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This essay examines the reflexive relationship between current correctional procedures in US prisons and subsequent re-offense rates among released inmates, a relationship that can be described as a recidivist cycle. In the ‘60s, the US saw a swift abdication of a short-lived era of rehabilitation implemented throughout US correctional facilities. Thereafter, as part of the “get-tough on crime” philosophy, correctional and political ideology shifted toward what is known as the crime control model. Under this model, prisons emphasize deterrence, retribution, and incapacitation as the strongest attack to counter public crime. The impacts of past policy decisions are analyzed through the lens of the crime control model and compared to a contemporary analysis of current penological approaches. Conclusions describe how the status quo perpetuates the recidivist cycle, meaning the correctional facilities fail at effectively correcting offenders and preventing future crime. Solutions are suggested to rehabilitate offenders via in-prison programs that target criminal cognitive behavior based on changing criminal thinking and behavior rooted in offenders’ inherent criminality levels. Potential policy implications are also presented.

A man sits in his home flipping through newspapers for potential job opportunities. Days later, he arrives at an interview at a construction company. He has no prior employment, and he spent the last decade in and out of jail and on parole. The
interviewer asks about his educational history. He has none beyond the 10th grade. It is one day before his six month anniversary out of prison. Once again, another interviewer turns him down. The next day he robs a gas station, violates his parole, and is sent back to prison. The cycle starts over.

This is the reality for tens of thousands of US inmates currently leaving and re-entering the US Correctional System. Under the punitive ideological and procedural approach known as the crime control model, prisoners sit in correctional facilities without being afforded proper, evidence-based treatment to correct their criminal thinking or behavior. This phenomenon is a direct reflection of the ideological shift away from rehabilitation toward the subsequently made policies conducive to the crime control model. As a result, the United States has held the highest recidivism rate in the world for decades due, in part, to its punitive emphasis on incapacitation and specific deterrence rather than proper rehabilitation of inmates. In order to end the recidivist cycle, there must be an exchange of the crime control model for rehabilitative reentry programs that target specific needs of criminal thinking and behavior.

This analysis has three goals. The first is to provide context by offering a working definition of recidivism, addressing the prevalence of recidivism in US prisons, explaining the cyclical nature in recidivism and mass incarceration, and outlining those most at risk. The second goal is to examine the positive illusions of inmates contrasted with the realities of recidivist statistics and to identify where the problem lies in current correctional procedure. The third and final goal is to examine how cognitive-behavioral treatment can reduce the major causes of recidivism.
What is Recidivism?

Recidivism, or the tendency for a released ex-offender to reoffend and become re-incarcerated, is historically prevalent in the US. In 1987, the US had a 41 percent recidivism rate among federal ex-offenders within just three years of their release from prison (Dhami 632). Since then, this rate has continued to rise. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, half of the prison population released annually will re-offend and be re-incarcerated between six months to two years after returning to their communities (Seigafo 184). The Bureau of Justice Statistics conducted a five-year study of roughly 400,000 ex-offenders. The study found that while 50 percent of offenders recidivated after six months to two years, 76.6 percent of the same sample were re-incarcerated after five years (Seigafo 184). Therefore, the likelihood of recidivating increases the longer an inmate remains reintegrated in society.

These statistics become more important when put into the context of contemporary US release data. As of 2010, the number of prisoners released from state and federal correctional facilities equaled 708,677 per year (Nally et. al 17). If nearly half of those inmates reoffend within six months and more than 75 percent of them do the same within just five years of their release, then society faces a significant social issue. The consequences are twofold and reciprocal. First, failure to reduce recidivism puts public safety at high risk. Second, inevitably the majority of US prisoners will continue to recidivate if not provided with the necessary resources to correct their criminogenic behaviors prior to societal reintegration.

Recidivism and US Prisons

While the recidivism rate is high, the rate of incarceration in the US is astronomical (Seigafo 183). Along with the highest recidivism rate, the US also holds the highest incarceration rate in
the world. The most recent prison population data report states that federal US corrections currently house over two million inmates (Seigafo 183). Based on the 2010 census, the Bureau of Justice Statistics found incarceration rates equaled 500 sentenced prisoners per 100,000 citizens (Nally et al. 17). Among those sentenced in that year, the number of prisoners released from state and federal correctional facilities amounted to 708,677 prisoners (Nally et. al 17).

