

The Attitudes of Male Inmates towards Recidivism

Adam Kaiser & Bethany Lewitzke
*Undergraduate Students, Department of Human
Development and Family Studies*

Key Words: recidivism, jail, inmates

Abstract

The United States incarcerates more people than any other country in the world (Vacca, 2004). An existing body of research demonstrates that programs for incarcerated individuals to reduce recidivism have a positive impact (Katsiyannis, Zhang, Barrett, & Flaska, 2004). The central research question in this study was, “from the male inmate perspective, what factors contribute to reducing recidivism”? It was hypothesized that incarcerated males would agree that more programs are needed in order to help them not reoffend. The site of this nonrandom study was at a northwestern Wisconsin jail. The participants were 50 incarcerated males. Survey data was statistically analyzed using frequencies, mean comparisons, correlations, and a reliability analysis. Overall, there were a number of positive correlations among the variables with the hypothesis being supported. Cronbach’s Alpha reliability was 0.884. It would be recommended that jail program directors advocate for comprehensive pre and post release services to reduce recidivism and to tailor those services needed to each individual. Implications for future research include using a larger sample and comparing groups based on age.

Introduction

An existing body of research supports programs for

incarcerated individuals that reduce recidivism (Freudenberg, Daniels, Crum, Perkins, & Richie, 2008; Golden, Gatchel, & Cahill, 2006; Katsiyannis, Zhang, Barrett, & Flaska, 2004; Vacca, 2004). The United States incarcerates more people than any other country in the world (Vacca, 2004). This statistic alone makes the fight against recidivism all the more important. Current research showed that programs for incarcerated individuals within the jails were only somewhat successful (Katsiyannis et al., 2004). The research also showed that programs after release had a minimal impact on the success of the individuals in a positive way (Golden et al., 2006). Are the programs offered for incarcerated individuals really what they need to succeed? After the researchers reviewed current literature on recidivism, male inmates, 18 and above, were surveyed at a northwestern Wisconsin jail. They were surveyed on what they thought they needed to not reoffend.

Literature Review

The researchers examined the existing literature on what male inmate attitudes were towards the factors that contributed to their recidivism. Focusing on male inmates, the literature found was quite vast, but was not always clear and concise on what the incarcerated individual's perspective was. As a result only four relevant articles were used. All four articles (Freudenberg et al., 2008; Golden et al., 2006; Katsiyannis et al., 2004; Vacca, 2004) pointed out different variables that play a part in recidivism which were all part of the incarcerated individual's environment in and out of the correctional system. These variables included: alcohol abuse, depression, attachment issues, age of initial incarceration, educational achievement, employment status, income level, housing situation, and cultural background. There was an agreement amongst all authors that there is disconnect among correctional facility administrators on the

goal of the correctional system: punishment or rehabilitation. Each study also mentioned the high cost of incarceration and the effect it has on the development of programs to combat the rise of recidivism among incarcerated individuals (Freudenberg et al., 2008; Golden et al., 2006; Katsiyannis et al., 2004; Vacca, 2004).

Freudenberg et al. (2008) examined what happens when incarcerated individuals are released and what happens when they go home. This study also stated that the U.S. has the highest incarceration rate and that from the years of 1980 to 2002 the incarcerated population had risen over 265 percent. Four-hundred and ninety-one adolescent incarcerated males participated in the study. The participants were asked what problems they think they may have once they are released from lock up. The obstacles they cited were unemployment, proper education, poverty, increased alcohol and drug use, and finding proper housing. The males were followed up on for a minimum of three months. The research showed that after release the participants were not more likely to be employed and even less likely to be in school. Males living with peers that used drugs were more likely to use drugs themselves and were three times more likely to re-offend. The participants in the study stated that employment and education were the biggest problems they faced and the research supported this. The authors deemed this important because it showed that the participants had realistic assessments of the difficulties they would face after being released.

Golden et al. (2008) examined the effectiveness of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) "Thinking for Change" Program. This program is comprised of 22 sessions to help probationers ease back into society. The sample included 100 male probationers of either medium-risk or high-risk as evaluated by their probation officer. This study stated that keeping people in jail is expensive and probation

is a way to rehabilitate within the community. The program was to help with interpersonal and social problem solving skills. The research showed that 62 percent of the participants graduated the program and 38 percent dropped out. The graduates of the program demonstrated lower recidivism while 75 percent of the drop outs re-offended, 50 percent of them within three months of being released and put on probation. Research showed that people who learned the skills set forth in the class were less likely to re-offend. The authors stated they wanted to examine the motivation behind the compliance and non-compliance of the individual's probation.

