



Universiteit Utrecht



SurAnt

Together, ‘one step forward’ in life

An evaluative study of SurAnt, focusing on the reintegration
of former detainees

Utrecht University: Faculty Social Science
Master Sociology: Contemporary Social Problems

Master thesis

Student:	Julia Emmen 5884004
Supervisor University Utrecht:	J. J. Mandemakers
Internship organization:	SurAnt
Supervisor internship:	J. Dragtenstein
Academic year:	2017-2018
Date:	29-06-2018

Abstract

The Netherlands is one of the countries with the highest recidivism rates. Nearly 50 percent of the detainees who have been released end within two years up in detention again. The objective of this research is to help improve the reintegration of former detainees in the Netherlands by studying how Stichting SurAnt provides support for former detainees. The main research question is: *“To what extent does the support offered by SurAnt help former detainees to successfully reintegrate?”*. I focused in this research solely on reintegration problems related to employment, housing and debt.

To answer the research question I have used data collected from seventy dossiers and five semi-structured interviews. The results shows that most clients of SurAnt have problems related to a combination of two or three of the areas. 18,6 percent of the clients of SurAnt had problems solely related to employment, 17,1 percent had problems solely related to housing and only 10,0 percent had problems solely related to debt. Additionally, the results show that SurAnt achieves results for a third of all clients that had an intake in 2017. This includes the 75,7 percent of clients that still have appointments in 2018. All clients that were interviewed indicated that they were satisfied with the help SurAnt gave them. Furthermore, all clients indicated that they would contact SurAnt again when they need help with an issue in their lives.

Keywords: Stichting SurAnt, reintegration, former detainees, employment, housing and debt.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Background information	3
2.1 Crime and detention in the Netherlands	3
2.2 The Dutch reintegration policy	4
2.3 Critical points of the Dutch reintegration policy	5
2.5 Stichting SurAnt	6
3. Theoretical framework	8
3.1 Social learning theory	8
3.2 Social bond theory	9
3.3 Cognitive transformation theory	10
3.4 Importance of employment, housing and debts in the reintegration process	11
4. Method	14
4.1 Ethics	14
4.2 Research part I: Dossiers	15
4.2.2 Operationalization of concepts	15
4.2.3 Analyses	20
4.3 Research part II: Interviews	20
4.3.1 Participants	20
4.3.2 Analyses	21
5. Results	22
5.1 Demographics of the clients	22
5.2 Sub-question 1	23
5.3 Sub-question 2	25
5.3.1 Practical help offered by SurAnt	25
5.3.2 Link with the literature	26
5.4 Sub-question 3	28
5.5 Sub-question 4	29
6. Conclusion	31
7. Discussion	33
8. Policy recommendations	35
9. Literature list	37
10. Appendixes	42

1. Introduction

When criminologists refer to ‘citizens’, they use the term in opposition to criminal detainees (Behrens, 2004). This creates a clear separation; criminals on one side and law abiding citizens on the other side. However, research shows that detainees see themselves as citizens. After discharge from detention, former detainees often want to assume their roles as taxpayers, homeowners, volunteers and employees (Behrens, 2004). Nonetheless, the reintegration process, the transformation from a former detainee to a law abiding citizen, is not easy (Graffam, Shinkfield, Lavelle & McPherson, 2004). A person who has a criminal record faces a multitude of barriers that affect a successful reintegration into society (Graffam et al., 2004).

The term reintegration is commonly used in the context of the discharge of a person from an institution, such as a hospital, prison, or another setting, in which the individual is separated from the community and needs to return to community life (Bradford, Jette & Hernandez, 2012). In this research reintegration is defined as the process of adjusting to life outside of the penitentiary institutions and maintaining a crime free lifestyle (Davis, Bahr & Ward, 2013).

Yearly approximately 35.000 adult detainees leave penitentiary institutions in the Netherlands (Raad voor Strafrechttoepassing en Jeugdbescherming (RSJ), 2017). Successful reintegration into society is very difficult and the risk of recidivism is high (Graffam et al., 2004). Recidivism refers to the relapse of criminal behavior, which includes rearrest, reconviction and reimprisonment (Wormith et al., 2007). In the Netherlands, more than 47 percent of the detainees who have been released, relapse within two years and end up in detention again (Rijksoverheid, 2018). Compared to twenty other countries, the Netherlands has one of the highest recidivism rates (Fazel & Wolf, 2015). Only France (59%) and Ireland (51%) have a higher recidivism rate than the Netherlands (47%). In contrast, Norway (20%) and Iceland (27%) have the lowest recidivism rates (Fazel & Wolf, 2015). This high recidivism rate in the Netherlands raises the question of what goes wrong during the reintegration process of former detainees.

Maruna and Imarigeo (2013) argue in their research that a high rate of recidivism occurs because the needs of former detainees are often being neglected. The council that advises the Dutch government about criminal policies agrees with this statement (RSJ, 2017). The council argues that the current reintegration policy does not provide the right support for all former detainees. Due to the fact that the current Dutch reintegration policy has received a lot of criticism (RSJ, 2017), other organizations have taken up the task to support former

detainees in their reintegration process. SurAnt is an organization which works both inside and outside the penitentiary institutions to support (former) detainees reintegrate. SurAnt offers (former) detainees help with practical matters and encourages them to become more self-reliant. They do this through offering motivational communication and assistance in five different areas of their lives; employment and income, housing, debt, care and governmental affairs, SurAnt wants to ensure that former detainees have a solid basis from which they can work on returning to society (SurAnt, 2018).

The objective of this research is to help improve the reintegration of former detainees in the Netherlands by studying how SurAnt provides support for former detainees. The main research question is: *“To what extent does the support offered by SurAnt help former detainees to successfully reintegrate?”*

As reintegration is a very broad concept, this research will only focus on three specific areas concerning the reintegration of former detainees, namely employment, housing and debts. These three areas were chosen because previous research (Davis et al., 2013; Evans, 2014; Willis, 2016) shows that these areas are very important for the successful reintegration of former detainees. Additionally, research from the Dutch Ministry of Security and Justice (Beerthuisen, Beijersbergen, Noordhuizen & Weijters, 2015) shows that those three areas, employment, housing and debts, could use improvement within the Netherlands. Although SurAnt is also present in the reintegration centers within the penitentiary institutions, this research will only focus on the reintegration centers of SurAnt outside the penitentiary institutions. To help answer the main research question four sub-questions are drawn up:

Question 1: How extensive are the problems of former detainees concerning employment, housing and debt?

Question 2: What kind of services does SurAnt offer to aid former detainees with their problems concerning employment, housing and debt?

Question 3: To what extent do these services offered by SurAnt match with the needs of the former detainee?

Question 4: To what extent are former detainees satisfied with the services provided by SurAnt?

To answer the main research question, I have analyzed data collected from seventy dossiers and five semi-structure interviews. The dossiers were provided by SurAnt and consist of information about all clients who visited one of the two reintegration centers outside the penitentiary institutions. The semi-structure interviews were held with clients that were aided by Stichting SurAnt.

2. Background information

This chapter will give some background information about the reintegration process in the Netherlands. First, crime and detention in the Netherlands will be discussed. Second, the Dutch reintegration policy will be explained. Additionally, some critical point about the reintegration policy will be given. Lastly, some background information will be given about SurAnt.

2.1 Crime and detention in the Netherlands

In the Netherlands, 37.158 new offenders enter a penitentiary institution every year. 92 percent of these new offenders are male and 8 percent are female (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2017). Compared to other countries of Europe, the Netherlands has a relatively low number of detainees (Aebi, Tiago & Burkhardt, 2016). The Netherlands has 53 detainees per 100.000 inhabitants, while Europe has on average 115.7 detainees per 100.000 inhabitants (Aebi et al., 2016). The four most common offence types that causes people to end up in detention in the Netherlands are (1) property crimes, (2) violent and sexual crimes, (3) drug offences and (4) the disruption of public order and destruction (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2016). Adult detainees are on average detained for 103 days, approximately three months (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2017). 55 percent of adult detainees is set free within one month, 38 percent remains in a penitentiary institution between one month and one year, while 7 percent of adult detainees are detained longer than one year. Only a total of 33 prisoners in the Netherlands have a lifelong sentence (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2017). The number of detainees in the Netherlands has declined in recent years. Between 2005 and 2015, the number of detainees has decreased more than 20 percent (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2016).

Although, the number of detainees in the Netherlands has declined, it is striking that, among adult detainees, the recidivism rate is increasing (Weijters, Verweij & Tollenaar, 2017). A large part of the crime in the Netherlands is repetition crime; crime committed by people who previously came into contact with the police or judicial authorities (RSJ, 2017). As stated before, more than 47 percent of the detainees who have been released, will end up in detention again within two years (Rijksoverheid, 2018).

The Netherlands has 24 penitentiary institutions on various locations (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2018). These penitentiary institutions consist of various departments. One of these departments is the house of detention. This department is intended for detainees who are

in pre-trial detention and have not yet been convicted. There is, in most cases, also a separate department for frequent offenders. Additionally, vulnerable detainees, detainees with physical and / or mental problems, have a separate department with extra care facilities. There are also four Penitentiary Psychiatric Centers within the Netherlands, where detainees with serious psychiatric disorders or psychological problems are being detained (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2018).

2.2 The Dutch reintegration policy

The goal of the Dutch reintegration policy is to ensure that the return of former detainees into Dutch society goes as smoothly as possible. The Dutch Ministry of Security and Justice wants to establish that the risk of recidivism is as small as possible and that society suffers as little as possible from the reintegration of former detainees (RSJ, 2017). The target group of the Dutch reintegration policy are all former detained citizens aged 18 or older, with a valid residence status, who will return to society after their stay in a penitentiary institution.

The Dutch reintegration policy states that the responsibility of a successful reintegration lies with the detainee himself. However, the detainees are supported with their reintegration process by municipalities, penitentiary institutions and several chain partners, such as SurAnt (RSJ, 2017). As stated before, the Dutch reintegration policy focusses on five areas; (1) identity papers, (2) housing, (3) income, (4) debts and (5) health care (Rijksoverheid, 2018b). The Dutch Ministry of Security and Justice assumes that when those five areas are problem free, and other criminogenic factors are absent, the chance that former detainees will relapse into criminal behavior will be non-existent (RSJ, 2017).

