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ABSTRACT

California has begun the implementation of Assembly Bill 109—Public Safety Realignment—to mitigate the effects of prison overcrowding. At the time of this research there were approximately 143,000 inmates housed within the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), nearly 100,000 active parolees, and a recidivism rate of 65% (78% in San Francisco). The Coming Home or Going Home project quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed the results of a survey questionnaire of 40 active male parolees in San Francisco. The cohort was between the ages of 28 and 53, served more than one prison term and at least one parole violation. The research concluded that parolees face critical challenges with substance abuse, housing, and employment upon release from prison. The quantitative results confirmed there is a strong positive correlation between the education level of ex-convicts and the amount of time they had spent in prison. Although the CDCR drastically reduced the number of inmate vocational, educational, and substance abuse programs in their prisons, existing programs were under-utilized by the cohort. For those who did participate in the California New Start Program there were significant findings demonstrating that inmates benefitted and were able to obtain jobs upon release. Final analysis concluded that the CDCR needs to implement policy that focuses on rebuilding lives and providing opportunities to those who have been marginalized by incarceration.
1. INTRODUCTION

Coming home or going home? This is common theme in the California parole population. To many, prison represents home, a cycle of release and re-incarceration that the majority of California’s parole population cannot break. After years and years of research, 57,000 employees, and a ten billion dollar budget, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) has yet to develop any type of comprehensive reentry plan that addresses substance abuse, job training, career development, education, and housing needs of ex-convicts.

This study is intended to highlight both quantitative and qualitative effects of the prison experience, as it pertains to preparing inmates for successful reentry back into the community. The quantitative aspect of this research produced descriptive statistics of the parolee population in San Francisco. Moreover, it highlighted challenges parolees face upon release and revealed positive associations between educational level and incarceration rates, paroling homeless and drug use, and participation in prison programs and gainful employment. Qualitatively, this research answered two pertinent questions. Has prison prepared inmates to integrate back to the community? And is there a need for a comprehensive reentry program?

The mission statement of the CDCR claims to “provide effective rehabilitation and treatment, and to integrate offenders successfully into the community” (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation [CDCR], Annual Report 2011a). With a budget that has increased over $1.2 billion over the past few years, while simultaneously cutting inmate vocational, educational, and substance abuse programs to proportionally low levels, it may be difficult for the CDCR to fulfill its’ mission statement. It is imperative that Californians understand the scope of the problem parolees in California face in their state.
According to Petersilia (2001a), “Virtually no systematic, comprehensive attention has been paid by policy makers to deal with people after they are released, an issue that has been termed prisoner reentry” (p.360). If nothing is done to correct the problems we face as a society, regarding prisoner reentry, the problems will continue to escalate. “Nearly 700,000 parolees are doing time on U.S. streets. Most have been released to parole systems that provide few services and impose conditions that almost guarantee parolees’ failure” (Petersilia, 2001a).

Prisoner reentry is complex. The average ex-convict returning to the community “will have served a longer prison sentence than in the past, be more disconnected from family and friends, have a higher prevalence of substance abuse and mental illness, and be less educated and employable than those in prior prison release cohorts. Each of these factors is known to predict recidivism, yet few of these needs are addressed while the inmate is in prison or on parole” (Petersilia, 2003). It is the scope of this research project to go into the community and understand the challenges San Francisco’s parole population face upon release from prison, and examine the obstacles affecting successful reentry.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Prisoner reentry is on the forefront of corrections within the United States. Until recently, California had the largest prison population of any state with a 173,312 prisoners. With the implementation of Assembly Bill 109, Public Safety Realignment, the Supreme Court ordered California to reduce its prison population to 130,000 inmates. “One in seven state prisoners in the United is incarcerated in California, and between 1980 and 2007, California’s prison population increased over sevenfold, compared with a fourfold increase nationally” (Grattet, Petersilia, Lin, & Beckman, 2009).
Recidivism is a major problem in California. Recidivism can be defined as a return to prison for those on parole, either as a violation of their parole or reoffending while on parole. The CDCR Adult Institutions Outcome Evaluation Report (2011b) defines recidivism as a “return to prison as its primary indicator of a recidivist” during a given time period, namely that of which the individual was on parole. A three year research study on recidivism by the CDCR tracked the release of inmates from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007 and drew remarkable conclusions. The report found that the three year recidivism rate for the 2006-07 cohort was 65.1%, yet those labeled rereleases was much higher at 76.4%.

In examining the trend of the recidivists over the three year period, nearly 50% who returned to prison do so within the first six months of release. The rate of recidivism for this same group rises to 75% at the one year mark. According to the CDCR Adult Institutions Outcome Evaluation Report (2010), San Francisco had one of the highest overall recidivism rates in the state at 78.3%. In all categories of recidivism, San Francisco was a top achiever sending parolees back to prison.

Drug use amongst parolees and recidivism seem to go hand in hand. A 2006 study by Cartier, Farabee, and Prendergast tracked methamphetamine use and recidivism in California. The research results showed that those who used methamphetamine had a recidivism rate of 81.6% in a twelve month period as compared to those who did not use methamphetamine (53.9%) during the same twelve month period.

According to Petersilia (2003), “How we plan for an inmates’ transition to free living—including how they spend their time during confinement, the process by which they are released, and how they are supervised after release—is critical to public safety. This process is
called *prison reentry* and, simply defined, includes all activities and programming conducted to prepare ex-convicts to return safely to the community and to live as law abiding citizens”.

The process of reentry begins once an inmate is incarcerated. The programs an inmate participates in during his/her term of incarceration can have a great impact on reentry. A failed reentry process by a parolee inevitably leads to recidivism.

The issues surrounding prisoner reentry are multifaceted. Ex-convicts are typically uneducated, have little marketable job skills, suffer from substance abuse problems, and have no means to support themselves. According to former Attorney General Janet Reno (2000), “[she] called prisoner reentry one of the most pressing problem we face as a nation” (as cited in Petersilia, 2001a).

