

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Returns to Custody and Successful Releases: Comparison of Findings from Two Qualitative Studies of Federal Releases

2023 N° R-454

ISBN: 978-0-660-67801-6

Cat. No.: PS83-3/454E-PDF

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.

**Returns to Custody and Successful Releases: Comparison of Findings from Two
Qualitative Studies of Federal Releases**

Gregory P. Brown

Christopher Greco

Jane Barker

Kindra McMillan

Grace Tiersma

Institute for Applied Social Research (IASR)

School of Criminology and Criminal Justice

Nipissing University

&

Kaitlyn Wardrop

Lynn A. Stewart

Correctional Service of Canada

2023

Acknowledgements

The research reported here would not be possible without the willing cooperation and patience of the 112 men and women who volunteered to be interviewed for these studies, in hopes that the information they provided might help to better both the institutional and the community release planning and support programs for those re-entering what is very often a stressful, even frightening outside world.

Guidance and organizational support for the research was provided by the Interventions and Women Offenders Research Unit of the Correctional Service of Canada.

The research was funded under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Correctional Service of Canada and the Institute for Applied Social Research at Nipissing University.

Executive Summary

Key words: *qualitative study; participant responses; revocations, returns to custody, successful releases, community supervision*

Along with findings from quantitative studies, individual accounts of release experiences collected in qualitative studies can help both to improve risk prediction and better support institutional and parole release programs designed to reintegrate offenders into the community.

The current study combines the results of two qualitative studies of Canadian federal offenders on conditional release, including a sample of offenders revoked and returned to custody within the previous six months ($N = 64$) and a second sample of those successful on release in the community for a period of six months or more ($N = 48$). An interview protocol was developed separately for each study, combining semi-structured questions about known risks or protective factors with open-ended questions designed to probe offenders' experiences and perceptions about each factor. Non-proportional quota sampling was employed to ensure adequate representation from men, women and Indigenous persons, and as broad a regional representation as possible. The goals of the study were to (1) compare risk and protective factors identified in the two studies, (2) use participant accounts to better understand how risk or protective factors impact on revocation or successful release in the community, (3) identify new risk or protective factors, or combinations of factors, that could assist in improving the validity of risk prediction instruments and better support community reintegration and release planning.

Study results validate the findings from previous quantitative and qualitative studies, including the use of instruments combining both risk and protective factors to predict likelihood of revocation/recidivism. Substance misuse, along with higher levels of criminogenic, employment and emotional needs measured at intake and at release combine with lack of social support on release to increase the risk of revocation. Those successful on release, especially those who demonstrate lower levels of need at intake, reported that the involvement in institutional programs fosters acceptance of responsibility for one's criminal behaviour and the adoption of prosocial attitudes toward desistance and avoidance of substance misuse. Social support, in particular family support, serves as a critical catalyst for making possible a successful transition into the community, to housing, employment, transportation, programs, recreational and emotional support – at least until individuals have time to build their own support systems. For women with substance misuse problems who lack social support systems, and Indigenous offenders with substance misuse problems who lack family and cultural/community supports, the risk for revocation is highest.

The study findings reflect the important role that social support, especially family and community/culture, play in making successful transition to the community possible. This begs the question: for those most vulnerable offenders, those without social and community/cultural supports - “How does one build positive social support systems where none now or previously existed” – if indeed revocations are to be turned into successful releases?

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	v
List of Appendices	vii
Introduction.....	1
Objectives of the Current Study.....	2
Method	3
Research Design.....	3
Participants.....	3
Measures/Material.....	7
Procedure/Analytic Approach.....	8
Results.....	10
Interviewer-Rated Scoring of Main Interview Protocol Factors.....	10
Participant Responses to Interview Protocol Screening Questions by Main Topic and Subtopic Questions	17
Participant Verbal Responses to Open-Ended Questions About Community	31
Discussion	38
Overview of findings	38
Women on community release.....	42
Indigenous ancestry and community release	43
Limitations of the Study.....	44
Conclusions.....	46
References	47

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Demographic and Offender Characteristics of Revocations of Release (N = 64)^a and Successful Release (N = 48)^b Participants</i>	4
Table 2 <i>Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Interview Protocol Factors, Revocations (N = 64)^a and Successful Releases (N = 48)^b</i>	10
Table 3 <i>Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b</i>	18

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Factors Associated with Returns to Custody Interview Protocol.....	55
Appendix B: Factors Associated with Successful Releases Interview Protocol.....	91
Appendix C: Supplemental Analyses of Interviewer-Rated Scores by Gender and Indigenous Ancestry	126
Appendix D: Supplemental Analyses of Participant Responses to Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Gender, & Indigenous Ancestry	134

Introduction

Most research on offender recidivism focuses on quantitative studies of individual characteristics and social and environmental factors that are a risk for re-offending (Desmarais, Johnson & Singh, 2016; Katsiyannis, Whitford, Zhang & Gage, 2018; Olson, Stalans & Escobar, 2016; Viljoen, Cochrane & Jonnson, 2018). More recently, the role that protective factors play in moderating risks has attracted research interest (Andershed, Gibson & Andershed, 2016; Bahr, Harris, Fisher & Harker Armstrong, 2010; Cording & Christofferson, 2016; Neil, O'Rourke, Ferreira & Flynn, 2019; Polaschek, Yesberg & Chauhan, 2018; Yesberg & Polaschek, 2015; Serin, Chadwick & Lloyd, 2016; Stewart, Brine, Wilton, Power & Hnain, 2015; Ttofi et al., 2016). In addition, a growing number of quantitative studies have documented and compared the contribution of risk and protective factors to release outcomes (Andershed, Gibson & Andershed, 2016; Bahr, Harris, Fisher & Harker Armstrong, 2010; Coupland, 2015; Huebner & Berg, 2011; Neil, O'Rourke, Ferreira & Flynn, 2019; McKendy & Ricciardelli, 2019; Polaschek, Yesberg & Chauhan, 2018; Yesberg & Polaschek, 2015).

A smaller number of qualitative studies have explored the experiences of individual offenders and their explanations of what they believe are the factors that contributed to their success or failure while on release in the community (Cobbina, 2010; Doherty, Forrester, Brazil & Matheson, 2014; Harding, Wyse, Dobson & Morenoff, 2014; Liem & Richardson, 2014; Sousa, Cardoso & Cunhab, 2019). Along with the findings from quantitative studies, individual accounts of release experiences collected in qualitative studies may help both to improve risk prediction, and better support institutional and parole release programs designed to reintegrate offenders into the community.

Objectives of the Current Study

The current study combines the results of two recent qualitative studies of Canadian federal offenders on conditional release (Brown et al., 2019a; 2019b). The objectives of the study are:

1. To compare risk and protective factors measured qualitatively in each study;
2. To make use of offender narratives to further elaborate on the operation of risk or protective factors as they impact on revocation or successful release in the community; and,
3. To identify new risk or protective factors, or combinations of factors, that could assist in improving the validity of risk prediction instruments and better support community reintegration and release planning.

Method

Research Design

Qualitative, in-person interviews were conducted with two independent samples of federal offenders. An interview protocol was developed separately for each study, combining semi-structured questions about known risks or protective factors with open-ended questions designed to probe offenders' experiences and perceptions about each factor (Brinkman, 2017). Non-proportional quota sampling was employed to ensure adequate representation from men, women and Indigenous persons, and as broad a regional representation as possible (Cresswell, 2018; Hoover et al., 2019; Morrow et al., 2007; Robinson, 2014).

Each study was conducted under the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Correctional Service of Canada and the Institute for Applied Social Research (IASR) of the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Nipissing University. The Nipissing University Research Ethics Board (NUREB) reviewed and approved each of the studies according to the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans, including Chapter Nine – Research Involving the First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples of Canada (Government of Canada, 2014).

Participants

In the first study (Brown et al., 2019a), federal offenders returned to prison on revocation of conditional release within the previous six months during the study participant recruitment period January 2018 – October 2018 were eligible to participate, and a total of 64 offenders completed interviews. In the second study (Brown et al., 2019b), federal offenders successfully completing a conditional release in the community for a period of more than six months and up to two years during the study participant recruitment period January 2018 – October 2018 were eligible to participate, and 48 offenders completed interviews. Interviews were completed at eight different institutions and nine parole offices across the Pacific, Prairie, Ontario and Quebec regions. Due to the relatively small concentration of eligible cases in the Atlantic region, no interviews were completed in that region. The demographic and offender characteristics of the participants in the two studies are compared in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic and Offender Characteristics of Revocations of Release (N = 64)^a and Successful Release (N = 48)^b Participants

Demographic/Offender Characteristic	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	df
	%	(n)	%	(n)		
Gender						
Female	34.4	(22)	37.5	(18)	0.117	1
Male	65.6	(42)	62.5	(30)		
Average age at release in years (s.d.)	34.4	(9.8)	42	(12.7)	$t =$ 3.601***	110
Ethnicity						
Indigenous	50.0	(32)	27.1	(13)	7.439*	2
White	40.6	(26)	50.0	(24)		
Other	9.4	(6)	22.9	(11)		
Marital status						
Single	56.3	(36)	50.0	(24)	2.952	2
Married/common-law	34.4	(22)	29.2	(14)		
Other/unknown	9.4	(6)	20.8	(10)		
Major admitting offence						
Homicide related	12.5	(8)	20.8	(10)	8.893	5
Robbery	18.8	(12)	6.3	(3)		
Drug offences	20.3	(13)	22.9	(11)		
Assault/Other violent offences	17.2	(11)	8.3	(4)		
Sexual offences	7.8	(5)	16.7	(8)		
Property/Other non-violent offences	15.6	(10)	25.0	(12)		
Average sentence length in years (s.d)	4.0	(2.46)	4.7	(3.04)	$t = 1.206$	98
Release Type						
Day parole	43.8	(28)	62.5	(30)	4.948*	1
Statutory release	56.3	(36)	33.3	(16)		
Criminal history risk level – Intake						
Low	6.3	(4)	16.7	(8)	3.952	2
Medium	43.8	(28)	47.9	(23)		
High	48.4	(31)	35.4	(17)		

Table 1 (cont'd)

Demographic and Offender Characteristics of Revocations of Release (N=64)^a and Successful Release (N=48)^b Participants

Demographic/Offender Characteristic	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	df
	%	(n)	%	(n)		
Criminogenic need level - Intake						
Low	-. ^c	-. ^c	10.4	(5)	10.687**	2
Medium	23.4	(15)	37.5	(18)		
High	75.0	(48)	52.1	(25)		
Community Functioning Need - Intake						
None	28.1	(18)	37.5	(18)	4.698	3
Low	18.8	(12)	25.0	(12)		
Medium	31.3	(20)	20.8	(10)		
High	9.4	(6)	2.1	(1)		
Employment Need - Intake						
None	4.7	(3)	18.8	(9)	9.607*	3
Low	15.6	(10)	20.8	(10)		
Medium	53.1	(34)	41.7	(20)		
High	15.6	(10)	4.2	(2)		
Marital/Family Need - Intake						
None	20.3	(13)	37.5	(18)	7.771	3
Low	14.1	(9)	18.8	(9)		
Medium	42.2	(27)	25.0	(12)		
High	12.5	(8)	4.2	(2)		
Personal/Emotional Need - Intake						
None	1.6	(1)	2.1	(1)	9.264*	3
Low	3.1	(2)	10.4	(5)		
Medium	21.9	(14)	39.6	(19)		
High	62.5	(40)	35.4	(17)		
Substance Abuse Need - Intake						
None	4.7	(3)	33.3	(16)	17.005**	3
Low	7.8	(5)	6.3	(3)		
Medium	20.3	(13)	14.6	(7)		
High	56.3	(36)	33.3	(16)		
Criminal history risk level - Release						
Low	6.3	(4)	16.7	(8)	4.483	2
Medium	43.8	(28)	50.0	(24)		
High	48.4	(31)	33.3	(16)		

Table 1 (cont'd)

Demographic and Offender Characteristics of Revocations of Release (N=64)^a and Successful Release (N=48)^b Participants

Demographic/Offender Characteristic	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	df
	%	(n)	%	(n)		
Criminogenic need level - Release						
Low	- ^c	- ^c	14.6	(7)	11.119**	2
Medium	43.8	(28)	47.9	(23)		
High	54.7	(35)	37.5	(18)		
Community Functioning Need - Release						
None	26.6	(17)	39.6	(19)	6.753	3
Low	23.4	(15)	33.3	(16)		
Medium	32.8	(21)	18.8	(9)		
High	9.4	(6)	2.1	(1)		
Employment Need - Release						
None	4.7	(3)	20.8	(10)	13.179**	3
Low	20.3	(13)	31.3	(15)		
Medium	54.7	(35)	39.6	(19)		
High	14.1	(9)	2.1	(1)		
Marital/Family Need - Release						
None	21.9	(14)	35.4	(17)	7.775	3
Low	18.8	(12)	29.2	(14)		
Medium	40.6	(26)	29.2	(14)		
High	12.5	(8)	2.1	(1)		
Personal/Emotional Need - Release						
None	1.6	(1)	4.2	(2)	5.005	3
Low	7.8	(5)	16.7	(8)		
Medium	45.3	(29)	52.1	(25)		
High	39.1	(25)	22.9	(11)		
Substance Abuse Need - Release						
None	4.7	(3)	31.3	(15)	20.089***	3
Low	9.4	(6)	20.8	(10)		
Medium	42.2	(27)	25.0	(12)		
High	37.5	(24)	18.8	(9)		

^a missing data not reported < 11%

^b missing data not reported: < 13%

^c '- ' no responses recorded for this category

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

Among these two samples, those successful on release were older ($t(110) = 3.601, p = .000$) than offenders who were revoked and returned to custody (Hall, 2015; Severson, Veeh, Bruns & Lee, 2012; Stahler et al., 2013; Staton, Dickson, Tillson, Webster & Leukefeld, 2019; Stewart, Brine, Wilton, Power & Hnain, 2015). They were also less likely ($X^2(2, n = 112) = 7.439, p = 0.024$) to be of Indigenous ancestry (Farrell MacDonald, 2018; Stewart et al., 2017a; Thompson, Forrester & Stewart, 2015; Tremblay, 2017). The sample of those successful in the community were also statistically significantly more likely ($X^2(1, n = 110) = 4.948, p = 0.026$) to have been released on day parole (Ostermann, 2015; Polaschek et al., 2018; Thompson et al., 2015).

Similar to finding in other studies, the sample of offenders revoked while on release were statistically significantly more likely to have demonstrated higher levels of criminogenic need at intake ($X^2(2, n = 111) = 10.687, p = 0.005$), along with higher levels of employment need ($X^2(3, n = 98) = 9.607, p = 0.022$), personal/emotional need ($X^2(3, n = 99) = 9.264, p = 0.026$) and risk for substance abuse ($X^2(3, n = 99) = 17.005, p = 0.001$) (Polaschek et al., 2018; Serin, Lloyd, Helmus, Derkzen & Luong, 2013; Thompson et al., 2015) than the sample of those successful in the community. At release, the sample of those revoked and returned to custody continue to demonstrate statistically significantly higher levels of criminogenic need ($X^2(2, n = 111) = 11.119, p = 0.004$), employment need ($X^2(3, n = 105) = 13.179, p = 0.004$) and substance abuse need ($X^2(3, n = 106) = 20.089, p = 0.000$) (Thompson et al., 2015; Yuhnenko, Blackwood & Fazel, 2019).

Measures/Material

Each of the interview protocols employed in the research was composed of a series of semi-structured and open-ended questions about risk or protective factors related to revocation/recidivism, derived from extensive reviews of the research literature and from data collected as part of the Correctional Service of Canada Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process (Brown & Motiuk, 2005; Stewart, Wilton & Sapers, 2016; Bourgon, Mugford, Hanson & Coligado, 2018) including a report by Wardrop, Sheahan & Stewart (2019). In addition to unique questions about revocation or successful release, common topics about risks or protective factors explored in each interview protocol ranged from release planning and social networks and connections, through employment/education/financial stability and community functioning, to pro-criminal attitudes, personal/emotional issues and connection to spirituality. Copies of the complete interview protocols used in each of the studies are included in Appendices A and B.

Interviews took between thirty minutes and one and a half hours to complete, and were manually transcribed by the researchers or, with the permission of the participant, digitally recorded. A combination of binary responses scored either as ‘0’ = no (does not apply to me), or ‘1’ = yes, and open-ended questions asking the participant to explain in their own words how each of the identified factors impacted on their release and their general experiences of community release, was employed. In addition, upon completion of the interview, the IASR researchers scored the participant responses within each of the main factor topics on a 3-point scale, ranging from ‘2’ = the factor was a problem for their release, ‘1’ = the factor did not have a major impact on their release, ‘0’ the factor was positive and helpful with respect to their release.

Assessor training. Members of the IASR research team involved in administering the interview were experienced in conducting personal interviews with offenders both in institutional and community settings. To ensure consistency in completion of the interview protocol, two members of the research team were present at each interview.

Procedure/Analytic Approach

Participant recruitment. Correctional Service of Canada staff regularly provided the IASR researchers with an updated list of offenders who met the criteria in each study. Two members of the IASR research team were dispatched to conduct interviews at institutions, parole offices or halfway houses with a sufficient concentration of potential participants to ensure an adequate response rate, including women and Indigenous offenders. No compensation or incentive to participate in the study was provided to offenders who had been revoked and returned to custody. Offenders who were successful on release and interviewed in parole offices or halfway houses were provided with a \$20 coffee card to compensate them for any expenses they incurred in attending the interview

Informed consent and data management. The IASR researchers provided volunteers with a verbal summary of the informed consent form, and encouraged them to ask questions about the procedures to be employed and the terms of their participation. All participants were then asked to sign a paper copy of the informed consent form, including permission to access their Offender Management System (OMS) file, prior to proceeding with the interviews. Debriefing procedures were outlined on the consent form. Interviews were conducted in English or French. For each of the studies, a data file with participants’ demographic and offender

characteristics was created by the CSC - Interventions and Women Offenders Research staff for the purpose of data analysis and reporting of results.

Analytic/statistical techniques. Frequency counts are reported for the interviewer-scored ordinal (0,1,2) and binary (0,1) interview protocol questions. Chi-square analyses and Student's t-tests of differences between means were conducted to identify statistically significant differences in the demographic and offender characteristics, and protocol responses, between the revocations and successful releases study participants, using IBM SPSS Statistics 26 (IBM Corporation, 2019). Participants' verbal responses to the interview protocols were coded, classified and analyzed using the NVivo 12 (QSR International, 2018) qualitative analysis program. Using an iterative process, whenever a new node (theme) or sub-node was identified during the course of the NVivo coding, previously coded interviews were revised to ensure consistency and incorporation of the newly revised coding structure, allowing for a thematic-based summation of the interview content.

As the number of offenders who participated in each of the qualitative studies is relatively small, reported results should be interpreted with caution.

Results

Interviewer-Rated Scoring of Main Interview Protocol Factors

The distribution of interviewer-rated scoring of participants' responses within each of the main interview protocol factors, for both the revocations and successful release samples, is displayed in Table 2. Where the same questions were asked of samples, chi-square test comparisons of the distributions of responses are reported.

