections, as well employment. Unsuccessful releasees also reported more difficulties with anger and substance abuse in the community than successful releasees.

Negative emotional states, particularly anger, were common in releasees who did not succeed in the community. It is unclear what impact the current negative

emotional state had on their recall of their previous emotional state in the community. It is likely that pervasive anger foreshadows relapse to offending or other maladaptive behaviour such as substance use for some offenders.

In terms of relating perceptions to objective assessments of needs, both groups of releasees tended to recognize employment as important to their success on release. However, many failed to appreciate the effects of substance use. These findings indicate resources directed to address employment and substance abuse needs are critical to the success of offenders on release. Moreover, it is important that offenders recognize the link between their substance use and offending patterns.

Releasees with many psychopathic traits scored higher on risk and needs. Moreover, psychopathy was most associated with criminal history, antisocial attitudes, antisocial pattern, drug use, and employment. This combination of risk and needs results in offenders who can be described as high risk, high need, and low responsivity (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Moreover, this research also reveals that chronic problems with employment and drug use are related to psychopathy. Focus on the needs of employment and drug use for offenders who have psychopathic traits may lead to potentially better outcomes on release.

Directions for Future Research

Ideally, longitudinal research is needed to further explore offenders' perceptions of factors related to their outcome on release. Offenders would be recruited before their release until sentence completion or revocation, or even to two years after sentence completion. Perceptions of the factors related to release outcome by releasees

would be monitored through open-ended questions and through ratings of specific factors as in this research. However, the factors reported in the open-ended questions would also be rated by releasees as to their relative importance on their release. In addition to perceptions, coping efficacy, emotional states, and objective risk and needs would also be regularly monitored for the group of offenders.

Coping efficacy would be assessed by rating the efficacy of coping for offenders' actual behaviour. Emotional states would also be monitored by self-reports and by observations of parole officers and clinical professionals. Objective assessments of risk and needs would be regularly conducted. Given, the apparent differences in attributions of successful and unsuccessful releasees, locus of control and other measures to assess attributions would also be measured. The current research analyzed differences between revocation cases with those who have not been revoked. Future research could also assess the differences between these two groups and with a third intermediate group of suspension cases.

This exploratory research examined male releasees and did not examine different offender groups. It would be useful to examine the perceptions of female offenders, lifers, and first time offenders and compare these perceptions with the data collected in this study. Little is known about the perceptions of these groups and hence, these are areas for future investigation.

It is important to continue investigating the reasons why offenders succeed and fail on release in the community. Much has been learned about factors related to recidivism through objective assessments of risk and needs (see Andrews & Bonta,

1994). However, insight into the association between these objective assessments and offenders' perceptions of their needs may yield additional information that is important for supervision and intervention.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th ed.). Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Andrews, D.A. (1982). The Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI): The first follow-up. Toronto: Ministry of Correctional Services (Ontario).
- Andrews D.A., & Bonta J. (1994). The Psychology of Criminal Conduct. Cincinnati OH: Anderson.
- Andrews D.A., & Bonta J. (1995). The Level of Service Inventory - Revised. Mental Health Systems.
- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R.D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17, 19-52.
- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J.L., & Wormith, J.S. (1995). The Level of Supervision Inventory - Ontario Revision - Interview and scoring guide. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Andrews, D.A., Kiessling, J.J., & Kominos, S. (1983). The Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI-6) Interview and scoring guide. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Andrews, D.A., Kiessling, J.J., Mickus, S.G., & Robinson D. (1986). The construct validity of interview-based risk assessments in corrections. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 18, 460-470.
- Andrews, D.A., & Wormith, J.S. (1984). Criminal sentiments and criminal behaviour. Program Branch Users Report. Ottawa. Solicitor General Canada.
- Bonta, J. (1989). Native inmates: Institutional response, risk, and needs. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 31, 49-62.
- Bonta, J., Harman, W.G., Hann, R. G., & Cormier, R.B. (1996). The prediction of recidivism among federally sentence offenders: A re-validation of the SIR scale. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 38, 61-79.
- Bonta J., Law M., & Hanson K. (in press). The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders: A meta-analysis. Canadian Psychology.
- Bonta, J., & Motiuk, L.L. (1990). Classification of halfway houses: A quasi-experimental evaluation. Criminology, 28, 497-506.

Cleckley, H. (1976). The mask of sanity (5th ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

Correctional and Conditional Release Act, RSC, C-20, (1992).

Correctional Service Canada, (1986). Basic Facts About Corrections in Canada, 1986. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Correctional Service Canada, (1993). Basic Facts About Corrections in Canada, 1993. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Correctional Service Canada, (1997). Basic Facts About Corrections in Canada, 1997. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Dahlstrom, W.M., & Walsh, G.S. (1960). An MMPI handbook: A guide to use in clinical practice and research. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Farrington, D.P. (1995). The development of offending and antisocial behaviour from childhood: Key findings from the Cambridge study in delinquent development, Journal of Child Psychology, 360, 929-964.

Grant, B., Motiuk, L.L., Brunet, L., & Lefebvres, L. (1996). Day parole program review: Case management predictors of outcome. (User Report No. 1996-03). Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, Corrections Branch.

Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the prediction of adult offender recidivism. What works. Criminology, 34, 575-606.

Gough, H.G. (1969). Manual for the California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Hanson R.K., & Bussière M.T. (1996). Predictors of sexual recidivism: A meta-analysis. (User Report No. 1996-04). Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, Corrections Branch.

Hare, R.D. (1980). A research scale for the assessment of psychopathy in criminal populations. Personality and Individual Differences, 1, 111-119.

Hare, R.D. (1991). The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems.

Hare, R. D. (1996). Psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder: A case of diagnostic confusion. Psychiatric Times, 13, 39-40.

Hare, R.D., Forth, A.E., & Strachan, K. (1992). Psychopathy and crime across the lifespan. In P. Peters & V. Quinsey (Eds.), Aggression and violence across the lifespan (pp. 285-300). New York: Sage.

Hare, R.D., Harpur, T.J., Hakstian, A.R., Forth, A.E., Hart, S.D., & Newman, J.P. (1990). The revised Psychopathy Checklist: Reliability and factor structure. Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 2, 338-341.

Hare, R.D., & Hart, S.D. (1995). Commentary on antisocial personality disorder: The DSM-IV field trial. In W.J. Livesley (Ed.), The DSM-IV personality disorders (pp. 127-134). New York: Guilford.

Hare, R.D., & Jutai J.W. (1983). Criminal history of the male psychopath: Some preliminary data. In K.T. Van Dusen & S.A. Mednick (Eds.), Prospective studies of crime and delinquency (pp. 225-236). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Hare, R.D., & McPherson, L.M. (1984). Violent and aggressive behavior by criminal psychopaths. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 7, 35-50.

Hare, R.D., McPherson, L.E., & Forth, A.E. (1988). Male psychopaths and their criminal careers. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, 710-714.

Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., & Cormier, C.A. (1991). Psychopathy and violent recidivism. Law and Human Behavior, 15, 625-637.

Hart, S.D., & Hare, R.D. (1997). Psychopathy: Assessment and association with criminal conduct. In D.M. Stoff, J. Brieling, & J. Maser (Eds.), Handbook of antisocial behavior. New York: Wiley.

Hart, S.D., Kropp, P.R., & Hare, R.D. (1988). Performance of male psychopaths following conditional release from prison. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, 227-232.

Hemphill, J.F., Hare, S.D., & Hare, R.D. (1994). Psychopathy and substance abuse. Journal of Personality Disorder, 8, 169-180.

Henderson, M., & Hewstone, M. (1984). Prison inmates' explanation for interpersonal violence: Accounts and attributions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 789-794.

Hoffman, P.B. (1983). Screening for risk: A revised salient factors score (SFS81). Journal of Criminal Justice, 22, 477-494.

Irwin, J. (1970). The felon. NJ: Prentice -Hall.

Jolin, A., & Gibbons, D.C. (1987). Age patterns in criminal involvement. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 31, 237-261.

Knight, B.J., & West, D.J. (1975). Temporary and continuing delinquency. British Journal of Criminology, 15, 1443-1446.

Kosson, D.S., Smith, S.S., & Newman, J.P. (1990). Evaluating the construct validity of psychopathy on Black and White male inmates: Three preliminary studies. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 99, 250-259.

Loza, W., & Simourd, D. (1994). Psychometric evaluation of the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) among male Canadian federal offenders. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 21, 468-480.

McWhinnie, A.J., & Andrews, D.A. (1996). Corrections utilization study: A review of the national and international recidivism literature.

Meisenhelder, T.N. (1977). An exploratory study of exiting from criminal careers. Criminology, 15, 319-334.

Miller, D. T., & Ross, M. (1975). Self-serving biases in the attribution of causality: Fact or fiction. Psychological Bulletin, 82(2), 213-225.

Motiuk, L.L., & Brown, S.L. (1993). The validity of Offender Needs Identification and Analysis in community corrections. (User Report No. 34). Ottawa: Canada: Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

Motiuk, L.L., & Brunet, L. (1991). Conditional release supervision standards: An update on training for offender risk/needs assessment. A paper presented at the Second Annual Corrections Research Forum, Quebec City.