Research by the Pacific Institute (2010) found that California Parolees encountered struggles with employment, housing, and substance abuse upon release from prison. Additionally, Visher, LaVigne, and Travis (2004) discovered “returning prisoners are faced with many challenges, including finding a job, housing, and substance abuse treatment; reuniting with family; and reintegrating into the community”. Housing is an essential need for ex-convicts returning to the streets fresh out of prison. Any hope of rebuilding one’s life starts with a roof over your head. Petersilia (2003) emphasized, “Parole officials say that finding housing for parolees is by far their biggest challenge, even more difficult and more important than finding a job”. Bradley (2001) claims, “Housing is the linchpin that holds the reintegration process together. Without a stable residence, continuity in substance abuse and mental health treatment is compromised. Employment is often contingent upon a fixed living arrangement” (as cited in Petersilia, 2003).
Housing, homelessness, recidivism, and reentry are all intimately linked. According to Ripley (2002), “30% to 50% of big-city parolees are homeless” (as cited in Petersilia, 2003). Official reports from the CDCR claim that about 10% of California’s parolees are homeless but in areas such as San Francisco and Los Angeles that rate is estimated to be as high as 50% (Petersilia, 2003).

The numerous challenges an ex-convict encounters finding employment may result in a return to drugs and crime. According to Petersilia (2001b), “The majority of inmates leave prison with no savings, no immediate entitlement to unemployment benefits, and few employment prospects. One year after release, as many as 60% of former inmates are not employed in the regular labor market, and there is increase reluctance among employers to hire ex-offenders” (Work and Economic Well-Being section, para. 1). Research by Devah Pager (2003) titled “The Mark of a Criminal Record” concludes, “a criminal record presents a major barrier to employment, with important implications for racial disparities”.

In a 13 month report by the CDCR (COMSTAT DAPO Statistical Report, 2012) which tracked the period from February 2011 through February 2012, the results confirm the difficulties parolees face when it comes to finding work. According to the COMSTAT Report for Parole Region 2 (which San Francisco is a part) unemployment rates of parolees fluctuated between 77% in February 2011 and 67% in February 2012.

2.1 Necessity of Further Research

Over 100,000 inmates a year are being released to communities in California. The lack of inmate programs in California prisons has further burdened newly frees inmates. The vast majority lack the skills and education to find employment and thus obtain housing. They also
typically must come to terms with contentious family situations—often a prerequisite for adjusting to society at large.

Furthermore, many return with untreated substance abuse issues, hindering chances for successful reintegration. Two out of three California parolees are returned to prison. It is critical to our community to find out what is working, what is lacking, and what parolees need to rebuild their lives and smoothly transition back to the community as law abiding, self-sufficient citizens.

The stark reality is that another marginalized group has arisen. Ex-cons coming home from prison unprepared to reenter the community have an impact that transcends the correctional community. “The reality is that the public is put in serious jeopardy when structured, planned community re-entry is not a mandated requirement of release from prison and jail. Offenders return to what they know—drugs, crime and the streets—and can do when alternatives do not exist (Connelly & Larivee, 2004).

3. METHODOLOGY/RESEARCH DESIGN

Prisoner reentry has the ability to impact communities and society as a whole. The concept of “reentry” is relevant to numerous settings in which inmates transition from incarceration to the freedom. The scope of the “Coming Home or Going Home” project was limited to those who were released from the California Department of Corrections and were paroled to San Francisco. This research examined the challenges parolees face from the time of their incarceration, through their release, as well as integration back into society. The Coming Home or Going Home project targeted male parolees in San Francisco who have served multiple prison terms and multiple parole violations. It was designed to explore the phenomenon of prisoner reentry in the perspective of the parolee; focusing on 5 main areas of interest: the prison experience, education, employment, housing, and substance abuse. The goal was to
collect information on the parolee’s life history, how they spent their time in prison preparing for release, and challenges they faced once they were released. I explored the reentry process by interviewing 30 active male parolees in San Francisco. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used in this research as data was collected with the objective to gain an understanding, from a parolee’s perspective, what it is like to transition from prison to the streets.

3.1 Data Collection
The data was collected through in-depth, face to face, semi-structured interviews utilizing a predesigned survey questionnaire which included both open and closed ended questions. The goal was to capture each parolee’s perception of the reentry process, gain an understanding of how they perceived prison prepared them for life in the community, and what they key challenges they face as they transition from incarceration to the streets. The interviews were conducted, recorded, and transcribed by the researcher from July 2012-August 2012.

3.2 Sampling/Cases
A sample size of thirty respondents was used for this research. A nonprobability, purposive sample, utilizing snowball sampling was implemented to meet the criteria of the selected sample population. The entire sample population for this research was male, active parolees in San Francisco, and between the ages of 28 and 53. From the outset, it was the goal to only interview parolees who had served more than one prison term and more than one parole violation. All of the respondents except one met this criterion. The one of respondent had served only a single prison term. Of the respondents, eight were in a residential treatment program, twelve were residents of a parole funded halfway house, six were currently homeless,
two lived with family, and two lived in their own apartments. It is the aim of this research to draw conclusions upon two overarching points:

1. In the perspective of San Francisco’s male parole population, is there a need for a comprehensive re-entry program?

2. What do San Francisco’s parolees feel they need to stay out of prison, discharge parole, live a crime free life, and become self-sufficient?

3. Has prison prepared inmates to integrate back to the community

4. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS SECTION

The data for the qualitative analysis was derived from both open and closed ended questions. The data being analyzed represents attitudes, explanations, experiences, and challenges. The unit of the analyses is the individual and the group via the 30 respondents that participated in the research. The major concepts covered were the prison experience, participation in prison programs, substance abuse, and challenges with housing, employment, and living a crime free life leading to self-sufficiency.