The annual release of 708,677 inmates from the prison population is useful for analyzing recidivism. As prior research shows, at least half of the prisoners released annually in the US are likely to be re-incarcerated within just six months to two years (Seigafo 184). This means that the number of offenders recidivating is contributing to the incarceration rate. With 2.2 million inmates, prisons are running out of cells to house everyone, causing a race to expand prison facilities. In 1996 alone, the government paid for the construction of 31 new prisons, not to mention the 61 additional prisons to be completed by the end of 1997 (Alarid 8).

The pressure to compete with mass incarceration forces the government to foot the bill for the US Correctional System’s prison expansion efforts. This is evidenced through the rise in government funding of correctional programs. Since the late 1990’s, the fiscal budget for US Corrections has grown at an unprecedented rate, starting at $35.8 billion in 1982 and increasing to $93.8 billion by 1992 (Savelsberg 190). Furthermore, the allocation of such funds that went directly toward prison construction alone increased by 593 percent (Savelsberg 190). The massive increase in funding is due to the sheer fact the United States arrests more of its individuals than it knows what to do with.

Consequently, more prisoners are being released back into their communities without proper preparation during their sentences in order to make room for incoming inmates. Without
preparation, the indicators of recidivism impede ex-offenders from achieving a successful reintegration, increasing the likelihood of reoffense. Lockwood's study affirms this increase; out of 1,335 released inmates, 51 percent of those who recidivated did so due to committing a new offense (Lockwood et al. 61). In sum, it is this exact relation between prison population and recidivism that initiates a recidivist cycle: the prisons are forced to release inmates prematurely, the prisoners recidivate, so the prisoners ultimately return to prison.

**Demographics Most at Risk**

It is important to conceptualize which individuals living in our society are most likely at risk for this phenomenon. While the reports of recidivism and incarceration rates have been empirically high and steadily increasing, so have reports regarding its demographics. For the purposes of this analysis, two demographic categories will be discussed: race and age.

In 1987, the Federal Bureau of Prisons reported those at greatest risk of recidivating are typically African-Americans and Hispanics compared to Non-Hispanic Whites (Harer 2). From the same report, African-Americans, Hispanic, non-Hispanic, and Caucasian ex-offenders recidivated at rates of 58.8 percent, 45.2 percent, 40.2 percent, and 33.5 percent respectively (Harer 2). Part of the reason for the disparity between the recidivation rates is due to greater representation of some races in prison compared to others. For example, nearly half (45 percent) of the prison population is made up of African-Americans, whereas Whites make up 30 percent (Alarid 9). Logically, only those who have been imprisoned and later released can recidivate.

At the same time, recidivism rates were “inversely” correlated to age (Harer 3). The research found that recidivism rates decreased as an ex-offender got older. In fact, ex-offenders younger than twenty-five years of age experience a recidivism rate
of 56.6 percent and those older than fifty-five retain a rate of 15.3 percent (Harer 3). This shows that there is a drastic disparity between ages as a dynamic of recidivism.

In no way are race and age argued to be the predictive indicators of recidivism. Plainly, an individual’s race or age does not make someone more likely to reoffend. The importance in noting the race and age of released offenders is that recidivism is disproportionally spread across individuals akin to certain demographics. The fact that this is spread disproportionately among younger, African-American males is an issue outside the scope of this investigation.

**Prisoners’ Positive Illusions**

Given the major factors of a high probability of going back to prison, prisoners are surprisingly optimistic and confident that they will not recidivate after their release. A study analyzed inmates from the US and the UK to collect data on their plans for post-release. In a sample of 130 UK prisoners, 70 percent of the medium-risk offenders predicted they only had a 50 percent likelihood of committing another offense (Dhami 633). Similarly, out of 324 US prisoners, 78 percent of them said it would easy to renew family ties, find a residence, get a job, and stay out of jail (Dhami 633). Prior to their release and subsequent reoffense, the participants reported that they would be successful in their reintegration into society (Dhami 634).