Table 2
Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Interview Protocol Factors, Revocations (N = 64)^a and Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of		Successful		χ^2	df
	Release		Releases			
	%	(n)	%	(n)		
Feelings About Desistance						
Negative impact	c		10.9	(5)		
None/somewhat harmful			19.6	(9)		
Positive impact			69.6	(32)		
Release Conditions						
Negative impact	54.7	(35)	c			
None/somewhat harmful	21.9	(14)				
Positive impact	23.4	(15)				
Release Planning						
Negative impact	34.4	(22)	23.9	(11)	2.983	2
None/somewhat harmful	37.5	(24)	32.6	(15)		
Positive impact	28.1	(18)	43.5	(20)		
Post-release support from CSC						
Negative impact	c		10.9	(5)		
None/somewhat harmful			39.1	(18)		
Positive impact			50.0	(23)		
Post-release support from others in community						
Negative impact	c		30.4	(14)		
None/somewhat harmful			21.7	(10)		
Positive impact			47.8	(22)		

Table 2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Interview Protocol Factors, Revocations (N = 64)^a and Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	df
	%	(n)	%	(n)		
Relationship with Parole Officer						
Negative impact	34.4	(22)	c			
None/somewhat harmful	37.5	(24)				
Positive impact	28.1	(18)				
Social Networks and Connections						
Family support						
Negative impact	18.8	(12)	8.7	(4)	4.457	2
None/somewhat harmful	28.1	(18)	19.6	(9)		
Positive impact	51.6	(33)	71.7	(33)		
Intimate relationships						
Negative impact	14.1	(9)	58.7	(27)	25.823***	2
None/somewhat harmful	6.3	(4)	8.7	(4)		
Positive impact	78.1	(50)	32.6	(15)		
Support from children						
Negative impact	9.4	(6)	58.7	(27)	29.961***	2
None/somewhat harmful	20.3	(13)	10.9	(5)		
Positive impact	67.2	(43)	30.4	(14)		
Support from friends/associates						
Negative impact	37.5	(24)	26.1	(12)	1.754	2
None/somewhat harmful	31.3	(20)	39.1	(18)		
Positive impact	29.7	(19)	34.8	(16)		
Overall social support						
Negative impact	c		4.3	(2)		
None/somewhat harmful			34.8	(16)		
Positive impact			60.9	(28)		
Employment/Education/Financial						
Education/upgrading						
Negative impact	60.9	(39)	28.3	(13)	19.246***	2
None/somewhat harmful	25.0	(16)	41.3	(19)		
Positive impact	4.7	(3)	30.4	(14)		
Employment						
Negative impact	39.1	(25)	30.4	(14)	1.725	2
None/somewhat harmful	23.4	(15)	19.6	(9)		
Positive impact	37.5	(24)	50.0	(23)		

Table 2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Interview Protocol Factors, Revocations (N = 64)^a and Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	df
	%	(n)	%	(n)		
Finances						
Negative impact	17.2	(11)	10.9	(5)	2.056	2
None/somewhat harmful	26.6	(17)	19.6	(9)		
Positive impact	56.3	(36)	69.6	(32)		
Community Functioning						
Neighbourhood						
Negative impact	42.2	(27)	c			
None/somewhat harmful	21.9	(14)				
Positive impact	34.4	(22)				
Accommodation						
Negative impact	29.7	(19)	2.2	(1)	24.977***	2
None/somewhat harmful	43.8	(28)	28.3	(13)		
Positive impact	25.0	(16)	69.6	(32)		
Community programs						
Negative impact	50.0	(32)	34.8	(16)	9.962**	2
None/somewhat harmful	42.2	(27)	37.0	(17)		
Positive impact	6.3	(4)	28.3			
Community services						
Negative impact	c		2.2	(1)		
None/somewhat harmful			23.9	(11)		
Positive impact			73.9	(34)		
Leisure activities						
Negative impact	54.7	(35)	8.7	(4)	26.382***	2
None/somewhat harmful	28.1	(18)	43.5	(20)		
Positive impact	15.6	(10)	45.7	(21)		
Avoidance of Substance Misuse						
Negative impact	60.9	(39)	17.4	(8)	41.109***	2
None/somewhat harmful	17.2	(11)	0	(0)		
Positive impact	20.3	(13)	80.4	(37)		

Table 2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Interview Protocol Factors, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a and Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	df
	%	(n)	%	(n)		
Attitudes Toward Justice System						
Negative impact	25.0	(16)	21.7	(10)	0.252	2
None/somewhat harmful	48.4	(31)	45.7	(21)		
Positive impact	25.0	(16)	28.3	(13)		
Personal/Emotional						
Negative impact	64.1	(41)	c			
None/somewhat harmful	14.1	(9)				
Positive impact	18.8	(12)				
Identity						
Negative impact	c		2.2	(1)		
None/somewhat harmful			34.8	(16)		
Positive impact			60.9	(28)		
Coping skills						
Negative impact	c		2.2	(1)		
None/somewhat harmful			43.5	(20)		
Positive impact			50.0	(23)		
Cultural & Spiritual Identity						
Negative impact	21.9	(14)	17.4	(8)	7.682*	2
None/somewhat harmful	56.3	(36)	34.8	(16)		
Positive impact	20.3	(13)	43.5	(20)		

^a missing data not reported < 4%

^b missing data not reported < 6%

^c a comparable item was not asked in the respective interview protocol, Revocations of Release or Successful Releases.

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

A majority (69.6%) of those successful on release were rated by interviewers as expressing positive views about their ability to be successful in desisting from criminal involvement, and most (80.4%) claimed to have made a conscious decision not to get involved in criminal activity. While most of those successful in the community reported that their release conditions did not pose a barrier to their success, a majority of those returned to custody (54.7%) were rated by the interviewers as expressing the view that release conditions had a negative impact on their success in the community. Neither group of participants expressed strong views

about the negative or positive benefit of release planning, the use of post-release supports, or relationship with their parole officer.

Compared to those revoked and returned to custody (51.6%), a greater proportion of those successful in the community (71.7%) were rated as experiencing family support as a positive impact on their release. On the other hand, though less than half of those interviewed in the two studies reported currently being in an intimate relationship, those successful on release were rated as statistically significantly more likely to perceive intimate relationships as having a negative impact on their release ($X^2(2, n = 109) = 25.823, p = 0.000$). Similarly, those successful on release were rated as significantly more likely than those revoked to experience relationships with children ($X^2(2, n = 108) = 29.961, p = 0.000$) as a negative factor in their release in the community.

Those successful on release were statistically significantly more likely to be rated as experiencing education/upgrading programs received while incarcerated as having a positive impact on their release ($X^2(2, n = 104) = 19.246, p = 0.000$), and were also more likely to experience employment and finances as positive factors in their release. Similarly, those successful on release were statistically significantly more likely to be rated as finding that their accommodation ($X^2(2, n = 109) = 24.977, p = 0.000$), involvement in community programs ($X^2(2, n = 109) = 9.962, p = 0.006$) and involvement in leisure activities ($X^2(2, n = 108) = 26.382, p = 0.000$) contributed positively to their success in the community.

Compared to those revoked and returned to custody, those successful on release were statistically significantly more likely to be rated as managing issues related to substance misuse in a positive manner ($X^2(2, n = 108) = 41.109, p = 0.000$), and experiencing a connection to their cultural and spiritual identity as a positive factor in their release ($X^2(2, n = 107) = 7.682, p = 0.021$).

The distribution of interviewer-rated scoring of the study participants' responses within each of the main interview protocol factors, for both the revocations and successful release studies and by gender and by Indigenous ancestry, are displayed in Tables C1 and C2 in Appendix C. As the number of participants in each of the categories of the protocol factors disaggregated by gender and Indigenous ancestry may be very small, chi-square tests of the differences in the distribution of responses are not reported.

As shown in Table 3, the majority of women and men successful on release were rated by

the interviewers as expressing strong feelings about desistance (Successful Women: 72.2%; Successful Men: 64.3%). On the other hand, more than half of women and men who had their release revoked and returned to prison were rated as experiencing their release conditions as having a negative impact on their release (Revoked Women: 59.1%; Revoked Men: 52.4%), and most of those revoked experienced the relationship with their parole officer as having no impact (Revoked Women: 50.0%; Revoked Men: 31.0%) or a harmful impact (Revoked Women: 31.8%; Revoked Men: 35.7%). Compared to women who had their release revoked and were returned to custody (Revoked Women: 31.8%), half of women successful on release (Successful Women: 50.0%) were rated as finding the release planning process had a positive impact on their release. On the other hand, most men, whether revoked or successful in the community, experienced the release process as having no impact or a somewhat harmful impact on their release.

Women successful on release were more likely to be rated by the interviewers as having positive support from family members and from friends (Revoked Women: 31.8%; Successful Women: 94.4%), and the majority of men, whether revoked or successful, were also rated as finding family support a positive impact on their release (Revoked Men: 61.9%; Successful Men: 57.1%). However, women and men successful on release were much less likely to have experienced intimate relationships or support from children as positive factors in their release. Overall, half or less of the participants in the two studies were rated as experiencing friends or associates as a positive impact on their release.

Both women and men successful on release in the community were more likely than their revoked counterparts to be rated as experiencing the education/upgrading they participated in while incarcerated as having had a positive impact on their release, along with their employment and financial situation while in the community. Similarly, those successful in the community, both women and men, were more likely to be rated as experiencing their accommodation and their participation in community programs and leisure activities as having had a positive impact on their release.

Both women and men successful on release (Successful Women: 55.6%; Successful Men: 96.4%) were proportionately more likely than women and men who were revoked (Revoked Women: 13.6%; Revoked Men: 23.8%) to be rated as experiencing their ability to manage substance misuse as having a positive impact on their release. Women successful on release were

more likely (Successful Women: 66.7%) to rate their involvement in cultural or spiritual practices as having a positive impact on their release.

As displayed in Table C2, among those successful on release, Indigenous offenders were proportionately more likely (Successful Indigenous: 76.9%; Successful Non-Indigenous: 65.6%) to be rated as expressing a strong commitment to desistance. Among those revoked while on release, Indigenous offenders were more likely to be rated by the interviewers as experiencing their release conditions as having a none/somewhat harmful or negative impact on their release (Revoked Indigenous: 59.4%; Revoked Non-Indigenous: 50.0%). Overall, whether successful or unsuccessful in the community, or of Indigenous ancestry or not, fewer than half of the study participants were rated as having experienced the release planning process as a positive process, and one-third or fewer expressed views that the relationship with their parole officer had a positive impact on their release.

Indigenous offenders who were successful on release were more likely to be rated as experiencing family support as a positive factor in their release (Successful Indigenous: 69.2%; Revoked Indigenous: 53.1%), while intimate relationships (Successful Indigenous: 69.2%) and support from children (Successful Indigenous: 69.2%) were rated to have negative impacts on release. In contrast, intimate relationships (Revoked Indigenous: 81.3%) and support from children (Revoked Indigenous: 71.9%) were interviewer-rated as having a positive impact on release for those who were revoked. One-third or less of the participants were rated as experiencing friends/associates as a positive impact on their release.

Overall, less than one-third of the study participants were rated as experiencing the education/upgrading they received while incarcerated as having a positive impact on their release. Compared to all other groups, Indigenous offenders who were revoked while on release were the most likely (Revoked Indigenous: 50.0%) to be rated as expressing the view that their employment experiences had a negative impact on their release. Across all groups, half or more were rated as experiencing finances as a positive factor in their release, although non-Indigenous offenders, either successful or revoked while on release, were proportionately more likely (Revoked Non-Indigenous: 62.5%; Successful Non-Indigenous: 75.0%) to have experienced finances as a positive impact.

Indigenous offenders who were returned to custody were most likely among all groups to have been rated by the interviewers as having experienced accommodations (Revoked

Indigenous: 31.3%) and leisure activities (Revoked Indigenous: 53.1%) as negative factors in their release, along with issues with substance misuse (Revoked Indigenous: 68.8%; Successful Indigenous: 53.1%). Indigenous offenders who were successful on release (Successful Indigenous: 61.5%) were the most likely group to have experienced involvement with spiritual/cultural identity as a positive impact on their release.

Participant Responses to Interview Protocol Screening Questions by Main Topic and Subtopic Questions

Participant responses to the binary-response screening questions by main interview protocol factor and subtopics, including a categorized summary of participants' verbal responses to the questions, are shown in Table 3 beginning on the following page, for both revocations and successful releases study participants. Where the same questions were asked of samples, chi-square test comparisons of the distributions of responses are reported. Breakdowns of responses by gender and Indigenous ancestry are reported in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D.

Feelings about desistance. Among participants successful on release in the community, most (80.4%) expressed a strong commitment to desistance as an important factor in their success in the community. Women (Successful Women: 88.9%; Successful Men: 75.0%) and non-Indigenous offenders (Successful Indigenous: 76.9%; Successful Non-Indigenous: 81.3%) were most likely to report making a conscious decision not to reoffend. "I knew I would never return to crime" was a consistent theme in the qualitative interviews, including one older participant who observed that the chances of returning to crime were "None - I am 50 years old so enough of this BS." Another successful participant observed:

It has to be up to you to change. It has to be up to you as a person. You know what I mean? You have to be ready and you have to be wanting to change. Otherwise nothing is going to happen and nobody's going to do nothing for you.

Table 3

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a versus Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	<i>d</i> <i>f</i>
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b		
Feelings about Desistance						
Consciously decide not to get involved in criminal activity?						
Yes		d	80.4	(37)		
No			19.6	(9)		
Release Planning						
Prior to release did you have a release plan?						
Yes	82.8	(53)	d			
No	17.2	(11)				
Anyone outside institution help with release plan?						
Yes		d	73.9	(34)		
No			26.1	(12)		
Anyone at institution help with release plan?						
Yes	43.8	(28)	65.2	(30)	4.608*	1
No	54.7	(35)	34.8	(16)		
Did your release plan include <i>Section 84</i> planning?						
Yes	15.6	(10)	d			
No	81.3	(52)				
Did CSC provide help to make transition into community (e.g. parole officer, Elder)?						
Yes		d	84.8	(52)		
No			15.2	(7)		
Did someone else in the community help with your transition?						
Yes		d	63.0	(29)		
No			37.0	(17)		
Did you feel you had a realistic release plan?						
Yes	81.3	(52)	d			
No	18.8	(12)				
When entering the community, did everything go according to plan?						
Yes	51.6	(33)	d			
No	48.4	(31)				

Table 3 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a versus Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	df
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b		
Release Conditions						
Release conditions on release?						
Yes	100	(64)	d			
No	– ^c	– ^c				
Did release conditions have effect on your returning to custody?						
Yes	87.5	(56)	d			
No	12.5	(8)				
Social Networks and Connections						
Did family members provide support on release?						
Yes	78.1	(50)	84.8	(39)	0.521	1
No	20.3	(13)	15.2	(7)		
Are you currently involved in an intimate relationship?						
Yes	45.3	(29)	43.5	(20)	0.070	1
No	53.1	(34)	56.5	(26)		
Did your partner help you with release planning?						
Yes	d		28.3	(13)		
No			17.4	(8)		
Do you have any children?						
Yes	65.6	(42)	63.0	(29)	0.154	1
No	32.8	(21)	37.0	(17)		
How many children do you have?						
One	28.6	(17)	17.4	(8)	1.115	3
Two	18.8	(12)	19.6	(9)		
Three	14.1	(9)	17.4	(8)		
Four+	6.3	(4)	6.5	(3)		
If you have children under age 18, were you primary caregiver while on release?						
Yes	9.4	(6)	15.2	(7)	2.138	1
No	56.3	(36)	37.0	(17)		

Table 3 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a versus Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	d f
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b		
How many children currently live with you?						
None	54.7	(35)	41.3	(19)	3.902	3
One	9.4	(6)	15.2	(7)		
Two	1.6	(1)	4.3	(2)		
Three	- ^c	- ^c	2.2	(1)		
Did your children help with your release?						
Yes			26.1	(12)		
No			23.9	(11)		
Did your parenting responsibilities impact your return to custody?						
Yes	23.4	(15)			d	
No	39.1	(25)				
Do you socialize with friends often?						
Yes	78.1	(50)	63.0	(29)	3.551	1
No	20.3	(13)	37.0	(17)		
Employment/Education/Financial						
Education/upgrading while incarcerated?						
Yes	60.9	(39)	78.3	(36)	3.314	1
No	37.5	(24)	21.7	(10)		
Since your release, education/upgrading while in community?						
Yes	26.6	(17)	56.5	(26)	10.089**	1
No	73.4	(47)	43.5	(20)		
Did your participation in education/lack of have any effect on your release in the community?						
Yes	40.6	(26)			d	
No	56.3	(36)				
Did anyone help you find work on your release?						
Yes	28.1	(18)	71.7	(33)	19.900***	1
No	70.3	(45)	28.3	(13)		

Table 3 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a versus Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	d f
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b		
Did you find a job in your community?						
Yes	62.5	(40)	76.1	(35)	1.965	1
No	35.9	(23)	23.9	(11)		
Was your job...?						
Full-time	48.1	(31)	54.3	(25)	1.641	3
Part-time	7.8	(5)	15.2	(7)		
Casual	3.1	(2)	4.3	(2)		
Other	1.6	(1)	-	-		
How much time during your release did you have a job (%)?						
<25	10.9	(7)	4.3	(2)	4.390	3
25 – 50	9.4	(6)	13.0	(6)		
50 - 75	15.6	(10)	10.9	(5)		
75 - 100	29.7	(19)	50.0	(23)		
Did you like your job?						
Yes	57.8	(37)	67.4	(31)	0.056	1
No	6.3	(4)	8.7	(4)		
Community Functioning						
Where you are living is safe and stable?						
Yes	23.4	(15)	89.1	(41)	46.215***	1
No	76.6	(49)	10.9	(5)		
Lot of crime or substance misuse where you live?						
Yes	51.6	(33)	41.3	(19)	1.308	1
No	46.9	(30)	58.7	(27)		
Do you have access to family physician when needed?						
Yes	d		76.1	(35)		
No			23.9	(11)		
Do you have access to mental health supports?						
Yes	d		89.1	(41)		
No			10.9	(5)		
Do you have access to reliable transportation when needed?						
Yes	d		89.1	(41)		
No			10.9	(5)		

Table 3 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a versus Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocation of Release		Successful Releases %		χ^2	df
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b		
Do you have access to assistance in the community?						
Yes	54.7	(35)	d			
No	43.8	(28)				
Do you have access to technology (e.g. phone, television, internet)?						
Yes	d		91.3	(42)		
No			8.7	(4)		
Following release have you been involved in CSC programs?						
Yes	43.8	(28)	71.7	(33)	8.037**	1
No	54.7	(35)	28.3	(13)		
Following release have you been involved in any non-CSC programs?						
Yes	d		43.5	(20)		
No			56.5	(26)		
Avoidance of Substance Misuse						
Have you had any issues with substance misuse?						
Yes	82.8	(53)	56.5	(26)	9.279*	1
No	15.6	(10)	41.3	(19)		
Attitudes Toward Justice System						
Do you accept the decisions and instructions the criminal justice system has given you?						
Yes	d		87.0	(40)		
No			10.9	(5)		
Personal/Emotional						
Are you motivated to remain successful in the community?						
Yes	d		95.7	(44)		
No			2.2	(1)		
Do you believe you will remain successful in the community?						
Yes	d		93.5	(43)		
No			- ^c			

Table 3

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a versus Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release		Successful Releases		χ^2	df
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b		
Do you do things without thinking them through fully?						
Yes	64.1	(41)	d			
No	34.4	(22)				
Do you have a hard time dealing with stressful situations?						
Yes	59.4	(38)	d			
No	39.1	(25)				
Cultural & Spiritual Identity						
Do you consider yourself connected to your culture?						
Yes	d		52.2	(24)		
No			45.7	(21)		
Do you consider yourself a spiritual person?						
Yes	79.7	(51)	80.4	(37)		
No	18.8	(12)	17.4	(8)		
<i>If Indigenous</i> , do you use any cultural resources in the community?						
Yes	d		13.0	(6)	0.028	1
No			52.2	(24)		
<i>If Indigenous</i> , did you experience <i>Section 81</i> transfer or <i>Section 84</i> release?						
Yes	d		50.0	(23)		
No			37.0	(17)		

^a missing data not reported < 4%

^b missing data not reported < 6%

^c ‘-‘ no responses recorded for this category

^d a comparable item was not asked in the respective interview protocol, Revocations of Release or Successful Releases.

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

Release planning

Compared to those who were revoked while on release, offenders successful on release were statistically significantly more likely to report having received help with developing a release plan while incarcerated ($X^2(1, n = 109) = 4.608, p = 0.032$). A majority (73.9%) also reported receiving help from others outside the institution in developing a release plan, and from

CSC staff (84.8%) and others in the community (63.0%) in making the transition to the community. Men (Successful Women: 61.1%; Successful Men: 82.1%) and non-Indigenous offenders (Successful Indigenous: 61.5%; Successful Non-Indigenous: 78.1%) were more likely to report receiving help from someone other than CSC staff. Among those successful on release, supports in planning the release and making the transition into the community varied from “my wife”, “my mom”, “my sisters” and “just me and the wife and kids and stuff” through “I did get counseling with an elder, yes” and “Yep they [parole officers and volunteers here at CCC] helped a lot. They were there most. You can talk to them anytime and they will drive you to get your ID” to “I would say a social worker and I've been working with a rehabilitation counsellor” and “I went to John Howard Society once. That was to get a resume done but other than that, no. I've pretty much done everything on my own with the help of my mom my mom and my dad and my sisters.” By contrast, those revoked while on release in the community expressed much less certainty about whether they had a release plan in place when entering the community “yeah there was somewhat of a plan I guess you could say. Actually, no, I don't think there was a plan. I think it was more so the conditions”, and were less likely to be able to identify reliable sources of support for their transition into the community “they were going to [help me] and then I never seen any help from them.” Most of those returned to custody (81.3%) reported that they believed they had a realistic release plan when entering the community, though fewer than half (48.4%) reported that events unfolded as planned when in the community: “[I thought] it'd be easier.”

Only one-quarter of Indigenous offenders revoked and returned to custody (25%) reported having included *Section 84* provisions in their release. Both those who were revoked and those successful on release appeared confused about the purpose of *Section 84* release “I don't remember what the section 84 is for really”.

Release conditions

A strong majority of those revoked and returned to custody (87.5%) reported that their release conditions had a strong impact on their return to prison “it is to a point where they can nitpick - nitpick at any reason to throw me back in if they didn't like me.” Men were somewhat more likely to report a negative impact of their conditions (Men: 88.1%; Women: 81.8%) on their revocation. Among those successful on release, a majority of the study participants reported that their release conditions did not have an impact on their release, “I mean, I knew there was

going to be these conditions. Really, compared to a lot of people, my conditions are easy. So, I mean consequences for actions and these are mine.”

Relationship with parole officer

Among those successful on release, positive relationships with and support from the parole officer were most commonly mentioned, as “the best thing that happened to me, I don't know, I ended up with a pretty good parole officer” and “I think my parole officer realized my potential more than I did at the time. I just kept my nose down and kept plugging away at what I needed to do to be successful.” On the other hand, those returned to custody reported less positive relationships with parole officers, “At first I thought she was okay, right. But then last time, she got like more nosey and more like strict”, and “she was actually nice to begin with ... but now like closer to the end like recently she's turning out to be so rude, disrespectful, like non-empathetic.”

