



A SURVEY OF RECIDIVISM RESEARCH IN  
THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

105524

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by  
Massachusetts Department of  
Corrections

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Prepared by:

Dallas Miller  
Research Assistant

105524

NCJRS

MAY 29 1987

ACQUISITIONS

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Michael V. Fair  
Commissioner

July, 1984

PUBLICATION #: 13709

Approved by Daniel Carter, State Purchasing Agent

105524

Abstract

This study presents the results of a survey of recidivism research being conducted in the United States and Canada. The purpose is first to describe the recidivism research done in other correctional agencies and second to place research done in Massachusetts in the context of this overall research picture. The description of the research is in terms of both official definitions of recidivism used by the various agencies and the manner in which those definitions are operationalized. Each of the 67 correctional agencies contacted for this survey responded. Twenty of those agencies conducted no recidivism research; fourteen only collected data on prior incarcerations or commitments to the agency; and thirty-three conducted follow-up research on returns after release from the agency. The essential differences between research on returns and research on commitments are elaborated, and a more detailed description of the research on returns is presented.

A Survey of Recidivism Research In  
The United States and Canada

One major thrust of corrections research for over a decade in Massachusetts has been in the area of recidivism: How many inmates released from state correctional facilities are subsequently reconfined in either Massachusetts facilities or in correctional facilities elsewhere. This research has been found useful in the formulation of policy matters, in the making of program decisions and in the measurement of the effects of community corrections programs on the reintegration of offenders. In aiming to improve this research, there arose questions about the recidivism research efforts undertaken by other corrections agencies. An understanding of research conducted elsewhere may be valuable in the continuing re-evaluation of the recidivism research effort in Massachusetts.

The variability in definitions of recidivism was recognized by James A. McCafferty in "Can We Find a Standard Statistical Definition for Recidivism". McCafferty (1958; 200) first defines recidivism as "the number of prisoners imprisoned more than once", then declares that "generally everyone agrees with this basic definition", but finally reports "little agreement as to what will be counted as evidence of

recidivism". If this observation is true, then what are the different approaches to recidivism?

If the basic definitional agreement exists but operational agreement does not, then a variety of approaches to recidivism should exist within a general overall framework. This variability in operationalizing definitions of recidivism can provide a rich source of ideas, a cross-fertilization of research efforts, or it can isolate those efforts and insulate them from each other. These variations become a problem only if they go unrecognized in the interpretation of the results of research. Since recidivism research is used by correctional administrators in a variety of ways (program decisions, evaluation measures, etc.) a variety of operational definitions and conceptual approaches may be essential.<sup>1</sup>

In view of the variability associated with recidivism research, the present study is being done first to discover what other corrections agencies are doing and planning in regard to this type of research and second to place Massachusetts' efforts in the context of the research efforts of these other agencies. The focus of this attempt will be on the various definitions of recidivism and on the methodological strategies used by the different agencies in operationalizing those those definitions. This study will present an overview of recidivism

---

<sup>1</sup>Ralph W. England (1962; 240) in a summary of some of the problems in developing comparable recidivism measures, finds the variability of research criteria unfortunate. He favors "the use of generally accepted standards", rather than recidivism criteria which fit the particular use of the particular study.

research being conducted by correctional agencies throughout the United States and Canada, focusing on conceptual approaches to the basic definition of recidivism and on operational approaches to the evidence of recidivism. No attempt will be made to construct "ideal" approaches from the survey responses and nothing contained in this report is intended as such.

### Methodology

In an attempt to present a coherent picture of conceptual and operational strategies being used by other correctional agencies, this study draws together information about recidivism research being conducted in the United States and Canada. A total of 67 correctional agencies were contacted in attempting to answer the following series of questions.

How many agencies conduct recidivism research?

What data do they report?

What is the official definition of recidivism?

What is the nature of the follow-up period?

What return types constitute recidivism?

What population is used in this research?

What sources of information are checked?

How often are the data gathered?

How often is a report published?

In order to answer these questions about the conceptual and operational schemes used in the research conducted by other correctional agencies, a questionnaire was constructed (see Appendix B). The questionnaire was pre-tested, revised and mailed to 67 correctional agencies in the United States and Canada, taken from the American Correctional Association Directory for 1983 (listed in Appendix A, Table 1). Along with the questionnaire went a cover letter and a sample completed package for Massachusetts including a code sheet, coding instructions and a recently completed departmental recidivism study (see Appendix B).

Questionnaires were mailed to each state correctional agency, to corrections agencies of U.S. territories and possessions, to the District of Columbia, to the U.S. Federal Bureau of Prisons, to each Canadian provincial correctional agency and to the Canadian Federal Correctional Service. After receiving replies to the initial mailing of the questionnaire, problems with those responses were resolved by telephone with the person who had completed the survey instrument. A second mailing was sent to those agencies that did not respond to the first questionnaire mailing. This procedure was repeated with non-responding agencies and with referrals to other agencies until each agency has responded. A draft of the report was circulated to all respondents, with their comments and corrections then incorporated into this final report.

Completed survey instruments were assembled from each of the 67 correctional agencies contacted. In addition 27 (57%) of the 47 agencies which responded that they conduct recidivism research included a sample of their data (reports, data sheets, etc.) with the completed questionnaire (listed in Appendix C). Data from Utah were taken from a telephone

follow-up call. California, Hawaii, New York, Puerto Rico and the Federal Bureau of Prisons included detailed coding information while Saskatchewan included a provincial correctional "Centre Intake Form".

### Data Analysis

The analysis of the data presented a number of obstacles. Of the 67 responding agencies, those who reported doing recidivism research were actually collecting two completely different sorts of data. Forty-seven agencies reported conducting recidivism research, with 33 researching returns after release from prison and 14 researching commitments to prison with prior incarcerations. The fundamental differences in the nature of these types of data require separate treatment.

These differences have been recognized in a number of works. Daniel Glaser in The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System (1964; 3-35) presents a thorough overview of the differences between these two types of research. McCafferty (1958) summarizes the problems with commitment research yet fails to distinguish forcefully between the two types of research. Both sources cite an overall figure of approximately 50% of commitments with prior incarcerations, often used as a "recidivism rate". Glaser goes further to cite an overall figure in earlier research of about one-third of all releases who are subsequently recommitted. So the "recidivism rate" varies considerably given the different types of data. In Massachusetts for example, releases

in 1980 had a recidivism rate of 26% (LeClair, 1983) while 52% of 1980 commitments had prior adult incarcerations (Holt, 1981). In this instance, the percentages that could be used to indicate repeat commitments vary by half. Both of these types of data are necessary, but they cannot be equated and are herein treated separately.

### Findings

Questionnaire responses of the 33 agencies conducting recidivism research on returns after release from prison will be examined in detail separately from a discussion of responses of the 14 agencies conducting research solely on commitments with prior incarcerations. Responses of the agencies researching commitments are treated more summarily, as the survey instrument was directed more at research on returns after release.