Katsiyannis et al. (2004) examined the background and psychosocial variables associated with recidivism among adolescent males. The study stated that recidivism has a serious effect on the economy. The author stated that one individual being incarcerated may cost on average two million dollars. This meant that even programs at a success rate of one to five percent can help the economy. They observed and interviewed 299 adolescent males in a youth rehabilitation center. The tools they used were the Adolescent Drinking Index, the Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale, the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment, and the Personality Research Form. The research the authors performed gave them an idea of the variables that affect recidivism. The variables included: alcohol abuse, depression, levels of parent and peer attachment, personality traits, the age of their first incarceration, and their educational achievements. The authors stated that factors that lead to incarceration include: severity of offense, IQ, prior family arrests, family violence, parental crime, impulsivity, a lack of affectionate bonding, and delinquent siblings. Psychosocial factors include: general deviance, amorality, problems with authority, alcoholism, and distress. The research found that there was less cognitive structure for those that reoffended. Results also

showed a lowered sense of approval and support, a tendency for poor relationships, mistrust, and disengagement. Of all the variables examined, the age of the first incarceration was the single most important predictor for recidivism.

Vacca (2004) examined the role of literacy and programs that incorporated help with social skills, artistic development, and strategies for incarcerated individuals to effectively deal with their emotions. The study stated that the United States of America incarcerates more people than any other country and most are re-offenders. It stated that appropriate education would put recidivism on a decline. The research also stated that appropriate education is hindered by values and attitudes of correctional facility authority figures (security, control, punishment, and rehabilitation), facility overcrowding, and lack of funding. The research showed that inmates were more likely to participate in educational programs if there were clear opportunities to improve their capability of success. The research also explained that literacy was an issue for incarcerated individuals upon release, because to combat recidivism these men needed to be able to fill out job applications, write letters, and also keep a job. It also stated that literacy was also needed for inmates to “pass the time” by being able to read for comfort and recreational purposes. The authors stated that appropriate education was not just for teaching but promoting a positive transition into society.

Collectively, the research lacked a clear strategy to reduce recidivism but all agreed it is a significant societal problem. The research has shown a connection between the environment and the problems it can cause for the individual if proper programs are not in place to promote success after release. Common variables have been found so that better understanding of recidivism can be achieved, but solutions are at a minimum (Vacca, 2004; Freudenberg et al., 2008; Golden et al., 2006; Katsiyannis et al., 2004). More research

is needed to examine what adult male re-offenders need to successfully reenter society; the contribution of this study.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework that was applied to this study was Bronfenbrenner's Family Ecology Theory (Strong, DeVault, & Cohen, 2005). The Family Ecology Theory states that as individuals develop, they acclimate themselves to their surrounding environments, which consist of four levels. These levels include: the microsystem as the immediate environment; the mesosystem as the connections between the microsystems; the exosystem as the environment that indirectly affects the person, and the macrosystem which is the cultural, laws, attitudes and beliefs that affect the United States.

The application of the Family Ecology Theory to this study would predict that each level of environment would have an effect on how that individual would cope with a situation. Another prediction would be that a lack of programs in the jail system, part of the offender's microsystem, would affect recidivism of an incarcerated individual.

Purpose Statement & Hypothesis

The purpose of this study was threefold. One was to examine the attitudes of incarcerated males and the factors that contributed to recidivism; secondly; to develop a reliable survey instrument to measure those attitudes; and thirdly; to increase awareness of how to improve programs for incarcerated males. The central research question in this study was, "from the male inmate perspective, what factors contribute to reducing recidivism?" The authors hypothesized that incarcerated males would agree that more programs are needed in order to help them not to reoffend.

Method

Participants

The site of this study was at a northwestern Wisconsin jail. The participants were 50 incarcerated males. Participants were between the ages of 14-52 years of age and had their first incarceration anywhere between the ages of 10-44 years old. 20 of the participants had been incarcerated 1-5 times. Also, participants had been incarcerated anywhere between 6-35 times throughout their life. 40 participants had either a high school diploma or equivalency and ten did not.