Those successful on release were most likely to express the view that the release planning process and the role of the parole officer are secondary to the individual commitment to change:

I really believe it's all on the person. I truly believe that. You can give somebody all the support you can possibly give them but if they don't wanna change or if they don't want a better life, they are not going to have one. Everybody gets, I believe, the same support like they all get a PO, they all get a team, but its whether you follow the rules... It's all on the person. I believe their parole officer and the team is doing their part, so it's all on you.

Social networks and connections

Overall, those revoked while on release and those successful in the community do not differ significantly from one another with respect to receiving support from family, friends or intimate partners while on release, or with respect to childcare responsibilities. Women who were successful on release (Successful Women: 100%) are most likely to report receiving support from family members, while women who were revoked reported the least amount of support from family members (Revoked Women: 50%). When they were supportive, family members provided a wide range of assistance, including “emotional support”, “helped financially”, accommodation, and transportation: “They helped me let's see they helped me like with a roof to stay over my head when I first got out until I got everything in order.” At the same time, those revoked while on release observed that contact with family members could pose a risk for problems while on release: “son smokes a little bit of weed” and “my sister has criminal charges, outstanding charges and stuff”, or, “I cut myself off from everybody, that's everybody that's a bad influence on me, like my family - cuz my family, one side of my family's all like

gang members and stuff like that, so I cut them out.”

Fewer than half the participants in the two studies reported being in an intimate relationship at the time of their interview. Among those successful on release, fewer than one-third (28.1%) reported that their intimate partner helped with their release planning, with women (Successful Women: 16.7%; Successful Men: 35.7 %) least likely to report receiving support from an intimate partner. A majority of participants expressed the view that involvement with an intimate partner posed a risk for success in the community, or can be just too difficult to negotiate:

At first, yeah [it was a source of comfort and support] ... It got toxic pretty close to the end.” and “The girl I was with on released ended up being a basket case ... a closet case. What I mean by that is I found out that she used to do Coke and stuff at home by herself. And I didn't know this. So, when I found out, it caused a lot of problems near the end.

For me to be able to go to their house, this guy has to come to their home. So, that means that I have to bring my parole officer to a woman's home, where she might have a kid, you know what I mean, or whoever there. And I have to bring a man to her door to walk around her home, to inspect it, to make sure that it's suitable for me to be there, you know what I mean? You tell me if that helps with your relationship or how many people are going to be okay with that or how lucky do you have to be to find a girl that's good looking, has a personality you have chemistry with, you get along with, you can trust her and she's going to be okay with all that. You tell me if that's going to be easy.

Two-thirds of the participants in the studies reported having children, though only about one-half reported having children living with them, and fewer than one-quarter acted as a primary care-giver for their children while on release. Among those revoked and returned to custody, many expressed the view that children were a positive impact on their release, “a source of comfort and support, cuz it gives me a purpose”, though “damaged” relationships with children could also be a very stressful factor impacting on their release;

I mean yeah it's very stressful definitely when I think about it. It definitely bothers me like I should be there to help them but I can't it's very stressful ... I'm 27 right now and I'm losing my damn hair I'm going to be bald by 30.

For those successful on release, relationships with children living with them were described in positive terms, as “awesome, fun definitely fun”, though “estranged” relationships with children they did not live with was a source of stress:

It's good. I don't know how to explain it. It's good. I mean, we don't have any issues [with the children living with me]. I have issues with my son. He's a drug addict. So, I don't really have a relationship.

They're just different kids. I mean they have their own life. I haven't been there, so it is

not like they look to me for anything...and there is nothing I can do for them, so my hands are tied even though I would jump through 15 different hoops for CFS, they still screwed me at the end, so I gave up on it.

Most of the participants in the two studies reported socializing with friends, though men (Successful Women: 72.2%; Successful Men: 57.1%) and Indigenous offenders (Successful Indigenous: 53.8%; Successful Non-Indigenous: 65.6%) who were successful on release were least likely to report socializing with friends on a regular basis. Among those successful on release, making new, prosocial friends was often cited as an important source of social support while struggling to adjust to life in the community:

Now I'm starting to have good friends, new friends where I work and stuff like that ... the friends that I used to have before were just to get high, to party with. That was my friends before. Now I have friends to go to a festival and enjoy and have fun and laugh and, you know, having a good time. Of course it's positive because I can be like, well, you know, this is great. Like I don't need nobody just to get high and, you know, just to go and lock myself up in a house and do drugs all night. There's more interesting things that we can do.

On the other hand, the risks that socializing with friends and associates could pose for failure on release was a common theme among those returned to custody “Yes having friends affected my time on release and return to custody: they were a bad influence” and some noted they hung out with friends they knew were a bad influence simply because they had no alternative sources of support or friendship: “My son understands that I'm in jail and he knows, and I just explained to him ... the reasoning: because I have bad friends. And he's like well I guess you need new friends now.”

Education, employment and finances

Most the participants in the two studies reported receiving education or skills upgrading while incarcerated, though fewer than half of those who were revoked (40.6%) believed that had any impact on their success/failure while on release. On the other hand, many of those successful on release expressed positive views about their education or skills training, even if it did not always lead to a job:

It's been positive. I mean I haven't used it to my advantage or anything. I am just, it gives me good, what's the word I'm looking for? Sorry, I'm not that good with my words. Confidence to be able to say that I did that, you know. To tell my kids that, even though I was inside, I was trying to be positive and do things to better myself.

Compared to those revoked and returned to prison, those successful on release were statistically significantly more likely ($\chi^2(1, n = 110) = 10.089, p = 0.001$) to report having

received education or skills upgrading while in the community, though again, most expressed the view that the courses they took did not necessarily lead directly to finding a job: “affect my release? Not really. Like anything that you do and accomplish it brings you a sense of satisfaction that you accomplished something. So, I guess in a way that way, yeah.”

Those successful on release were statistically significantly more likely to report having received help in finding a job on release ($X^2(1, n = 109) = 19.900, p = 0.000$), with case workers, parole officers, friends, family and former employers being most frequently cited as help sources. Among those revoked and returned to prison, their experience with finding employment was markedly different:

A lot of the jobs I applied for, because they were welding or shop jobs and stuff like that, a lot of them said we have criminals here you can't work here. So it ruined a lot of my interactions out there. I couldn't get a job anywhere, anywhere I applied at least ... I just got my welding ticket last time I was in. When I was in, I passed the welding course. So I applied for a lot of welding ... of construction type of jobs. A lot of those types of jobs have criminals that work with them.

About half of the study participants held a full-time job on release, with successful releases slightly more likely (Revoked: 48.1%; Successful: 54.3%) to have held a full-time job, but proportionately much more likely (Revoked: 29.7%; Successful: 50.0%) to have worked a majority of the time while on release. Most of the participants reported that they liked the job they had while on release. Among those successful on release, most agreed that having employment played a significant role in being successful on release in the community, in providing activity, structure, responsibility and income:

It gives you something to do during the day, so you're not out gallivanting around or getting into trouble. And it gives you financial support. And it gives you something to work towards as well.

Part of it is responsibility you know I am responsible to my employer but also it is earning money and being able to pay bills and also have some entertainment.

Few of the participants, either revoked or successful on release, cited finances or inability to make ends meet as a problem during their release: “At first, obviously cause I was only making like \$300 a week. But now, like I am able to maintain. I'm able to because now I have to do the financial disclosure. So, I see where my spending habits are and what needs to be cut back.” On the other hand, having too much money could be a problem “I didn't have to pay rent or pay for food and I got to use the car and didn't have to pay for gas. So it was very easy for me to fall back into the addiction, because I had money.”

Community functioning

Those successful on release rated the safety of their accommodation and their neighbourhood statistically significantly more positive ($X^2(1, n = 110) = 46.215, p = 0.000$) than those revoked and returned to prison, with women most likely to report living in a safe and stable environment. Most of those successful on release reported living in a private residence, most often with a parent, partner and/or child, grandparent, sibling, cousin or unrelated persons, and the neighbourhood was described positively “It's a very healthy environment. There's lots of walking trails and not a bunch of crack heads around.” Those returned to custody were more likely to report living in halfway houses or other shared accommodation, often with others they believed posed a risk for their reoffending:

Thing I kind of found funny was like all my conditions it says to not associate with these people and they're putting me in an environment where I'm surrounded by these people 24/7 so I don't know how I'm supposed to like I said some of these conditions were just totally unrealistic and yeah I had a hard time trying to understand and deal with them.

Those successful on release were proportionately less likely to report a lot of crime or substance misuse where they lived (Revoked: 51.6%; Successful: 41.3%). While those successful on release described their neighbourhood in positive terms, those revoked and returned to custody were more likely to report that their neighbourhood was “kind of a skid row neighborhood” and “every time I got off the bus I was offered drugs.”

Those successful on release reported having good access to community resources, including a family physician, mental health supports, reliable transportation and technology: “I think it helps immensely [having a car] because it helps you get everywhere you need... and it helps you to help with your family and little ones. It is really a lot of stress off everyone, you being able to drive and whatnot.” At the same time, those successful on release were statistically significantly more likely to report being involved with CSC programs while in the community ($X^2(1, n = 109) = 8.037, p = 0.005$), and more than half (56.5%) reported attending non-CSC programs, though most of the participants reported that the programs they attended did not affect their release, at least not directly:

I mean it [the programing] helps you to analyze everything, you know, and to help you to stop and think about the consequences of your actions. But like I said, like it didn't really help me. Like for me, the most help that I had it was the time that I did.

Those successful on release reported their involvement in leisure activities in the community positively, as “you have to have things to do. You don't want to be staying home all

the time. It is not good”, while those who were returned to custody generally viewed their lack of involvement in leisure activities as contributing to their lack of success “If I had something to do, then I wouldn’t have gotten so caught up and been where I had been to get arrested.”

Substance misuse

Compared to those successful on release, offenders revoked and returned to custody were statistically significantly more likely to report problems with substance misuse while on release ($X^2(1, n = 108) = 9.279, p = 0.002$), with women (Women: 86.4%; Men: 78.6%) and those with Indigenous ancestry (Indigenous: 90.6%; Non-Indigenous: 71.9%) most likely to report problems. A number of those revoked pointed to release conditions applied to those with substance misuse problems as virtually guaranteeing a return to custody, arguing that “They need to . . . be a lot more compassionate when it comes to drug addicts.” A similar perspective on the risks posed by substance misuse was expressed by successful release participants:

Being drug free, no weed or whatever. No drinking, none of that. Being around people that are actually doing things for themselves . . . so positive people. Not being around the same crowd I was with when I was in.

In the wrong situations, yeah I'm pretty, like I've never gotten both feet into addiction but I've always known that the potential was there and I've certainly blown more than one pay cheque and been stupid broke and not been able to pay rent because I spent it all on crack.

Attitudes toward justice system

A strong majority (S: 87.0%) of those successful in the community expressed acceptance of the decisions and instructions of the criminal justice system with respect to their status as an offender, though most also expressed a negative opinion of the system itself:

I feel like it is built to maintain a cycle...a negative cycle to keep people who come in contact with it in it permanently I feel like it is a reoccurring repetitive cycle that's what I feel, I feel like once they get in that cycle they just want them to stay there by any means necessary and that's how it works.

Similarly, those returned to custody expressed overwhelmingly negative views about the criminal justice system:

I think they are confused as to whether they are going to be like an American system, and jail everyone forever, or whether they want to actually help people. They don't know what they're doing. They don't have a clue what they are doing. They just know every April is a new budget and we have to get more money.

Personal/emotional characteristics

A majority of those returned to custody reported feelings of impulsivity (64.1%) and difficulty dealing with stressful situations (59.4%):

I get bored very easily. So, if I get frustrated, I'm bored. Here it comes back to money. If I had no money to go anywhere, to go to the gym, or go to the mall, you get frustrated and you start, you're stuck. It's crazy. You're free on the street, but you're stuck you don't feel free.

Among those successful on release, most (95.7%) reported being motivated to remain successful, and most (93.5%) expressed the belief that they would continue to be successful “With a successful job that I like doing, most likely being able to have a place on my own and be living with my children.”

Culture & spirituality

Most of the participants in the two studies expressed that they considered themselves a spiritual person, though with those with Indigenous ancestry were most likely to report being a spiritual person (Revoked Indigenous:90.6%; Successful Indigenous: 92.3). Among those successful on release, those with Indigenous ancestry were most likely (Successful Indigenous: 76.9%) to report being connected to their culture, though less than half of Indigenous persons (Successful Indigenous: 46.2%) reported using any cultural resources in the community. Still, some pointed to a positive impact of making a connection to Indigenous culture: “the Aboriginal healing...to help me connect with my native...my Indigenous background” and “I guess really goes back to the Aboriginal healing program because it's a safe place to talk with no worrying about what people are going to think of you.”

Half (Successful Indigenous: 50%) of those with Indigenous ancestry successful on release had a *Section 81* transfer or *Section 84* release, though most expressed the view that it did not have any real affect on their release “No, I don't think that had really any help.” Those with Indigenous ancestry revoked and returned to prison reported being unsure about what a *Section 81* transfer or *Section 84* release was or would do for them, “I don't remember what the section 84 is for really” and “[It is] like, really basic, and not personal to me. It was, yeah, already set out as a template.”

Participant Verbal Responses to Open-Ended Questions About Community Release Experiences

As components of both the revocations and successful releases interview protocols, a number of open-ended questions were posed to the participants by the interviewers. Making use of the NVivo 12 (QSR International, 2018) qualitative analysis software, participant responses were coded and categorized by major themes.

Explanations for failure or success on community release

Among those who were revoked and returned to prison, substance misuse was the most often cited reason for their return, resulting both in breaches of conditions and new charges for criminal activity.

I couldn't find a job that paid enough to pay the bills even an apartment a two-bedroom apartment cost me \$1,200 a month and when you're only making \$16 an hour it's kind of hard to so I ended up doing illegal activities and then it's easier to do illegal activities when your high on drugs so...

Breaches of conditions, including claims that parole officers are either too strict or not providing sufficient support, were the second most commonly reported reason for revocation:

I tried to reach out to her I tried to be honest with her [parole officer] you know. I'm not going to be able next time. I can't open up to her like I did before because she'll just send me back here you know like I might relapse once or twice but that's because I'm a recovering addict it's going to happen I'm going to have those moments where I'm going to relapse especially if you're not getting treatment right and it's going to be an accident. The part where it should become a problem is when I go on the run. I'm doing it everyday I'm stuff like that that's different then just doing it one time and being honest about it.

A number of those revoked also observed that, by their very design, CSC-administered programs often put together individuals who pose a risk for each other:

I can understand the drugs or drinking because that is going to be, it led to my crime. They're going to have that there. But when there is certain parts and I can't be around people, that made it a little awkward because they were putting me around the people.

Other reasons given for failure on release included barriers to being able to find good, stable employment, the stress of managing finances, lack of access to transportation and the issue of being honest with one's parole officer:

I didn't talk about my stress to my PO, and stuff like that. I felt like he was going to throw me back in here for saying the wrong shit. It's like I never been on parole before, I was just thinking like what if I say the wrong thing to this guy.

A number of those interviewed also noted problems with racist attitudes, especially toward Indigenous persons, including "it's hard [to find a job] when you're an Aboriginal" and, from the perspective of one successful release participant:

I had a job lined up I had family support I had lots of friends support and I had a place to live... and no previous substance abuse issues. So that's probably, as well, and I would argue that being Caucasian would also be a factor. Because you see a lot of guys that are successful most of them are Caucasian and the ones that tend to fail are First Nations. Their background 100% when you are raised in a shitty situation and you don't have family and all that it seems that to be that the first nations in Saskatchewan don't have that so you see a lot of a lot of them fail.

In contrast to those revoked and returned to custody, those successful in the community most often cited the support they received from family members, from their parole officer, counsellors, friends, and even former employers as critical to their success: “Well I I’m successful because I built up a good community support system inside prison and they, when I got parole, they were there to help me”, and:

In the community I think the biggest success has been having a parole officer that actually has a good relationship with me. He makes sure that I am still following my conditions and he makes sure that I am doing I’m doing everything right, but he will actually talk to me and ask me how my week was.

The second most common reason given by those successful on release for their being successful in the community was attitude: “I was successful because basically I came out with the attitude of staying out and I got myself a job and started involving myself with the community” and “You have to make the choice. Either you’re ready for it or you’re not ready for it and, if you’re not ready for it, then yes you’re going to be caught up in the system and you’re going to feel that the system is failing you and setting you up.” Employment was the third most common reason given for success. For those successful on release, employment provided structure, positive relationships, and financial resources: “Having a job is number one, so you have some financial support there. Support from my parents, support from my friends...” and “I am living with my family and I’m doing work making \$100 a day and everything is good.”

Among those successful on release, access to and use of programs and treatment services was a fourth reason commonly given for success:

Well I think a long story short, I made the decision . . . that I would never reoffend again. Certainly, as far as that goes, excuse me my restrictions are limited there’s not a diction issue there that sort of thing so thankfully I don’t have that to battle with I have had astounding support it’s been positive all along the way from corrections to what’s in the community I have a COSA.

I did therapy while I was in prison it taught me it helps me to get out of my negative thinking it helps me to escape I used to escape into a fantasy world and do a lot of fantasizing because I wasn’t happy with myself with the way my life is going and I was very insecure when I committed the crimes that I did. Right on and so I got a lot of good therapy some bad therapy too but I spent many years in therapy and I changed my thinking I learned to identify the risk situations and try to avoid them and I’m pretty good at it now and I set up a support system in the community here.

Barriers to successful transition into community

Among those revoked and returned to prison, a number of barriers to making a successful transition into the community were noted, including “loneliness”, “anxiety”, “changes in

technology”, financial concerns “you only get \$7 a day \$70 a week” and, in particular, lack of access to transportation, which could be tied to other problems: “\$64 a week, like what are you supposed to do with that? A bus cost \$2 or \$3 now, like fuck man”, “A lot of us failed because we don't have transportation to our jobs...” and:

Yeah, it was a safety thing because like I needed a mode of like transportation, I needed a person that I can call everyday, that can come and get me so I can go and do things during like the day, so I wouldn't have to...like be alone in this place. So yeah, like I wanted to initiate this friendship because he had a vehicle and that, he was a very nice person, like seemed to have been a very nice person. And yeah, he could have been like the person that I could call on to help me. Kind of just be there for me...so I'm not alone. That's what I was kind of like thinking would come out of that friendship. But it turned out to, you know, really come back on me in a very bad way. But it was all I knew. I didn't know anybody else in Vancouver and, you know, I literally had, I was very, I guess I would say desperate for another friend in Vancouver that would be there, that I could call every single day and come and spend time with me and actually like pick me up, so I wouldn't have to go anywhere myself.

Release conditions were frequently cited by those revoked and returned to custody as a barrier to community integration, especially with curfews, travel restrictions and prohibitions on associating with family members and friends limiting their ability to find emotional supports in the community. Another important limitation noted was the stigma of being a criminal: “I was trying to work, but when I told them I had a criminal, well they asked me if I had a criminal record and I said yes, and then they never called me back. It happened a lot” and “They wouldn't give me my medication unless I admitted that I did drugs. When I went out to the hospital, they had me tell the doctor that I was on drugs.”

Among those successful on release, the capacity to overcome barriers was a dominant theme:

Being drug free, no weed or whatever. No drinking, none of that. Being around people that are actually doing things for themselves ...so positive people. Not being around the same crowd I was with when I was in.

You have to have balance you got to find work you have to ask for help sometimes and you have to do things that relieve stress like exercising or you no hobbies now I do volunteer I'm so that helps that builds relationships so...

Substance misuse and mental health

Among those revoked and returned to custody, the perception that there is a “zero tolerance for relapse” by parole officers was a common theme:

Well, you've got a guy who is an ex-alcoholic or ex drug addict walking through the main street of alcoholic and drug addict City. You know? I would live downtown from it but it

still makes it complicated when you walk around and smell that pot and you think that would be nice to smoke but, I can't because I will go back to jail. You know? So, you can't right- you know - but yeah I wrestled with those everyday.

I can understand no drugs but there should be something in effect that helps you out there or maybe come back for 30 to 90 days and then get another chance not just completely throw you back in jail and just leave you there. There's no, they don't do anything to help you. They just throw you back in jail and then, when your new statutory release, comes you try again.

At the same time, those returned to custody expressed they believed there was a need for more mental health supports when returning to the community:

I feel like if they actually supported me in my mental health and helped me. Like cuz when I'm in a state of anxiety, I'm not going to say yes, let's go to the hospital let's go do this, you know. I need somebody who's going to say 'you know what, you're not doing well right now, how about we go to the hospital? Let's see what's going on with you, see if we can figure something out.' I shouldn't have to have to gauge that alone by myself . . . I feel like that would help me. For them to recognize that I was having a difficult time, even though I verbalized this to them. They weren't actually seeing it and taking it as a serious thing and helping me get to those supports that would help me stay out there.

For those successful on release in the community, fewer reported having issues with substance misuse: “No, not at all. Well in the past I smoked pot when I was a kid growing up. I drink booze but I didn't drink when I was out for four years. I didn't drink while I was out” and “I wouldn't say I do. I mean smoking marijuana is substance abuse. No, I wouldn't consider that a drug problem.”