Motiuk, L.L., & Porporino, F.J. (1989a). Field test of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale: A study of offenders on caseload. (User Report No. 6). Ottawa: Canada: Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

Motiuk, L.L., & Porporino, F.J. (1989b). Offender risk/needs assessment: A study of conditional releases. (User Report No. 1). Ottawa: Canada: Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

Mulvey, E., & Aber, M. (1988). Growing out of delinquency: Development and desistance. In R.L. Jenkins & W.K. Brown (Eds.) The abandonment of delinquent behavior: Promoting the turnaround (pp. 97-115). New York: Praeger.

Nuffield, J. (1982). Parole decision-making in Canada: Research towards decision guidelines. Ottawa: Communications Division.

Palmer, W.R. (1996). Parole prediction using current psychological and behavioural variables, a longitudinal criterion measure, and event history analysis. Doctoral dissertation, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.

Paulhus, D.L. (1991). In measurement of personality and social psychological attitudes. Academic Press.

Paulhus, D.L., & Reid, D. (1991). Enhancement and denial in socially desirable responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 307-317.

Pichot, P. (1978). Psychopathic behaviour: A historical overview. In R.D. Hare & D. Schalling, (Eds.), Psychopathic behaviour: Approaches to research (pp. 55-70). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Rand, A. (1987). Transitional life events and desistance from delinquency and crime. In M.E. Wolfgang, T.P. Thornberry, & R.M. Figlio (Ed.) From boy to man, for delinquency to crime (pp. 134-164) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rice, M.E., & Harris, G.T. (1995). Psychopathy, schizophrenia, alcohol abuse, and violent recidivism. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 18, 333-342.

Rice, M.E., Harris, G.T., & Quinsey, V.L. (1990). A follow-up of rapists assessed in a maximum security psychiatric facility. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4, 435-448.

Rowe, R.C. (1995). The utilization of an interview-based classification instrument of parole board decision making in Ontario, Unpublished masters thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa.

Rutter, S.M. (1996). Introduction: concepts of antisocial behavior, of causes and of genetic influences. In G.R. Rock & J.A. Goode (Ed.) Genetics of criminal and antisocial behaviour (pp. 15-29) Toronto: Wiley.

Serin, R.C. (1991). Psychopathy and violence in criminals. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6, 423-431.

Serin, R.C. (1996). Violent recidivism in criminal psychopaths. Law and Human Behavior, 20, 207-217.

Serin, R.C., & Amos, N.L. (1995). The role of psychopathy in the assessment of dangerousness. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 18, 231-238.

Serin, R.C., Peters, R.D., & Barbaree, H.E. (1990). Predictors of psychopathy and release outcome in a criminal population. Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 2, 419-422.

Shover, N. (1983). The later stages of ordinary property offender careers. Social Problems, 31, 208-218.

Smith, A.S., & Newman, J.P. (1990). Alcohol and drug abuse - Dependence disordered in psychopathic and nonpsychopathic criminal offenders. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 99, 430-439.

Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (1996). Using multivariate statistics. NY: HarperCollins College Publishers, Inc.

Waller, I. (1974). Men released from prison. Toronto: University Press.

Widom, C.S., & Shepard, R.L. (1996). Accuracy of adult recollections of childhood victimization: Part 1: Childhood physical abuse. Psychological Assessment, 8, 412-421.

Wong, S. (1985). Criminal and institutional behaviors of psychopaths. Ottawa, Ontario: Programs Branch Users Report, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Wormith, J.S., & Andrews, D.A. (1985, October). An introduction to the Level of Supervision Inventory Ontario Revision (LSI-OR). Poster Session at the IACRA Research Conference, Ottawa, Ontario.

Zamble, E. (1989). Coping Situations Questionnaire: Form M. Unpublished. Queens; University.

Zamble, E., & Quinsey, V.L. (1991). Dynamic and behavioral antecedents to recidivism: A retrospective analysis. (User Report No. 17). Ottawa: Canada: Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

Zamble, E., & Quinsey, V.L. (in press). The criminal recidivism process. Cambridge University Press.

Zamble, E. & Porporino, F. J. (1988). Coping, behavior, and adaptation in prison inmates. N.Y. Spring-Verlag.

Appendix A

Psychopathy Checklist – Revised**Factor 1: Selfish, callous, and remorseless use of others**

<u>Item</u>	<u>Description</u>
1.	Glibness/superficial charm
2.	Grandiose sense of self-worth
4.	Pathological lying
5.	Conning/manipulative
6.	Lack of remorse or guilt
7.	Shallow affect
8.	Callous/lack of empathy
16.	Failure to accept responsibility for own actions

Factor 2: Chronically unstable, antisocial, and social deviant lifestyle

<u>Item</u>	<u>Description</u>
3.	Need for stimulation
9.	Parasitic lifestyle
10.	Poor behavioural controls
12.	Early behaviour problems
13.	Lack of realistic goals
14.	Impulsivity
15.	Irresponsibility
18.	Juvenile delinquency
19.	Revocation of conditional release

Items not loading on Factor 1 or 2

<u>Item</u>	<u>Description</u>
11.	Promiscuous sexual relationships
17.	Many short-term marital relationships
20.	Criminal Versatility

Appendix B

Community Risk/Needs Management Scale

1. **Assessment Date (yy/mm/dd)** _____
2. **Time from First Release (mos)** _____
Note if on day parole then on full parole - code when first released on day parole
3. **Criminal Risk Rating**
 1. Low
 2. Medium
 3. High
 4. Not Known
4. **Case Needs Rating**
 1. Low
 2. Medium
 3. High
 4. Not Known
5. **Level Of Supervision**
6. **Employment**
 1. Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment
 2. No immediate need for improvement
 3. Some need for improvement
 4. Considerable need for improvement
7. **Marital/Family**
 1. Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment
 2. No immediate need for improvement
 3. Some need for improvement
 4. Considerable need for improvement

8. Associates/Social Interaction

1. Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment
2. No immediate need for improvement
3. Some need for improvement
4. Considerable need for improvement

9. Substance Abuse

1. Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment
2. No immediate need for improvement
3. Some need for improvement
4. Considerable need for improvement

10. Community Functioning

1. Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment
2. No immediate need for improvement
3. Some need for improvement
4. Considerable need for improvement

11. Personal/Emotional

1. Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment
2. No immediate need for improvement
3. Some need for improvement
4. Considerable need for improvement

12. Attitude

1. Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment
2. No immediate need for improvement
3. Some need for improvement
4. Considerable need for improvement

Appendix C

Level of Service Inventory - Ontario Revision**A. GENERAL RISK/NEED FACTORS****Criminal History**

1. Any prior adult convictions
2. Two or more prior convictions
3. Three or more prior convictions
4. Three or more present offences
5. Arrested under age 16
6. Ever incarcerated upon conviction
7. Ever punished for institutional misconduct
8. Charge laid or parole /probation suspended during prior community supervision

Education/Employment

9. Currently unemployed
10. Frequently unemployed
11. Never employed for a full year
12. Less than grade 10 or equivalent
13. Less than regular grade 12 or equivalent
14. Suspended or expelled at least once
15. Participation/performance
16. Peer interactions
17. Authority Interactions

Family/Marital

18. Dissatisfaction with marital or equivalent situation
19. Nonrewarding, parental
20. Nonrewarding, other relatives
21. Criminal-family/spouse

Leisure/Recreation

22. No recent participation in an organized activity
23. Could make better use of time

Procriminal Attitude/Orientation

24. Supportive of crime
25. Unfavourable toward convention
26. Poor, toward sentence
27. Poor, toward supervision/treatment

Substance Abuse

- 32. Alcohol problems, ever
- 33. Drug problem, ever
- 34. Alcohol problem, currently
- 35. Drug problem, currently
- 36. Law Violation
- 37. Marital/family
- 38. School/work
- 39. Medical or other clinical indicators

Antisocial Pattern

- 40. Psychological assessment indicated for antisocial personality
- 41. Early and diverse antisocial behaviour
 - Arrested under age 16 and at least one of the following
 - official record of assault violence
 - escape history
 - charge laid during prior community supervision
- 42. Criminal attitude at least one of item 28, 29 or 31
- 43. A pattern of generalized trouble
 - At least four of the following:
 - financial problems, 3 or more address changes, item 11, item 12. item 14,
 - item 19, item 23, item 27

B. SPECIFIC RISK/NEED FACTORSPotential Problems with Criminogenic Potential

- Clear problems of compliance (specific conditions)
- Diagnosis of other personality disorder
- Threat from third party
- Problem-solving/self-management skill deficits
- Anger management deficits
- Intimidating/controlling
- Inappropriate sexual activity
- Learning disability
- Poor social skills
- Peers outside age range
- Racist/sexist behaviour
- Underachievement
- Other (specify)

History of

Sexual assault
Physical assault (extrafamilial)
Physical assault (intrafamilial)
Assault on an authority figure
Weapon use
Fire setting
Escapes/UAL
Impaired Driving

C. RISK/NEED SUMMARY

Total LSI-OR Score (A)
Total Strengths (A)
Total Personal Problems (B) Criminogenic Potential