Open coding was used to develop general themes, which was then followed by axial coding. Axial coding is the “process of relating categories to their subcategories” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The qualitative data collected for the research project “Coming Home or Going Home” was based on the perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes of the SF parolee’s that were interviewed. The concepts, categories of major themes, and corresponding codes that were discovered arose from the transcripts of open-ended questions from the interviews and are presented in Table 1.
The objective was to gain an understanding of how each respondents prison experience sets the stage for the reentry process, as well as develop a well critiqued answer to the primary questions this research addresses, “Is there a need for a comprehensive reentry program that starts at the inception of incarceration and continues through release on parole and contains housing, education, job training, and treatment for substance abuse?” The data which is used for this research is first-hand accounts of current male parolees in San Francisco who provided pertinent information to the issues this research is addressing.

5. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS SECTION
The quantitative analysis will provide descriptive statistics of the population as well supporting evidence for the qualitative analysis. In this section the key issue was to gain insight on incarceration, indicators of recidivism, and desistance from crime through training programs and employment. Inferential statistics, Chi Squared and Gamma analysis, was used to measure relationships between variables with nominal data, and a Correlation test was used to measure the correlation between variables with ratio data. Using SPSS, 3 tests were conducted to test relationships between variables. Variables PHL (Parole Homeless), UD (Used Drugs), CNS (Employment Training Program), and EMP (Employment Status) were all recorded using nominal
data. Variables ELS (Education Level) and YPRA.A (Total Years Spent in Prison Over Lifetime) were recorded using ratio data. Data that was collected in nominal form was tested using a Chi² test in SPSS, while data recorded using ratio data was tested using a Correlation test in SPSS.

Table 2 represents the variables tested quantitatively.

**Table 2: Variables used for Chi² and Correlation Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Variable Type</th>
<th>Data/Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paroled Homeless [PHL]</td>
<td>1 (yes) or 2 (no)</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Nominal/Chi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Drugs [UD]</td>
<td>1-(Within 6 hrs) 2-(7-24hr) 3-(25-48 hrs) 4-(3-7 days) 5-(8-14 days) 6-(15-30 days) 7-(31-60 days) 8-(61-90 days) 9-(91-180 days) 10-(Still clean)</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Nominal/Chi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Training Program [CNS]</td>
<td>1-(yes) or 2-(no)</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Nominal/Chi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment [EMP]</td>
<td>1-(yes) or 2-(no)</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Nominal/Chi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level [ELS]</td>
<td>The highest grade completed in school</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Ratio/Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years Spent in Prison [YPRA.A]</td>
<td>Total # yrs in prison each over lifetime</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Ratio/Correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the cohort, an alarming 40% claimed they paroled homeless. Without a stable residence upon release, the likelihood of a parolee staying out of prison is severely reduced. All 12 respondents who paroled homeless (100%) used drugs within the first 48 hours after release compared to only 33% of those who had a place to reside. (APPENDIX D, Figure 1 & 2)

Although the research displayed many prisons programs were underutilized, the California New Start (Employment Training Program) was no exception. Only 20% of the cohort participated in the program, yet those who did had benefited. A criminal record and lack of work history marginalizes a parolee’s prospect of employment. The cohort was largely
unrepresented in the workforce as only 23% of the parolees interviewed had a job. (APPENDIX D, Figure 3 & 4).

The mean educational level of the cohort was 10.9, while the mode was 11. This representation demonstrates the distribution is very slightly negatively skewed. Needless to say, only 27% of the cohort had graduated from high school. The mean time respondents had spent in prison was 9.82 years which is slightly higher than the median, which is 9.25 years, and considerably higher than the mode which is 6 years. This indicates that the distribution is very slightly positively skewed. (APPENDIX D, Figures 5 & 6)

6. RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST 1</th>
<th>$H_0$</th>
<th>$H_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Relationship between Paroled Homeless[PHL] and Using Drugs [UD] (Chi$^2$/Gamma)</td>
<td>There is not a relationship between Paroling Homeless and Using Drugs</td>
<td>There is a relationship between Paroling Homeless and Using Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST 2</td>
<td>$H_0$</td>
<td>$H_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Relationship between Employment Training Program [CNS] and Employment [EMP] (Chi$^2$/Gamma)</td>
<td>There is not a relationship between participation in Employment Training Program and getting a Job</td>
<td>There is a relationship between participation in Employment Training Program and getting a Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST 3</td>
<td>$H_0$</td>
<td>$H_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Correlation between Education Level [ELS] and Total Years Spent in Prison [YPRA.A] (Correlation)</td>
<td>There is not a correlation between Education Level [ELS] and Total Years Spent in Prison [YPRA.A]</td>
<td>There is a correlation between Education Level [ELS] and Total Years Spent in Prison [YPRA.A]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Hypothesis that have been tested

The data for the variables was analyzed using SPSS. Test 1 utilized a Chi$^2$ test and analyzed the nominal data from two variables: Paroled Homeless [PHL] and the length of time
that passed after the respondents release from prison until they used drugs [UD]. Test 2 also employed a Chi$^2$ test and investigated the relationship between the nominal data collected for two variables: Participation in an employment training program within the CDCR [California New Start Program] [CNS] and each parolee’s current employment status [EMP]. Lastly, test 3 evaluated two ratio variables to see if a correlation existed between each parolee’s education level [ELS] and how many year they had spent in prison over their lifetime [YPRA.A]. (See Appendix C for SPSS Output results for all hypothesis tests).

7. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS RESULTS

One of the main objectives of this research was to get a clear understanding from the perspective of the parolees what the experience entailed from the time of arrest, serving time in the penitentiary, and paroling to the streets. The narratives of the respondents were examined and coded. The common streams of information arose from the interviews. The codes that developed out of the research were all intertwined relating and interlocking one code to another.