Similarly, fewer of those successful on release reported having a need for mental health services, relying instead on other sources of support:

Well I never really spoke to anybody really other than my PO, if I'm feeling some type a way, or my mom. So, I've never gone out to actually seek professional help, but I've dealt with it in other ways.

Coping skills

A majority of those revoked and returned to custody reported acting impulsively (64.1%), and having a hard time dealing with stress (59.4%). Women were especially likely to report acting impulsively (Revoked Women: 68.2%; Revoked Men: 59.5%) and to have a hard time dealing with stress (Revoked Women: 81.8%; Revoked Men: 45.2%). Poor decision-making making a common theme:

Well during that binge during when I was drinking these girls showed up and told me they had some cash and whatever and they would take me out shopping. And they promised me that we'd be back before my curfew the next day...it didn't happen.

So what happened was I was driving in front of mine to Regina and I accidentally ingested his methadone he had in the back seat. So I was charged with driving under the influence and dangerous driving so of course right away they revoked me and they brought me here and then through court process it all came forward that it was accidental and all charges got dropped and yet they still wouldn't release me.

Among those successful on release, experiences with decision-making and handling stress were expressed more positively:

I also think about who I want to be and the person I want to be and all of these things combined makes it so I don't make any stupid decisions.

I could play guitar. I can hug my son. I can ask for help. I go for a drive and be with nature. I do some of the things that I've learned through the elders sometimes. Staying busy is the best thing.

Almost all of those successful on release reported being motivated to remain in the community (S: 95.7%), believing they would continue to be successful (S: 93.5%), and most described themselves in positive terms: "Well, from where I was to where I am today, I am very positive. I can talk a lot better now. I am more outgoing and I'm a hard worker" and "I am a work in progress. I've come a long way from where I'm coming from and I'm very ambitious, determined, driven, and just trying to live my best life and help others while I succeed."

The future

Those revoked and returned to custody expressed a number of sometimes conflicting ideas about what they would do differently in the future when released again into the community:

No matter what, I'll be honest and upfront. I would call and tell my parole officer I'm going to detox, I'm not high, but I'm going to get high and can you come see me at detox.

I am not going to volunteer information to CSC ever again. If they ask me, I'll tell them. I won't hide stuff from them. But I will never trust in them to do what the right thing would be, because they have proved they won't do it.

Well right now I'm in the process of applying for rehab and after that I would like to go to the silver living whatever it's called and then after that I really want to get my own place so I can finally get my daughter and I did call my school and they will welcome me back.

I'm definitely going to set myself up by myself to a mental health connection that's not within the CSC. I'm going to definitely look into my mental health options and get my resources together and my supports together so I can be successful.

For those successful on release in the community, perspectives on the future were overwhelmingly positive:

I don't know if I really have any long-term goals I just want to be still working and maybe saving some money I don't really have plans on buying a house or any of that kind of stuff just when I get too old and want to be able to retire and relax.

I would like to see myself go to school or already have a career and I would like a home, not renting. I don't want to rent.

With a successful job that I like doing, most likely being able to have a place on my own and be living with my children.

I would like to have myself my own place with my own landscaping company.

Discussion

Overview of findings

Comparison of the results from the qualitative study of federal offenders revoked and returned to custody ($N = 64$) with the qualitative study of federal offenders successful on release in the community ($N=48$) confirms many of the findings previously reported in other quantitative and qualitative studies of community release, while at the same time highlighting the need to better account for the interactions between different risk and positive factors as these contribute to the experiences of offenders on release in the community.

Statistically significant differences in the distribution of demographic and offender characteristics among the participants in the two qualitative studies demonstrate that younger age, Indigenous ancestry, statutory release, higher levels of criminogenic need, employment needs, personal/emotional needs and substance abuse needs are correlated with revocation and return to custody, findings supported by other quantitative (Staton et al., 2019; Stewart et al., 2015; Farrell MacDonald, 2018; Ostermann, 2015; Polaschek et al., 2018; Serin et al., 2013; Severson, Veeh, Bruns & Lee, 2012; Thompson et al., 2015; Yukhnenko et al., 2019) and qualitative (Johnson, 2015; Western, Braga, Davis & Sirois, 2015) studies.

Findings from the comparison of interviewer ratings of participant responses to the interview protocol questions reveal a number of statistically significant differences between participants in the two studies. In contrast to those successful on release, those revoked and returned to custody were significantly more likely to be rated as experiencing substance abuse, education/vocational, accommodation, use of community programs, leisure time and involvement with cultural/spiritual identity as having a negative impact on their release, findings supported in other quantitative (Bucklen & Zajac, 2009; Gutierrez, Wilson, Rugge, & Bonta, 2013; McKendy & Ricciardelli, 2019; Olson, Stalans & Escobar, 2016; Stahler et al., 2013; Staton et al., 2019) and qualitative (Bowman & Travis Jr., 2012; Cobbina, 2010; Weiss, Hawkins & Despinos, 2010) studies. Those revoked and returned to custody were significantly more likely than those successful on release to be rated as experiencing intimate relationships and support from children as having a positive impact on their release, while those successful on release were likely to recognize these as potentially problematic for making a successful transition to living in the community. Instead, those successful on release were more likely to perceive family support,

especially from parents and siblings, for making possible a successful transition into the community, to housing, employment, transportation, programs, recreational and emotional support. Quantitative (Berg & Huebner, 2011; Duwe & Clark, 2011; Spjeldnes, Jung, Maguire & Yamatanit, 2012; Taylor, 2015) and qualitative (Davis et al., 2012; Rodermond, Kruttschnitt, Slotboom & Bijleveld, 2016; Stewart et al., 2015) studies report that the quality of intimate partner and family supports is the operative factor in failure or success on community release.

Participant responses to the main protocol factors screening questions show that those revoked and returned to custody were statistically significantly less likely to have received help with release planning while incarcerated, to have been involved in education/upgrading while on release, to have had help finding employment in the community, to have safe and stable accommodation, to have been involved in CSC programs while on release, and to have avoided substance abuse, findings supported in other quantitative (Dickson, Polaschek & Casey, 2013; Richards, 2016; Visher, Lattimore, Barrick & Tueller, 2017) and qualitative (Bunn, 2019; Iudici, Boccato, & Faccio, 2018) studies.

The results derived from that qualitative analysis of participants' verbal responses support the findings from the demographic and offender characteristics, interviewer ratings and main protocol factors screening questions comparisons, but introduce a number of additional factors for consideration when assessing readiness for community release, and highlight the interaction between different factors in undermining or supporting release.

Among those successful on release, a majority (80.4%) reported having made a conscious decision not to get involved in criminal activity before they were released into the community. Attitude was a recurrent theme, in particular the recognition that it is up to the individual to make success happen. The important role that prosocial identity change plays in desistance from crime has received support in other quantitative (LaCourse, Johnson Listwan, Reid & Hartman, 2019; Rocque, Posick & Paternoster, 2016) and qualitative (Cobbina, 2010; Doherty et al., 2014; Liem & Richardson, 2014) studies.

Though less than half of the participants in the revocations and successful release studies were interviewer-rated to have experienced release planning as a positive impact on their release, those successful on release were significantly more likely to report having received help in making a release plan, and described their release plan, transition into the community, and relationship with their parole officer in much more positive terms (Heidemann, Cederbaum &

Martinez, 2014). Still, most participants reported they received little help from the institution in developing a release plan.

Among those revoked and returned to custody, the barriers they confronted with their release conditions, and perceived inflexible parole officers watching out for violations of conditions, were a consistent theme, coupled with the view that the criminal justice system is unfair and stacked against offenders: “It is a business. Once they get you in their sights, it's all about, you know, repeat customers”, sentiments reported in other studies (Bowman & Travis Jr., 2012).

The role of family in community release, including relationships with parents, siblings, intimate partners and children, is complex. Among those successful on release, family support from parents (especially mothers) and siblings is frequently reported as critical to success in supporting release plans, finding employment, financial support, good accommodation, transportation and emotional support, a finding frequently reported in other quantitative and qualitative studies (Bahr et al., 2010; Davis, Bahr & Ward, 2012; Dues & Clark, 2011). On the other hand, among those revoked and returned to custody, family support was often described in more problematic terms: “I cut myself from everybody, that's everybody that's a bad influence on me, like my family—cuz my family, one side of my family's all like gang members and stuff like that, so I cut them out” and “No, well they were positive support, but like I said I felt bad sometimes, you know, driving me here, getting me A to B, helping me with these things, could be the smallest little thing.” As a result of the less positive family support they received, those revoked and returned to custody were consequently more likely to report problems in finding employment, good accommodation, finances, and accessing transportation. At the same time, while those revoked and returned to custody were significantly more likely to be interviewer-rated as experiencing support from intimate partners and children as a positive factor, those successful on release were more likely to recognize the risk that intimate partners and children could pose for their success on release (Davis et al., 2012; Rodermond et al., 2016).

As demonstrated in other quantitative (Thompson et al., 2015; Visher, Debus-Sherrill & Yahner, 2011) and qualitative research (Bahr et al., 2010), employment is a critical factor in sustaining successful release. Those successful on release were more likely to have received support in finding a job, to have found a full-time job, to have liked their job, and to have expressed positive opinions about the importance of their job to their success: “I know that it [my

job] is going to be what keeps me going and makes my future happen.” Those revoked while on release were more likely to describe their employment in problematic terms: “I’ve always sold drugs...I’ve never had a normal job” and “like the parole officer sometimes like doesn’t see you at work. So now I have to find a job that lets me leave for an hour twice a week...not many employers are willing to let you go.”

Among those successful in the community, willingness to seek out and become involved in community programs and resources, including treatment resources, was a distinguishing characteristic. Linked with prosocial attitudes, King (2013) refers to a growing sense of ‘agency’ and self-efficacy among those who end up being successful on release in the community: “I feel like you just need to really, really wrap your mind around the fact that things may not come right away. You have to be willing to put in the work the time. It’s all about focus and discipline” and “It has to be up to you to change. It has to be up to you as a person. You know what I mean? You have to be ready and you have to be wanting to change. Otherwise nothing is going to happen and nobody’s going to do nothing for you.”

Substance abuse was identified by participants in both of the studies as the most significant threat to being successful on release. The correlation between substance abuse and risk for revocation/recidivism has been well-established among all subgroups of offenders in other quantitative (Katsiyannis et al., 2018; Dowden & Brown, 2002; Dunbar & Helmus, 2014; Håkansson & Berglund, 2012; Serin et al., 2016; Stewart et al., 2017a; Thompson et al., 2015) and qualitative (Bahr et al., 2010; Davis et al., 2012; Doherty et al., 2014; Rodermond et al., 2016) research. However, participants in both studies argued that drug and alcohol problems cannot be addressed simply by imposing conditions on their use: “all my life I always had issues with drinking” and “crack cocaine since I was 14”. Better access to treatment, and greater flexibility in interpreting violations of release conditions “They need to ... be a lot more compassionate when it comes to drug addicts” could reduce the number of revocations, while at the same time allowing more time to for offenders to adjust and re-establish the supports necessary for successful release. Among those revoked and returned to custody, the need for better mental health care and supports in the community was a consistent theme, though rarely mentioned by those successful on release (Bowman & Travis Jr., 2012; Cloyes, Wong, Latimer & Abarca, 2010).

Women on community release

Compared to men and other women revoked and returned to custody, women successful on release were more likely to be interviewer-rated as expressing positive attitudes about desistance (Successful Women: 72.2%), and experiencing the release planning process (Successful Women: 50.0%), post-release support from CSC (Successful Women: 61.1%) and from others (Successful Women: 61.1%) as having a positive impact on their release. Women successful on release were more likely to be interviewer-rated as experiencing family support (94.4%), support from friends and associates (50%), and overall social support 77.8%) as having a positive impact on their release. Women successful on release were also more likely to be rated as experiencing education/upgrading (44.4%), finances (72.2%), accommodation (94.4%), community programs (33.3%), community services (88.9%), attitudes toward criminal justice system (38.9%), self-identity (77.8%), coping skills (61.1%) and cultural/spiritual identity (66.7%) as having a positive impact on their release. The important role that family, peer and community supports play in successful re-entry for women offenders is consistently reported in other research (Heidemann, Cederbaum & Martinez, 2016; Pettus-Davis, Veeh, Davis & Tripodi, 2018; Staton et al., 2019; Taylor, 2015).

Compared to men and women successful on release, women revoked and returned to custody were interviewer-rated as more likely to experience the relationship with their parole officer as having none (50.0%) or a negative (31.8%) impact on their release. Women who were revoked were also rated as more likely to report a negative impact of family support (36.4%), support from friends/associates (45.5%), employment (40.9%), finances (18.2%), accommodation (40.9%), leisure (63.6%), avoidance of substance misuse (68.2%) and personal/emotional problems (77.3%), suggesting that women returned to custody may be representative of an especially vulnerable group of offenders with high rates of substance misuse combined with lack of prosocial supports in the community (Ferguson, 2015; Shantz, Kilty & Frigon, 2009; Matheson, Doherty & Grant, 2011).

Women's responses to the protocol screening questions describe a similar result: compared to men and to women returned to custody, women successful on release reported a higher proportion of prosocial attitudes about desistance (88.9%) and belief in their success on community release (94.4%), along with receiving help from institutional staff with developing a release plan (66.7%), help from others in the community with transition (72.2%), support from

family (100%) and help from children with release (44.8%). Women successful on release were also more likely to report receiving education/upgrading while in community (50.0%), help with finding employment (72.2%), safe and stable accommodation (100%), access to family physician (83.3%), mental health supports (72.2%), reliable transportation (100%), and access to technology (100%). In addition, women successful on release were more likely to report involvement in non-CSC programs while in the community (55.6%), accepting decisions of the criminal justice system (88.9%), being connected to their culture (61.1%), being a spiritual person (88.9%) and using cultural resources in the community (16.7%).

In contrast, women revoked and returned to custody were more likely to report not having a release plan (18.2%), that their release plan was not realistic (18.2%), that things did not go according to plan when in the community (59.1%) and that they did not receive support from family (45.5%). On the other hand, women who were revoked were more likely to report having children (68.2%) but less likely to have any of the children living with them (54.5%). Like their male counterparts revoked and returned to custody, more than two-thirds of revoked women (68.2%) reported they did not have help in finding employment in the community, were more likely (36.4%) to report they did not find a job, and less likely to have found stable employment (18.2%). In addition, women revoked and returned to custody were more likely to report living in unsafe, unstable accommodations (31.8%), to have not been involved in CSC programs in the community (59.1%), to act impulsively (68.2%), and have a hard time dealing with stressful situations (81.8%). Women returned to custody were more likely (86.4%) to report problems with substance misuse. Again, as reported in other research, women without strong family and community supports, and with substance misuse problems, are at high risk for revocation while on release: “I don't think I would have come back to jail if I live with my mom. I would have got to have been home with my family. I believe I never would go back to jail” (Ahmed & Keenan, 2016; Janssen et al., 2017; Johnson, 2015; Matheson et al., 2011).

Indigenous ancestry and community release

Among those with Indigenous ancestry, those successful on release were the least likely among any other group to report being involved in an intimate relationship (61.5%), most likely to report having access to mental health supports (76.9%), most likely to report being a spiritual person (92.3%) and to using cultural resources in the community (46.2%): “I guess really goes back to the Aboriginal healing program because it's a safe place to talk with no worrying about

what people are going to think of you.” Nearly half of those with Indigenous ancestry successful on release (46.2%) reported having a *Section 81* transfer or *Section 84* release.

On the other hand, compared to those with non-Indigenous ancestry or Indigenous ancestry successful on release, those with Indigenous ancestry revoked and returned to custody were more likely than any other group to report having had a release plan prior to release (90.6%) and for the release plan to have included *Section 84* planning (25.0%). Those with Indigenous ancestry who were revoked were also more likely than any other group to report having children (71.9%), but least likely to report being the primary caregiver (65.6%) or having children living with them (62.5%). At the same time, those with Indigenous ancestry who were returned to custody were more likely than any other group to report not having a job while on release (50%), and to have problems with substance misuse while on release (90.6%). A growing body of research supports the finding that the history of colonization and cultural assimilation imposed on those of Indigenous ancestry, combined with the unequal operations of the criminal justice system itself, make those with Indigenous ancestry particularly vulnerable for contact with the criminal justice system, and vulnerable to revocation when released (Gideon, 2013; Howell, 2008; Stewart et al., 2017b; Tremblay, 2017).

Among those with Indigenous ancestry overall, relatively few (12.5%) reported having a release plan that included *Section 81* transfer or *Section 84* release provisions, and fewer than half of those with Indigenous ancestry make use of cultural resources within their community. A recent review by Jeffries and Stenning (2014) questions the extent to which recent legislative and regulatory initiatives in Canada, Australia and New Zealand designed to address the over-representation and subsequent criminalization of those with Indigenous ancestry are effective, or taken seriously. Among those with Indigenous ancestry participating in the two qualitative studies reported here, few appeared to have been adequately informed about how *Section 81* or *Section 84* provisions could help with their release into the community: “Yeah, I don't know how because I don't remember it being shared that much. I just remember sitting with the community and accepting me out”, “Yeah [I was released from prison on a *Section 84*]. I don't think I probably would have needed it because I was low-risk and I never got in trouble” and:” don't remember what the section 84 is for really”.

Limitations of the Study

Sample selection bias (Smith & Noble, 2014; Rossi, Lipsey & Henry, 2019) may be

evident in the pre-existing differences in the distribution of demographic and offender characteristics between the two study samples, with those revoked and returned to custody demonstrating younger age, Indigenous ancestry, and higher levels of criminogenic, employment, personal/emotional and substance abuse need at intake compared to those successful on release, all of which have been shown to correlate with increased risk for recidivism (Polaschek et al., 2018; Serin et al., 2013; Staton et al., 2019; Stewart et al., 2015; Thompson et al., 2015; Yukhnenko et al., 2019). On the other hand, those successful on release in the community may inevitably at intake demonstrate lower risk of revocation on release, given evidence of their pre-existing protective factor strengths related to prosocial attitudes, family support, employment and community functioning (Cording & Christofferson, 2016; Coupland, 2015; Neil et al., 2019; Polaschek, et al., 2018). Whether the findings of the current study are confounded by selection bias, or whether any study of failure/success on community release reflects pre-existing risk/need differences among offenders, will require additional study to determine, perhaps in the form of a prospective study of offenders with matched risk/need levels at the time of release into the community

As qualitative studies, the sample sizes of the revocations ($N = 64$) and successful releases ($N = 48$) studies reported on here dictate that caution should be exercised in interpreting results, and only limited comparisons of the results by gender or Indigenous status can be made. Similarly, owing to the small sample sizes, it was not possible to examine regional differences in the community release experiences of the study participants. Nevertheless, the samples are larger than most qualitative studies of their kind. What is more, comparison of the study results with previously published quantitative and qualitative studies of revocation and successful release demonstrates a close concordance between results, suggesting that the findings from the current study are a generally valid representation of the experiences of offenders on conditional release in the community.

By their vary nature, qualitative studies are criticized for the use of researcher interpretation of verbal responses. However, use of two-person interview teams and two-person transcription, NVivo coding, and coding validation teams in both studies ensured that coding of qualitative responses was consistent, and open to review by multiple members of the research team.

Conclusions

Combining and analyzing the interviewer-rated, binary-scored responses and open-ended verbal responses from participants in the revocations and successful releases qualitative studies renders conclusions that both validate the findings from previous quantitative and qualitative studies, including the use of instruments combining both risk and protective factors to predict likelihood of revocation/recidivism, and which highlight the critical importance of social support, especially family support, to successful release into the community. Assuming that acceptance of responsibility for one's criminal behaviour and adoption of prosocial attitudes toward desistance and avoidance of substance misuse are at least in part a consequence of the rehabilitative programs and treatment offenders receive while incarcerated, it seems apparent from the study findings presented here that social support, especially family support, is the catalyst for making possible a successful transition into the community, to housing, employment, transportation, programs, recreational and emotional support – at least until individuals have time to build their own support systems. For women with substance misuse problems who lack social support systems, and for those with Indigenous ancestry with substance misuse problems who lack family and cultural/community supports, the risk for revocation is highest. Viewed from this perspective, the fundamental question for correctional rehabilitative treatment programs may then be – “How does one build positive social support systems where none now or previously existed” – if indeed revocations are to be turned into successful releases.

