

RE-INCARCERATION OF PRISONERS IN ARIZONA:

A FOCUS ON DRUG OFFENDERS

The re-incarceration of prisoners in Arizona: a Focus on Drug Offenders

Submitted to

Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

By:

Dr. Nancy Rodriguez

Arizona State University

and

Dr. Jessica Saunders

RAND Corporation

Introduction

Over the past three decades, the United States prison population has grown dramatically. The latest figures from the Bureau of Justice Statistics indicate that the federal and state prison population increased by three percent from 2005 to 2006. By the end of 2006, 2.26 million inmates were in custody in state and federal prisons (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007).

Not surprisingly, drug offenders comprise a growing proportion of the nation's prison population. From 1990 to 1998, they represented 19% of the total increase in the number of state inmates (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2000). Recent figures show that 20% of all state inmates are imprisoned for drug offenses. The increase in incarceration rates, especially among drug offenders, can be attributed to the War on Drugs, which resulted in the implementation of various sentencing policies including sentencing guidelines, mandatory minimums, and three strikes law, all of which stipulated more punitive treatment of offenders (Spohn, 2002). By the mid 1990s, sentencing policies were perceived to be responsible for the increasing rate of drug offender imprisonment as well as for producing profound racial disparities in the sentencing process of offenders (Sentencing Project, 1998).

The extent to which such policies, more specifically, the incarceration of offenders has reduced crime have received substantial attention in the academic literature. Efforts to identify how drug offenders have been impacted by their incarceration have centered on examining their rates of recidivism. The majority of these studies have found that incarceration has minimal impact on reducing rates of recidivism (Petersilia, Turner, and Peterson, 1986; Spohn and Holleran, 2002) thus, providing a basis for alternative forms of treatment by the justice system. In recent years, mandatory drug treatment programs as well as reentry programs have been created to curb increasing incarceration rates (Farabee, Hser, Anglin, and Huang, 2004; Longshore et al., 2004; Petersilia 2003). These programs

seek to increase the likelihood of success for offenders either before their incarceration or upon release from prison. One way to evaluate the impact of mandatory drug treatment and reentry programs is to measure the extent to which offenders remain crime free (avoid rearrest) as well as comply with the terms of community supervision. Since community supervision failures represent a significant portion of the prison population, their status is particularly important in studies of recidivism. While an extensive body of research has examined the recidivism of offenders, few have identified their likelihood of re-incarceration due to community supervision failure relative to the commission of a new crime.

In this study, we seek to address this limitation of prior work by examining the re-incarceration of offenders in Arizona. The focus of our study centers on analyzing the rates of re-incarceration for drug offenders relative to violent, property, and sex offenders. We also place an empirical focus on the status of community supervision failure and how that affects the re-incarceration of offenders. Lastly, we examine re-incarceration using four measures, including re-incarceration, time until re-incarceration (in months), community supervision revocation, and convicted and sentenced for the commission of a new crime. The examination of these multiple measures of recidivism provides a comprehensive review of the re-incarceration of prisoners in the state. Although the current study does not constitute an evaluation of recent policies or programs created to address drug crimes and post release success, our study has important implications for these efforts.

The Incarceration of Drug Offenders

At the center of the imprisonment boom in the United States is the drug offender. While violent crimes continue to represent the most common reason offenders are serving time in state prisons (52%), property (21%) and drug (20%) offenders represent a significant portion of prisoners (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007). Data from the Federal Bureau of Prisons reveal an even higher proportion of drug offenders in federal institutions. In 2006, more than half of prisoners in federal custody were

serving time for a drug crime. This represents a 26% growth in drug offenders from 2000 to 2006 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007).

While only a fifth of state prisoners constitute drug offenders, drug use plays an important role in the offending of most prisoners. Survey results from prior studies indicate that 83% of prisoners report past drug use and 57% were using drugs in the month before their offense (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1999). Nineteen percent of state prisoners said that they committed their current offense to obtain money for drugs. More than half of state prisoners indicated they were under the influence of alcohol or drugs while they committed their current offense.