Research Design

The purpose of survey research is to be able to generalize from a sample of males to a similar larger population so that some inferences can be made about recidivism and the attitudes of male inmates (Babbie, 1990). This particular study focused on what male inmate attitudes were towards the factors that contributed to their recidivism. The survey design type can be described as a cross-sectional study design in that it was used to gather the attitudes of the incarcerated males at one point in time. The form of data collection was self-administered questionnaires that were distributed by the program director of the jail. The rationale for using this method was that it was the most efficient method to gather the data from the jail as well as obeying the laws of the county, state, and federal government. The population for this study was Wisconsin jail inmates and the sample population was male inmates in one northwestern Wisconsin jail. The sample design was purposive and non-random. The ethical protection of human subjects was provided by completing the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) training; this study has been approved by the IRB.

Data Collection Instrument

In order to identify the attitudes of incarcerated males towards recidivism a survey was designed. The survey included a brief description of the study with an implied consent, definition of any terms not commonly known, risks and benefits, time commitment, confidentiality, voluntary participation, and contact information for counseling services and the supervisor as well as instructions for completing the survey.

The survey consisted of five demographic questions relating to gender, age, age of first incarceration, number of times incarcerated, and graduation from high school or having obtained a GED. Participants were given fourteen closed-ended statements based on a 5-point Likert scale which measured the intensity of the respondents' attitudes ranging from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree). The survey statements were informed by literature and theory.

The survey instrument had both face validity and content validity. Because the questions and concepts addressed in the survey were literature-inspired, it was determined that they clearly connected with what is needed to help prevent recidivism. . The questions addressed a broad range of services or programs that are needed to reduce the likelihood to re-offend.

Procedure

The survey began with an email to the jail director stating the purpose for the study and asking for permission to survey the inmates. Data for the study was then collected when the researchers received permission to enter the jail under the director's supervision on November 12, 2009.

Data Analysis Plan

The data was first cleaned and checked for any

missing data. The cleaned surveys were then coded using acronyms for each variable. The first five questions on the survey were demographic variables: gender, age, age of first incarceration, number of times incarcerated and graduating from high school or having a GED. Each survey statement was a dependent variable and given an acronym. The survey began with the statement: In order to not re-offend, I am in need of the following: A high school diploma/GED (*GED*); Education beyond a high school diploma/GED (*COL*); Job training (*EMP*); Problem-solving skills (*PSS*); Services to help me cope with stress (*STR*); Mental health services (*MHS*); A support system (*SUP*); Health insurance (*HEL*); Alcohol abuse services (*ALA*); Other drug abuse services (*DRG*); Parenting skills classes (*PAR*); Relationship-building skills (*RBS*); Safe housing (*HOS*); and A different environment to return to after release (*ENV*).

The data analyzing tool used was the computer program called the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS). The data analysis included: frequencies, a reliability analysis, correlations, and mean comparisons. A Cronbach's Alpha reliability analysis was also conducted.

Results

All variables were subjected to frequency distribution analysis. Results indicated that there was no missing data. For the variables (*GED*) and (*COL*) most respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that they needed a high school diploma/GED or more education beyond high school to not re-offend. For the variables (*EMP*) and (*PSS*) most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they needed job training and problem solving skills in order to not re-offend. For the variables (*STR*) and (*MHS*) most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they needed services to cope with stress and mental health services in order to not re-offend. For the variables (*SUP*) and (*HEL*) most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they needed some sort of support

system or health insurance in order to not re-offend. For the variables (*ALA*) and (*DRG*) most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they needed alcohol abuse services or other drug abuse services in order to not re-offend. For the variable (*PAR*) respondents were mixed on the idea of needed parenting skills in order to not re-offend. For the variable (*RBS*) most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they needed relationship building skills in order to not re-offend. For the variables (*HOS*) and (*ENV*) most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they needed safe housing and a different environment to return to after release in order to not re-offend. There were no significant mean comparisons, but the table was included for research purposes. (refer to Table 1 for Frequency Distribution Analysis and Table 2 for Mean Comparisons).