E. RISK/NEED PROFILE

Criminal History Rating
Employment/Education Rating
Family/Marital Rating
Leisure/Recreation Rating
Companions Rating
Procriminal Attitudes Rating
Substance Abuse Rating
Antisocial Pattern Rating
Total LSI-OR Risk Rating
Override

F. OTHER CLIENT ISSUES

Social, Health, And Mental Health

Financial problems
Homeless or transient
Accommodation problems
Health problems
Depressed
Physical ability
Low self-esteem
Shy/withdrawn
Diagnosis of psychosis

Suicide attempts/threat
Other evidence of emotional distress
Immigration issues
Victim:family violence
Victim: physical assault
Victim: sexual assault
Victim of neglect
Other (specify)

G. SPECIAL RESPONSIVITY CONSIDERATIONS

Motivation as a barrier
Engages in denial/minimize
Interpersonally anxious
Cultural issues
Ethnicity issues
Low intelligence
Communication barriers
Other (specify)

Appendix D

**Semi-Structured Interview
Offenders' Perceived Factors in Success and Failure on Release
(Successful Releasees)**

Section 1: Perceived Factors in Success or Failure on Release

Section 2: PCL-R and LSI-OR

Section 3 - Strategies to Prevent Offending

Sample: _____

ID#: _____

Race: _____

Age at Release _____

Date of Birth: _____

INTERVIEW INFORMATION

Interviewer: _____

Interviewed at: _____

Type of setting: _____

Date of Interview: _____

Observed by: _____

RATER INFORMATION

Rater: _____

Date of Rating: _____

Interview Type: **Audiotape**

Section 1: Perceived Factors in Success or Failure on Release

- 1 Let's start with a very general question. Were there any particular problems that you remember while you have been in the community? *(If "yes" get specific descriptions)*

(If "no" to above, repeat in a different form)

Well, were there things that made your life difficult, or that you were having trouble dealing with? *(specify)*

2. What would you say are significant influences or things that helped you to succeed while you have been in the community?

3. Indicate the importance of each of the following factors on your success in the community on a 5 point scale (1 = not important, 5 = extremely important). Any factor which is rated as having an effect, rate whether this effect was positive or negative.

-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
great	fair	some	little	none	little	some	fair	great
effect								effect
Negative				Neutral		Positive		

_____ 1. significant other (spouse, girlfriend)
 Explain _____

_____ 2. child/children
 Explain _____

_____ 3. parent or parents
 Explain _____

_____ 4. sibling or siblings
 Explain _____

_____ 5. friend or friends
 Explain _____

_____ 6. parole officer
 Explain _____

_____ 7. alcohol/drugs
 Explain _____

- _____ 8. moved away from community where the offence was committed
 Explain _____

- _____ 9. employment
 Explain _____

- _____ 10. educational or vocational skills
 Explain _____

- _____ 11. living arrangements
 Explain _____

- _____ 12. financial situation
 Explain _____

- _____ 13. feeling less anxious
 Explain _____

- _____ 14. feeling less depressed
 Explain _____

- _____ 15. feeling less angry
 Explain _____

- _____ 16. expectations of life changed
 Explain _____

- _____ 17. changes in values (unlike before, now think crime is wrong)
Explain _____

- _____ 18. growing up or becoming more mature
Explain _____

- _____ 19. treatment in the community or in prison
Explain _____

- _____ 20. fear of returning to jail
Explain _____

- _____ 21. impact of potential crimes on victims
Explain _____

- _____ 22. a startling or disturbing event, such as death of a friend or relative, or having an illness or near death experience
Explain _____

- _____ 23. other (specify)
Explain _____

- _____ 24. other (specify)
Explain _____

- _____ 25. it just happened, no specific reasons
Explain _____

Appendix E**Semi-Structured Interview
Offenders' Perceived Factors in Success and Failure on Release
(Unsuccessful Releasees)****Section 1: Perceived Factors in Success or Failure on Release****Section 2: PCL-R and LSI-OR****Section 3 - Strategies to Prevent Offending**

Sample: _____

ID#: _____

Race: _____

Age at Release _____

Date of Birth: _____

INTERVIEW INFORMATION

Interviewer: _____

Interviewed at: _____

Type of setting: _____

Date of Interview: _____

Observed by: _____

RATER INFORMATION

Rater: _____

Date of Rating: _____

Interview Type: **Audiotape**

Section 1: Perceived Factors Related to Release Outcome

- 1 Let's start with a very general question. Were there any particular problems that you remember in the month before your revocation? *(If "yes" get specific descriptions)*

(If "no" to above, repeat in a different form)

Well, were there things that made your life difficult, or that you were having trouble dealing with? *(specify)*

2. What would you say were significant influences or factors that contributed to you doing crime or violating the conditions of your release?

3. Indicate the importance of each of the following factors on your success in the community on a 5 point scale (1 = not important, 5 = extremely important). Any factor which is rated as having an effect, rate whether this effect was positive or negative.

-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
great effect	fair	some	little	none	little	some	fair	great effect
Negative			Neutral			Positive		

_____ 1. significant other
Explain _____

_____ 2. child/children
Explain _____

_____ 3. parent or parents
Explain _____

_____ 4. sibling or siblings
Explain _____

_____ 5. friend or friends
Explain _____

_____ 6. parole officer
Explain _____

_____ 7. alcohol or drugs
Explain _____

- _____ 8. more comfortable in jail than in the community
Explain _____

- _____ 9. employment
Explain _____

- _____ 10. educational or vocational skills
Explain _____

- _____ 11. living arrangements
Explain _____

- _____ 12. financial situation
Explain _____

- _____ 13. feeling anxious
Explain _____

- _____ 14. feeling depressed
Explain _____

- _____ 15. feeling angry
Explain _____

- _____ 16. expectations of life changed
Explain _____

- _____ 17. there is nothing wrong with doing crime
Explain _____

_____ 18. didn't think I would get caught

Explain _____

_____ 19. getting caught and returning to prison is no big deal

Explain _____

_____ 20. crime is exciting or fun

Explain _____

_____ 21. victim(s) deserved it

Explain _____

_____ 22. wanted revenge

Explain _____

_____ 23. did the offence on a whim or impulse

Explain _____

_____ 24. other (specify)

Explain _____

_____ 25. other (specify)

Explain _____

_____ 26. it just happened, no specific reasons

Explain _____

Appendix F

Section 3 - Strategies to Prevent Offending (Successful Parolees)

1. At what point did you feel closest to reoffending (during this conditional release)?
(Indicate on time line of conditional release; try also to pinpoint date)

Release-----1/4-----1/2-----3/4-----End of
Sentence

2. What did you do or almost do?

3. How close were you to doing it (0-100% probability)?

0-----25%-----50%-----75%-----100%

Not at all Somewhat half & half pretty committed
close close close offence

4. What were the events, behaviours and feelings that were happening at that point?
(Probe for need areas)

5. Rate each of the following areas on the scales indicated:

- a. Employment (CRNMS, LSI-OR)

Education, skills, physical or learning disabilities, dissatisfied with job, unstable work history, poor attendance or work habits, trouble getting along with co-workers and supervisors,

1. Good or Excellent
2. OK
3. Not so good
4. Poor, terrible

Explain _____

b. Relationship with significant other or family (CRNMS; LSI-OR)

Poor relationship with spouse, spousal abuse, victim of spousal abuse, abuse of children, ineffective parenting, poor family functioning, abuse as a child

1. Good or Excellent
2. OK
3. Not so good
4. Poor, terrible

Explain _____

c. Influence of friends (CRNMS; LSI-OR)

Socially isolated, criminal friends, friends with alcohol or drugs problems, uses others, easily influenced by others, not assertive with friends

1. Good or Excellent
2. OK
3. Not so good
4. Poor, terrible

Explain _____

d. Use of leisure/recreation time(CRNMS combine e&f; LSI-OR)

No recent participation in an organized activity, could make better use of time

1. Good or Excellent
2. OK
3. Not so good
4. Poor, terrible

Explain _____

e. Drug or alcohol use (CRNMS; LSI-OR)

Drinking or drug problem that interferes with relationships, employment, legal, physical or financial.

1. Good or Excellent
2. OK
3. Not so good
4. Poor, terrible

Explain _____

f. Getting along in the community (CRNMS)

History of unstable accommodation, poor grooming or physical health, poor financial management, lacks hobbies and interests, difficulty using social services

1. Good or Excellent
2. OK
3. Not so good
4. Poor, terrible

Explain _____

g. Stress management, coping with problems (CRNMS)

Poor problem solver, able to set realistic long-term goals, no regard for others, impulsive, anger problem, problems with stress/coping, inappropriate sexual behaviour, sexual dysfunction, mentally low functioning, mental illness, suicide attempts or self-injury, eating disorder

1. Good or Excellent
2. OK
3. Not so good
4. Poor, terrible

Explain _____

h. Attitudes; about breaking the law and our criminal justice system, towards minorities and women (CRNMS; LSI-OR)

Antisocial attitude (stealing and violence are acceptable), attitude that women are inferior to men and that other ethnic groups are inferior, unable to work towards life goals

1. Good or Excellent
2. OK
3. Not so good
4. Poor, terrible

Explain _____

6. Did you discuss being close to offending with anyone?
(If yes) Who? (If no) Why not?

IF NO OFFENCE OCCURRED:

7. What stopped you from following through?

Appendix G

Coping Situations

In this questionnaire we describe some common situations that happen to people on the outside. For each situation we would like you to pretend that it is actually happening to you. After you think about it, we would like you to tell us how you would react to it or deal with it or try to work it out. Use your own words to describe what you think you would think and do. Then answer the other questions about your thoughts and feelings in each case.

