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ABSTRACT

Unfortunately, little or no time is spent on transitioning inmates back into society, especially those with physical and mental disabilities. One support service that is being taken into consideration is the Day Reporting Center. Day reporting centers are highly structured nonresidential programs. Parolees report to the center on a daily basis, submit to drug tests, and are enrolled in various counseling, education, or vocational classes. Whereas most centers have strict monitoring and surveillance of parolees, one center that stands out in its alternative approach of self-governance is the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center in San Bernardino, California. There, the parolees are allowed to contribute to the running and governance of the Center.

The hypothesis asserts that the positive culture that surrounds the Center provides parolees the opportunity to reconsider, revise, challenge, and change their negative criminal identities, by viewing themselves in a constructive manner to successfully transition back into society. Eight assumptions were used to either support or nullify the hypothesis: spheres of civility; performative spaces; personal social space; weaving theory; opportunity theory; transformation theory; Freirian pedagogical approach; and pelindaba. The data was gathered using multiple sources, such as several interviews with staff and ex-parolees, and observations of daily procedures and classroom instruction and interaction. NVivo 8, a Qualitative Data Analysis software program (QDA), was used to transcribe, code, and organize the interviews into various themes. The comments
by staff and parolees demonstrated that the implementation of these assumptions has resulted in a family like environment. This environment has allowed parolees to focus on their identity in a positive, transformative, and rehabilitative manner that is supported by everyone at the Center.

Further research can be conducted as to whether the success of the Center can be replicated at other centers. This study has implications for the public school system. It suggests principles that if applied to the public school system, may reach difficult to teach populations.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

General Statement of the Problem

How can a society’s moral content be determined? Cardinal Roger Mahoney sums this up by stating, “ANY SOCIETY, ANY NATION, IS JUDGED on the basis of how it treats its weakest members—the last, the least, the littlest” (Holman, 1999, p. 1; emphasis in original).

The prison population is one of the most disadvantaged groups in modern society because of its low academic skills and literacy rates, along with various disabilities that likely contribute to imprisonment. Upon completing their sentence, most inmates reenter society with no more skills than when they left. Because of a lack of marketable skills, a criminal record, and no transitional services or assistance, many turn back to crime as a means of support (Klein, Tolbert, Bugarin, Cataldi, & Tauschek, 2004). This includes offenders with learning and/or mental and emotional disabilities (Hayes, Shackell, Mottram, & Lancaster, 2007). The inmate population is known to have lower than average academic skills, with 40% of juveniles and at least 50% of adult prisoners needing special educational support (Weisel, Toops, & Schwartz, 2008).

Regrettably, the United States has the highest rate of incarceration of any country in the world (Bureau of Justice, 1992). One solution to reduce the number of incarcerations is to reduce the number of re-offenders, a solution that
can be facilitated through education, which can be an essential link for inmates to move into the real world. With success in academics and vocational education, they also develop social skills necessary for the workplace (Ubah, 2004). Years of research show that educational programs during incarceration reduce recidivism by permitting inmates to gain knowledge, skills, and self-confidence (O'Neill & Berie, 2007).

Researcher's Purpose for Study

This study is of particular interest to me because of the serious consequences of inadequate and biased schooling. I first witnessed this during a student teaching fieldwork assignment. It was in an elementary class where I was assisting the teacher in tutoring some of her students. One student in particular had learning difficulties. The teacher said not to bother with him because he was going to, "slip through the cracks and end up in prison." This remark left a deep impression on me and throughout my teaching career I made it a point to see whether this view was shared by other teachers, and whether it had any negative effects on this had on students with learning disabilities. What I found was that, because these students are excluded, many simply give up learning. When I taught third grade I found this was the case with some of my students with learning difficulties; the same was true with my ninth grade Special Day Class. In teaching adults with learning disabilities, many of whom were homeless, I witnessed the end result of failing these students. If they did not, "end up in prison," they became homeless. The aim of this study is to find a solution to this
tragedy caused by exclusion. During my teaching career I developed an alternative approach toward instruction based on learning, self-esteem, and self-efficacy. I even went so far as to give the students a voice in the learning process by allowing them to give feedback and recommendations. The results were astounding, with almost no behavioral issues, and an increase in test scores, and a sense of camaraderie in the classroom. It is hoped that the efforts of articulating a vision based on democracy will have a similar effect of promoting learning, self-esteem, and self-efficacy among the parolees.

Significance of the Study

According to the PEW's Center on the States report, *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008*, more than one in every 100 American adults is either in jail or prison. This means that with 2.3 million people behind bars, the United States incarcerates more people than any other country in the world, including China, which comes in second with 1.5 million, and Russia, a distant third with 890,000(Pew Charitable, 2008). Interestingly, the PEW Charitable Center study in 2010 showed a decline in the number of state prisoners; the first time in nearly forty years, with a drop of 3% in the state prison population from 2008 to 2010 (PEW Charitable, 2010). There are a number of explanations for this decline. One is the effort by the states toward lenient sentencing and release policies, which helps reduce the cost of correctional system. There are other factors as well. There are endeavors to reduce recidivism.
In 2007, Texas faced an increase of up to 17,000 inmates in just five years. Rather than spend nearly $2 billion on new prison construction and operations, $241 million was spent on residential and community-based treatment. Nevada expanded its prison education, vocational, and substance abuse programs. Inmates who participate in these programs can earn “good time” credits allowing for supervised early release. This saved the state $38 million in prison expenses for 2009. California also plans to cut its expenses by the release of low-risk inmates and reducing recidivism by holding violators to alternative methods of accountability, rather than incarceration. The number of parolees in California increased ten times over the past twenty years compared to three times for the United States. This is a disproportionate number of parolees; eighteen percent reside in California in comparison to twelve percent for the rest of the country. In addition, San Bernardino has a disparate amount of parolees for California. The city is home to ten percent of the County's parolees, but houses 23 percent. In other words, San Bernardino, "bears a disproportionate burden on top of a disproportionate burden - because of the number of parolees compared to other states" (Eggleston, Rennie, & Riggs, 2008; p. 4). Nationwide, states spent 6.8 percent of their budgets on corrections in 2007, which is one out of every fifteen. California’s prison expenditures are among the highest in the nation. Whereas the national average for housing an inmate is $26,000, California spends $43,287 (Grattet, Petersilis, & Lin, 2008). The budget projection for corrections for 2012-2013 is $10,718,529, or 7.8% of total state expenditures. In addition to the efforts on the part of the states to reduce
recidivism, there has been a gradual 37% decline in the criminal rate since 1990 (PEW Charitable, 2010).

Yet, in spite of the expenses to reduce recidivism, minimal efforts are being done to transition ex-offenders back into society (PEW Charitable, 2008). Little or no time is spent educating and employing parolees: 70%-80% of parolees are unemployed; 85% still have some form of substance abuse problem; 50% are illiterate; and 60%-90% lack the necessary skills to survive outside the prison (Eggleston, Rennie, & Riggs, 2008).

Another matter is reintegrating ex-offenders with disabilities. These disabilities can be physical and/or mental; this is especially crucial since they entail additional obstacles for ex-offenders to overcome. Those with disabilities face higher rates of unemployment and homelessness, which make it all the more difficult to reintegrate back into society (Haney, 2001). Various sources claim that persons with disabilities are significantly higher among the incarcerated population than among the general population of the United States. One source states that 52% in a sample study of prisoners were dyslexic (Van Alsenoy, 2007). A 2005 survey found that more than half of all prison and jail inmates had mental health problems: 56% of state inmates; 45% of Federal inmates; and 64% of jail inmates (James & Glaze, 2006).

One source goes so far as to say that 70% of incarcerated juveniles qualify for special education (Russell, 2002). A further study showed 72% of male and 70% of female inmates suffer from two or more mental health disorders (Talbot & Riley, 2007). This is in contrast to 11% of the U.S. population, eighteen
or older (James & Glaze, 2006). In regard to disabilities as a whole, of the 291.1 million people in the 2005 population of the United States, 54.4 million, or 18.7 percent, reported some level of disability (Brault, 2008). It is also likely that between one third and one half of those incarcerated cannot read or write (Bayliss, 2003; & Corcoran, 1985).

Ninety-five percent of confined felons are released at some time and many of those will have disabilities (Pew Charitable, 2008). Unfortunately, between 50% and 70% become reincarcerated (Bayliss, 2003). Reasons for recidivism can be attributed to the negative effects of prisonization, which is the process by which inmates assimilate into the inmate subculture and institutionalization, which creates situations of learned helplessness as offenders become dependent on the institution, rather than on themselves (Lawson, Segrin, & Ward, 1996; Haney, 2001; Clemmer, 1940). The majority of inmates are released directly into the community without any opportunity to readjusting or to debrief, which makes transitioning from prison to home problematic. For those with disabilities this is essential if their disability hinders them from surviving outside of prison without the proper support. While some of California’s programs have shown promising results for mentally ill parolees, such programs fail to reach many offenders who need them. Mentally ill parolees often return home without needed medication, treatment, and supervision required to reduce their recidivism. Too many mentally ill parolees are returning to prison, and too many are returning for reasons unrelated to the committing of new crimes. The Board of Prison Terms can have the prisoners’ parole revoked if they consider that a
mentally ill parolee is a danger to themselves or others and is in need of psychiatric treatment and order their return to prison (Grattet, Petersilla, & Lin, 2008). In their *Draft Components of the San Bernardino County Reentry Collaborative Report*, Drs. Gehring and Eggleston recommended Parolee Outpatient Clinics (POCs) as an important source of mental health care for parolees. They believe that POCs contribute to lower recidivism rates among mentally ill and recommend that providers assess policy and institutional barriers that may prevent access to needed services (Gehring & Eggleston, 2012).

One support service has been the Day Reporting Centers (DRCs), which offer transitioning programs from prison/jail into the community with limited supervision (Diggs & Pieper, 1994). Day reporting centers can be defined as highly structured, nonresidential programs. Parolees report to the center daily, or call in several times a day. At the center, they submit to drug testing, and enroll in counseling, education, or vocational classes. The main advantage of DRCs is that all of these services are in one location (Digg & Piper, 1994).

Two DRCs, one rural and one urban, that were studied as to their ability in reducing recidivism, had rigorous programs to assist parolees in transitioning back into their communities. This was accomplished through four stages or phases: phase I lasted four weeks, five days per week, and five hours a day; phase II was four weeks, three days per week, and five hours per day; phase III lasted four weeks, two days per week, and five hours a day; and phase IV, which is aftercare, was three months of programming, with one visit per week for the first month, then one visit every two weeks for the second month, and just one
visit for the third month. With the rural program, 16.7% of those completing the program were re-arrested, while 18.9% were rearrested in the urban program. The recidivism rates were lower for those completing the program in comparison to those who did not, except for the most troublesome parolees. It is believed that their criminal behavior was more deeply rooted and that a Day Reporting Center was not able to alter their criminality significantly. During the twelve months the rural program saved $1893, and the urban program saved $359 for each parolee (Craddock, 2000).

According to the Pew Charitable Trusts (2011), recidivism rates have declined. From 1999-2002 the recidivism rate for the United States was 45.4%, which declined to 43.3% between 2004-2007. California's recidivism rate for 1999-2002 61.1%, decreased to 57.8% for 2004-2007, but increased to 63.7% for 2012 (Pew Charitable, 2011; Office of Research, 2012).

Most centers have in common strict monitoring and surveillance of parolees, which still support institutionalization. An alternative approach to this penal practice is based on one of self-governance, as espoused by William George who argued that correctional institutions should be based on the U.S. Constitution (George, 1911). A center that allows parolees the opportunity to shoulder responsibility is the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center (SBDRC). The objective behind the SBDRC is one of self-governance, patterned after the models established by George and Osborne for prisons (George, 1911; Osborne, 1915). One purpose of the current study is to examine how the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center accomplishes this goal by taking a humane approach. It
promotes mutual respect and care for human dignity, based on democracy, self-governance, and self-esteem (Gehring & Eggleston, 2010).

When such efforts toward allowing persons who have been exposed to the harsh and structured environment of prison to shoulder responsibility prove successful, then those with disabilities also stand a chance of becoming self-enabling. Elmira Reformatory provided vocational/special education programs, instead of treating offenders as “defectives” or “exceptionally stupid” (Gehring & Rennie, 2008). These vocational/special education programs are in contrast to earlier efforts toward rehabilitation by means of torture, such as flogging, dark cells, and starvation. In time, the public became tired of these inhumane methods and began demanding more positive means for behavioral change (Gehring & Eggleston, 2007). There was the introduction of education and promotion of literacy as a means for reducing recidivism by Robert Raikes and the Philadelphia Society of Public Prisons (Gehring & Eggleston, 2007). This was followed up by the Elmira Reformatory that established vocational education. These innovations continued with the Junior Republic, where academic, social, and vocational education were used as a means for social reform, along with the establishment of the Mutual Welfare League (Gehring & Eggleston, 2007).

If these approaches in prisons can benefit inmates and parolees, then certainly they can work in less harsh environments, such as in public schools. Rodriguez and Brown’s (2009) qualitative approach focused on student interviews by the use of participatory action research (PAR), which allows for open dialogue with students’ views on improving education in their schools. The
study made the bold assertion that the voicing of the experiences by students was a true form of democracy that can help reduce school disciplinary action, instead of being isolated from school and the community, which can eventually lead to incarceration (p. 31).

Research Question

As suggested, institutionalization can debilitate individuals by causing them to become dependent on the institution rather than on themselves. In light of this, how does the staff at the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center define and implement a democratic organizational culture aimed at re-integrating ex-offenders into society so as to assist offenders to reconsider, revise, and challenge their criminal identities?

I believe this positive organizational culture provides offenders the opportunities to reconsider, revise, and challenge their criminal identities, which in turn, prepares them for reintegration. The study was not so much seeking to confirm that this happens, so much as to explore how this happens.

The researcher will pay particular attention to the identity work of staff with students who have been identified as learning-disabled.

To answer this question, an inquiry was made of the policies and programs of the Center to see if they were able to reverse the effects of institutionalization according to the testimonies of the Center staff.

Central to this hypothesis is the concept of organizational niches, particularly "schools as niches". Prison schools are often innovative, flexible,
experiential and student-centered, which enable them to respond to students in a manner that supports niche qualities described by Seymour (1977). "Schools-as-niches" may offer students more comfort than other places in the prison: they are a good place ‘to escape the cockroaches’. Prisoner-students allude to the niche-like qualities of schools, stating that good teachers help them recover their self-esteem, as well as provide support and meaningful work for them. Prisoners allude to the school as meaningful activity when they talk about time serving them by going to school, rather than them serving time (Wright, 2012, p. 28-29).

General Design

Case study was chosen as the means of gathering data because of its holistic in-depth ability to bring out the detailed viewpoints of the participants by the use of multiple sources of data (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991). Thus, it contains detail, richness, variance, and depth. Case study can evolve as interrelated events become more evident (Flyvberg, 2011).

Case studies have been around as long as recorded history and have contributed to a large portion of books and articles. Yet, they are not highly regarded; only two out of thirty graduate courses in cases studies are offered by major universities. The justification for this lack of support is that one cannot generalize based on one case study, but this is not necessarily true. For example, Galileo’s rejection of Aristotle’s law of gravity was based not on a series of observations, but on a single experiment. It was a single case that disproved Aristotle. This is strengthened by Karl Popper’s "All swans are white," that finding
just one case of a black swan can falsify the proposition, thereby giving it general significance (Flyvberg, 2011). Some argue that that case studies are only useful in developing hypotheses, but not in testing and verifying their validity. According to critics, testing hypotheses relates to generalizability by selecting typical or average cases. Nevertheless, atypical or extreme cases can often present more information. A single case can either confirm or falsify a hypothesis. This was illustrated by an occupational team wanting to investigate whether organic solvents were responsible for brain damage. Instead of choosing the typical worksite, one was chosen that stood out for its unique adherence to safety regulations. When incidents of brain damage were found, it was determined that organic solvents were responsible. This was based on the site's strict safety protocols. It was determined that since, the findings were valid for this case, they were valid for all others (Flyvberg, 2011).

According to Ragin (1992) another advantage to single or small-N studies is the ability to easily revise, which can be difficult with large-N studies.

There is also the concern that researchers may have preconceived notions which can influence the veracity of the study. Because of this qualitative research is sometimes viewed as less rigorous in its ability to close in on real-life situations. This may be true in some cases. Yet, even the interpretation of statistical results can be subjective. According to Campbell, Ragin, Geertz, Wieviorka, Flyvberg, and others (2011), researchers typically revise their hypothesis if they find their preconceived ideas were wrong (Flyvberg, 2011). Dense narratives based on thick description provide protection against narrative
fallacy. This can be demonstrated by the fact that it can be difficult or impossible to summarize the narratives into neat formulas, general propositions, and theories. Some critics view this as a drawback, rather than the study uncovering a rich problematic (Flyvberg, 2011). Since case studies are multi-perspectival, the researcher is able to consider the perspectives of all the actors and the interaction between them (Feagin, Orum, and Sjoberg, 1991).

With all research, consideration must be given to internal and external validity, and reliability. Yin (1994) suggested using multiple sources of evidence to ensure validity: survey instruments, interviews, and documents. Yin (1994) also listed six sources of evidence for case study protocol: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation, and physical artifacts; not all of these are needed in every case study. Yin continues by adding three principles for case study data collection:

1. Using multiple sources of data
2. Create a case study database
3. Maintain a chain of evidence

To accomplish these tasks Yin (1984) developed a list of case study procedures:

1. Design a case study protocol:
   a. determine the required skills
   b. develop and review the protocol

2. Connect the case study:
   a. prepare the data collection
   b. distribute questionnaires
c. conduct interviews

3. Analyze case evidence:
   a. analytic strategy

4. Develop conclusions, recommendations, and implications based on the evidence.

Finally, Yin (1993) identified some types of case studies: exploratory, explanatory, and descriptive. Stake (1995) added three others: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. The one that is of particular relevance to this study is the intrinsic approach, where the researcher has an interest in the case. The term intrinsic suggests that researchers who have a genuine interest in the case use this approach to better understand the case because in all its particularity and ordinariness. The purpose is not to understand some abstract construct or generic phenomenon or build theory (Stake, 1995). The protocols and procedures outlined by Yin were used in developing the study.

In developing the case study protocol the required skills entailed a clear understanding of data collection and analysis. This would require learning to use NVivo 8, with its numerous features. NVivo is a qualitative data analysis (QDA) computer software package produced by QSR International designed to triangulate and evaluate data (Maxwell, 1996). NVivo is specifically designed for qualitative research, with numerous features for developing projects (QSR International, 2009). NVivo is able to interface with a number of programs and formats: Microsoft Word, Adobe Document Format, video/media files, and audio files. Documents can be edited after they have been imported. One can work
directly from audio and video files in creating transcripts or keywords. Afterwards, transcripts, imported documents, videos and pictures can be organized into hierarchies of data known as nodes. Project items, such as nodes, can be grouped together using the "set" feature. These sets can be rearranged to show sequence of events. The "attributes" feature can be used to compare cases by using demographic data like gender, age, or region. To capture ideas and thoughts, NVivo provides the memo feature to record observations and link them to other nodes. It makes sense that, of all of this information, the "code" feature is the most useful. Related materials including documents, pictures, and video or audio files can be coded into themes, ideas, people, or places by using color coding stripes. The data can then be organized by using a matrix to compare items and identify patterns or themes. Sometimes it is necessary to gather items together. This can be accomplished using "search" to identify the most frequently used words in selected notes. Finally, the findings can be exported as documents, charts, or PDF format.

NVivo also works effectively with teams. Each team member can create a project and share it with other team members to create a final project. After learning how to properly use NVivo’s features, other skills were necessary to master, such as Adobe Sound booth and Microsoft Office.

Connecting the study together entailed drafting a list of those to be interviewed, both staff and ex-parolees. In validating the truthfulness of the interviews, personal observations were conducted of the daily routine of the Center, actions of the staff and parolees, and classroom instruction. During the
interviews and observations, artifacts were collected, such as class worksheets and other pertinent documentation.

In conclusion, an intrinsic case study was chosen because of my personal interest in the transitioning of offenders back into society. The San Bernardino Day Reporting Center has a unique approach that differs from other day reporting centers in its democratic approach which allows parolees a voice in the governance of the Center. If the efforts of the Center are successful, then such methods might be applied to other day reporting centers.

In this qualitative study the method is to explore, through observations and interviews, the offender identity work of Center staff. This method is supported by the concept of "performative space" which allows students the opportunity to focus and negotiate their social identity in a positive manner, rather than their prison stereotypes (Wright, 2012). Prison education may work because prisoners are afforded social, physical and emotional spaces where multiple roles are considered that impact self-appraisal, identity formation and future behaviors. Schools should be explored in future research as construction sites, identity stations and identity zones of transition where prisoners find opportunities to negotiate appropriate and practice multiple, tentative, sometimes novel, pro-social identities. Ideally, "performative spaces" are social and physical locations where actors experience freedom to perform new identities and/or creatively reshape old ones. In these spaces identities are (relatively) fluid; there is a playfulness to be oneself (or someone else). Again ideally, in these spaces, identities are relatively unissued, problematic, requiring negotiation, rather than
stereotypic, taken-for-granted or predetermined in advance by stigma, racism and prejudice, for example. In these busy, dynamic interpretive and transactional spaces, identities may be recognized, supported, endorsed, renegotiated, contested, modified, revised and adopted. We hypothesize that relatively ideal "performative spaces" are likely to appear in culturally hybrid borderlands or in liminal spaces (such as airport lounges and social gatherings of strangers like conferences), where identities are likely unstable, tentative, in "limbo" due to fission and fusion of class, race, gender, geography, norms and cultures. In borderland cultures such as prison schools as in liminal spaces, identities reflect an “in-betweenness” between past, present and future selves” (Wright, 2008; Wright, 2012).

Limitations

While every effort was made to make this study as conclusive as possible there were still limitations. The study was conducted at only one day reporting center, which may not be representative of other centers. Other factors not impacting deinstitutionalization may not be addressed. Performative space is a sensitizing concept that requires further elaboration in the literature; no evaluation of the skills and knowledge gained that may help them reintegrate.

Definitions

To help facilitate the reading, a series of definitions of certain terms have been included.
Inmate self-governance can be defined as a mixed prisoner-staff group asked to participate in the overall organization and structure of the prison (Toch, 1995). Inmate representation in decision-making operates within narrow boundaries (Johnson, 1977).

Prisonization is the process inmates experience when they assimilate into the prison subculture (Clemmer, 1940). Inmates exhibit a unique form of adult socialization, whereby they take on, in greater or less degree the folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary (Clemmer, 1958). It is also described as a code of conduct that is verbalized one way or another among many prison inmates to defend themselves to the death or face becoming a victim (Wright, 2012).

The term “institutionalization” is used to describe the process by which inmates are shaped and transformed by the institutional environments in which they live (Hendey & Pascall, 2001). The psychological impact of incarceration is hypervigilance, an emotional over-control, in which one becomes socially withdrawn to the point of becoming humorless and lethargic (Haney, 2001).

Learning Disability, according to Public Law 94-142, is “a disorder in one or more basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations” (United States Office of Education, 1997, p. 65083).
Another definition is by the Interagency Committee on Learning Disabilities (1987) in which a learning disability is:

A heterogeneous group of disorders manifested by significant difficulties in acquisition and use of listening, speaking, reading, writing, reasoning, or mathematical abilities, or of social skills. These disorders are intrinsic to the individual and presumed to be due to central nervous system dysfunction (Interagency Committee on Learning Disabilities, 1987, p. 222).