The most striking area within this survey were the inmates’ positive illusions in regard to achieving stability, specifically post-release. Simply put, the predictions of the inmates do not reflect the statistical reality. According to the study, results found prisoners believed to have a 70.28 percent chance at finding a job (Dhami 638). The prisoners also only reported a 30.5 percent chance of committing a new crime as well as a mere 26.23
percent chance of being re-incarcerated (Dhami 638). While it is now known that recidivism rates are on average closer to 50 percent within the first 6 to 12 months of release, it is interesting to note predictors of the likelihood of recidivating from the perceptions of the prisoners themselves.

This research tells us that offenders want to succeed. Unfortunately, the majority do not have success in their reintegration. This could mean inmates simply have not learned the skill-sets to be a contributive member of society by the time they leave prison. Demographic research notes that most of the prison populations are made up of young inmates. Therefore, the narrative argues the majority of the released inmates were incarcerated when they were young, are undereducated, have a poor employment history, lack job skills, fail at establishing positive relationships, and present indicators of criminogenic cognitive-behavior. If these same inmates were never taught how to correct those issues before their release, then it is unlikely any change would occur during their reintegration. In terms of recidivism being a cyclical phenomenon, for those with repeat offender history, it is plausible that they will never receive preparation to acquire those skills. Subsequently, they may simply continue to be processed in and out of the correctional system without relief.

**The Major Indicators of Recidivism**

It is apparent that the lack of inmate preparation for reintegration into society post-release is causing a recidivist cycle. When prisoners enter a US jail or prison, most programs do not aim to target criminogenic risk factors, such as what causes a criminal to act on his or her motivations and what triggers deviant behavioral responses. Therefore, when prisoners are released, stress factors in the community can impede an ex-offender’s successful reintegration since no treatment was provided to teach
inmates how to overcome these obstacles and deal with them in prosocial ways.

There are two types of risk factors which ought to be evaluated when attempting to predict an individual inmate's likelihood of recidivism. The first are static risk factors, which are those that are constant and cannot be changed through treatment, (Brown 3). Examples of these factors are educational, employment, and criminal histories. The second are dynamic risk factors. These factors can be changed through treatment (Brown 3). Dynamic factors include antisocial personalities or behaviors, substance abuse, social ties with antisocial peers, and employability. These risk factors are those that are considered mostly criminogenic and can encourage future criminal thinking and behavior.

Based on current criminological research, treatment programs tend to mostly focus on job securement after release. The problem is that while employment is important, preparation through in-prison treatment ignores other, more significant, dynamic risk factors. This theory is evidenced through evaluative research of the relationship of employment and recidivism. In the article, “Employment and Recidivism among Men Released from Prison,” D. Steffey argues that while results of employment-based treatment are mixed, most have negative effects, and the studies do not specifically analyze employment as a direct predictor of recidivism. Instead, this connection is nearly impossible to conclude based on current research due to the other risk factors that affect both employability and recidivism. Therefore, other confounding dynamic risk factors cannot be overcome through providing inmate programs that solely focus on career and technical education, and such programs merely oversimplify the issue. Consequently, it is necessary to go beyond employment-related variables in order to implement in-prison programs designed to target specific high-risk factors. Such factors include
an individual's antisocial behaviors, substance abuse, poor social achievement, and family history (i.e., bad childhood, exposed to a family prone to crime, neglect) (Dhami 633). These criminogenic factors surface before incarceration, as they are inherent to the individual’s predisposition toward crime. Pre-prison factors are all based in criminal thinking and can subsequently transcend into post-prison behavior and result in higher recidivism rates. Any combination of these factors can cause an individual to be more naturally prone to recidivating simply due to their own psychological make-up, childrearing, stressors of their surrounding environment, and/or habitually deviant behavior. Since these factors present themselves prior to the initial offense and punishment served, they are rooted in their criminal thinking and behavior. If these variables remain untreated due to placing an emphasis on employment preparation, then the same pre-prison factors will remain after rehabilitation. Essentially, the released prisoner would still think and respond like a criminal as opportunities arise in the environment regardless of whether he or she had a job.