### Research on Commitments

Though commitment data will be excluded from the following analysis, a summary of the responses of those agencies which collect and analyze data solely on prior incarcerations of a commitment population seems useful. The research conducted by the 14 agencies basing their work on this type of data is quite different from the research conducted by those agencies basing their work on releases. Many of the questions in the questionnaire presume a release population. Research on commitments

involves no follow-up period, no types of returns and one population only; the data are typically gathered on an on-going basis as inmates are committed, and the official definition of recidivism approaches the concept from an angle incongruent with research on releases. Only seven of these fourteen agencies publish research on a regular basis, one irregularly and six not at all.

The population of commitments with prior incarcerations corresponds roughly to that portion of a population of previous releases who have been returned. Research focusing on commitment data misses those previous releases who were never returned. Data on prior incarcerations reveals nothing about successes, only failures. Without a proper perspective, comparing successes and failures, this type of research yields more limited results, results which are not comparable to follow-up recidivism research.

Florida, which responded that they conduct research on commitments only, nevertheless enclosed a draft of a study of returns completed in 1977 along with several reports outlining problems with recidivism research. Hawaii, Missouri, Texas and Virginia enclosed statistical reports which detailed the number of commitments with prior incarcerations presented in a variety of formats and with a variety of other data. Hawaii's response indicated a forthcoming study of returns of releases, currently being conducted within another agency. Of the U.S. territories and possessions, only Guam and Puerto Rico collect commitment data on prior incarcerations; none research releases. Puerto Rico, which enclosed extensive intake coding information and forms with the survey

instrument, has reports available in Spanish only.

Of the Canadian agencies, two provinces (British Columbia and Yukon) responded that they conduct recidivism research on a commitment population. Both indicated the use of a centralized computer data base. Both responded that they publish their findings, yet neither included the data in their survey response.

A number of agencies which conduct follow-up recidivism research on returns after release from custody noted that they did, additionally, collect data on prior incarcerations of commitments. One agency, for example, responded that commitment data was used "for other research and not in our 'recidivism' analyses".

#### Research on Returns

The bulk of this study will focus on those 33 agencies that conduct recidivism research directed at determining which inmates are returned after release from prison. The use of the terms "return" or "recommitment" in some cases can mean nothing more extensive than a new arrest without a conviction or a conviction resulting in probation, but as some convention is necessary, the dichotomy of return research and commitment research will be used. This usage separates the two major research contingents, even if the term "return" may include sanctions other than recommitment to prison.

Despite the terminological ambiguities, this research yields the most complete data and is conducted by a large proportion of the responding

agencies. Glaser (1964; 15) states that "the only conclusive way to find out how many men released from prison are imprisoned again is to follow for a number of years all those released in a given period...a 'cohort follow-up study'."

The responses to the questionnaire of agencies engaged in recidivism research involving a release population will be examined in an effort to answer the questions cited above. An attempt will be made to present an overall view of the conceptual and operational schemes used by the various agencies along with a summary of recidivism data extracted from the reports gathered from these agencies.

In interpreting the following, it should be noted that the more complete the information used to calculate a recidivism rate, the higher that rate will be. Longer follow-up periods, a greater number of return types constituting recidivism and a greater number of information sources checked will always lead to higher recidivism rates. While the more types of releases included in the research population may not lead to higher recidivism rates, the completeness of the research seems enhanced when all of the various release types are used. Similarly, the more often the data are gathered, the more complete the overall research effort seems, though rates should not be independently affected. These variables may be considered as constituting a matrix of completeness, with some of the variables unambiguously related to higher rates (follow-up length, return types and information sources) and others (research population, frequency data gathered; etc.) contributing to the completeness of the research findings but perhaps not contributing directly to higher recidivism rates.

How Many Agencies Conduct Recidivism Research?

Of the 67 responding agencies, 33 conducted follow-up type recidivism research on releases, 14 gathered data solely on prior felony commitments and 20 conducted no research of this type (see Appendix A, Table 1). Of the 33 agencies conducting research on releases, 29 were U.S. agencies (27 state agencies, the District of Columbia and the Federal Bureau of Prisons) and 4 were Canadian agencies (3 provincial agencies and the Canadian Federal Correctional Service). Of those 33, all but two agencies responded that the research was conducted by a research section within the agency. Only Nevada and the Canadian Correctional Service reported research conducted by their parole agencies, though the reports of a number of agencies seem to indicate that the research was conducted in ambiguous administrative settings.

Massachusetts collects data on prior commitments as well as conducting follow-up recidivism research on releases from state correctional facilities. Both types of data are generated by a research unit within the Department of Correction.

Summary of Reported Recidivism Data

Of the 33 agencies which responded that they conduct follow-up research on commitments of releases, 24 agencies indicated either that they published research or presented the data in some form that may be communicated (see Appendix A, Table 2). Data or reports were not received from two agencies

which reported publishing, leaving 22 of those 33 agencies with summary data. Included in Table 2 are data from a draft of a Florida research study on releases which was enclosed with the survey even though Florida responded that they collect commitment data only. Florida was otherwise classified as researching commitments only. Responses of those two agencies (Maine and Alberta) which did not enclose reports cannot be considered conclusive, as the publications were used to verify and to clarify responses to the survey instrument. The responses of these agencies and of the 9 agencies which indicated that they did not publish recidivism data were nonetheless classified as conducting research on release populations and were included in the analysis. (Appendix C lists all data received, regardless of format, both commitment and release research.)

The formats of these 23 sources of data (including Florida data) vary from unpublished data sheets to sections of planning documents to journal articles. Where a variety of data was received, recidivism rates calculated with one year follow-ups of releases from 1975 on were presented. Exceptions to this proved, in reality, to be the rule. Many of the reports summarized here include data and recidivism rates for a greater number of years and for longer periods of time than that presented in Table 2.

To aid in interpretation of the recidivism rates presented, release year, follow-up length and type of release are included. The release years vary from fiscal to calendar years, from 1956 to 1981 and from releases in half year periods to 2 year periods. The follow-up length varies from 3

months to 18 years. The types of release vary from specific subpopulations to all releases.

What is the Official Definition of Recidivism?

The answers to this question, central to conceptual inquiry in this survey, were quite varied. These conceptualizations involved a number of important divisions in the nature of the research, divisions inherent in the ensuing methodological discussions.

In response to the open-ended question on the survey instrument, 33 agencies reported that they investigated returns after release from prison. Twenty-two of those agencies investigated returns to the same agency only; three investigated returns to either the same or to federal custody; one used returns to the same agency or to county facilities; six counted returns to any state or county agency; and one investigated returns to any state, county or federal facility.