Day Reporting Centers (DRCs) are nonresidential transitioning programs from prison/jail into the community with limited supervision (Diggs & Pieper, 1994).

Cycles of poverty in education theory is used to show the relationship between education and poverty. Oscar Lewis defines the culture of poverty as a set of beliefs and values passed on from generation to generation. Once the culture poverty comes into existence tends to perpetuate itself (Ryan, 1976). Education plays a key role in reducing poverty, and can be seen as both a cause and a factor contributing to poverty (Rose & Dyer, 2008).
Assumptions

The following assumptions apply for this dissertation:

1. Spheres of civility are ethical forms of communication such as respect, politeness, reciprocity, and inclusiveness, considered the foundation to democracy (Wright & Gehring, 2008).

2. Performative spaces are where inmates are allowed to focus on their identity in a positive, transformative, and rehabilitative manner. An interactive social and physical space can be created in carceral style institutions based on negotiation, rather than on stereotypes, and identities can be contested, revised and adopted (Wright, 2012).

3. Personal social space allows the freedom to maneuver or find one’s place in an educational program by choosing courses of interest in having access to outside educational institutions (Wright, 2012).

4. Weaving theory is a process of common sense knowledge, newly learned knowledge, memories, life experiences, and classroom practices and interactions which are shaped by student-teacher interaction, the process is both psychological and sociological. Students distill information that they consider important, and not necessarily from the teacher or prison (Reuss, 1999).

5. Opportunity theory endorses the ideal/optimistic belief that the higher the level of education, the higher the earning power, which can help inmates “to go straight,” and successfully re-integrate into a free and well-abiding
society (Ubah & Robinson, 2003). The opportunities model states, "Give a prisoner the opportunity to go straight and she/he will" (Wright, 2012).

6. Transformation theory of emancipatory learning is a means for adults to become self-learners by defining their own learning objectives and needs; an alternative way of accomplishing this is by art, which frees an individual from external authority. Disempowered individuals lack spontaneity and so depend on external authority to guide their thinking and activities. Allowing for creative thinking enhances personal growth, self-esteem, and the self-concept that one can lead a crime free life by witnessing what they are able to accomplish in the classroom (Clements, 2004).

7. The Freirian pedagogical approach endorses education where it not only reduces illiteracy, but empowers students by means of “liberational” education. This is in contrast to what Freire termed as “banking education”, in which information is merely deposited without any critical participation on the part of the student. Liberational education, on the other hand, allows students to become empowered by understanding the world in which they live and attaining greater economic, political, and social capital (Clements, 2004, p. 176).

8. Pelindaba is the concept based on the assumption that the "story is finished, the past is gone, we are starting a new adventure and we do not use what has happened before as our model for what we do now." Pelindaba is a nuclear power plant in South Africa which acquired its meaning during the change from apartheid; pela means the story and
daba means finished. The alternative meaning can refer to not only oneself, but of others. The pelindaba power plant helped initiate an international treaty that focused on a nuclear free zone in a nuclear waste free zone in Africa. Applying this to the Center that means not only is the past gone, but the Center is a place for conversation where it will work with others, but where staff will stand up and protect themselves (Gehring & Eggleston, 2010, p. 4).

This study demonstrates that staff implemented a democratic organizational culture aimed at reintegrating offenders into society by assisting them to reconsider, revise, and challenge their identities. This is achieved by the assumptions of spheres of civility, performative spaces, and personal social spaces, which have created a family-like environment based on honesty and respect.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The methods of dealing with criminal behavior have evolved over time from torture and starvation, to more positive methods for behavioral change (Gehring & Eggleston, 2007). This has been a progressive process built on academic and vocational education, along with personal development. Progress has not been easy, because of hindrance and opposition. To facilitate understanding of the history behind correctional rehabilitation, pertinent factors needed to be arranged into subheadings. For instance, the subheading “Principle Behind Rehabilitation” deals with the theories supporting rehabilitation and the history behind them, such as England's constructive approach in producing law-abiding citizens. The subheading “Obstacles That Can Hinder Rehabilitation” outlines both the legal and personal efforts behind preventing rehabilitation programs. Some of these include legislation, prison staff, prison culture, inmates, and the lack of resources for correctional education. On the other hand, the following subheadings center on the consequences of positive efforts toward transitioning offenders back into society. One program designed to accomplish this is the Day Reporting Center. The elements of this program are divided into subheadings dealing with the history of day reporting centers, the success of their efforts, the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center (SBDRC) and its philosophies of pelindaba, self-governance, and self-determination. The final
subheading “Measuring Program Success” outlines the evaluation of program success, which is based on the SBDRC's recidivism rate. The rate in the state of California is 67.4%.

Benchmark of Adult Status

There are a number of factors that must be addressed for successful rehabilitation to take place; one of these is gainful employment (Furstenburg, Kennedy, McLoyd, Rumbaut, & Settersten, 2004). A major step toward adulthood for Americans is employment. "Getting and keeping a good job is a major benchmark of adult status" (Fourqurean, Meisgeier, Swank, & Williams, 1991, p. 400). Being gainfully employed and functionally independent is expected after high school (Harvey, 2001). Therefore, for parolees to transition back into society they must have the means to financially support themselves in addition to housing and healthcare. This means meeting the needs of employment, housing, and healthcare (Hendey & Pascall, 2001). Today's workplace calls for new technological skills, which should be provided by vocational counselors and educators (Rojewski, 1999; Johnson, Stodden, Emanuel, Luecking, & Mack, 2002). These skills can facilitate inmates' rehabilitation back into society.

Principle Behind Rehabilitation

The principles of rehabilitation are based on theories of individual change: moral development, social/psychological development, opportunity, and performative spaces. The moral-development theory hypothesizes that prison-
based educational programs offering liberal studies in the areas of philosophy, sociology, history, and literature strengthen inmates' conscience help them become aware of the thoughts and feelings of others (Ubah & Robinson, 2003). The social/psychological developmental theory rests on the assumption that positive behaviors come about by exposure to academic and vocational programs. Opportunity theory states that the chance to obtain a General Educational Development (GED), vocational credential, or college degree improves inmates' chances of staying out of prison by improving their psychological well-being. Performative space theory suggests what happens when inmates are allowed to focus on their identity in a positive, and transformative, rehabilitative manner. Wright (2012) believes that education is correctional because it offers prisoners an interactive social and physical space based on negotiation rather than on stereotypes, where their negative identities as prisoners can be contested, revised and adopted. Educational opportunities can enhance employment opportunities and community adjustment (Foley & Gao, 2004). Correctional education helps reduce the number of re-offenders by reducing the number of incarcerations. The Office of Correctional Education found that inmates who participated in correctional education were one third as likely to be reincarcerated as nonparticipants and also earned higher wages (Klein, Tolbert, Bugarin, Cataldi, & Tauschek, 2004). There is a well-established correlation between literacy and recidivism. Prisoners who have access to educational courses and training while in prison gain the necessary skills and qualifications to help them find employment (Natale, 2010). Years of research
show that educational programs during incarceration reduce recidivism by permitting inmates to gain knowledge, skills, and self-confidence (O'Neill & Bierie, 2007). This makes prison more bearable by turning education into a positive experience and in some programs, allowing inmates to earn college degrees (Ubah & Robinson, 2003).

Britain’s policy toward rehabilitation is one example of the multiple factors prisons can address. England’s rehabilitation approach toward penal education is divided into five activities: (1) vocational training, (2) remedial education (basic literacy and numeracy), (3) academic programs, (4) therapeutic programs (cognitive and anger management skills), (5) and recreation (arts and crafts) (Clement, 2004). The aim of these activities is personal development, correcting socio-educational injustices, and community education (Clements, 2004) as well as enhancing security within prisons. Liberal studies and art education are advocated for five reasons. According to a study by Clement, security is enhanced (1) because inmates are occupied with something of interest, (2) because of the introduction to education, (3) because of the opportunity for creative thinking, (4) because individuals explore potential and interests, and (5) because programs produce active citizens.

The Irish government took an approach toward correctional education similar to that of the Nordic countries by placing emphasis on art and creativity. One agency is the Irish Advocacy Network (IAN), which is made up of people who use or have used mental health services. The goal is to resettle inmates back into the community as fully participating citizens through services, including
education (Irish Advocacy, 2008). This transition back into society is facilitated through in-service support that covers internal and external courses, including the arts, and literacy development, which include:

- **Basic Education.** For example, including literacy and numeracy.
- **General subjects.** For example, English, history, geography, mathematics, languages, computers.
- **Physical education, home economics and health education.**
- **The Arts.** For example, visual arts, music, drama, creative writing, photography.
- **Practical subjects.** For example, woodwork, metalwork, horticulture.
- **Courses that address particular problems or needs that prisoners have.** For example, pre-release courses, addiction awareness, childcare, group skills, and anger management.

Another Irish agency is the Prison Arts Foundation. It is a charitable trust that seeks to provide access to the arts for those previously excluded or from marginalized communities (Prison Arts Foundation, 2012). It accomplishes this by employing professional artists in a variety of disciplines to engage, teach, and give inspiration to adults serving custodial sentences in the prisons of Northern Ireland. This approach toward helping inmates become active citizens is elucidated by Jack Mezirow’s transformation theory of emancipatory learning (Mezirow, 1994).
Mezirow defined transformational learning as the means for adults to become self-learners by defining their own learning objectives and needs; one way of accomplishing this is by art (Clements, 2004). Art promotes creative thinking, which helps free an individual from external authority. Disempowered individuals lack spontaneity and so depend on external authorities to guide their thinking and activities. Promoting creative thinking enhances personal growth, self-esteem, and the self-concept that one can lead a crime free life by witnessing what one is able to accomplish in the classroom. In addition, having an educational background such as a General Educational Development (GED) or degree in Liberal Studies provides the inmate student with more opportunities for legitimate employment (O'Neill & Bierie, 2007). Even so, correctional education has its own unique obstacles that hinder rehabilitation. These hindrances come from various sectors, such as legislation, prison staff, prison culture, inmates, and lack of resources for correctional education.

Obstacles that Hinder Rehabilitation

Legislation

Legislators often do not share in the optimistic view of education, but take the pessimistic outlook that if education did not benefit inmates while they were in a free society, how will it do so under the harsh conditions of prison? Advocates for reducing all correctional programs cite a survey by Lipton, Martinson, and
Wilkes (1975) of prison reform programs for male inmates between 1945 and 1967. The purpose of that survey was to see what works and what does not.

The results alleged that few rehabilitative efforts had any appreciable effect, and were interpreted by critics to mean that nothing works. This survey by Lipton, Martinson, and Wilkes shifted American correctional philosophy from rehabilitation to deterrence and incapacitation (Ubah & Robinson, 2003). Congress's "tough on crime" policy impacted the drafting and passing of the anti-crime Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1993 and the Higher Education Re-authorization Act of 1994, eliminating access to Pell Grant funding of college for inmates. Offenders were now viewed as evil doers to be punished and deterred through harsh sentencing (Ubah & Robinson, 2003). Some in Britain went so far as to suggest that prison education might be making better criminals (Bayliss, 2003). Those who did not take the tougher approach were viewed as "bleeding heart liberals" (Ubah & Robinson, 2003). Besides legislators, some prison staff can also act as a hindrance toward rehabilitation.

**Prison Staff**

One reason for claims that some prison staff are becoming a hindrance toward rehabilitation is the fact that prisons are breeding grounds for aggression and anger, and prison staff sometimes view educational and vocational programs as nuisances (O'Neill & Bierie, 2007). This has produced a lack of commitment on the part of staff toward rehabilitation. Many feel that the main function of a prison is security, which has resulted in a culture of belittling inmates and
cynicism toward education (Bayliss, 2003). Many older guards view prisoner rights in education as an erosion of their authority. Many of them receive low pay and little respect, which breeds jealousy as they watch inmates become certified mechanics, high school graduates, or even college graduates, earning more money than they do (Corcoran, 1985). Other hindrances come from the prison culture itself.

Prison Culture

Hindrance from the prison culture takes place in part because the prison population is probably one of the most disadvantaged groups in modern society. This has resulted in a stifling culture of cynicism among teaching staff, inmates, and prison officers (Bayliss, 2003; Griffin & Hepburn, 2006). Prisons have become more difficult to adjust to and survive in over the last several decades in light of the harsh "tough on crime" policies (Haney, 2002; Day, Acock, Bahr, & Arditti, 2005; Hoschstelter, Murphy, & Simons, 2004). Inmates face the challenge to survive prison and eventually reintegrate back into society; this can prove especially difficult for those who have committed minor crimes such as drug abuse (Bahr, Armstrong, A. Gibbs, & Harris, 2005).

Prison has a subculture based on various pains of imprisonment and deprivation. Prisons are institutions where the individual becomes socialized through a series of degrading ceremonies (Hunt, Riegel, Morales, & Waldorf, 1993). Prisoners are denied their privacy rights and lose control over the most mundane aspects of life that most citizens take for granted, such as when to get
up, what to eat, where to go, and with whom they are able to share a sleeping space. Gymnasiums are now used to house inmates, and, if one does have a cell, it is roughly the size of a king-size bed (Hunt, Riegel, Morales, & Waldorf, 1993; Haney, 2002). These rigid conditions, along with a sense of being treated like an infant, produce an atmosphere that is harsh and violent (Haney, 2002).

Adapting to prison can be painful. The assimilation process can be subtle.

Communication research has shown that there are three stages of organizational socialization: anticipatory, encounter, and metamorphosis (Hunt, Riegel, Morales, & Waldorf, 1993; Lawson, Segrin, & Ward, 1996). These three stages, when applied to corrections, are referred to as "prisonization", which is the process by which inmates assimilate into the inmate subculture (Clemmer, 1940). Part of the inmate subculture is its position toward education.

Obstacles to Correctional Education

Inmates

Inmates are not always receptive to correctional education and there are various reasons for this. Teaching in corrections takes place within a culture of security and stress. For the incarcerated student there is the severe psychological stress that comes from prison, which can result in mental breakdown or suicide (Corcoran, 1985). There are generally three predominant tendencies among incarcerated students: an attempt to re-create a conventional society within; an attempt to reject the conventional norms of society; and the
attempt to accept conventional norms, but reject responsibility for their offense and the nature of that offense (Bayliss, 2003; Corcoran, 1985).

Inmates can be suspicious of the motives behind education. Many suspect that the underlying purpose is one of control, keeping prisoners busy and quiet, and eventually reducing recidivism (Bayliss, 2003; Corcoran, 1985). There are also prisoners who only attend class to reduce their sentences (Bayliss, 2003).

Lack of Resources

Since most political campaigns endorse the tough on crime policy, basic educational resources have been diminished. Simple luxuries such as quiet classrooms are no longer available. Cellblocks tend to be impossibly noisy, making it difficult to study. There is also a lack of resources for those with special needs (Corcoran, 1985). Still, there are benefits to correctional education.

Benefits of Correctional Education

To understand the benefits to correctional education, it is first necessary to return to the Lipton, Martinson, and Wilkes (1975) survey of prison reform programs and the claim that "nothing works". Lipton and his colleagues cited 48% positive outcomes of the prison-reform programs they examined. Martinson (1979) later revised his earlier study, stating that some treatment programs were beneficial and had an appreciative effect on recidivism (Martinson, 1979). Ross and Fabiano's research was in response to Martinson by comparing and contrasting the features of the most effective correctional education programs in
North America. It was shown how those programs improved interpersonal
cognition (Ross & Fabiano, 1984).

Secondly, it must be acknowledged that one reason for high recidivism is
a panoptic influence that Foucault criticized as a negative form of self-regulation.
Michael Collins (1988) argued that this panoptic method of control only reduced
the inmates' ability to learn and become autonomous, thereby impeding them
from successfully returning to mainstream society. One solution is the Freirian
educational approach.

Freire wanted education not only to reduce illiteracy, but to empower
students by means of liberational education, which is in contrast to what he
termed as banking education, which is merely depositing information without any
critical participation on the part of the student. Liberational education allows
students to become empowered by understanding the world in which they live in
order to attain greater economic, political, and social capital (Clements, 2004).
This reflects Merizow's transformational theory where correctional education can
encourage alternative, rational goals, and objectives (Clements, 2004). These
can be achieved by adopting the principles of adult education: viewing inmates
as subjects, rather than objects: focusing on what they have, rather than what
they lack: on what motivates them, rather than on what the penal system feels
they need (Bayliss, 2003). Inmates are allowed to pursue a reasonably skilled
and attractive career that will keep them from reoffending. The result of these
efforts has been a 75% to 80% reduction in recidivism (Bayliss, 2003; Duguid,
Hawkey, & Knights, 1998). Education in prison is a necessary link for inmates moving into the real world. With success in academics and vocational training they also develop social skills necessary for the workplace (Ubah, 2004). Unfortunately, prison cultures are antithetical to democracy because, they are alienating, bureaucratic, disciplinary, and brutal, laced with struggles for power and authority (Wright & Gehring, 2008). To counter this, there should be two clear objectives for prison education: teaching prisoners something and changing their attitudes toward society (Wright, 2012). What then are the efforts toward reintegrating inmates back into the community, and what resources are offered?

As already noted, in 2007 more than $44 billion was spent for corrections; a 315% increase, in comparison to 1987, where the states collectively spent $10.6 billion of their general funds on corrections, with minimal efforts toward the transitioning of ex-offenders back into society (PEW Charitable, 2008). Little or no time was spent training and employing parolees: 70%-80% of parolees are unemployed; 85% still have some form of substance abuse; 50% are illiterate; and 60%-90% lack the necessary skills to survive outside the prison (Eggleston, Rennie, & Riggs, 2008). There are basic needs to be addressed, such as Housing, medical care, food, clothing, and transportation. Housing is the most important, since it can be considered the “linchpin that holds the reintegration process together” (Stanford Criminal, 2005 p. 2). This is necessary, since California parolees, upon being released, are simply given $200 and a ride to the nearest bus stop, so their most immediate concern is finding shelter. Supervised
programs that address shelter help ease the burden of looking for a place to live, along with assisted supervision in the other areas of employment, medical care, and transportation. When such support is not afforded many parolees become homeless; parolees in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino’s parolees live on the streets. That only induces them to return to a life of crime in order to support themselves, which is one reason why thirty percent are arrested within six months after release (Singerman, 2006). One alternative offered by both state and private institutions is parolee group homes. Another approach toward parolee transition is the Day Reporting Center (DRC).

Research on day reporting centers is minimal, because they are a recent response to managing criminal behaviors. There is the issue of the effectiveness of these programs in lowering recidivism and the cost of operation, along with monitoring parolees’ activities, and determining what action should be taken if a parolee violates the rules and regulations of the center. There are two divergent positions regarding organizational structure that attempt to address these issues: one mimics the penal system’s authoritarian approach; the other is centered on democracy and self-governance. The common aim behind both approaches is the successful rehabilitation of inmates, but this can only be achieved by reducing the negative effects of prisonization and institutionalization.
Release and Rehabilitation

Except in cases of professional criminals, reasons for recidivism accrue from the negative effects of prisonization, such as the assimilation of inmates into the inmate subculture (Lawson, Segrin, & Ward, 1996). The psychological impact of incarceration is hypervigilance, an emotional over-control, in which one becomes socially withdrawn to the point of becoming humorless and lethargic (Haney, 2001). Another aspect of adjusting to incarceration is relinquishing one's initiative and becoming dependent on the institution for day-to-day decision-making. In rare cases, some inmates become so "adjusted" that they can be extremely uncomfortable if autonomy is returned (Haney, 2001). Since the majority of inmates are released directly into the community without any readjusting or debriefing, this makes transitioning from prison to home problematic. To address this issue Haney (2001) made the following recommendations:

- Provide effective decompression programs.
- Give prisoners some understanding of the ways in which prison may have changed them.
- Provide occupational and vocational training and assistance in finding employment.
- Provide parenting classes.

DRCs provide these services by means of their transitioning programs from prison/jail into the community with limited supervision (Diggs & Pieper,
History of Day Reporting Centers

Day reporting centers first began in Great Britain in the 1970s as a solution to the overcrowding of prisons in England and Wales, along with the overloaded cases handled by probation officers. The centers were set up largely to handle older petty criminals and were designed as treatment centers. By the mid-1980s more than eighty centers were in operation throughout Britain (Diggs & Pieper, 1994). This system was adopted in the United States in 1986 when the Massachusetts Hampton County Sheriff's Department opened a Day Reporting Center. The center grew into handling juvenile offenders and de-institutionalized mental patients by adopting the techniques learned from ten years of experience in Great Britain (Diggs & Pieper, 1994). As with the British centers, most of the clients were low-level offenders convicted of drug, alcohol, and property offenses. The average time spent in the programs was between six to eight weeks, with a 79% completion rate. Some of the programs used electronic monitoring, which may have successfully deterred misconduct.

As in Britain, each center had its own clientele, objectives, and manner of operations, but most had three overlapping purposes: (1) to provide surveillance of offenders, (2) to provide treatment services, and (3) to provide alternatives to overcrowded jails or prisons. To achieve these goals, centers followed three
principles: (1) clients regularly report to staff, (2) the number of contacts made by parolees is higher than if they reported through normal supervision, and (3) a range of programs is offered that is not normally available outside the center (Craddock & Graham, 2002).

Diggs and Pieper (1994) showed that even though there is a wide range of DRCs in the form of government, public and private agencies with different missions and goals, most have the following similarities. They:

- Operate on the same site of a residential correctional facility, such as a halfway house or work-release facility
- Offer supports, such as substance abuse, mental health, education, vocational training, and job placement
- Screen for use of intoxicants and illegal drugs
- Set curfews and controls over participants, along with knowing their whereabouts and associates
- Have less stringent and frequent monitoring
- Apply intermediate sanctions, when needed, such as house arrest
- Support in the areas of court-ordered fines, restitution, community service, family support.

Because of the wide range of Day Reporting Centers, with their different missions and goals, the question arises as to the success of their efforts.
Efforts Toward Success

The success of these efforts varies, since there is little empirical research done to compare DRCs with other programs because DRCs are relatively new and they vary in terms of clientele, programs, and perspective, so the reduction in rearrest results are mixed. Some feel that location and completion of the programs are critical. Others feel intense supervision and rehabilitation are important. Research by Craddock and Graham (2002), Marciniak (2000), and Diggs and Pieper (1994) examined the arguments for success based on location and program completion, or intensive supervision plus rehabilitation; the results were mixed.

Craddock and Graham’s research (2002) involved two centers in a Midwestern state: one rural and the other an urban program, which were fifteen weeks long. The rural center had a 61.3% program completion rate, whereas the urban 41.1%. A minor difference was seen in the rearrest rates with 16.7% for the rural center and 18.9% for the urban center. The major difference was with those who did not complete the program and were rearrested: 28.3% for the rural center and 37.7% at the urban center. The study suggested that location and lower rates of completion of the program may have contributed to the urban center’s higher percentage of rearrests. Still, the offenses were less serious and smaller in number in comparison to other intervention programs.

Marciniak’s (2000) study of North Carolina’s DRC, hypothesized that intense supervision coupled with an emphasis on rehabilitation would "lessen the
rate of rearrests as the re-offender is resocialized to living a law-abiding lifestyle" (Marciniak, 2000, p. 3). Unfortunately, this study showed that North Carolina’s center did not significantly reduce recidivism and that any rehabilitation effects may have been counterbalanced by the increased surveillance on the part of the center’s staff and probation officers. Because of this lack of success, it could be argued that the center was not cost effective.

