Prisoners Reentry Service

Christy Buelna

University of North Texas at Dallas

TECM 2700.031 –Technical Writing

Professor Tinajero

April 25, 2021

Prisoners Reentry Service

Problem Statement

The annual release of almost 1900 prisoners leaves them with limited options for effective reintegration into their communities. When these newly released inmates return to society, they face a variety of issues, including unique restrictions that exacerbate their problems. These inmates are increasingly denied proper treatment and facilities, which adds to a high rate of re-incarceration. Within five years after their release, almost three-quarters of ex-prisoners are re-arrested. Almost all who return to jail or prison return to the society. As a result, the issue of reentry and its effect on individuals, their families, and the neighborhoods to which they return is a major concern for these recently released inmates (Ouellette et al., 2017). Furthermore, scholars have demonstrated no interest in how ideas, rather than restorative justice, could help guide reentry procedures and policies. The treatment-social reinforcement behavior modification connection, for example, can be more challenging than just treating as a means of social support (Miller, 2004).

When offenders are released from jail, they face a variety of serious unintended effects that can obstruct effective community reintegration (Ouellette et al., 2017). The Harlem district of New York has been a case study for examining the issues of criminal reentry into society. In an area characterized by widespread poverty, violence, and corruption, the neighborhood had a high number of parolees (Senanayake, 2019). Although most reentry programs begin after a prisoner is released, certain individuals become victims of unfair targets while still incarcerated. Others are releasing people to try to provide vital care since they have been released. Several

scholars have recently shown an interest in examining evidence-based reentry services and activities to aid in the reintegration of inmates from custody or incarceration into the society. The aim of these programs and resources is to improve community safety. What works, though, is still a mystery.

Tailored programs can help with reentry issues, but community support is also needed for long-term public programming and successful community reintegration. One major concern is whether locals endorse various reentry programs in general. The public aversion to measures that aid ex-inmates' reintegration will be a significant legislative barrier to introducing social facilities and initiatives. Regardless of individuals' perception regarding abstract legislation, how residents feel about interacting with ex-offenders is an essential concern for reintegration. Lacking personal support can hinder the success of reintegration policies even if the public supports such legislation at a policy level. Though recent event shows that Americans increasingly support reentry services, it is unclear the proportion of people support them as abstract concepts versus specific activities (Lattimore et al., 2010).

It is also important to consider that people's opinions on reentry policies can vary, even though they have the same level of assistance. It has been established that ex-offenders pose a threat to society, influencing societal perceptions of their reintegration into society. However, whether those assumptions of inmate reentry services and ex-offenders' personal recognition are based on stereotypes about people's willingness to improve remains unknown. According to previous studies, punitiveness decreases as people think criminals will improve and live virtuously (Moak et al., 2020; Vuk et al., 2020). As a result, it is important to look at the public's support for reentry services in general, as well as their individual embrace of ex-offenders back into society.

Research Questions

1. What is the importance of exploring prisoner reentry problems?

2. Can tailored programs and public support influence the success of reentry programs?

3. What is the need to win public opinion and support for reentry programs?

Why the Problem is Important to Study

The United States continues to see an extraordinary rise in its inmate population in the twenty-first century. The criminal justice system spends a lot of money developing and enforcing inmate reentry programs, which benefit the 640,000 prisoners who are released from jail each year. When they return to the society, a large percentage of these former prisoners have co-occurring needs. In other words, they are looking for social care, therapy for drug abuse, and work. As a result, a recurring issue with inmate reentry programs is how to assign personalized care to help these offenders meet their needs. Despite their differing needs, these ex-prisoners frequently receive the same facilities. Because of the pressing need to meet the diverse needs of released inmates, it is important to investigate inmate reentry services. This necessitates investigating the value of utilizing particular models including the Reentry Well-being Assessment Tool (RWAT) to direct care assignment in prisoner reentry initiatives (Veeh et al., 2018).

On the other hand, it is important to investigate the role of public sentiment with regards to inmate reentry services in order to affect their effectiveness and societal inclusion. This is because public opinion can have an effect on government resource distribution. In such a situation, it is important to investigate the implications of the public's adamant opposition to reentry services. That also includes how their views could affect legislators and policymakers to be more hesitant to commit funding that might help inmates reintegrate into society, for fear of

sacrificing political support and reelection from their voters. To affect the effectiveness of ambitious reentry initiatives and the level of popular support, critical analysis of these issues is critical. Second, it is important to investigate the impact of ex-offenders' public perceptions on their inclusion or rejection in societies, as well as how this can help or hinder effective group reintegration (Ouellette et al., 2017). This is especially important when dealing with issues such as work and housing, which could necessitate more individual participation from the general population in order to achieve effective neighborhood reintegration. It is important to consider how lawmakers, legislators, and criminal justice system advocates can use public opinion to help prisoners reenter society.