Special cases of definitions of recidivism could not be subsumed under the general categories. California includes among the return jurisdictions sentences to "community correctional programs". The District of Columbia specifies that the new confinement period be at least 31 days while New Hampshire specifies 60 days. Utah defines recidivism negatively: "successful completion of parole or probation is not recidivism". New Jersey defines it "as an annual percentage of the total number of persons supervised during the reporting period". Ohio which conducts research on returns to prison after release, replied that

they "try to define clearly each failure pertinent to a particular study... avoiding the term recidivism due to ambiguity". Finally, Rhode Island makes a distinction between "prison recidivism" and "total recidivism", the latter including probations, suspended and deferred sentences.

In Massachusetts, the official definition of recidivism is reincarceration for thirty days or more during the follow-up period, provided that the inmate has spent thirty days in custody prior to release from a state facility to the community. This includes those state offenders who were subsequently recommitted by parole violation or new sentence and to county facilities, state facilities, federal facilities or jail awaiting trial.

#### What is the Nature of the Follow-up Period?

The questionnaire next explored the nature of the follow-up period, the period of time for which the research agency follows the released inmate to determine whether the inmate has been reincarcerated. The follow-up period was described through several different attributes. The first item was the type of follow-up used, the number of times rates are calculated for each release cohort and whether this is routinized into a regular data base, and second was length in months of those follow-up periods.

The types of follow-up periods varied among the respondents (see Appendix A, Table 3). Seven agencies reported using a single follow-up with a fixed time period for all their recidivism research. For example,

an agency may follow the release cohort for one year only. At the end of that single follow-up period with a one-year time frame, a recidivism rate is calculated. Then the research on that release cohort is ended, and the research effort shifts to the next release cohort.

Five agencies responded that they used multiple follow-up periods with fixed time frames for each period. For example, an agency may use two follow-up periods for each release cohort, a one year and a two year time frame. The release cohort would then be followed for one year and a recidivism rate would be calculated. Then the same cohort would be followed for the next year to give a recidivism rate at two years after release. Each following release cohort would be treated exactly the same. The number of times the research is done and the recidivism rates are calculated never varies, and the number of years from release to the times when the recidivism rates are calculated does not change.

Fourteen agencies reported that the number and time frames of the follow-up periods used were variable. No routine procedure had been developed by these agencies. Seven agencies followed only supervised releases (generally paroles with a few agencies researching other supervised cases) for the length of supervision.

The lengths of these various types of follow-up periods ranged from one to over five years (see Appendix A, Table 3). With the exception of single fixed type follow-up periods, maximum lengths were used to characterize the time frames of the research. This means that in many cases, particularly in those agencies that use supervision as their follow-up type, most inmates will be followed for shorter periods of time

than the maximum cited in Table 3. The length of the follow-up period does not take into account whether the follow-up is measured from calendar year to calendar year or whether the follow-up period is calculated from the date of an individual's release. If the former rule is used, two inmates in the same release cohort, released in different months, are presented as having spent the same amount of time on release, where they in fact have different periods of time at risk.

Massachusetts research utilizes a fixed one year follow-up annual recidivism report. This routine research is supplemented by research using longer follow-up periods (up to a maximum of 5 years).

#### What Return Types Constitute Recidivism?

To discover which types of returns are considered to constitute recidivism, the survey sets forth a number of conditions and asks the respondent to check those conditions which are used in determining recidivism (see Appendix A, Table 4). Of the return types listed, eight agencies used new arrests, twenty-nine counted technical parole violations, thirty counted parole violations with new arrests, ten used new jail commitments, ten checked new county house of correction commitments, thirty used new state/province commitments, thirteen counted new federal commitments, eight used jailed awaiting trial and six agencies counted new probations as conditions constituting recidivism. The number of return types used by any one agency ranged from one to eight different conditions checked.

There are some deviations here. Mississippi doesn't count technical parole violators as recidivists until after the parole revocation hearing, while Wisconsin includes parole absconders not yet apprehended in their data. Georgia counts "anything that winds him back up in prison". South Carolina distinguishes technical violations and generates separate rates. The U.S. Bureau of Prisons has used a variety of different approaches but has used each of the above criteria for at least one study. The only major difference between the U.S. and Canadian agencies seems to be that Canadian provincial agencies include "county" offenders and probationers in their jurisdiction.

In Massachusetts, any sort of recommitment for 30 days or more, whether county, state or federal, is included as a condition of recidivism. Probations and new arrests are not included.

#### What Population is Used in This Research?

In order to get at the characteristics of the research population, two survey questions were required. The first asks about the definition of the population and the second asks about the sampling procedure.

In response to the open-ended survey question regarding the definition of the research population, 19 agencies replied that they included all releases. A number of these suggested that this meant only releases to the community. Rhode Island, for example, excludes "escape, death or transfer"; South Carolina excludes all those "unlikely to return" such as death or resentence. The Federal Bureau of Prisons excludes "short

termers, releases to detainer, deportations, and re-releases". Maine was the sole respondent routinely using fiscal year data on all releases, though a number of states reported having used fiscal data at some time. Washington reported including only those releases having served "terms of one year or more".

Ten agencies used only those releases under supervision. Six of these used only paroles, while four studied paroles and other supervised releases. Nevada and Utah studied paroles and probations; Illinois studied "all under supervision"; and the Canadian Federal Service studied those released to "full parole or mandatory supervision". Nevada and the Canadian Federal Service had research conducted by agencies responsible for parole and other supervision, yielding a necessarily different population than other agencies. New Jersey bases their research on the total number of releases on parole in a given year rather than on a cohort of releases to parole in a given year, again, yielding a different population.

Three agencies reported that they performed such research as needed on specific sub-populations, such as program participants or inmates with certain characteristics. One agency with a unique research population, New York, responded that they study only first paroles, only first conditional releases and all maximum expirations of sentence.

In response to questions on sampling procedure, 27 respondents used the entire population on their research (see Appendix A, Table 5). Five agencies used samples of the population, and one agency varied between the two approaches.

In Massachusetts, annual release cohorts are used as the research population, including paroles and discharges. The inmate must have spent thirty days in custody prior to release from a state facility to the community. The entire population is included in the research.

What Sources of Information are Checked?

To determine which sources other agencies check,<sup>2</sup> the questionnaire lists data sources and asks the respondent to check all sources used (see Appendix A, Table 6). Of the 33 respondents 32 used their agency records; three used court records; four used police records; fourteen used parole records; eight used probation records; one used county records; four used inmate self reports; three used FBI records; and one each used interstate compact records, a "comprehensive data base" and "any verifiable source". The number of types of records checked by the various researching agencies ranges from one to seven sources.