A distinguishing characteristic of the prison population is the overrepresentation of racial minorities. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2007), Black males represent 38% of inmates in state and federal custody, 34% of White men, and 21% of Hispanic men. Such rates have resulted in numerous studies addressing the sentencing outcomes of racial and ethnic groups (Kramer and Steffensmeier, 1993; Tonry, 1996; Zatz, 1984), particularly the racial disparate treatment of drug offenders relative to other types of offenders (Crawford, 2000; Kramer and Ulmer, 1996; Kramer and Steffensmeier, 1993; Spohn and Cederblom, 1991). Research has found direct and indirect race/ethnicity effects in sentencing outcomes as well as interaction effects between race/ethnicity and extralegal factors (e.g., gender and employment status), legal criteria (e.g., offense seriousness and prior record), and context-based measures (e.g., racial composition and crime rate) (Britt, 2000; Spohn and Holleran, 2002; Steffensmeier, Ulmer, and Kramer, 1998; Ulmer and Johnson, 2004). Not only are racial and ethnic minorities more likely to be incarcerated than White offenders; they are also more likely to receive longer sentences of imprisonment. Although such studies have provided greater insight into the sentencing and imprisonment of racial and ethnic minorities, few have addressed how failure during community supervision is related to the imprisonment and recidivism of offenders.

Table 1: Sample Demographics

	Non Drug Offenders N=69,117	Drug Offenders N=20,075
Gender		
Male	90.8%	83.7%
Female	9.2%	16.3%
Age of incarceration	30.30	31.32
Race		
White	49.9%	43.4%
African-American	11.1%	14.9%
Hispanic	30.9%	38.2%
Native American	6.8%	2.4%
Citizenship		
U.S. Citizen	88.1%	80.7%
Non Citizen	11.9%	19.3%
Arrest History (Excluding most recent arrest)		
Prior Arrests	4.95	5.33
Number of Prior Charges	10.63	11.39
Number of Prior Drug Charges	.72	2.56
Most Proximate Arrest		
Number of Charges	2.83	2.81
Drug Charge	15%	82%
Community Supervision Revocation	59.9%	53.0%
Current Conviction		
Number of Charges	1.45	1.42
Time Served (in months)	18.30	18.80

*Groups are significantly different on everything except number of charges in most recent arrest.

Recidivism of Prisoners

Recidivism rates among former prisoners are particularly useful in gauging the impact of incarceration as well as the capacity of institutional corrections to address the risk and needs of prisoners. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2002), two-thirds of prisoners released in 1994 were re-arrested during a three-year follow-up period. Specifically, property offenders exhibited the highest rates of recidivisms (74%), followed by drug offenders (67%) and violent offenders (62%). Less than five percent of rapists were arrested for another rape during the follow-up period. A review of the type of offenses committed by prisoners who are re-arrested show that 32% were property offenses, 30% drug offenses, 22% violent offenses, and 28% public order offenses.

The incarceration of drug offenders, in particular, low-level drug offenders has been the focus of studies attempting to provide a better understanding of the criminal justice system involvement of imprisoned drug offenders. Extensive criminal histories and prior drug crimes represent important characteristics of these offenders. Statistics from the Bureau of Justice Statistics (1999) indicate that more than half of drug offenders in state prisons (54%) were on probation or parole at the time of their arrest and over third-fourth (83%) had a prior sentence to incarceration or probation. Further, nearly a third of prisoners reported that all of their prior sentences had been for drug-related crimes (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1999).

In order to gain a more comprehensive perspective on the recidivism of offenders, studies have examined the influence of socio-demographic indicators, prior criminal record, and offense characteristics on the probability or the timing of recidivism (Hepburn and Albonetti, 1994; Kruttschnitt, Uggen, and Shelton, 2000; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002; Petersilia, Turner, Kahan, and, 1985; Rhodes, 1986; Smith and Akers, 1993; Visher and Linster, 1990; Visher, Lattimore, and Linster, 1991). In general, studies have found males, younger offenders, racial and ethnic minorities, being employment

status, marital status, and possessing more serious prior records are related to higher rates of recidivism. A history of drug use and community supervision requirements directly related to drug use (e.g., drug testing, mandatory drug or alcohol treatment) are also associated with higher rates of recidivism (Gray, Fields, and Maxwell, 2001; Petersilia et al., 1985; Sims and Jones, 1997; Whitehead, 1991).