Diggs’s (1994) critique of Florida’s Orange County DRC, whose program was also one of intense supervision and rehabilitation, was more positive, because it had a success rate of 84%. The amount of time between completing the program and rearrest averaged 7.5 months, with the shortest period being one month and the longest, seventeen months. What these centers had in common was a strict monitoring and surveillance of the parolees, which did not allow for self-governance. This contrasts with the alternative approach espoused by William George for juvenile centers; that of correctional institutions based on the U.S. Constitution.

George used the U.S. Constitution as the framework for a New York juvenile institution, the Junior Republic. He allowed children to manage their entire institution democratically, with elected executive and legislative branches, as well as a Supreme Court, except for the school which was under the control of the New York penal system (Gehring & Rennie, 2008; George, 1911). Osborne furthered this concept by establishing the Mutual Welfare League, an inmate-run organization at Auburn Prison (Gehring & Rennie, 2008; Osborne, 1915). Both
examples proved successful by reducing assaults, rape, drugs, and recidivism. The cooperation among inmates and with prison staff allowed for resolutions without conflict. If a grievance occurred, the representatives from the Mutual Welfare League would sit down with prison officials and come to an agreement without the inmates resorting to violence to get their voices heard.

The article, “Bargaining in Correctional Institutions: Restructuring the Relation between the Inmate and the Prison Authority” provides a potential solution to prison riots (The Yale Law Journal, 1972). It advocates a bargaining relationship between inmates and prison staff, where inmates are allowed to voice their complaints and concerns directly, rather than covertly by means of so-called prison "leaders" and prison guards. Such an open system legitimizes negotiation and shows inmates that positive change can come about without the use of coercion and extortion (Zalman, 1972). This is the method used by Nordic countries in their correctional systems.

Compared to the United States, Denmark and Sweden's approach toward prison reform of bargaining sessions between inmates and their correctional institutions has proven to be far more successful than the retaliatory measures taken in this country. This open institutions policy, along with a one-to-one inmate-to-staff ratio, has resulted in the number of inmates remaining at around 5000, in comparison to America's growing prison population (Ward, 1972). The mission of staff is to provide less control and more support, with inmates going to town or visiting their families during the weekend and voluntarily returning on
Monday; most of these inmates are convicted of crimes such as drunk driving (37%), larceny (23%), violence (11%), fraud (7%), drugs (5%), and refusing military service (4%)(Ward, 1972).

A study of the penal system in Scotland by Toch (1995) also shows that freedom of choice afforded to inmates can have positive results, but comes with great effort and sacrifice on the part of both inmates and staff. Strange as it may seem, many prisoners resist giving up structure for trust and responsibility. The same is true for prison officers, because prisoners and staff both have to address the structure of governance. This is the case because. “Prisoners must give up structure, the support inherent in dependence, and the luxury of blaming staff for every conceivable adversity, and staff members must give up structure and prized assumptions about the immaturity, incapacity, and intrinsic untrustworthiness of prisoners” (Toch, 1995, pp. 3).

Establishing a structure of self-governance entails drafting a constitution and putting it into practice. Toch witnessed some of the difficulties in the drafting of a new mission statement in the spirited Scottish debates, with one inmate storming out during the proceedings. Toch stated that the American correctional systems are capable of providing prisoners with the opportunity to shoulder and discharge the same responsibilities as seen in Denmark, Sweden, and Scotland, but it is hesitant and takes a more retributive attitude. One such place that allows parolees the opportunity to shoulder responsibility is the San Bernardino Day
Reporting Center (SBDRC). One objective of that center is self-governance as patterned after the models established by George and Osborne.

The organizational structure that the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center has established is based on “pelindaba,” the South African Sotho word meaning a place where people gather, but where the past is forgotten. The values of pelindaba are based on four principles: (a) trust, (b) tension between a person’s limitations and his/her abilities, (c) democracy, and (d) showing one’s best side in a safe and healthy organization. These principles are operationalized by putting a human face on the Center by promoting mutual respect and genuine caring for human dignity, based on democracy, self-governance, and self-esteem (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011). In order to establish self-governance among ex-offenders, an understanding of prison culture and organizational justice is necessary.

Prison Culture and Organizational Justice

Understanding of prison culture is not that easy; negative treatment and politics play important roles. As mentioned by Hunt, Riegel, Morales, and Waldorf (1993), prisoners become socialized through a series of degrading ceremonies that deny their dignity and rights. This is in addition to the bias of prison sentencing. Steffensmeier and Demuth (2000) tie this bias of sentencing to the critical race theory theme of the “challenge to dominant ideology” which argues "that traditional claims of objectivity and meritocracy camouflage the self-
interest, power, and privilege of dominant groups in U.S. society” (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001, p. 2). This is shown through coercive treatment toward socially disadvantaged minorities because they lack the resources to resist the imposition of negative labels. Their behavior is viewed as a threat to the economic and moral interests of more powerful groups. As a result, punishment is harsher toward those viewed as racially and culturally different, and thereby dangerous and unpredictable (Steffensmeier & Demuth, 2000, p. 708). Such stereotyping has made these groups feel alienated, distrustful, and hostile toward the courts. Therefore, they are often unwilling to work with either the judge or prosecutor to reduce their sentences by pleading guilty or accepting responsibility (blameworthiness). In turn, this unwillingness is used to justify stricter punishment (Everett & Wojtkiewicz, 2002).

There is another cultural difference that affects the concept of self-government within the prison subculture. In addition to the psychological deprivation of freedom, many inmates come from poor and underrepresented community groups. All this translates into less political decision-making. The lack of political insight and participation is imported into the inmate subculture, where opposition rather than participation becomes the norm (Johnson, 1977). Introducing the opportunity to have a voice in the penal system can be foreign to many inmates, so an honest effort on the part of prison administration is necessary. Historically, some efforts toward self-government were successful, whereas others were complete failures (Johnson, 1977; Baker, 1964). Some of
the reasons are: members that served on inmate councils; the restrictive bylaws that governed the councils; and lack of support from prison officials. Johnson carried this criticism further, stating that advisory councils can be a dominant, but superficial feature that administration uses for crime control (Johnson, 1977). Superficial self-governance can be counterproductive. In mainstream society such measures are met with resistance and deviance. Promising inmates a voice in prison activities and then reneging can have serious consequences, such as riots, work stoppages, and death. In corporations and factories, betrayal can result in workplace deviance (Henle, 2005).

The basis for this behavior is employee frustration in the workplace in regard to organizational justice. Henle identifies two ways to stop deviance. One is by initially trying to identify a prospective employee’s personality traits. The other has management acting with fairness and sensitivity. In addition, fairness can be based on trust, respect, consideration in communication, and explaining the rationale behind different decisions (Simmons & Roberson, 2003). People perceive fairness when they have a voice in the decision-making process (De Cremer & Tyler, 2007). This is related to procedural justice, where employees perceive fairness, because they too have a voice in decisions that affect them by providing timely feedback without bias (Heslin, & Vande Walle, 2009). Doing so communicates that administration is displaying a willingness to work with personnel. There must be an employee perception that managers are concerned about them by communicating respect, avoiding impropriety, and providing
justification for their decisions (Mayer, Nishu, Schneider, & Golden, 2007). These actions are reciprocated by cooperation with management, especially if both management and personnel have the same self-interests. This democratic management style promotes organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), where personnel are willing to sacrifice their time and energy for the organization without reward (Simmons & Roberson, 2003).

To facilitate these gains, those in leadership positions must take into account that their actions will be judged on the cultural standards of subordinates. This leads back to acknowledging that inmates have a voice in prison activities. Not according inmates their rights in a fair and honest manner can result in more serious consequences: riots, work stoppages, and even death. Since McCormick’s report on the Attica riot in 1971, more peaceful resolutions are in place to address inmate grievances. This can be seen by the use of an ombudsman or inmate representation for inmates to have a democratic voice. Some believe that it is necessary for inmates to have a democratic voice; others feel that this is utterly ridiculous. According to the judgmental position, inmates have no right to the democratic decision-making process. They cannot vote themselves out of prison, so any efforts toward democracy must be defined within the limits of inmate captivity (Baker, 1985). The positive notion is that allowing inmates proactive engagement with prison administration can develop leadership skills and responsibility. Baker warned that in order for this system to
work there must be a positive interaction between both parties. If not, then an atmosphere of mistrust can develop.

One method to curtail mistrust is inmate self-government (Osborne, 1915). Osborne felt that the warden should never hand over a prison to convicts, but that inmates must work closely with prison administration. Baker warned this does not guarantee success. He cites examples in different states, showing the success and failures of prison administration working with advisory councils composed of inmate representatives elected to provide input in the decision-making process (Baker, 1985). The San Bernardino Day Reporting Center staff believes that self-governance, along with respecting the cultural and ethnic diversity of parolees, is an effective means of transitioning them back into the community.

San Bernardino Day Reporting Center Assistance in Transitioning

Philosophy Behind the Center

At the 1999 European Prison Education Association Conference, Drs. Eggleston and Gehring presented their position on democracy in prison and prison education, which has acted as the guiding philosophy behind the Center. The effectiveness of democracy in prison is a “hidden heritage” to which most correctional educators have not had access (Eggleston & Gehring, 2000, p. 360). Correctional education is a laboratory where new methods are tested. If they are
successful in that most restrictive environment (prison), they might work anywhere. The objective is to make better citizens, where community authority is shared and responsibility is divided. Eggleston and Gehring (2000) outlined three venues for democratic educational strategies: classrooms; schools; and/or institutions. These democratic management systems allow opportunity for students to make right or wrong choices, thus allowing for cognitive and moral development.

Even though these democratic methods in correctional education have no prescribed formula, they are, in part, based on "mediated learning experiences" (MLE), where guidance is provided until a person is capable of making correct decisions without guidance (Feuerstein, 1980). Not everyone has the same abilities, so instruction must be planned according to their highest potential. Eleven years after the European conference, these democratic principles are the basis for the Center's mission.

San Bernardino Day Reporting Center

The San Bernardino Day Reporting Center (SBDRC) is a program designed to assist parolees to successfully transition back into society. The SBDRC is a two-story building with various rooms used for remedial education, GED preparation, orientation, and anger management classes, along with many other classes. There is also a wardrobe room where students can obtain fresh shirts, ties, and suits to go on job interviews, as well as everyday clothes. The building is clean and well-maintained. The students who assist in running the
SBDRC generally wear shirts and ties, and conduct themselves in a professional manner. The "pelindaba" organizational climate, where the past is gone, can facilitate a new adventure. It is a place where one can feel safe and have the opportunity to put one's life back in order. One means of accomplishing this is through Center governance shared with the parolees themselves, in a democratic fashion. They vote for those taking on leadership roles. In addition, assistance is offered in the following areas: remedial education, GED preparation, vocational training, employment assistance, anger management and battering classes, child support, assistance for the homeless, and various other programs (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011). The original plan for the Center was a large reentry program, which was never realized.

Original Plan

The Center was originally planned as the Community Reentry Education Employment Service and Training (CREST) program, with a much more extensive budget and increased services and students. Because of the State budget cuts, this never came to fruition. It would cost the State at least $17 million. Instead, a smaller program was developed, the Day Reporting Center, which was negotiated for $1.2 million a year. This has been supported by California Senator Negrete McLeod, Assemblywoman Wilmer Amina Carter, and Mayor Pat Morris, along with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. The landlord went so far as to hold the building for nine months until the funding came through (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011).
Other Centers

Dr. Eggleston and Dr. Gehring have researched the anomalies of the bottom-up perspective and how this has represented the potential for the human condition in confinement. They report that democratic prison anomalies can help drive reentry programs. A majority of the Day Reporting Centers (DRCs) in the State are for-profit. As a result these centers have very few programs, unpleasant quarters, and reporting places for parolees to come in and report and hang out because they have to. Most of the centers are small and poorly maintained, with only mandated programs, such as batterers and anger management. Basically, what the San Bernardino Center has learned from the history of these centers is what not to do (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011).

Pelindaba

Dr. Eggleston describes pelindaba as a concept of forgetfulness and forgiveness: "The story is finished, the past has happened, we are starting a new adventure and we don't use what has happened before as our model for what we do now" (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011). Part of the concept or meaning of pelindaba can be, "We want to work with you, but also if we need, we will stand up for ourselves, we'll protect ourselves" (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011). To protect the Center, grievances are left behind. The Center is a neutral ground for gangs and for those who were frowned upon by fellow inmates, such as sex offenders. Some have described the Center as a sanctuary (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011).
**Employment and Schooling**

At the SBDRC there are one full-time and two part-time job developers. In addition, the Center offers GED preparation, which is non-mandated and is its largest program. There is also a plan for vocational training where the Center has been negotiating with the California Institution for Men (CIM) warden to transfer the print shop from CIM to the San Bernardino parole unit, and locate it in the former Norton Air Force Base. Arrangements are being made to hire an instructor and offer two courses: one in printing, the other in graphic arts. Eventually, it is hoped that there will also be a machinist shop (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011).

**Concept of Self-governance**

J. E. Baker (1964), an associate warden, in his article, “Inmate Self-governance,” considered the pros and cons of inmate self-government. He stated that opinions fall into two categories, positive and negative. A survey was given to a staff of 52 penitentiaries, with 44 responding, asking their opinions concerning inmate self-government and whether it was successful. Only thirteen out of forty-four had direct experience with inmate self-government. Two institutions reported that sometimes the results were constructive, while at other times destructive. Some responses were more critical, for example saying that advisory councils were of no value, or that they served the interests of only a few inmates (Baker, 1964).
Because of this dilemma, newcomers coming into the SBDRC are introduced to the issues of self-governance. Efforts are made so there is not an adversarial top-down climate. There are rules, but the parolees, now referred to as students, are given the opportunity to learn how to live within a democracy. One issue of learning and working within a democracy is that everything has to be negotiated. It cannot be where a warden or director says, "I am the guy in charge and this is the way it's going to be because I say so; thank you very much." Dr. Eggleston cites the example of the director of a college program for inmates at Simon Frazier College in British Columbia. The director of the program was frustrated because of the group taking extended time making democratic decisions whether to have cookies or cake at an event. Yet, this is a step in the process toward democratization, by allowing people to make minor decisions, along with minor mistakes (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011).

One of the things made clear during the orientation sessions is that with rights and responsibilities there is no free ride, a person has to consider the welfare of others. A case in point concerns free lunches provided for SBDRC by Mary’s Mercy Center, a homeless shelter. The rule is that, at the end of the day, if there are extra lunches the students can take them home for dinner. Some students, though, eat four lunches and left no extras. In a similar vein, there was a problem once with some students obtaining bus passes only to sell them.

It was observed that a few students were unable to make the leap into a free democratic society. Dr. Eggleston made it clear that the Center is still new
and has a long way to go, and there are going to be "bumps in the road." The Center enrolls people who are accustomed to an authoritarian environment, so both staff and students are having difficulties in making the leap toward self-governance. However, that is a part of the Center’s educational program (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011). This concept of self-governance can also contribute to self-determination.

Self-determination

Historically, self-determination refers to national self-governance or political rights (Wehmeyer, 1997; Wehmeyer, 2003). For disability advocates, it is the inherent right of those with disabilities to be allowed to assume responsibility and control over their lives and to take appropriate actions when necessary. Individuals with disabilities should have the same opportunity to exercise the civil and human rights enjoyed by all citizens. This can be as simple as deciding what to wear or eat, or as complex as buying a house or choosing medical care. Where then do those with learning disabilities acquire the skills of self-determination? One place to start is the example set through the educational policies and practices of the SBDRC.

One of the goals of education is to produce responsible and self-sufficient citizens, with one of the outcomes being self-determination (Wehmeyer, 1997). Self-determination involves both academic and employment success (Carter, Lane, Pierson, & Glaeser, 2006). Nevertheless, many students with learning
disabilities are not prepared for employment and independent living, in part, as a result of the educational process. Adult outcomes for those with learning disabilities show that many are unemployed or under-employed, with only 37% being able to live independently and just 40% making more than minimum wage (Wehmeyer, 1997). A more recent survey showed that 45.6% of individuals with a disability were employed. The median monthly income of those with a severe disability was $1458, $2250 for those with a non-severe disability, and $2539 for those with no disabilities (Brault, 2008). There are various explanations for this deficit in education.

Overly structured environments, such as some special education classrooms, can limit the opportunity to improve one's decision-making and develop as internal locus of control. In extreme cases (as in prison), such surroundings can prohibit students from realizing their true potential (Wehmeyer, 1997). The majority of students want to participate in defining their future and the outcomes by their decisions (Taylor, Adelman, & Keser-Boyd, 1983).

Another area of concern is that teachers feel ill-prepared to introduce and develop self-determination, and are uncertain as to its effectiveness (Thoma, Nathanson, Baker, & Tamura, 2003). This is especially true for disabled students. Because of their academic and behavioral needs, promoting self-determination is not a high priority (Carter, Lane, Pierson, & Glaeser, 2006).

Anyon (1981) conducted a study to address social classes and the hidden curriculum. It showed disparities in education between the rich and not so rich.
She examined four different schools and their educational policies: working class, middle class, affluent professional and executive elite. For working class schools, most of the rules were just steps to follow for teachers and students. The students were told to copy the steps and their work was evaluated, not on what was right or wrong, but on whether the students followed the rules correctly. Instead of meta-cognitive instruction, the teachers would simply say, "This is how you do them," (p. 74) without any elaboration. With regard to language arts a teacher commented, "Simple punctuation is all they'll ever use" (p. 74). Social studies was mechanized, rote work.

In the middle class school, work was graded on getting the right answers that were usually found in the book (Anyon, 1981). Teachers felt language arts were based on what students would need for everyday life. The lessons did not involve implementing critical perspectives, and there was little creativity. Children were to store up facts to use later for testing.

At the affluent professional school, the work was creative and done independently. Students were continually asked to express and apply new ideas and concepts. There were few rules, with work being evaluated for quality of expression. Social studies was made up of student presentations from current news events. The children had a part in negotiating the instruction (self-determination and self-governance). If they felt they had not adequately learned the lesson, the teacher would go over it again (Anyon, 1981).
The executive elite school's goal was to develop students' intellectual powers (Anyon, 1981). Children were continually asked to reason though a problem and produce intellectual products that were logically sound. They were to question the answers given by fellow students. In social studies, science, and health, discussions addressed current issues and problems. Anyon noticed that those discussions attended to real issues. They were asked, "Why do workers strike?" "Is that right or wrong?" "Why do companies put chemicals in food when natural ingredients are available" (p. 85)? Many of the answers were very well thought out. There were no bells to announce the next period. To keep the children in line they were told, "It is up to you." "You are the only driver of your car and only you can regulate your speed" (self-determination and self-governance) (p. 86). This is in sharp contrast to counting 5,4,3,2,1 to keep the students in line, where there is no choice but to obey. Anyon noticed that each of the four schools prepared students for the social level they were to occupy, thereby reproducing a stratification of social class distinction.

As with the example set by the affluent professional and executive elite schools' styles of instruction, if successful transition from school into the workforce is to take place, then students must be allowed to take a more active role in their education, life planning, and goal setting (Field, Martin, Miller, Ward, & Wehmeyer, 1998). As observed in Anyon's study, students benefit from additional instruction focusing on self-determination, such as goal setting, choice making, problem identification, problem solving, and self-evaluation (the way a
person views him/herself), especially for those with emotional and learning disabilities (Carter, Lane, Pierson, & Glaeser, 2006). Allowing students to choose how they learn, as with the affluent professional and executive elite schools, demands more dedication on the part of educators. Simply telling them what they are learning is for their own good is not promoting learning, but limiting it (Kohen, 1993). If students feel they have control of their lives, they perform better than those who feel others dictate their destiny (Wehmeyer, 1997). The teaching methods of the affluent professional and executive elite schools reflect the principles of performative spaces, weaving, personal social space, and sphere of civility.

The purpose behind the teaching methodologies of performative spaces and weaving is to rectify the educational gap between the working, affluent professional, and executive elite classes. For inmates, performative spaces allow them the opportunity to focus and negotiate their social identity in a positive manner, rather than reproduce prison stereotypes (Wright, 2012). This is similar to the approach taken by the executive elite school where students were told it was up to them to control their identity and the social level they would occupy.

Weaving necessitates the combining of past and present knowledge, and experiences where the students distill the information they consider important (Reuss, 1999). The affluent professional curriculum was creative and performed independently, allowing the students to apply their knowledge and experiences to the context of the instruction.
Finally, there is the concept of personal social space, where the student has the freedom to maneuver and find his/her place in an educational program by choosing courses that interest them (Wright, 2012). Students at Anyon’s affluent professional school could negotiate the instruction, and if they felt they had not received adequate instruction, the teacher would have to reteach it. This is in sharp contrast to the instruction given to the working-class students wherein they were told exactly what to do and how to do it. There was the sphere of civility where there was reciprocity and inclusiveness between students and teacher. This exhibited a lack of respect for the students’ ability to contribute to their learning.

These ethical forms of communication are considered the foundation of democracy (Wright & Gehring, 2008). The results are a sense of identity, self-worth, and social awareness. This is crucial for those with learning disabilities. Those with learning disabilities who have high self-determination are more likely to live independently, are more active in their vocational career planning, and complete their training with a mean income 2.7 times higher than those who do not (Wehmeyer, 2003). The importance placed on self-determination and controlling one’s life is the philosophy behind the SBDRC.

**Measuring Program Success**

After all the time and effort placed in rehabilitative programs, the bottom line is that they have not accomplished what they were intended for. State data
collection varies as to the timing, population, and quality. Due to this variability it is nearly impossible to aggregate data across states to produce credible national estimates of educational practices and outcomes (Klein, Tolbert, & Tauchek, 2003). How then is success measured? In corrections, success is typically rated by low recidivism, the absence of re-offense. Using this data can be problematic, as reported by Gehring in his study on “Recidivism as a Measure of Correctional Education Program Success” (Gehring, 2000).

Gehring found that recidivism data is unsophisticated and incapable of measuring incremental progress of ex-offenders after their release from prison. Recidivism rates mostly measures yes or no, but have difficulty identifying levels of improvement. Additionally, it can be used to measure individual success, but not program success. It says nothing about the degree of employment (sustainable or impoverished), social life (family, friends, and community), and personal satisfaction (self-worth, sense of achievement). Nevertheless, administrators and politicians support programs that are verified by data based on recidivism, and especially whether they should be funded and replicated.

Gehring offered four suggestions to maximize recidivism data effectively: define and collect data that is consistent with the existing milieu; use pilot projects first, then continue the program elements that are successful; be open to change; and place emphasis on transitioning back into the community. He concluded that if one is required to define success by recidivism, one should strive to make sure the data is useful. Unfortunately, despite these suggestions,
not all fifty states are able or willing to provide data to determine whether their correctional interventions are effective (Pew Charitable, 2011).

There is one other issue dealing with measuring program performance. Although federal, state, and private prisons provide educational programs, little is known about them. Much of what we know comes from two national surveys from the U.S. Department of Justice which comes out every five years: Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities, and Survey of Inmates of Federal and State Correctional Facilities. These surveys provide comparable data, but provide little information in regards to correctional educational programs. Because of this, basic questions about program outcomes remain unanswered, making it impossible to compare correctional education with other job training services. Detailed data on program performance is often missing. Because of the timing of federal surveys, the most current data available was last evaluated in 1997, so that little is known about more recent conditions (Klein, Tolbert, Bugarin, Cataldi, & Tauschek, 2004).

Summary of the Literature Review

The prison population is probably one of the most disadvantaged groups in modern society; a segment of this group is those with learning and mental disabilities.

Regrettably, the United States has the highest rate of incarceration of any country in the world (Bureau of Justice, 1992). One solution in reducing the
number of incarcerations is to reduce the number of re-offenders, a solution that can be facilitated through correctional education.