Several agencies cited difficulties in obtaining the data necessary to properly determine the post-release status of the research population. Legal restrictions on access to records are often designed with protection of the privacy of the offender uppermost, and those restrictions can block the flow of information from one portion of the criminal justice system to another, hampering research efforts. One agency may not legally be able

---

<sup>2</sup>Glaser (1964; 19-21) systematically describes the procedure and records used to determine recidivism rates for a group of 1956 Federal releases.

to gather certain types of information or to gain access to particular records. As one agency put it, "we are presently attempting to negotiate with other...state criminal justice agencies the sharing of data from their computer systems but the progress has been slow due mainly to regulations regarding access to these types of data". Similar complaints were expressed by a number of respondents.

In Massachusetts, a variety of information sources is checked to determine the status of releases. Agency records, parole records, court records, probation records and county records are all used in determining the number of inmates returned during the follow-up period. FBI records are sometimes included with agency records but not as a matter of course. Access to records is legally formalized, with criminal justice agencies applying to an independent board for that access.

#### How Often are the Data Gathered?

Responses to that question on the questionnaire ranged widely. One agency collects the data at three month intervals, two at six month intervals, seventeen annually, two every two years, one every three years and one every five years. Six agencies responded that they collect data continuously, and three collect data on a variable basis. In Massachusetts the data are gathered annually.

How Often is a Report Published?

To determine publication information on research done in other agencies, the survey asked first whether a report was published and second how often. In response, ten agencies stated that no report is published.<sup>3</sup> One agency responded that a report is published every three months; two published reports every six months; nine published annually; three published reports every two years; one published every five years; and seven published on a variable basis.

In Oregon, such research is not funded for publication, but the data are available upon request. South Carolina, Maine and New Hampshire publish recidivism data for in-house distribution only. Kentucky conducted a study in 1980, but due to methodological questions, it is unavailable for distribution. Utah publishes recidivism data as part of the statistical section of the annual corrections division plan. Maryland, which has done "special recidivism analyses" with differing methodologies in the past, is currently evaluating a revised methodological strategy and has produced some "preliminary recidivism data" under the new methodology. Colorado plans to begin publishing their research in the

---

<sup>3</sup> McCafferty (1958; 197) recognized a set of underlying problems here: Doubtless lack of confidence in the recidivism data may be one reason for not releasing such vital information. Another reason appears that the release of recidivism data without considerable explanation may harm what are regarded to be progressive institutional programs. These problems were echoed by a number of agencies.

near future. In addition to the 1979 study listed here, Rhode Island has a 1981 study out of print and a report forthcoming this summer. Oregon indicated that in addition to research done within the agency, an outside research center is currently producing a draft recidivism study of state releases. The Federal Bureau of Prisons, which has produced a number of ground-breaking reports, expects to begin routinely publishing annual recidivism reports sometime in 1984.

Of the Canadian agencies which responded that they conducted recidivism research, only Saskatchewan did not publish their research. They did, however, include a data sheet prepared for legislative debate. Alberta indicated that they publish without enclosing a report. Ontario sent a number of studies, with recidivism data included as part of several reports. The Canadian Federal Service publishes recidivism data annually as one part of their "Main Estimates".

In Massachusetts, recidivism reports are published annually and are supplemented periodically by studies with longer follow-up periods.

#### Conclusion

This study aims at presenting a general picture of the state of recidivism research in the United States and Canada. By detailing an overview of the differences and similarities in the research being conducted, this study may contribute to the development of future recidivism research in Massachusetts and elsewhere. The difficulties encountered in recidivism research are generally recognized, but

information on how researchers get around those difficulties is incomplete. This study presents a broad view of research strategies, conceptual and operational.

Conceptual differences are a major problem in the comparability of research in different agencies. Perhaps most important is the need to distinguish adequately between research which uses prior incarcerations of commitments as indicators of recidivism and research which uses recommitments of releases to indicate recidivism. This major difference has long been recognized, and it only becomes a problem when the two kinds of research are treated as equivalent. The definitional differences within each of the two basic types of research are generally less problematic. Though these differences may impede the comparability of research within the two basic types, they may in fact be essential to the practical value of particular studies.

Methodologically, the lack of clarity and consensus in the conceptual schemes is compounded by disagreement on how to research the issue. Differences in what types of returns are counted, in what population is researched and in what sources of information are checked all contribute to dissimilarity in recidivism research. Operational differences in measuring recidivism differ in a manner parallel to definitional differences. Like the conceptual snags, differences in operationalizing definitions of recidivism may be inevitable in this type of research. The immediate needs which the research is intended to address may outweigh any need of researchers to develop comparable research methods.

Of the 67 respondents to the survey, 20 agencies (30%) conducted no

recidivism research, 14 (21%) collected data only on commitments with prior incarcerations and 33 (49%) conducted research on returns to prison after release. Though 20 agencies replied that they conducted no recidivism research, it is possible that some collect data on prior incarcerations of commitments without referring to that as recidivism. Certainly the agencies researching commitments are working with completely different data than the agencies researching releases. That both call their research "recidivism" is itself problematic.

Of those 33 agencies researching returns, 22 studied returns to their own agency only. The remaining 11 agencies studied returns to their own and to a combination of other agencies: county, state/province or federal.

Research in Massachusetts fits in with those 11 agencies studying returns to a combination of agency jurisdictions. The wider the scope of return jurisdictions in recidivism research, the more complete the findings, the higher the recidivism rate and the truer the picture of post-release behavior. Research covering the same agency only inevitably misses some releases who are resentenced to other jurisdictions. For some purposes, this limitation may be valid. Returns to other agencies have little or no direct impact on the releasing/researching agency, yet that research will yield recidivism rates somewhat lower than research on the same releases which included returns to other agencies.

The nature of the follow-up period in this research was described by the type of follow-up and by the length of the follow-up period. Fourteen of the 33 agencies researching returns used variable types of follow-up periods; seven used a single follow-up with a fixed time span;

seven followed supervised releases for the length of supervision; and five used multiple follow-up periods with fixed time frames for each. The maximum lengths of these various types of follow-up periods ranged from one year to over five years.

Massachusetts uses a routine one year follow-up for annual recidivism reports supplemented by reports which cover up to five year follow-up periods. The type of follow-up (based on the number of times rates are calculated for each cohort and whether this is routinized into a regular data base) has no unambiguous relationship to the magnitude of the rates, yet multiple follow-ups with recidivism rates calculated at different points in time for the same release cohort provides longitudinal information unavailable with single fixed follow-ups or with variable follow-up types. The rate is unambiguously higher for longer follow-up periods, whether they be single follow-ups or subsequent, later follow-ups of a single cohort being followed through a number of years.

The most prominent types of returns considered by the 33 agencies researching returns include parole violations with new arrests (30 agencies), technical parole violations (29 agencies) and new state/province commitments (30 agencies). Thirteen agencies counted new federal commitments; ten used new jail commitments; ten counted new (county) house of correction commitments; eight used new arrests; eight used jailed awaiting trial and six agencies counted new probations as conditions constituting recidivism.