Table 1
Frequency Distribution

Variable	SD	D	U	A	SA	Total
GED	24.0%	12.0%	12.0%	18.0%	34.0%	100.0%
COL	14.0%	8.0%	20.0%	28.0%	30.0%	100.0%
EMP	12.0%	10.0%	16.0%	30.0%	32.0%	100.0%
PSS	14.0%	12.0%	14.0%	30.0%	30.0%	100.0%
STR	12.0%	8.0%	10.0%	32.0%	38.0%	100.0%
MHS	24.0%	12.0%	14.0%	26.0%	24.0%	100.0%
SUP	14.0%	8.0%	14.0%	26.0%	38.0%	100.0%
HEL	16.0%	12.0%	18.0%	24.0%	30.0%	100.0%
ALA	26.0%	6.0%	18.0%	24.0%	26.0%	100.0%
DRG	28.0%	8.0%	8.0%	30.0%	26.0%	100.0%
PAR	28.0%	8.0%	22.0%	22.0%	20.0%	100.0%
RBS	20.0%	12.0%	10.0%	30.0%	28.0%	100.0%
HOS	22.0%	8.0%	14.0%	20.0%	36.0%	100.0%
ENV	16.0%	6.0%	16.0%	18.0%	44.0%	100.0%

Note. (GED)= Need a high school diploma or equivalence;(COL)= Need education beyond high school or equivalence;(EMP)= Need job training;(PSS)= Need problem solving skills;(STR)= Need services to help cope with stress;(MHS)= Need mental health services;(SUP)= Need a support system;(HEL)= Need health insurance;(ALA)= Need alcohol abuse services;(DRG) = Need other drug abuse services;(PAR)= Need parenting skills classes;(RBS)= Need relationship-building skills;(HOS)= Need safe housing;(ENV)= Need a different environment to return to after release.

Table 2
Means Comparisons

	GED	COL	EMP	PSS	STR	MHS	SUP
Mean	3.26	3.52	3.60	3.50	3.76	3.14	3.66
SD	1.61	1.37	1.35	1.40	1.36	1.52	1.42
Range	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	HEL	ALA	DRG	PAR	RBS	HOS	ENV
Mean	3.40	3.18	3.18	2.98	3.34	3.40	3.68
SD	1.44	1.54	1.59	1.50	1.50	1.57	1.49
Range	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

Note. (GED)= Need a high school diploma or equivalence;(COL)= Need education beyond high school or equivalence;(EMP)= Need job training;(PSS)= Need problem solving skills;(STR)= Need services to help cope with stress;(MHS)= Need mental health services;(SUP)= Need a support system. (HEL)= Need health insurance;(ALA)= Need alcohol abuse services;(DRG) = Need other drug abuse services;(PAR)= Need parenting skills classes;(RBS)= Need relationship-building skills;(HOS)= Need safe housing;(ENV)= Need a different environment to return to after release.

Correlations were run on all variables. A total of 60 significant correlations were found between variables. There were 25 strong correlations at a $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed): (COL) and (EMP) as well as (EMP) and (PSS) were strongly correlated. (PSS) was strongly correlated with (STR), (MHS), (SUP), (DRG), (PAR), (RBS), and (HOS). (STR) was strongly correlated with (MHS), (SUP), (HOS), and (ENV). (MHS) was strongly correlated with (SUP), (HOS), and (ENV). (SUP) had a strong correlation with (HOS) and (ENV). (ALA) had a strong correlation with (DRG) and (RBS). (DRG) was strongly correlated with (PAR) and (RBS). (PAR) and (RBS) as well as (RBS) and (HOS) were strongly correlated. There was also a strong correlation between (HOS) and (ENV).

There were 13 medium correlations at a $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed): (GED) and (EMP), (COL) and (PSS), (PSS) with (ALA), (STR) and (RBS), (MHS) and (RBS), (SUP) and (RBS) as well. (ALA) was medium correlated with (PAR), (HOS), and (ENV). (DRG) had a medium correlation with

(HOS) and (ENV). (PAR) had a medium correlation with (HOS). There was also a medium correlation between (RBS) and (ENV).

There were 17 medium correlations at a $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed): (GED) had a medium correlation with (COL). (COL) had a medium correlation with (MHS), (ALA), (DRG), (PAR), (RBS), and (ENV). (EMP) had a medium correlation with (MHS). (PSS) had a medium correlation with (ENV). (STR) had a medium correlation (ALA) and (DRG). (MHS) had a medium correlation with (HEL), (ALA), and (PAR). (SUP) had a medium correlation with (HEL) and (DRG). There was also a medium correlation between (DRG) and (ENV).

There were 5 weak correlations at a $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed). (GED) had a weak correlation with (PSS). (COL) had a weak correlation with (SUP) and (HOS). (MHS) had a weak correlation with (DRG). There was also a weak correlation between (SUP) and (ALA) (refer to tables 3 for correlations).