To help get these five areas problem free, the Dutch detainees are supported by the reintegration centers (RIC) that are present within all penitentiary institution (Rijksoverheid, 2018b). During their time in detention, approximately four hours per week are scheduled to spend on reintegration activities (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2018b). When detainees arrive in the penitentiary institution it is mandatory to fill in several questionnaires, one questionnaire that tests their knowledge about the Dutch language and one questionnaire in which detainees have to reflect on their life. Additionally, whenever a detainee stays in a penitentiary institution for longer than ten days, the Dutch government assigns the detainee a case manager. This case manager will make a reintegration plan with the detainee (Rijksoverheid, 2018b). The reintegration plan contains everything that is important to guiding and supporting the reintegration process of the detainee as well as possible (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2018c).

When a citizen becomes detained, the municipality of this citizen is made aware of this. Therefore, the municipality can take the first measures to support the detainee (RSJ, 2017). After discharge from detention, the municipalities are responsible to help detainees with their reintegration (Rekenkamer Amersfoort, 2017). In larger municipalities a separate department for the aftercare of former detainees has been set up (RSJ, 2017). In smaller municipalities there is a single coordinator in charge for the aftercare of detainees (RSJ, 2017). However, little is known about how the different municipalities exactly implement support for detainees in their district (Rekenkamer Amersfoort, 2017).

2.3 Critical points of the Dutch reintegration policy

There are some critical notes concerning the Dutch reintegration policy. First of all, the Dutch reintegration policy does not suit all sections of the target group (RSJ, 2017). Due to the fact that the Dutch reintegration policy states that the reintegration process is the responsibility of the detainee, it is now the case that whenever detainees do not want to participate in reintegration activities, they are discharged of the obligation to participate. Detainees who have no interest in receiving support on the five basic conditions do not get any support. Most detainees of this group choose to maintain their criminal existence after release. Therefore, this group of detainees requires a different approach (RSJ, 2017).

Secondly, detainees with a sentence of less than four weeks are also not reached by the current reintegration policy (RSJ, 2017). Practice shows that these detainees often do not get a case manager assigned and therefore they have no reintegration plan. Thirdly, a significant proportion of the target group of the reintegration policy consists of people with a migrant background (RSJ, 2017). Nevertheless, there is no separate policy that focusses on the reintegration of people with a migrant background. Due to language barriers and cultural differences many former detainees with an ethnic minority background experience difficulties in accessing support networks that can help them with their reintegration (So, 2014). Therefore, detainees with a migrant background could benefit from a specified policy (RSJ, 2017).

Lastly, although resolving problems concerning the five areas can generally contribute to the reduction of the risk of recidivism and achieve a successful reintegration, only resolving problems focusing on those areas is often not sufficient (RSJ, 2017). It will be better to determinate per individual case whether behavioral change is necessary and from which other reintegration activities they can benefit (RSJ, 2017).

2.5 Stichting SurAnt

SurAnt was founded in the 1980s by a group of friends who had noticed that detainees of Antillean and Surinamese origin in the penitentiary institutions of Bijlmer needed more social contact (SurAnt, 2018). Therefore, this group of friends started a volunteer initiative that visited these detainees. These visits were experienced by the detainees as very positive and therefore it was decided that the visit groups would be extended to all detainees who have the need for more social contact. Over time, those visit groups became focused on practical assistance with regard to the reintegration of detainees. Since 2007, this volunteer initiative has been transferred to an official foundation, SurAnt (SurAnt, 2018).

The goal of SurAnt is to offer support to everyone who has been in contact with the Dutch law (SurAnt, 2018). SurAnt is present both inside and outside the penitentiary institutions. In total, SurAnt can be found in eight penitentiary institutions, namely Heerhugowaard, Zwaag, Schiphol, Zaanstad, Nieuwegein, Nieuwersluis, Almere and Lelystad. Additionally, SurAnt has two reintegration centres outside the penitentiary institutions, one in Almere and one in Amsterdam (SurAnt, 2018).

In addition to the reintegration centres, SurAnt also offers former detainees various projects that promote their reintegration, such as gaining work experience and providing information about spending time in detention to (secondary) schools and youth institutions (SurAnt, 2018). Through these various activities SurAnt wants to reduce the risk of recidivism and crime prevention (SurAnt, 2018).

Through motivational communication and assistance in five different areas of their lives, namely employment and income, housing, debt, health care and governmental affairs, SurAnt wants to help (former) detainees to create a solid basis with which they can return to society (SurAnt, 2018). To help (former) detainees in the reintegration centres adequately, SurAnt uses three different methods during their appointments, namely a solution oriented style of working, motivational speech and the eight phases model (SurAnt, 2017).

The client has a central position during the solution oriented method (SurAnt, 2017). The goal is to strengthen the autonomy of the client by focussing on the solution of a problem instead of the problem itself. The employees of SurAnt initially take on an 'I do not know' attitude. This means that they let the clients themselves figure out how to solve the problem. The employees try to raise the client's self-esteem, causing the client to come up with practical solutions. Additionally, the employees support the clients in finding a solution for their problem by asking open and solution orientated questions. These solution orientated questions stimulate the client to think about the possibilities for solving the problem and cause

the clients to determine which actions they have to take. This method emphasizes the competences and strengths of the clients in order to give them self-confidence and teach them new behavior (SurAnt, 2017).

Motivational speech is a method that is used by SurAnt to intrinsically motivate the clients to change (SurAnt, 2017). There are four general principles underlying the motivational speech method: express empathy, develop discrepancy, go with resistance and support personal effectiveness. Expressing empathy is done by listening attentively to the stories of clients without judging them. Developing discrepancy is done by gaining insight into the current situation of the client and their ideal situation. Going with resistance is done by recognizing the resistance of clients. Changing is difficult and must not be contradicted. Supporting personal effectiveness is done by giving clients the tools to let them achieve behavioral change (SurAnt, 2017).

The eight phases model enables clients to work on their future in a targeted way (SurAnt, 2017). By using eight consecutive steps, both the clients and the employees enter the assistance process in a structured way. The eight phases consists of: (1) registration phase, (2) intake phase, (3) start phase, (4) execution phase, (5) planning phase, (6) analysis phase, (7) evaluation phase and (8) end phase. The first three phases emphasis on the client and the therapist getting to know each other better. The three following phases focus on drawing and executing the support plan. The last two phases evaluate on the support plan.

3. Theoretical framework

In this chapter three theoretical perspectives will be used to explain why some former detainees do reintegrate successful and others do not. Additionally, some examples of how these theoretical perspectives can be implemented in reintegration activities are given. The three theoretical perspectives are: social learning theory, social bond theory and cognitive transformation theory. Lastly, the importance of employment, housing and debt to successfully reintegrate will be discussed. In addition, an overview of the situation of Dutch former detainees concerning those three areas will be given.

3.1 Social learning theory

Social learning theory assumes that criminal motivations are learned through associations with others (Bandura, 1971). New patterns of behavior can be obtained by direct experience or by observing behavior of others (Bandura, 1971). Therefore, achieving a successful reintegration depends on the level of criminality in the interpersonal networks of the detainees (Bahr, Harris, Fisher & Harker Armstrong, 2010). Through peers and family members, former detainees are exposed to particular attitudes and behaviors (Agnew, 2005). When former detainees spend time with people who are not involved in deviant behavior, they are more likely to receive support for following a more conventional path. On the other hand, when former detainees spend time with people who are involved in deviant behavior, they are more likely to be influenced to behave in the same way (Agnew, 2005). Research shows that an important part of successfully reintegrating is to end relationships with people who are involved with crime (Byrne & Trew, 2008). Marriage and employment is one way to alter networks, so that former detainees spend less time with deviant friends and more time with law abiding persons. Spending less time with friends that stimulate and reward criminal behavior causes motivation for committing to a non-criminal lifestyle (Giordano, Cernkovich & Rudolph, 2002). An important concept in Bandura's social learning theory is self-efficacy (Bandura, 1971). Self-efficacy is defined as individual judgement of how well a person can execute a course of action (Bandura, 1971). So, in regard to reintegration, self-efficacy is the belief in one's own abilities to successfully reintegrate into society (Bahr et al., 2010).

A way that social learning theory can be implemented in reintegration activities is by letting employees teach (former) detainees how to do certain things in a legal and community accepted way. The reintegration centers rely on the independence and the responsibility of the detainees to arrange their own reintegration. However, detainees who are not able to do so,

are supported by the employees of reintegration centrum (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2018d). Additionally, reintegration activities within and without Dutch penitentiary institutions are nowadays very focused on promoting the self-reliance of (former) detainees (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2016). The general assumption is that by increasing the self-reliance of (former) detainees, their self-efficacy will also increase. Within the Dutch penitentiary institutions detainees are encouraged to do more things independently. For example, detainees in some Dutch penitentiary institutions have access to the key of their own cell. In this way, the detainee can move around within the prison to go to an activity, such as work or recreation. Self-reliance is promoted in prisons in order to ensure that detainees become more responsible and to prevent that detainees become passive during their time in the penitentiary institutions (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2016). Research from De Jong, Willems and Torregrosa (2016) compared a department of the Dutch penitentiary institution where self-reliance was not promoted with a department that did promote the self-reliance of the detainees. The results show that the detainees from the department that promoted self-reliance more often thought about their future (78%), felt more useful (78%) and were happier and more positive (de Jong, Willems & Torregrosa, 2016). Therefore, it is assumed by the Dutch Ministry of Security and Justice that improving self-reliance of detainees helps them with their reintegration into Dutch society (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2016).