Massachusetts uses each of these return types except new arrest and

new probation. This is an area in which variability in operational definitions creates important differences in research conducted by the various agencies. It may be important for some purposes to use new arrests or new probations, for example, as return types, depending on the nature of the releasing/researching agency. A parole agency research project may limit itself to counting parole violations, while a probation agency project may have different requirements. Type of return has a unique relationship to the magnitude of the resulting recidivism rates. The earlier in the criminal justice process that return types are counted, the higher the recidivism rates. Thus research which counts new arrests will have a built-in tendency to produce higher rates, yet surely not all of these arrests will be further processed. Research using new probations will yield higher recidivism rates than research which does not consider an offender returned until he has been committed. Parole violations, technical or with new arrests, complete the research and combined with new commitment/offense return types, will yield higher rates. A return for parole violation with a new arrest need not be convicted. Not all arrests are convictions; not all convictions result in criminal sanctions; and not all sanctions are counted as constituting recidivism. The variability in return types may be necessary for the practical value of the research.

Regarding the types of releases included in the research, nineteen agencies conducted research on all releases in a given year; ten researched all supervised releases; three researched specific sub-populations; and one agency researched all first paroles, first conditional releases and all expirations. Twenty-six of those agencies used the entire population

as defined above in their research; five used samples of the population; and one agency varied its research approach.

Massachusetts research uses the entire population of all releases to the community that fit the official definition in a given year. Whether research is conducted on all releases, all supervised releases, specific sub-populations or some other grouping of releases may be wholly dependent on the purposes of the research and may have no relation to the magnitude of the resulting rates. Though use of the entire population of releases may result in more complete data, well drawn samples should yield accurate rates.

Thirty-two agencies reported that they used their own agency records to determine the status of releases. Fourteen used parole records, and eight used probation records. Four used police records; and four used inmate self-reports. Three used court records; three used FBI records; one used county records; and three used other records.

Massachusetts uses agency records, parole records, probation records, court records and county records. FBI data are present in some agency records but are generally used by the agency to determine if repeat commitments had been incarcerated out of state while on release. They are of use for recidivism research purposes only if they indicate an earlier commitment date (out of state) for a known (in-state) recidivist. The more encompassing the records used, the more complete the findings, in general. Yet the types of records used are related to the types of returns considered. If the agency is interested in new probations as a condition of recidivism, probation records are necessary. Conversely, it

may be that in some cases the types of records available determine the types of returns considered. To make this decision on the availability of information rather than on the needs of the agency places strictures on the potential uses and practical value of research.

The data are gathered at anywhere from three month intervals to once every five years, with over half of the agencies (17) collecting data annually. Nine agencies do not publish their findings; the remaining 23 publish at anywhere from 3 month to 5 year intervals.

Massachusetts collects data and publishes recidivism reports annually. Supplementary research is conducted at periodic intervals. The importance of publishing lies in methodological development and in the dissemination of ideas. The routinization of conducting and publishing recidivism research yields comparable research for different years for a particular agency and establishes a data base which may be useful to administrators in a variety of ways.

Although never complete in absolute terms and in a constant process of revision and refinement, Massachusetts research seems to compare favorably with research done in other agencies. The comparisons generally place the research done in Massachusetts among the most complete in terms of return types, information sources, research population and frequency of publication.

Appendix A

Table 1

Type of Research Conducted by Responding Agency

No Research	Prior Incarcerations of Commitments	Returns of Releases
Alaska	Alabama	California
Arizona	Florida	Colorado
Arkansas	Hawaii	District of Columbia
Connecticut	Indiana	Georgia
Delaware	Missouri	Illinois
Idaho	New Mexico	Iowa
Kansas	North Dakota	Kentucky
Pennsylvania	Tennessee	Louisiana
South Dakota	Texas	Maine
Vermont	Virginia	Maryland
Wyoming	Guam	Massachusetts
American Samoa	Puerto Rico	Michigan
Virgin Islands	British Columbia	Minnesota
Manitoba	Yukon	Mississippi
New Brunswick		Montana
Newfoundland		Nebraska
Northwest Territories		Nevada
Nova Scotia		New Hampshire
Prince Edward Island		New Jersey
Quebec		New York
		North Carolina
		Ohio
		Oklahoma
		Oregon
		Rhode Island
		South Carolina
		Utah
		Washington
		Wisconsin
		U.S. Federal
		Alberta
		Ontario
		Saskatchewan
		Canadian Federal

Table 2

Summary of Reported Recidivism Data

Agency	Recidivism Rates+	Release Year	Follow-up Length	Report Type	Report Year	Release Type
California	18.1%	1978	1 Year	Unpublished Data Sheet	1983	Parole Only (98% of all releases)
	23.4%	1979	1 Year			
	26.7%	1980	1 Year			
	28.7%	1981	1 Year			
District of Columbia	51.0%	1978 Adults	3 Years	Analysis Report	1982	Parole Only
	61.9%	1978 Juveniles	3 Years			
Florida	18.7%	1974	18 Months	Published Study	1977	All Releases
Georgia	4.1%	7/71-9/81	6 Months	Unpublished Computer File	1982	All Releases
	10.6%	7/71-6/81	1 Year			
Iowa**	62.0%	1977-81	1 Year	Published Article	1984	Specific Population Subsets
	51.0%	1978	1 Year			
	20.0%	1979	1 Year			
	15.0%	1980	1 Year			
Maine	Unavailable			Unpublished Data Sheet		
Maryland	14.1%	7-8/1979; 3-6/1980	1 Year	Unpublished Handout Preliminary Data	1984	All Releases
	17.7%	1981	1 Year			
	19.5%	1982	1 Year			
Massachusetts*	20.0%	1975	1 Year	Published Study	1983	All Releases
	16.0%	1976	1 Year			
	15.0%	1977	1 Year			
	16.0%	1978	1 Year			
	26.0%	1979	1 Year			
	26.0%	1980	1 Year			

Table 2

Summary of Reported Recidivism Data  
(Continued)

Agency	Recidivism Rate+	Release Year	Follow-up Length	Report Type	Report Year	Release Type
Michigan	39.3% 69.5%	Jan-Jun, 78	1 Year 1 Year	Published Study	1983	Paroles vs. Community Programs
Minnesota	26.0% 25.0% 21.0%	1980 1981 1982	1 Year 1 Year Till 7/83	Published Study	1983	All Releases
Mississippi	2.9% 7.9% 16.3%	7/78-12/81 7/78-12/81 7/78-12/80	3 Months 6 Months 1 Year	Updated Study	1982	All Releases
Nebraska	27.9%	FY-78-79	3 Years	Published Study	1983	All Releases
New Jersey	No Rates	All Under Supervision 1976-1981	Annual	Published Study	----	Paroles Only
New York	25.1%	1976	1 Year	Published Study	1983	All Releases
North Carolina	23.5% 13.3% 14.8%	Jan-Jun, 68 Jan-Jun, 75 Jan-Jun, 79	1 Year 1 Year 1 Year	Research Bulletin	1983	All Releases
Ohio	16.4% 14.7% 9.7% 11.4% 11.5% 9.6%	1975 1976 1977 1978 FY79 1980	1 Year 1 Year 1 Year 1 Year 1 Year 1 Year	Research Bulletin	1982	Paroles Only