Situation 1

You are living on the outside and having troubles with your old lady. She wants you to do half of the housework, but you're working full time and you're pretty tired every day after you get home.

1. Aside from what you would do, how would you feel in this situation?
(Please circle the best choice)

- a) Angry
- b) Depressed, down, low
- c) Anxious, uptight
- d) Guilty, ashamed
- e) Lonely
- f) Other (name it) _____

2. How strongly would you feel that way? (Circle the number that shows how much)

Just a bit

A great deal

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

3. If this situation happened to you, how would you deal with it? (If you would do more than one thing, write them all down)

4. How well do you think you would handle this situation? (Circle the number that fits)

Not well at all

Very well

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

5. How much would the whole situation bother you? (Circle the number that fits)

Not at all

Very much

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

Situation 2

You get a new job. It pays well and you enjoy the work but the only problem is that your supervisor keeps bugging you to work harder. You can feel him watching you every time you even slow down and he's accused you of slacking off several times.

1. Aside from what you would do, how would you feel in this situation?
(Please circle the best choice)

- a) Angry
- b) Depressed, down, low
- c) Anxious, uptight
- d) Guilty, ashamed
- e) Lonely
- f) Other (name it) _____

2. How strongly would you feel that way? (Circle the number that shows how much)

Just a bit

A great deal

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

3. If this situation happened to you, how would you deal with it? (If you would do more than one thing, write them all down)

4. How well do you think you would handle this situation? (Circle the number that fits)

Not well at all

Very well

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

5. How much would the whole situation bother you? (Circle the number that fits)

Not at all

Very much

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

Situation 3

You've been living on the outside for several months. Things are going fine, except that you never have enough money for the things you want. Now it's just after the middle of the month and you know you're going to run out of money in a week. but you don't get paid until the end of the month.

-
1. Aside from what you would do, how would you feel in this situation?
(Please circle the best choice)

- a) Angry
- b) Depressed, down, low
- c) Anxious, uptight
- d) Guilty, ashamed
- e) Lonely
- f) Other (name it) _____

2. How strongly would you feel that way? (Circle the number that shows how much)

Just a bit

A great deal

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

3. If this situation happened to you, how would you deal with it? (If you would do more than one thing, write them all down).

4. How well do you think you would handle this situation? (Circle the number that fits)

Not well at all

Very well

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

5. How much would the whole situation bother you? (Circle the number that fits)

Not at all

Very much

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

Situation 4

While you are living on the outside, a friend you have known for several years comes over to visit. He invites you to a party in the house of a guy he knows (but you don't know him). Your friend says that it will be a really wild party. You're not sure that you want to go with this person; you were never that close to him, and you have to work tomorrow.

1. Aside from what you would do, how would you feel in this situation?
(Please circle the best choice)

- a) Angry
- b) Depressed, down, low
- c) Anxious, uptight
- d) Guilty, ashamed
- e) Lonely
- f) Other (name it) _____

2. How strongly would you feel that way? (Circle the number that shows how much)

Just a bit

A great deal

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

3. If this situation happened to you, how would you deal with it? (If you would do more than one thing, write them all down).

4. How well do you think you would handle this situation? (Circle the number that fits)

Not well at all

Very well

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

5. How much would the whole situation bother you? (Circle the number that fits)

Not at all

Very much

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

Situation 5

You really want to stay out of trouble on the outside, so you stay from all the people you used to hang around with. You get along fine with the people at work, but you find it hard to make new friends, and lately you've been feeling all alone. Last night you felt it a lot, and it kept you awake most of the night.

1. Aside from what you would do, how would you feel in this situation?
(Please circle the best choice)

- a) Angry
- b) Depressed, down, low
- c) Anxious, uptight
- d) Guilty, ashamed
- e) Lonely
- f) Other (name it) _____

2. How strongly would you feel that way? (Circle the number that shows how much)

Just a bit

A great deal

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

3. If this situation happened to you, how would you deal with it? (If you would do more than one thing, write them all down).

4. How well do you think you would handle this situation? (Circle the number that fits)

Not well at all

Very well

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

5. How much would the whole situation bother you? (Circle the number that fits)

Not at all

Very much

-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----

Appendix H

Balanced Inventory Of Desirable Responding (Bidr)

INSTRUCTIONS: Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how true it is.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not True			Somewhat			Very

- _____ 1. My first impressions of people usually run out to be right.
- _____ 2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
- _____ 3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
- _____ 4. I have not always been honest with myself.
- _____ 5. I always know why I like things.
- _____ 6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.
- _____ 7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.
- _____ 8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.
- _____ 9. I am fully in control of my own fate.
- _____ 10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.
- _____ 11. I never regret my decisions.
- _____ 12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.
- _____ 13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.
- _____ 14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.
- _____ 15. I am completely rational person.
- _____ 16. I rarely appreciate criticism.
- _____ 17. I am very confident of my judgments.
- _____ 18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.
- _____ 19. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.
- _____ 20. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.
- _____ 21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
- _____ 22. I never cover up my mistakes.
- _____ 23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
- _____ 24. I never swear.
- _____ 25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
- _____ 26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
- _____ 27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back.
- _____ 28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
- _____ 29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.

- ___ 30. I always declare everything at customs.
- ___ 31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
- ___ 32. I have never dropped litter on the street.
- ___ 33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
- ___ 34. I never read sexy books or magazines.
- ___ 35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
- ___ 36. I never take things that don't belong to me.
- ___ 37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
- ___ 38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
- ___ 39. I have some pretty awful habits.
- ___ 40. I don't gossip about other people's business.

Appendix I

Coding Manual

Offender Demographics

1. Date Of Birth (yy/mm/dd): (/ /)
2. Age at release: _____
If an offender has been on day parole then full parole, code age at release onto day parole
3. Marital Status at the time of release
 1. Single/never married
 2. Common-law union (relationship more than six months)
 3. Married
 4. Separated
 5. Divorced
 6. Widowed
 9. Not Known
4. Ethnicity
 1. Caucasian
 2. Asian
 3. Black
 4. Native
 5. Other (Specify)
 9. Not Known
5. Education Level at Release: _____
Number of years of formal education at release (e.g., grade 10 would be coded as "10")

Criminal History

6. Index Offence(s) for Current Sentence: _____

Note: For recidivists - offences for which he was originally serving in the community when revoked

7. Total Sentence for Index Offence (mos): _____

8. Description of Index Offence

Include whether offender takes responsibility(denies, minimizes the consequence to victim, etc.)

9. Number of Previous Adult Incarcerations: _____

10. Ever incarcerated upon adjudication (No=0; Yes=1)
Circle appropriate category

11. Total Aggregate Sentence as an Adult (mos): _____

12. First time Adult Offender: (No=0; Yes=1)

No formal contact with criminal justice system as an adult prior to the current offence. Circle appropriate category

Official Criminal History

Enter the number of offences (charges and convictions) for each individual crime. If there is none enter "0". This section is to be coded exclusively from official criminal history FP records (adult and young offender: to assist in coding criminal versatility for PCL-R). See PCL-R manual for more detailed coding.

Nonviolent Offences

_____ Theft, breaking and entering, possession of housebreaking tools, possession of stolen property, disguised with intent, auto theft, forcible entry, unlawfully in a dwelling house.

_____ Drug offences (possession, trafficking)

_____ Major driving offences (hit and run, dangerous driving, driving while impaired, failure to stop/remain at the scene of an accident)

_____ Fraud, forgery, false pretenses, uttering a forged document, use stolen credit cards

_____ Escape, unlawfully at large, failure to appear, breach recognizance, failure to comply, breach probation

_____ Obstruction of justice, obstruct a peace officer, resist arrest, assault police officer, contempt of court, perjury

_____ Crimes against the state, treason, espionage, smuggling, evasion of income tax

_____ Miscellaneous, vandalism, mischief, causing a disturbance, willful damage, trespassing, conspiracy to commit, setting off a fire alarm, vagrancy, contributing to juvenile delinquency, living off the avails of prostitution, attempted suicide harassing phone calls, and minor driving offences (driving while disqualified).

13. ____ *Total nonviolent offences*

14. ____ *Age onset of nonviolent offences (code 99 if the offender has not committed any nonviolent offences)*

Violent offences

- _____ Robbery, armed robbery, robbery with violence
- _____ Assault, assault causing bodily harm
- _____ Uttering threats, taking place in a riot, intimidation
- _____ Attempted murder
- _____ Murder
- _____ Manslaughter
- _____ Possession of a weapon, possession of explosives
- _____ Assault with a weapon, pointing a firearm
- _____ Arson, firesetting
- _____ Kidnapping, unlawful confinement, forcible seizure. hijacking
- _____ Wounding
- _____ Sex offences, rape, indecent assault, incest, prostitution, indecent exposure
- _____ Other

14. _____ *Total violent offences*

15. _____ *Age onset of violent offences (code 99 if the offender has not committed any nonviolent offences)*

16. _____ *Number of adult/young offender dispositions*

17. Arrested under age 16 (No=0; Yes=1)
Circle appropriate category

Juvenile Delinquency (from official records for item 18 PCL-R)*Circle appropriate category*

_____ Has a history of serious offences as an adolescent (murder, attempted murder, manslaughter,, rape, serious assault, robbery, auto theft or other major theft kidnapping, arson, fraud, drug trafficking, major driving violations, escape, etc.