3.2 Social bond theory

According to Hirschi's social bond theory, individuals are restrained from engaging in deviant behavior through their social bonds with society (Hirschi, 1969). The theory consists of four elements: attachment, commitment, involvement and beliefs. The theory states that when individuals are strongly attached to conventional others, committed to achieving societal goals, engaged in conventional activities and believe in the moral values of society, they will be less likely to engage in criminal activities (Hirschi, 1969). In other words, when social bonds to the society are strong, former detainees will be prevented from engaging in criminal activities (Bahr et al., 2010). For example, when former detainees develop social bonds with people who are involved in conventional activities, these bonds are likely to restrain them from getting involved with criminal behavior. This is a form of informal control. As individuals develop bonds with conventional individuals and institutions, they develop a certain stake in conformity, which constrains them when they are tempted to participate in criminal activities. This does not have to be a conventional individual, but could also be an institution, such as an educative environment (Bahr et al., 2010).

A way to implement the social bond theory is by creating a bond between social workers and (former) detainees. This social bond is likely to restrain the (former) detainee from getting involved with criminal behavior (Sampson & Laub, 1990). An example of a bond that is formed during the time of detention is the bond between the case manager and the detainee. The case manager oversees all reintegration activities of the detainee and ensures that the detainee does not return to crime after release from detention (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2018c). Because one case manager is assigned during the whole detention time of the detainee, a social bond develops between the case manager and detainee (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2018c).

3.3 Cognitive transformation theory

According to the cognitive transformation theory of Giordano et al. (2002), social bond theory (Hirschi, 1969) and social learning theory (Bandura, 1971) are incomplete in explaining reintegration because they ignore the role of individual choice in the change process. Cognitive transformation theory assumes that there are four elements which determine a successful reintegration. The first element is that former detainees need to want to change. Some former detainees like their life as it was and do not wish to change. Others say that they would like to change and are willing to put effort in changing their behavior. Secondly, former detainees need to be exposed to particular circumstances that help them to move toward change. Examples are obtaining a good job, getting education or marrying. The third element is the development of a conventional self. Former detainees need to see themselves as conventional citizens. Finally, previous conducted criminal behavior must be reinterpreted. For example, detainees who were dealing drugs, need to view the drug culture as something that damages other people. If these elements are met, a successful reintegration is certain according to the cognitive transformation theory (Giordano et al., 2002). Rungay (2004) developed a theoretical perspective of desistance that has similarities to the theory of Giordano et al. (2002). Rungay (2004) argues that a successful reintegration occurs when the former detainee develops personal readiness to change and has the opportunity to change. Former detainees are more likely to adopt a more prosocial identity if they perceive change to be possible, in accordance with self-efficacy mentioned above, but also when they recognize opportunities to change (Rungay, 2004).

The cognitive transformation theory is implemented in practice by motivating (former) detainees to develop the will to change and help them move towards change. A way enable this in the current Dutch reintegration policy is by rewarding detainees who want to work on

their future with extra reintegration activities (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2018b). For example, detainees who are motivated can participate more in reintegration activities than detainees who are not motivated. A way to expose (former) detainees to circumstances that help them to move towards change is by offering them help in the reintegration centers (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2018d). Additionally, detainees are able to enjoy an education and participate in work activities in the Dutch penitentiary institutions (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2018b). Lastly, a way to make (former) detainees see themselves as conventional citizens is by increasing their self-, which causes them to believe more in their own abilities to successfully reintegrate into society (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2016).

3.4 Importance of employment, housing and debts in the reintegration process

Research shows that former detainees who are employed tend to reintegrate more successfully into society, than former detainees who are not employed (Davis, Bahr & Ward, 2013). Through employment detainees can develop bonds with colleagues and become more dependent on a pay check. This is in line with Hirischi's (1969) social bond theory. The temptation to participate in illegal activities will decrease because of the social bonds former detainees create through employment (Hirischi, 1969). The prospect of losing colleagues and a steady pay check will restrain former detainees from engaging in criminal behavior (Davis et al., 2013). However, social and legal barriers could cause difficulties for former detainees to obtain work (Graffam et al., 2004). Social barriers include stigmatization and discrimination towards former detainees who apply for a job. Legal barriers could refer to corporate policies that include restrictions on hiring former detainees, which adds to difficulties in re-entering the work field (Graffam et al., 2004). In the Netherlands, 72,4 percent of the detainees have an income before becoming detained, compared to only 61,6 percent of the detainees after release (Beerthuisen et al., 2015). So, there is a clear decrease of the number of detainees that have an income after release from detention. Additionally, three quarters of the detainees do not generate an income from employment after release, but have an income in the form of benefits (Beerthuisen et al., 2015).

Previous research shows that people with an unstable housing situation come in contact with the criminal justice system more often than people with a stable housing situation (Willis, 2016). Access to suitable and stable housing has long been recognized as an important component of successful reintegration (Willis, 2016). This is in line with the cognitive transformation theory (Giordano et al., 2002), that states that former detainees need to be exposed to particular circumstances that help them move forward and away from crime.

A stable housing situation could provide former detainees with a degree of steadiness, which makes it easier for former detainees to arrange necessary affairs for their reintegration and help them move forward. Additionally, a stable housing situation helps former detainees to see themselves as conventional citizens, which will, according to the cognitive transformation theory, prevent former detainees from engaging in criminal behavior (Giordano et al., 2002). Research (Willis, 2016) shows that periods of homelessness over time significantly increase the risk of recidivism among former detainees. Social barriers could again cause problems for former detainees who are looking for a house (Graffam et al., 2004). A lot of former detainees fear hostility from the community and are afraid to be rejected for housing because of their criminal history (Graffam et al., 2004). In the Netherlands, 84,6 percent of the detainees have a place to live before they end up in detention. After discharge from detention, this percentage slightly increases to 86,1 percent (Beerthuizen et al., 2015). Although, this is a small increase, research shows that before becoming detained most detainees lived in rented or owned accommodation, but after release from detention, most former detainees live with family or in social care centers (Beerthuizen et al., 2015).

Debt is another important factor that has a lot of impact on the successful reintegration of former detainees (Evans, 2014). Former detainees with debt encounter a number of problems. For example, debt reduces household income and limits the ability of a former detainee to obtain housing and employment. Additionally, a debt increases the likelihood of a former detainee to get involved with the criminal justice system again. When the former detainee is over indebted, which means the detainee gains more debts than his or her income every month, the chance of recidivism is even higher. Fines and interest that accrue over time often make the debt unmanageable for former detainees. Debt also has an effect on their psychological wellbeing. Former detainees with debts often have expressed feelings of anxiety, anger and hopelessness. Those who experience these psychological symptoms are even more likely to avoid payment (Evans, 2014). Experiencing problems related to debt can have an impact on the self-efficacy of former detainees. Self-efficacy is an important concept in Bandura's social learning theory, which is also useful in understanding reintegration (Bandura, 1971). Former detainees with a debt have low self-efficacy, believing that no amount of effort would change their situation. This could affect the reintegration of these former detainees in a negative way, because individuals with low self-efficacy do not believe that they have the abilities to successfully reintegrate into society (Bandura, 1971). Research shows that nearly three quarters (73,2 percent) of the former detainees in the Netherlands have debts (Beerthuizen et al., 2015). Approximately 30 percent of the indebted detainees have a

debt over 10.000 euros. However, this number could even be higher, due to the fact that not all debts of the detainees are known (Beerthuisen et al., 2015). From the detainees who had no debts at the start of detention, about a quarter appears to create debts during their time in detention (RSJ, 2017).

4. Method

In this study I made use of both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Using a mixed method increases the internal validity and reliability of the research (Abowitz & Toole, 2009). To answer the research question I have used data collected from dossiers and interviews. The target group of the research is in line with the target group of the Dutch reintegration policy, namely citizens aged 18 or older, with a valid residence status, that return to the Dutch society after their stay in a Dutch penitentiary institution.

The dossiers were provided by SurAnt and consist of information about all clients who visited one of the two reintegration centers outside the penitentiary institutions in 2017. I used the dossiers to obtain an overview of the extensively of the problems encountered by former detainees. In addition, I used the dossiers to research what kind of services SurAnt offers to aid former detainees with their problem. Lastly, I used the dossiers to examine to what extent the services offered by SurAnt match with the needs of the former detainees. Semi-structured interviews were held to provide more in-depth information about the work method of SurAnt. The interviews were also used to examine to what extent former detainees were satisfied with the services provided by SurAnt. In total five interviews were conducted.

4.1 Ethics

In this paragraph I will discuss the ethical considerations regarding this research. Ethical concerns are important when the research involves people, organizations and societies (Heilbron, 2015). Due to the fact that this research focuses on a vulnerable target group, it is important that ethical considerations are taken into account with caution.

Data was managed according to the protocol of the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Utrecht. To secure the privacy of the respondents, the data from both the dossiers and the interviews was anonymised. SurAnt gave their consent to use their client dossiers for this research. In order to be as transparent as possible, the participants of the interviews were informed about the aim of the research and about what would be done with the data afterwards. All clients that were interviewed participated voluntarily and were asked for permission to record the interview. Additionally, the recordings of the interviews were deleted after the 1st of June 2018 to ensure that no third parties could gain access to the files.

Lastly, I have to mention that I did an internship with SurAnt. This gives me more insight knowledge about their work methods and their clients. Additionally, I conducted this research as unbiased as possible.

4.2 Research part I: Dossiers

The dossiers from 2017 consist in total of 139 clients, which have had 945 appointments. A subset of the dossiers from 2017 will be examined. All dossiers from clients that were part of the target group and had reintegration problems that either focus on employment, housing, debt or a combination of these will be included in this research. Whether a client had reintegration problems related to employment, housing, debt or a combination was checked by looking at the subject of the appointments indicated on the treatment forms. The final dataset consists of 70 clients with 307 treatment forms.

The dossiers consist of two parts, intake forms and treatment forms. The intake forms are filled in by an employee of SurAnt together with the client during the first appointment. The intake form consists of eight different parts, namely personal data, address data, detention data, family data, financial data, health, application data and a section of particularities of the client. In the particularities section of the intake form, employees of SurAnt could mention remarkable things related to the situation or problems of the former detainee. The intake form includes both open and closed questions, see Appendix A. The treatment forms are filled in by the employees of SurAnt after they have had an appointment with a client. The treatment form consists of an open space where employees of SurAnt could describe which activities they undertook during the appointment and what should be done next appointment, see Appendix B.