When comparing rates of recidivism among prisoners and probationers, prior research has found higher rates of recidivism among offenders released from prison (Petersilia, Turner, and Peterson, 1986). Petersilia and colleagues found that during a two-year follow-up period of released prisoners and a comparison group of probationers, imprisonment had a significant positive effect on recidivism for property offenders. Further, length of time the offender was imprisoned had a small, yet significant, negative effect on recidivism for drug offenders. Spohn and Holleran (2002) compared recidivism rates among prisoners and probationers for three distinct groups: drug offenders, drug-involved offenders, and non-drug offenders. The authors found that offenders who were incarcerated had significantly higher rates of recidivism than those who were on probation. Also, imprisonment led to higher rates of recidivism among drug offenders than drug-involved offenders or non-drug offenders. Results from these studies reveal how incarcerated offenders fare in terms of recidivism relative to offenders on community supervision. Two important elements often not accounted for in prior studies is the failure of community supervision of incarcerated prisoners and recidivism based on community supervision failure (i.e., parole) versus the commission of a new crime.

Table 2: Recidivism Rates by Offender Type

	Re- Incarceration	Months Until Re- incarceration	Community Supervision Revocation	Convicted & Sentenced for New Crime
Drug Offenders	43.1%	29.34	28.2%	14.9%
Violent Drug Offenders	54.7%	39.63	34.3%	20.5%
Violent Offenders	46.9%	28.23	28.9%	18.0%
Property Offenders	55.2%	35.00	28.2%	20.0%
Sex Offenders	31.9%	28.59	17.9%	14.0%

The important role of Community Supervision in the study of Re-incarceration

Studies of community supervision have centered on either the probation or parole population. While this independent focus makes sense given the challenges associated with tracking offenders from one correctional system to another, the intersection between probation and institutional corrections cannot be ignored. The identification of prisoners who are imprisoned due to probation revocation is difficult to ascertain as probation failure may have been attributed to technical violations, the commission of a new crime, or both. The manner in which correctional systems classify such failures varies across jurisdictions thus making their identification and tracking difficult. Estimates of the parole violation population in prison are more readily available. According to Petersilia (2003), approximately 40% or more of those committed to prison each year have had their parole revoked. The extent to which community supervision failure, either due to probation or parole revocation affects levels of re-incarceration is relatively unknown. However, some insight on the relationship between community supervision and re-incarceration has been recently provided.

A study on the levels of recidivism of adult prisoners in Oklahoma examined how the release status of prisoners (released to probation versus being discharged) affected their rates of recidivism (Spivak and Damphousse, 2006). Researchers found that prisoners released to probation were significantly associated with a greater hazard of recidivism. According to Spivak and Damphousse (2006), probationers who are younger, have fewer past incarcerations, and served shorter times in confinement, had a higher risk for criminal offending. This increased risk for offending would certainly affect their success post-release. Given the challenges prisoners face once released, the type of continuum of services and treatment they receive from the criminal justice system becomes an important dimension of their success in the community.

Currently, every state has implemented some form of prisoner reentry program in order to assist former prisoners in their reintegration to the community (Petersilia, 2003). The basis for such programs has been on addressing their needs and identifying the risks and challenges they face upon release (Visher and Travis, 2003). Sampson and Laub (1993) argue that imprisonment weakens an offender's social bonds and reduces individuals' opportunities to participate in conventional society. This may include difficulty in finding stable employment, securing housing and reunification efforts with loved one (Petersilia et al., 1986). Illegal drug use and ineffective substance abuse treatment have been identified as distinguishing characteristics among former prisoners (Petersilia, 2001). As a result, proper healthcare, treatment, and job training are critical components of reentry programs (Petersilia 2003; Rubinstein and Mukamal, 2002; Travis and Lawrence 2002; Travis, Solomon, and Waul, 2001; Visher and Travis 2003). In the end, it is likely that former prisoners' likelihood of succeeding in the community is heavily influenced by their community supervision status as well as the capacity of reentry programs to address their high-risk tendencies.

Current Study

The current study seeks to build upon the existing body of research on drug offenders, community supervision, and recidivism. We rely on data from the Arizona Department of Corrections and the Arizona Department of Public Safety to examine three research questions. First, we conduct a comprehensive review of incarcerated drug offenders in the state to identify how drug offenders vary from non-drug offenders. Second, we examine the rates of recidivism rates for both community supervision revocation and commission and conviction for a new crime for the different types of offenders. Third, we conduct several analyses to examine how prior community supervision failure influences recidivism rates, net the effect of legal and extralegal factors. The contribution by this work centers not only on controlling for community supervision failure but also in distinguishing the specific type of failure (i.e., community supervision or commission of a new crime).