**A Historical Emphasis on Education and Unemployment**

For decades, the most significant recidivist factors have been assumed to be an inmate’s educational and employment histories. At face value, this is a valid assumption, since lack of education has been proven to have a correlation with unemployment rates and recidivism among ex-offenders. Studies show that roughly 42 percent of African American offenders and 30 percent of Caucasian offenders released did not complete high school (Lockwood et al. 68). Furthermore, these same offenders never obtained a stable job prior to recidivating (Lockwood et al. 68). Additional research found that those who managed to either become employed or attend school had a recidivism rate of 25.6 percent versus those who did not who had a rate of 60.2 percent.
(Harer 3). Therefore, these correlations do warrant that education and employment are important, but they do not necessitate that a lack of these factors causes recidivism. To say the opposite would be an overgeneralization of criminological theory; research proves over-emphasizing employment-based correctional programs has been ineffective by ignoring key, dynamic risk factors of recidivism such as pro-criminal cognitive-behavior.

Listwan et al. argue “industrial model” programs, or those based in job preparation, are ineffective for their design for three historical reasons. First, when the US economy met its decline, the availability for employment for those low-class workers deteriorated significantly. Second, this fact, coupled with the rise in minority groups in prison, further undermined the ability to secure job employment upon release. (19) This is important since the low-class demographics are composed of mostly minority groups and make up the majority of prison population. The effect was a unique group of people deemed especially unemployable compared to their counterparts. Third, prison populations since the ’70s have increased seven-fold, making it impossible for prisons to house every inmate. This caused release programs to switch from points of “meaningful reintegration” to “supervision” (Listwan et al. 19). When mass incarceration caused prisons to become overcrowded, the existing inmates needed to be released without having any sort of treatment in order to make room for more initiates. In sum, the released inmates were never corrected—only punished. They never learned important job skills to secure employment, such as how to manage their criminal thinking in a prosocial manner that would comply with the moral and legal codes of society. This created a cycle of overcrowded prisons and prematurely released inmates with no hopes of employment.
The Crime Control Model and Its Effects

The shift from meaningful reintegration toward punitive supervision came about through the crime control model and the legislation passed therein. During the onset of mass incarceration, prison administrations and political authorities focused on retribution, punishment, and deterrence, creating the pillars of what is coined the crime control model. In his article, “Assessing the Impact of the Great Prison Experiment on Future Crime Control Policy,” Byrne notes that, since the 1970’s, authorities attempted to ensure public safety through mass incarceration to create a specific deterrence that would ideally reduce crime in general society. To do so, prison populations increased by 628 percent and reached 1.5 million inmates in correctional facilities by 2005 (Byrne 3). Contextually, the most recent prison population data reports that state and federal US corrections currently house over 2 million inmates (Seigafo 183). This means that majority of the prison population came to be during a mere three decades, making the US hold the highest incarceration rate in the entire globe.

The crime control model was based on the idea that punishment outweighs supportive rehabilitation, believing it was more important get criminals off the streets and locked away in order to set an example rather than to solve the internal or structural problems which may have contributed to or brought about the criminal activity. Byrne argues this “get-tough” approach toward combating crime fails in three ways. First, research shows that incarceration has held a meager 2-4 percent impact on the greater society in invoking crime deterrence. Second, studies found that simply incarcerating an individual does nothing to invoke their own personal deterrence from reoffending. For this, the evidence does not show incarceration works as a rehabilitative strategy in and of itself. Instead, the third point
purports that prisons are criminogenic, meaning they can add to an offender’s likelihood to recidivate after release. (Byrne 4)

These points cause us to question why authorities have continued to support and perpetuate incarceration as an effective tool for crime reduction. In their article, Useem et al. explain this could be due to false assumptions regarding the outcomes of mass incarceration. Research in support of overall effectiveness of the crime control model is scarce. Of what research does exist, Useem et al. argues that the conclusions are severely limited (27). The researchers analyzed two popular studies supporting the crime control effect on incarceration and crime rates. Useem et al. offers critiques of both studies, arguing that their methods were limited and lacked proper analysis of crime control policies. Further, the researchers argue that lesser crime rates as a result of the crime control policies are insignificant due to the reciprocal relationship between incarceration and crime rates. For example, reduced crime could be a result of increased imprisonment, not from incarceration working as a rehabilitative tool. To the same extent, increased crime in society could subsequently increase imprisonment. This could ultimately result in an illogical fallacy where the crime control model can offer effective impacts on society through punitive retribution.