4.2.2 Operationalization of concepts

Employment. Two different factors will be taken into account to measure how extensive the problems of former detainees related to employment are, namely having a job and job satisfaction. Having a job is measured on the intake form asking clients if they have a salary. This was a closed question and clients could either fill in yes or no. Job satisfaction was only measured when clients indicated that they had problems related to employment and had a job. Job satisfaction is defined as the positive emotional state resulting from the appreciation of one's job. This is measured using the open particularities section of the intake form and the treatment forms. I coded job satisfaction by using four different codes; (1) not satisfied and want to change my job, (2) not satisfied but do not want to change my job, (3) satisfied with my job and (4) unknown. Whenever clients indicated that they were not satisfied with their job, I examined the reason for their dissatisfaction.

To measure to what extent the services offered by SurAnt match with the needs of the former detainee, I looked at which results SurAnt obtained with their services. I have measured the results related to employment problems by examining if clients with

employment problems have found paid work during or at the end of their treatment. To determine if a client has found work or not, the open section of the treatment forms concerning employment problems was coded as; (1) found new (paid) work, (2) got a job interview or (3) no result.

Housing. To measure how extensive the problems related to housing are, housing situation and housing satisfaction are taken into account. I measured housing situation by coding the open sections of the intake forms and treatment forms by using five different codes; (1) homeless, (2) living in a shelter, (3) living with friends, (4) living with family and (5) having a place to live (including renting or owning their own place). Housing satisfaction is defined as the positive emotional state resulting from one's living situation. I measured housing satisfaction by coding the open part of the intake forms and treatment forms. Four different codes were used; (1) not satisfied and want to change my living situation, (2) not satisfied but do not want to change my living situation and (3) satisfied and (4) unknown. Furthermore, if clients indicated that they were not satisfied with their housing situation, I examined the reason for their discontent.

Again, I measured which results SurAnt obtained related to housing by examining to what extent the services offered by SurAnt match with the needs of the former detainee. I have measured the results related to housing by examining if clients with housing problems have found their own place. I coded the treatment forms based on two codes; having a place to live or no result.

Debt. Four different factors were taken into account to measure how extensive the problems related to debt were; having a debt, having an overview of the debt, the amount of a debt and having a payment arrangement. Having a debt is measured by using an open question of the intake form asking clients at which companies they have a debt. If the clients did not list any companies, I assumed that the client did not have debt. Whenever the question was filled out, I assumed that the client did have a debt. Additionally, having an overview of the debt is also measured by using this question on the intake form. Whenever the clients filled in the companies where they have a debt and mention the amount of debt, I assumed that the client had an overview of their debt. Whenever the clients mention that they do not know where they have debt and how large their debt is, I concluded that the clients do not have an overview of their debt. I measured the amount of debt by coding the open section of the intake form and the treatment form. These sections were coded by using one code, namely the amount of debt. Having a payment arrangement is measured using the closed question on

the intake form, asking clients if they have a payment arrangement. Clients could either answer with yes or no.

Once again, I measured to what extent the services from SurAnt match with the needs of the former detainee by looking at which results SurAnt obtained related to debt. I have measured the results by examining whether the debt of clients has decreased. To determine if the debt has decreased, I coded the open section of the treatment forms based on three codes; (1) having a new payment arrangement, (2) the debt is paid off or (3) no result.

Method of treatment. To answer the second sub-question, I examined the method of treatment SurAnt used. The method of treatment is defined as the way in which former detainees are offered support by employees of SurAnt. To determine the method of treatment, I examined several variables, namely the amount of appointments, how many different employees of SurAnt helped the client and the executed action. The executed action will differ for the three areas. SurAnt helped clients with employment problems in five different ways; (1) making and updating resumes, (2) writing motivation letters, (3) helping clients to start their own business, (4) replying to job applications and (5) helping clients to register with an employment agency. For clients with housing problems, SurAnt undertook five different actions; (1) helping clients to make an online account on a housing website, (2) helping clients to apply to housing applications, (3) helping clients to apply for housing urgency at the government, (4) helping clients to arrange emergency shelter and (5) refer clients to external partners. Lastly, SurAnt aided clients with debt problems in four different ways; (1) create an overview of the debt, (2) arranging new payment arrangements, (3) helping clients to pay payment arrangements and (4) referring clients to external partners.

Furthermore, I examined to what extent the literature was implemented in the work method of SurAnt. To research if the social bond theory was implemented in the work method, I examined if clients were consistently helped by the same employee. I counted how many different employees filled out a treatment form for the same client. I assumed that when the client was helped by less employees than half the appointments the client had, the client was consistently helped by the same employee. Additionally, to research if the transformation theory was implemented in the work theory, I examined if detainees had received assignments to do by themselves at home. I coded the intake form and treatment form with two different codes; received homework or received no homework. In addition, I examined if the clients undertook actions themselves or had a wait-and-see attitude by coding the intake forms and treatment forms with two codes; wait-and-see attitude and undertook actions themselves.

Age. Age is an important factor to include while looking at the reintegration of former detainees. Research shows that motivation for change increases with age (Terry, 2003). When detainees noticed that the population of the penitentiary institution around them consists of detainees younger than themselves, they will feel less comfortable. As a result, older detainees have more motivation to successfully reintegrate and not return to the penitentiary institution (Terry, 2003).

Gender. Gender is defined as the biological sex of the clients. Gender could have an influence on the reintegration of former detainees, due to the fact that man and women face different barriers while reintegrating (Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009). Gender is measured by asking clients if they are (1) female or (2) male. This was a closed question and clients could only chose one of those two options.

Ethnicity. Ethnicity is defined as the country of birth. Members of minority groups are at greater risk to experience negative stigmatizing, which makes them less likely to successfully reintegrate (Benson, Alarid, Burton & Cullen, 2011). The stigmatization of former detainees hinders possibilities to develop a conventional, legal lifestyle, and promotes the limitation of social contracts and the sense of social isolation that former detainees experience (MCAlinden, 2005). Ethnicity is measured on the intake form, asking clients to fill out their nationality and place of birth. Based on the answers clients gave on both questions, I divided ethnicity into five categories: (1) Dutch, (2) Netherlands Antilles and Surinam, (3) Mediterranean (Moroccan and Turkish), (4) other European countries and (5) other non-western countries.

Marital status. Research shows that having a partner or being marriage can help former detainees refrain from crime (Sampson & Laub, 1990). As a result, it is more likely that former detainees who are married reintegrate successfully into society (Sampson & Laub, 1990). The clients could indicate their marital status on the intake form by selecting one of the following categories: (1) married, (2) unmarried, (3) living together (4) single and (5) divorced.

Number of children. Number of children is defined as the amount of children that the clients have at the moment of the first appointment. Research shows that having children could help former detainees renounce from criminal behavior. Children could function as an informal guardian, which makes it easier for former detainees to successfully reintegrate (Sampson & Laub, 1990). The number of children is measured by the question on the intake form asking the clients to fill in their family composition. This question is an open question in

which respondents could fill in multiple information. However, only the number of children is taken into account.

Perceived physical and mental health. Perceived physical and mental health is defined as the state of physical and mental health stated by the clients. Perceived physical and mental health could influence the reintegration of former detainees, because former detainees with health problems face more barriers while reintegrating, especially in the area related to employment (Mallik-Kane & Visser, 2008). Perceived physical health is measured in the intake form, asking clients if they experience barriers relating to mental or physical health. This was a closed question, clients could either tick the box that indicated that they (1) experienced barriers related to mental health or the box that indicated that they (2) experienced barriers related to physical health. Examples of barriers related to mental health are mental illnesses and stress. An example of a barrier related to physical health is a disease that has a negative influence on your physical wellbeing, such as cancer. When both boxes were ticked it indicated that client (3) experienced barriers related to mental and physical health. If none of those two boxes were ticked, I assumed that the client experienced (4) no barriers related to their health.

Addiction problems. Addiction is defined as the compulsive use of a substance despite the adverse consequences. Similar to perceived physical and mental health, former detainees with an addiction face more barriers while reintegration than former detainees without an addiction (Mallik-Kane & Visser, 2008). Addiction is measured in the intake form, asking clients if they have an addiction. This was a closed question, clients could either tick the box that indicated that they had (1) an alcohol addiction, (2) a drugs addiction, (3) another addition, (4) both an alcohol and drugs addiction, (5) an alcohol and another addiction or (6) a drugs and another addiction. If none of those boxes were ticked, I assumed that the client had (7) no addiction.

Period of detention. The period of detention could determine to what extent a detainee is alienated from society (Nieuwbeerta, 2007). It is generally assumed that detainees who were in detention for a longer amount of time are more alienated from society than detainees who were in detention for a short amount of time. Detainees who are detained for a longer period of time could have taken over deviant norms and values of other offenders, which reduces the chance that they will, after release, focus on obtaining a conventional life (Nieuwbeerta, 2007). The period of detention is measured in the intake forms asking clients to state their period of detention. Clients filled in their period of detention by mentioning the month and year they got detained and the month and year of their release. The period of

detention will in this research be calculated in the amount of months former detainees were detained.

4.2.3 Analyses

I analysed part of the data obtained from the dossiers by using the statistical analysis software SPSS 24 for Windows and I analysed another part of the data by using the analysis tool Nvivo 11 for Windows. I used SPSS 24 for Windows to calculate frequencies and generate descriptive statistics. Additionally, I used Nvivo 11 for Windows to code the open parts of the dossiers. Variables included in this analysis were job satisfaction, result treatment employment, housing situation, housing satisfaction, result treatment housing, amount of debt, result treatment debt and method of treatment.

4.3 Research part II: Interviews

To identify what kind of services SurAnt offers to support their clients and to what extent the former detainees were satisfied with the services provided by SurAnt, I conducted five semi-structured interviews. The advantage of semi-structured interviews is that it provides space for discussing new subjects that have been mentioned during the interview (Schmidt, 2004). I interviewed five clients of SurAnt who had an intake with the organization in 2017. One client is still currently being supported by SurAnt and four clients were supported by SurAnt in the past. I conducted the interviews over the phone and the interviews approximately took 15 minutes, depending on the time that was needed to obtain the relevant information. I chose a duration of 15 minutes, because previous research showed that this particularly target group has a short attention span (Gertner, 2003; Ginsberg, Hirvikoski & Lindefors, 2010). The topic list included topics such as questions about the situation of the former detainee before they received help from SurAnt, the work method from SurAnt and the satisfaction of the former detainees with the help of SurAnt, see Appendix C.