Years of research show that educational programs during incarceration reduce recidivism by using vocational, remedial, academic, and counseling programs. The aims behind these activities are personal development, correcting socio-educational injustices, and educational programs that can benefit the community (O'Neill & Bierie, 2007; Clements, 2004). This can be accomplished by adopting the principles of adult education: viewing the inmates as subjects, rather than objects; focusing on what they have, rather than on what they lack; and on what motivates them, rather than on what the penal system feels they need (Bayliss, 2003). Allowing inmates to pursue skilled careers has proven to reduce recidivism (Bayliss, 2003; Duguid, Hawkey, & Knights, 1998). This is critical since 70%-80% are unemployed, because they lack the necessary skills to survive outside the prison (Eggleston, Rennie, & Riggs, 2008).

There are basic needs to be addressed, such as housing, medical, food, clothing, and transportation, with housing being the most important since it can be considered the "lynchpin that holds the reintegration process together" (Stanford Criminal, 2005, p. 2). This is important, since California parolees, upon being released, are simply given $200 and a ride to the nearest bus stop, so their most immediate concern is finding shelter. Supervised programs that address shelter help ease the burden of looking for a place to live, along with assisted supervision in the other areas of employment, medical, and transportation. When
such support is not afforded many parolees become homeless; parolees in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino’s parolees live on the streets. Another approach toward parolee transition is the Day Reporting Center (DRC). One such center that allows parolees the opportunity to shoulder responsibility is the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center (SBDRC).

The objective behind that Center is one of self-governance as patterned after the models established by George and Osborne. The organizational climate is one of "pelindaba," where the past is gone and a new adventure is beginning. It is a shelter where one can feel safe and have the opportunity to begin to put one’s life back in order. The means of accomplishing this is the Center being governed, in part, by the parolees themselves in a democratic fashion. They are allowed to vote for those taking on leadership roles. In addition to this learning process, assistance is offered in the areas of remedial education, GED preparation, vocational training, employment assistance, anger management and battering classes, child support, assistance for the homeless, and various other programs (Eggleston & Gehring, 2011). The final objective is to make better citizens, where community authority is shared and responsibility is divided. The program is experimental; correctional education is understood as a laboratory where new methods are tested. If they are successful in the most restrictive environment (prison), they might work anywhere. Finally, there is the matter of measuring the success of these endeavors.
After all the time and effort placed in rehabilitative programs, the bottom line is whether they accomplish what they are intended for, and how that should be measured. In corrections, success is usually rated by the absence of re-offenses or recidivism, but using this data can be problematic. Recidivism is a dichotomous variable (it mostly measures yes or no), and it does not identify levels of improvement. Nevertheless, administrators and politicians support programs that are verified by data based on recidivism, and that support contributes to whether they are continued and funded. There are four ways to maximize recidivism data effectively: define and collect data that is consistent with the existing milieu; use pilot projects first, then use the program elements that are successful; be open to change; and place emphasis on transitioning back into the community. If one is required to define success by recidivism one should make sure the data is useful. It is hoped that this study will contribute a deeper understanding of how Day Reporting Centers can assist offenders in becoming deinstitutionalized and learning to shoulder responsibility. This was the objective of correctional reformists such as William George and Thomas Mott Osborne. By demonstrating how the models of self-governance can still work today, might renew an interest in this alternative approach toward transitioning offenders back into society.
CHAPTER THREE
DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Methodology

Design and Theoretical Framework

The study considered the question, “How do the staff at the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center define and implement a democratic organizational culture aimed at reintegrating offenders into society by assisting offenders to reconsider, revise, and challenge their criminal identities?” In order to answer this question, an inquiry was made of the policies and programs of the Center to understand the process by which they endeavor to reverse the effects of prisonization. This decisive factor facilitated in answering the research question.

The reason for choosing case study as a method of research is its ability to answer the how and why question of the study, how does the staff at the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center define and implement a democratic organizational culture aimed at reintegrating offenders into society by assisting offenders to reconsider, revise, and challenge their criminal identities? The study also inquired into why the Center is successful. It is not one policy or feature that makes the Center stand out, but a weaving together of eight assumptions: spheres of civility, performative spaces, personal social space, weaving theory, opportunity theory, transformation theory, and the Freirian pedagogical approach.
Researcher’s Background

The premise for this study lies in the experiences I have undergone in my teaching career, which began with my first introduction to the teaching field. While working with a first grade teacher, I was asked to tutor one of her low-performing students. She advised not to spend too much time since he was “special education” and was going to slip through the cracks and more than likely end up in prison. This negative comment shocked me. Instead of taking her advice I patiently worked with the student and gradually he was able to complete the lesson, with an added measure of self-confidence. This experience has guided my educational philosophy; that everyone can learn if given the opportunity and support.

I began to test the validity of her statement by observing whether other teachers felt the same and whether this student population was going to “slip through the cracks.” I found her statement to be accurate. Many of these students were brushed aside and with little or no effort to adjust instruction to meet the learning difficulties of these students. After teaching in primary, secondary, adult, public and nonpublic, regular and special education, I found this belief to be commonplace. In nonpublic schools I have witnessed the treatment of emotionally disturbed students and those with learning disabilities to be both cruel and violent. Even though public schools are not as extreme, there is the labeling, tracking, and perpetuating of these disabilities.

Over time, I developed teaching strategies that recognized and respected the different learning styles of my students, resulting in improved academic and
social skills. I allowed for personal social space that gave students a voice in their instruction. This made the students feel they had a part in the learning by being able to make decisions in regard to art projects, language art assignments, and other class functions, which they bought into and felt they were a contributing factor to the governance of the classroom. This buy-in resulted in closer student/teacher interaction, but also alienated me from the status quo and administration. The research I have done at the Center confirmed my suspicions, that preconceived notions toward students with disabilities result in behavioral problems and a disproportionate number being incarcerated. I realized that efforts toward preparing and transitioning those with learning disabilities began with corrections, such as Elmira Reformatory. I was surprised to discover that my pedagogical approach resonated with this country’s hidden heritage found in correctional education. Correctional education has been a laboratory where new methods and innovative teaching methods are tested.

I now feel I have come full circle. Students with disabilities can slip through the cracks and end up in prison, but appropriate correctional education offers a means of resolving this injustice. Reading In The Borderlands (Wright, 2008) confirmed that I am not alone in feeling alienated when teaching outside the status quo. The purpose of the study is to show how permitting a democratic atmosphere in the classroom can enhance both academic and social skills learning. Documenting this can reinforce an alternative approach toward special education that I so strongly endorse.
Setting and Context

The San Bernardino Day Reporting Center’s agenda is to aid offenders to successfully transition back into society by offering remedial education, General Educational Development (GED) preparation, and job development, along with social skills, such as anger management and parenting classes. The Center is located in a clean and well-maintained two-story building. This is in contrast to other centers that are cramped and dirty. Some of the students who assist in the running of the Center wear shirts and ties, and all conduct themselves in a professional manner.

The organizational climate promotes the concept of "pelindaba," where the past is gone and a new adventure is beginning. It is a sanctuary where one can feel safe and have the opportunity to begin to put one's life back in order. This is accomplished through the Center being governed by the parolees themselves in a democratic fashion, where they are allowed to vote for those taking on leadership roles. In addition to this learning process, assistance is offered in the areas of: remedial education, GED preparation, vocational training, employment assistance, anger management and battering classes, child support, assistance for the homeless, and other various programs. The Center has been in operation for two years and continues to receive support, not only from California State University, San Bernardino, but also from the community, along with the mayor’s office.
Participants

The participants included staff (n = 7), discharged parolees (n = 4), and parolees (n = 12) that have been quoted from Breaking the Chains, a booklet that contains essays written by staff and students expressing their feelings regarding the Center (Day Reporting Center, 2012).

Staff are twenty-one or older, male and female, and include the chief director, an assistant director, a job developer, two caseworkers, and two instructors. The discharged parolees are twenty-one or older; all were males. The parolees quoted from Breaking the Chains, a booklet that contains essays written by staff and students expressing their feelings regarding the Center.

To protect the confidentiality of the participants and to safeguard identifiable records and data, the names of participants will be numerically coded. This was to ensure that the participants were not identified and requested to remain anonymous, which is why the names shown are pseudonyms (appendix G). The interviews and transcripts were archived and digitally downloaded on to a thumbdrive and locked in the researcher’s office for a minimum of seven years. The hard copies were shredded.

During the interviews some of the discharged parolees’ responses were very short, or rambled on incoherently. Both can be indicative of certain learning difficulties. Personal questions were not asked because of them being considered a vulnerable population.
Data Collection

An intrinsic study was used to understand the particular nature of the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center. The purpose behind an intrinsic case study is to better understand a particular case, not how it is similar to other cases, but its own particularities. It is often exploratory in nature, and the researcher is guided by a personal interest in the case, rather than in extending theory or generalizing across cases (Stake, 2000). The case study has long been accepted as a general approach to understanding a phenomenon by the use of interviews and direct observations. There are three traditional approaches:

- Illustrated - a descriptive account of the main characteristics of a real world example to clarify an idea or reinforce an argument.
- Exploratory - an attempt to understand what happens within a case by looking beyond descriptive features and studying the surrounding context.
- Explanatory - an attempt to explain why certain behaviors occurred by determining causes and effects. (Commonwealth, 2010)

The exploratory case study model was chosen for this study in order to investigate the environment surrounding the Center, according to Stake (1995) there are three additional types of case studies: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. The purpose behind an intrinsic case study is to better understand a particular case; not how it is similar to other cases, but its own particularities. The instrumental case study is used to examine a particular case to see whether it provides insight into an issue or generalization. The collective case study’s aim is to investigate a phenomenon, population, or general condition and entails
individual cases grouped together to see if they manifest some common characteristics. The intrinsic case study model was chosen in order to closely examine the Center and its own particularities and not to develop the generalization found with an instrumental case study or the general and common characteristics of DRCs as a whole, which is the purpose of the collective case study model.

The outline below was used to help anticipate issues that would be handled. It included the nature of the center; its historical background; physical settings; and informants. The conceptual structure of a case study is usually organized around a small number of research questions (Stake, 2000).

The outline of the study focused on the following topics:

- **Topical issue:** The vision of a Day Reporting Center is based on the concepts of democracy, education, and rehabilitation
- **Foreshadow problem:** The prisonization of inmates causes them to become institutionalized to a point where it is difficult for them to integrate back into a free society
- **Issue under development:** The San Bernardino Day Reporting Center's mission is to de-institutionalize and integrate ex-offenders back into society by means of self-governance
- **Assertion:** The policies of pelindaba and self-governance play a central role in integrating ex-offenders back into society. (Stake, 2000)

To reduce the likelihood of misrepresentation, the research employed a redundancy of data gathering and triangulation.
Triangulation is a process using multiple perceptions to clarify meanings and verify the repeatability of an observation or interpretation. It also clarifies meaning by identifying different ways a phenomenon can be seen. Triangulation for this study was accomplished by grouping particular words from the participants into themes, such as politeness and respect, to see if their meanings were clarified. The data was gathered using multiple sources, such as several interviews with staff and ex-parolees, and observations of daily procedures and classroom instruction and interaction (Stake, 2000). The personal comments of participants regarding the practices and policies at the SBDRC helped explain the efforts behind parolees successfully reentering the community.

Data Analysis

**NVivo**

The instrument used to organize and analyze the data was NVivo, a Qualitative Data Analysis software program (QDA). Even though NVivo was developed in 1999 by Tom Richards, and sets the standard for qualitative analysis, not every researcher is acquainted with various terms used in NVivo (Bergin, 2011). The various terms, ideas, and coding used in qualitative research are identified by different labels. Margaret Walsh summarizes this by stating that "NVivo has its own lingo that users will need to learn in order to maneuver around the program (Walsh, 2003). To facilitate this, an understanding of these terms used in NVivo and how they compare to qualitative research is in order:
• Sources: where data documents, memos and media files are stored.
• Nodes: where ideas and coding are stored.
• Sets: where groups of sources and ideas are stored.
• Queries: where to ask questions of your data
• Models: where diagrams and images are made.
• Links: to connect data items and content.
• Classifications: for attributes and relationships.

Coding

This study examined:

• How staff define democratic organizations.

• How staff implement policies, practices that are consistent or inconsistent with their definitions of democracy.

• How staff talk to, with, and about offenders in their classrooms, in hallways, and in everyday interactions.

• How staff believe they are changing identities, behaviors and outcomes associated with prisons (prisonization) and providing offenders opportunities to develop more positive socially accepted identities.

The most widely used means of data analysis is the process of coding and then segregating the results into categories (Glesne, 2006). Listening to the tapes and transcribing them while at the same time analyzing and writing notes facilitated in developing tentative ideas. It was by listening to the statements of the participants that various themes were emerged. The goal is to code and
categorize. This is different from quantitative analysis in which pre-existing categories are already in place. On the other hand, qualitative research produces its own concepts and categories where the coding is grounded in the data. To accomplish this, codes must be linked and cross-referenced (Maxwell, 1996). This process Lichtman (2012) referred to as the Three Cs: coding, categorizing, and identifying concepts. To restate, coding is the analytic process where data are fractured, conceptualized, and integrated to form theories, concepts are the building blocks of theories, and categories are made up of concepts. The goal of the Three Cs is to code the initial data by the identification of categories so as to finish establishing the important concepts of the research.

Strauss and Corbin (1998) expanded on the coding process by identifying three types of coding: open, axial, and selective. Coding is when the data is broken down into discrete parts in order to look for similarities and differences. This is done by conceptualizing, giving the data labels and names. Doing so not only identifies parts of the data but defines their properties or characteristics. Once labeled, the data can be placed into categories that, when grouped together, become concepts. These categories can be further divided into subcategories, for example, the concept of spheres of civility was divided into the subcategories of respect, politeness, reciprocity, and inclusiveness. One way of undertaking open coding is line-by-line analysis. This is a close examination of the data phrase-by-phrase or word-by-word. Another method is to peruse by paying particular attention to the entire document.
Axial coding is linking subcategories around the axis of related categories. The linking is not so much descriptive as it is consensual. For instance, the assumption of inclusiveness is linked to the interactive experiences shared between staff and students. One important feature of axial coding is focusing on the interweaving of conditions; this coincides with the weaving theory where common sense, newly learned knowledge, memories, life experiences are woven together. Selective coding can best be understood by seeing how it relates to open and axial coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

The coding process is in three stages: open coding, axial coding, and finally selective coding. Open coding generates categories and their properties, and shows how they vary. Open coding began with placing keywords, such as respect, self-governance, tired of being tired, and trust into free nodes. In axial coding categories are linked together. These free nodes were then individually categorized into tree nodes, such as inclusiveness, politeness, reciprocity, and respect being grouped together. Selective coding is the final process where the major categories are integrated to form the theory. The tree node of inclusiveness, politeness, reciprocity, and respect was in place under the theme of the theory of spheres of civility. Referring back to axial coding, there must be an axial part or central/core category that has evolved from the research; this gives it analytic power. This power comes from its ability to pull other categories on which to gather further examples. The body of research literature from previous findings also contributes to this process. If this does not work, then selectively collecting data might. If all this proves unsuccessful, then trimming
some of the extraneous concepts might be in order (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). One hitch with collecting data is collecting too much, which is referred to as "fat data" (Glesne, 2006).

Due to the fat data in this study, I reduced data that dealt with learning disabilities and school failure and susceptibility theories and the role they play in contributing to academic failure, which can lead to a negative self-image, which can in turn results in delinquent behavior and dropping out of school (Waldie and Spreen, 1993). A number of participants supported this position this during their interviews. Even though this information can prove valuable, it was not relevant to the hypothesis of the study and was therefore deleted from the literature review and not included in Chapters Four and Five. There was also the matter of outlying cases, which can force a reevaluation of a theory based on erroneous assumptions.

Identifying outlying cases happened when I became aware of the staff's previous experiences working with those with learning disabilities as a contributing factor to their working effectively with students. During the beginning of the interviews I discovered that staff had some experience with special education, and based their philosophies and treatment of the parolees on those experiences. I therefore assumed that special education played a key role until the last interview where a staff member attributed his success to the positive family environment he grew up in. This forced a reevaluation of the importance of experience in special education. It was this finding that supported the assertion by Strauss and Corbin (1998) that the concepts we draw from our data, like life,
do not always fit into neat little boxes, and that there are exceptions (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

**Data Collection Tools**

The interview protocols (appendix E) were selected from Jacob and Furgerson (2012). These helped shape the interview process, facilitate its delivery, and make it trustworthy. A list of the questions were prepared for both staff and ex-parolees and given to them before the interview (appendix C). The interviews were conducted by the researcher at the Center with the permission of Dr. Eggleston. Each participant was given a permission letter explaining the purpose for the study. Participants were told of their right to stop the interview anytime they wished and that their identities would remain anonymous. The development of the questions was guided by the research hypothesis. They were open-ended, which permitted the interviewees to express themselves freely in a quiet semi-private place. The questions began easily and gradually became more complex with on the spot follow up questions when a comment seemed unclear or new themes emerged. Some of the interviews were longer than others, depending on the interviewee. A number of the interviews lasted between fifteen and twenty minutes, where others were up to one to two hours. Some were more open than others, and some with learning difficulties had difficulty expressing themselves. Their responses to the questions would be one or two words, or a rambling of incoherent sentences. It was by using prompts and showing a genuine concern and interest that the parolees began to speak more freely. One
discharged parolee gave an account of his experiences in solitary confinement at a high-security prison in the United States. When he was first released, it was difficult for him to be in crowds or to socialize. The support he received at the Center helped him to transition gradually back into society. It was during the interview that I realized just how articulate he was, when given the chance. After a few prompts, staff also began sharing some of their deepest feelings about the Center, their families, and their beliefs, with two interviews lasting two hours each. There was one issue that surfaced which was a request from participants to remain anonymous and not share their comments with others, including the directors.

This fear of being identified was addressed by explaining the protocols outlined in the IRB proposal that their names would be coded so their identities would remain anonymous. Nothing discussed or revealed could be considered out of place, such as gossip or negative remarks about the center, staff, or parolees. In fact, staff and discharged parolees had nothing but praise for the Center. One reason behind this fear might be attributed to the close connection with corrections and the panoptic environment that it brings with it.

Informed Consent and Confidentiality

Each participant was given a permission letter explaining the purpose for the study. Participants were told their right to stop the interview anytime they wished and that their identities would remain anonymous.
Confidentiality or Anonymity

To protect the confidentiality of the participants and to safeguard identifiable records and data, the names of participants were numerically coded. This was to ensure that the participants were not identified and requested to remain anonymous, which is why the names shown are pseudonyms (appendix G). The interviews and transcripts were archived and digitally downloaded on to a thumbdrive and locked in the researcher’s office for a minimum of seven years. The hard copies will be shredded after the study is completed. With only eleven participants it would difficult to provide a description of events that would remain completely confidential for those who participated in the study, even in the summary. A summary of the study was made available to the Center.

Participation

Participation was voluntary, and refusing to participate did not involve any penalty or loss of benefits to which the participants were entitled, and discontinuing participation at any time did not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which they were entitled. All eleven of the participants were interviewed, with no one refusing to participate.

Risks

There were no reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts to the subject. Answers would not impact the staffs’ employment. In spite of these provisions to minimize risk, some staff still requested their names remain anonymous.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

The study answered the question, how do the staff at the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center define and implement a democratic organizational culture aimed at reintegrating offenders into society by assisting them to reconsider, revise, and challenge their criminal identities? Clearly there is evidence in the lower recidivism rate of the parolees leaving the Center, in comparison with the rest of the State of California. The study revealed that it is not just one policy or feature that makes the Center stand out, but a weaving together of eight assumptions: spheres of civility, performative spaces, personal social space, weaving theory, opportunity theory, transformation theory, and the Freirian pedagogical approach. In addition, there are the concepts of self-governance and family. These eight assumptions, and concepts of self-governance and family, are woven into the mission and vision of the Center.

First, I will discuss how the mission/vision of the Center has defined its policies around the principles of self-governance. This will be followed by assumptions, which will determine if the staff at the Center define and implement a democratic organizational culture aimed at reintegrating ex-offenders into society so as to assist offenders to reconsider, revise, and challenge their criminal identities. This will be undertaken by reviewing the comments from staff
and students. Personal observations will confirm the statements by the participants, and the recidivism rate for the SBDRC will give statistical confirmation of the success of the Center. Finally, weaving theory will show how the assumptions are linked together, such as self-governance being linked to inclusiveness, interaction, and negotiation. This should help the reader to be familiar with the themes from the interviews.

As mentioned in Chapter One, there is a concern that researchers may have preconceived notions which can influence the veracity of a study. To prevent this, a set of eight assumptions were used to verify whether a family-like environment existed at the Center. These assumptions were developed by other researchers to critique whether inmates were offered the opportunities and support to transition back into society. These were not preconceived notions by this researcher, but used to either verify or nullify the hypothesis that the Center provides parolees the opportunity to successfully transition back into society.

Chapter Four Outline
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Mission and Vision of the Staff

We Are Not Quite There Yet

Some organizations have a set mission and vision statement, while the Center's policies continue to adapt and change, with the purpose of meeting the students' needs. This is demonstrated by the varying mission and vision statements from the staff. To Jane the vision is:

Really to help prevent students from going back to prison, and maybe more importantly, even having them become a model in their homes so that they can start breaking the cycle of incarceration, the generational cycle of incarceration. Because, if they change, they have the potential to change their families; the mission is to help them develop skills so that they can then lead crime-free lives. One of the decisions that can be made with adults is to change their lives. They also have the decision to keep on doing what they've been doing (Jane, personal communication, June 16, 2013).

This generational cycle of incarceration ties in with the cycles of poverty in education theory. The culture of poverty is a set of beliefs and values that are reproduced from generation to generation. Once the culture of poverty begins, it tends to perpetuate itself; education can play a key role in reversing this process (Bradshaw, 2007). Not having the proper schooling can be defined as 'capability deprived', where chronically poor people have little access to resources such as health, education, and social capital.
Such deprivation can result in a lack of skills necessary for sustainable employment. The opposite of this is ‘capability enhanced’, where education allows for a person to break free of the cycle of poverty. Unfortunately, the hidden curriculum in education can also be a causal factor contributing to poverty (Rose & Dyer, 2008). Schooling can contribute to the reproduction of unjust and inequitable social conditions when it promotes the social relations of dominance, hierarchy, and respect for authority in order to socialize future workers. A study of low-income students in Northern Ireland showed that boys as young as nine or ten became disenchanted with school because of the negative treatment they received from their teachers. This was in contrast to their higher income peers who described positive experiences while in school (Hirsch, 2007).

The solution offered was to allow children to develop positive relationships with supervising adult by allowing them a democratic voice in the running of the classroom and school. This solution closely resembles the mission of the Center in allowing parolees to have a democratic say in the governance of the Center.

Elizabeth paraphrased Dr. Eggleston and Dr. Gehring's aims of the vision and mission, suggesting that their vision is a much more humane, realistic, and modernized version of the penal system, which allows offenders to be treated in a way that will make them better citizens as participants in society when they are finished with their incarceration and rehabilitation. She added that mission of the Center is to facilitate the vision by providing the social services, education support, and practical necessities, such as a place to live, hot food and clothing,
job counseling, and so on; to people who use the Center for their period of parole and sometimes after parole.

Elizabeth highlighted the importance that, "Every human being in society deserves humane treatment regardless of who they are and offense or issues may be" (Elizabeth, personal communication, July 8, 2013). According to Elizabeth, this is shown by combining holistic education with the general needs of the student. She explained how her holistic approach could be considered humane. When she saw that the students were not comprehending the material, she considered it her responsibility to communicate better to them, rather than assuming that they were dense. So she made changes to the lesson until the students understood.