Table 2  
Summary of Reported Recidivism Data  
(continued)

Agency	Recidivism Rates+	Release Year	Follow-Up Length	Report Type	Report Year	Release Type
Oklahoma	35.0	1976-77	5 Years	Unpublished Study	1981	All Releases
Oregon	16.7%	1973	1 Year	Inter-Office Memo on Early Releases.	1982	Parole Only
	18.2%	FY 78-79	1 Year			
	17.7%	1981	1 Year			
	33.3%	1/78-6/78	3 Years	Data Sheet	1984	All
	34.7%	7/78-12/78				
	32.0%	1/79-6/79				
	37.3%	7/79-12/79				
45.2%	1/80-6/80					
39.4%	7/80-12/80					
Rhode Island	25.6%	1975	13 Months	Published Study	1979	All Releases
	28.1%	1976				
	23.3%	1977				
South Carolina	9.5%	1977	1 Year	Unpublished Memorandum	1981	All Releases
Utah	14.0%	---	---	Division Plan	1983	Parole & Probations
Washington	12.5%	1975	1 Year	Published Study	1983	All Releases
	16.2%	1976	1 Year			
	14.2%	1977	1 Year			
	14.2%	1978	1 Year			
	12.4%	1979	1 Year			
	11.5%	1980	1 Year			
Federal Bureau	23.7%	Jan-Jun,78	1 Year	Published Study	1981	All Releases

Table 2

Summary of Reported Recidivism Data  
(continued)

Agency	Recidivism Rates†	Release Year	Follow-Up Length	Report Type	Report Year	Release Type
Federal Bureau (cont.)	32.2%	1970	1 Year	Published	1980	All Releases
	24.3%	1978	1 Year	Study		
	15.0%	1956	1 Year	Published	1977	All Releases
	34.0%	1956	2 Years	Study		
	35.0%	1956	4 Years			
	51.0%	1956	5 Years			
	59.0%	1956	10 Years			
63.0%	1956	18 Years				
Alberta	Unavailable					
Ontario	22.1%	1977	2 Years After Probation Expiration	Published Study	1981	Probation Only
Saskatchewan	39.0%	1977	1 Year	Unpublished Data Sheet	1983	"Direct Sentence Offenders"
	36.0%	1978	1 Year			
	35.0%	1979	1 Year			
	40.0%	1990	1 Year			
	43.0%	1981	1 Year			
Canadian Federal	31.2%	1975	to 6/83	Study	1983	Full Parole
	24.8%	1976				
	25.3%	1977				
	26.4%	1978				
	53.9%	1975	to 6/83	Study	1983	Mandatory Supervision
	55.4%	1976				
	54.8%	1977				
	54.4%	1978				

+ The variability of the data presented in this table required that figures be extracted from the reports used, many of which contain more complete data. Rates obtained after a one year follow-up for releases from 1975 on were used whenever possible and feasible.

\* LeClair (1983).

\*\* "Failure rates included in this report are calculated on the basis of a linear projection representing a rate over time", James Boudouris.

Table 3

Maximum Length of Supervision by Type of Follow-Up

Follow-Up Type	Maximum Length (In Months)							Non-Specific	Total	
	12	18	30	36	48	60	Over 60		Number	Percent
Single	2	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	7	( 21%)
Multiple	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	5	( 15%)
Variable	0	1	0	4	0	3	2	4	14	( 42%)
Supervision	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	7	( 21%)
TOTAL	2	1	1	11	1	7	2	8	33	(100%)

Table 4

Types of Return

Agency	New Arrest	Technical Parole Violation	Parole Violation with Arrest	New Jail Commitment	New County Commitment	New State/Province Commitment	New Federal Commitment	Jailed Awaiting Trial	New Probation
California	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Colorado		X	X			X			X
Washington D.C.	X	X	X	X			X	X	
Georgia		X	X			X			
Illinois		X	X			X			
Iowa	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Kentucky		X	X			X			
Louisiana		X	X			X			
Maine		X	X			X		X	
Maryland						X			X
Massachusetts		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Michigan		X	X			X			
Minnesota		X	X			X			
Mississippi		X	X			X			
Montana		X	X						
Nebraska			X			X			
Nevada		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
New Hampshire	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
New Jersey		X	X		X	X	X		
New York		X	X			X			
North Carolina		X	X			X			
Ohio	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Oklahoma		X	X			X	X		
Oregon		X	X			X			X
Rhode Island		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
South Carolina		X	X			X			
Utah		X	X			X	X		
Washington						X			
Wisconsin	X	X	X			X			
U.S. Federal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Alberta		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ontario	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Saskatchewan					X	X			X
Canada Federal		X	X				X		
TOTAL	8	30	31	11	11	31	14	9	6

Table 5

Characteristics of Sample

Characteristics of Sample	Sample Size					Total	
	Ten Percent	Fifteen Percent	Thirty Percent	One-Hundred Percent	Variable	Number	Percent
Entire Population	0	0	0	27	0	27	( 82%)
Population Sample	1	2	1	0	1	5	( 15%)
Variable Types	0	0	0	0	1	1	( 3%)
TOTAL	1	2	1	27	2	33	(100%)

Table 6

Types of Records

Agency	Agency Records	Court Records	Police Records	Parole Records	Probation Records	County Records	Inmate Self-Report	FBI Records	Other
California	X			X				X	
Colorado	X								
District of Columbia	X								
Georgia	X								
Illinois	X								
Iowa	X		X	X					
Kentucky	X			X	X				
Louisiana	X								
Maine	X			X	X		X		
Maryland	X			X	X				
Massachusetts	X	X		X	X	X			
Michigan	X								
Minnesota	X								
Mississippi	X								
Montana	X	X		X					
Nebraska	X								
Nevada	X								
New Hampshire	X	X	X	X			X		
New Jersey	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
New York	X								
North Carolina	X								
Ohio	X			X					X
Oklahoma	X							X	
Oregon	X			X	X				
Rhode Island	X			X	X				X
South Carolina	X								
Utah	X				X				
Washington	X								
Wisconsin	X			X	X				
U.S. Federal								X	
Alberta	X								X
Ontario	X		X				X		
Saskatchewan	X								
Canada Federal	X			X					
TOTAL	33	4	4	15	9	2	4	3	3

Appendix B

Survey of Recidivism Research

We are compiling information on recidivism research throughout the United States and Canada in order both to improve our own efforts in this area and to add to the understanding of the current state of recidivism research.