References

- Ahmed, R., & Keenan, K. (2016). *Beyond survival: A qualitative study of the impact of homelessness and incarceration on women's health final report*. Edmonton, Alta: Homeward Trust. Retrieved from homewardtrust.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Beyond-Survival-A-Qualitative-Study-of-the-Impact-of-Homelessness-and-Incarceration-on-Women%E2%80%99s-Health.pdf.
- Andershed, A. K., Gibson, C. L., & Andershed, H. (2016). The role of cumulative risk and protection for violent offending. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *45*, 78-84. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.02.006 0047-2352
- Bahr, S. J., Harris, L., Fisher, J. K., & Harker Armstrong, A. (2010). Successful reentry: What differentiates successful and unsuccessful parolees? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *54*(5), 667-692. doi: 10.1177/0306624X09342435
- Berg, M. T., & Huebner, B. M. (2011). Reentry and the ties that bind: An examination of social ties, employment, and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, *28*(2), 382-410. doi: 10.1080/07418825.2010.498383
- Bourgon, G., Mugford, R., Hanson, R. K., & Coligado, M. (2018). Offender risk assessment practices vary across Canada. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *60*(2), 167-205. doi: 10.3138/cjccj.2016-0024
- Bowman, S. W., & Travis Jr, R. (2012). Prisoner reentry and recidivism according to the formerly incarcerated and reentry service providers: A verbal behavior approach. *The Behavior Analyst Today*, *13*(3-4), 9-19.
- Brinkman, S. (2017). The interview. Pp. 576-599 in Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Brown, G.P., Greco, C., Barker, J., McMillan, K., Tiersma, G., Wardrop, K., & Stewart, L.A. (2019a). *In Their Own Words: Factors Associated with Revocation of Conditional Release Among Federal Offenders A Qualitative Study*. Unpublished Manuscript. Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Brown, G.P., Greco, C., Barker, J., McMillan, K., Tiersma, G., Wardrop, K., & Stewart, L.A. (2019b). *In Their Own Words Part II: Factors Associated with Successful Community Release Among Federal Offenders Preliminary Findings from the Qualitative Study*. Unpublished Manuscript. Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Brown, S.L. & Motiuk, L.L. (2005). *The Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) Component of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) Process: A Meta-Analytic, Psychometric and Consultative Review*. (Research Report R-164). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.

- Bucklen, K. B., & Zajac, G. (2009). But some of them don't come back (to prison!) Resource deprivation and thinking errors as determinants of parole success and failure. *The Prison Journal*, 89(3), 239-264. doi: 10.1177/0032885509339504
- Bunn, R. (2019). Intersectional needs and reentry: Re-conceptualizing 'multiple and complex needs' post-release. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 19(3), 328-345. doi: 10.1177/1748895817751828
- Cloyes, K. G., Wong, B., Latimer, S., & Abarca, J. (2010). Time to prison return for offenders with serious mental illness released from prison: A survival analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(2), 175-187. doi: 10.1177/0093854809354370
- Cobbina, J. E. (2010). Reintegration success and failure: Factors impacting reintegration among incarcerated and formerly incarcerated women. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 49(3), 210-232. doi: 10.1080/10509671003666602
- Cording, J. R., & Christofferson, S. M. B. (2017). Theoretical and practical issues for the measurement of protective factors. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 32, 45-54. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2016.12.007 1359-1789
- Coupland, R. (2015). *An examination of dynamic risk, protective factors, and treatment-related change in violent offenders*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Saskatchewan).
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches – 5th Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davis, C., Bahr, S. J., & Ward, C. (2013). The process of offender reintegration: Perceptions of what helps prisoners reenter society. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 13(4), 446-469. doi: 10.1177/1748895812454748
- Desmarais, S. L., Johnson, K. L., & Singh, J. P. (2016). Performance of recidivism risk assessment instruments in US correctional settings. *Psychological Services*, 13(3), 206. doi: 10.1037/ser0000075
- Dickson, S. R., Polaschek, D. L., & Casey, A. R. (2013). Can the quality of high-risk violent prisoners' release plans predict recidivism following intensive rehabilitation? A comparison with risk assessment instruments. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 19(4), 371-389. doi: 10.1080/1068316X.2011.640634
- Doherty, S., Forrester, P., Brazil, A., & Matheson, F. I. (2014). Finding their way: Conditions for successful reintegration among women offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 53(7), 562-586. doi: 0.1080/10509674.2014.944740
- Dowden, C., & Brown, S. L. (2002). The role of substance abuse factors in predicting recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 8(3), 243-264. doi: 10.1080/106831602100015781

- Dunbar, L., & Helmus, L. (2014). Unlawfully at large: A profile of federal offenders who breach conditional release. (Research Report R-271). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Duwe, G., & Clark, V. (2013). Blessed be the social tie that binds: The effects of prison visitation on offender recidivism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 24(3), 271-296. doi: 10.1177/0887403411429724
- Farrell MacDonald, S. (2018). *Comparison of release conditions for Indigenous and non-Indigenous federal men offenders*. (RIB-18-10). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada
- Ferguson, C. (2015). Parole in Western Australia: An analysis of parole cancellations of female offenders. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, (501). Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Gideon, L.A. (2012). *Cognitive, criminogenic, and cultural styles of Aboriginal and Caucasian offenders in northern Ontario*. (Doctoral dissertation, Laurentian University Sudbury).
- Government of Canada (2014). *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. Ottawa: ON: Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research, Catalogue No: RR4-2/2014E-PDF
- Gutierrez, L., Wilson, H. A., Rugge, T., & Bonta, J. (2013). The prediction of recidivism with Aboriginal offenders: A theoretically informed meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 55(1), 55-99. doi: 10.3138/cjccj.2011.E.51
- Håkansson, A., & Berglund, M. (2012). Risk factors for criminal recidivism—a prospective follow-up study in prisoners with substance abuse. *BMC Psychiatry*, 12(1), 111. doi: 10.1186/1471-244X-12-111
- Hall, L. L. (2015). Correctional education and recidivism: Toward a tool for reduction. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 66(2), 4-29. doi: 10.2307/26507655
- Harding, D. J., Wyse, J. J., Dobson, C., & Morenoff, J. D. (2014). Making ends meet after prison. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33(2), 440-470. doi: 10.1002/pam.21741
- Heidemann, G., Cederbaum, J. A., & Martinez, S. (2014). “We Walk Through It Together”: The Importance of Peer Support for Formerly Incarcerated Women's Success. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 53(7), 522-542. doi: 10.1080/10509674.2014.944741
- Hoover, D. S., Pappadis, M. R., Housten, A. J., Krishnan, S., Weller, S. C., Giordano, S. H., ... & Volk, R. J. (2019). Preferences for communicating about breast cancer screening among racially/ethnically diverse older women. *Health Communication*, 34(7), 702-706. doi:

10.1080/10410236.2018.1431026

- Howell, T. (2008). *The point of no return: Aboriginal offenders' journey towards a crime free life*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia).
- IBM Corporation. (2019). *SPSS Statistics 26*. Somers, NY: IBM Corporation Software Group.
- Iudici, A., Boccato, F., & Faccio, E. (2018). Perspectives on recidivists: the views of detainees, the general public and people working with offenders. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 7(1), 60-75. doi: 10.5204/ijcjsd.v7i1.356
- Janssen, P. A., Korchinski, M., Desmarais, S. L., Albert, A. Y., Condello, L. L., Buchanan, M., ... & Leggo, C. (2017). Factors that support successful transition to the community among women leaving prison in British Columbia: A prospective cohort study using participatory action research. *CMAJ open*, 5(3), E717. doi: 10.9778/cmajo.20160165
- Jeffries, S., & Stenning, P. (2014). Sentencing, aboriginal offenders: law, policy, and practice in three Countries. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 56(4), 447-494. doi: 10.3138/cjccj/2014.503
- Johnson, Ida M. (2014). Economic impediments to women's success on parole: We need someone on our side. *The Prison Journal*, 94(3), 365-387. doi: 10.1177/0032885514537760
- Katsiyannis, A., Whitford, D. K., Zhang, D., & Gage, N. A. (2018). Adult recidivism in United States: A meta-analysis 1994–2015. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(3), 686-696. doi: 10.1007/s10826-017-0945-8
- King, S. (2013). Early desistance narratives: A qualitative analysis of probationers' transitions towards desistance. *Punishment & Society*, 15(2), 147-165. doi: 10.1177/1462474513477790
- LaCourse, Ashleigh, Shelley Johnson Listwan, Shannon Reid, and Jennifer L. Hartman. Recidivism and reentry: The role of individual coping styles. *Crime & Delinquency*, 65(1), 46-68. doi: 10.1177/0011128718790497
- Liem, M., & Richardson, N. J. (2014). The role of transformation narratives in desistance among released lifers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(6), 692-712. doi: 10.1177/009385
- Matheson, F. I., Doherty, S., & Grant, B. A. (2011). Community-based aftercare and return to custody in a national sample of substance-abusing women offenders. *American Journal of Public Health*, 101(6), 1126-1132. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2010.300094
- McKendy, L. & Ricciardelli, R. (2019). Women offenders under community supervision: comparing the profiles of returners and non-returners to federal prison. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 10: 875. doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2019.00875

- Morrow, K. M., Vargas, S., Rosen, R. K., Christensen, A. L., Salomon, L., Shulman, L., ... & Fava, J. L. (2007). The utility of non-proportional quota sampling for recruiting at-risk women for microbicide research. *AIDS and Behavior*, *11*(4), 586-595. doi: 10.1007/s10461-007-9213-z
- Neil, C., O'Rourke, S., Ferreira, N., & Flynn, L. (2020). Protective Factors in Violence Risk Assessment: Predictive Validity of the SAPROF and HCR-20V3. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, *19*(1), 84-102. doi: 10.1080/14999013.2019.1643811
- Olson, D. E., Stalans, L. J., & Escobar, G. (2016). Comparing male and female prison releasees across risk factors and postprison recidivism. *Women & Criminal Justice*, *26*(2), 122-144. doi: 10.1080/08974454.2015.1083930
- Ostermann, M. (2015). How do former inmates perform in the community? A survival analysis of rearrests, reconvictions, and technical parole violations. *Crime & Delinquency*, *61*(2), 163-187. doi: 10.1177/0011128710396425
- Pettus-Davis, C., Veeh, C.A., Davis, M. & Tripodi, S. (2018). Gender differences in experiences of social support among men and women releasing from prison. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *35*(9), 1161-1182. doi: 10.1177/0265407517705492
- Polaschek, D. L., Yesberg, J. A., & Chauhan, P. (2018). A year without a conviction: An integrated examination of potential mechanisms for successful reentry in high-risk violent prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *45*(4), 425-446. doi: 10.1177/0093854817752757
- QSR International (2018). NVivo 12 Pro. QSR International Pty Limited. Doncaster, Victoria, Australia. www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo/nvivo-products/nvivo-12-pro
- Richards, C. M. (2016). *You Can Get Prepared, But It's Still Scary Walking Out The Door: Exploring the Role of Dynamic Re-entry Factors in Release Planning for High-Risk Offenders*. (Master's thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, Australia).
- Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *11*(1), 25-41. doi: 10.1080/14780887.2013.801543
- Rodermond, E., Kruttschnitt, C., Slotboom, A. M., & Bijleveld, C. C. (2016). Female desistance: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Criminology*, *13*(1), 3-28. doi: 10.1177/1477370815597251
- Rocque, M., Posick, C., & Paternoster, R. (2016). Identities through time: An exploration of identity change as a cause of desistance. *Justice Quarterly*, *33*(1), 45-72. doi: 10.1080/07418825.2014.894111

- Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W. & Henry, G.T. (2019). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach 8th Edition*. Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.
- Severson, M. E., Veeh, C., Bruns, K., & Lee, J. (2012). Who goes back to prison; who does not: A multiyear view of reentry program participants. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 51*(5), 295-315. doi: 10.1080/10509674.2012.677944
- Serin, R. C., Lloyd, C. D., Helmus, L., Derkzen, D. M., & Luong, D. (2013). Does intra-individual change predict offender recidivism? Searching for the Holy Grail in assessing offender change. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*(1), 32-53. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.09.002
- Serin, R. C., Chadwick, N., & Lloyd, C. D. (2016). Dynamic risk and protective factors. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 22*(1-2), 151-170. doi: 10.1080/1068316X.2015.1112013
- Shantz, L., Kilty, J. M., & Frigon, S. (2009). Echoes of imprisonment: Women's experiences of “successful (Re) integration”. *Canadian Journal of Law & Society/La Revue Canadienne Droit et Société, 24*(1), 85-106. doi: 10.1017/S0829320100009789
- Smith, J., & Noble, H. (2014). Bias in research. *Evidence-based nursing, 17*(4), 100-101. doi: 10.1136/eb-2014-101946
- Sousa, S., Cardoso, J., & Cunhab, P. (2019). Risk and protective factors in criminal recidivist inmates. *Annals of Medicine, 51*(sup1), 184-184. doi: 10.1080/07853890.2018.1562754
- Spjeldnes, S., Jung, H., Maguire, L., & Yamatani, H. (2012). Positive family social support: Counteracting negative effects of mental illness and substance abuse to reduce jail ex-inmate recidivism rates. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 22*(2), 130-147. doi: 10.1080/10911359.2012.646846
- Stahler, G. J., Mennis, J., Belenko, S., Welsh, W. N., Hiller, M. L., & Zajac, G. (2013). Predicting recidivism for released state prison offenders: Examining the influence of individual and neighborhood characteristics and spatial contagion on the likelihood of reincarceration. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 40*(6), 690-711. doi: 10.1177/0093854812469609
- Staton, M., Dickson, M. F., Tillson, M., Webster, J. M., & Leukefeld, C. (2019). Staying Out: Reentry Protective Factors Among Rural Women Offenders. *Women & Criminal Justice, 29*(6), 368-384. doi: 10.1080/08974454.2019.1613284
- Stewart, L., Brine, K., Wilton, G., Power, J. & Hnain, C. (2015). *Resilience Factors related to Success on Release for Offenders with Mental Disorders*, (Research Report R-336). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Stewart, L. A., Wilton, G., & Sapers, J. (2016). Offenders with cognitive deficits in a Canadian \

prison population: Prevalence, profile, and outcomes. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 44, 7-14. doi: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2015.08.026 0160-2527

- Stewart, L. A., Wardrop, K., Wilton, G., Thompson, J., Derkzen, D., & Motiuk, L. (2017a). *Reliability and validity of the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised* (Research Report R-395). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Stewart, L. A., Wardrop, K., Wilton, G., Thompson, J., Derkzen, D., & Motiuk, L. (2017b). *Indigenous Offenders: Major Findings from the DFIA-R Research Studies* (Research at a Glance, September 2017). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Taylor, C. J. (2015). Gendered pathways to recidivism: differential effects of family support by gender. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 25(3), 169-183. doi: 10.1080/08974454.2014.989305
- Thompson, J., Forrester, T., & Stewart, L. (2015). *Factors Related to Community Supervision Outcomes: Revocations* (Research Report R-304). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Tremblay, T. P. (2017). Aboriginal offender parole outcomes. *The Organizational Improvement Plan at Western University*, 17. Retrieved from <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/oip/17>
- Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., Piquero, A. R., Lösel, F., DeLisi, M., & Murray, J. (2016). Intelligence as a protective factor against offending: A meta-analytic review of prospective longitudinal studies. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 45, 4-18. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.02.003 0047-2352
- Viljoen, J. L., Cochrane, D. M., & Jonnson, M. R. (2018). Do risk assessment tools help manage and reduce risk of violence and reoffending? a systematic review. *Law and Human Behavior*, 42(3), 181-214. doi: 10.1037/lhb0000280
- Visher, C. A., Debus-Sherrill, S. A., & Yahner, J. (2011). Employment after prison: A longitudinal study of former prisoners. *Justice Quarterly*, 28(5), 698-718. doi: 10.1080/07418825.2010.535553
- Visher, C. A., Lattimore, P. K., Barrick, K., & Tueller, S. (2017). Evaluating the long-term effects of prisoner reentry services on recidivism: What types of services matter?. *Justice Quarterly*, 34(1), 136-165. doi: 10.1080/07418825.2015.1115539
- Wardrop, K., Sheahan, C. & Stewart, L.A. (2019) *A Quantitative Examination of Factors Available in the Offender Management System Associated with Successful Release*. (Research Report R-429). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Weiss, J. A., Hawkins, J. W., & Despinos, C. (2010). Redefining boundaries: A grounded theory study of recidivism in women. *Health Care for Women International*, 31(3), 258-273. doi: 0.1080/07399330903052160

Western, B., Braga, A. A., Davis, J., & Sirois, C. (2015). Stress and hardship after prison. *American Journal of Sociology*, *120*(5), 1512-1547. doi: 160.094.050.118

Yesberg, J. A., & Polaschek, D. L. (2015). Assessing dynamic risk and protective factors in the community: Examining the validity of the Dynamic Risk Assessment for Offender Re-entry. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *21*(1), 80-99. doi:10.1080/1068316X.2014.935775

Yukhnenko, D., Blackwood, N., & Fazel, S. (2019). Risk factors for recidivism in individuals receiving community sentences: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *CNS spectrums*, 1-12. doi: 10.1017/S1092852919001056

Factors Associated with Returns to Custody Interview Protocol

Correctional Service of Canada

&

Institute for Applied Social Research (IASR)

Nipissing University

100 College Drive, Box 5002

North Bay, Ontario

P1B 8L7

Tel: 705-474-3450 ext. 4454

Email: gregb@nipissingu.ca

Factors Associated with Release Conditions Interview Protocol

Current date: _____

Interview Location: _____

Interview Number: _____

Interviewer: _____

Background Questions

My name is _____ and I am a researcher from _____. We are doing research to find out what things in people's lives lead them to return to custody while on supervision. As you have recently returned to custody, you have been identified as a possible participant. We hope that learning about these problems will help us think through better ways to help people before and after their release.

We have file information on your background based on information from OMS, but would like to ask you a few more questions. When we do the research and write the research report none of the documents will have your name on it and only the grouped information will be presented. No one will be identified.

****Depending on whether the participant has consented to participate prior to interviewers' visit, you may or may not want to reiterate the following information:*

As mentioned in the consent form, your information will remain confidential except under the following circumstances: If you disclose information about plans to harm yourself or others, information concerning any unknown emotional, physical or sexual abuse of children, or information about any other criminal activities not already known to authorities, the researcher is required to report this information to the appropriate authorities.

Do you have any questions or any concerns?

All completed research published by the Correctional Service of Canada is available on the web - <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/research/index-eng.shtml>. This project is not likely to be completed for at least a year.

Open-Ended Questions

Probe if necessary. Try to encourage as much detail without asking any leading questions.

Q1. In general, why do you believe you ended up returning to custody after your release from the institution into the community? What things in your life contributed to your return to custody?

Q2. What were some of the most difficult problems you faced in the community? Looking back, what would you have done differently?

Semi-Structured Questions

OK, thanks for that – it’s helpful to have you talk about your release experience in your own words. Now I am going to ask you some more detailed questions. All these questions are about the time you were in the community before you were sent back to custody.

Part A - Release Conditions

Q3. Were there release conditions you had to follow on release?

No [skip to Q6](#)

Yes → *If yes*, what were they?

↳ Q4. *If you had release conditions* how did the conditions affect your time in the community (i.e., did they make it easier or harder?)

Q5. *If you had release conditions* did your conditions have an effect on your returning to custody?

No

Yes → *If yes*, which one(s) in particular and how did they make your release difficult?

Q6. Did you participate in electronic monitoring?

No

Yes → *If yes*, how did that affect your time on release?

Interviewer Rating – Release Conditions

- 2** *The participant indicates that their release conditions were a problem affecting their community success.*
- 1** *The participant indicates that their release conditions had a little impact on their community success.*
- 0** *The participant indicates that their release conditions had no impact or were helpful.*

Part B - Overall Release Planning

General Release Planning (plans for release were made to prepare for life once released to the community)

Q7. Prior to release, did you have a release plan?

No

Yes → *If yes*, what was it? Who assisted you in development of the plan?

Q8. Did CSC staff support and/or help you in developing your release plan?

No

Yes → *If yes*, how?

Q9. *If applicable*, did your release plan include *Section 84* planning for release into an Indigenous community?

Yes → *If yes*, how would you describe the planning for a *Section 84* release? What issues or barriers arose during the process? What went well?

No → *If no*, is a *Section 84* release something you were interested in?

└→ If you are/were interested in a *Section 84* release why did your release plan not include *Section 84* planning?

Q10. Did you feel that you had a realistic release plan?

Yes

No → *If no*, do you feel that not having a good release plan affected your chances of staying in the community?

Q11. When entering the community, did everything go according to your plan?

Yes (everything pretty much went according to plan)

No → *If no*, what happened that did NOT go according to your plans? How did this affect your release?

Interviewer Rating – Release Planning

2 *The participant indicates that there was almost no release planning prior to release and/or the planning was not helpful.*

1 *The participant indicates that there was some planning but it was not detailed and/or it was not useful or realistic.*

0 *The participant indicates that there was detailed planning (felt confident that things were in place on his or her release) and that it was realistic/helpful.*

Part C - Relationship with Parole Officer

Q12. Can you describe your relationship with your community parole officer while you were on release?

Q13. How did your relationship with your parole office in the community affect your return to custody?

Interviewer Rating – Relationship with Parole Officer

- 2** *Participant does not believe s/he was supported by community parole officer.*
- 1** *Participant believes s/he had some support from community parole officer.*
- 0** *Participant believes s/he had strong support from community parole officer.*

Part D - Employment/Education/Financial Stability

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

A. Employment

Q14. Did CSC staff provide assistance in helping you find a job when you were released?

No

Yes → *If yes*, how did CSC staff help you find a job? Who gave you this help (e.g., institutional parole officer, community parole officer, Aboriginal Community Liaison Officer, etc.)?

Q15. On your release did you find a job in the community?