Overall, the review of criminological literature empirically suggests the crime control model is ineffective at reducing crime and may, in fact, exacerbate high recidivism. Therefore, the crime control model actually encourages a cyclical relationship between incarceration, release, and recidivism.

**Replacing the Crime Control Model with Rehabilitation**

The problem with the status quo of correctional facilities is that the programs and procedures fail to follow the suggestions of evidenced-based research. Since research has shown the
ineffective outcomes of career programs and incarceration as a deterrent, it is the obligation of correctional administrators and policymakers to implement policies and programs that adhere to the research. This would be achieved through providing Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment (CBT).

Latessa finds that cognitive behavioral programs have the greatest effect at reducing recidivism overall due to their focus in changing procriminal thoughts and behaviors among ex-offenders (227). Barnes et al. provide further detail of how (CBT) impacts prisoners (612). CBT modifies behavior through actively participating with the individual and ultimately changing their natural cognition and behavioral actions toward criminogenic stimuli (Barnes et al. 612). The programs work to find the source of the problem, or the variables which elicit a prisoner’s procriminal thoughts and behaviors, and then teaches them in an individualized manner prosocial method to manage their own deviance (Barnes et al. 612). What makes CBT most effective is that it has the capacity to combine training in social, interpersonal, and anger management skills to prepare ex-offenders for the emotional or environmental variables they will face during reintegration (Barnes et al. 612). Therefore, regardless of employment or lack thereof, criminals acquire the tools to combat their stressors or overcome tempting opportunities that would have previously triggered criminal behavior.

In addition to these findings, research points to specific successes of experimental testing in concern of CBT. In their article, Tourunen et al. analyze the policy changes made throughout the penal system to combat drug-related crimes with prison-based drug treatment (PBDT) programs administered throughout prisons in Finland. The findings show that PBDT could be an illustration for implementing rehabilitative programs in prisons. This is an interesting study for cross application because, historically, Finland experienced a drug-related crime wave.
during the ‘60’s which is when the United States experienced a violent crime wave leading to its push toward increased penal harm in prisons. Finnish prisons started implementing treatment programs in the 1990’s, which was ultimately followed by a second drug wave (Tourunen et al. 575). Eventually new rehabilitative initiatives focusing on cognitive-behavioral programs were becoming more popular and started being tested in Finland. Results showed this specific form of rehabilitative programming yielded many positive results for prisoners, and that no longer is “punishment . . . based solely on the criminal act and the general deterrence of punishment” (Tourunen et al. 585). The prison-based drug treatment program is just a small scale of cognitive behavior treatment, but it yields two promising messages. First, it is a comparable example in which a correctional system has rejected a punitive control model. Second, its individualized aim to target a specific, dynamic risk factor (i.e., substance abuse) demonstrates the possible outcomes if the use of such programs was more encouraged in the US.

Further steps can be taken to target multiple specific needs conducive to criminal thinking and behavior. In his article, Don Andrews outlines 18 principles to follow to ensure effective correctional programs which span from ideological suggestions to the actual structuring and management of applied rehabilitation services. While all are important, there are three that ought to be implemented uniformly across all rehabilitative programs. The first is to target six dynamic risk factors of recidivism: antisocial attitudes and cognitive states that support criminality, weak self-control, reckless aggression, pleasure-seeking against prosocial norms, and problematic circumstances in their environment that could trigger deviant behavioral responses (Andrews 218). The second is to abdicate the current emphasis on punitive control, retributive incapacitation, and specific deterrence. Instead,
significant and repeated reduction in recidivism has been proven when programs offer “clinically relevant and psychologically appropriate human service under conditions and settings considered just, ethical, legal, decent, [and] efficient” (Andrews 218). The third principle is to commit to programs that answer to an offender’s individual risk level, criminogenic needs, and learning styles (Andrews 219).

Risk: According to Andrews, assessing risk means to determine, based on clinically relevant practices, the likelihood of an offender to reoffend after reentry (219). This is important to assess at the point of incarceration, as it gives insight to correctional directors that helps determine what types of rehabilitative programs ought to be offered and to what extent. It is evident those people predicted to have a higher probability of recidivating should be afforded more intensive interventions and resources. This is because those people who pose a low threat of recidivating will likely reintegrate successfully without any rehabilitative treatment. Doing so is not only advantageous to the correctional facilities for providing resources in a cost-effective way while receiving the highest net benefit possible, but also to the offenders who will be afforded a better chance at remaining reintegrated in the society regardless of the circumstances surrounding them.