Patricia also endorsed the importance of education as a part of the vision/mission of the Center, because of its ability to empower, stating that, when people become educated:

They’re given another tool to begin to rebuild their lives by adding that tool to their tool belt. To realize this, there has to be a place where they are given the same chances as everyone else. That other people are also involved in empowerment of disenfranchised populations, such as prisoners, and can see how it's worked here so other people, prisoners or parolees, come out of prisons can be given the same chance, that some of our people are given (Patricia, personal communication, June 4, 2013).
These comments by staff on the Center’s vision/mission tie in with the Freirian pedagogical approach which endorses education so that it not only reduces illiteracy, but empowers students by means of “liberational” education.

Charles believes that this action will help students to "dodge some of life's blows", and according to Mary this leads to a safer San Bernardino by reducing recidivism. This is the rationale behind the name change from Day Reporting Center to Cal State San Bernardino Reentry Initiative; to assist students in making a successful transition from incarceration to free society. This has been an ongoing policy.

Drs. Eggleston and Gehring patterned the Center after previous institutions, but there is still much to be learned and improved on. Jane bore this out when she said:

I believe we are operating consistently with our mission and vision. We're not there yet, you know. We're always in this period of what we need to do better, because the whole point of program evaluation is for program improvement. So we’re not there yet. But I do think that we have made it consistent with our vision and mission (Jane, personal communication, June 16, 2013).

This outlook was shared by Charles. When the Center was first opened they did not know what was going to happen within the first year:

I think when we first opened up, everybody had the right goals and emotions to work with this population, but we didn't know what was going to happen within a year. We didn't know how it was going to turn out in six
months. We just decided to go off with what we know is best, and that is try to help as many individuals as we can, and we all knew that support was huge and so as far as the ex-offender population, it's changed dramatically (Charles, personal communication, June 27, 2013).

James added that change can also be seen in the staff, because they are learning as they go forward and are applying what they are learning. This learning process not only affects attitudes, but policies as well. Mary made it clear that the Center's policies were fluid.

In the beginning there were no policies in place, but there was the freedom to create new ones as needed. To Patricia the vision of the Center is to act as a model for other organizations. One defining feature of the SBDRC is the role students play in the self-governance of the Center.

Most organizations have in place a mission/vision statement that defines policy. This can make it difficult for the organization to adapt and change if necessary. Day Reporting Centers are similar in that they are highly structured nonresidential programs, which offer little room for change. Parolees report to the center, submit to drug tests, and enroll in various classes. What makes the SBDRC different is its continuing efforts toward adapting its policies. This is reflected by the staff having their own interpretation of what the mission and vision is. Some feel it is helping parolees transition back into society and become empowered to change themselves. The main point is that the Center is continuing to change and evolve. This coincides with Peter Senge's *The Fifth Discipline* (1990), which states that, like people, organizations are capable of
learning, because their employees are capable of learning. Organizations have the ability to learn by allowing members to contribute to the learning process and encouraging everyone to build on the shared vision.

Self-governance

All of the staff were found to be supportive of self-governance and felt that it was necessary for enabling students to reintegrate back into society. David stated that the students must have a voice in order to be responsible, not just for themselves, but for their fellow students. They are to "call the shots", not the State. He likened their experiences of democracy to a two-year-old learning to walk for the first time; they are not graceful and make a lot of mistakes. Patricia believes self-governance means empowerment, because of the choice and ability to participate in the governing of the Center. James added that any student can approach staff, and if they feel that the response is inadequate, they can turn to their elected officials, such as the president, to represent them:

James: I see students go up to the president, the vice-president and, and have a sit down and talk about certain issues around the Center. And then the president, the vice-president sit down with the program director. Now she moved up to another position, but she will go directly to the program director and address situations with students we're feeling or going on around the Center. All the way up to the kitchen area, things that need to be cleaned out throughout the Center. We're talking about stupid things, doesn't have to be something major; we're talking about just who's going to clean up the kitchen at the end of the day. People were leaving coffee
cups everywhere. The students wanted to know how to handle these situations. But no one wants to be the rat, per se. So have the president and he’s the voice of the students.

Interviewer: I never thought of that, so he doesn’t get any stitches.

James: There you go.

Interviewer: No stitches.

James: There you go. So it's a voice for the students to go to him to have problems, and this president or the governance body, will be the means to solve those problems.

Interviewer: What they have accepted now is the legal means to do it, so they can’t be snitches.

James: Yes, it's a way to solve problems for their own selves. It’s their voice of their peers. (James, personal communication, July 16, 2013)

Going to the president to handle different situations does not violate the prison code of being a snitch, because, as James pointed out, the president acts as the students' representative. Mary felt that self-governance gives the students a sense of independence and the desire to make sure that the Center would still be here ten years from now. Elizabeth described this as buy-in, because it:

Allows them to see the big picture of how the actions of individuals affect the running of an organization. And I think, maybe most of all, it creates buy-in. They begin to feel like an offense toward the Center is an offense toward them, like if somebody takes a laptop or something. That they no longer would brush it off as ‘well that's just not cool’, but they begin to say,
wait a minute that might cost this organization some money to replace and it's my organization, as well as everybody else's (Elizabeth, personal communication, July 8, 2013).

As beneficial as self-governance can be, Jane warned that it is not a panacea in that self-interests can negatively affect the distribution of resources. The example she gave was regarding the first elected leadership. The president and other elected representatives were allowing their people to get most of the services, such as donated suits, ties, and shirts. When it was brought to their attention that, as leaders, they must represent everyone, they, "rose to the occasion", and began taking into account everyone's needs (Jane, personal communication, June 16, 2013). Charles summed up the benefits of self-governance in that it keeps those in leadership roles busy, while other students look to them as examples:

I think by giving him [president] responsibility, which is one of the students, was heavy on his drug abuse, and because we gave him this position of leadership, he has no time to think about because one should keep their mind busy; there's no time even to think about going back to what you used to do. So by him having that responsibility, knowing that people are going to "look my way, I am somebody now, I'm the president, I'm vice-president, you know, and they look at me as an example" (Charles, personal communication, June 27, 2013).

The importance of setting aside self-interests is based on organizational justice, where employees become angry if they feel they are being ignored,
which leads to workplace deviance. Henle (2005) identifies two ways to stop deviance. One is by initially trying to identify a prospective employee’s personality traits. The other has management acting with fairness and sensitivity. In addition, fairness can be based on trust, respect, consideration in communication, and explaining the rationale behind different decisions (Simmons & Roberson, 2003).

Within any organizational culture, betrayal can result in deviance. People perceive fairness when they have a voice in the decision-making process (De Cremer & Tyler, 2007). This fairness must be based on trust, respect, and consideration in communication, along with administration explaining the rationale behind their decisions, if they are contrary to the decisions reached by the employees (Simmons & Roberson, 2003). When respect and consideration are shown, they are reciprocated by both employees and administration. Jane emphasized that trust works both ways between staff and students, but it is the responsibility of staff to take the lead in showing trust. This is related to procedural justice, where employees perceive fairness, because they too have a voice in decisions that affect them, by providing timely feedback without bias (Heslin, & Vande Walle, 2009). Doing so communicates that administration is displaying a willingness to work with personnel. There must be an employee perception that managers are concerned about them by communicating respect, avoiding impropriety, and providing justification for their decisions (Mayer, Nishu, Schneider, & Golden, 2007). For James this means:

They [students] have a voice, they actually have a voice, they actually have a means to get their voices heard. They have a way to go not just to
staff members, but to their own peers and talk to them personally to get something done (James, personal communication, July 16, 2013).

Baker (1985) warned that in order for this to work there must be a positive interaction between both parties. If not, then an atmosphere of mistrust can develop.

One method to curtail mistrust is inmate self-government (Osborne, 1915). The San Bernardino Day Reporting Center staff believes that self-governance, along with respecting the cultural and ethnic diversity of parolees, is an effective means of transitioning them back into the community. This is a defining characteristic of the Center. As with the ancient Greek States, politics was an alternative to war, where negotiation and compromise were used instead. There are a number of other benefits as well: buy-in, communication, empowerment, giving back, having a voice, independence, responsibility, and teamwork. Jason noted that it is communication that allows self-governance to work at the Center:

Interviewer: The how do you think that democracy, the way that the Center is handled in a democratic fashion, has helped you in helping others?

Jason: I think I think worked real well because we all communicate with each other.

Interviewer: Okay and how, how did that help and how do you think that helps the Center now?

Jason: Cause pretty much everybody knows, everybody pretty much knows what needs to be done and what is expected of them and whatnot.
Interviewer: Okay, now what about the decision-making process when it comes to staff, how does that, how does that tie in, how does it help staff?
Jason: It makes, it makes lives a lot easier for them.
Interviewer: How?
Jason: Cause they don't they don't got to deal with all of the commotion because everybody helps and got it under control.
Interviewer: Now, what you mean by everybody has it under control?
Jason: Like, like, like leaving something. You can leave something around and it'll still be there; mean if you leave it and come back, it'll still be there.
Interviewer: Now do you think that's because of the students having a say so in the Center?
Jason: Yeah.
Interviewer: Why?
Jason: Because they're communicating. If one, if one, one person is, is taking, and nobody else is doing it, we're all going to know who's doing it, and everybody else is going to talk, it's got to be him. (Jason, personal communication, July 29, 2013)

There is the sense of empowerment, because as Patricia testified “[students] have the choice and ability to participate” (Patricia, personal communication, June 4, 2013). David feels that this helps to deinstitutionalize the students:

Most of these guys are so externally located. The State tells me what to wear, the State tells me what time to get up, the State tells me what to eat,
the State tells me what I'm going to get, what I'm not going to get. Now all of a sudden I'm calling the shots here? And it's totally new to them. And sometimes, that can be scary, but it can be very empowering at the same time (David, personal communication, September 10, 2013).

Patricia added that empowerment gives the students the opportunity to act independently. This leads to responsibility, to which Jason commented:

Gives a person a chance to see what life's really about. About having responsibilities and giving to the community, because we were all convicts. So, if we can't help each other, how do you expect other people from the outside world to help us (Jason, personal communication, July 29, 2013)?

People perceive fairness when they have a voice in the decision-making process (De Cremer & Tyler, 2007). This is something the staff at the Center support and feel is necessary for reintegration. There are pros and cons to self-governance, especially if mistakes are made (Baker, 1964). Still, it empowers parolees in deciding for themselves what works and what does not, what is right and what is wrong, which can benefit both staff and students. One student, Steven, related how he witnessed staff and students coming together to resolve issues that arise at the Center:

Sometimes like they [staff] might have a certain way of doing something, but they've never been in that situation themselves, now we're coming, the student body is telling them they been in that situation and now we realize that it should be, it could be dealt with in a better fashion this way and then
and then you can come together and make a decision. Staff sits back and see it working and say wow. Doesn't mean they're going to have great order, or we'll put it in the trial period. You see, like you say, the democratic, democracy of being able to come to them with an opinion how do you think it should be run. Instead of this is our way or no way (Steven, personal communication, May 26, 2013).

Remarks of Mission and Vision at Student Orientation

At the student orientation, the staff described how they were going to implement the mission and vision of the Center, and presented a session on how this was going to be realized. The student orientation is held for each new group of potential students and is conducted by one of the students acting as the presenter. The presenter began by emphasizing the importance of support from the parolees’ families. He stated that the Center has an open-door policy and everything is in-house:

We do offer here an open-door policy up here [Center]. Any of the staff, any of the mentors throughout this program we're here to help you guys make this transition as easy as possible. But all of you guys are talking about getting a job this is one class I'd highly recommend that you take the job development, it's actually a two-part class. We have an in-house job developer that goes out into the community and looks for employers (personal observation, June 2, 2013).

But, in order for the program to work, students must be honest with the staff. The student body president was then invited to step up and present himself.
He stated he is only the middleman between them and staff, and he is there for them. He encouraged the prospective students by saying the program works, “This program will give you everything you want you just have to want. So don’t be shy” (personal observation, June 2, 2013).

The third person to speak was the director, noting that she is their tour guide, and that the program only works if both staff and parolees are honest with each other. She encouraged them to enjoy their stay at the Center. The fourth speaker, Jane, began by stating that it took six years for the Center to begin operating. She tells the students not to trust the staff at first, but allow them to prove themselves, and if there are any problems, they have a student body to represent them and each student has a voice in the running of the Center:

But we do have this idea of treating people with dignity, everyone being a part of what we’re doing. We have an elected student body like a president, vice-president, secretary-treasurer, Supreme Court judge, and our student body, and everybody knows that they don’t get to make all the decisions. And frankly, we don’t all get to make the decisions either even though we have to go by what the contract says, but everyone has a voice here and yours will be just as important as another person (Jane, personal communication, June 16, 2013).

The fifth speaker was a caseworker who likened the Center to a construction zone, where students can rebuild their lives, like gluing a broken bowl back together. The job developer added that there is help and that the
Center should be like their second family. At the awards ceremony the same ideas concerning the vision and mission were repeated.

Jane again mentioned the issue of respect and trust, and how they applied to both staff and students, and were qualities staff identified with the democratic culture of the Center. The manner in which staff implement the goals behind the vision and mission of the Center, affirms the foreshadowed concepts such as the spheres of civility, performative spaces, and personal social space. These theories allow individuals to prove who they are in a personal space that is civil. As I used these criteria, I noticed that they were woven together and did not operate independently of each other.

The data was coded into groups of themes of what NVivo refers to as tree nodes. The tree nodes were divided into three groups: assumptions, DRC, and parole office/prison. These nodes were coded into eight concepts: Freirian, opportunity theory, Pelindaba, performing spaces, personal social space, spheres of civility, transformation theory, and weaving theory. These concepts were further divided into subgroups: performative spaces (interactive and negotiations); personal social space (access to outside education, and find one's place and freedom to maneuver); spheres of civility (inclusiveness, politeness, reciprocity, and respect). NVivo has a feature called coding stripes that show how different nodes are related to each other. For instance, respect is related or linked to inclusiveness; reciprocity is linked to politeness. The study further separated the three concepts, spheres of civility, personal social space, and performative spaces into two groups, staff and students.
When those in positions of authority communicated respect, it is more likely for their actions to be reciprocated, and this was one of the topics at the student orientation. The staff voiced their views about honesty and the Center being like a construction zone to rebuild lives.

Assumptions

Spheres of Civility/Staff

Respect. During the student orientation, the importance of respect was mentioned. Jane assured the prospective students that disrespect shown by staff would not be tolerated because respect is a two-way street, and “this is a place to grow.” Jane maintained that, “We have tried to take the best of what has been done with the inside [prison] programs, programs historically that have been managed democratically, and use that theoretical foundation for developing an outside [outside of prison] program” (Jane, personal communication, June 16, 2013).

NVivo connected the coding of respect to reciprocity, inclusiveness, and politeness.

Reciprocity. Charles clarified how reciprocity played a part at the Center. As he mentioned during the orientation, it was his responsibility to provide help to the students, and the students reciprocated by giving him advice and encouragement:

There’s times where they [students] lead me [Charles] in here and they’ll come in here and someone will say what’s going on. This is not you?
[Charles] Can I [student] help you with anything? And I [Charles] sit there and I talked to them. And I tell them about my situation. And they're [students] offering me some advice and they're telling me everything is going to be all right. Just let it go man. Tomorrow's another day for you [Charles], you know, once again just jump on the saddle (Charles, personal communication, June 27, 2013).

This reciprocation links or extends to inclusiveness. When respect and consideration are shown, they are reciprocated between staff and students. This is connected to procedural justice, where employees perceive fairness, because they have a voice. This means including them in the decision-making process (Heslin, & Vande Walle, 2009).

Inclusiveness. In this next section I collected together comments that participants said that related to the topic of inclusiveness. James recounted how during holiday gatherings everyone was involved in the festivities, which including staff, students, and family:

Everybody's doing what they really want to do. Everybody gets involved. If they don't want to do nothing, they don't have to. And we also invite the students to also bring their family members. Now, of course, we have age limits. It has to be above eighteen. But as long as they bring their family members we don't have a set limit on it. And we also encourage students who've already graduated out of parole, and are off parole, just still come on by (James, personal communication, July 16, 2013).
Inclusiveness could not only involve large gatherings and festivities, but also applied when just a few persons were casually meeting to share daily events. Patricia related her experiences with inclusiveness:

Some of my most rewarding moments I think is not while I'm doing my case work, but when my doors open and I have an African-American gentleman sitting in front of me, a Hispanic gentleman sitting in front of me, and maybe a Caucasian lady, and we're all in the room together and we're all talking. We're not talking about work, we're not talking about goals, we're not talking about any of that stuff, we are talking about Lakers or whatever we're talking about, but there's so much more that happens within those interactions (Patricia, personal communication, June 4, 2013). These three aspects of respect, reciprocity, and inclusiveness play a role in politeness.

**Politeness.** Politeness is demonstrated throughout the Center, and can be as unpretentious as described by Charles, “I would go out of my way to introduce myself, shake their hands, welcome them into their house. I would do this more than one time” (Charles, personal communication, June 27, 2013). Mary provided another example of how straightforward and uncomplicated politeness can be:

When I go into the woman's restroom and there's no toilet paper I come back out and get rolls and they'll see me and they'll say hey, you know, I'll take that for you, or I'll do that (Mary, personal communication, May 31, 2013).

Politeness can even affect policy such as drug abuse, as Mary conveyed:
We don’t kick them out automatically if they come in having used drugs or alcohol. They can’t stay here that day if they’re actively high. But, it’s a bump in the road for them. And, so, we work with them to the maximum extent possible (Mary, personal communication, May 31, 2013).

At the student orientation, Jane emphasized how important it was for staff to show respect to the parolees. Because of this policy, reciprocity was demonstrated by the students by trying to encourage a staff member who was depressed. This policy of inclusiveness I witnessed at Center gatherings where everyone was invited, from past graduates to family members. This inclusiveness led to simple deeds of politeness, such as greeting staff or offering to wash their car. These spheres of civility have resulted in a sense of identity and self-worth among the parolees, which developed in performative spaces.

**Performative Spaces/Staff**

Performative Spaces are where inmates can focus on their identities in a transformative manner. It is essential for students to be able to focus on themselves in a positive, transformative, and rehabilitative manner by managing identity, negotiation, and choosing a course of interest (Wright, 2012). Staff member James outlined the process that the students go through at the Center in learning how to develop goals and gradually achieving one after the other until they start viewing themselves in a positive manner:

Interviewer: That seems to answer what we've gone over seems to answer eight, says, do you feel that Center has helped ex-offenders transition back into the community?
James: We try to do everything we can Greg. We give them if we can get them jobs, get on their education, get them back in the college, you know. A lot of these things I wish I said earlier in the conversation, hopefully you have everything from here right now: going back to college, getting them on their feet, shown them there's another way. Whatever we can to make them productive members of society, productive members back into the community, whatever we can do to help them out. And I tell you first things I do is I want to know their goals, what are your goals? Let me know what your goals are and I'll do whatever I can to help you to obtain those goals. And after we obtain those goals let's think of something else, let's try to go after that. And it's a building block, it's one after another, after another, and pretty soon they go through a 365 days of doing nothing but being productive and achieving things that they have, things they thought they'd never be able to achieve, but once they achieve one thing it just rolls over to the next achievement, to the next achievement. Before you know it great things (James, personal communication, July 16, 2013).

Identity. Focusing on identity in a positive, transformative, and rehabilitative manner is one objective of the Center. One of the staff, Charles, related how:

They have found themselves while in prison, who they really are on the inside, and how they came to finally realize who they are again. They stated that they have come to understand that they do respect themselves
and respect others, and that in order to help themselves they also have to help others (Charles, personal communication, June 27, 2013).

I discovered this concept was something new that while interviewing one of the parolees, Anthony, about the effectiveness of different rehabilitation programs. He praised the STAR program (Success Through Addiction Recovery), which deals with drug rehabilitation. But, it was while in prison that he decided to change his behavior:

Number one thing that you learn, that I learned, when I went down first, it's all about me, all about me. Now that being said I said a little prayer, “Hey God can you show me where my faults are at, so I can change. Show my weaknesses.” And I happen to be in my cell and my homie was sitting there. ‘Hey Rich come on down here, I want to kick your fucking ass.’ I look this guy and ‘I'll rock you to the world what's with the mouth?’ When I got down there I looked at him. He’s standing there and got that ugly face on him, he’s got that. You know. And it’s like looking at a mirror. I looked at that guy and like, is that way you've been, is that the way it was? And I just looked at him, turned around and got back on the bed, and didn’t say nothing and he didn’t say nothing, dropped it. But it was like looking in the mirror. And that showed me, that showed me so, so much. Okay, Rich see who you were, you see all that, that’s who you were Rich. All that little tough guy who you thought you were. That’s how you treated your wife, or that's how you treated your children. That’s how you treated your mom and dad, your grandmother. That’s how you treated your family on the
outside. So, it’s no longer about me. And I’m sitting in there and thinking these people are at home crying about me, and I’m not even thinking that at first. I'm locked down to get to deal with. But then it started opening my eyes, see another point. I seen the real, real, the real picture, the real picture. These people here [staff at Center] they, I mentioned the first time I came here, I didn't have that trust in them, none. They knocked it down individually, all in their own little ways. They take that time to actually show us, which is great, you know. I'm just amazed, I'm just amazed. Don't get me wrong, every day, every day’s not pretty, you know what I mean, cause I'd be a liar if I said it was. I mean straight up, man. I've had my down days. But when I have my down days, man they see and they read it so quickly, so fast; that's cool (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013).

This awareness of who he is, with his strengths and weaknesses, finally allowed Anthony to connect with his wife, children, and parents. This awareness was recognized by the staff at the Center. After completing various courses, he was asked to become a facilitator by teaching classes and being a representative for the Center before the community.

While observing his class I witnessed how staff member Mark demonstrated this support by reassuring the students that: “All of us are like diamonds in the rough, that everyone has some hidden talent, and that it is necessary to learn how to turn off the prison mentality that they will always be bad” (personal observation July 3, 2013).
This effort to turn off the prison mentality is what Patricia referred to as empowerment, "I think the vision is to have a place other people are also involved in the empowerment of disenfranchised populations, such as prisoners" (Patricia, personal communication, June 4, 2013). Negotiation is a necessary component of reintegrating back into society by making one’s needs known.

Mark encouraged the students by saying that, “All of us are like diamonds in the rough, that everyone has some hidden talent, and that it is necessary to learn how to turn off the prison mentality that they will always be bad” (personal observation July 3, 2013).

Negotiation. In order for students to be able to focus on transforming their identities, an environment must be established or negotiated that allows for a measure of peace and security, such as housing, employment, and medical care. Seymour (1977) touches on this when he describes the niches inmates make for themselves while in prison. These niches can be places that contain objects, space, resources, and relationships between people that are ameliorative by making situations more bearable and satisfactory. Niches can act as growth environments by providing a refuge that does not negatively label inmates but enhances their self-understanding and ability to cope with stress. Niches are usually isolated, calm, and quiet. The activities in these settings provide opportunities for inmates to learn to effectively manage their time and energy, which gives them a personal sense of ownership and ability to govern their own activities. Charles outlined an incident with a student who was homeless and how it affected his sense of identity and self-esteem. The student told Charles, “I don't
have a place to stay, I need a place to stay at, I'm tired of living on the streets.” Charles responded, “Okay, what if I were to tell you that we can pay your housing for 125 days, 120 days, all right?” The student countered, “Well, I don't have to pay anything?” Charles continued, “No you don't have to pay anything. Just follow the program and you have a roof over your head, you have a bed to lay in, you'll be okay, alright? What else do you need?” The student answered, “I need clothes.” Charles replied:

Okay. Well at that time we used to have $10 vouchers that we used to give out to the Goodwill. And I told him I'll give you $10 to go buy yourself some clothes, okay and in time if you need more then we'll give you more, right? And at that time his whole persona started to change a little bit. Now he started to stand up straight, now he was, okay can you buy me a car? And I said I cannot buy you a car, but I'll tell you what, I can give you a bus pass for a month to take you from point A to point B (Charles, personal communication, June 27, 2013).