Table 3
Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variable	GED	COL	EMP	PSS	STR	MHR	SUP
GED							
COL	.324*						
EMP	.422**	.585**					
PSS	.293*	.370**	.515**				
STR				.619**			
MHS		.305*	.305*	.558**	.693**		
SUP		.291*		.577**	.777**	.709**	
HEL						.345*	.326*
ALA		.358*		.437**	.330*	.352*	.288*
DRG		.309*		.577**	.310*	.291*	.359*
PAR		.331*		.507**		.312*	
RBS		.347*		.545**	.478**	.414**	.407**
HOS		.297*		.590**	.586**	.527**	.625**
ENV		.332*		.302*	.574**	.514**	.631**

Table 3.2

Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variable	HEL	ALA	DRG	PAR	RBS	HOS	ENV
HEL						.345*	.326*
ALA		.358*		.437**	.330*	.352*	.288*
DRG		.309*		.577**	.310*	.291*	.359*
PAR		.331*		.507**		.312*	
RBS		.347*		.545**	.478**	.414**	.407**
HOS		.297*		.590**	.586**	.527**	.625**
ENV		.332*		.302*	.574**	.514**	.631**

Note. (GED)= Need a high school diploma or equivalence;(COL)= Need education beyond high school or equivalence;(EMP)= Need job training;(PSS)= Need problem solving skills;(STR)= Need services to help cope with stress;(MHS)= Need mental health services;(SUP)= Need a support system;(HEL)= Need health insurance;(ALA)= Need alcohol abuse services;(DRG) = Need other drug abuse services;(PAR)= Need parenting skills classes;(RBS)= Need relationship-building skills;(HOS)= Need safe housing;(ENV)= Need a different environment to return to after release -N=50; **Correlation is significant at the $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed); *Correlation is significant at the $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed).

A reliability analysis was run to indicate if the 14 variables (*GED, COL, EMP, PSS, STR, MHS, SUP, HEL, ALA, DRG, PAR, RBS, HOS, & ENV*) were a reliable index to measure the major concept: Male inmate attitudes towards recidivism. Cronbach's Alpha is a measure of reliability and in this analysis was 0.884. This value indicated that the survey questions were a reliable measure of the major concept.

Discussion

Overall, results supported the hypothesis that male inmates need services in order to reduce recidivism and not reoffend. Significant positive correlations were found; these correlations were supported in the literature (Vacca 2004, Katsiyannis et al., 2004, Freudenberg et al., 2008, & Golden et al., 2008). Each dependent variable will be discussed in terms of how the results were supported in the literature and/or through the Family Ecology theoretical framework (Strong et al., 2005). Thereafter, limitations to the study,

implications for practitioners, implications for future research, and concluding remarks will be discussed.

Results showed that respondents were mixed that they would need a high school diploma or equivalency in order to not re-offend which was supported by the literature (Vacca, 2004). These results may be skewed because some respondents may have already had a high school diploma or equivalency. More respondents agreed that they would need even more education than a high school diploma or equivalency in order to stay out of jail. According to Vacca, education promotes a healthy transition back into society. There was a significant positive correlation between needing higher education and needing job training in order to not re-offend; these results are also supported by Vacca. Golden et al. stated that inmates needed problem solving skills in order to not re-offend (2008). The following results supported this literature. For the survey statement of an inmate needing problem solving skills in order to not re-offend a positive strong significant correlation was found between many of the other variables. The variables included needing services to help cope with stress, needing mental health services, needing a support system, needing alcohol abuse services, needing other drug abuse services, needing parenting skills classes, needing relationship building skills, and needing safe housing. Golden et al. did not describe all of these variables in their literature in correlation to problem solving, but it does show the impact that knowing how to solve problems may have a significant impact on recidivism. A majority of respondents agreed that they needed services to help cope with stress in order to not re-offend which is supported in the literature. Katsiyannis et al. explained that distress had a role in re-offending (2004). A strong positive correlation was found between needing services to help cope with stress and respondents saying they needed mental health services, a support system, safe housing, and a different environment to