Section I

- 1. Does your agency collect recidivism data? Yes No

If your agency does not collect data in this area, but a second party (outside agency, university, research firm, etc.) does recidivism research on the agency's inmate population, please send us the name and address of that party along with this signed form. If no research is done on your agency in this area, please sign on reverse and return.

Outside Research Agency

- 2. How does your agency officially define recidivism? (explain fully)

- 3. What is the length of follow-up? (explain fully)

- 4. Which of these conditions (if other aspects of definition and time frame apply) are checked to determine whether a person is a recidivist? (check all that apply)

- New Arrest
Technical Parole Violation (no new arrest)
Parole Violation with New Arrest
New Jail Commitment
New House of Correction/County Commitment
New State Commitment
New Federal Commitment
Jailed, Awaiting Trial
Other (specify)

- 5. How does your agency define the population for purposes of this research? (explain fully)

6. The data is collected on:

- a sample of the release population \_\_\_\_\_%
- the entire population of releases (within the time frame)

7. Data sources used are: (check all that apply).

- your agency records
- court records
- police records
- parole records
- probation records
- jail/county records
- inmate self-report
- other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8. The recidivism data is gathered every \_\_\_\_\_ years. (estimate if variable)

9. Is the recidivism data published in a report or as part of a report?  Yes  No

10. How often is the report published? \_\_\_\_\_ years (estimate if variable)

11. Does your agency have authority over: (check all that apply)

- felons
- misdemeanants
- county inmates

12. Does your agency have any offenders aged 17 or under? (attach explanation if necessary)

- Yes \_\_\_\_\_%
- No

Section II

Please enclose (check if enclosed)

- Your agency's latest recidivism report
- Your agency's coding sheet for gathering data (if unavailable, please attach a complete variable list)
- Your agency's instructions for filling out coding sheets for recidivism data collection

This information Provided By:

NAME	TITLE
DATE	TELEPHONE NUMBER

AGENCY ADDRESS

# The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

## Department of Correction

*Leverett Saltonstall Building, Government Center*

*100 Cambridge Street, Boston 02202*



Michael V. Fair  
Commissioner

In Massachusetts, one major research concern has been and continues to be with the area of recidivism: How many inmates released from state correctional facilities are subsequently reconfined in either our facilities or in other correctional facilities. We are currently re-evaluating our approach to this type of research. As the first step in that re-evaluation, we want to examine similar research efforts in other corrections agencies. The information we gather will be compiled into a report which will be sent to all respondents.

Enclosed are a blank questionnaire and a completed package regarding research in Massachusetts. Using the completed package as a guide, please fill out the blank questionnaire and return it along with the requested materials regarding recidivism research conducted within your agency. We have attempted to be as thorough as possible in asking questions and providing for answers, as the accuracy and completeness of the resulting report will depend on the responses to this questionnaire. We realize that this will not provide for every contingency and ask you to elaborate fully answers to any questions for which the answers provided are not adequate for the situation in your agency.

Please be sure to provide your name, position and telephone number as we will do telephone follow-ups to clarify answers to some questions. If your agency does not conduct recidivism research of its own, yet a second party does research on your inmate population, please return the questionnaire and any available materials and forward to us the name, address of the party that does the research.

Thank you for your cooperation in helping us to upgrade our research efforts. A comprehensive account of recidivism research should aid in all our research efforts.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dallas H. Miller".

Dallas H. Miller  
Research Unit

DHM/cc  
Enc.

Survey of Recidivism Research

We are compiling information on recidivism research throughout the United States and Canada in order both to improve our own efforts in this area and to add to the understanding of the current state of recidivism research.

Section I

- 1. Does your agency collect recidivism data?  Yes  No

If your agency does not collect data in this area, but a second party (outside agency, university, research firm, etc.) does recidivism research on the agency's inmate population, please send us the name and address of that party along with this signed form. If no research is done on your agency in this area, please sign on reverse and return.

Outside Research Agency \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 2. How does your agency officially define recidivism? (explain fully) re-incarceration (county, state, federal, or jailed awaiting trial) for over 30 days during follow-up period

- 3. What is the length of follow-up? (explain fully) yearly reports with 1-year follow-ups are supplemented by reports with 2, 3 and 5-year follow-ups

- 4. Which of these conditions (if other aspects of definition and time frame apply) are checked to determine whether a person is a recidivist? (check all that apply)

- New Arrest
- Technical Parole Violation (no new arrest)
- Parole Violation with New Arrest
- New Jail Commitment
- New House of Correction/County Commitment
- New State Commitment
- New Federal Commitment
- Jailed, Awaiting Trial
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

- 5. How does your agency define the population for purposes of this research? (explain fully) all persons incarcerated in state system over thirty days who were released (paroled, discharged or sentence expired) to the community during the calendar year

6. The data is collected on:

- a sample of the release population \_\_\_\_\_%
- the entire population of releases (within the time frame)

7. Data sources used are: (check all that apply)

- your agency records
- court records
- police records
- parole records
- probation records
- jail/county records
- inmate self-report
- other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8. The recidivism data is gathered every 1 years. (estimate if variable)

9. Is the recidivism data published in a report or as part of a report?  Yes  No

10. How often is the report published? 1 years (estimate if variable)

11. Does your agency have authority over: (check all that apply)

- felons
- misdemeanants
- county inmates *(a small number of county inmates, mostly women, are held in state facilities)*

12. Does your agency have any offenders aged 17 or under? (attach explanation if necessary)

- Yes 2%
- No

Section II

Please enclose (check if enclosed)

- Your agency's latest recidivism report
- Your agency's coding sheet for gathering data (if unavailable, please attach a complete variable list)
- Your agency's instructions for filling out coding sheets for recidivism data collection

This Information Provided By:

Dallas H. Miller Research Staff  
 NAME TITLE  
(617) 727-4485  
 DATE TELEPHONE NUMBER

MA. Dept. of Correction - Research  
100 Cambridge Street  
Boston MA 02202

AGENCY ADDRESS

Control

R	8	1
1	2	3

Commitment Institution & Number

4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Name

11	12	13	14

Date Incarcerated (MM,DD,YY)

15	16	17	18	19	20

Date Released (MM,DD,YY)

21	22	23	24	25	26

Type of Release

27

Institution Released From

28	29

Date Returned To Custody

30	31	32	33	34	35

Date Re-Released

36	37	38	39	40	41

Type of Return (Par. Disch.)

42

New Offense (P.V. NC)

43	44	45

Date Warrant Issued

46	47	48	49	50	51

Disp. of New Arrest

52

Type(s) of Parole Violation

53	54

IRI

Result

55

Sequence Number

56	57	58	59

Conditions of Release

60

61

62

63

Institutional Moves

Max.