4.3.1 Participants

I selected the participants for the interviews by using the dossiers. The sample is a stratified sample, meaning that I divided the dossiers into subgroups, which were divided into smaller groups to complete the sampling process. First, I divided the dossiers in groups based on the main problem the detainee experienced, either employment, housing or debts. Second, I divided those three groups into smaller groups based on the fact if the clients were still being aided by SurAnt or not. All together I approached nineteen clients by telephone and asked if they wanted to participate in this research. In total, five clients agreed to participate. Before

the interviews started, I shortly explained the aim of the research. Furthermore, I assured the respondents that their anonymity was preserved and asked the respondents for permission to record the interview.

4.3.2 Analyses

To analyze the interviews, I conducted a code-based analysis by using the steps from Boeije (2005). First, I analyzed the interviews by coding them openly. By doing so, I assigned codes to common recurring themes. Secondly, I analyzed the interviews by coding them axially, whereby the codes were being ordered and reduced. Thirdly, the interviews were being analyzed by selective coding, where codes were being combined. Lastly, I organized the codes based on their recurrence and importance for answering the sub-questions (Boeije, 2005). I coded the interviews in the analysis tool Nvivo 11 for Windows.

5. Results

In this chapter, I will discuss the results from the analyses of the dossiers and the five semi-structured interviews. The aim of the chapter is to find out to what extent the support offered by SurAnt helps former detainees to successfully reintegrate. I will first describe the demographics of the clients. Thereafter, I will discuss the results per sub-question.

5.1 Demographics of the clients

In 2017, 70 clients with problems related to employment, housing or/and debts had an intake at SurAnt. Of those 70 clients, 26 clients are still being aided by SurAnt in 2018 and 44 clients did not need any more help of SurAnt in 2018. Table 1 shows the following demographics of the clients; gender, age, ethnicity and marital status. With help of a chi-squared test, I examined if the clients of SurAnt are a good representation of the total number of detainees in the Netherlands. For this purpose, I used the most recent dataset from Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2017). As there was no data of the marital status for the total amount of detainees in the Netherlands, no chi-squared test could be conducted.

Table 1. Demographics of the clients.

	SurAnt		CBS
	N (70)	%	%
Gender			
Men	64	91,4%	92,0%
Woman	6	8,6%	7,8%
$\chi^2(1; N=70) = 0,074, p = 0,785$			
Age			
18-25	8	11,4%	17,0%
25-45	41	58,6%	57,9%
45-65	18	25,7%	23,1%
65+	3	4,3%	1,5%
$\chi^2(3; N=70) = 5,082, p = 0,166$			
Ethnicity			
Dutch	37	52,9%	36,2%
Netherlands Antilles & Surinam	17	24,3%	16,5%
Mediterranean	5	7,1%	16,3%
Other European countries	5	7,1%	18,1%
Other non-western countries	6	8,6%	11,7%
$\chi^2(4; N=70) = 17,464, p = 0,002$			
Marital status			
Married	7	10,0%	
Unmarried	33	47,1%	
Divorced	6	8,6%	
Living together	3	4,3%	
Single	13	18,6%	

Table 1 shows that the clients of SurAnt are a good representation of the total number of detainees in the Netherlands for gender and age. However, the clients of SurAnt are not a good reflection of the total population, when looking at ethnicity. Most than half of the clients of SurAnt had a Dutch ethnicity, while only one third of all the detainees in the Netherlands have a Dutch ethnicity. Furthermore, Table 1 shows that most clients of SurAnt were unmarried (47,1%). Therefore, it is not striking that only 29,5 percent of the clients indicated that they had children.

On average, the clients of SurAnt had an detention time longer than one year (17,4 months), with one month as the lowest amount of detention time and approximately 18 years (219 months) as the highest amount of detention time. The average detention time of the clients of SurAnt is very high compared with the average detention time of all the adult detainees in the Netherlands. In the Netherlands, adult detainees are on average detained for 103 days (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen, 2017). However, it is worth mentioning that the amount of detention time was unknown for almost half of the clients of SurAnt (48,6%).

Most clients indicated that they had no mental or physical health problems (61,4%). Four clients indicated that they had both mental and physical health problems (5,7%). Additionally, 17,1 percent indicated that they had physical health problems and 10,0 percent indicated that they had mental health problems. Furthermore, most clients indicated that they had no addiction (82,9%), only 1 out of 5 clients of SurAnt indicated that they had an addiction. Compared to the average percentage (60,0%) of all detainees in the Netherlands with an addiction (NOS, 2017), the percentage clients of SurAnt with an addiction is quite low.

5.2 Sub-question 1: how extensive are the problems of former detainees concerning employment, housing and debt?

Table 2 shows the distribution of the kind of problems the clients of SurAnt have. Problems related to all areas, employment, housing and debt, were among the clients of SurAnt most common (25,7%). In contrast, problems related to both employment and debt were least common (4,3%).

Table 2. Percentage of clients with problems related to employment, housing and debt

	N	%
Employment only	13	18,6 %
Housing only	12	17,1 %
Debt only	7	10,0 %
Employment and housing	5	7,1 %
Employment and debt	3	4,3%
Housing and debt	12	17,1%
Employment, housing and debt	18	25,7%
Total	70	100%

Table 3 shows what type of problems clients of SurAnt had. The table shows that 7 clients indicated that they had paid work, but wanted to change their job. The three main reasons clients were not satisfied with their job were that they could not work enough hours, were working on an irregular basis and had to travel too much. Additionally, Table 3 shows that 4,3 percent of the clients with problems related to housing indicated that they had their own place to live. One of those clients was not satisfied with their current housing situation, due to the fact that he/she had roommates. The other client indicated that he/she wanted to get ownership of the house of his/her parents and needed help to arrange this. Lastly, Table 3 shows that all clients that indicated that they had problems related with debt, also had a debt. Due to the fact that most clients did not have an overview of their debt, the amount of debt was often unknown. For the few clients of whom the total amount of debt was known, the amount varied between five hundred and twenty thousand euros. It is striking that more clients had a payment arrangement than a clear overview of their debt. The dossiers show that most payment arrangements were made for the Centraal Justitiele Incassobureau (CJIB). The CJIB is an executive organization of the Ministry of Justice and Security that deals with the collection of imposed fines and the settlement of criminal matters (Centraal Justitiele Incassobureau, 2018). I think it is likely that those payment arrangement were made when the clients were still in detention, due to the fact that CJIB is an executive organization of the Ministry of Justice and Security.

Table 3. Type of the problems

	N	%
Employment	39	
No paid job	32	82,1%
Paid job	7	17,9%
Housing	47	
Homeless	45	95,7%
Own place to live	2	4,3%
Debt	40	
Having a debt	40	100,0%
Overview of debt	6	15,0%
Payment arrangement	14	37,5%

5.3 Sub-question 2: what kind of services does SurAnt offer to aid former detainees with their problems concerning employment, housing and debt?

First, with help of the dossiers of the clients, I will examine which practical help is offered. Secondly, I will examine to what extent the services offered by SurAnt matches with the three theoretical perspectives that I used to explain the reintegration process of former detainees.

5.3.1 Practical help offered by SurAnt

The 70 clients that had an intake with SurAnt in 2017 had in total 307 appointments afterwards. The minimum amount of appointments for a client was 0 appointments and the maximum amount of appointments was 32 appointments. On average the clients of SurAnt had 4 appointments per client. Table 4 shows the amount of appointments per problem subject. Table 4 shows that clients with problems related to housing and debt had on average the most appointments (8). Clients with problems related to solely employment or solely housing had, on average, the least appointments (2). As is shown in Table 4, clients with a combination of problems had on average more appointments than clients with problems related to solely one area.

Table 4. Appointments per problem subject

	Mean	Min	Max	N
Employment	2	0	4	13
Housing	2	1	6	12
Debt	3	1	13	7
Combination employment and housing	4	2	8	5
Combination employment and debt	5	1	8	3
Combination housing and debt	8	0	32	12
Combination employment, housing and debt	5	1	22	18
Total				70

Table 5 shows which services SurAnt offered to all their clients with issues related to employment, housing and debt. Table 6 shows that a lot of clients with employment issues did not receive any help from SurAnt (41,0%). The main reason that SurAnt did not aid clients with these problems is due to the fact that clients indicated that their problems related to employment had no priority. For example, a few clients indicated that their problems related to housing were more important. Table 5 also shows that the same number of clients were helped with making an online account on housing websites as with applying on housing applications. Lastly, Table 5 shows that almost half of the clients with issues related to debt were helped with creating an overview.

Table 5. Services offered to clients by SurAnt

	N	%
Employment	39	
Making or updating resumes	11	28,2%
Writing motivation letters	3	7,7%
Starting up a own business	5	12,8%
Replying for job applications	6	15,4%
Registering with an employment agency	2	5,1%
No help	16	41,0%
Housing	47	
Making an online account on a housing website	15	31,9%
Applying on housing applications	15	31,9%
Applying for housing urgency at the governance	2	4,3%
Arranging emergency shelter	5	10,6%
Referring clients to external partners	4	8,5%
No help	18	38,3%
Debt	40	
Creating an overview of their debt	18	45,0%
Arranging a new payment arrangement	11	27,5%
Helping clients to pay their payment arrangement	1	2,5%
Referring clients to external partners	3	7,5%
No help	9	22,5%

5.3.2 Link with the literature

The social learning theory states that new patterns of behavior can be learned by experiencing or by observing behavior of others (Bandura, 1971). This means that employees of SurAnt can teach former detainees new patterns of behavior by leading by example. Since learned behavior of the detainees cannot be examined by using the dossiers, I used the interviews to examine to what extent the social learning theory is applied in the work method of SurAnt. During the interviews I asked the clients to what extent they had learned things from SurAnt

employees. All clients indicated that they learned more practical things from SurAnt employees. An example is:

"I also learned how to present myself during a job interview. That during a job interview you actually have to talk to someone and you cannot have a bad attitude. The first impression counts. So, you have to talk well."