Methodology

Data

Data for this study come from two sources: Arizona Department of Corrections (ADC) and the Arizona Department of Public Safety (AZDPS). ADC provided an electronic database with each prison system entry in the state of Arizona from 1985 through 2007. Demographic data, such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, and citizenship status, as well as the criminal statute violation for which the sentence was imposed were included in the database. AZDPS provided a database that contained criminal history information for the prisoners in the ADC database containing data on the date and description of the criminal violation for each charge for each arrest of prisoners. Individuals in the two databases were matched using their Arizona State Identification Number (AZID). A total of 156,962 unique individuals were matched across the two databases. The sample was limited to include only those who were released with at least 5 years of follow-up data available (through December 2004) which decreased our

sample to 89,192 unique offenders who entered prison at least one time during our sampling time frame.

Measuring Recidivism

Recidivism in many of the previous studies focused on re-arrest, which may or may not lead to re-incarceration. We decided to focus on re-incarceration, as prison overcrowding is an increasingly salient problem in today's society.¹ Recidivism in this study was measured and examined in four ways: (1) re-incarceration, which is any return to prison; (2) the time until re-incarceration (in months); (3) community supervision revocation, which is a return to prison due to failure in community supervision; and (4) convicted and sentenced for the commission of a new crime, which is the return to prison due to conviction for a new crime.

In order to compare the recidivism of drug offenders to other types of offenders, the sample was divided into six offender types: (1) Drug Offenders, those who were convicted of only drug offenses, (2) Violent Drug Offenders, those who were convicted of both a drug offense and either a violent or sexual offense, (3) Property Offenders, those who were convicted of property offenses, (4) Violent Offenders, those who were convicted of violent offenses, and (5) Sex Offenders, those who were convicted of a sexual offense. Other offenders who were not captured in this typology were mostly convicted of Driving Under the Influence (DUI). See Appendix A for a review of the coding scheme for all variables in the analyses.

Analytical Strategy

A series of four regression models were run to estimate the difference in recidivism dependent variables by offender type after controlling for other demographic and criminal history factors, such as

¹It is important to note that data discrepancies prohibited the utilization of re-arrest as a measure of recidivism.

gender, age, race/ethnicity, conviction type, arrest history, and most proximate arrest. These models were estimated to parse out the differences between offender types that were not due to differences in demographics or criminal histories.²

Findings

Of the 89,192 individuals, 58% (N= 52,049) of these offenders were committed to the ADC after failing their community supervision. Also, 22 percent of offenders (N=20,075) were convicted of at least one drug offense (subjects were convicted of between 1 and 12 offenses that were classified as either violent, property, drug, sex, or other). Drug and non-drug offenders were compared across an assortment of demographic and criminal history variables (see Table 1). In general, the drug offenders were more likely to be women (16.3% versus 9.2%), non citizens (19.3% versus 11.9%), and African-American or Hispanic (14.9% versus 11.1% and 38.2% versus 30.9%, respectively). They also had more lengthy arrest histories, both over their entire lives and in the arrest most proximate to their incarceration.³ They had more arrests (5.33 verses 4.95), more prior charges (11.39 verses 10.63), and more prior drug charges (2.56 verses .72). In fact, drug offenders were significantly different on each measured factor with the exception of the number of charges in their most proximate arrest to the incarceration.

The raw recidivism rates for prisoners are compared in Table 2. Property and Violent Drug Offenders were the most likely to return to prison (55.2% and 54.7%, respectively) and Sex Offenders

² Interestingly, none of our prediction models were very accurate and could not account for more than 10 percent of the variation.