This assistance permitted the student to identify himself as a homeless person, but with the ability to move forward, which improved his self-esteem. This was underscored by distributive justice where the perceived fairness of a person's outcomes was based on a reward or a decision that was made, rather than whether it was fair or not. This could entail relationships where one was putting more into a relationship than what he/she was getting out of it. The norm was that, if you helped someone, they should reciprocate in some way. There was also the principle of equity where everyone should receive the same
outcome, regardless of one's input, or the notion that more favorable outcomes should be given to those in need (SAGE Publications, 2009).

Choosing a Course of Interest. Identifying one's self can be achieved by means of education. Having the freedom to choose courses that are of importance and interest contributes to democracy, self-governance, and reintegration. According to Freirian liberational education, education not only reduces illiteracy, but empowers students to understand the world in order to attain greater economic, political, and social capital. The Center encourages this style of pedagogy.

Elizabeth stated that her goal was not just to drop facts into the students’ heads, but to draw them out to know their goals and issues in order to tailor the instruction. In connection with identity, Patricia did not support the notion of people being a part of a melting pot, because it stripped them of their identity. Reintegration should include things that shape who we are, and affording the same privileges to everyone, regardless of whether they have gone to prison.

It was found that performative spaces could have different meanings. Elizabeth felt that students should think for themselves. Patricia felt that this could be accomplished by turning off the prison mentality. Mark encouraged the students by telling them they were like diamonds in the rough. What this had done was to create an environment where parolees were able to focus positively on their identities. This would not be possible if the parolees did not have a sense of security and peace which was provided in the way of housing and
employment. This helped reduce much of the stress that came from being released from prison without any support.

**Personal Social Space/Staff**

The freedom to explore one’s abilities and potentials is the objective behind Personal Social Space by having access to outside education, such as college. According to James, a number of students are going to college due to the support from the Center, because "it has the means to help" (James, personal communication, July 16, 2013).

Many students did not know how to turn a computer on to register for college courses. Now they had staff members who would sit down with them to enroll in classes. The result was that students who graduated with their AA or AS degrees continued toward their Bachelor’s degree. The presenter at the orientation told the incoming students that when he had first come to the Center, he did not know how to operate a computer. But, through the help of the staff, he had been able to graduate on the Dean’s list with an Associate’s degree and is now working toward his Bachelor’s. He assured the students that, "not one red cent," came out of his pocket. Instead, he was awarded supplemental income to allow him the time to study. He concluded that it took him more than nineteen months just to get a part time position. Still, he recommended for them not to wait for the economy to pick up, that they should do something to make themselves more productive, such as attending college.

Even though some programs at the Center are mandatory, such as Anger Management and Batterers class, college courses are voluntary. As Jane put it,
"Adults need to make the decisions themselves" (Jane, personal communication, June 16, 2013). While coding, NVivo linked personal social space with self-governance and inclusion. Jane stated that the Center has a series of programs that were suggested by students. One class is Spanish.

A couple of English-speaking students said that they would like to learn Spanish; now the Center offers Spanish. Having this freedom to maneuver and finding one’s place can be seen by the fact that students not only come to the Center to take their classes, but can stay as long as they want, just as with an adult school. This shows an effort on the part of staff to provide opportunity and support for parolees to reintegrate back into the community. But, how were parolees responding to these efforts? Their comments added deeper insight into the success of the Center and the culture that has developed over the past two years.

The comments of staff indicted the Center shows students how to use computers, and how to enroll in college courses through the internet. The staff also took into consideration the parolees' request for particular classes they felt were beneficial. This is a prime example of personal social space in that the Center provided access to outside educational sources, along with the freedom to maneuver and negotiate within the educational system.

**Spheres of Civility/Discharged Students**

In the interviews, one theme stood out, the gratitude the students feel toward the Center which links to inclusiveness, respect, reciprocity, and politeness, or as a sphere of civility (Wright & Gehring, 2008).
Inclusiveness. In *Breaking the Chains*, Gary writes about the care and support he received because of the Center’s policy of inclusiveness:

"I've always turned to drugs. I don't turn to drugs anymore since I been out, since I been coming here. There's always a, you know, Eddie, Genna, or whoever. How you doing? Alright, what's up, it looks like you got something on your mind. I say, yeah, I do, but now's not the time to talk about it, or whatever. You know, they care about everybody, you know. And that's why I think for some reason I come back, because they know if I'm in a bad mood or if I've got something on my mind."

Respect. Steven related the respect he was shown by staff along with inclusiveness:

"They're very respectful, that's one thing I noticed that right from the beginning. if you have a problem you come to them and they'll sit down and talk to you, instead of just like get out of here, like you do to a kid, go to your room or something. They're willing to help you, you know. They'll sit down and talk to you, try to find out what's going on with you (Steven, personal communication, May 26, 2013).

Anthony confirms this respect when he states that staff will, "talk to you as a person and, not knock you down" (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013).

Reciprocity. The effort on the part of staff trying to motivate self-esteem is mentioned by Stephen in his essay in *Breaking the Chains*, in that "By educating ex-offenders and teaching them how to build self-esteem, integrity and a general
overall purpose in their lives, society will be a much safer place for all of us.” This support that staff provided was reciprocated in ways that were available to the students. Mary commented on how the students assisted the Center the best way they could:

Their way of giving back is take care of the office. And I guess that's a sense of home, I guess for them. I can't have them wash my car, and they'll offer to wash my car. I can't have them bring me a big meal, you know, because it's inappropriate (Mary, personal communication, May 31, 2013).

She also related the moral support that was shared, “There are some days I was frustrated and miserable last week, because I had to do all of this administrative stuff, interviewing, contract negotiations and I did not, the interactions with the students and I was missing that.”

**Politeness.** Inclusiveness, respect, and reciprocity cannot be achieved without politeness. According to one student, Anna, one of the students who wrote an essay in *Breaking the Chains*, this required each and every person to, “fit and blend with one another, helping us and guiding us to the mark we all strive for, success, freedom, responsibility, and sobriety; this is a once in a lifetime shot.” The next concept is performative spaces.

I considered it necessary to compare the comments of staff with students to verify staff statements, along with discovering new data. One theme that stood out was the gratitude students felt towards staff. This was because of the respect and kindness shown them. They responded to this by volunteering to do
whenever they could at the Center. I found this to be a blending together of staff and students.

**Performative Spaces/Discharged Students**

The aim of performative spaces is for students to focus positively on their identity and reintegrate back into society. Unfortunately, society has negative perceptions of offenders, which even after being released, parolees feel alienated. They are portrayed, as George expressed:

> As being the worst of the worst, the baddest of the badest, that's why they've gotta keep them locked up; that's crap, because I came out of there, I ain't the baddest of the badest, I'm not the worst of the worst, you know what I mean. I didn't go and kill anybody or do anything like that, you know (George, personal communication, July 7, 2013).

To Anthony, the key to changing this negative identity is to develop a different mindset, “Anybody that has 10 years you can guarantee they've been institutionalized. But, when you start changing that frame of mind, and start thinking differently, it takes time, doesn't happen overnight. Takes time to eliminate all that ugliness, and you start getting different” (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013).

The performative space the Center has developed is patterned after pelindaba, where the past is forgotten and the goal is to move forward. This means staff must have a different frame of mind. According to Anthony, they were already doing this, "They are more like, how are you doing today, how you doing. You doing clean, you know. They talk to you as a person and not knock
you down. They just tell you consequences” (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013). Education plays an essential role at the Center.

Jane’s goal was for education to be a central component, unlike corrections where, “They’re so wrapped up with the correctional mission that they forget they’re educators first. There is a big emphasis on making sure the school room is secure.” Instead of being patterned after the correctional system, it was decided that the Center would become an adult school and take on the liberational pedagogy of Freire. Jason said that the staff:

Gave me more skills on how to present myself and carry myself at the job and how to get more jobs and everything else with the same techniques. And they been working for me ever since. They show me the proper attire, and the proper speech, and conversation to have with people, that more or less gets you in the door and how to stay in the door (Jason, personal communication, July 29, 2013).

A number of classes were designed to accomplish this, such as Critical Thinking, Creative Writing, Toastmasters, and Job Development.

**Critical Thinking.** The Critical Thinking class allows students the freedom to judge for themselves who was telling the truth. Steven says, "We’d sometimes would watch videos, and then he [the teacher] would ask, do you think that's real or fake? He left it to us to try to determine, and then he would give us the answer at the end” (Steven, personal communication, May 26, 2013). Anthony relates the same scenario, how the students would watch a TV advertisement and then decide its validity. This pushed the student to “really pay attention.”
Creative Writing. The Creative Writing class gave the students the opportunity to express themselves. Anthony described how the teacher [Elizabeth] would assign topics, such as an event that changed their lives. This prompted the students to write from their hearts. After reading what he wrote, Anthony felt a weight being lifted from his shoulders. Elizabeth commented that she never judges her students. This was attested to by Anthony that the teacher would bring up topics, but never judged the students’ commentaries:

She would tell me, Elizabeth [teacher], she would tell us okay here’s my topic write about it, something that where it was a change in your life, what was a change in your life and we’d write. So, we would write a little, little. So, you can write whatever you want. Now what I wrote I wrote deep from my heart because I’m writing. Not like carrying on a conversation, I’m writing. So my sentences were, were short but deep, very, very deep every word being said there was a lot behind it. She corrected with a little red pen and she would come back and she’d say, do you want to read it? And I said do you want me what? And when I read, it started taking things off my shoulders cause it, you get emotional. I, I, you know you know because a lot of us we get emotion because we’re writing we’re deep. We really put our feelings in and tell it down on a piece of paper and when we bring it out, like wow. That was such a very, very, very powerful class. I commend her highly on that one. Cause that help me deal with things that I was not, that I kept inside. Didn’t know how to talk about, how to deal with. But once I brought it out, started talking about it is not like she judged
it made no she didn't go nowhere with it. She's just brought it up there, and different topics boom, boom, boom, boom. Helped knock down that big old wall that I had built up; knocked that wall down. My uh, you know, where I can trust. She, was a very, very, very powerful; man, great great, great class. It also goes along that, that arts expression class they had here (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013). This helped knock down the wall of mistrust that had been built over the years. Writing not only played a part in deinstitutionalization, but did so learning how to speak in front of others, which was the goal behind Toastmasters class.

**Toastmasters.** For some, Toastmasters helped them to reintegrate after being in solitary confinement for years. George attested to this, "Toastmasters as well. Yeah, well that's basically what helped me, like come out of my shell a little bit and talk in front of people" (George, personal communication, July 7, 2013). Anthony commented that, “Toastmasters was a class that the students asked staff to be mandatory, because they realized the need to learn and adapt their speaking abilities to match that of society outside of prison. It teaches one how to speak to an employer” (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013).

**Job Development.** Relating to job development, Charles maintained that his responsibility was to prepare students for the job market. Anthony added that staff, "know what is needed to get you working. Because, they know what is needed out there to get a job, get up there and speak to employers, but not like you came out of prison" (George, personal communication, July 7, 2013). George corroborated this, "I went to job development. So what that helps you out on how
to dress, how to speak without prison talk or anything like that. It helps you out on getting your job resumes, your thank you letters out” (George, personal communication, July 7, 2013).

A number of parolees commented on traditional education and its failings. During the interviews a concern came up about public education. The students expressed that the caring manner at the Center was in stark contrast to what they had experienced with their teachers: Anthony, “I got to teach you this because, because I get my paycheck. This is the way I am, I have to do this” (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013), Steven, “Not willing like to take feedback. Where I’m the teacher you’re the student it’s my way or the wrong way. That’s way I always took it, you know” (Steven, personal communication, May 26, 2013), and Jason, "I never had nobody kind of like show me what to do or what not. They will just tell you, but showing is better than telling. You can show a person then, it'll sink in their head” (Jason, personal communication, July 29, 2013).

Not only does the Center promote teacher/student interaction, but goes so far as to have the students act as facilitators in the classroom, as told by Anthony, “and they called me out there and they call me in there and do you want to be a facilitator? Do I want to be a what? Facilitator? You want me to run that class? You have a way of talking to people, and they come to you. So that’s what I did. I became a facilitator for that class” (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013).
Analyzing the comments of the students led to a new insight regarding performative spaces. The parolees realized that society views them as the worst of the worst, and that, in order to transition back into society they need to rid themselves of this mental stereotype. But, Mary expanded on this by maintaining that staff must also change their thinking regarding this negative stereotype. When this is achieved, then classes such as Creative Thinking and Writing, Job Development, and Toastmasters can accomplish their goals.

**Personal Social Space/Discharged Students**

In demonstrating the freedom to choose courses of interest, Anthony stated that when students saw something that was not right, “We can bring it to their attention [staff], they can deal with it.” This was the case with including a Spanish class and making Toastmasters mandatory. Anthony summed it up nicely, "They have shown me again, they've shown me, they taught me to be a person, that I am a person, I'm not a number, I'm not a number, not as CDC number, I'm a person" (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013).

In confirming the statements of the staff and students, personal observations were employed to determine whether spheres of civility, performative spaces, and personal social space were being practiced.

This section showed that students were able to bring to staff’s’ attention what courses were of interest and what they considered necessary, such as making Toastmasters mandatory. According to Digg and Piper (1994) this is in stark contrast to the highly structured policies other day reporting centers use in developing their classes.
Personal Observations

Spheres of Civility

Concerning inclusiveness and respect, while observing the Anger Management class, I saw an honest effort on the part of David to assist the students in dealing with their anger issues and the students acknowledging his sincerity. This was shown by them feeling safe in discussing different subjects and sharing intimate feelings about their past, their parents, and even their weaknesses. In the GED class, I observed that the classroom was open for discussion so that the students felt free to comment. Elizabeth did not try control the classroom, but kept it on track with how an essay should be structured.

With reciprocity, Mary maintained that:

I'd love to say that there is no typical day at the Day Reporting Center. That is a statement that I use every day, that's what I love about the Center. I think for us as we open the doors, you see six to seven individuals always taking the lead in cleaning up the place first thing in the morning. And if you come in at nine o'clock, as soon as we open the door, there are 6 to 7 students that just walk in and go straight to the kitchen and start making the punch, I mean no direction is given. The other ones are checking the bathrooms, so there's that sense of collaboration first thing in the morning (Mary, personal communication, May 31, 2013).

I witnessed this when I visited the Center when it opened in the morning. There were ten students waiting for the Center to open at 9 am. As soon as the doors opened, each student went to work. Some went to the kitchen to clean out
the old food from the refrigerator. Others began making coffee and punch. Everyone greeted each other during this time. The impression one got of the Center was how organized everything was, with both staff and students attending to their respective tasks. In speaking with one of the teachers concerning how organized and smoothly things were going, one student remarked that the reason was had to do with being institutionalized for years. She said that while in prison one is directed as to what to do and this makes it easy for the students to perform any task automatically.

In evaluating the statements from staff and students it was necessary for me to personally observe to verify the truthfulness of their statements. For instance, David, during his interview, stated his concern for his students. Sitting in on his Anger Management class confirmed his honest efforts toward helping them. This was reciprocated by students sharing their deepest feelings. Mary boasted how helpful the students were in cleaning and vacuuming the Center, and preparing coffee and punch in the morning. I was invited to see this for myself. What I saw verified exactly what Mary had described. This forced a reevaluation of institutionalization. Are there positive aspects of institutionalization? The research so far portrays institutionalization negatively, such as the effects of the panopticon.

Performative Space

While observing the Career Development class, I saw Mark demonstrate an effort to deinstitutionalize students by stating to them that even with their tattoos, if they learned to express themselves eloquently and became
accustomed to doing so, they would feel better about themselves, which would persuade others to respect them. Being a parolee happened only in their minds. In the Cognitive Behavior class, Charles touched on how to get rid of bad memories, using the example of two dogs; the dog that gets fed the most, grows the most. The same applies to positive and negative thinking. She used the case of parolees who are homeless. Even though they may be living on the streets and depending on food stamps, by coming to the Center they receive positive reinforcement. This positive reinforcement could overcome their negative thinking, or memory traces, by filling them with positive thinking. This resulted in higher self-esteem. If they had no support in adjusting to being on the outside, the only option was going back to prison where they felt it was normal and safe.

In analyzing this brief section a new concept became evident in regards to performative space. Performative space allows one to identify themselves as someone different. But in order to accomplish this there must be support, especially if one was homeless and depending on food stamps. This is why the Center provides shelter and employment.

**Personal Social Space**

Allowing students to participate in class was one of the basic forms of personal social space. In the career development class this was evident when the teacher used the round robin approach. One student was afraid to read, so Mark tactfully said it was alright, instead of insisting that the student read.

One of the purposes behind personal social space was to allow students the freedom to maneuver or find one’s place in education. This could not be
accomplished if the students felt they were being forced to perform tasks they were not comfortable with. I have taught such students and if given time to progress, they do, at their own pace.

Recidivism Rate for the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center

The measure of the success of the SBDRC could be measured by its recidivism rate. This is the standard that States use to gauge the success of their rehabilitation programs. Unfortunately, state data collection varies from state to state as to timing, population, and quality. In addition, Gehring (2000) argues that recidivism rates are incapable of measuring inmates’ achievements, after their release, as to their employment, social life, and personal satisfaction. Nevertheless, recidivism is the conventional means of comparing levels of achievement, especially if the data is from the same State. Mary stated that the recidivism rate for the Center was 16.7%, but added, “The real recidivism rate should be 6%” (Mary, personal communication, May 31, 2013). She supported this in that the true recidivism rate, as defined by the State is someone who commits a brand-new crime and is placed back into custody. Of the six individuals that had been rearrested, three were off parole, but the paper work never made it through the system. So when they were pulled over for whatever reason, they were told they were in violation of parole, when in reality they had been discharged.
The actual recidivism rate for the Center was 16.4%, not 16.7%. This data was presented at the Center's One Year Celebration, February 3, 2012 (Appendix D). The recidivism rate for the State of California is 63.7%, which is four times higher than the Center's 16.4% (California Department of Corrections, 2012).

Using recidivism rate as the standard measurement of success showed that the Center is achieving its goal of transitioning parolees back into society. Based on the data presented at the Center's One Year Celebration, the Center's culture, which is based on support and rehabilitation, has had a positive effect on transforming criminal identities and resulted in lower recidivism rates.

Reasons Behind the Success of the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center

The reasons behind the success of the SBDRC rest on the support and rehabilitative culture that has developed at the Center, based on performative spaces, and personal social space. This is in contrast to the culture of prisons, probation, and parole.

The aim of prisons is to support the "tough on crime" legislation by retaining offenders in prison, so that they do not pose a danger to society. Offenders are now viewed as evil doers to be punished and deterred through harsh sentencing (Ubah & Robinson, 2003).

When I began the study, I was not aware of the difference between probation and parole; Anthony helped clarify this difference. Parole is under the
jurisdiction of the State. An offender can be on parole for up to three years. The
goal is to discharge those who follow the conditions of their parole. Probation is
managed by the counties, with the intent to reincarcerate as many parolees as
possible. Whereas parole has the STAR program that deals with drug
rehabilitation, probation has no such services. In visiting a parolee’s home,
parole will show identification and then check out the home or administer a drug
test. In contrast, probation brings the sheriff and the police department
completely dressed up with guns to raid a parolee’s home; to probation the
Center is referred to as “hugs and thugs”.

**Prisons**

According to the students, the primary goal of prison is to retain inmates
by having them reincarcerated. The question was asked if services, such as
counseling and education, were offered in prison. Steven said:

No they don't do that. They've never done that with me. It's just basically,
I'll tell you what they have to offer, it's up to if you want to take them, and
there's not very much in there anymore, they've taken all of them. Mainly
you're locked up, do whatever you want with your time, it's up to you
(Steven, personal communication, May 26, 2013).

Jason was asked if he was able to go to staff for assistance; his answer
was no. When asked whether counselors prepared them for exiting prison, he
responded, "They don't even do that" (Jason, personal communication, July 29,
2013). The same question was asked of George:
George: Inside there they do have pre-release classes, pre-release in the SHU [solitary confinement]. But, here's the thing I heard. Everybody that goes, they didn't get nothing out of it.

Interviewer: Did you attend? What about the ones that have attended, what did they say that it entails?"

George: A bunch of crap.

Interviewer: Like what?

George: They don't do nothing, they just get on a computer. There's a certain block over there. They hook up a computer to your TV, they bring it in for you and then you can go do job search, if you need your birth certificate, your Social Security card, you can go and start that. But with a lot of guys, nine times out of ten, the teacher's not even there, nobody's there to help you out.

Interviewer: So if you don't even know how to operate a computer?

George: If you don't operate a computer, you're stuck pretty much. So, I mean, and I think honestly just because they did for the money. Because I know Pelican Bay was hurting up there and they even took our college courses away online, on the TV (George, personal communication, July 7, 2013).

Jason went further concerning the negativity of the correctional officers upon his release. One had told him, “You're going to see me in six months.” Jason replied, “I said you's a lie; I ain't proved them right yet. Already proved him wrong” (Jason, personal communication, July 29, 2013).
Probation

The dominant view parolees have regarding probation is that it has goals similar to prison’s, that of returning offenders back to prison rather than rehabilitating them. Anthony's experiences and comments with probation illustrate this:

Anthony: Oh, there's a big difference. Parole, parole is for state, where they'll deal with you as you're on parole for three years, maybe 13 months, three years, whatever the time of the term is. As probation, they are very harsh. They're probation, parole has a sense trying to get you, and if you follow the conditions get you off of parole. Probation, on the other is, I want to get you another term. There, there, there if you, if you look if you did the information, and check it out, you'll find probation right now, man, they are incarcerating more people on terms, not on violations, on terms. Interviewer: Now what are terms?

Anthony: Terms means you're doing some years, doing some time, you're going back to prison (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013).

Parole

According to the students, of the three institutions cited, parole was the one that made attempts toward rehabilitation. To Anthony there was a stark difference between probation and parole in the way they treated offenders. This perception was shared by both staff and students. George recounted the experiences he had gone through with five parole agents and how he had finally received the help he had needed and was discharged:
I went through five parole officers. This fifth officer I got discharged from, he's the one that got me in here, cause I was looking for a job and I was getting frustrated. There was nothing out there. I was getting mad and impatient. Because I knew it was going to be a while before I got a job. So I went to my parole officer and told him, Mr. Day listen, find me a program that I can at least get into, to get my mind off things and see if they can help me. And so we found this place and I got in here and ever since then I'm doing a lot better now. I mean I'm still out there looking, but I've also learned things since I been here, you know what I mean? Since I started coming here, even though my parole officer knew, he knows this place is helping people. So, he basically left me alone and said, 'I'm going to put you up for discharge after two years,' and I was high risk (George, personal communication, July 7, 2013).