_____ Has a history of minor offences as adolescent including possession of drugs, minor theft, possession of stolen property, simple assault, mischief, causing a disturbance, minor driving violations, breach of probation, etc.

_____ Has no history of arrests for antisocial behaviour as an adolescent

Other

17. Escapes: _____

18. Violations while on conditional release(No=0; Yes=1)

Code technical or new charges or convictions while on parole, statutory release (mandatory supervision), probation, bail, or restraining orders

19. Treatment Programs during last incarceration (list): _____

20. Treatment Programs on release (list): _____

Release History**Current Release****20. Release Type**

1. Day parole
2. Full parole
3. Statutory release
4. Other (specify)
5. Not known

21. Release Length (Mos): _____

22. Current Conditions : _____

23. Therapeutic Interventions: _____

24. Previous Type Under Same Release (Note: must have successfully been in the community completed this type and went on to current type)

1. Day parole
2. Full parole
3. Statutory release
4. Other (specify)
5. Not known

25. Previous Type of Release Length (Mos) : _____

26. Total Release Length (current + previous; Mos) : _____

27. Total Suspensions: _____

28. Reasons For Suspensions: _____

29. Total Revocations: _____

30. Total Technical Violations: _____

31. Reasons For Violations: _____

38. Total Suspensions: _____
39. Total Revocations: _____
40. Longest Interval before Revocation (mos): _____
41. Shortest Interval before Revocation (mos): _____
42. Progressively shorter time periods to revocation
(No=0; Yes=1)
43. Number of Technical Violations: _____
44. Number of Times Previously Revoked for Same Technical Reason:

45. Number of Revocations For New Offense: _____
46. Number of Revocations For Violent Offense: _____
47. Revocations/Release
(number of revocations per number of releases): _____
48. Time without Revocation/Interval at Risk: _____

Other Information

49. Statistical Information On Recidivism Score (SIR) : _____
50. Revised SIR Score: _____
51. Number of Institutional Misconducts: _____

Appendix J

Semi-Structured Interview

Section 2: LSI and PCL-R

BACKGROUND

Let me start with some general stuff. I want to know a bit about your background generally. This set of questions is sort of a grab bag, but I'm asking them all now because they may be hard to find in your file and they may not fit anywhere else.

Note: The interview is geared to nonrecidivists (the rephrasing of questions for recidivists are in brackets)

SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT (PCL-R)

1. How many different elementary schools did you attend?
Why did you change schools?
2. How many secondary schools did you attend?
Why did you change schools?
3. What was your attendance like in school?
How often did you skip out? Why? At what age(s)?
4. What kind of grades did you get in school?
Did you ever fail a grade? Why? At what age(s)?
5. Did you like school?
Did you find it boring? Did you have any trouble paying attention?

How would your teachers have described you (day-dreamer, hyper, etc.)?

6. How well did you get along with the teachers? (LSI-OR)

1. Very well
2. Satisfactorily
3. Not so well
4. Poorly

7. How well did you get along with the other kids at school? (LSI-OR)

1. Very well
2. Satisfactorily
3. Not so well
4. Poorly

8. Did you have any close friends?

9. How was your behavior at school?

Did you get into physical fights? How often? At what age(s)? What percent of the time did you start them? Have you ever used a weapon in a fight? How many times? Did you ever hurt someone badly? What did you do? Age?

Did you get into trouble for anything else (disturbing the class, being drunk/stoned at school, cheating, stealing, etc.)? How often? At what age(s)?

Were you ever suspended or expelled? How often? What for? At what age(s)?

10. Did you graduate from high school?

IF NO, ASK:

Did you quit school? Why?

11. How far did you go in school before you left?(Distinguish from upgrading in prison)

How old were you when you left school?

12. What did you do after leaving school?

13. Have you done any upgrading or taken any technical or vocational courses?
Describe it. How did you do?

Well, we know from talking to other guys that there are a number of things that they often have trouble with. Let me ask you about them.

ACCOMMODATION (LSI-OR)

First, let's get some information about where you are living now (When you were on release just before returning to prison where were you living?).

1. Who are (were) you living with?
 1. Nuclear family (wife, common-law, children)
 2. Family of origin (parents)
 3. Other family (siblings, aunt/uncle, cousins)
 4. Friends
 5. On your own
2. What kind of place are (were) you living in?
 1. Own house/condo
 2. Rented house/apartment
 3. Room
 4. Shelter/hostel
 5. Institution
 6. No fixed address
 7. Other (specify)
3. Including that one, how many different places have (had) you lived in during your conditional release?

SUPERVISION

1. You are (were) under supervision of a parole officer, right?
 No Yes
2. What special terms are (were) attached to your release (e.g., having to abstain from alcohol?)
3. Did you ever break any of these rules?
 No Yes
 (If yes) Which ones? How often? When was the first time you broke any of those rules?

4. Was there anything that you can remember that was happening in your life at that time that might have led you to break your terms (Generally want antecedents and consequences, here as well as elsewhere)?
5. Did your release plans create any difficulties for you?
6. How well do (did) you get along with your Parole Officer?
 1. Excellent
 2. Good
 3. OK
 4. Not so good
 5. Poor, terrible
7. Do you think that he/she helped you to get along on the outside, or did he/she maybe make no difference, or even make it harder for you? (Explain)
8. What could he/she have done differently to help you?

FINANCES

Next I want to look at how are (were) getting along financially.

1. What is (was) your main source of income?
 1. Employment
 2. UIC or disability
 3. Welfare
 4. Spouse/family
 5. Friends
 6. Illegal activities
 7. Other (specify)
2. Are you able to make ends meet or are (were) you running up a debt?
3. How is your credit rating? Did you ever fall behind on payment of your bills? How often?
At what age(s)?

4. Have you borrowed any money from a bank or loan company or anyone else (if yes, get details)

How many? At what age(s)? Did you pay it (them) back? Why/why not?

Have you ever borrowed money from family or friends? Did you ever not pay it back?

How often?

6. Have you ever declared bankruptcy? If so, how much did you owe? Has it been finalized yet?

7. Did you ever have to pay alimony or child support?

How much? Was it court-ordered? Did you pay it? Did you ever fall behind in your payments?

Do you send money when you are in jail?

EMPLOYMENT

Now I would like to ask you some questions about work.

Work History (PCL-R)

1. What kind of work have you done in the past?
2. How many different jobs do you think you have had?
3. What was your longest job? What was the shortest?

ASK FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT THREE OR FOUR OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S LONGEST OR MOST RECENT JOBS:

4. What was the position? What were the duties?

How long did you do that for? How old were you when you started? How old were you when you stopped?

Did you enjoy it? Did you find it boring? How was the money?

Why did you leave that job? Did you quit or were you fired?

5. Are you a reliable employee?
Are you a hard worker?
Do you usually get along with your boss and co-workers?

Have you ever get in trouble at work (for being late or absent, drinking/using drugs at work, etc.)? How often? At what age(s)?

Have you ever been fired? How often? At what age(s)? What happened?

6. Did you ever leave a job with no other job in sight?
How often? Why? At what age(s)?

7. Have you ever been unemployed?
How often? At what age(s)? For how long? How did you support yourself?

Were you looking for work? How seriously?

8. Have you ever collected UI, welfare, or some other form of social assistance?
How many times? At what age(s)?

9. On the street how do you support yourself?
Did you ever rely on someone else for food, money or lodging? Who? What did they give you? For how long?

Did you ever support yourself through crime (e.g., selling drugs, thefts, mugging or rolling people, prostitution, pimping, and frauds)? When?

Current Situation (LSI-OR)

1. Are (When you were on release) you working?
(If not working) Are you doing something else, like going to school?
 1. Unemployed/not in school
 2. Student (What program? How long does it run? How long have you were attending)
 3. Employed part-time
 4. Employed full time
 5. Other (specify)
2. How long have you been doing that? (How long did you do that?)
(If working) Is (Was) there any chance that you may lose (have lost) your job?
3. How well do (did) you like your job (program)?
 1. Very well
 2. Somewhat
 3. Neutral
 4. Disliked some
 5. Strongly disliked
4. What is (was) your position? What are (were) your duties?
5. Would you say you work (worked) hard at it?
6. Are (Were) you having any problems with work/school?
(If yes) What? How about the other people you work (worked) with (the other students/trainees)? Bosses, teacher? How do (did) you get along with them?

Career Goals (PCL-R)

1. Is there any trade or occupation you would like to have?
How long have you wanted to do this? Have you planned or prepared for this occupation in any way? What training do you require?
2. Do you have any long-term goals?

3. Where would you like to be in ten years?
4. What problems are you having in achieving these goals?

LEISURE/RECREATION (LSI-OR)

All right, now I am interested in what you do (did) in your spare time.