No → *If no*, skip to Q20.

Yes → *If yes*, then...

└─→ Q16. What type of job was it?

Q17. Was your job...

Full-time

Part-time

Casual

Other? _____ (specify)

Q18. How much time during your release did you have a job?
(Interviewer will determine what percentage of time was
spent employed based on participant's response)?

25% or less

25% to 50%

50% to 75%

75% to 100%

Q19. Did you like your job?

Yes → *If yes*, why?

No → *If no*, why not?

Q20. Did you participate in vocation training or certification prior to your release?

No

Yes → *If yes*, what type of vocational training or certification did you
participate in?

↳ Q21. Did the vocational training you participated in at the institution help you find a job?

Yes → If yes, how?

No → If no, why not?

Q22. If you were employed, was your job in a similar field to the vocational training you received at the institution?

No

Yes

Q23. Did you participate in vocational training or certification during your time in the community?

No [skip to Q26](#)

Yes → If yes, what type of vocational training or certification did you participate in?

└─▶ Q24. Did this vocation training or certification help you find a job?

Yes ─▶ *If yes, how?*

No ─▶ *If no, why not?*

Q25. *If you were employed*, was your job in a similar field to the vocational training you received in the community?

No

Yes

Q26. *If you did not find a job when you were on release*, why do you think this is? Do you think that not finding a job affected your return to custody?

Interviewer Rating - Employment

2 *Participant was not employed at any time during release.*

1 *Participant was employed part-time or for a short time.*

0 *Participant was employed full-time.*

B. Education

Q27. Did you participate in education programs prior to your release (e.g., GED, CEGEP)?

No

Yes → *If yes*, how long were you involved in education/upgrading activities?

Q28. During your release were you involved in education or upgrading in the community?

No skip to Q31

Yes → *If yes*, what type of education or upgrading in the community were you involved in?

↳ Q29. *If involved in education or upgrading in the community*, was it a continuation from your educational activities while incarcerated?

Yes

No

↳ Q30. If involved in education or upgrading in the community, how long were you involved in education/upgrading activities in the community?

Q31. Do you feel that your participation/lack of participation in education had any effect on your release in the community?

No

Yes → If yes, how did your participation/lack of participation in education affect your release in the community?

Interviewer Rating – Education

2 *Participant believes education/upgrading did not help him or her stay out of prison (would also include those who felt that the lack of participation in education/upgrading impacted on their return to custody).*

1 *Participant was in an education program part-time or for a short time, therefore it did not impact the offender’s success in the community.*

0 *Participant was in extensive education/upgrading.*

C. Financial Stability

Q32. Can you tell me how you met your financial needs (for example, employment, social assistance, disability, etc.) in the community?

Q33. Did you have enough stable money to meet your basic financial needs?

Q34. How do you think your money or financial situation affected your coming back to custody?

Interviewer Rating – Financial Stability

2 *Participant believes unstable finances affected their return to custody.*

1 *Participant has some financial concerns but didn't impact their return to custody.*

0 *No financial concerns.*

Part E - Community Functioning

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

A. Accommodation

Q35. Where did you live on release?

Q36. With whom did you live while you were on release?

Q37. Would you say that this was an unsafe living arrangement (e.g., living with people who are a bad influence or may be dangerous towards you)?

No

Yes → *If yes, how was it unsafe/dangerous for you?*

Q38. Would you say that you had an unstable living arrangement while on release (e.g., hostel, short term rooming house)?

No

Yes → *If yes, how was it unstable?*

Q39. Was there a lot of crime or substance misuse around where you were living when you were on release?

Q40. How do you think the kind of accommodation you had on release affected your time in the community?

Interviewer Rating - Accommodation

- 2** *Offender had unsafe and/or unstable accommodation (hostel, short term rooming house, criminal neighbourhood, etc.) and it affected their release.*
- 1** *Offenders had accommodation but there are some concerns.*
- 0** *Offender had stable long-term accommodation in a safe environment.*

B. Community Resources

Q41. Did you have access to help and assistance in the community (e.g., John Howard Society, Friendship Centre)?

No

Yes → *If yes*, what types of help or assistance did you access in the community?

Q42. Did you access any CSC programs or services for help while you were in the community?

No

Yes → If yes, which CSC programs did you access in the community?

Q43. How did having or not having these kinds of help and resources affect your release?

<i>Interviewer Rating – Community Resources</i>	
2	<i>Participant does not have access to or has not accessed community resources or found them unhelpful/ not having access to community resources affected their release.</i>
1	<i>Participant has accessed some community resources.</i>
0	<i>Participant has fully accessed community resources and found them helpful.</i>

C. Leisure Activities

Q44. What did you do in your free time in the community?

Q45. How frequently did you engage in leisure activities?

Q46. How do you think that having or not having something to do with your spare time affected your return to custody?

Interviewer Rating – Leisure Activities

- 2** *Offender has not been involved in any structured (e.g., prosocial activities that may include clubs, that take up time out of their day, may involve others) leisure on release.*
- 1** *Offender has limited involvement in structured leisure.*
- 0** *Offender has been involved in multiple structured or one consistent structured leisure activity on release.*

D. Neighbourhood

Q47. What kind of a neighbourhood did you live in while you were on release? Was there a lot of crime or substance use?

No

Yes → *If yes*, how do you think it affected your return to custody?

Interviewer Rating - Neighbourhood

2 *The participant indicates that he or she lived in a very problematic neighbourhood.*

1 *The participant indicates that he or she lived in a somewhat problematic neighbourhood.*

0 *The participant indicates that he or she lived in a good neighbourhood.*

Part F - Social Networks and Connections

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

A. Friends and Associates

Q48. Did you socialize with friends on release?

No

Yes → *If yes, how did you socialize with friends? (In person, phone, social media, other?)*

Q49. How do you think having or not having friends affected your time on release and your return to custody?

Interviewer Rating – Friends and Associates

- 2** *The participant indicates that he or she had no support from friends OR friends were a factor in their coming back to custody.*
- 1** *The participant indicates that he or she had some support from friends and/or the friends were not a very positive but not really a factor.*
- 0** *The participant indicates that he or she has had positive support from friends.*

B. Intimate relationships

Q50. Are you currently involved in an intimate relationship (e.g., boyfriend, girlfriend, partner, spouse)?

No

Yes → *If yes*, how did this relationship affect your time on release? Was this relationship a bad influence/source of stress? Was this relationship a source of comfort and support?

Interviewer Rating – Intimate Relationships

- 2** *The participant indicates that he or she was in a very problematic intimate relationship or partner is a negative influence (substance misuse, criminal involvement, and anger/violence).*
- 1** *The participant indicates there are some problems with their partner but not extensive and not a key factor in returning to custody.*
- 0** *The participant indicates a healthy relationship with their partner or had no relationship.*

C. Family of Origin

Q51. Are you currently in contact with your family of origin (e.g., mother, father, siblings)?

No

Yes → *If yes*, who are you in contact with? Are you close to your family of origin? How have these/this relationship(s) affected your time on release? Was this relationship a bad influence/source of stress? Was this relationship a source of comfort and support?

Interviewer Rating – Family

2 *The participant indicates that he or she had no support from family OR family was a factor in their coming back to custody.*

1 *The participant indicates that he or she had some support from family members and/or family was not very positive but not really a factor.*

0 *The participant indicates that he or she has had positive support from family.*

D. Parenting/Children

Q52. Do you have any children?

No [skip to Q61](#)

Yes → *If yes*, how many children do you have? _____

└─→ Q53. What are their ages? _____

Q54. If you have a child or children under age 18, were you the primary caregiver while on release?

Yes

No

Q55. How many of your children lived with you while you were on release? _____

Q56. How would you describe your relationship with your children that lived with you?

Q57. How would you describe your relationship with your children that did not live with you?

Q58. How often while you were on release did you see your children that did not live with you?

Q59. Did your parenting responsibilities impact your return to custody?

No

Yes → If yes, how?

Q60. Did you find parenting responsibilities to be stressful and/or difficult? Did you find your children to be a source of support/comfort?

<i>Interviewer Rating - Parenting</i>	
2	<i>The participant indicates severe problems or stress related to parenting and this could have been a factor in returning to custody.</i>
1	<i>The participant indicates some problems or stress related to parenting.</i>
0	<i>The participant indicates no problems or stress related to parenting or has no children or has no responsibility for the children</i>

Part G – Attitudes Toward Crime and Criminal Justice System

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

A. Attitudes Towards the Criminal Justice System

Q61. Based on your own experiences, what is your opinion of the criminal justice system (e.g., courts, police, parole officers, etc.)?

Q62. Based on your own experiences, how you feel you have been treated by authorities overall.

B. Pro-Criminal Attitudes

Q63. How do you feel about being taken back into custody?

Q64. Do you believe you should have been returned to custody? Do you believe your actions warranted being returned to custody?

Interviewer Rating – Antiauthoritarian and Pro-criminal Attitudes

2 *Participant indicates strong antisocial/antiauthoritarian attitudes.*

1 *Participant indicates some antisocial/antiauthoritarian attitudes.*

0 *Participant has pro-social attitudes (no indication of resenting the criminal justice system or authorities or pride in delinquency).*

Part H - Personal/Emotional

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

A. Impulsivity

Q65. In your day-to-day life, do you act without thinking things through fully? Do you have a hard time setting long-term goals? Do you take risky actions? Please explain.

No

Yes → *If yes to any of the above, do you believe not thinking before acting or not being able to plan or taking too many risks were some reasons why you returned to custody? How?*

B. Coping With Stress

Q66. Do you have a hard time dealing with stressful situations? Do you give up easily?
E.g., what do you do when your parole officer says something that you do not like/agree with? What do you do when you get in a disagreement with a family member or friend?

No I do not have a problem dealing with stressful situations

Yes → If yes to any of the above, how did dealing with stress affect on your return to custody?

C. Anger Management

Q67. In the community did you get frustrated a lot? Did you often feel very angry?
How do you manage your anger? How did your anger and frustration affect your return to custody?

<i>Interviewer Rating – Personal/Emotional Issues</i>	
2	<i>Serious personal emotional issues that could have been factors in failure on release.</i>
1	<i>Factors are a problem but not serious.</i>
0	<i>No personal or emotional problems.</i>

Part I - Substance Misuse

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

Q68. Have you had any issues in the past with substance use?

No

Yes → *If yes, was this still an issue for you on release? How did substance misuse affect your return to custody?*

Interviewer Rating – Substance Misuse

2 *Substance misuse was a serious problem while in the community contributing to return to custody.*

1 *Some ongoing problems.*

0 *No issue with substance misuse or issue has been under control on release.*

Part J - Connection to Culture/Spirituality

Q69. Do you consider yourself a spiritual person?

No

Yes → *If yes, what spirituality do you identify with?*

Q70. What culture do you identify with?

Q71. Do you consider that you were connected to your culture and/or spirituality while you were on release?

Q72. How often did you attend/participate in cultural and/or spiritual activities while you were on release?

Q73. While on release, did you use any cultural resources in the community (e.g., Aboriginal community liaison, Elder, Friendship Centre, etc.)?

Q74. How do you think that a lack of connection or your good connection to culture/spirituality affected your ability to remain in the community?

<i>Interviewer Rating – Cultural and Spiritual Identity</i>	
2	<i>Offender describes no affiliation with a cultural identity or a spiritual affiliation.</i>
1	<i>Offender has some indication of a positive affiliation with a community, culture or spiritually.</i>
0	<i>Offender has a strong positive affiliation with a community, culture or spiritually identity.</i>

Part K - Additional Information

Q75. We are interested in knowing about any other information you think might explain your return to custody. Are there any other comments that you would like to share with us?

Q76. You have listed a number of things that happened in the community that were a problem for you (mention them now or show them to the participant so he or she can review them). What would you say was the most important factor? Is there another one?

Q77. What one thing could have been done for you that would have made it likely that you could still be in the community?

Q78. What will you do on your next release to avoid the things that were a problem for you?

OK – that’s all the questions we have for you today.

Thank-you so much for taking the time to do this interview with us. The information you have given us will be used by the Correctional Service of Canada to plan ways to improve the process of release into the community. Again, thank-you!

Factors Associated with Successful Release Interview Protocol

Correctional Service of Canada

&

Institute for Applied Social Research (IASR)

Nipissing University

100 College Drive, Box 5002

North Bay, Ontario

P1B 8L7

Tel: 705-474-3450 ext. 4454

Email: gregb@nipissingu.ca

Factors Associated with Successful Release – Interview Protocol

Current date: _____

Parole Office: _____

Interview Number: _____

Interviewer: _____

Background Questions

My name is _____ and I am a researcher from _____. We are doing research to find out what things in people's lives help them when they are released so that they do not return to custody. You have been identified as one of those who were released and has been successful. Congratulations!

We have file information on your background based on information from OMS, but would like to ask you a few more questions. Your answers to these questions will be combined with information provided by CSC (e.g., demographic and offence information). When we do the research and write the research report none of the documents will have your name on it and only grouped information will be presented. No one will be identified.

****Depending on whether the participant has consented to participate prior to interviewers' visit, you may or may not want to reiterate the following information:*

As mentioned in the consent form, your information will remain confidential except under the following circumstances: If you disclose information about plans to harm yourself or others, information concerning any unknown emotional, physical or sexual abuse of children, or information about any other criminal activities not already known to authorities, the researcher is required to report this information to the appropriate authorities.

Do you have any questions or any concerns?

All completed research published by the Correctional Service of Canada is available on the web - <http://www.csc-ccc.gc.ca/research/index-eng.shtml>. This project is not likely to be completed for at least a year.

Open-Ended Questions

Probe if necessary. Try to encourage as much detail without asking any leading questions.

Q1. In general, why do you believe that you have been successful after your release from the institution into the community? What has helped you to stay out without returning to custody?

Q2. What things in your life do you feel have helped you remain in the community for this long?

Q3. Complete this sentence. *I could not have been able to stay out in the community successfully without.....*

Q4. What is the best thing that has happened to you since your release? What is the worst thing?

Q5. How do you think you are doing right now??

Semi-Structured Questions

OK, thanks for that – it’s helpful to have you talk about you’re your experience in the community in your own words. Now I am going to ask you some more detailed questions. These questions are about how the kind of preparation and planning you did to get ready for your release, and your experiences since you have been living on release in the community.

Part A - Feelings about Desistance

❖ (**definition**: the offender has made a conscious and publically disclosed decision to desist from crime)

Q6. When you were getting ready for release, what did you think your chances were that you would return to crime?

Q7. Did you consciously say to yourself that you were not going to get involved in criminal activity?

No

Yes → *If yes*, what made you decide that you would not be involved in criminal activity?

Q8. What did you say to others about your future?

Q9. How important do you think it was to your success on release that you made this decision and that you let people know about it?

Interviewer Rating: Feelings about Desistance

- 2** *The participant indicates that their release conditions were a problem affecting their community success*
- 1** *The participant indicates that their release conditions had a little impact on their community success*
- 0** *The participant indicates that their release conditions had no impact or were helpful*

Part B - Release Planning

A. Pre-Release Planning (plans were made prior to release to prepare for life in the community; e.g., where they will live, where they will work, etc.)

Q10. Prior to release, what plans were made to prepare your release to the community?

Q11. Did anyone outside the institution help you make a release plan (e.g., family, friends, etc.)?

No

Yes → If yes, who? How did they help?

Q12. Did anyone at the institution help with release planning (e.g., parole officer, elder, correctional officer, case management team, Aboriginal community development officer, chaplain, etc.)?

No

Yes → If yes, who? How did they help?

Q13. Do you feel that your release plan was realistic?

Q14. How did entering the community go, compared to what you had planned?

Interviewer Rating: Outside Release Planning Assistance

- 2** *The participant indicates that there was detailed planning (felt confident that things were in place on his or her release).*
- 1** *The participant indicates that there was some planning but it was not detailed.*
- 0** *The participant indicates that there was almost no outside (re: non-CSC) release planning prior to release.*

Interviewer Rating: CSC Release Planning Assistance

- 2** *The participant indicates that CSC provided assistance developing a realistic release plan.*
- 1** *The participant indicates that CSC provided some assistance developing a release plan OR the release plan was somewhat unrealistic.*
- 0** *The participant indicates that CSC provided no assistance developing a release plan.*

B. Post-Release Support

Q15. Did the Correctional Service of Canada provide supports to help you make the transition to the community (e.g. community parole officer, Elder services, etc.)?

No

Yes → If yes, what kind of support did they provide?

Interviewer Rating: Post-Release Support

2 *The participant acknowledges lots of support post release from CSC*

1 *The participant reports some limited support post release from CSC*

0 *The participant does not believe he or she has been supported post-release by CSC*

Q16. Was there something or someone else in the community who helped you transition to the community (e.g., volunteer services, advocacy groups, band, etc.)?

No

Yes → If yes, what kind of support did they provide?

Interviewer Rating: Post-Release Support

2 *The participant acknowledges lots of support post release from others in community*

1 *The participant reports some limited support post release from others in community*

0 *The participant does not believe he or she has been supported post-release by others in community*

C. Release Conditions

Q17. Were there any release conditions associated with your conditional release? To the best of your recollection, what were they?

Q18. How are your release conditions affecting your ability to remain in the community (i.e., are they making it easier or harder?)

D. Day of Release

Q19. On what day of the week were you released into the community?

Q20. Do you feel that the day of the week had any impact on your ability to transition into the community (e.g., did it have any impact on your ability access services)? Why or why not?

Part C - Social Networks and Connections

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

A. Family Support

Q21. Did any family members (e.g., parents, siblings, extended family) provide support on release?

No

Yes → If yes, what kind of help did they provide?

Interviewer Rating: Family Support

- 2** *The participant indicates that he or she has received strong support from family that has helped them on their release*
- 1** *The participant indicates that he or she had some support from family but it was not extensive.*
- 0** *The participant indicates that he or she had no support from family OR the family was not a positive influence (substance misusers, criminal involvement, anger).*

B. Intimate Relationships

Q22. Are you currently involved in an intimate relationship (e.g., boyfriend, girlfriend, partner, spouse)?

No [skip to Q25](#)

Yes → *If yes*, how has this relationship affect your time on release?



Q23. Did your partner help you in your release planning?

No

Yes → *If yes*, what kind of help?



Q24. How has your partner helped since release?

Interviewer Rating: Intimate Relationships

2 *The participant indicates that he or she has received strong support from an intimate partner that has helped them on their release*

1 *The participant indicates that he or she had some support from an intimate partner but it was not extensive*

0 *The participant indicates that he or she had no support from an intimate partner OR the partner was not a positive influence (substance misusers, criminal involvement, anger)*

C. Children/Parenting

Q25. Do you have any children?

No [skip to Q34](#)

Yes → *If yes*, how many children do you have? _____

└─→ Q26. What are their ages? _____

Q27. When/how often do you have contact with your children?

Q28. If you have a child or children under age 18, are you the primary caregiver?

Yes

No

Q29. How many of your children currently live with you?

Q30. How would you describe your relationship with your children that live with you?

Q31. How would you describe your relationship with your children that do not live with you?

Q32. How has having children affected your release?

Q33. Did your child(ren) help you with your release?

No

Yes → If yes, how did your child(ren) help when you were released?

Interviewer Rating: Support from Children

- 2** *The participant indicates that he or she has received strong support from children and/or was the primary care giver for children under 18 so was committed to staying in the community because of their children*
- 1** *The participant indicates that he or she had some support from children and/or shared to some extent in childcare responsibilities and being responsible for children helped them*
- 0** *The participant indicates that he or she had no support from children or had no Children*

D. Friends and Associates

Q34. Do you socialize with friends often?

No

Yes → If yes, how you socialize with friends (e.g., in-person, social media, etc.)?

Q35. How have your friends affected your release?

Interviewer Rating: Support from Friends

- 2** *The participant indicates that he or she has received strong support from friends that has helped them on their release*
- 1** *The participant indicates that he or she had some support from friends but it was not extensive*
- 0** *The participant indicates that he or she had no support from friends OR friends were not a positive influence (substance misusers, criminal involvement, anger)*

Interviewer Rating: Part C - Overall Social Support

- 2** *The participant indicates that he or she has received support from multiple sources that has helped them on their release*
- 1** *The participant indicates that he or she had some support from family or friends or a partner but it was not extensive*
- 0** *The participant indicates that he or she had no support from anyone in a social network on release OR the supporters were not a positive influence (substance misusers, criminal involvement, anger)*

Part D - Employment/Education/Financial Stability

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

A. Education/Upgrading

Q36. Did you receive any education or upgrading while you were incarcerated?

No

Yes → If yes, what education or upgrading did you receive?

Q37. How do you think the education or upgrading you received while incarcerated has affected your release?

Q38. Since your release, have you been involved in education or upgrading *in the community*?

No

Yes → If yes, what education or upgrading have you received? How do you think this education or upgrading has affected your release?

Interviewer Rating: Education/Upgrading

- 2** *The participant was involved in upgrading/education and credits this as a factor in helping him or her stay in the community.*
- 1** *The participant had some limited involvement in education/upgrading.*
- 0** *The participant had no involvement in upgrading/education or it was a negative experience*

B. Employment

Q39. Did anyone (including CSC) help you find work on your release?

No

Yes → *If yes*, who helped, and how did they help you find work?