**Segregation:** Nearly all the respondent’s spoke of the negative effects that prison has on individuals as the prison culture cultivates antisocial behavior. The divisions of race are clearly drawn and inhibit inmates from participating in pro-social activities due to racial barriers. Where an inmate eats, exercises, and watches TV are all dictated by race and there is seldom lengthy interaction with other races. It was clear from the interviews that respondents felt that the racial divisions caused tension in the prisons and contributed to the difficulty of trying to rebuild one’s life on the inside. “Race, and even ethnic-based gang violence is the top security concern for prison guards. California, in the words of one official, is ground-zero for race-based prison gangs” (Webster, 2005). When respondents were asked about their time spent in prison
and how they spent their time nearly all responded claimed they stuck with their own race.

One respondent elaborated:

...there are a lot of things I could have done in prison to better my life but I couldn’t do them because I would have been scorned by my own race. I couldn’t afford for that to happen because if anything was to kick off on the yard no one would have my back so I had to put my safety ahead of trying to fix my life (Interviewee # 22).

**Peer Pressure:** As segregation inhibits pro-social behavior, another thread that emerged from the context of the interviews was peer pressure. Respondents felt that peer pressure and negative attitudes toward trying to better oneself deters many inmates from participating in programs in prison that would help better their lives. The negative connotation of prison programs was widely prevalent amongst the inmates during incarceration. Respondents noted that peer pressure inhibited the expression of positive attitudes to rehabilitative programs and trying to do something better with their life. Some inmates would belittle programs to gain the acceptance and approval of other prisoners even though they personally felt quite positive about the programs and wanted to participate in them. As one respondent noted:

...A lot of my friends say things like “that SAP program is a joke, it’s not going to stop me from using dope”; inside they really don’t feel that way they just say that kind of stuff in front of their homeboys because they want to fit in (Interviewee #3).

Respondents admitted that they gave into peer pressure mainly for acceptance. Prison can be a very dangerous place and without some form of bonds or friendships it can place an inmate as a vulnerable target. Many respondents were approached by prison gangs. Hispanics
respondents in particular felt they had no alternative but to be part of one of the Hispanic gangs. One respondent claimed:

...The first day I hit the yard during my first prison term I was approached by people of my own race wanting to know where I was from. I had never been involved in gangs on the streets but prison didn’t leave me any alternative. You need to have a group to run with in the joint because if you try to do your own time you will be a target for everyone. Prison is one place where you definitely need someone to have your back. Once your involved it hard to get out. The last thing you’re trying to do is better yourself. You’re more focused on the here and now and less worried about tomorrow or what you’re gonna do when you get out. (Interviewee # 4)

Startling statistics arose surrounding programs that are offered in the CDCR. The participation level amongst respondents was very low mainly due to the negative culture in prisons, segregation, and peer pressure. Figure 7 depicts participation in prison programs amongst respondents.

![Participated In Prison Programs (n=30)](image)

*Figure 7: Participation in prison programs amongst respondents*
**Drugs:** When asked the question, “Do you consider yourself a drug addict?” over 86% of respondents said “Yes”. Nearly all respondents who claimed to be drug addicts noted that they felt drugs had ruined their life and was the number one cause for all of their problems in life. As one respondent explained:

…If I never used drugs I would have never gone to prison. Drugs have affected relationships with my family, friends, and girlfriend. Drugs have been the great remover in my life….anything good in my life has been removed by drugs (Interviewee #17).

One of the major risk factors for a parolee is drug use. A large majority of prisoners have had problems with alcohol and other drugs (Petersilia, 2005). Eighty percent of respondents stated that involvement with drugs contributed to their most recent incarcerations. Respondents explained that when they started to use drugs they associated with others who used drugs and eventually started committing crimes. They further explained that drugs and crimes ran hand in hand.

As explained in Bandura’s theory (1982), self-efficacy is a prominent apparatus for change. The responses during the interviews demonstrated how self-efficacy determined successful from unsuccessful time periods during respondents lives. During the successful times respondents were more firm in their beliefs that they could stay away from drugs, crime, and friends who were involved in negative activities. During these successful intervals respondents felt as if they could do the right thing and make good and productive choices regarding their lives. At other times, when they failed they did not believe in themselves and their ability to stay clean, succeed, and make good choices.
**Employment:** Transitioning from prison to the streets is a very difficult task and finding a job enables a parolee to support him/herself. When asked the question, “What has been your biggest challenge since you got out of prison?” 60% of the respondents stated that they couldn’t find a job. Many of the respondents elaborated that their lack of work experience and education enhanced by their long criminal record has made it a daunting task just trying to find a job:

...I have no work history and a bad record. The tattoos on my neck and hands don’t make it any easier. I have been trying to find a job for a few months and no one will even call me in for an interview (Interviewee #24).

A majority of the respondents clearly explained that finding a job would give them purpose and a legal means to support themselves and not getting a job lead them back to crime and drugs which eventually ended them back in prison. As one respondent commented:

...it’s like a never ending marry-go-round. I get out of prison with all the best intentions, stay off drugs and look for work. Then comes the realization that no one is going to hire me and I need money to support myself and a place to live. Every time it leads me right back to the things that got me put in prison in the first place....methamphetamine and stealing (Interviewee #7).

Respondents noted that a job enabled them to support themselves, and a crucial component to staying out of prison. Laub and Sampson (2003) support this idea identifying that a job is an important factor in moving away from a life of crime as it leads a parolee to a change in priorities, daily activities, and provides structure in their lives. When parolees have a job they have less time to hang out with old friends who may be involved in crime and drugs. The
following chart represents the National, State of California, and the City of San Francisco unemployment rates as represented by the Department of Numbers (2012) for July 2012 compared to those of the San Francisco Parolees who participated in the Coming Home or Going Home research (See Figure 8).

![Figure 8: Unemployment Rates of San Francisco Parolees](image)

**Optimism:** Even with the deck stacked against them, it was amazing the optimism within this group of parolees. When asked the question, “Do you think you will go back to prison?” all but three said no. An astonishing 90% of respondents said that they would not return to prison. In follow up questions to their response, respondents stated a variety of reasons why they wouldn’t go back and why they thought they would make it.