1. What do (did) you usually do in your spare time?
(Try to specify activities within each category and get number of hours/week)

	Ever?		Hrs/wk
	No	Yes	
1. Family activities, including housework			
2. Hobbies/crafts			
3. Listening to music			
4. Watching TV			
5. Physical activities: sports/recreation			
6. Specific activities with friends(what types of activities?)			
7. Hanging around with friends			
8. Other (specify)			
2. How often do (did) you feel bored?			
1. Never			
2. Rarely			
3. Sometimes			
4. Often			
5. All the time			

PEERS(LSI-OR)

Now I would like to ask you some questions about your relationships with your friends.

1. Do (Did) you have enough friends?

2. Would you say that you have (had):
1. Many close friends
 2. A few close friends
 3. Many casual friends
 4. A few casual friends
 5. Other (elaborate)
3. Would you say that your group of friends has changed since you were last in the community (the time before your last incarceration) ?
- new group of friends altogether? - same group, different behaviour?
4. How close would you say you are to your friends? (use five point scale from very close to distant)
1	2	3	4	5
very
close	close	somewhat
close	not very
close	distant

How long have you known them? Do you keep in touch with them? (PCL-R)
What makes a "close friend" Is it important for you to have someone close?

6. Do you feel able to discuss personal problems with your friends?
1	2	3	4	5
never	rarely	sometimes	often	always

Can you rely on your friends when you need help or are in trouble? (How many of them, why or why not?) Do you? (If no to either of the preceding) Why not?

7. Did your friends have any formal contact with the criminal justice system? In what way?
8. Do (did) any of your friends have a drinking problem? Drug problem? How serious is (was) the problem? Is he or she receiving treatment (Did he or she receive treatment)?

MARITAL/FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

I want to ask you now about your family when you were growing up.

Family Life (PCL-R)

1. Were you raised by your natural parents? How long did you live with them? (Specify age)

Did you ever live with anyone else (step/adoptive/foster family, group home, etc.)? Who?
At what age(s)? How did you come to live there? Why?

ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PRIMARY PARENTAL HOME(S):

2. What was your home life like?

How did you get along with your parent(s)? Describe them. Were they affectionate towards you? Did you do activities with them? What did they do for a living? Were they ever on welfare?

Did they get along well together? Did they argue much? Did they ever have physical fights?
Did they ever separate? What age were you? How did this affect you?

Do you have any brothers or sisters? How did you get along with them?

Were things strict at your house? Were there lots of rules? How often did you break the rules, lie, run away, steal, etc.)? At what age(s)? Why? How were you punished? How was your behavior compared to your siblings?

2. Did anybody in your home have any troubles with the law? Who? What happened?

3. Did anybody in your home have any serious mental or physical problems? Who? What about problems with alcohol or drugs?

ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE INDIVIDUAL'S PRIMARY SURROGATE HOME(S)

4. What was life like?
Who else lived there? How did you get along with them?

Were things strict there? Were there lots of rules? How often did you break the rules (lie, run away, steal, etc.) At what age(s)? Why? How were you punished?

Did anybody there have problems with the law? Who? What happened?
Did anybody there have any serious mental or physical problems? Who? What about alcohol or drug problems?

5. Were you ever abused physically, sexually, or emotionally? By whom? At what age(s)? What happened?

6. Did you ever run away from home overnight?
Why? How many times? At what age(s)? Did you contact your parents?

7. How old were you when you left home?
Why? At what age(s)? What did you do?

8. Have you ever "hit the road" and traveled without real plans?
At what age(s)? What was the longest time you were gone? Where did you go? What did you do?
Did you tell anyone you were going?

9. What is the longest time you have lived without a fixed address? When?

What's the longest time you've ever lived in the same place, since you've been on your own?
(mos)

Current Family Relationships

1. What is your relationship with your family like now?
How often do you see them or talk to them on the phone? When was the last time?
What are they doing? How are they? Do you feel you can talk to them about problems or go to them for help?

Sexual Relationships (LSI-OR)

1. Are you currently (When you were in the community were you) married or living with a woman?

1. Legally married
2. Common law
3. Separated or divorced
4. Single
5. Other (specify)

(If in a serious relationship) How long have you been in your current relationship?

3. On a scale of one to five, from very close to distinct, rate your relationship with your significant other

1	2	3	4	5
very	close	somewhat	not	very distant
close		close	close	

4. If you had a personal problem about something, can you go to her for help?
Do you? (If no to either of the preceding) Why not?

5. Has your significant other ever had formal contact with the criminal justice system? In what way?

6. Has your significant other ever had a drinking problem? Drug problem? When? How serious?
Is she receiving (did she receive) treatment?

7. How many live-in relationships have you had?
(INCLUDE BOTH HETEROSEXUAL AND HOMOSEXUAL)

How many times have you been married or lived common -law?

- IF THE INDIVIDUAL HAS HAD NUMEROUS RELATIONSHIPS, ASK:
Why have you had so many relationships?

- IF THE INDIVIDUAL DENIES ANY LIVE-IN RELATIONSHIPS, ASK:
Have you ever had a serious girlfriend?

Have you ever had a homosexual relationship?

FOR THE LONGEST OR MOST RECENT LIVE-IN RELATIONSHIP, ASK:

8. How long did the relationship last? How old were you when it started?
Describe your partner. What do (did) you like best about your partner? Are you in love with your partner, or is it more of a physical relationship?

Is (Was) the relationship stable? Do (Did) you argue much? Do (Did) you ever have physical fights?

IF RELATIONSHIP HAS ENDED, ASK:

9. Why did the relationship end? How long did it take you to get over it?

10. Have you ever been deeply in love? With who?

11. How old were you when you first had a sexual relationship?
Was it with a stable partner, or a casual acquaintance?

12. How many different sexual partners have you had?
How many were casual acquaintances ("one night stands")?

13. Have you ever had relationships with more than one person at the same time?
Tell me about it.

14. Have you ever been unfaithful to any of your partners? How often? At what age(s)?
Did your partner ever find out? How did your partner react?

15. Do you have any children or step-children? Who was the mother? How long did you know her? How many? How old are they? What are their birthdates? What grade are they in at school?

How is your relationship with your children? How often do you have contact with them? Have you ever failed to take care of your children?

ALCOHOL/DRUG USE

Let's now talk about your alcohol and drug use.

1. Have you ever had an alcohol or drug problem? (Y/N)
(If yes) When?

Did your alcohol/drug use cause problems for people? At what age(s)?

2. Did it cause problems for you in any of the following (Y/N):

1. Health (e.g., D.T.'s, liver)
2. Family (fights with spouse, parents)
3. Relationships with friends/other
4. Legal (getting into trouble)
5. Employment/school
6. Financial situation

- 3 Even if you didn't have a problem, did other people ever say anything about your alcohol/drug use? (If yes, get details)

4. Have you ever been treated for an alcohol or drug problem? Y / N
If yes, did you find the treatment effective? Were you in favour of getting treatment?

Current Substance Use

1. Do (Did) you use alcohol or drugs now?
What types? Since what age(s)? (as a teenager? as an adult?)
2. Have you ever seriously abuse alcohol or drugs? Were you ever addicted?

3. Why do you use drugs (stimulation, escape, relaxation, etc.)?
4. Did you ever do anything dangerous or get into trouble when drunk or stoned (drive while impaired, get into fights, get arrested)?
5. Were you drunk or stoned when you committed one or more previous offenses?

HEALTH

Let's talk now about your health.

1. Do you have any serious medical problems (seizures, severe headaches)?
Describe them. When did they start? Are you presently on (Were you on) any medication?
If so, are (were) you taking your medication regularly? If no, why not?
2. Have you ever been seen by a psychologist or psychiatrist?
What for? At what age(s)? In prison, or on the street? What was the diagnosis? What treatment(s) did you receive?

Have you ever been hospitalized for mental or emotional problems? What for? At what age(s)?

3. Were you ever on medications for your nerves?
What medications? What dosages? When? What for? Who prescribed them?
4. As a child were you ever diagnosed as "hyperactive"?
By whom? At what age(s)? Did you receive treatment?
5. Have you ever tried to commit suicide?
How many times? Why? At what age(s)? Were the attempts serious, or were they a means of getting attention?
6. Do you get angry easily? What kinds of things make you angry? What do you usually do when you are angry?

7. How would you have rate (rated) your life on a scale of 1 to 100, where 1 is unbearable and 100 is all you'd ever want from life (when you were in the community)?
8. How confident are (were) you that you can (could) succeed on the outside
 1. Completely confident
 2. Fairly confident
 3. Halfway confident
 4. A little lacking in confidence
 5. Completely lacking in confidence

Childhood/Adolescent Behavior (PCL-R)

I now want to ask you when you were a kid. What kinds of things you used to do.

1. When you were young (age 12 and under), did you do anything like vandalize a school or someone else's property, set fires, hurt animals for fun, steal from your parents or tell a lot of lies? How often? At what age(s)?

Did you ever get caught? How were you punished?

2. Did you ever get into trouble with the police as a child? ("CHILD" AGE 12 AND BELOW)
What for? At what age(s)?
3. Were you ever arrested as a juvenile? ("JUVENILE" MEANS AGE 17 AND BELOW)
How many times? At what age(s)? What for? Were you convicted? Were any of these crimes violent?
4. How old were you when you first started doing crime?
What kinds of things did you do?
5. Did you ever commit crimes as a juvenile and not get caught? What?