Two clients also indicated that they had learned more than just practical things from the employees of SurAnt. A client said the following about this:

"Yes uhm, yes. I can now uhm, write the right things in letters, for example. Now, I also dare to write those letters. I uhm, yes, I also stick to appointments and uhm people make many appointments with me."

This client indicated that he/she not only learned how to write letters but also that he/she now dares to write those letters. This can be linked to self-efficacy. Another client said the following about self-efficacy:

"I have learned a lot. I have also learned that I can do it myself. For example, I made a motivation letter, all by myself."

The social bond theory states that individuals are restrained from engaging in deviant behavior through their social bonds with society (Hirschi, 1969). A way in which SurAnt can implement the social bond theory in their work method is by creating a bond between their employees and clients. I used the dossiers to examine if clients are consistently helped by the same employee, allowing clients to build a more personal bond with this employee. The data shows that on average the clients had 2 employees helping them. The data shows that 76,1 percent of the clients had the same employee helping them, with whom they could build a more personal bond.

From the five clients that were interviewed, three indicated that they were constantly helped by the same employee. These clients all stated that they experienced this very positively. The following was said about it:

"The same person, because I am someone who, because I am quite... I wanted to have one person myself. Not different people. I do not like that. But I did have someone there who I could really trust. And that really helped me. I could tell her everything."

From the clients who were not helped by the same employee, only one indicated that they rather would be helped by the same employee:

“Yes, actually, that's what I wanted. Always being helped by the same person.”

The transformation theory states that former detainees can only successfully reintegrate into the society if they want to change and are motivated to change (Giordano et al., 2002). A way I examined if the transformation theory is applied in the work method, is by studying the dossiers and researching if detainees had received assignments to do by themselves at home. By giving former detainees homework, they learn that they also need to do things themselves. The data shows that 10,0 percent of the clients got homework from employees. An example of this was looking and applying for houses or applying on job applications. Additionally, I examined to what extent clients undertake actions themselves or have a wait-and-see attitude. The data shows that 23 clients (32,9%) also undertake actions themselves. Examples of those actions are calling organizations themselves or creating an account for a housing website by themselves.

Only one client said something during the interview that can be related to the transformation theory. The client mentioned that the employees of SurAnt helped him/her to follow a legal path:

“Yes, just someone who will help you walk a certain path, because you are doing already very good on your own.”

5.4 Sub-question 3: to what extent do the services offered by SurAnt match with the needs of the former detainee?

This sub-question will be answered by looking at which results the services offered by SurAnt have achieved. Table 7 shows the results SurAnt achieved for her clients.

Before answering this sub-question, I think it is important to mention that it is possible that some clients ended the aid from SurAnt before their problems were solved. Some clients could decide by themselves that they did not want or need any help from SurAnt anymore. Therefore, SurAnt could not help them fully. There is however no information about these dropouts in the data. Additionally, a lot of clients are still being helped by SurAnt in 2018. However, the results SurAnt obtained in 2018 are not included in this research.

Table 6 shows that SurAnt achieved results for 6 clients with employment issues. However, 19 clients from SurAnt with employment issues are still being aided by SurAnt in 2018. So, of the 20 clients that only received help from SurAnt in 2017, 30 percent achieved results for employment issues. The same goes for clients with housing and debt issues. So, of the clients that only received help from SurAnt in 2017, 23,3 percent achieved results for their housing issues and 58,3 percent achieved results for their problems related to debt.

Table 6. Results SurAnt achieved

	N	%
Employment	39	
Finding (new) work	4	10,3%
Getting a job interview	2	5,1%
Housing	47	
Finding a (new) place to live	4	8,5%
Referred to external partners	3	6,4%
Debt	40	
Debt is decreased	10	25,0%
Debt is waived	1	2,5%
Referred to external partners	3	7,5%

5.5 Sub-question 4: to what extent are former detainees satisfied with the services provided by SurAnt?

The goal of the fourth empirical sub-question is to examine to what extent clients that were helped by SurAnt are satisfied with the help they received. Additionally, I examined if previous clients of SurAnt would ask SurAnt for aid again when they encounter any new problems. To answer this sub-question I conducted five semi-structured interviews.

All five clients were very satisfied with the help SurAnt gave them. One clients even compared SurAnt with the church, namely people who helped him/her without prejudice:

“I think it is just like, just like, in the church or something like that. That, uhm, those people do not have an opinion of me. They are very social and they asked me very nicely what I needed help with. They just said that they wanted to help me. The feeling was just right. I noticed that. Do you understand that?”

Another client said the following about the help he/she received by SurAnt:

“Interviewer: How did you experience this help? Client: As very nice. ~ we were helped by [name employee] and [name employee] and they both did their best. Both on an official level as a social level. They were interested and, well how can I describe this. I just appreciated their help. They just really thought along with me.”

Additionally, all clients indicated that they had no point of improvement for SurAnt, the only thing one client had to say about the subject was the following:

“Interviewer: Can you think of a point of improvement for SurAnt, something they can do better in the future? Client: Uhm. I think they can

promote themselves more. I think more people, like me, can really benefit from their help.”

The client had as point of improvement that SurAnt could promote herself more. In this manner, more people would know about the organisation and receive the help they needed.

From the four clients that received aid from SurAnt only in 2017, all clients stated that they would contact SurAnt again when they needed help. Two respondents even indicated during the interview that they wanted to make another appointment. A respondent said the following about this:

“I already sent a few e-mails to SurAnt. I did this, because I want to come to SurAnt again. So, I send those e-mails to get help.

6. Conclusion

Compared to twenty other countries, the Netherlands is one of the countries with the highest recidivism rates (Fazel & Wolf, 2015). Nearly 50 percent of the detainees who have been released end within two years up in detention again (Rijksoverheid, 2018). As there is a lot of criticism about the Dutch reintegration policy (RSJ, 2017), I analyzed non governmental support provided by SurAnt. The main research question is: *“To what extent does the support offered by SurAnt help former detainees to successfully reintegrate?”* I focused solely on reintegration problems related to employment, housing and debt because previous research (Davis et al., 2013; Evans, 2014; Willis, 2016) shows that these areas are very important for the successful reintegration of former detainees.

To help answer the main research question four sub-questions were drawn up. I will now give a short summary of the main results. First of all, the results show that most clients of SurAnt have problems related to a combination of two or three of the areas (54,3%). 13 clients (18,6%) had problems solely related to employment. 12 clients (17,1%) had problems solely related to housing and only 7 clients (10,0%) had problems solely related to debt. From the clients with problems related to employment, 82,1 percent had no paid work and 17,9 percent did have paid work. 68,1 percent of the clients was homeless. All clients with problems related to debt had a debt, from which 37,5 percent already had ongoing payment arrangements.

On average the clients of SurAnt had 4 appointments per client. The action SurAnt undertook the most to help clients with problems related to employment was making or updating clients resume. The main ways SurAnt helped clients with problems related to housing was by either helping clients to make an online account on housing websites or by helping clients to apply on housing applications. Lastly, the action SurAnt undertook the most to help clients with problems related to debt was by creating an overview of clients debt.

Additionally, the results showed that SurAnt did provide help that matches with literature that explains the successful reintegration of former detainees. For example, all five clients that were interviewed indicated that they had learned practical things from the employees of SurAnt. In addition, 76,1 percent of the clients had the same employee helping them during all their appointments, with whom the clients could build a more personal bond. Although this percentage is high, it would be better to link all clients to one specific employee. It is not clear why 32,9 percent of the clients were constantly helped by different employees. Only 10,0 percent of the clients got homework from employees and only 32,9

percent of the clients undertook actions to improve their reintegration process besides their appointments with SurAnt. This indicates that the transformation theory is implemented poorly in the work method of SurAnt.

Furthermore, the results show that from the clients that were helped for employment by SurAnt only in 2017, 30 percent achieved results. For housing, 23,3 percent of the clients that only received help from SurAnt in 2017 achieved results and for debt, this percentage was 58,3 percent.

To conclude, this research shows that SurAnt achieves results for a third of all clients that had an intake in 2017. This includes the 75,7 percent of clients that still have appointments in 2018. Additionally, all clients interviewed indicated that they were satisfied with the help SurAnt gave them. The four clients that already completed their treatment, all indicated that they would contact SurAnt when they encounter problems with an issue in their lives.

7. Discussion

This research uses both interviews and dossier research to answer the main research question. Due to the fact that this research uses a mixed methods design, the internal validity of this research is high.

One interesting finding of this mixed method research is that more than half of the clients of SurAnt (54,3%) had problems related to a combination of employment, housing and/or debt. These results are in line with a previous study, that shows that having problems could cause even more problems (Evans, 2014). For example, having a debt limits the ability of former detainees to obtain housing and employment (Evans, 2014). In addition, having no paid work which could provide a sufficient income, could cause difficulties to find proper housing (Beerthuisen et al., 2015). Being over indebted, could also have an effect on the psychological wellbeing of former detainees, making it more difficult to solve their problems themselves (Evans, 2014). Another interesting finding is that clients with problems related to debt achieved more often (58,3%) results with the aid of SurAnt more often (58,3 %), than clients with problems related to employment (30,0%) or housing (23,3%). A possible reason explaining this difference in success rate is that achieving result for problems related to debt is easier than for employment and housing. Both the debtor as the indebted are happy that the debt will decrease. Achieving results for employment or housing is more difficult, due to the fact that multiple variables must be taken into account. For example, to find a new place to live, the availability of houses, income of the client and the demands of the client must be taken into account. Another interesting finding is that only half of the clients with issues related to debt were helped with creating an overview of their debt, while 85,0 percent of the clients with problems related to debt indicated that they had no overview of their debt.