64

Med.

65

Min.

66

Pre.

67

Security Level of Releasing Institution

68

Parents Ever Incar.

69

Siblings Ever Incar.

70

RECIDIVISM: DATA CODE SHEET: LONG TERM FOLLOW-UP  
1976 RELEASES

<u>COLUM(S)</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>INSTRUCTIONS</u>
1-3	Control Number	(column 2 = year; column 3 = length of follow-up in years)
4-7	Sequence Number	
8-13	Date Committed	(in P.V. date returned on P.V. instead of commitment date: use "street-to-street" definition)  Format: MM DD YY e.g. January 6, 1970 = 010670
14	Commitment Type	1 = court commitment 2 = parole violation 3 = H.C. transfer 4 = out-of-state transfer 5 = transfer from Federal institution 6 = return from escape
15-20	Release Date	date released to street on parole or discharge
21	Release Type	1 = parole 2 = discharge
22-23	Releasing Institution	See Appendix A
24-29	Date Returned to Custody	Format: MM DD YY
30	Data Source	1 = original recidivism data sheet 2 = movement print-out 3 = card and folder 4 = probation check
31	Type of Return	0 = not returned at all 1 = returned P.V., technical violation 2 = returned P.V., new arrest 3 = new commitment, H.C. 4 = new commitment, MCI 5 = new commitment, out of state 6 = new commitment, Federal 7 = returned awaiting trial & held in custody until return on P.V. or new commitment

COLUMN(S)

VARIABLE

INSTRUCTIONS

32-33	Institution of Return	See Appendix A
34-36	New Offense	See Appendix B
37-42	Date Re-Released	Format: MM DD YY
43	Number of Maximum Security Institutions that individual spent time in on this "street to street" period	Maximum = Walpole, Concord, Bridgewater, and Framingham women
44	Number of Medium Security Institutions	Medium = Norfolk, S.E.C.C.
45	Number of Minimum Security Institutions	Minimum = Forestry, Framingham men
46	Number of Pre-Release Institutions	

Appendix C

Reports Received with Questionnaire

California

"After Release from California Prisons? - Parole Outcome"; Dorothy R. Jaman; 1983.

District of Columbia

"Recidivist Report for 1978 Releasees"; Clinton R. Boyd and William Wimbrow; 1982.

Georgia

"Return-to-Prison Report"; computer file developed by Tim Carr.

Florida

"Evaluation of the Correctional System and Programs".

"Issues of Recidivism in Criminal Justice Evaluation".

"Relative Comparison of the Incarceration Rate".

"A Study of Recidivism Rates for Inmates Released from Custody During Calendar Year 1974"; Research Section; 1977.

"Job History Follow-Up of Vocationally Certified Inmates"; 1982.

"Analysis of Slam-Phase II"; 1983.

Hawaii

"Trends of the Felon Population"; 1983.

Iowa

"Recidivism as a Process"; James Boudouris; Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation; Volume 8 (3), Spring 1984; Pages 41-51.

Iowa (continued)

"The Recidivism of Releasees from the Iowa State Penitentiary at Fort Madison"; Division of Adult Corrections; James Boudouris; January 1983.

Michigan

"Community Residential Programs and the Issue of Threat"; Terry H. Murphy; 1983.

Minnesota

"Return Rates of Adults Released from Minnesota Correctional Facilities During 1980, 1981, 1982 as of July 1, 1983"; 1983.

Mississippi

"Mississippi Average Recidivism Rates"; Sanda K.C. Martin and W. Scott Fulton; 1982.

Missouri

"Commitments and Releases"; Lee Roy Black and Donald L. Smith; 1983.

Nebraska

"Recidivism Among FY78-79 Adult Male Releases"; Research and Planning Section; 1983.

New Jersey

"Annual Arrests and Disposition Report"; Fred B. Holley, Victor R. D'Ilio and Anthony Venanzi; Bureau of Parole.

New York

"1976 Releases: Five Year Post Release Follow-up"; Henry C. Donnelly and Gerald Bala; 1983.

North Carolina

"Recidivism Rates in North Carolina"; Research Bulletin 12; North Carolina Department of Correction; March 1983.

Ohio

Memorandum Detailing Parole Performance; Patricia L. Hardyman; 1982.

Oklahoma

"Inmates Released from Confinement in 1976 and 1977 and Subsequently Returned to Prison"; Lolita Rogers; 1981.

Ontario

"Factors Related to Recidivism Among Adult Probationers in Ontario"; Sally Rogers; 1981.

"Chronic Young Offenders"; Marian L. Polonoski; 1980.

"Parole Decision Making in Ontario"; Patrick Madelen; 1980.

"The Community Service Order Programme in Ontario"; Silvia Herman; 1981.

Oregon

Interoffice Memo; O.R. Chambers; 1982.

Puerto Rico

Informe Estadístico Mensual, Instituciones Penales, Instrucciones Generales (Monthly Statistical Report, Penal Institutions, General Instructions).

Rhode Island

"Highlights of the Report: Recidivism at the Adult Correctional Institution"; Walter J. Fontaine; 1979.

Saskatchewan

"Recidivism Rates Among Direct Sentence Offenders at 6 Month Intervals", Information Management Section; Data Sheet; 1983.

South Carolina

Memorandum on Recidivism; Mee Sim Lee; 1981.

Texas

"Fiscal Year Statistical Report"; Management Services; 1982.

Utah

Unpublished Division Plan; 1983.

Virginia

"Felons and Recidivists: FY 1981"; Research and Reporting Unit; 1982.

Washington

"Female Recidivism in Washington State"; 1982.

"Comparison of Recidivism Rates for Prisoners Released from Work Release Versus Institutions".

"Recidivism Rates at One Through Five Years at Risk for Offenders Released During Fiscal Years 1960 - 81"; 1983.

Federal Bureau of Prisons

"How Persistent Is Post-Prison Success?" Howard Kitchener, Annesley K. Schmidt, and Daniel Glaser; 1977.

"Measuring Recidivism for Federal Offenders"; James L. Beck; 1980.

Employment, Community Treatment Center Placement, and Recidivism: A Study of Released Federal Offenders"; James L. Beck; 1981.

Sources

England, Ralph W. "A Study of Postprobation Recidivism Among Five Hundred Federal Offenders". In The Sociology of Punishment and Correction; edited by Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang. John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Glaser, Daniel. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Babbs-Merrill Company, 1964.

Holt, Linda K. 1980 Court Commitments to the Massachusetts Department of Correction. Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1981.

LeClair, Daniel P. The Effect of Community Reintegration on Rates of Recidivism. Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1983.

McCafferty, James A. "Can We Find a Standard Statistical Definition for Recidivism?" American Correctional Association Proceedings (1958), Pages 190-206.