Current Antisocial Behaviour

1. What are you on parole/probation (in jail) for right now? How long is your sentence?
 - a) What happened? What did you do? What do the police say that you did?

- b) What the offence spontaneous or was it planned?
 - c) Were you the only person involved or were you with others?
 - d) Was the victim male or female?
 - e) Did you know the victim?
 - f) Did the victim have physical injuries? Hospital care required? For what?

 - g) Were you drunk or stoned at the time of the offence?
 - h) How did you get arrested?

 - i) How old were you when the offence was committed?
2. Do you feel this sentence is fair?
3. Do you think current charges or sentence will have any effect on your life? What type?
4. While in prison did you take part in any treatment programs? If yes, did you find them helpful? Did you think they were unnecessary? Did you refuse to participate in any, and if so why?
5. What other types of offences have you been arrested for as an adult? What is the most serious offense you have ever committed? Describe it.
6. Have you ever been convicted for fraud, forgery, false pretenses, impersonation, perjury, etc.? If yes, how many times?
7. Who or what is to blame for your offenses?
- Why did (do) you commit crimes? Why did you start crime?
- IF THE INDIVIDUAL TAKES PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:
8. What could you have done to avoid committing the offense?
- Have you ever tried to stop crime? How?
9. What factors would help keep you out of crime?

10. Do you regret having committed your offenses? Why/why not?

11. What effect have your crimes had on the victims?

How do feel about the effect on the victims? Have you had contact with them?

12. Are your crimes usually impulsive (spur-of-the-moment) or planned?

13. How do you feel when you are doing a crime?
Are you nervous? Excited? Scared?

Do you like doing crime?

14. Did you ever commit crimes and not get caught?
What types? How often? At what age(s)?

15. Have you ever breached parole or probation, escaped, gone UAL (unlawfully at large), or had a FTA (fail to appear at court)? Which one(s)? How often? At what age(s)?

16. Have you ever used aliases? How often? Why?

17. Would you find it easy or difficult to tell a lie when it is in your best interest?

18. Have other people ever described you as a hustler or a manipulator?

General Questions

1. Do you like to speed or take chances when you drive?
Have you ever been stopped by the police for speeding or reckless driving? How often?

2. Do you ever do crazy or dangerous things for fun?
What types of things? At what age(s)?

3. How often do you get into physical fights?
Have you ever "lost control"? What was the worst injury you ever caused someone?

4. Have you ever done anything that made you feel guilty or that you were sorry you had done (other than crime)?
What did you do? Why did you feel badly about it?
5. If the price were right, is there anything you would not do? What?
6. When you work at something for a long time, do you get bored easily?
7. Do you lie a lot? How often? Are you good at it?
8. Do you think that people are easy to "con" or manipulate?
Do you ever do it? What are some examples?
9. How do you feel about yourself?
How is your self-esteem? Rate your self-image on a scale of 1 to 10.
10. Has anyone close to you died?
How did that affect you? How did you handle it? Did you go to the funeral?

IF NO, ASK:

Has anyone close to you ever been seriously ill? How did that affect you? How did you handle it? Did you go to the hospital?

12. What's the most depressed you have ever been?
13. What is the happiest you have ever been?
14. Are you satisfied with your life so far?
Is there anything missing in you life? What?

What would you describe as your main failures?

In deciding what to do, would you consider the consequences of your actions in terms of how they affect others?

15. Do you sometimes put on a show of feelings because other people expect it, even though you so do feel that way? When? Describe it.
16. Are you patient and tolerant with other people?
17. Are you concerned that your criminal history will prevent you from accomplishing your goals?

INTERVIEW NOTES

Circle appropriate rating

1. Rate the clarity and coherence of subject's responses during the interview

1. Subject's responses were clear and coherent
2. Some mild problems understanding subject's responses
3. Some moderate problems understanding subject's responses
4. Subject's responses were almost totally unclear or incoherent

2. Rate consistency of subject's responses during the interview:

1. Subject's responses were consistent
2. Some mild inconsistencies were apparent in interview
3. Some moderate inconsistencies were apparent in interview
4. Subject's responses were almost totally inconsistent

3. Rate the overall validity of the interview

1. Valid and problem free
2. Valid, but with mild problems
3. Valid, but with moderate problems
4. Invalid, most items would be scored on the basis on file information

4. Describe any aspects of the subjects' demeanor and behaviour during the interview that seem important or that may not be apparent in audio-tapes. Such comments may focus on the subject's style of speech, nonverbal behaviours, interpersonal style, or self-image. (Does offender currently have any active symptoms of a major mental illness?)

Appendix K

Informed Consent

The purpose of an informed consent is to ensure that you understand the purpose of the study and the nature of your involvement. The informed consent provides you with sufficient information such that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study. Please ask the researcher to clarify any concerns you may have.

Purpose: This research is being conducted by researchers from Carleton University in Ottawa. The purpose of this study is to assess what factors are related to whether an individual stays crime-free or commits crimes while on release from prison.

Task Requirements: I understand that the study will involve a 2.0-2.5 hour interview and 15-20 minutes of self-report questionnaires.

Potential Risk/Discomfort: The research design is approved by the Ethics Committee at Carleton University and by Correctional Services of Canada. There are no physical or psychological risks associated with this research.

Anonymity/Confidentiality: The data collected in this study is confidential. The information will be used for research purposes only and will not be disclosed to the institution or parole offices. All data will be coded such that my name will not be associated with the data. The coded data will be available only to the researchers associated with this project. I understand that confidentiality will be broken only under the following circumstances: specific plans to harm myself or others is revealed or disclosure of child sexual/physical abuse.

Right To Withdraw: It is my right to withdraw from this study at any time. If I choose not to participate, or to withdraw, this will have no impact on the status of my release in the community, access to treatment, or cause me to be revoked.

Research Personnel: Please contact the following individuals if you have question with respect to ethical concerns: Heather Burke is the principal investigator (613-520-2600, ext. 1408); Heather Vamplew is the assistant investigator (613-520-2600, ext. 1408); Dr. Adelle Forth is the Faculty Advisor (613-520-2600, ext. 1267). Dr. Bill Jones is the Chair of the Department of Psychology (613-520-2600, ext. 2648). Dr. Lise Paquet is the Chair of the Ethics Committee (613-520-2600, ext. 7513).

Signatures

I have read the description of the study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's Name: _____ Participant's Signature: _____

Researcher's Name: _____ Researcher's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix L

Consent To Audiotape Interview

I understand that part of the research involves audiotaping the 2.0-2.5 hour interview. I have been told that the purpose for audiotaping is to ensure that all of the information I say in the interview is documented correctly. I have been told that confidentiality will be maintained and that I will not be identified by name.

Participant's Name: _____ Participant's Signature: _____

Researcher's Name: _____ Researcher's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix M

Consent For Access To Parole Files (*For Successful Releasees*)

I understand that part of the research involves accessing my parole files. I have been told that confidentiality will be maintained and that I will not be identified by name (all information will be coded). My signature allows the parole office to release the information to the researcher.

Participant's Name: _____ Participant's Signature: _____

Researcher's Name: _____ Researcher's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix N

**Consent For Access To Institutional/Parole Office Files
(For Unsuccessful Releasees)**

I understand that part of the research involves accessing my institutional and parole files. I have been told that confidentiality will be maintained and that I will not be identified by name (all information will be coded). My signature allows the institution and parole office to release the information to the researcher.

Participant's Name: _____ Participant's Signature: _____

Researcher's Name: _____ Researcher's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix O

Debriefing Form

Thank you for your participation in this study. The purpose was to investigate why some individuals felt they were able to stay crime-free and why other individuals felt they offended when they were released to the community from prison. The factors identified in this research may aid in developing correctional programs that will further assist individuals in staying crime-free. All the information that you provided will be kept confidential. Neither your institution, parole office, nor Correctional Services Canada will have access to this information. All the reports will be coded in such a way that no person's answers can be identified. None of the information gathered for this study will be left at the institution or at the parole offices.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the present study, please feel free to ask.

Appendix P

List Of Contacts (*Successful Releasees*)

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the present study, you can contact any of the following individuals:

Heather Burke (Principal Investigator): 613-520-2600, ext. 1408
Heather Vamplew (Assistant Investigator) 613-520-2600, ext. 1408
Dr. A. Forth (Faculty Advisor): 613-520-2600, ext. 1267

If you have any ethical concerns, contact the following individuals:

Dr. W. Jones (Chair of the Department of Psychology): 613-520-2600, ext. 2648
Dr. L. Paquet (Chair of the Ethics Committee): 613-520-2600, ext. 2692

We may also be contacted in writing at:

Carleton University
Department of Psychology
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 5B6

If any of the content of the interview or questionnaires caused you to feel any distress, please contact one of the psychologists on staff at the National Parole Board. You may also call the following number if you need to talk:

Ottawa Distress Centre: 238-3311

Appendix Q

List Of Contacts (*Unsuccessful Releasees*)

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the present study, you can contact any of the following individuals:

Heather Burke (Principal Investigator): 613-520-2600, ext. 1408

Heather Vamplew (Assistant Investigator) 613-520-2600, ext. 1408

Dr. A. Forth (Faculty Advisor): 613-520-2600, ext. 1267

If you have any ethical concerns, contact the following individuals:

Dr. W. Jones (Chair of the Department of Psychology): 613-520-2600, ext. 2648

Dr. L. Paquet (Chair of the Ethics Committee): 613-520-2600, ext. 2692

We may also be contacted in writing at:

Carleton University

Department of Psychology

1125 Colonel By Drive

Ottawa, Ontario

K1S 5B6

If any of the content of the interview or questionnaires caused you to feel any distress, please contact one of the psychologists or social workers on staff at the institution.