It is essential to explore the topic because a need exists to recognize the various challenges former prisoners encounter upon release from jail or prison and support, they need. That necessitates examining the benefits of reentry services such as education, housing, and job training. Furthermore, such issues call for establishing the importance of planning for reentry initiatives for offenders while still incarcerated for their release (Ouellette et al., 2017). Indeed, public opinion research on reentry services is critical because it can decide if former inmates may be able to find work and benefit from other important programs such as opioid recovery. It is critical to investigate whether reentry belief is linked to cultural and public support for reentry programs.

Anticipated Benefits

The proposed study would determine the role of public opinion in determining the success of inmate reentry services. This is crucial because it would make it easier for lawmakers and policymakers to devise plans for gaining public approval for reentry programs. Such activities could result in the creation of a problem-solving strategy based on local collaboration, intensive case management, and active participation of criminal justice stakeholders.

Furthermore, recognizing the obstacles that convicted prisoners face will help in the development of plans for establishing reentry programs and stable reintegration into society. Importantly, such actions will aid in the development of programs that will strengthen the protection and cohesiveness of America's most disadvantaged populations by solving prisoner reentry concerns.

References

Miller, J. M. (2014). Identifying collateral effects of offender reentry programming through

      evaluative fieldwork. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *39*(1), 41-58. https://doi

      10.1007/s12103-013-9206-6

Ouellette, H. M., Applegate, B. K., & Vuk, M. (2017). The public's stance on prisoner reentry:

      Policy support and personal acceptance. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *42*(4),

      768–789. https://doi-org.libraryresources.columbiasouthern.edu/10.1007/s12103-016-

      9382-2

Senanayake, N. (2019). Harlem parole reentry court: An initiative in offender reintegration.

      *Current Issues in Criminal Justic*e, *31*(2), 292–301. https://doi-

      org.libraryresources.columbiasouthern.edu/10.1080/10345329.2019.1604056

Veeh, C. A., Renn, T., & Pettus-Davis, C. (2018). Promoting reentry well-being: A novel

      assessment tool for individualized service assignment in prisoner reentry programs.

      Social Work, *63*(1), 91-93.

Addition Sources that will Be Used

Decker, S. H. and Pyrooz, D. C. (2020) 'The imprisonment-extremism nexus: Continuity and

      change in activism and radicalism intentions in a longitudinal study of prisoner reentry',

      PLoS ONE, *15*(11), 1–21. https://doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0242910.

Designing a Prisoner Reentry System Hardwired to Manage Disputes. (2010). *Harvard Law*

      Review, *123*(5), 1339–1360.

Doleac, J. L. (2019). Wrap-around services don't improve prisoner reentry outcomes. *Journal of*

      Policy Analysis & Management, *38*(2), 508–514. https://doi-

      org.libraryresources.columbiasouthern.edu/10.1002/pam.22119

Mijs, J. J. B. (2016). The missing organizational dimension of prisoner reentry: An ethnography

      of the road to reentry at a nonprofit service provider. *Sociological Forum*, *31*(2), 291–

      309.

Krontiris, K., & Watler, C. (2009). Rethinking prisoner reentry in Harlem. *Harvard Journal of*

      African American Public Policy, *16*, 73–84.

Lattimore, P., Steffey, D., & Visher, C. (2010). Prisoner reentry in the first decade of the twenty-

      first century. *Victims & Offenders*, *5*(3), 253–267. https://doi-

      org.libraryresources.columbiasouthern.edu/10.1080/15564886.2010.485907

Moak, S. C., Walker, J. T., Earwood, M., & Towery, G. (2020). Using reentry simulations to

      promote changes in attitude toward offenders: Experiential learning to promote

      successful reentry. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *45*(1), 126. https://doi-

      org.libraryresources.columbiasouthern.edu/10.1007/s12103-019-09500-9

Vuk, M., Applegate, B. K., Ouellette, H. M., Bolin, R. M., & Aizpurua, E. (2020). The pragmatic

      public? The impact of practical concerns on support for punitive and rehabilitative prison

      policies. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *45*(2), 273–292. https://doi-

      org.libraryresources.columbiasouthern.edu/10.1007/s12103-019-09507-2

Wheeler, D. P., & Patterson, G. (2008). Prisoner reentry. *Health and Social Work*, *33*(2), 145-

      146.