Jason underwent the same experience of frustration after being released, and relates how his parole agent stepped in, "when I begged him, pleaded with him, I said hey man I need help, I need somewhere to stay." When the student was allowed to attend the Center, as he worded it, “Everything started to fall in line” (Jason, personal communication, July 29, 2013). Jason contrasted his discouraging experience with a correctional officer and the Center:

Because everything you need is right here; the encouragement, the help, the answers, and anything you don't know. Somebody, even if it's not staff, there's somebody here who can help you with it, because we've all
been through it one way or another (Jason, personal communication, July 29, 2013).

This distinction could be attributed to the Center's culture which was based on support and rehabilitation. While all the students were mostly negative about the correctional system and public education, they had only praise for the Center because of its positive approach toward assisting parolees. The culture of the correctional system was in contrast to the Center's culture that was centered on self-governance and the assumptions of spheres of civility, performative spaces, and personal social space. This had given students a voice and developed a community of support based on communication, teamwork, and interaction.

Culture

Jason connected self-governance with the culture at the Center:

The decision-making process when it comes to staff makes lives a lot easier for them cause they don't have to deal with all of the commotion, because everybody helps and gets it under control, like leaving something. You can leave something around and it'll still be there; mean if you leave it and come back, it'll still be there because they're communicating. If one person is taking, and nobody else is doing it, we're all going to know who's doing it (Jason, personal communication, July 29, 2013).

James boasted about the teamwork, of how students and staff come together in preparing the Christmas festivities:
I had the political staff who are run by the students come, I can't think of the word right now, but I had them help me go out to Target, Walmart. We sent faxes, called them, and had everybody and their mama donating to our Center. And we had [Mary] on it, we had everybody, not just staff, but students all involved on trying to get donations from all different types of places so that we can make it the best Christmas ever for our students (James, personal communication, July 16, 2013).

To James this had led to the Center being more open and affable: As staff we are goofy ourselves to break the mold and allow the students to see that we can be fun too. And when they see that, I know that they start to be fun too and they start singing and they start to open up and that's not just in our offices but outside the offices where everybody is gathering and are able to see that and wow if they can do that so can I, and we don't discourage it. We encourage every student to be an individual (James, personal communication, July 16, 2013).

James concluded that the outcome could be seen on the students' faces, "They're happy, they come back, they're not like, I don't want to go to that place. It's not always about business, the business is them. They are the business, to help them out, to encourage them to be free" (James, personal communication, July 16, 2013). Even in this businesslike atmosphere, there was camaraderie. He shared his experience in working with the job developer and how each staff depended on the other; this way of thinking had carried over to the students, with staff and students treating each other as family.
Elizabeth added:

I would say that people become personally vested in the place and recognize its value and they are proud to be members of the Center. Many people refer to it as a family. So, whereas people didn't have a family or didn't have good relations with their family, or only had one family, or only had a gang family, they now have a new attachment to a healthy organization (Elizabeth, personal communication, July 8, 2013).

I have overheard students refer to the Center as their home, which explains why if the students see something dirty they will clean it up.

James summed it up by saying that, "It's a culture like no other that I've ever worked with anywhere. Because, we work with love, we work with compassion, we work with understanding" (James, personal communication, July 16, 2013).

The prison culture is one where inmates develop a learned helplessness in becoming too dependent on the institution. This was why the majority of inmates were unable to readjust back into the community. On the other hand, the Center’s culture was based on self-governance, resulting in the parolees feeling personally invested in the Center, going so far as viewing it as their family. This sense of family I found is, in part, due to the relationship between staff and students.

**Relationship between Staff and Students**

During the interviews I noticed how many of the staff, specifically, six out of seven, had previous experience with those with special needs.
Jane said she was the first special education teacher in the Virginia prison educational system. Mary commented how she wanted to be a Special Education teacher and became an instructional assistant for communicatively handicapped students. She also worked in a group home for individuals with developmental disabilities and severely physically handicapped individuals. Patricia helped in a halfway house for female inmates coming out of prison with mental health and substance abuse issues and had always worked with people with special needs. Elizabeth worked with a large spectrum of students, including those in Special Education. David worked at a psychiatric unit dispensing medication, planning activities, and conducting group therapy. Even though David had not worked in Special Education, he lived in a sober living halfway house for about a year with eight individuals that were on parole, some of which were as he described them, "colorful" (David, personal communication, September 10, 2013).

Charles was the only one who had no previous experience with Special Education, but attributed his success in working with parolees to his family:

Everything that I have today is not because of my own, because I have a great family support system, and I relate that to my students here. Because, I wasn't allowed to receive life's full blow, I believe that if I offer my students that same support that was offered to me, they can dodge some of life's blows as well (Charles, personal communication, June 27, 2013).

This is important because a large number of those incarcerated have some form of disability, whether it is physical or mental. One statistic states that
70% of those incarcerated have some form of disability, particularly learning (Russell, 2002; Talbot & Riley, 2007).

Mary, Patricia, and Elizabeth all agreed that approximately 70% of the students at that Center have some type of disability, particularly learning. The identification of students with special needs was completed within the first fifteen minutes into the intake process. One advantage to having staff that had dealt with special education was the training in adapting the curriculum to match the academic level of the students.

Elizabeth stated how she tailors the curriculum for her students and her approach towards them:

I try to tailor my teaching style to the learning styles of this large spectrum of students I have. And I let them know that I am not here to judge them, I'm here to facilitate them attaining their goals, whether they're little goals, or big goals and I try to employ humane methods to obtain the results I need (Elizabeth, personal communication, July 8, 2013).

Elizabeth also teaches Creative Writing, where students have the opportunity to write about what interests them. One sample I read was an essay that dealt with removing car dents. The essay was concise and was something the student took pride in writing (appendix E). Another class was art, where students were allowed to show their creativity, with the students being focused on the project while laughing and joking with each other. This was an example of transformation theory, in which art nurtures creative thinking, enhances personal
growth, self-esteem, and self-concept that can lead to a crime-free life. There was also the patience and caring shown by these professionals.

With Elizabeth’s class, everyone was respectful toward one another. With everyone given the opportunity to be able to pick and choose what they considered to be important in their GED essay. One student mentioned that staff at the Center were not on their backs, but were there to help them reintegrate back into society. Each student had something to offer and was acknowledged for it.

David described his training as a psychologist and counselor, and how he interacted with the students:

I was trained in counseling. I mean I had this hammered into me, what's his name, Carkhuff’s empathic responses, and I'm a big fan of Carl Rogers and the helping relationship and letting them know that I'm on your side, I'm in your corner, I'm here for you, I work for you. I call a lot of my students here sir. Why, why are you calling me sir? Because I'm here providing a service for you, I work for you. I'm not going to do it on your terms, but I'm here working for you. And they're just not used to that (David, personal communication, September 10, 2013). David, in teaching his class on Anger Management, demonstrated respect and reciprocity by drawing his students out to share their childhood experiences dealing with violent parents, and was very careful not to embarrass or offend. This made the students feel safe and promoted reciprocity between him and them.
Patricia stated that she had wanted to work with offenders because she felt everyone deserves the opportunity to change their life. Observing her classroom I could see the positive teacher/student interaction. The Cognitive Behavior Strategies class by Patricia also showed care and respect for the students by informing them that they did not have to take her class if they did not want to. Her aim was to assist students to learn how to reduce negative thinking by replacing it with positive thinking, which coincided with her philosophy that people should be able to change and be given the chance to change. This reinforced opportunity theory, which suggested that, if given the opportunity to go straight, he/she would do so. There was one more element that contributed to the Center’s success.

**Tired of Being Tired**

When deciding to go straight, the presenter at the student orientation made it clear that, “It boils down to being sick and tired of being sick and tired. Trust and believe me, you will do something different. So, hopefully that's where you guys are at right now.” The presenter added that the mission of the Center was to facilitate students to reintegrate back into society, but:

The first thing we want to do is enable you guys to accept responsibility for your actions. We play a part, a big part in getting ourselves in these situations. Once we own up to that then we can address the issues and move forward (personal observation, June 2, 2013).
In *Breaking The Chains*, those students who had decided to change their lives had done so because of being tired of their negative lifestyle. Gary related how:

I was killing myself without really knowing why, but I've become aware of why and the reason is because I'm ashamed of all the things I've missed out on but have always wanted, like a wife, kids, a home, family, and friends that love me for me. So I just kept getting high to cover up the way I really felt about those things, and I'm upset with myself for waiting so long to get over it.

As stated by Anthony, there was also the matter of being isolated from one’s family:

Locked up with no phone calls of talking to family kinda tore me apart as I missed having the little ones asking questions, their laughter, and sad times. I had to put my mind thinking what can I do, either way it was make or break me. I chose the better. I'm so thankful for being given the chance (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013).

Along with the loss of freedom, there is the negative environment that offenders had to endure. George described his feelings:

I said, man I got tired of that. I got tired of the damn politics, the bull crap and all that, you know. It’s just gets to a point where you get older and it’s like, man, don't get me wrong I was still fully involved in everything in there when I left, but when I got out I was like, what the hell was I doing (George, personal communication, July 7, 2013).
This sense of being sick and tired not only affects offenders, but the staff as well. Jane shared her experience of being a teacher in the prison system:

I just knew this wasn’t working, and it was also at the same time of more challenges with the other administration staff that I did not want to deal with. And it was also the same time I was getting my doctorate in correctional education. So I had another option, and so I probably could have stayed there (Jane, personal communication, June 16, 2013).

This deep desire for change, coupled with support from staff, accounted for the Center’s 16.4% recidivism rate. It was a weaving together of all the assumptions that defined the Center. There was no one factor that contributed to the Center's culture, but a number of attributes that were woven together. NVivo showed that a number of nodes of the assumptions were linked together. For instance self-governance was linked with inclusiveness, reciprocity, respect, and politeness. In order for self-governance to operate effectively it had to entail inclusiveness if the decision-making process was to occur. There must be reciprocity, where the way individuals were treated was reciprocated by politeness and respect. If all these nodes were employed, students would be able to find themselves and maneuver within society by the family-like culture exhibited at the Center.

Family

This family-like culture, as the presenter stated, defined the Center:

You guys noticed when you first came in, we have a real family orientated environment, you know. We all laugh and joke and have fun, that's the
way we do things here. You won't see anyone here with a badge or a
gun, or anything along those lines. They don't act like parole officers
because they're not. There actually a staff here that believes in you. When
[Patricia] said it's like a family, this is your second family or your family
period, we really mean it (personal observation, June 2, 2013).
One final instance verified the relationship between self-governance with
the Center's family-like environment. James recounted the family atmosphere at
holiday gatherings:
Students on holidays will bring themselves over here, even those off
parole, or been out of the Center for a couple of months, but when it
comes to holiday they will just show up. Knowing that we will be open that
day and knowing that it feels like a family environment for them to just
bring their loved ones, their wives, and they want to tell us what
happened, what's going on with them. It took us a while to build this
camaraderie, this family environment, especially on the holidays. But we
were able to establish something. Now it's just a set norm. What we're
doing this holiday? Well, guess what, we're going to barbecue. Okay. But
let's find out what we're going to do on the barbecue, what are we going to
buy? And then, it's just known that if anybody who's anybody was to come
by we're going to be doing something cool. Never know what it is, because
she [Mary] always has something on her mind to make something special,
especially Christmas. She'll make the best Christmas this year because
what we do on Christmas is we love to get the students involved. I did this
last Christmas; for I had the political staff who is run by the students come. I can't think of the word right now, but I had them help me go out to Target, Walmart. We sent faxes, called them, and had everybody and their mama donating to our Center. And we had Mary on it, we had Andrea on, we had everybody, not just staff, but students all involved on trying to get donations from all different types of places so that we can make it the best Christmas ever for our students (James, personal communication, July 16, 2013).

Anthony interjected that these gatherings would not be possible were it not for the help and support from the student government:

Anthony: If I have something on my mind that can be helpful, I can bring it again to their [staff] attention, and we as students work together with the government situation we have here. We work as a team and try to work it out to where we can help bring it to their attention and then see and check out what can we do here. Now, Christmas time is coming and we’re going to do this. We’re thinking about things that we can do that can be helpful, rather than we can take care of ourselves, we don’t need you guys, get out of here, you guys are nothing to us.

Interviewer: So, you do give suggestion then when it comes to Christmas.

Anthony: Sure, sure that’s the point behind this.

Interviewer: Like what?

Anthony: Like for example, when we’re going to have a barbecue.

Because these people here treat you like a family. I mean for reals. That’s
the big thing about the DRC is they treat us like a family. I think you know we’re capable. Who’s going to do the barbecuing? Who’s going to do the cooking? Who’s going to do this or that? We do our little bit okay. Let's get our team together so we have a very positive thing where we all help each other out. (Anthony, personal communication, July 25, 2013)

This culture of family was made possible by the all the applications woven together. This has resulted in a community that was supported by solidarity. As Mary stated, “So, I don't need to run this place by myself, I have a whole group of individuals that help me run it, and that is not just staff, it's the students” (Mary, personal communication, May 31, 2013). This has led to a culture based on communication, teamwork, positive interaction.
Introduction

Some of the most disenfranchised populations are prisoners and parolees. Reasons are numerous: lack of education, physical and mental disabilities, criminal record that hinders them from obtaining employment, and the effects of institutionalization and prisonization. These factors make it difficult to reenter society. The intention behind incarceration is to rehabilitate offenders so they are able to transition back into society. Since the 1900s, efforts have been taken towards more humane approaches and rehabilitation, instead of flogging prisoners, placing them in dark cells, or starving them. There are many examples of rehabilitative efforts in the prison system.

The promotion of literacy and vocational education was one of these methods used by Robert Raites and the Philadelphia Society of Public Prisons. Elmira Reformatory was in the forefront of combining special education with vocational training (Gehring & Rennie, 2008). Another prison reformer, William George drew on the U.S. Constitution as the framework for the Junior Republic. Thomas Mott Osborne formed the Mutual Welfare league at Auburn penitentiary (George, 1911; Osborne, 1915).

Due to the economic downturn and large budget deficits, states today are pressured to reduce the enormous expenditures spent on corrections. Emphasis is now being placed on the early release of inmates, with minimum supervision.
This is in contrast to the previous policy of getting tough on crime, which promoted increased incarcerations and sentences. Nevertheless, the United States has the highest rate of incarcerations than any nation, including China and Russia. In 2007, states spent more than $44 billion dollars on corrections, with little spent for inmate transition to the community. On release, 70%-80% of parolees are unemployed, 85% have substance abuse issues, 60%-90% lack the skills necessary to survive outside prison. Most prisoners on release are merely given $200 and a bus pass.

Interestingly, although federal, state, and private prisons provide educational programs, little is known about them. The U.S. Department of Justice, Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, and Survey of Inmates of Federal and State Correctional Facilities provide comparable data, but little on the correctional educational programs, with detailed data on program performance missing.

Two prominent researchers have led the way in correctional education, Drs. Eggleston and Gehring. At the 1999 European Prison Education Association Conference, Eggleston and Gehring presented William George and Thomas Mott Osborne's concept of democracy in penal classrooms and institutions. These democratic principles became the basis for the establishment of the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center. It is for this reason that this study has concentrated on one attempt toward the alternative program of rehabilitation initiated at the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center.
The hypothesis of the study states that the success behind the Center is based on a positive organizational culture that provides offenders the opportunities to reconsider, revise, and challenge their criminal identities, which prepares them to reintegrate back into society. The study has shown that the Center implements a democratic organizational culture where students are successfully deinstitutionalized and transitioned back into society. This has been the result of a weaving together of the characteristics of the Center where it has become a unique culture based on a family-like environment. Eight principles (originally foreshadowed concepts), define the Center: spheres of civility; personal social space; performative spaces; Freirian liberational pedagogy; transformational theory; opportunity theory; Pelindaba; and weaving theory. Staff and students agreed that the principles behind these eight assumptions guide the Center. Examining their statements illustrates how each assumption has contributed to the vision and mission of the Center.

Vision and Mission

The vision and mission of the Center was interpreted slightly differently by each of the staff, who focused on one or more of the principles. Jane, Charles and James hold the view that the Center's policies should change in meeting the students' needs. It was evident that the vision and mission was not based on any prescribed formulas, but on "Mediated Learning Experiences" (MLB), where guidance is provided until the person is capable of making correct decisions (Feuerstein, 1980). This principle was applied not only to the students, but staff
as well, including Jane. She bore this out when she said, "I believe we are operating consistently with our mission and vision. We’re not there yet. We’re always in this period of what we need to do better." Her vision is for students to develop the skills necessary for them to lead crime-free lives. Staff member Elizabeth believes this can be accomplished by education and social services. Patricia, another staff member, argued that education is able to empower the disenfranchised, such as parolees.

Principles

One policy that has continued to evolve and change at the Center is self-governance, where for two years students have been allowed a voice in the governance of the Center. For democracy to function there must be spheres of civility which are composed of inclusiveness, reciprocity, respect, and politeness. An example of inclusiveness is holiday gatherings, which include staff, students, and family. Everyone is allowed to be involved in the preparations if they chose, with the student government helping to decide who barbecues, cooks, and cleans up. In order for inclusiveness to be successful there must be reciprocity, where each party treats the other with respect. Respect, according to Dr. Eggleston, coincides with democracy. She stated that respect must be shown because it is a two-way street that allows for negotiation and compromise.

The Center was developed according to the democratic framework of various prison programs, where democracy and reciprocity are more than mutual respect, but personal support as well. The help offered by staff member Charles
was returned when students noticed him being depressed and made efforts to cheer him up and offer him advice. Support was also shown in taking care of the everyday maintenance of the Center. In certain incidences this translated into politeness. Mary experienced staff offering to help her with the upkeep of the restrooms. One student sums this up as a blending together of each and every person. Together, these three attributes of inclusiveness, reciprocity, and respect demonstrate the quality of politeness.

One teacher Patricia, associated democracy with the empowerment of education based on Freirian liberational pedagogy. Freire not only wanted education to reduce literacy, but for students to understand how to attain economic, political, and social freedom. This leads to the assumption of Performative Spaces, where one is able to focus on identity in a positive, transformative, and rehabilitative manner.

The students discovered that transformation and rehabilitation begins with one’s self. While in prison, some students found themselves and began to respect who they were. The Center continues to reinforce this self-respect by saying that "everyone is like a diamond in the rough," and that everyone has some hidden talent. This is necessary in order to turn off the prison mentality that offenders are and will always be bad. One student related how alienated parolees feel after being released from prison because of the negative perceptions society has toward them. The student stood up for himself by maintaining he was not "the worst of the worst." The principle of Pelindaba has played a part in this transformation of one's identity; it directs staff at the Center
to forget the past and focus on the present and future. Once this is achieved, students feel confident in choosing courses that interest them; this is one feature of performative spaces.

To promote rehabilitation and the positive transformation of one’s self, certain classes were set up by staff, such as Critical Thinking, Creative Writing, Toastmasters, and Job Development. Critical Thinking helped students to judge for themselves who was telling the truth, for example in TV advertisements. Creative Writing prompted students to write from their hearts. Toastmasters, as one student related, "Helped me come out of my shell a little bit and talk in front of people." Job Development helped students to write resumes and thank you letters, dress appropriately, and know how to conduct themselves at an interview. All of these classes are voluntary except for Toastmasters. The students, through their experiences, realized how important it was to use the same language spoken by others outside of prison, and it was by student representation that Toastmasters was made mandatory. This decision exemplifies the self-governing characteristic of the Center. Personal social space also assisted students by giving them access to outside education, such as college.

The impact of Personal Social Space on the Center could be seen in the number of students who graduated with AA or AS degrees and continued on toward their Bachelor’s degree. This resulted in higher self-esteem. It exemplified transformation theory of emancipated learning in that adults become self-learners by defining their own learning objectives. This heightens their creative thinking, which in turn adds to their personal growth and their concept of themselves. One
student expressed the change in his identity, "They have shown me, they taught me to be a person, I'm not a number, not a CDC number, I'm a person." These three assumptions of spheres of civility, performative spaces, and personal social spaces coincide with Haney's (2001) recommendation for transitioning from prison to home:

- Provide effective decompression programs.
- Give prisoners some understanding of the ways in which prison may have changed them.
- Provide occupational and vocational training and assistance in finding employment.
- Provide parenting classes.

Opportunity theory, a criminological theory that states that positive behaviors come about when prisoners have opportunities afforded by academic and vocational programs also has explanatory power with regard to the Center's success. The presenter at the student orientation received his AA and was pursuing his Bachelor's. Achieving these results has not been without hindrances. There is the mistrust that offenders have for any institution that is considered a part of corrections.

This mistrust for correctional institutions was discovered during the research and confirmed during the interviews. Inmates are suspicious of the motives behind education. They wonder if the underlying purpose is for control.
For a number of inmates, mistrust began while attending public school. It was felt that teachers were in it for the "paycheck," and that they were not willing to listen to student feedback. There was also the mistrust surrounding the democratic voice of the students. J. E Baker in his article "Inmate Self-governance" cited the pros and cons of inmate self-governance, noted that the inmate Advisory Council in one prison served the interests of only a few inmates (Baker, 1964). In the beginning, this was true for the Center. In the beginning, the first elected student representatives served only the interests of their group. In spite of these difficulties, both issues surrounding education and governance were resolved in a peaceful manner. Elizabeth drew out her students so she could tailor her instruction around their goals and interests. Jane and staff approached the student governing body and explained to them the principles of representative democracy. This resulted in the student president and other officials readjusting their priorities to include everyone. These endeavors on the part of staff created trust and honesty, which promoted a family-like environment.

These eight principles combined together, have created a family-like atmosphere at the Center. However, there are two other themes that emerged from the data that contribute towards the success at the Center. One is what staff and students referred to as tired-of-being-tired, and the other is the relationship between staff and students.
Tired-of-being-Tired

Tired-of-being-tired is the consequence of a lifestyle that has been negative and unfulfilling, where the individual is finally weary of it and wishes to change. This also is referred to as "going straight." The presenter at the Orientation used the phrase "being sick and tired of being sick and tired." This comment means that ex-offenders gained an awareness of their responsibility for actions in the past. The Center helped students to address other issues, such as academic/vocational education, and move forward. Gary in describes in *Breaking The Chains* what it means to be sick and tired of being sick and tired. He confessed how he was:

Killing myself without really knowing why, but I've become aware of why and the reason is because I am ashamed of all of the things I've missed out on, but always wanted, like a wife, kids, a home, a family, and friends who love me for me.

Another student, George, was more candid, "It just gets to a point where you get older and it's like ... what the hell was I doing" (George, personal communication, July 7, 2013). Even staff have felt sick and tired. When teaching in the Virginia correctional system, Jane realized that correctional education was not working, so she left her teaching position. Another important theme is the relationship between staff and students that has contributed to the Center's success.
Special Education and the Relationship between Staff and Students

This study also suggested the importance of professional training and experience for staff working at the Center. During the interviews, I noticed how many of the parolees had previous experiences with Special Education; six out of seven. The Center is informed by special education theory and practice. For example, Jane was the first Special Education teacher in the Virginia correctional system. The rest of the staff either worked in Special Education, mental health, or as was the parolees, some of whom had learning disabilities. The students who were tired of being tired needed support from individuals who had the insight and patience to work with them; this is especially important since 70% of inmate's have some type of disability. This afforded a good relationship between staff and students.

In addition to these statements from staff and students as to this relationship, there were my personal observations of the daily activities surrounding the Center. One example is the verification of a remark made by Mary as to how the students assist in the maintenance of the Center. She recounted that when the Center opened at nine o'clock, six to seven students went straight to the kitchen and started making punch and coffee. Others checked the bathrooms. She recommended that I witness this for myself. What I saw were 10 students waiting for the Center to open. As soon as the doors opened, some went to the kitchen and others to the restrooms or began vacuuming. The impression I had was how organized and smooth the Center
operated, and how warm, friendly and open everyone was. Other observations revealed the inclusiveness and respect practiced by everyone. The classrooms were open to discussion, which made the students feel safe and willing to share their thoughts, even if they were personal. The outcome of this relationship, along with the assumptions, identified above, provide staff with the rationale behind the Center's low recidivism rate.