The reason varied from wanting to be a better father, proving to their parents they had changed, wanting to live a good life, don’t want to spend the rest of their life in prison, they had learned from their mistakes, and they weren’t going to use drugs. As one respondent noted:
...I have been doing life in prison on the installment plan and I’m not giving the state anymore of my time. I may not be able to change the past but I can change my future. I’m just taking it one day at a time. I will eventually get a job. I know it’s going to be tough but I put myself in this position and I’m gonna change my life and the way society views convicts (interviewee # 27).

The message was clear. This group of parolees knows the road they are on isn’t easy but their responses were very consistent that they could stay out of prison, get a job, and support themselves. Their display of optimism in a not so optimal situation was astonishing.

Figure 6 presents key challenges San Francisco Parolees faced during the first week of their release from prison. An astonishing 40% did not have a place to live. Without a residence, it is extremely difficult for a parolee to obtain gainful employment, go to school, or have any chance of success of changing their past mistakes into a positive future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not have a place to live</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No hot meals</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CA ID</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No financial resources</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support from family</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No transportation</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No job waiting</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 9: Challenges for SF Parolees*
Parolees face challenges in housing. Often, qualifying for housing requires a lawful job with verifiable employment, good credit, finances to pay deposits and credit checks, as well as passing a criminal background check. Figure 10 presents difficulties the cohort of San Francisco Parolees faced in regards to finding housing.

![Experienced Difficulties With Housing](image)

**Figure 10: SF Parolees Facing Difficulties with Housing**

8. **QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS RESULTS (see APPENDIX C for SPSS Output Results)**

Quantitative analysis tested relationships between particular variables. The first test measured the relationship between nominal data of those who paroled homeless and the time after release from prison that the respondent used drugs.
In summary, 40% of the respondents stated they paroled with nowhere to live. Of the respondents who paroled homeless, 50% used drugs within 6 hours of release and all respondents who paroled homeless used drugs within 48 hours after their release from prison. All but four respondents have at some point used drugs since their release while 27% of the cohort used drugs within the first 6 hours. Each parolee is given $200 upon release and for those with no home to return to the results are quite prevalent that they use the money to buy drugs. According to the Chi\(^2\) test results, this test was significant at the 95% confidence level and Tukey’s Guide categorized the relationship as “very strong”. There was significance evidence to support the claim that there is a relationship between paroling homeless and using drugs.

The second test measured the relationship between nominal data of those who completed a job training program in prison (California New Start Program) and those who were employed at the time of the survey.

At the time of the survey, unemployment amongst the cohort was extremely high at 76.7%.
Although participation in prison programs amongst the respondents was very low, there was a very strong positive relationship between participation in the California New Start Program (Employment Training Program) and those who actually got jobs. According to the results of the $\chi^2$ test, the results for this test were significant at the 95% confidence level and Tukey’s Guide categorized the relationship as “very strong”. There was significance evidence to support the claim that there is a relationship between completing a job training program in prison and obtaining gainful employment upon release. These finding indicate that the program has an impact on employment and would suggest that the CDCR find ways to have higher participation rates among inmates.

The final quantitative test conducted in SPSS measured the relationship/correlation between the ratio data of respondent’s education level and the total number of years each respondent had spent in prison over their life time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highest Grade Completed In School</th>
<th>How Many Years Total Have You Spent In Prison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Grade Completed In School Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Many Years Total Have You Spent In Prison Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.556</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The mean education level of the cohort was 10.9 (grade level) while the mean time respondents has spent in prison over their lifetime was 9.8 years. According to the results of the Correlation tests, the results of this test were significant at the 99% confidence level and Tukey’s Guide categorized the relationship as “moderate”. The relationship between the two
variables was -.566. This implies a moderate negative relationship. The negative number indicates that as the education level increased, the number of years the respondents has spent in prison over their lifetime decreased. (see Appendix C, test 3, Scatter Plot results). There was significance evidence to support the claim that there is a correlation between education level and the amount of time respondents had spent in prison over their lifetime.

Additionally, respondents served an average of 3.8 prison terms, 3.23 parole violations which sent them back to the penitentiary, over 73% had not graduated from high school, and had been addicted to drugs for years.

9. CONCLUSION/POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Since the inceptions of prisons in California, communities have been confronted with the challenge that once a prison sentence has been served the inmate will be returning to the community where the offense was committed. The overarching question of this research: “Is there a need for a comprehensive reentry program that starts in prison and continues to the streets when inmates parole?”, showed an overwhelming agreement amongst respondents.

Figure 11: Survey response regarding the need for a comprehensive re-entry program.
The information gained from this research will be useful for the CDCR and policy makers as prisoner reentry moves to the forefront of corrections in California. The results were astonishing and confirm prior research by Petersilia (2003) that parolees have a high prevalence of substance abuse, are less educated, and are confronted with severe challenges regarding employment and housing. The research concludes that there is a strong correlation between the education level of ex-convicts and the amount of time they have served in prison throughout their life time. Additionally, those who had no home or housing waiting for them upon their release from prison returned to drug use immediately. The underutilization of prison programs by the cohort demonstrates that the CDCR needs to develop a new culture in prison, one that is based on education, transformation, and personal accountability.