This research has some limitations. One limitation of this research is that it is possible that the dossiers do not contain all information. The dossiers of clients are written by different employees of SurAnt and it could be the case that different employees write down different information. For example, some employees might emphasize in the treatment forms what still needs to be done to help the client, while other employees might emphasize the accomplishments they have made together with the client. So it is possible that some information about the help SurAnt offered is missing. Another limitation is that the dossiers do not elaborate why and when clients leave SurAnt. It is not known if clients leave SurAnt because they solved all their problems and have the tools to successful reintegrate into the society or leave SurAnt because they see crime as a better way to live their lives. It is also

possible that clients of SurAnt leave the organization because they have become detained again. The reasons why clients leave SurAnt could provide insight in things that SurAnt could improve. Lastly, the fact that only five clients of SurAnt were interviewed, is a limitation. Although, nineteen clients were approached only five clients were willing to participate. Therefore, it could be that only the clients that were positive about SurAnt wanted to be interviewed and help the organization grow. Additionally, it is possible that the people who were interviewed answered in a socially desirable way and were afraid to answer questions truthfully. Of course, this study has tried to prevent this effect. For example, by telling the clients that it is important to answer the questions as honest as possible.

I will also give two recommendations for future research. Although this research only focusses on reintegration problems related to employment, housing and debt, SurAnt also provides aid in the areas of income, care and governmental affairs, it is interesting to examine to what extent SurAnt helps former detainees in those reintegration areas. It could be that former detainees problems in those areas prioritize, which could cause different outcomes. Additionally, this research only focusses on the reintegration centers from SurAnt outside the penitentiary institutions, while SurAnt is also present in eight reintegration centrums within the penitentiary institutions. It would be interesting to not only examine the effectiveness of the reintegration centrums outside the penitentiary institutions, but also inside the penitentiary institutions. Due to the fact that the reintegration centers within the penitentiary institutions have more strict rules about how to help detainees and what is allowed to do, this could cause different outcomes.

8. Policy recommendations

Based on the results of this research, I will give three recommendations. The first recommendation is to match all clients consistently during the length of the treatment with one or two employees. Secondly, SurAnt should give clients tasks that they need to do before the next appointment. Lastly, SurAnt should better keep track of why and when clients leave.

First, this research shows that 76,1 percent of the clients had the same employee helping them. With those employees, clients can build a bond and are therefore less likely to engage in criminal behavior (Bahr et al., 2010). The clients who were interviewed and were helped by the same employee all indicated that they experienced this as very positive. Therefore, my first recommendation is to match every client with the same one or two employees. In this way, the clients can develop a social bond with this employee. Due to this social bond, the clients will consider the prospects of losing the association with this employee before engaging in criminal behavior (Bahr et al., 2010). In other words, the clients will be less likely to engage in criminal behavior, because they do not want to let the employee down.

Various previous research (Brown & Ross, 2010; Lewis, Maguire, Raynor, Vanstone & Vennard, 2007) has shown that matching a social worker or volunteer to a former detainee can have actual effects in the life of the detainee. Building a social bond with a so called 'buddy' can influence a former detainees positively in four different areas; (1) psychological benefits, such as being more confident and a decrease of stress, (2) social communicative benefits, such as being better able to build social contacts, (3) personal development, such as more faith in their own positive future and (4) broadening horizons, such as having new interests and hobbies or doing volunteer work (van der Tier & Potting, 2015).

Second, this research shows that only 10,0 percent of the clients of SurAnt got certain tasks to do at home. Additionally, only 32,9 percent of the clients undertook actions to improve their reintegration process besides their appointments with SurAnt. The transformation theory (Giordano et al., 2002) states that former detainees can only successfully reintegrate into society if they want to change and are motivated to change. By giving detainees homework, they learn that they need to do things themselves when they want to reintegrate successfully into the society. Because of this, the former detainees develop a certain readiness to change. Rumgay (2004) states that former detainees are more likely to adopt a more prosocial identity if they perceive a possibility to change, which making homework can give them.

Research (Boven, Keizer & Tiemeijer, 2017) shows that the Dutch society makes high demands on citizen's self-reliance. Promoting former detainees to become more self-reliant and to develop a certain will to change therefore is a necessary aspect for returning to Dutch society. Additionally, people who are self-reliant often think more positive about their future, feel more useful and are, in general, happier and more positive (de Jong et al., 2016). Therefore, my second recommendation is that the employees of SurAnt give clients little tasks that they need to do before the next appointment. Additionally, the employees need to actively encourage clients to undertake actions to improve their reintegration process by themselves.

Lastly, as stated above, the dossiers of SurAnt do not explain when and why clients leave SurAnt. The reason why and time clients leave SurAnt could provide insight in things that SurAnt could improve. Therefore, my last recommendation is for SurAnt to better keep track of why and when clients leave. There are several ways in which they can implement this recommendation. First, SurAnt could implement exit interviews with their clients. When a client indicates that they want to leave, SurAnt could have an evaluative interview with them to ask why they wanted to leave and in which way they could possibly help more. Second, SurAnt could call clients a week after they left to ask if they need any further support. By doing so, SurAnt provides clients with an easy way to ask for help. Additionally, SurAnt knows with certainty that they helped the client as well as they could. It is however very important that those calls and exit interviews are well documented in the dossiers of the clients.

9. Literature list

- Abowitz, D. A., & Toole, T. M. (2009). Mixed method research: Fundamental issues of design, validity, and reliability in construction research. *Journal of construction engineering and management*, 136(1), 108-116.
- Aebi, M. F., Tiago, M. M. & Burkhardt, C. (2016). SPACE I – Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics: Prison populations. Survey 2015. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Retrieved from: http://wp.unil.ch/space/files/2017/04/SPACE_I_2015_FinalReport_161215_REV170425.pdf
- Agnew, R. (2005). *Why do criminals offend? A general theory of crime and delinquency*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Bahr, S. J., Harris, L., Fisher, J. K., & Harker Armstrong, A. (2010). Successful reentry: What differentiates successful and unsuccessful parolees?. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 54(5), 667-692.
- Bandura, A. (1971). Social learning theory. Retrieved from: http://www.asecib.ase.ro/mps/Bandura_SocialLearningTheory.pdf
- Beerthuizen, M. G. C. J., Beijersbergen, K. A., Noordhuizen, S., & Weijters, G. (2015). Cahier 2015-11. Vierde meting van de monitor nazorg ex-gedetineerden. Retrieved from: https://www.wodc.nl/binaries/cahier-2015-11-volledige-tekst_tcm28-73365.pdf
- Behrens, A. (2004). Less than the average citizen?: Stigma, role transition and the civic reintegration of convicted felons. *After crime and punishment: Pathways to offender reintegration*, 261. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Christopher_Uggen2/publication/242366209_27Less_than_the_average_citizen%27_Stigma_role_transition_and_the_civic_reintegration_of_convicted_felons/links/00b495314c15bf2422000000.pdf
- Benson, M. L., Alarid, L. F., Burton, V. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2011). Reintegration or stigmatization? Offenders' expectations of community re-entry. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(5), 385-393.
- Boeije, H. (2005). *Analyseren in kwalitatief onderzoek*. Amsterdam, Nederland: Boom Lemma Uitgevers.
- Bovens, M., Keizer, A. G., & Tiemeijer, W. (2017). Weten is nog geen doen: Een realistisch perspectief op redzaamheid. *WRR Rapporten aan de Regering*, (97).
- Bradford, D. W., Jette, A. M., & Hernandez, C. J. (2012). Issues in defining and measuring

- veteran community reintegration: Proceedings of the working group on community reintegration, VA rehabilitation outcomes conference, Miami, Florida. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and development*, 49(1), 87.
- Brown, M. & Ross, S. (2010). Mentoring, social capital and desistance: a study of women released from prison. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 43(1): 31-50.
- Byrne, C. F., & Trew, K. J. (2008). Pathways through crime: The development of crime and desistance in the accounts of men and women offenders. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 47, 238-258.
- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. (2016). Minder gedetineerden in gevangenis. Retrieved from: <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2016/49/minder-gedeteneerden-in-gevangenis>
- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. (2017). Gedetineerden; geslacht, leeftijd en herkomstgroepering. Retrieved from: <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=82321ned&D1=a&D2=0&D3=0&D4=a&D5=7-11&HDR=G1,G2,G4&STB=T,G3&VW=T>
- Centraal Justitieel Incassobureau. (2018). Wat is het CJIB. Retrieved from: <https://www.cjib.nl/wat-het-cjib>
- Davis, C., Bahr, S. J., & Ward, C. (2013). The process of offender reintegration: Perceptions of what helps prisoners reenter society. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 13(4), 446-469. Retrieved from: <http://journals.sagepub.com.proxy.library.uu.nl/doi/full/10.1177/1748895812454748>
- de Jong, B. J., Willems, P. J. H., & Torregrosa, L. D. R. 2016. Zelfredzaamheid in detentie. Retrieved from: <file:///C:/Users/Julia/Downloads/tk-bijlage-zelfredzaamheid-in-detentie.pdf>
- Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen. (2016). Meer eigen verantwoordelijkheid en zelfredzaamheid gedetineerden. Retrieved from: <https://www.dji.nl/nieuws/nieuwsbericht/meer-eigen-verantwoordelijkheid-en-zelfredzaamheid-gedeteneerden.aspx>
- Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen. (2017). Dit is DJI. In cijfers en feiten gebaseerd op 2016. Retrieved from: https://www.dji.nl/binaries/LR_103353_ditisDJI_NL_tcm41-121756.pdf
- Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen. (2017). Dit is DJI. In cijfers en feiten gebaseerd op 2016. Retrieved from: https://www.dji.nl/binaries/LR_103353_ditisDJI_NL_tcm41-121756.pdf

- Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen. (2018). Over DJI. Retrieved from: <https://www.dji.nl/over-dji/>
- Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen. (2018b). Aan de slag met re-integratie. Retrieved from: <https://www.dji.nl/justitiabelen/volwassenen-in-detentie/re-integratie/aan-de-slag-met-re-integratie.aspx>
- Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen. (2018c). Detentie- en re-integratieplan. Retrieved from: <https://www.dji.nl/justitiabelen/volwassenen-in-detentie/re-integratie/detetie-en-re-integratieplan.aspx>
- Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen. (2018d). Re-integratie Centrum (RIC). Retrieved from: <https://www.dji.nl/justitiabelen/volwassenen-in-detentie/re-integratie/re-integratie-centrum-ric.aspx>
- Evans, D. (2014). The debt penalty: Exposing the financial barriers to offender reintegration. Retrieved from: https://jpo.wrlc.org/bitstream/handle/11204/3755/The%20Debt%20Penalty_Exposing%20the%20Financial%20Barriers%20to%20Offender%20Reintegration.pdf?sequence=3
- Fazel, S., & Wolf, A. (2015). A systematic review of criminal recidivism rates worldwide: current difficulties and recommendations for best practice. *PloS one*, *10*(6), e0130390. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4472929/>
- Gertner, N. (2003). Videoconferencing: Learning Through Screens. *Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J.*, *12*, 769.
- Ginsberg, Y., Hirvikoski, T., & Lindefors, N. (2010). Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) among longer-term prison inmates is a prevalent, persistent and disabling disorder. *BMC psychiatry*, *10*(1), 112.
- Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S. A., & Rudolph, J. A. (2002). Gender, crime, and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, *107*, 880-1064.
- Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A., Lavelle, B., & McPherson, W. (2004). Variables affecting successful reintegration as perceived by offenders and professionals. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *40*(1-2), 147-171. Retrieved from: http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.library.uu.nl/doi/pdf/10.1300/J076v40n01_08
- Heilbron, J. (2005). *Wetenschappelijk onderzoek: dilemma's en verleidingen (2e druk)*. Amsterdam, Nederland: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen.
- Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2003). *Shared beginnings, divergent lives: Delinquent boys to age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lewis, S., Maguire, M., Raynor, P., Vanstone, M. & Vennard, J. (2007). *What works in*

- resettlement? Findings from seven pathfinders for short-term prisoners in England and Wales. *Criminology and criminal justice*, 7(1): 33-53.
- Mallik-Kane, K., & Visher, C. A. (2008). *Health and prisoner reentry: How physical, mental, and substance abuse conditions shape the process of reintegration* (p. 82). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center.
- Maruna, S., & Immarigeon, R. (Eds.). (2013). *After crime and punishment*. Routledge.
- McAlinden, A. (2005). The use of shame with sexual offenders. *British Journal of Criminology*, 45, 373-394.
- Nieuwebeerta, P. (2007). *Gevangenisstraf, levenslopen en criminele carrières*. Utrecht: Universiteit Utrecht.
- Nieuwsuur. (2017). Rapport: re-integratie gedetineerden schiet ernstig tekort. Retrieved from: <https://nos.nl/nieuwsuur/artikel/2196255-rapport-reintegratie-gedetineerden-schiet-ernstig-tekort.html>
- NOS. (2017). Eigen keuken, eigen douche, eigen sleutel: de gevangenis anno 2017. Retrieved from: <https://nos.nl/nieuwsuur/artikel/2199364-eigen-keuken-eigen-douche-eigen-sleutel-de-gevangenis-anno-2017.html>
- Nu.nl. (2017). Hulp na vrijlating gevangene schiet tekort door gebrekkige samenwerking. Retrieved from: <https://www.nu.nl/algemeen/4950431/hulp-vrijlating-gevangene-schiet-tekort-gebrekkige-samenwerking.html>
- Raad voor Strafrechttoepassing en Jeugdbescherming (RSJ). (2017). Van detineren naar re-integreren. Retrieved from: https://www.rsj.nl/binaries/Advies%20Van%20detineren%20naar%20re-integreren_tcm26-283592.pdf
- Rekenkamer Amersfoort. (2017). Rekenkameronderzoek. Nazorg: terugkeer van ex-gedetineerden in de Amersfoortse samenleving. Retrieved from: <https://www.bmc.nl/Eindrapport%20rekenkameronderzoek%20Nazorg%20terugkeer%20van%20ex-gedetineerden%20in%20de%20Amersfoortse%20samenleving.pdf>
- Rijksoverheid. (2018). Recidive verminderen. Retrieved from: <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/recidive/verminderen-recidive>
- Rijksoverheid. (2018b). Hoe is de re-integratie en nazorg voor gevangenen geregeld? Retrieved from: <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/recidive/vraag-en-antwoord/hoe-is-de-nazorg-voor-gedetineerden-geregeld>
- Rumgay, J. (2004). Scripts for safer survival: Pathways out of female crime. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43, 405-419.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 609-627.

- Schmidt, C. (2004). The analysis of semi-structured interviews. *A companion to qualitative research*, 253-258. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305496229_Wolff_in_Flick_et_a#page=268
- So, J. (2014). 'Fighting a war alone': reintegration of ex-offenders from ethnic minority groups. *China Journal of Social Work*, 7(1), 64-77. Doi: 10.1080/17525098.2014.882791
- Spjeldnes, S., & Goodkind, S. (2009). Gender differences and offender reentry: A review of the literature. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 48(4), 314-335.
- SurAnt. (2017). Werkprotocol SurAnt 2017-2018. Amsterdam: author.
- SurAnt. (2018). SurAnt biedt gratis hulpverlening aan gedetineerden en ex-gedetineerden. Retrieved from: <http://www.surant.nu/>
- Terry, C. M. (2003). *The fellas: Overcoming prison and addiction*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Tier, M. van der, & Potting, M. (2015). Een maatje voor iedereen?. Een wetenschappelijke basis onder de methode maatjesproject. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305303527_Een_maatje_voor_iedereen_Een_wetenschappelijke_basis_onder_de_methode_maatjesproject
- Weijters, G., Verweij, S. & Tollenaar, N. (2017). Recidive onder justitiabelen in Nederland. Een verslag over de periode 2004 tot en met 2016. Retrieved from: https://www.wodc.nl/binaries/FS2017-5_2768_tcm28-299134.pdf
- Willis, M. (2016). Supported Housing for Prisoners Returning to the Community: a review of the literature. Retrieved from: http://assets.justice.vic.gov.au/corrections/resources/19acadf4-576b-4fd8-9158-b3c3248a6c77/supported_housing_prisoners2016.pdf
- Wormith, J. S., Althouse, R., Simpson, M., Reitzel, L. R., Fagan, T. J., & Morgan, R. D. (2007). The rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders: The current landscape and some future directions for correctional psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(7), 879-892.

10. Appendixes

Appendix A: Intake form

Persoonsgegevens

Achternaam Voornaam Geslacht Man Vrouw

Geboortedatum Geboorteplaats Burgelijkestaat

Godsdienst Nationaliteit Legitimatie Identiteitsbewijs Paspoort Verlijf

BSN Nummer Digid Ja Nee Rijbewijs

Adresgegevens

Woonadres Postcode Woonplaats

Postadres Telefoon Nr Emailadres

Detentiegegevens

Detentieperiode van ... tot en met ... Delict

Inrichting/PI bij Binnen RIC bezocht Ja Nee

Familiegegevens

Gezins samenstelling Contact familie Vaak Soms Nooit

Financiële gegevens

Inkomen/Salaris Ja Nee

Uitkerings situatie WW WVB Wajong WIA AOW

Toeslagen Huur Zorg Langdurigheid Kindgebonden budget

Schulden bij

Betalings regeling Ja Nee Rekening Nummer

Gezondheid

Verzekerd Ja Nee

Belemmeringen Lichamelijk Psychisch

Verslaving Alcohol Drugs Overig

Belemmering toelichting

Verslaving toelichting

Aanmeldingsgegevens

Traject begeleider Verwijzer

Contact door Datum aanmelding

Bijzonderheden

Appendix B: Treatment form

Naam *

Categorie Wonen Werk Inkomen Schulden Zorg Overig

Datum aanmelding ?

Hulpvraag *

Appendix C: Topic list**Introduction**

Good day, do I speak to [name respondent]? My name is Julia from Stichting SurAnt and I am conducting an evaluation study about this foundation. I am examining to what extent clients of Stichting SurAnt are satisfied with the help they got and what Stichting SurAnt can improve. Can I ask you a few questions about the help you received from Stichting SurAnt, this will take around fifteen minutes?

I would like to thank you in advance for participating in this research. Before we begin, I like to go through a few things first. First of all, I want to assure you that you will remain anonymous during and after this interview. Your name and personal information will not be shared and is only known to me. Secondly, I would like to ask permission to record this interview. This makes it easier for me to use the interview later on in the research. The recording will not be shared with others. Are you willing to give permission for the recording and use of this interview?

As mentioned earlier, this research is to improve Stichting SurAnt. It is therefore important that you answer the questions as honest as possible.

1. Situation before treatment

1. Is it true that in 2017 you were helped by SurAnt in the area of employment, housing or debt?
2. Can you tell us something about your situation before you were helped by SurAnt?
 - Where did you need help with?
 - How did you end up in that situation?
3. How did you come in contact with SurAnt?

Employment

1. How long were you unemployed?
2. To what extent did not having a job affect your daily life?
3. How did you feel about not having a job?

Housing

1. How long were you homeless?
2. To what extent did being homeless affect your daily life?
3. How did you feel about having no home?

Debts

1. How long did you have debts?
2. How much did a debt affect your daily life?
3. How did you feel about having a debt?

2. Treatment from Stichting SurAnt

1. How has Stichting SurAnt helped to improve your situation?

Social learning

1. To what extent have you learned things from the employees of SurAnt?
2. Did you learned from employees of Stichting SurAnt how to solve problems yourself?
 - Yes: Can you give an example of this? / No: why?
3. To what extent have you been stimulated by SurAnt to do things yourself?
 - What did you think of that?

Social bond theory

1. Have you always been helped by the same employee?
 - What did you think of that?

Cognitive transformation theory

1. To what extent did the employees of Stichting SurAnt motivate you to change your life?

- Why / how?

2. To what extent did SurAnt give you the opportunity to change your life?

3. Evaluation SurAnt

1. To what extent has SurAnt helped you with your situation?

2. How did you experience the help of SurAnt?

- What was nice?

- What was less pleasant?

3. Are there things that SurAnt should have done differently?

4. Was the help Stichting SurAnt offered in line with your expectation?

5. Why did you stop going to appointments of Stichting SurAnt?

4. Current situation

1. Can you tell me something about your current daily life?

- Work / debts / housing?

2. If you need help, would you approach Stichting SurAnt again?

5. End

1. Do you want to add something to the interview?

2. Do you have any further questions?