Q40. On your release, did you find a job in the community?

No [skip to Q45](#)

Yes → *If yes*, what type of job was it?



Q41. Was your job...

Full-time

Part-time

Casual

Other?

_____ (specify)

Q42. How much time during your release did you have a job?
(Interviewer will determine what percentage of time was
spent employed based on participant's response)?

25% or less

25% to 50%

50% to 75%

75% to 100%

Q43. Did you like your job?

Yes → If yes, why?

No → If no, why not?

Q44. Do you think having a job has helped you stay out of
prison? Please explain why you feel it has or hasn't helped.

Interviewer Rating: Employment

2 *The participant currently has stable employment*

1 *The participant is employed part-time*

0 *The participant is not employed or has unstable employment*

C. Finances

Q45. Since your release, have you been able to pay your bills?

Q46. How do you think your financial situation has affected your release?

Q47. Do you have any other sources of income other than your job (if applicable) (e.g., do you rely on social assistance, help from family, etc.)?

No

Yes → If yes, how do you think this has affected your release?

Interviewer Rating: Finances

- 2** *The participant currently has a stable adequate income (i.e., regular part-time or full-time employment, ability to pay bills)*
- 1** *The participant has some income (i.e., part-time, contract, seasonal)*
- 0** *The participant has not had a reliable source of income*

Part E – Community Functioning

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

A. Accommodation

Q48. Where do you live?

Q49. With whom do you live?

Q50. Would you say that where you are living now is a safe and stable living arrangement?

No

Yes → *If yes*, how is it unsafe or unstable for you?

Q51. Is there a lot of crime or substance misuse around where you live?

No

Yes

Q52. How do you think the type of place you live in has affected your release?

Interviewer Rating - Accommodation

- 2** *Offender has stable long-term accommodation in a safe environment.*
- 1** *Offenders has accommodation but there are some concerns.*
- 0** *Offender has unsafe and/or unstable accommodation (hostel, short term rooming house, criminal neighbourhood, etc.) and it affected their release.*

B. Community Resources

Q53. Do you have access to a family physician when needed?

No

Yes

Q54. If you needed it, do you have access to mental health supports (e.g.,counsellor/psychologist, therapist)?

No

Yes

Q55. How do you think having OR not having these supports (family physician, mental health counselling) has affected your release?

Q56. If you needed it, do you have reliable transportation access (e.g., bus, car)?

No

Yes

Q57. How do you think having OR not having access to transportation has affected your release?

Q58. Do you have access to technology (e.g., phone, internet, television)?

No

Yes

Q59. How do you think having OR not having access to technology has affected your release?

Interviewer Rating: Community Functioning

2 *The participant can fully function in the community and accesses community resources when necessary*

1 *The participant has some ability to function in the community but there are some concerns*

0 *The participant struggles to function in the community (e.g., has unsafe and/or unstable living arrangements, does not have access to community resources)*

C. Community Programs

Q60. Following release, have you been enrolled in and/or completed any CSC programs (e.g., community maintenance programs)?

No

Yes → *If yes*, how do you think participation in these program affected your

release?

Q61. Following release, have you been enrolled in any non-CSC programs?

No

Yes → *If yes*, how do you think participation in these programs affected your release?

Interviewer Rating: Community Programs

- 2** *The participant is currently in and/or completed programming AND assigns credit as a factor in his or her success*
- 1** *The participant has been in a program for a limited time OR assigns some credit as a factor in his or her success*
- 0** *The participant has not been in any programs OR does not credit this as a factor in his or her success*

D. Leisure activities

Q62. What do you do in your free time? How do you think that these activities contribute to your success in the community?

Interviewer Rating: Leisure Activities

- 2** *The participant has been involved in multiple structured or one consistent leisure activity*
- 1** *The participant has limited involvement in structured leisure*
- 0** *The participant has not been involved in any structured leisure*

Part F - Avoidance of Substance Misuse

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

Q63. Have you had any issues with substance misuse?

No

Yes → *If yes*, is this still an issue for you? How has substance misuse affected your release?

Interviewer Rating: Substance Misuse

2 *No issue with substance misuse or issue has been under control since release*

1 *Minor lapses that have not resulted in suspensions*

0 *Substance misuse an ongoing concern*

Part G – Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

Q64. What is your opinion of the criminal justice system (e.g., courts, police, parole officers, etc.)?

Q65. Do you accept the decisions and instructions the criminal justice system has given you?

No

Yes

Q66. How do you think that your treatment by criminal justice system authorities affected your release?

<i>Interviewer Rating – Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System</i>	
2	<i>The participant reports a positive opinion of the criminal justice system</i>
1	<i>The participant reports a neutral experience and attitude towards the system</i>
0	<i>The participant has strong negative attitude towards the criminal justice system</i>

Part H – Personal/Emotional

Note: Reminder concerning the limitations of confidentiality

A. Identity

Q67. How would you describe yourself to someone?

Q68. Are you motivated to remain successful in the community? Why/why?

No

Yes

Q69. Do you believe that you will remain successful in the community? Why/why not?

No

Yes

Q70. What are your long-term life goals/plans? Where would you like to see yourself in five years?

Interviewer Rating: Identity

- 2** *The participant has a strong positive prosocial identity (perceives themselves as person with positive attributes, has prosocial long-term plans)*
- 1** *The participant has some indication of a positive identity*
- 0** *The participant describes an antisocial identity (resentment of authority, hopelessness related to future, no buy in to be part of a prosocial community etc.)*

B. Coping Skills

Q71. When faced with a stressful situation, how do you cope? How do you manage set-backs and disappointments? E.g., what do you do when your parole officer says something that you do not like/agree with? What do you do when you get in an argument? with your parent or sibling?

Interviewer Rating: Coping Skills

- 2** *The participant has demonstrated excellent coping skills (manages adversity, seeks assistance appropriately, etc.)*
- 1** *The participant shows indication of some coping ability*
- 0** *The participant has poor coping skills (give up quickly, easily frustrated, angry, etc.)*

Part I - Connection to Culture/Spirituality

Q72. Would you consider yourself connected to your culture?

No

Yes → If yes, what culture do you identify with?

Q73. Do you consider yourself a spiritual person?

No

Yes → If yes, what spirituality do you identify with?

Q74. How often do you attend/participate in cultural and/or spiritual activities?

Q75. (*If you are an Indigenous person*), do you use any cultural resources in the community (e.g., Aboriginal community liaison, Elder, Friendship Centre, etc.)?

No

Yes → *If yes*, which ones do you use?

Q76. (*If you are an Indigenous person*), did you experience a *Section 81* transfer or *Section 84* release?

No

Yes → *If yes*, how do you feel this impacted your transition into the community?

Q77. How do you think this connection or lack of connection to your culture and/or spirituality affected your ability to remain in the community?

<i>Interviewer Rating: Connection to Culture/Spirituality</i>	
2	<i>The participant has a strong positive affiliation with a community, culture or spiritually identity</i>
1	<i>The participant has some indication of a positive affiliation with a community, culture or spiritually</i>
0	<i>The participant describes no affiliation with a cultural identity or a spiritual affiliation or a community</i>

Additional Information

Q78. We are interested in knowing about any other information you think might explain your success in the community. Are there any other comments regarding staying in the community that you would like to share with us?

OK – that’s all the questions we have for you today.

Thank-you so much for taking the time to do this interview with us. The information you have given us will be used by the Correctional Service of Canada to plan ways to improve the process of release into the community, so that everyone will have a good chance at being successful.

Again, thank-you!

**Appendix C: Supplemental Analyses of Interviewer-Rated Scores by Gender and
Indigenous Ancestry**

Table C1

Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scored of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Protocol Factors, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release Women		Successful Releases Women		Revocations of Release Men		Successful Releases Men	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Feelings About Desistance								
Negative impact	d		- ^c		d		17.9	(5)
None/somewhat harmful			27.8	(5)			14.3	(4)
Positive impact			72.2	(13)			64.3	(18)
Release Conditions								
Negative impact	59.1	(13)	d		52.4	(22)	d	
None/somewhat harmful	18.2	(4)			23.8	(10)		
Positive impact	22.7	(5)			23.8	(10)		
Release Planning								
Negative impact	27.3	(6)	16.7	(3)	38.1	(16)	28.6	(8)
None/somewhat harmful	40.9	(9)	33.3	(6)	35.7	(15)	42.9	(12)
Positive impact	31.8	(7)	50.0	(9)	26.2	(11)	16.7	(3)
Post-release support from CSC								
Negative impact	d		11.1	(2)	d		35.7	(10)
None/somewhat harmful			27.8	(5)			25.0	(7)
Positive impact			61.1	(11)			39.3	(11)
Post-release support from others in community								
Negative impact	d		22.2	(4)	d		35.7	(10)
None/somewhat harmful			16.7	(3)			25.0	(7)
Positive impact			61.1	(11)			39.3	(11)
Relationship with Parole Officer								
Negative impact	31.8	(7)	d		35.7	(15)	d	
None/somewhat harmful	50.0	(11)			31.0	(13)		
Positive impact	18.2	(4)			33.3	(14)		
Social Networks and Connections								
Family support								
Negative impact	36.4	(8)	- ^c		9.5	(4)	14.4	(4)
None/somewhat harmful	31.8	(7)	5.6	(1)	26.2	(11)	28.6	(8)
Positive impact	31.8	(7)	94.4	(17)	61.9	(6)	57.1	(16)
Intimate relationships								
Negative impact	22.7	(5)	55.6	(10)	9.5	(4)	60.7	(17)
None/somewhat harmful	4.5	(1)	16.7	(3)	7.1	(3)	3.6	(1)
Positive impact	72.7	(16)	27.8	(5)	81.0	(34)	35.7	(10)
Support from children								
Negative impact	13.6	(3)	38.9	(7)	7.1	(3)	71.4	(20)
None/somewhat harmful	27.3	(6)	22.2	(4)	16.7	(7)	3.6	(1)
Positive impact	59.1	(13)	38.9	(7)	71.4	(30)	25.0	(7)

Table C1 (cont'd)

Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Protocol Factors, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release Women		Successful Releases Women		Revocations of Release Men		Successful Releases Men	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	(n)	%	(n)	
Support from friends/associates								
Negative impact	45.5	(10)	5.6	(1)	33.3	(14)	39.3	(11)
None/somewhat harmful	36.4	(8)	44.4	(8)	28.6	(12)	35.7	(10)
Positive impact	18.2	(4)	50.0	(9)	35.7	(15)	25.0	(7)
Overall social support								
Negative impact	d		- ^c		d		7.1	(2)
None/somewhat harmful			22.2	(4)			42.9	(12)
Positive impact			77.8	(14)			50.0	(14)
Employment/Education/Financial								
Education/upgrading								
Negative impact	54.5	(12)	11.1	(2)	64.3	(27)	39.3	(11)
None/somewhat harmful	40.9	(9)	44.4	(8)	16.7	(7)	39.3	(11)
Positive impact	4.5	(1)	44.4	(8)	4.8	(2)	21.4	(6)
Employment								
Negative impact	40.9	(9)	33.3	(6)	38.1	(16)	28.6	(8)
None/somewhat harmful	22.7	(5)	22.2	(2)	23.8	(10)	17.9	(5)
Positive impact	36.4	(8)	44.4	(8)	38.1	(16)	53.6	(15)
Finances								
Negative impact	18.2	(4)	5.6	(1)	16.7	(7)	14.3	(4)
None/somewhat harmful	22.7	(5)	22.2	(4)	28.6	(12)	17.9	(5)
Positive impact	59.1	(13)	72.2	(13)	54.8	(23)	67.9	(19)
Community Functioning								
Neighbourhood								
Negative impact	40.9	(9)	d		42.8	(18)	d	
None/somewhat harmful	27.3	(6)			19.0	(8)		
Positive impact	31.8	(7)			35.7	(5)		
Accommodation								
Negative impact	40.9	(9)	- ^c		23.8	(10)	3.6	(1)
None/somewhat harmful	31.8	(7)	5.6	(1)	50.0	(21)	42.9	(12)
Positive impact	22.7	(5)	94.4	(17)	26.2	(11)	53.6	(15)
Community programs								
Negative impact	45.5	(10)	33.3	(6)	52.4	(22)	35.7	(10)
None/somewhat harmful	40.9	(9)	33.3	(6)	42.9	(18)	39.3	(11)
Positive impact	13.6	(3)	33.3	(6)	2.4	(1)	25.0	(7)
Community services								
Negative impact	d		- ^c		d		3.6	(1)
None/somewhat harmful			11.1	(2)			32.1	(9)
Positive impact			88.9	(16)			64.3	(18)

Table C1 (cont'd)

Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Protocol Factors, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release Women		Successful Releases Women		Revocations of Release Men		Successful Releases Men	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Leisure activities								
Negative impact	63.6	(14)	11.1	(2)	50.0	(21)	7.1	(2)
None/somewhat harmful	31.8	(7)	50.0	(9)	26.2	(11)	39.3	(11)
Positive impact	4.5	(1)	33.3	(6)	21.4	(9)	53.6	(15)
Avoidance of Substance Misuse								
Negative impact	68.2	(15)	38.9	(7)	57.1	(24)	3.6	(1)
None/somewhat harmful	18.2	(4)	- ^c		16.7	(7)	- ^c	
Positive impact	13.6	(3)	55.6	(10)	23.8	(10)	96.4	(27)
Attitudes Toward Justice System								
Negative impact	13.6	(3)	5.6	(1)	31.0	(13)	32.1	(9)
None/somewhat harmful	59.1	(13)	44.4	(8)	42.9	(18)	46.4	(13)
Positive impact	27.3	(6)	38.9	(7)	23.8	(10)	21.4	(6)
Personal/Emotional								
Negative impact	77.3	(17)	d		57.1	(24)	d	
None/somewhat harmful	9.1	(2)			16.7	(7)		
Positive impact	13.6	(3)			21.4	(9)		
Identity								
Negative impact	d		- ^c		d		3.6	(1)
None/somewhat harmful			16.7	(3)			46.4	(13)
Positive impact			77.8	(14)			50.0	(14)
Coping skills								
Negative impact	d		- ^c		d		3.6	(1)
None/somewhat harmful			33.3	(6)			50.0	(14)
Positive impact			61.1	(11)			42.9	(12)
Cultural & Spiritual Identity								
Negative impact	22.7	(5)	- ^c		21.4	(9)	28.6	(8)
None/somewhat harmful	59.1	(13)	27.8	(5)	54.8	(23)	39.3	(11)
Positive impact	18.2	(4)	66.7	(12)	21.4	(9)	28.6	(8)

^a – missing data not reported < 4%

^b – missing data not reported < 6%

^c no responses recorded for this category

^d a comparable item was not asked in the respective interview protocol, Revocations of Release or Successful Releases.

Table C2

Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Protocol Factors, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Feelings About Desistance								
Negative impact	d		7.7	(1)	d		12.5	(4)
None/somewhat harmful			15.4	(2)			18.8	(6)
Positive impact			76.9	(10)			65.6	(21)
Release Conditions								
Negative impact	59.4	(19)	d		50.0	(16)	d	
None/somewhat harmful	25.0	(8)			18.8	(6)		
Positive impact	15.6	(5)			31.3	(10)		
Release Planning								
Negative impact	34.4	(11)	15.4	(2)	34.4	(11)	25.0	(8)
None/somewhat harmful	43.8	(14)	46.2	(6)	31.3	(10)	31.3	(10)
Positive impact	21.9	(7)	38.5	(5)	34.4	(11)	43.8	(14)
Post-release support from CSC								
Negative impact	d		7.7	(1)	d		12.5	(4)
None/somewhat harmful			38.5	(5)			37.5	(12)
Positive impact			53.8	(7)			50.0	(16)
Post-release support from others in community								
Negative impact	d		15.4	(2)	d		34.4	(11)
None/somewhat harmful			23.1	(3)			21.9	(7)
Positive impact			61.5	(8)			43.8	(14)
Relationship with Parole Officer								
Negative impact	34.4	(11)	d		34.4	(11)	d	
None/somewhat harmful	31.3	(10)			43.8	(14)		
Positive impact	34.4	(11)			21.9	(7)		
Social Networks and Connections								
Family support								
Negative impact	15.6	(5)	- ^c		21.9	(7)	12.5	(4)
None/somewhat harmful	31.3	(10)	30.8	(4)	25.0	(8)	15.6	(5)
Positive impact	53.1	(17)	69.2	(9)	50.0	(16)	71.9	(23)
Intimate relationships								
Negative impact	9.4	(3)	69.2	(9)	18.8	(6)	56.3	(18)
None/somewhat harmful	9.4	(3)	- ^c		3.1	(1)	9.4	(3)
Positive impact	81.3	(26)	30.8	(4)	75.0	(24)	34.4	(11)

Table C2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Protocol Factors, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Support from children								
Negative impact	6.3	(2)	69.2	(9)	12.5	(4)	56.3	(18)
None/somewhat harmful	18.8	(6)	7.7	(1)	21.9	(7)	12.5	(4)
Positive impact	71.9	(23)	23.1	(3)	62.5	(20)	31.3	(10)
Support from friends/associates								
Negative impact	43.8	(14)	38.5	(5)	3.13	(10)	21.9	(7)
None/somewhat harmful	34.4	(11)	30.8	(4)	28.1	(9)	40.6	(13)
Positive impact	21.9	(7)	30.8	(4)	37.5	(12)	37.5	(12)
Overall social support								
Negative impact	d		- ^c		d		6.3	(2)
None/somewhat harmful			23.1	(3)			40.6	(13)
Positive impact			76.9	(10)			53.1	(17)
Employment/Education/Financial								
Education/upgrading								
Negative impact	65.6	(21)	23.1	(3)	56.3	(18)	31.3	(10)
None/somewhat harmful	21.9	(7)	46.2	(6)	28.1	(9)	40.6	(13)
Positive impact	3.1	(1)	30.8	(4)	6.3	(2)	28.1	(9)
Employment								
Negative impact	50.0	(16)	30.8	(4)	28.1	(9)	28.1	(9)
None/somewhat harmful	31.3	(10)	23.1	(3)	15.6	(5)	18.8	(6)
Positive impact	18.8	(6)	46.2	(6)	56.3	(18)	53.1	(17)
Finances								
Negative impact	12.5	(4)	23.1	(3)	21.9	(7)	6.3	(2)
None/somewhat harmful	37.5	(12)	23.2	(3)	15.6	(5)	18.8	(6)
Positive impact	50.0	(16)	53.8	(7)	62.5	(20)	75.0	(24)
Community Functioning								
Neighbourhood								
Negative impact	40.6	(13)	d		43.8	(14)	d	
None/somewhat harmful	25.0	(8)			18.8	(6)		
Positive impact	34.4	(11)			34.4	(11)		
Accommodation								
Negative impact	31.3	(10)	- ^c		28.1	(9)	3.1	(1)
None/somewhat harmful	50.0	(16)	30.8	(4)	37.5	(12)	28.1	(9)
Positive impact	18.8	(6)	69.2	(9)	31.3	(10)	68.8	(22)

Table C2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Protocol Factors, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Community programs								
Negative impact	53.1	(17)	30.8	(4)	46.9	(15)	34.4	(11)
None/somewhat harmful	40.6	(13)	38.5	(5)	43.8	(14)	37.5	(12)
Positive impact	6.2	(2)	30.8	(4)	6.3	(2)	28.1	(9)
Community services								
Negative impact	d		– ^c		d		3.1	(1)
None/somewhat harmful			38.5	(5)			15.6	(5)
Positive impact			61.5	(8)			81.3	(26)
Leisure activities								
Negative impact	53.1		– ^c		56.3	(18)	12.5	(4)
None/somewhat harmful	34.4		30.8	(4)	21.9	(7)	50.0	(16)
Positive impact	12.5		69.2	(9)	18.8	(6)	37.5	(12)
Avoidance of Substance Misuse								
Negative impact	68.8		– ^c		53.1	(17)	25.0	(8)
None/somewhat harmful	15.6		– ^c		18.8	(6)	–	
Positive impact	15.6		100	(13)	25.0	(8)	75.0	(24)
Attitudes Toward Justice System								
Negative impact	28.1		23.1	(3)	21.9	(7)	21.9	(7)
None/somewhat harmful	37.5		46.2	(6)	59.4	(19)	46.9	(15)
Positive impact	34.4		30.8	(4)	15.6	(5)	28.1	(9)
Personal/Emotional								
Negative impact	71.9		d		56.3	(18)	d	
None/somewhat harmful	12.5	(4)			15.6	(5)		
Positive impact	15.6	(5)			21.9	(7)		
Identity								
Negative impact	d		– ^c		d		3.1	(1)
None/somewhat harmful			15.4	(2)			43.8	(14)
Positive impact			84.6	(11)			53.1	(17)
Coping skills								
Negative impact	d		– ^c		d		3.1	(1)
None/somewhat harmful			53.8	(7)			40.6	(13)
Positive impact			46.2	(6)			53.1	(17)

Table C2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Interviewer-Rated Scores of Participant Responses Within Each of the Main Protocol Factors, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Risk/Success Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Cultural & Spiritual Identity								
Negative impact	12.5	(4)	- ^c		31.3	(10)	25.0	(8)
None/somewhat harmful	59.4	(19)	38.5	(5)	53.1	(17)	34.4	(11)
Positive impact	28.1	(9)	61.5	(8)	12.5	(4)	37.5	(12)

^a – missing data not reported < 4%

^b – missing data not reported < 6%

^c No responses recorded for this category.