Prisoner reentry is an area in which little policy has been implemented yet the need for a comprehensive plan needs to be addressed. The challenges that await inmates upon release are not effectively addressed during incarceration. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation have made drastic cuts to inmate programs which ultimately affects how inmates will serve their time of incarceration. Another factor that affected how inmates served their time was the prison culture. The research has provided both quantitative and qualitative results that support the need to transform the criminal justice system with an emphasis on assisting convicts rebuild their lives. The cohort of the Coming Home or Going Home project expressed that the way to move away from crime to a life of self-sufficiency would be through opportunity in education and employment. Unless the issues surrounding prisoner reentry are addressed, our community will continue to increase the number of marginalized prisoners returning to San Francisco.
10. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

The limitations of the Coming Home or Going Home begin with the self-report information of the respondents. Interviews were conducted in person and the respondents answered both the closed and open ended questions. Results of this research are based on respondents’ answers to the questions. Secondly, the entire cohort was male. Numerous women in California spend time in prison and face many of the same challenges men encounter upon release but it was the aim of this research to examine the challenges men face as they transition from prison to the streets. Lastly, this research was a “point-in-time” project, meaning that it was not a longitudinal study over time interviewing the cohort multiple times over a designated time frame.
Table 4: Demographics of Respondents for *Coming Home or Going Home* Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>n=30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of Residence</strong></td>
<td>SF (n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade or less</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Years Spent in Prison</strong></td>
<td>9.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Number of Prison Terms</strong></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Number of Parole Violations</strong></td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substance Abuse Problem</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent an Apartment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with family of Friends</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfway House</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Program</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age At First Arrest</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Coming Home or Going Home Research Variables
Table 5: Summary Table of Research Variables—Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>ST. DEV.</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHL</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELS</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.539</td>
<td>8 (8-16)</td>
<td>Chi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.585</td>
<td>25 (28-53)</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFAR</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.251</td>
<td>12 (14-26)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMINC</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.154</td>
<td>17 (1-18)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRITRM</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td>6 (1-7)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARVIO</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.208</td>
<td>7 (0-7)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRSDRG</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.414</td>
<td>30 (0-30)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADPR</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATPR</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.804</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATPRA</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRHSN</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.993</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXDFH</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRJOB</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.152</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STO</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPA</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFRP</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDP</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHM</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.814</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJW</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUAD</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCSR</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.906</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Hypothesis Testing

Test 1: Relationship between Paroling Homeless [PHL] and Using Drugs [UD]

In the following tables the results of Test 1 are summarized (Chi$^2$/Gamma).

### Paroled Homeless [PHL] * Time After Release Until Used Drugs [UD] (Crosstabulation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paroled Homeless</th>
<th>Within first 6 hrs</th>
<th>Within 24 hrs</th>
<th>Within 48 Hrs</th>
<th>Between 3 and 7 days</th>
<th>Between 8 and 14 days</th>
<th>Between 15 and 30 days</th>
<th>Between 31 and 60 days</th>
<th>Have not used drugs since my release</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>14.375</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>18.567</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Assoc.</td>
<td>10.875</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 16 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

### Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymp. Std. Error$^a$</th>
<th>Approx. $\tau^b$</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal by Ordinal</td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>5.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

### TEST     VARIABLES     HYPOTHESIS     COMMENT

| Test 1 | [PH] [UD] | H$_0$: Rejected H$_1$: Accepted | Enough evidence to support claim at $\alpha=.05$ |
**Test 2: Relationship between Employment Training Program (CNS) and Employment (EMP)**

In the following tables the results of Test 2 are summarized (Chi$^2$/Gamma).

**California New Start (CNS) (Employment Training Program) * Are You Currently Employed (EMP) (Crosstabulation)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Are you currently employed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California New Start Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California New Start No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction$^b$</td>
<td>5.136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>6.873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>7.610</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.40.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Symmetric Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymp. Std. Error$^a$</th>
<th>Approx. T$^b$</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal by Ordinal Gamma</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>2.148</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>HYPOTHESIS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Test 2 | [CNS] [EMP] | H$_0$: Rejected  
H$_1$: Accepted | Enough evidence to support claim at $\alpha=.05$ |
Test 3: Relationship between Education Level [ELS] and Total Years Spent in Prison [YPRA.A]

In the following tables the results of Test 3 are summarized (Correlation)

![Scatter Plot of [ELS][YPRA.A]](image)

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highest Grade Completed In School</th>
<th>How Many Years Total Have You Spent In Prison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Grade Completed In School Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.556**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Many Years Total Have You Spent In Prison Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.556**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>HYPOTHESIS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test 3</td>
<td>[ELS] [YPRA.A]</td>
<td>H₀: Rejected H₁: Accepted</td>
<td>Enough evidence to support claim at α=.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
Figures 1-6

Test 1: Relationship between Paroling Homeless [PHL] and Using Drugs [UD] ($\chi^2$)

Figure 1: Frequency Distribution of [PHL]

Figure 2: Frequency Distribution of [UD]
Test 2: Relationship between Employment Training Program [CNS] and Employment [EMP]

Figure 3: Frequency Distribution of [CNS] - In Prison Employment Training Program

Figure 4: Frequency Distribution of [EMP]

Are you currently employed
Test 3: Relationship between Education Level [ELS] and Total Years Spent in Prison [YPRA.A]

Figure 5: Histogram Of Education Level Of SF Parolees [ELS]

Figure 6: Histogram Of Total Years Spent In Prison in Lifetime [YPRA.A]
APPENDIX E
Interview Instrument
Overview:
The purpose of this research to gain an understanding a parolee faces after completing a prison term and reentering the community.

Informed Consent:
Participation in this interview is completely voluntary and optional. All information collected is confidential. You may decline to answer any of the questions and may stop the interview at any time.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

* [AGE]
1. What is your age?

_________ Years

* [GNDR]
2. How do you identify your gender?

□ 0-Female
□ 1-Male
□ 2-Transgender

* [MARST]
3. Are you married or in a domestic partnership?

□ 1-No
□ 2-Yes

* [RACE]
4. What is your race? (Check all that apply)

□ 1-African American or Black
□ 2-Asian American or Pacific Islander
□ 3-Native American or American Indian
□ 4-White or European American
□ 5-Latino, Chicano, or Latin American
□ 6-Multiple Races
□ 7-Some other race – Print race ___________________________________________

* [ELS]
5. Highest grade you completed in school?