Target criminogenic needs: Criminogenic needs are dynamic, and if controlled, can reduce criminal thinking and behavior (Andrews 219). This would subsequently reduce recidivism. The objective would be to provide inmates with the tools and skills to manage their own antisocial tendencies in order to respond to stressful or tempting environmental stimulus that could potentially result in a new offense. Some may argue that this objective ignores the high correlation between employment and recidivism; however, the ability to manage these internal risk
factors could prove significantly helpful in not only obtaining employment but maintaining it for the future.

Responsivity: Responsivity requires correctional directors to design programs that match the offenders' learning styles, ability to understand content, and their willingness to succeed (Andrews 219). This ensures that correctional facilities do not implement a “catch-all” blanketed system that ignores the personal needs of inmates. An individualized approach maximizes the chance of reducing the criminal behavioral tendencies of all inmates who are subjected to the cognitive behavioral treatment.

By following the research, correctional facilities can ensure that programs meet their maximum potential. Cognitive behavior treatment emphasizes the characteristics of offenders in dire need of rehabilitation that the current crime control procedures or employment programs neglect to consider. Evidence-based programs rooted specifically in changing criminal thinking and behavior will provide a greater assurance that offenders will be able to remain successfully reintegrated in society regardless of employment status and to dispel concerns of public safety.

**Policy Implications**

After decades of seeing recidivism affect the majority of released prisoners, there still has not been sufficient research into rehabilitative approaches or other options that would result in policy implications. The lack of research is due to the burden and cost of correcting recidivism.

The multitude of recidivist indicators make the burden of correction extremely high. There are pre-prison factors and post-prison factors, all of which endure through imprisonment as well. This makes it hard to decipher whether improvements in recidivism would be due to some in-prison rehabilitative program
or another variable manipulating the data results. For example, subliminal factors such as “self-selection” can be developed naturally during prison absent any rehabilitative training (Ward 199). In a study that provided career and technical education to inmates before their release, results showed if inmates show signs of self-selection, they would readily volunteer for the program (Ward 199). As a result, they could possibly be predisposed to higher motivations to succeed in their reintegration which could be true for several types of in-prison programs beyond those based on job employment preparation. Should those inmates perform better than others after their release, it could be due to their personality and will to succeed rather than the impacting effects of the rehabilitative treatment (Ward 199).

The research is extremely difficult to control for all subjective variables, which makes it harder to conclude that the rehabilitative approach would be effective for most released offenders (Ward 199). Since employability is highly correlated with recidivism, it should not be ignored, but there would need to be measures put in place to accommodate the individuals’ risk levels, criminogenic needs, and responsivity requirements. This challenge alone is multifaceted. Therefore, there is not yet enough research conducted to point to a specific solution, but there is certainly enough to recognize there are flaws within the system. The research that does exist on the matter concurs that the major recidivist indicators fall within the inmates’ criminal thinking and behavior.

Nevertheless, recidivism in the United States remains unsolved and practically untouched, since data shows that recidivism rates have been historically profound and continue to rise at a steady pace. From roughly 40 percent in 1987 to 50 percent as of most recently, the issue of recidivism has been evidenced for nearly three decades. Though the data clearly outlines the issues, there is an idea of where solutions lie, but less so on how to
effectively implement the correct programs. Without solidified research pinpointing the solution, it is difficult to expect a shift any time soon. What can be said is that complacency can only propel the recidivist cycle forward.

Conclusion

In order to see any impact on recidivism, it is imperative that time and resources are used in a smart, strategized, and just way. Simply locking someone away and focusing treatment on the sole goal of helping someone get a job will not change their inherent criminal thinking and behavioral pattern. Therefore, the types of programs emphasized in prison must be designed with the tools to alter and distinguish these risk factors. The major obstacles preventing the end of the recidivist cycle stem from the crime control model and the failure of authorities to make policy decisions based on evidence-based research. This is no longer about what causes the recidivist cycle; that has been made apparent. After decades of evidence identifying the causes, assessing the obstacles, and pointing to the solutions, it is time to actively work to end the recidivist cycle.
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