^d A comparable item was not asked in the respective interview protocol, Revocations of Release or Successful Releases.

**Appendix D: Supplemental Analyses of Participant Responses to Main Protocol Factors
Screening Questions, by Gender, & Indigenous Ancestry**

Table D1

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Gender, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a versus Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Female		Successful Releases Female		Revocations of Release Male		Successful Releases Male	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Feelings about Desistance								
Consciously decide not to get involved in criminal activity?								
Yes	d		88.9	(16)	d		75.0	(21)
No			11.2	(2)			25.0	(7)
Release Planning								
Prior to release did you have a release plan?								
Yes	77.3	(17)	d		83.3	(35)	d	
No	18.2	(4)			16.7	(7)		
Anyone outside institution help with release plan?								
Yes	d		61.1	(11)	d		82.1	(23)
No			38.9	(7)			17.9	(5)
Anyone at institution help with release plan?								
Yes	50.0	(11)	66.7	(12)	38.1	(16)	64.3	(18)
No	40.9	(9)	33.3	(6)	61.9	(26)	35.7	(10)
Did your release plan include <i>Section 84</i> planning?								
Yes	18.2	(4)	d		11.9	(5)	d	
No	72.7	(16)			85.7	(36)		
Did CSC provide help to make transition into community (e.g. parole officer, Elder)?								
Yes	d		83.3	(15)	d		85.7	(24)
No			16.7	(3)			14.3	(4)

Table D1 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Female		Successful Releases Female		Revocations of Release Male		Successful Releases Male	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Did someone else in the community help with your transition?								
Yes	d		72.2	(13)	d		57.1	(16)
No			27.8	(5)			42.9	(12)
Did you feel you had a realistic release plan?								
Yes	77.3	(17)	d		83.3	(35)	d	
No	18.2	(4)			16.7	(7)		
When entering the community, did everything go according to plan?								
Yes	36.4	(8)	d		59.5	(25)	d	
No	59.1	(13)			40.5	(17)		
Release Conditions								
Release conditions on release?								
Yes	95.5	(21)	d		100	(42)	d	
No	- ^c				- ^c			
Did release conditions have effect on your returning to custody?								
Yes	81.8	(18)	d		88.1	(37)	d	
No	13.6	(3)			11.9	(5)		
Social Networks and Connections								
Did family members provide support on release?								
Yes	50.0	(11)	100	(18)	90.5	(38)	75.0	(21)
No	45.5	(10)	- ^c		7.1	(3)	25.0	(7)

Table D1 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Female		Successful Releases Female		Revocations of Release Male		Successful Releases (S) Male		
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
Are you currently involved in an intimate relationship?									
Yes	40.9	(9)	44.8	(8)	45.2	(19)	42.9	(12)	
No	54.5	(12)	55.6	(10)	52.4	(22)	57.1	(16)	
Did your partner help you with release planning?									
Yes	d		16.7	(3)	d		35.7	(10)	
No			27.8	(5)			10.7	(3)	
Do you have any children?									
Yes	68.2	(15)	66.7	(12)	61.9	(26)	60.7	(17)	
No	27.3	(6)	33.3	(6)	35.7	(15)	39.3	(11)	
How many children do you have?									
One	18.2	(4)	22.2	(4)	28.6	(12)	14.3	(4)	
Two	27.3	(6)	16.7	(3)	14.3	(6)	21.4	(6)	
Three	18.2	(4)	22.2	(4)	11.9	(5)	14.3	(4)	
Four+	4.5	(1)	5.6	(1)	7.1	(3)	7.1	(2)	
If you have children under age 18, were you primary caregiver while on release?									
Yes	13.6	(3)	22.2	(4)	7.1	(3)	10.7	(3)	
No	54.5	(12)	33.3	(6)	54.8	(23)	39.3	(11)	

Table D1 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Female		Successful Releases Female		Revocations of Release Male		Successful Releases Male		
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
How many children currently live with you?									
None	54.5	(12)	33.3	(6)	52.4	(22)	46.4	(13)	
One	9.1	(2)	22.2	(4)	9.5	(4)	10.7	(3)	
Two	4.5	(1)	11.1	(2)	-. ^c		-. ^c		
Three	-. ^c		-. ^c		-. ^c		3.6	(1)	
Did your children help with your release?									
Yes	d		44.4	(8)	d		14.3	(4)	
No			11.1	(2)			32.1	(9)	
Did your parenting responsibilities impact your return to custody?									
Yes	18.2	(4)	d		23.8	(10)	d		
No	50.0	(11)			33.3	(14)			
Do you socialize with friends often?									
Yes	72.7	(16)	72.2	(13)	78.6	(33)	57.1	(16)	
No	22.7	(5)	27.8	(5)	19.0	(8)	42.9	(12)	
Employment/Education/Financial									
Education/upgrading while incarcerated?									
Yes	50.0	(11)	94.4	(17)	66.7	(28)	67.9	(19)	
No	40.9	(9)	5.6	(1)	33.3	(14)	32.1	(9)	
Since your release, education/upgrading while in community?									
Yes	36.4	(8)	50.0	(9)	21.4	(9)	39.3	(11)	
No	59.1	(13)	50.0	(9)	78.6	(33)	60.7	(17)	

Table D1 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Female		Successful Releases Female		Revocations of Release Male		Successful Releases Male	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Did your participation in education/lack of have any effect on your release in the community?								
Yes	40.9	(9)		^d	40.5	(17)		^d
No	50.0	(11)			57.1	(24)		
Did your participation in education/lack of have any effect on your release in the community?								
Yes	40.9	(9)		^d	40.5	(17)		^d
No	50.0	(11)			57.1	(24)		
Did anyone help you find work on your release?								
Yes	22.7	(5)	72.2	(13)	31.0	(13)	71.4	(20)
No	68.2	(15)	27.8	(5)	69.0	(29)	28.6	(8)
Did you find a job in your community?								
Yes	54.5	(12)	66.7	(12)	64.3	(27)	82.1	(23)
No	36.4	(8)	33.3	(6)	35.7	(15)	17.9	(5)
Was your job...?								
Full-time	45.5	(10)	44.4	(8)	47.6	(20)	60.7	(17)
Part-time	9.1	(2)	11.1	(2)	7.1	(3)	17.9	(5)
Casual	- ^c		11.1	(2)	4.8	(2)	- ^c	
Other	- ^c		- ^c		2.4	(1)	- ^c	

Table D1 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Female		Successful Releases Female		Revocations of Release Male		Successful Releases Male		
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
How much time during your release did you have a job (%)?									
<25	9.1	(2)	- ^c		11.9	(5)	7.1	(2)	
25 – 50	13.6	(3)	16.7	(3)	7.1	(3)	10.7	(3)	
50 - 75	13.6	(3)	11.1	(2)	16.7	(7)	10.7	(3)	
75 – 100	18.2	(4)	44.4	(8)	33.3	(14)	53.6	(15)	
Did you like your job?									
Yes	40.9	(9)	66.7	(12)	64.3	(27)	67.9	(19)	
No	13.6	(3)	- ^c		2.4	(1)	14.4	(4)	
Community Functioning									
Where you are living is safe and stable?									
Yes	63.6	(14)	100	(18)	81.0	(34)	82.1	(23)	
No	31.8	(7)	- ^c		19.0	(8)	17.9	(5)	
Lot of crime or substance misuse where you live?									
Yes	45.5	(10)	27.8	(5)	54.8	(23)	50.0	(14)	
No	50.0	(11)	72.2	(13)	42.9	(18)	50.0	(14)	
Do you have access to family physician when needed?									
Yes	d		83.3	(15)	d		71.4	(20)	
No			16.7	(3)			28.6	(8)	
Do you have access to mental health supports?									
Yes	d		72.2	(13)	d		64.3	(18)	
No			22.2	(4)			35.7	(10)	

Table D1 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Female		Successful Releases Female		Revocations of Release Male		Successful Releases Male	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Do you have access to reliable transportation when needed?								
Yes	d		100	(18)	d		82.1	(23)
No			-				17.9	(5)
Do you have access to assistance in the community?								
Yes	59.1	(13)	d		50.0	(21)	d	
No	36.4	(8)			47.6	(20)		
Do you have access to technology (e.g. phone, television, internet)?								
Yes	d		100	(18)	d		85.7	(24)
No			-				14.3	(4)
Following release have you been involved in CSC programs?								
Yes	36.4	(8)	61.1	(11)	45.2	(19)	78.6	(22)
No	59.1	(13)	38.9	(7)	52.4	(22)	21.4	(6)
Following release have you been involved in any non-CSC programs?								
Yes	d		55.6	(10)	d		35.7	(10)
No			44.4	(8)			64.3	(18)
Avoidance of Substance Misuse								
Have you had any issues with substance misuse?								
Yes	86.4	(19)	44.4	(8)	78.6	(33)	64.3	(18)
No	9.1	(2)	50.0	(9)	19.0	(8)	35.7	(10)

Table D1 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Female		Successful Releases Female		Revocations of Release Male		Successful Releases Male	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Attitudes Toward Justice System								
Do you accept the decisions and instructions the criminal justice system has given you?								
Yes	d		88.9	(16)	d		85.7	(24)
No			5.6	(1)			14.3	(4)
Personal/Emotional								
Are you motivated to remain successful in the community?								
Yes	d		94.4	(17)	d		96.4	(27)
No			-				3.6	(1)
Do you believe you will remain successful in the community?								
Yes	d		94.4	(17)	d		92.9	(26)
No			_{-c}				_{-c}	
Do you do things without thinking them through fully?								
Yes		68.2	(15)	d		59.5	(25)	d
No		27.3	(6)			38.1	(16)	
Do you have a hard time dealing with stressful situations?								
Yes		81.8	(18)	d		45.2	(19)	d
No		13.6	(3)			52.4	(22)	

Table D1 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Gender, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Female		Successful Releases Female		Revocations of Release Male		Successful Releases Male	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Cultural & Spiritual Identity								
Do you consider yourself connected to your culture?								
Yes		^d	61.1	(11)		^d	46.4	(13)
No			33.3	(6)			53.6	(15)
Do you consider yourself a spiritual person?								
Yes	81.8	(18)	88.9	(16)	76.2	(32)	75.0	(21)
No	13.6	(3)	5.6	(1)	21.4	(9)	25.0	(7)
<i>If Indigenous, do you use any cultural resources in the community?</i>								
Yes		^d	16.7	(3)		^d	10.7	(3)
No			55.6	(10)			50.0	(14)
<i>If Indigenous, did you experience Section 81 transfer or Section 84 release?</i>								
Yes	18.2	(2)	11.1	(2)	11.9	(5)	14.3	(4)
No	72.7	(16)	55.6	(10)	85.7	(36)	46.4	(13)

^a missing data not reported < 4%

^b missing data not reported < 6%

^c no responses recorded for this category

^d a comparable item was not asked in the respective interview protocol, Revocations of Release or Successful Releases.

Table D2

Comparisons of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a versus Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b
Feelings about Desistance								
Consciously decide not to get involved in criminal activity?								
Yes	d		76.9	(10)	d		81.3	(26)
No			23.1	(3)			18.8	(6)
Release Planning								
Prior to release did you have a release plan?								
Yes	90.6	(29)	d		71.9	(23)	d	
No	6.3	(2)			28.1	(9)		
Anyone outside institution help with release plan?								
Yes	d		61.5	(8)	d		78.1	(25)
No			38.5	(5)			21.9	(7)
Anyone at institution help with release plan?								
Yes	50.0	(16)	61.5	(8)	34.4	(11)	68.8	(22)
No	46.9	(15)	38.5	(5)	62.5	(20)	31.3	(10)
Did your release plan include <i>Section 84</i> planning?								
Yes	25.0	(8)	d		3.1	(1)	d	
No	71.9	(23)			90.6	(29)		

Table D2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b
Did CSC provide help to make transition into community (e.g. parole officer, Elder)?								
Yes	d		84.6	(11)	d		84.4	(27)
No			15.4	(2)			15.6	(5)
Did someone else in the community help with your transition?								
Yes	d		84.6	(11)	d		56.3	(18)
No			15.4	(2)			43.8	(14)
Did you feel you had a realistic release plan?								
Yes	78.1	(25)	d		84.4	(27)	d	
No	18.8	(6)			15.6	(5)		
When entering the community, did everything go according to plan?								
Yes	50.0	(16)	d		53.1	(17)	d	
No	46.9	(15)			46.9	(15)		
Release Conditions								
Release conditions on release?								
Yes	96.9	(31)	d		32	(100)	d	
No	- ^c				- ^c			
Did release conditions have effect on your returning to custody?								
Yes	87.5	(28)	d		84.4	(27)	d	
No	9.4	(3)			15.6	(5)		

Table D2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non- Indigenous		Successful Releases Non- Indigenous		
Social Networks and Connections									
Did family members provide support on release?									
Yes	78.1	(25)	84.6	(11)	75.0	(24)	84.4	(27)	
No	18.8	(6)	15.4	(2)	21.9	(7)	15.6	(5)	
Are you currently involved in an intimate relationship?									
Yes	37.5	(12)	38.5	(5)	50.0	(16)	43.8	(14)	
No	59.4	(19)	61.5	(8)	46.9	(15)	56.3	(18)	
Did your partner help you with release planning?									
Yes	d		30.8	(4)	d		28.1	(9)	
No			7.7	(1)			18.8	(6)	
Do you have any children?									
Yes	71.9	(23)	61.5	(8)	56.3	(18)	62.5	(20)	
No	25.0	(8)	38.5	(5)	40.6	(13)	37.5	(12)	
How many children do you have?									
One	34.4	(11)	15.4	(2)	15.6	(5)	15.6	(5)	
Two	15.6	(5)	7.7	(1)	21.9	(7)	25.0	(8)	
Three	12.5	(4)	30.8	(4)	15.6	(5)	12.5	(4)	
Four+	9.4	(3)	7.7	(1)	3.1	(4)	6.6	(2)	

Table D2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a versus Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b
If you have children under age 18, were you primary caregiver while on release?								
Yes	6.3	(2)	15.4	(2)	12.5	(4)	12.5	(4)
No	65.6	(21)	46.2	(6)	43.8	(14)	34.4	(11)
How many children currently live with you?								
None	62.5	(20)	42.2	(6)	43.8	(14)	40.6	(13)
One	9.4	(3)	15.4	(2)	9.4	(3)	12.5	(4)
Two	- ^c		- ^c		3.1	(1)	6.3	(2)
Three	- ^c		- ^c		- ^c		3.1	(1)
Did your children help with your release?								
Yes	d		23.1	(3)	d		28.1	(9)
No			30.8	(4)			21.9	(7)
Did your parenting responsibilities impact your return to custody?								
Yes	25.0	(8)	d		18.8	(6)	d	
No	43.8	(14)			34.4	(11)		
Do you socialize with friends often?								
Yes	68.8	(22)	53.8	(7)	84.4	(27)	65.6	(21)
No	28.1	(9)	46.2	(6)	12.5	(4)	34.4	(11)
Employment/Education/Financial Education/upgrading while incarcerated?								
Yes	68.8	(22)	69.2	(9)	53.1	(17)	81.3	(26)
No	28.1	(9)	30.8	(4)	43.8	(14)	18.8	(6)

Table D2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b
Since your release, education/upgrading while in community?								
Yes	28.1	(9)	38.5	(5)	25.0	(8)	46.9	(15)
No	68.8	(22)	61.5	(8)	75.0	(24)	53.1	(17)
Did your participation in education/lack of have any effect on your release in the community?								
Yes	46.9	(15)	^d		34.4	(11)	^d	
No	46.9	(15)			62.5	(20)		
Did anyone help you find work on your release?								
Yes	34.4	(11)	76.9	(10)	21.9	(7)	71.9	(23)
No	62.5	(20)	23.1	(3)	75.0	(24)	28.1	(9)
Did you find a job in your community?								
Yes	46.9	(15)	76.9	(10)	75.0	(24)	78.1	(25)
No	50.0	(16)	23.1	(3)	21.9	(7)	21.9	(7)
Was your job....?								
Full-time	28.1	(9)	46.2	(6)	65.6	(21)	59.4	(19)
Part-time	6.3	(2)	23.1	(3)	9.4	(3)	12.5	(4)
Casual	6.3	(2)	7.7	(1)	^{-c}		3.1	(1)
Other	^{-c}		^{-c}		^{-c}		^{-c}	

Table D2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous		
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b	
How much time during your release did you have a job (%)?									
<25	9.4	(3)	15.4	(2)	12.5	(4)	- ^c		
25-50	15.6	(5)	15.4	(2)	3.1	(1)	12.5	(4)	
50-75	21.9	(7)	7.7	(1)	9.4	(3)	12.5	(4)	
75-100	3.1	(1)	46.2	(6)	53.1	(17)	53.1	(17)	
Did you like your job?									
Yes	43.8	(14)	69.2	(9)	68.8	(22)	68.8	(22)	
No	3.1	(1)	15.4	(2)	9.4	(3)	6.3	(2)	
Community Functioning									
Where you are living is safe and stable?									
Yes	75.0	(24)	84.6	(11)	75.0	(24)	90.6	(29)	
No	21.9	(7)	15.4	(2)	25.0	(8)	9.4	(3)	
Lot of crime or substance misuse where you live?									
Yes	53.1	(17)	46.2	(6)	50.0	(16)	40.6	(13)	
No	43.8	(14)	53.8	(7)	46.9	(15)	59.4		
Do you have access to family physician when needed?									
Yes		^d	76.9	(10)		^d	78.1	(25)	
No			23.1	(3)			21.9	(7)	
Do you have access to mental health supports?									
Yes		^d	76.9	(10)		^d	65.6	(21)	
No			23.1	(3)			31.3	(10)	

Table D2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b
Do you have access to reliable transportation when needed?								
Yes		d	84.6	(11)	d		90.6	(29)
No			15.4	(2)			9.4	(3)
Do you have access to assistance in the community?								
Yes	56.3	(18)	d		50.0	(16)	d	
No	40.6	(13)			46.9	(15)		
Do you have access to technology (e.g. phone, television, internet)?								
Yes		d	92.3	(12)	d		90.6	(29)
No			7.7	(1)			9.4	(3)
Following release have you been involved in CSC programs?								
Yes	37.5	(12)	84.6	(11)	46.9	(15)	65.6	(21)
No	59.4	(19)	15.4	(2)	50.0	(16)	34.4	(11)
Following release have you been involved in any non-CSC programs?								
Yes		d	53.8	(7)	d		40.6	(13)
No			46.2	(6)			59.4	(19)
Avoidance of Substance Misuse								
Have you had any issues with substance misuse?								
Yes	90.6	(29)	69.2	(9)	71.9	(23)	53.1	(17)
No	6.3	(2)	30.8	(4)	25.0	(8)	46.9	(15)

Table D2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations ($N = 64$)^a versus Successful Releases ($N = 48$)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b
Attitudes Toward Justice System								
Do you accept the decisions and instructions the criminal justice system has given you?								
Yes		d	84.6	(11)	d		90.6	(29)
No			15.4	(2)			9.4	(3)
Personal/Emotional								
Are you motivated to remain successful in the community?								
Yes		d	100	(13)	d		96.9	(31)
No			_ ^c				3.1	(1)
Do you believe you will remain successful in the community?								
Yes		d	100	(13)	d		93.8	(30)
No			_ ^c				_ ^c	
Do you do things without thinking them through fully?								
Yes	59.4	(19)		d	65.6	(21)		d
No	37.5	(12)			31.3	(10)		
Do you have a hard time dealing with stressful situations?								
Yes	59.4	(19)		d	56.3	(18)		d
No	37.5	(12)			40.6	(13)		

Table D2 (cont'd)

Comparison of Participant Responses To Main Protocol Factors Screening Questions, by Indigenous Ancestry, Revocations (N = 64)^a versus Successful Releases (N = 48)^b

Factor	Revocations of Release Indigenous		Successful Releases Indigenous		Revocations of Release Non-Indigenous		Successful Releases Non-Indigenous	
	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b	%	(n) ^a	%	(n) ^b
Cultural & Spiritual Identity								
Do you consider yourself connected to your culture?								
Yes		^d	76.9	(10)		^d	43.8	(14)
No			23.1	(3)			56.3	(18)
Do you consider yourself a spiritual person?								
Yes	90.6	(29)	92.3	(12)	65.6	(21)	78.1	(25)
No	6.3	(2)	7.7	(1)	31.3	(10)	21.9	(7)
<i>If Indigenous, do you use any cultural resources in the community?</i>								
Yes		^d	46.2	(6)		^d	- ^c	
No			53.8	(7)			53.1	(17)
<i>If Indigenous, did you experience Section 81 transfer or Section 84 release?</i>								
Yes	28.1	(9)	46.2	(6)	3.1	(1)	- ^c	
No	71.9	(23)	53.8	(7)	90.6	(29)	50.0	(16)

^a missing data not reported < 4%.

^b missing data not reported < 6%.

^c no responses recorded for this category

^d a comparable item was not asked in the respective interview protocol, Revocations of Release or Successful Releases.