_________________________________________
6. Age at first arrest? ____________________

7. How many times have you been incarcerated? _____________________

8. How many prison terms have you done? _______________________
   [A prison term is a term served in prison for a new conviction]
   Terms

9. Total Number of years spent in prison? _________________________Years

10. Total combined number of parole violations for all prison terms?
    [A parole violation is a return to CDCR custody for violating parole or committing a new crime]
    _____________________

11. What was the reason for your most recent incarceration in prison (CDCR)?
    □ 1-Parole Violation   □ 5-Violent Person Crime
    □ 2-Drug Sales   □ 6-Other Crime
    □ 3-Drunk Possession
    □ 4-Property Crime

12. How long were you in prison during your most recent incarceration? _________________________Years

13. Did you parole homeless?
    □ 1-No
    □ 2-Yes
    □ 9- Don’t Know

14. Where type of living arrangements did you parole to?
    □ 1-Paroled to a private residence   □ 4-Paroled homeless
    □ 2-Paroled to a half-way house   □ 5-Don’t Know
    □ 3-Paroled to a substance abuse program
15. How long have you been out of prison?
_____________________Years

16. Have you used drugs since your release?
☐ 1-No
☐ 2-Yes
☐ 3-Don’t Know

17. Have you drank alcohol since your release?
☐ 1-No
☐ 2-Yes
☐ 3-Don’t Know

18. How much time elapsed between the time of your release from prison and the time you used drugs?
☐ 1-Within the first 6 hrs
☐ 2-Within the 24 hours
☐ 3-Within the 48 hours
☐ 4-Within 7 days (between 3 and 7 days)
☐ 5-Within 14 days (between 8 and 14 days)
☐ 6-Within 30 days (between 15 and 30 days)
☐ 7-Within 60 days (between 31 and 60 days)
☐ 8-Within 90 (between 61 and 90 days)
☐ 9-Within 180 (between 91 and 180 days)
☐ 10-Have not used drugs since my release

19. How much time had elapsed between the time of your release from prison and the time you drank alcohol?
☐ 1-Within the first 6 hrs
☐ 2-Within the 24 hours
☐ 3-Within the 48 hours
☐ 4-Within 7 days (between 3 and 7 days)
☐ 5-Within 14 days (between 8 and 14 days)
☐ 6-Within 30 days (between 15 and 30 days)
☐ 7-Within 60 days (between 31 and 60 days)
☐ 8-Within 90 (between 61 and 90 days)
☐ 9-Within 180 (between 91 and 180 days)
☐ 10-Haven’t drank alcohol since my release

20. Do you consider yourself a drug addict?
☐ 1-No
☐ 2-Yes
☐ 9-Not Sure
If yes go to #12, If no go to #13
[If yes ask what problems they have encountered from addiction?][Are they seeking treatment]

21. How many years have you been addicted to drugs?
22. Do you consider yourself an alcoholic?
   □ 1-No  □ 2-Yes  □ 9-Not Sure
   [If yes ask what problems they have encountered from alcoholism?]
   [Are they seeking treatment]  

23. How many years have you been an alcoholic?

24. Did drugs or alcohol play a role leading to your most recent incarceration? [Explain]
   □ 1-No  □ 2-Yes  □ 9-Not Sure  

25. Were you under the influence of drugs during the arrest that lead to your most recent incarceration? [Explain]
   □ 1-No  □ 2-Yes  □ 9-Not Sure  

26. What were you doing before your most recent incarceration?
   [Explore resources available such as material capital (housing, car, financial), human capital (skill set, education), and social capital (who they know).]  

---

**PRE-RELEASE PROGRAMS**

Participation in programs in prison to prepare for return to the community.

27. Did you receive any reentry classes, reentry counseling, or assistance with a comprehensive parole plan before your release\(^1\)?
   □ 1-No  □ 2-Yes  □ 2-Not Sure  
   Yes____________________[If yes, ask what they participated in and get an understanding, e.g. was it helpful? Explain:]  

28. During your most recent prison term or incarceration, did you participate in any of the following programs designed to help prepare you for release?²

* [SAP] A. Substance Abuse Programs (SAPs) □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
* [AP] B. Academic Program □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
* [CTE] C. Career Technical Education (Vocational Education) □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
* [CNS] D. California New Start (Employment Training Program) □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
* [CIDP] E. California Identification Project □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
* [PPBP] F. Pre-Parole Process Benefits Program □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
* [CRP] G. California Reentry Program □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
* [PC] H. Parenting Classes □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
* [AM] I. Anger Management □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
J. None of the above □ 1-No □ 2-Yes

*[RATPRA]

29. Thinking about the programs you participated in during your incarceration how would you rate them from extremely helpful to not helpful at all for preparing you to reenter the community at the end of your sentence.

□ 5-Extremely Helpful □ 4-Very Helpful □ 3-Helpful □ 2-Not Very Helpful □ 1-Not Helpful

*[RATPR]

30. Thinking about the information or services you received prior to your release, how would you rate them on a scale of 1 to 10 where 10 is extremely helpful and 1 is not helpful at all for your transition back to the community.³ [CIRCLE ONE]

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

31. What programs did you participate in prison which have assisted you in re-entry. What was available to you in prison in regards to getting an education or vocational training, or substance abuse treatment. [If participated, WHY? If not, WHY?][What helped?]

----

32. **What resources were available to you during your most recent incarceration?**

[Explore resources available such as material capital (financial), human capital (skill set, education), and social capital (who they know). [Social connections to the streets to help plan for your release.]