return to after release. The literature did not cite environment as a problem with stress (Katsiyannis et al., 2004). Results indicated that a majority of respondents needed health insurance in order to not re-offend. Although this was not supported in the literature, this could be supported by the Family Ecology Theory (Strong et al., 2005) in that our larger society does not provide universal coverage for all and those that may struggle with employment, such as offenders, may often not be covered. Half of respondents agreed they needed alcohol abuse services in order to not re-offend and over half of respondents agreed they needed other drug abuse and treatment services. This supported the literature of Freudenberg et al. whose research indicated that inmates were more likely to re-offend when they had a problem with drugs and alcohol (2008). There was also a strong significant positive correlation between inmates needing alcohol abuse services and needing other drug abuse services. Interestingly, respondents who said they needed alcohol abuse services also had a strong positive correlation with needing relationship building skills which is supported by Katsiyannis et al. stating that having a problem with alcohol affected their parent and peer attachment as well as had a negative effect on bonding affectionately (2004). Needing other drug abuse services had a strong positive correlation with needing relationship building skills as well as needing parenting skills; this is also supported by Katsiyannis. Strangely, the statement about needing parenting skills in order to not re-offend had the most varied responses. These results could be explained by the Family Ecology Theory (Strong et al., 2005) that messages originating in the larger culture such as the media, may be that people need to be able to handle their children; no literature covered this topic. Results also indicated that there was a significant strong correlation between respondents needing relationship building skills and safe housing to not re-offend. The Family Ecology Theory

(Strong et al., 2005) could explain that lack of relationship skills within the respondent's immediate interactions in their home, such as violence, could lead them to think it would be unsafe. Respondents who replied that they needed safe housing in order to not re-offend had a significant strong positive correlation with inmates who said they needed a different environment to return to after release. These results supported the literature that inmates who return to the same environment upon release are more likely to re-offend (Freudenberg et al., 2008). The number of inmates who agreed they needed a different environment to return to after release had the highest frequency of agreement amongst of all the variables which may indicate that these inmates have a more realistic assessment of the problems they will face when they are released.

Limitations

This study used a small and nonrandom sample and therefore unable to generalize and compare to the larger population of incarcerated males.

Implications for Practitioners

The results show that there is a need for inmates to receive services in jail and upon release to reduce recidivism. The incarcerated males indicated that the environment they return to upon release needs to be changed. Returning to the environment from before incarceration is difficult when trying to transition positively back into society. Other areas that the inmates need are more consistent drug and alcohol abuse services, programs that promote good mental health, and some sort of external or internal support system. Inmates that need and want better problem solving skills have also shown to need help in many of the variables listed above. A focus on the need of better problem solving techniques and strategies as well as individualized plans of relocation

upon release could be a significant step in the right direction. Cognitive-behavioral programming could be administered by jail directors and counselors within the jail systems.

Implications for Future Research

It is recommended that the next step of research be to use a larger, and a more diverse sample to be able to generalize to male inmates across the country. If this study were to be replicated, comparing variables with the age of first incarceration, number of times incarcerated, and having a high school diploma or education beyond high school would help to see if those groups have any implication of a higher re-offending rate. Only males were surveyed so extending this to females would also, possibly yield some different results according to gender.

Conclusion

As a result of this study, it is our hope that the rehabilitation system and government will recognize the need for services to help reduce recidivism within the male population of inmates. It is clear that help is needed for inmates to learn enhanced problem solving skills as well as ways to combat physical dependencies, cognitive and mental health issues, problems with employment, family members, and their everyday environment upon release. Inmates understand they need help with these issues. It is now time for the jail system to realize this and give these individuals the help they so desperately want, need, and deserve. When you change one offender's life course, you can be changing the next generation.

References

- Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Freudenberg, N., Daniels, J., Crum, M., Perkins, T., &

- Richie, B. (2008). Coming home from jail: the social and health consequences of community reentry for women, male adolescents, and their families and communities. *American Journal of Public Health, 95*(10), 191-202.
- Golden, L., Gatchel, R., & Cahill, M. (2006). Evaluation the effectiveness of the national institute of corrections' "thinking for change" program among probationers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 43*(2), 55-73.
- Katsiyannis, A., Zhang, D., Barrett, D., & Flaska, T. (2004). Background and psychosocial variables associated with recidivism among adolescent males: a 3-year investigation. *Journal of emotional and behavioral disorders, 12*(1), 23-29.
- Strong, B., DeVault, C., & Cohen, T. F. (2005). *Studying marriage and the family: The marriage and family experience* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Vacca, J. (2004). Educated prisoners are less likely to return to jail. *The Journal of Correctional Education, 55*(4), 297-305.