Appendix R

Variable Transformations

Criminal History

number of nonviolent convictions

nonviol nonviolt= $\sqrt{\text{nonviol} + 1}$

Onset nonviolent convictions

onset_nv nonsetnvt= $\sqrt{\text{onset_nv} + 1}$

number of violent convictions

violent violentt= $\lg_{10}(\text{violent} + 1)$

ageonset for violent convictions

onset_v onsetvt= $\sqrt{\text{onset_v}}$

Total sentence for index offence

sentence sentenct= $\lg_{10}(\text{sentence})$ Current Release

Release length

r_length r_lengtht= $\lg_{10}(\text{r_length})$

Previous release length

prev_len prev_let= $\lg_{10}(\text{prev_len} + 1)$

Total length

tot_len tota_let= $\lg_{10}(\text{tot_len})$

Total suspension

suspens suspent= $\lg_{10}(\text{suspens} + 1)$

technical suspensions

suspen_t suspentt= $\lg_{10}(\text{suspen_t} + 1)$

Substance suspensions

suspen_s suspenst= $\lg_{10}(\text{suspen_s} + 1)$

Offence suspensions

suspen_o suspenot= $\lg_{10}(\text{suspen_o} + 1)$

Interval before Suspension

interv_s = $\sqrt{\text{interv_s}}$

Official Revocation

off_rev offrevt = $\lg 10(\text{off_rev} + 1)$

Official Violent Revocations

offv_rev offvrevt = $\lg 10(\text{offv_rev} + 1)$

Interval before revocation

int_rev intrevt = $\sqrt{\text{int_rev}}$

Previous Release History

Number of Prior Releases

prior_re priorret = $\lg 10(\text{prior_re} + 1)$

Previous revocations

revoc_p revocpt = $\sqrt{\text{revoca_p} + 1}$

Factors Reported Unprompted

Number of positive factors reported

fact_pos factpost = $\sqrt{\text{fact_pos} + 1}$

Perceived factors

anger

pf_anger pf_anget = $\lg 10(\text{pf_anger} + 5)$

education/employment skills

pf_educ pf_educt = $\lg 10(5 - \text{pf_educ})$

employment

pf_emplo pf_emplt = $\lg 10(5 - \text{pf_emplo})$

Expectations changed

pf_exp pf_exptt = $\lg 10(5 - \text{pf_exp})$

Financial Situation

pf_fin pf_fint = $\lg 10(5 - \text{pf_fin})$

Friends

pf_frien pf_friet = $\lg 10(5 - \text{pf_frien})$

Living Arrangements

pf_livin $\text{pf_livet} = \lg 10(5 - \text{pf_livin})$

Growing up, becoming more mature

pf_matur $\text{pf_matt} = \lg 10(5 - \text{pf_matur})$

Parole Officer

pf_po $\text{pf_pot} = \lg 10(5 - \text{pf_po})$

Revenge

pf_reven $\text{pf_revet} = \lg 10(5 - \text{pf_reven})$

Siblings

pf_sibli $\text{pf_siblt} = \sqrt{5 - \text{pf_sibli}}$

Significant other

pf_sign $\text{pf_signt} = \sqrt{5 - \text{pf_sign}}$

Treatment

pf_treatq $\text{pf_trett} = \lg 10(5 - \text{pf_treat})$

Values

pf_value $\text{pf_valut} = \lg 10(5 - \text{pf_value})$

Did offence on a whim

pf_whim $\text{pf_whit} = \lg 10(5 - \text{pf_whim})$

Appendix S

Positive Factors on Release for Successful and Unsuccessful Releasees

Variable	Releasee Group						χ^2
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
	(N=58)		(n=29)		(n=29)		
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	

<u>Social Supports</u>							
Significant other	17	29	11	40	6	21	2.10
Friends	15	26	14	48	1	3	17.44***
Parents	9	16	7	24	2	7	3.54
Siblings	9	16	5	17	4	14	.13
Children	9	16	9	31	0	0	14.14**
Grandchildren	2	3	2	7	0	0	2.84
People in the community	3	5	3	10	0	0	4.32
<u>Corrections</u>							
Parole officer	14	24	12	41	2	7	10.22**
Parole office	2	3	2	7	0	0	2.84
Treatment	9	16	6	21	3	10	1.20
Halfway house staff	5	9	3	10	2	7	.22
Halfway house	4	7	3	10	1	3	1.12
Structure	4	7	3	10	1	3	1.12
Psychologist/psychiatrist	3	5	2	7	1	3	.36
Case management officer	2	3	2	7	0	0	2.84
Corcan	2	3	2	7	0	0	2.84
<u>Internal</u>							
Decision to stop	9	16	8	28	1	3	7.20*
Fear/not wanting							
to return to jail	8	14	8	28	0	0	12.38**
Positive attitude	7	12	7	24	0	0	10.67*
Growing up/more mature	3	5	3	10	0	0	4.32
Learning/getting							
acceptance from others	3	5	3	10	0	0	4.32
Self-acceptance	3	5	3	10	0	0	4.32
Self learning	3	5	3	10	0	0	4.32
Realistic plans	3	5	3	10	0	0	4.32

Myself	3	5	3	10	0	0	4.32
<u>Other</u>							
Employment	20	34	16	45	7	24	2.78
Recreation/leisure	7	12	6	21	1	3	4.45
Stay away from people/ places that are trouble	5	9	5	17	0	0	7.40
Spirituality	5	9	4	14	1	3	2.10
Volunteer work	5	9	4	14	1	3	2.10
Kept busy	5	9	4	14	1	3	2.10
Alcohol/drugs	4	7	3	10	1	3	1.12
School	3	5	3	10	0	0	4.32
Financial situation	3	5	2	7	1	3	.36
Free from jail	3	5	2	7	1	3	.36
John Howard Society	2	3	2	7	0	0	2.84
Living Arrangements	2	3	2	7	0	0	2.84
Moved away	2	3	2	7	0	0	2.84
Going to the gym	3	5	0	0	3	10	4.32

Note. Only factors reported by at least 5% ($n=2$) of either sample are shown. Two-tailed chi-squares and fisher's exact tests. $df = 58$. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Appendix T

Negative Factors on Release for Successful and Unsuccessful Releasees

Variable	Releasee Group						χ^2
	Total		Successful		Unsuccessful		
	(N=58)		(n=29)		(n=29)		
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	
<u>Corrections</u>							
Structure/restrictions	13	22	5	17	8	28	.90
Parole officer	9	16	2	7	7	24	3.45
The system/parole office	8	14	3	10	5	17	.59
Forced to reside at halfway house	7	12	1	3	6	27	4.45
Halfway house staff	2	3	0	0	2	7	2.84
Fellow offenders at halfway house	2	3	0	0	2	7	2.84
Halfway house far from family and friends	5	9	0	0	5	17	7.40
Lack of vocational rehab	3	5	1	3	2	7	.36
Program timing	5	9	0	0	5	17	7.40
Denied/difficult access to treatment	4	7	0	0	4	14	5.84
Forced to take programs	3	5	0	0	3	10	4.32
Treatment	2	3	2	7	1	3	.36
<u>Interpersonal Difficulties</u>							
Significant other	6	10	6	21	0	0	9.01*
Friends	6	10	3	10	3	10	0.00
Difficult to meet people	3	5	1	3	2	7	.36
<u>Emotional States/Coping</u>							
Anxiety	6	10	2	7	4	14	.76
Anger	3	5	1	3	2	7	.36
Depression	3	5	1	3	2	7	.36
Lonely	2	3	2	7	0	0	2.84
Difficult adapting to being out	4	7	3	10	1	3	1.12

Fear of police harassment/ being unjustly accused	3	5	2	7	1	3	.36
<u>Other</u>							
Jail house attitude	2	3	2	7	0	0	2.84
Being Bored	2	3	0	0	2	7	2.84
Health	2	3	2	7	0	0	2.84
Unemployment/ dissatisfaction with employment	13	22	5	17	8	28	.90
Financial situation	7	12	4	14	3	10	.16
Alcohol/drugs	5	9	2	7	3	10	.22

Note. Only factors reported by at least 5% ($\underline{n}=2$) of either sample are shown. Two-tailed chi-squares and fisher's exact tests. $\underline{df}=58$. * $p<.05$.

IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (QA-3)

APPLIED IMAGE, Inc
1653 East Main Street
Rochester, NY 14609 USA
Phone: 716/482-0300
Fax: 716/288-5989

© 1993, Applied Image, Inc., All Rights Reserved