33. **How did you spend your time in prison?**

34. **How has incarceration affected relationships with family and significant other?**

35. **Were you provided with any of the following information prior to release?**

*FPTL*

35. **How to find a place to live?**  

   □ 1-No □ 2-Yes If YES, was it helpful: □ 1-No □ 2-Yes

   Explain:

*FEPL*

36. **How to find employment?**  

   □ 1-No □ 2-Yes If YES, was it helpful: □ 1-No □ 2-Yes

   Explain:

*RAVP*

37. **What resources are available from parole?**  

   □ 1-No □ 2-Yes If YES, was it helpful: □ 1-No □ 2-Yes

   Explain:
38. How to further your education? □ 1-No □ 2-Yes If YES, was it helpful: □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
Explain:

39. How to get treatment for substance abuse problems or alcoholism?
□ 1-No □ 2-Yes If YES, was it helpful: □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
Explain

**BASIC NEEDS UPON RELEASE**

40. During the first week of your release from prison did you:4
*[PHL] A. Have a place to live? □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
*[GHM] B. Get hot meals □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
*[CID] C. Have a valid California ID □ 1-No □ 2-Yes

*[FR] D. Have financial resources? □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
*[FS] E. Have the support of your family? □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
*[AT] F. Have access to transportation? □ 1-No □ 2-Yes
G. Ask your parole agent for assistance? □ 1-No □ 2-Yes [If YES, Ask “F” & “G”], [If NO, Ask “H”]

H. Did you get the assistance? □ 1-No □ 2-Yes

*[MS] I. Access any medical services you needed? □ 1-No □ 2-Yes

**[MINS]**

41. What kind of health coverage do you have?5
□ 0 - MediCal □ 5 - Private Insurance through your employer/purchased
□ 1 - Medicaid □ 6 - Other
□ 2 – Medicare □ 7 - Don’t know
□ 3 - VA (Veterans Health care)
□ 4 - Healthy San Francisco

---

### POST RELEASE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Do you have a valid California ID?</td>
<td>1-No</td>
<td>2-Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDL</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Do you have a valid California Driver’s License?</td>
<td>1-No</td>
<td>2-Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSC</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Do you have a Social Security Card?</td>
<td>1-No</td>
<td>2-Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRPR</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Are you currently in a residential treatment program for substance abuse?</td>
<td>1-No</td>
<td>2-Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JTP</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Are you currently in or have you participated in a job training program since your release from prison?</td>
<td>1-No</td>
<td>2-Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENSCH</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Are you currently enrolled in school?</td>
<td>1-No</td>
<td>2-Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**48. What resources have been available since your release?**

[Explore resources available such as material capital (housing, car, financial), human capital (skill set, education), and social capital (who they know)]

**49. What have you been doing since you got out? Programs? Looking for work? Job training program?**

[Substance Abuse/Vocational Training/Education]
50. Please describe your current housing

☐ 0-Rent house   ☐ 6-Halfway house
☐ 1-Rent an apartment ☐ 7-Substance Abuse program
☐ 2-Rent a room   ☐ 8-Couch surfing
☐ 3-SRO          ☐ 9-Homeless
☐ 4-Live with family or friends
☐ 5-Shelter

51. Have you experienced difficulty in getting housing?
☐ 1-No ☐ 2-Yes ☐ 9-Don’t know

52. Which of the following, if any, have caused you difficulty in getting housing?[^6]

A. Can’t afford the rent ☐ 1-No ☐ 2-Yes
B. Can’t afford the deposit ☐ 1-No ☐ 2-Yes
B. Can’t afford the credit check ☐ 1-No ☐ 2-Yes
C. Don’t have a job ☐ 1-No ☐ 2-Yes
D. Poor Credit ☐ 1-No ☐ 2-Yes
E. No housing available where you wanted to live ☐ 1-No ☐ 2-Yes
F. Not legally eligible for housing because of criminal record ☐ 1-No ☐ 2-Yes
G. Experienced discrimination because of criminal record ☐ 1-No ☐ 2-Yes

Other difficulty getting housing?

53. How did you find housing? What impact has housing had on reentry? How difficult has it been to find housing? Who has helped you? Returning to old neighborhood?

### EMPLOYMENT

**[EMP]**

*54. Are you currently employed?*

- □ 1-No
- □ 2-Yes

Explain (looking for work?)

---

**[PREM]**

*55. Where you employed before going to prison?*

- □ 1-No
- □ 2-Yes

[If YES go to # 56][if NO go to # 57]

---

56. What were you doing for work?

---

**[CRREC]**

*57. Has your criminal record had an impact on employment?*

- □ 1-No
- □ 2-Yes [Explain]

---

**[STRJOB]**

*58. What has been your biggest struggle in finding a job?*

- □ 0 – No work history
- □ 1 – No work experience in the field you want to work
- □ 2 – No education
- □ 3 – No job skills
- □ 4 – Criminal record
- □ 5 – No transportation
- □ 6 – Can’t work due to a disability
- □ 7 – Parole won’t let you work in your professional field
- □ 8 – None

---

### REENTRY

**[BCSP]**

*59. What do you think has been your biggest challenge since you got out of prison?*

- □ 0 – Drug addiction
- □ 1 – Alcoholism
- □ 2 – Can’t find a way to legally support myself (can’t get a job)
- □ 3 – Stealing
- □ 4 – Paroled to same neighborhood I was arrested in
- □ 5 – Nowhere to live
- □ 6 – Don’t get along with parole officer
- □ 7 – Can’t access any resources to help you rebuild your life
60. What programs or resources do you think would be the most helpful to you in staying out of prison?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

61. Have you received any services through parole since your release?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

62. What kinds of services, programs, or support would be useful to you right now?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

*[HPA]*

62. How helpful has your parole agent been with your transition back to the community?

☐ 5-Extremely Helpful
☐ 4-Very Helpful
☐ 3-Helpful
☐ 2-Somewhat Helpful
☐ 1-Not Very Helpful

*[RTP]*

63. Do you think you will go back to prison?

☐ 0-No
☐ 1-Yes
☐ 2-Don’t Know

*[NFRP]*

63. Do you think there needs to be a reentry program that starts in prison and continues to the streets when you parole that includes housing, job training, education, and substance abuse support?

☐ 5-Very Strongly
☐ 4-Strongly Agree
☐ 3-Agree
☐ 2-Strongly Disagree
☐ 1-Very Strongly Disagree
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