Recidivism and the Center’s Accomplishments

According to Mary the report presented at the Center’s second anniversary showed a recidivism rate of 16.4%, which is four times lower than California’s recidivism rate of 63.7% (appendix D; Office of Research, 2012). Even though recidivism is the standard by which both federal and state agencies use to measure the success of their programs, this data can be problematic. Gehring (2000) found that recidivism rates did not measure changes in the prisoner or the partial success of programs. The data is not used to identify the adequacy or inadequacy of specific correctional program elements in order to ensure program improvement. It merely focused on whether the parolee returned to prison or not. It also is a measure that leaves little room for constructive criticism.

Typically, politicians and administrators only support a program if it demonstrates lower recidivism rates. An example of this occurred when a state found that one educational program reduced recidivism approximately 50%, so they extended the educational program. Another state though, found that
educational program did not reduce recidivism, so they wanted to discontinue it. No efforts were made to determine why the one program was successful and the other was not. Yet, even in regard to individual success, recidivism says nothing about the degree of employment, social life, and personal satisfaction of inmates or parolees.

The Center's accomplishments are evident in its low recidivism rate of 16.4%. Yet, this really says nothing about the personal growth and satisfaction that was found among the students at the Center. One instance of this relates to an essay in *Breaking the Chains*. Stephen, in his essay The DRC, described what he considered the reasons behind the Center's low recidivism rate. This involved programs that provided the necessary skills to transition back into society, along with the positive support from staff. To Stephen this contributed to a positive impact on society, “In addition, by educating ex-offenders and teaching them how to build self-esteem, integrity and a general overall purpose in their lives, society will be a much safer place for all of us” (appendix E).

**Concluding Comments**

This dissertation explored the hypothesis that the positive organizational culture of the San Bernardino Day Reporting Center provides offenders the opportunities to reconsider, revise, and challenge their criminal identities and so prepares them for reintegration into society seems valid. A democratic culture clearly helps to reintegrate offenders into society by assisting them in revising and challenging their criminal identities. The democratic organizational culture
was examined using a number of sensitizing concepts and theories, such as spheres of civility, performative spaces, and personal social space that created a family environment. The success of these endeavors is shown by the Center’s recidivism rate of 16.4%.

Clearly, democracy can have positive effects on recidivism. This dissertation represents the application of a number of theories regarding this relationship. At the 1999 European Prison Education Association Conference, Drs. Eggleston and Gehring presented their position on democracy in prison and prison education, which acted as the guiding philosophy behind the Center. The effectiveness of democracy in prison, along with correctional education, is America’s hidden heritage," which most practitioners have not had access (Eggleston & Gehring, 2000, p. 360). The conclusions reached in this work suggest that democratic cultures in organizations may be helpful with regard to reaching other non-traditional student populations. Historically, correctional education has been a laboratory in which new educational methods are tested, where anything that works in the most restrictive environment for education is likely to succeed elsewhere (Gehring, 1980, p. 5).

This hidden heritage of democratic organizational cultures and this study indicate that educational teaching strategies can reach regular education students and also students with learning disabilities as well. This work is situated then, in the history of the hidden heritage with regard to special education students. It was in the early years of prison reform that special education has its roots. Robert Raikes and the Philadelphia Society of Public Prisons was one of
the first to promote literacy and vocational education. Elmira Reformatory continued this emphasis on education by combining special education with vocational training (Gehring & Rennie, 2008). Under these conditions offenders were no longer treated as defectives or exceptionally stupid, but given every opportunity to acquire the skills necessary to survive outside of prison (Gehring & Rennie, 2008). With the Junior Republic, academic, social, and vocational education were used for social reform, along with the establishment of the Mutual Welfare League (Gehring & Eggleston, 2007). George used the U.S. Constitution as the framework the Junior Republic. He did this by allowing the children to manage the institution democratically, with elected executive and legislative branches, as well as a Supreme Court, except for the school which was under the control of the New York penal system (Gehring & Rennie, 2008; George, 1911). Osborne furthered this concept by establishing the Mutual Welfare League, an inmate-run organization at Auburn Prison (Gehring & Rennie, 2008; Osborne, 1915).

Both the Junior Republic and the Mutual Welfare League successfully reduced assaults, rape, and drug use in prison, drugs, and improved upon the recidivism rates of offenders. With the Mutual Welfare League, cooperation among inmates and with prison staff allowed for resolutions without conflict, where representatives from the Mutual Welfare League sat down with prison officials and come to a settlement without the inmates using violence to get their voices heard. These institutions developed their principles and values based on self-governance and a supportive community. This principle of democratic
organizations evident in the legacy or hidden heritage has been adopted by the SBDRC. Jane confirmed this when she described her understanding of reintegration and how the Center achieves that objective:

Well, there's a lot of research reintegration and reentry, and almost all the research says that it's one of the biggest factors when someone comes back into the community is to have someone at least or something that believes in them and that he or she can move, can get support by. And it can be a family member, it can be a minister, it can be, you know, there are many options for who that person can be, but there needs to be something positive or someone positive in the community that can help, and many of our guys because of the nature of their commitments have burned their bridges with family, with friends, with everyone. And so we become, they call it, they call this place their home, because everyone needs that in order to successfully reintegrate. It's too easy to go back to the life had been because they know that life. So we try to provide foundation. You'll see a sign, we have signs around that we put up that are some quotes from students, and one of them is along the lines of, "this is a place that treats me better than my family treats, treats me, treats me, more like a family than my family" (Jane, personal communication, June 16, 2013).

The results from these efforts are not only seen in the lowered recidivism rates, but the personal satisfaction, self-worth, and sense of achievement of both staff and students. This is the valid measure of rehabilitation.
Limitations

There are limitations to this study. Other Day Reporting Centers were not observed as to their organizational structure, culture, and effectiveness. Also, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation has implemented changes in its approach toward transitioning parolees by providing Residential Multi-service Centers, Computerized Literacy Learning Centers, Drug Treatment and various educational programs, and job placement assistance; these have not been compared with the services at the Center. There were also the limitations of access and longitudinal effect. The difficulty in getting permission from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, along with the time constraint, made it unfeasible to interview students that were not discharged from parole. The only available resource in obtaining their views of the Center was from their essays in Breaking the Chains. Longitudinal effect was another limitation due to the reduced time available to investigate any long-term outcomes on staff and students and the continued success of the Center.

Future Studies

A question raised by Jane was whether the success of the Center could be replicated at the new centers planned to open in Riverside and Victor Valley. Her concern is being able to share the practices and principles of the culture at the San Bernardino Center with other sites. There is the process of finding a location, buying furniture, and other logistics, but the real issue lies in being able to transfer the core values. As Jane stated, "You can jeopardize a program pretty
quickly by making a couple of wrong decisions” (Jane, personal communication, June 16, 2013).

This study can be beneficial to these new centers. It has provided a detailed and rich insight into the culture and organizational structure of the Center. The various principles such as spheres of civility, performative spaces, personal social space, help us understand why the Center is able to achieve its mission and vision of providing offenders a positive organizational culture that prepares them for reintegration. Allowing each center to apply these assumptions and closely monitoring whether this transfer of culture is possible, can assist in what actions can be taken to ensure each center realizes its own mission and vision.

This study has implications for the public school system. It suggests principles that if applied to the public school system, may reach difficult to teach populations. Students with disabilities, for example, can slip through the cracks and end up in prison, but appropriate correctional education offers a means of resolving this injustice.

This study resulted in my personal and professional growth. While interviewing different staff members I realized that I was not alone in feeling alienated when teaching outside the status quo. Permitting a democratic atmosphere in the classroom can enhance both academic and social skills learning. Documenting the success of the Center’s programs have served to reinforce an alternative approach toward special education, based on organizational justice models, which I so strongly endorse. I hope this study
helps others and me to reach the goal of saving those students who have slipped through the cracks and ended up in prison.
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INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Interview Questions

Interview Questions for Staff 1 (Jane):

1. What is a day like at the Center? Could you describe it in as much detail as possible?
2. How long has the Center been open?
3. Is the Center based on a model, philosophy, policy, guidelines?
4. What is the vision and mission of the center?
5. How do the policies (practices) and programs at center support or distract from this vision?
6. What programs are offered at the Center?
7. What educational programs are offered?
8. What programs do you offer?
9. How does education fit or not fit into the mission, the other programs?
10. What educational support services are offered for those with disabilities?
11. Do the Center's educational programs allow for the freedom of dialog?
12. What are some of the issues that ex-offenders struggle with?
13. What are some of the issues that staff struggle with? (prompt: resources, emotional struggles)
14. Have ex-offender and staff attitudes changed since the Center first opened?
15. What is your understanding of reintegration? Can you give some examples?
16. Have the Center's efforts toward self-governance facilitated a change in ex-offenders' perception of their abilities (prompt: self-efficacy?)
17. How do you feel about the Center's policy of ex-offenders having a voice, or say in the running of the Center? What are the benefits, if any? What are the negative consequences, if any?
18. Do you feel that Center has helped ex-offenders transition back into the community? How so?
19. Do you feel the Center has helped change the lives of the ex-offenders? How so?
20. Tell me about any changes that you might have witnessed on the part of ex-offenders as a result of being at the Center?
21. What contributions, if any, do you feel Center has made to ex-offenders? To the community?
22. Would you encourage other parolees to attend the Center? Why?

These questions relate to comments made at the orientation:
23. You mentioned it always remains a struggle in regards to the Center, how so?
24. Both you and the status place a great deal of importance on trust – no bullshit zone. This seems to tie in with your comments that we are all on the path of self-improvement. What brought about this outlook or mindset?
25. You mentioned that your first career was teaching in prisons and that you did not like what was happening, can you elaborate? Did your experiences influence the vision and mission of the CSRI?
26. During the orientation, each speaker displayed the same philosophy of being honest and having a true concern about each student’s success. It was noticed that there was coffee and doughnuts offered, lunch, which the students could take home, job development, clothing available to students, assistance in finding shelter, the opportunity of second and third chances of coming back, an open door policy with staff, and the concept that there is no difference between staff and student. How unusual is this? How does this compare with other centers a.k.a. the Moreno Valley DSR?
27. You mentioned about the opening of other centers, such in Victor Valley, how is this progressing?
Interview Questions

Interview Questions for Mary:
1. How many ex-offenders are enrolled?
2. What is the recidivism rate?
3. What is a day like at the Center? Could you describe it in as much detail as possible?
4. Is the Center based on a model, philosophy, policy, guidelines?
5. What is the vision and mission of the center?
6. How do the policies (practices) and programs at center support or distract from this vision?
7. What programs do you offer?
8. How does education fit or not fit into the mission, the other programs?
9. What educational support services are offered for those with disabilities?
10. Do the Center's educational programs allow for the freedom of dialog?
11. What are some of the issues that ex-offenders struggle with?
12. What are some of the issues that staff struggle with? (prompt: resources, emotional struggles)
13. Have ex-offender and staff attitudes changed since the Center first opened?
14. What is your understanding of reintegration? Can you give some examples?
15. Have the Center's efforts toward self-governance facilitated a change in ex-offenders’ perception of their abilities (prompt: self-efficacy?)
16. How do you feel about the Center's policy of ex-offenders having a voice, or say in the running of the Center? What are the benefits, if any? What are the negative consequences, if any?
17. Do you feel that Center has helped ex-offenders transition back into the community? How so?
18. Tell me about any changes that you might have witnessed on the part of ex-offenders as a result of being at the Center?
Questions relating to orientation:

19. During the orientation, you mentioned that it's "not about us (staff), but about you folks (students), you make it work. “What did you mean by that?

20. What drew you to working at an institution that deals with ex-offenders?

21. In addressing the students at the orientation you commented that, "I'm going to be your tour guide for the next year.” Can you elaborate?

22. The issue of honesty keeps coming up as a key theme in regards to the Center. You mentioned it, Dr. Eggleston, Mr. Vo., Mr. Rubio, Ms. West, Mrs. Marcus all mentioned how important trust is for both staff and students. Why do you consider this so important?

23. Have the experiences that you’ve had in your life shape the way you interact and work together at the Center?

24. Do you feel that the Center has been, as Dr. Eggleston puts it, a life-changing experience? Has it changed your philosophy or viewpoint toward the world around you?
Interview Questions

Interview Questions for Patricia:

1. What is a day like at the Center? Could you describe it in as much detail as possible?
2. Is the Center based on a model, philosophy, policy, guidelines?
3. What is the vision and mission of the center?
4. How do the policies (practices) and programs at center support or distract from this vision?
5. How does education fit or not fit into the mission, the other programs?
6. What are some of the issues that ex-offenders struggle with?
7. What are some of the issues that staff struggle with? (prompt: resources, emotional struggles)
8. Have ex-offender and staff attitudes changed since the Center first opened?
9. What is your understanding of reintegration? Can you give some examples?
10. Have the Center’s efforts toward self-governance facilitated a change in ex-offenders’ perception of their abilities (prompt: self-efficacy?)
11. How do you feel about the Center’s policy of ex-offenders having a voice, or say in the running of the Center? What are the benefits, if any? What are the negative consequences, if any?
12. Do you feel that Center has helped ex-offenders transition back into the community? How so?
13. Do you feel the Center has helped change the lives of the ex-offenders? How so?
14. Tell me about any changes that you might have witnessed on the part of ex-offenders as a result of being at the Center?
15. What contributions, if any, do you feel Center has made to ex-offenders? To the community?

16. Would you encourage other parolees to attend the Center? Why?

These questions relate to comments made at the orientation:
We are in a job of helping you restore your lives. This is a construction zone, figuratively. Our job here are to help you to get the tools that you need to build your house. I can’t build your house for you, but I can help you gather the tools that you need and gather the supplies you’ll to build your own house. If you build a house on a foundation of sand what you think is going to happen? It’s going to collapse eventually. So, what we want to do is to help you find that solid foundation, find that solid foundation and begin to rebuild your life.

17. How do you accomplish this goal?

So if we can assist you in any way possible please give us the opportunity. Another thing is we simply as reports over to your agents every 30 days. I can send over a sweet note if I know you. If I don’t know you it’s going to be a very basic note. So, if you want you want a good report with your agent, come and talk to us. Really take advantage of that.

18. How common is this attitude show by case workers? Was this something you were taught in your grad classes?

You know if you think of your life as bowl every once in a while your bowl may be dropped and the pieces may fly, right? But it’s our job to assist you in taking those pieces and putting that bowl back together; finding the glue that works to hold that bowl. Even a bowl that was once destroyed, the pieces were all over, can serve the same purpose that it once did if given the right glue to put those pieces back together. It can still hold water, it can still hold substances, and it can still serve the same purpose, and that bowl is your bowl. Your bowl, your life. Your life, even though at one time may have made some mistakes, it can serve the same purpose. You know, you can be restored. We believe in change here. You are in a house of change. So welcome.
19. This is an amazing statement. How did you develop such an approach toward helping this population (offenders)?

These question deal with the experiences you have under gone and how they have shaped you philosophy at the Center:

20. What drew you to working with offenders?
21. You mentioned that when you were younger that you had the desire to help others, such as being a police officer, a teacher and then a social worker. Could you elaborate on that again?
22. You also mention about your grandmother being a special education teacher and the impact that had on you. Could you go over that?
23. Do you feel that these experiences have shaped your views at the Center?
Interview Questions

Interview Questions for Charles:

1. What is the vision and mission of the center?
2. What are some of the issues that ex-offenders struggle with?
3. What are some of the issues that staff struggle with? (prompt: resources, emotional struggles)
4. Have ex-offender and staff attitudes changed since the Center first opened?
5. What is your understanding of reintegration? Can you give some examples?
6. Have the Center’s efforts toward self-governance facilitated a change in ex-offenders’ perception of their abilities (prompt: self-efficacy?)
7. How do you feel about the Center’s policy of ex-offenders having a voice, or say in the running of the Center? What are the benefits, if any? What are the negative consequences, if any?
8. Do you feel that Center has helped ex-offenders transition back into the community? How so?

The next set of questions deal with what you wrote in Breaking the Chains:

9. You mentioned that you worked at the Moreno Valley Parole Complex and that you were hoping to obtain a position of Parolee Agent I. You also stated that during the span of two years you have never worked for an establishment that meant more to you than the DRC. What do you feel the difference is between the Moreno Valley Parolee Complex and the DRC?
10. Dr. Eggleston mentioned that you are a graduate from California State University, San Bernardino. What was your subject area?
11. Have you ever had any previous experience working with those with special needs? What about offenders?
12. Are there any experiences that you can think of that has helped you understand and work with the students at the DRC?
13. You mentioned "healing people with troubled pasts is a mission we have engraved in our hearts." Could you elaborate on this?
14. You stated that the students humble you on a daily basis. How so?
Interview Questions

Interview Questions for James:
1. What is the vision and mission of the center?
2. What are some of the issues that ex-offenders struggle with?
3. What are some of the issues that staff struggle with? (prompt: resources, emotional struggles)
4. Have ex-offender and staff attitudes changed since the Center first opened?
5. What is your understanding of reintegration? Can you give some examples?
6. Have the Center’s efforts toward self-governance facilitated a change in ex-offenders’ perception of their abilities (prompt: self-efficacy?)
7. How do you feel about the Center’s policy of ex-offenders having a voice, or say in the running of the Center? What are the benefits, if any? What are the negative consequences, if any?
8. Do you feel that Center has helped ex-offenders transition back into the community? How so?

The next set of questions, in part deal, with what you mentioned at the orientation:
9. You mentioned that you are a caseworker and your job and Jenna's job is to help everybody achieve a goal, right? “So what we do is help set goals. But on the road to a goal success to achieve that goal the road can be bumpy, road has roadblocks, has all these things that can hinder you, hurdles, things like that. They can stop you achieving your goals. Our job is to help you get to that goal to assist you to go into that goal, get you over those roadblocks. Be the man who's on top of that wall that you can't climb and throw that rope down so you can climb it. So you can achieve and be successful on achieving those goals.” How do you help the students to set goals and then achieve them?
10. Did you have any schooling, such as graduate courses that may have prepared you to work with this population?

11. Have you ever had any previous experience working with those with special needs? What about offenders?

12. Are there any experiences that you can think of that has helped you understand and work with the students at the DRC?

13. You mentioned “Trust us, we'll trust you, but if you want to trust us right away let us work with you.” Could you elaborate on this?
Interview Questions

Interview Questions for David:

1. What is the vision and mission of the center?
2. How does education fit or not fit into the mission, the other programs?
3. What are some of the issues that offenders (students) struggle with?
4. What is your understanding of reintegration?
5. How do you feel about the Center’s policy of offenders (students) having a voice, or say in the running of the Center? What are the benefits, if any? What are the negative consequences, if any?
6. Do you feel that Center has helped offenders (students) transition back into the community?
7. Do you feel that education plays a part in offenders (students) reintegration back into society?
8. What is your teaching experience?
9. Have you worked with those with special needs?
Interview Questions

Interview Questions for Elizabeth:

1. What is the vision and mission of the center?
2. How does education fit or not fit into the mission, the other programs?
3. What are some of the issues that ex-offenders struggle with?
4. What is your understanding of reintegration? Can you give some examples?
5. Have the Center’s efforts toward self-governance facilitated a change in ex-offenders’ perception of their abilities (prompt: self-efficacy?)
6. How do you feel about the Center’s policy of ex-offenders having a voice, or say in the running of the Center? What are the benefits, if any? What are the negative consequences, if any?
7. Tell me about any changes that you might have witnessed on the part of ex-offenders as a result of being at the Center?
8. In Breaking the Chains you stated that you hope your style of holistic education would be what students would respond to. Could you describe your holistic approach?
9. What are your teaching experiences? Did they help you to develop your holistic philosophy toward education?
10. Have you ever taught those with learning disabilities?
11. What drew you to work with this student population?
Interview Questions

Interview Questions for Ex-offenders:

1. How long were you at the Center?
2. What programs were you enrolled in?
3. Describe the programs?
4. How do you feel about the Center’s policy of ex-offenders having a Democratic part in the running of the Center?
5. When did you finish or graduate from the Center?
6. Do you feel that Center helped you transition back into the community? How so?
7. Do you feel the Center helped change your life? How so?
8. Would you encourage others to attend the Center? Why?
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CREATIVE WRITING

THE DRC
Ron Henning
Creative Writing
The DRC

I feel that since DRC’s inception on Feb 4th, 2011, it has been instrumental in offering ex-offenders a place where they can learn and acquire the skills that are necessary to be productive citizens in today’s society. With the recidivism rate at an all-time high, I believe that DRC is showing people that there is an alternative to repeat offenders, through education, acclimatization and understanding. In the short time that DRC has been in operation, I'm sure they've enriched the lives of many people who, prior to DRC, were considered social outcasts. In addition, by educating ex-offenders and teaching them how to build self-esteem, integrity and a general overall purpose in their lives, society will be a much safer place for all of us. I personally would like to thank the Director, the professors, the staff and all those who endorse and believe in this program, because through this program I have a much greater chance of living a life outside of prison walls.

On February 4th, 2013 a celebration will take place, commemorating DRC’s two year anniversary. I am proud to be a part of this program and grateful to all involved at DRC for their support, sacrifice and belief in myself as a worthwhile human being. Thank You!
Interview Protocols

The list of protocols used to guide the interview process:

1. Pick a topic that interests you.
2. Research should guide your questions.
3. Use a script for the beginning and end of your interview.
4. Questions should be open ended.
5. Start with the basics.
6. Begin with easy to answer questions and move toward ones that are more difficult or controversial.
7. The phrase "tell me about..." is a great way to start a question.
8. Write big, extensive questions.
9. Use prompts.
10. Be willing to make "on the spot" revisions to your interview protocol.
11. Don't make the interview too long.
12. Practice with a friend.
13. Make sure you have set up a second shorter interview to help clarify or ask any questions you miss after you have transcribed the interview.
14. If needed, clear your project with your school's Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Tips for the Interview

These worked as additional tips for the interview:

1. Start with your script.
2. Collect consent.
3. Use some type of recording device and only take brief notes so you can maintain eye contact with your interviewee.

4. Arrange to interview your respondent in a quiet semi private place.

5. Be sure that both you and the interviewee block off plenty of uninterrupted time for the interview.

6. Have genuine care, concern, and interest in the person you are interviewing.

7. Use basic counseling skills to help your interviewees feel heard.

8. Keep it focused.

9. Listen, listen, listen.

10. End with your script.
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STAFF AND STUDENT PROFILES
Table 1

*Staff Profiles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender/Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff 1 (Jane)</td>
<td>Female/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff 2 (Mary)</td>
<td>Female/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff 3 (Patricia)</td>
<td>Female/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff 4 (Charles)</td>
<td>Male/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff 5 (James)</td>
<td>Male/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff 6 (David)</td>
<td>Male/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff 7 (Elizabeth)</td>
<td>Female/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff 8 (Mark)</td>
<td>Male/+21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Discharged Parolees Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender/Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1 (George)</td>
<td>Male/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2 (Anthony)</td>
<td>Male/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3 (Steven)</td>
<td>Male/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4 (Jason)</td>
<td>Male/+21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Parolees Quoted From Breaking the Chains*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender/Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 5(Gary)</td>
<td>Male/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9(Stephen)</td>
<td>Male/+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10(Anna)</td>
<td>Female/+21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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