³ We were unable to match the arrest that led to the incarceration with complete certainty, and so we opted to look at the one directly before the date of incarceration. Their most proximate arrest is not necessarily the arrest that led to their conviction; it is simply the last arrest before their incarceration.

were the least likely (31.9%), followed by Drug Offenders (43.1%). In general, drug offenders returned to prison after 2½ years, faster than Violent Drug Offenders or Property Offenders (3.33 and 3 years, respectively). Sex offenders were the group least likely to fail community supervision (17.9%) or be convicted of a new crime and sentenced to prison (14.0%). Drug Offenders failed community supervision at about the same rate as Violent Offenders and Property Offenders (28.2%, 28.9%, and 28.2%, respectively); however, they are less likely to be convicted and sentenced for the commission of a new crime (14.9%, 18.0%, and 20.0%, respectively). Those offenders who were convicted of both drug and violent crimes or sex crimes were the most likely to fail community supervision and be convicted and sentenced to prison for the commission of a new crime (34.3% and 20.5%).

Predicting Re-incarceration

Multivariate analyses predicting re-incarceration are presented in Table 3. Consistent with previous research, gender, age, race/ethnicity, and criminal history variables were related to recidivism. Male offenders were much more likely to be re-incarcerated and convicted and sentenced to prison for the commission of a new crime during the first five years out of prison than females, although they failed community supervision at the same rate. Younger offenders were more likely to be re-incarcerated, both due to failing community supervision and for the conviction of a new crime. Black and Native American offenders were more likely to be re-incarcerated than White offenders. Hispanic offenders were the least likely to be re-incarcerated.⁴ The racial and ethnic differences held for each type of re-incarceration (both failure on community supervision and conviction for a new crime), with

⁴ Citizenship status was not included in the model due to being highly correlated with ethnicity

the exception of Hispanic offenders being more likely to be convicted and sentenced to prison for the commission of a new crime than White offenders.

Not surprisingly, more serious criminal histories were related to higher rates of recidivism; the more prior arrests and prior charges, the higher the likelihood of re-incarceration and community supervision failure. Interestingly, the presence of a drug charge in their arrest records, either in their entire prior criminal histories or their most proximate arrest, the less likely the chances an offender would be re-incarcerated. Additionally, offenders were more likely to be re-incarcerated for each additional charge for which they were found guilty.

After controlling for the group differences in other risk factors for recidivism, Drug Offenders were more likely to be re-incarcerated in the five years after release than Violent Offenders or Sex Offenders. They were more likely to fail community supervision than either the Violent or Sex Offenders, but were less likely to fail community supervision than Property Offenders. Drug Offenders were less likely to be convicted and sentenced for the commission of a new crime than Property or Violent Drug Offenders. In terms of time to failure, Drug Offenders remained out in the community longer than the Violent Drug, Property, and Violent Offenders. Additional analyses revealed that most of offenders who were sent back to prison for the commission of a new crime, committed the same type of crime for which they were originally sent to prison (47.2% drug offenders, 41% property offenders, 55% violent drug offenders, 34% violent offenders, and 37% sex offenders). Drug offenders were also reconvicted for DUI (35%) and rarely violent crimes (12%).

Perhaps the most noteworthy finding was in the effect of community supervision. Specifically, offenders in prison due to a community supervision revocation were more likely to end up re-incarcerated after the completion of their prison term. This group was much more likely to fail

community supervision (as they had at least one time before), but less likely to be convicted of and sentenced to prison for the commission of a new crime. They also ended up back in prison sooner than those who had not previously failed community supervision. Failing community supervision in the past was the strongest predictor of re-incarceration after race/ethnicity.

Table 3: Regression Models

	Re- Incarceration	Months Until Re- Incarceration	Community Supervision Revocation	Convicted & Sentenced for New Crime
	Exp(b)	Exp(b)	Exp(b)	Exp(b)
Male	1.26*	0.99	0.98	1.60*
Age	0.96*	1.00*	0.97*	0.97*
Race/Ethnicity (White is reference)				
Black	1.60*	1.10*	1.47*	1.19*
Hispanic	0.92*	0.96*	0.84*	1.14*
Native American	1.18*	0.94*	1.10*	1.14*
Type of Offender (Drug is reference)				
Violent Drug	1.04	1.08*	0.99	1.08*
Property	1.10*	1.09*	1.05*	1.06*
Violent	0.92*	1.08*	0.90*	1.01
Sex	0.77*	0.91*	0.64*	1.05
Conviction				
Community Supervision Revocation	1.41*	1.08*	1.55*	.97*
Number of charges	1.04*	1.01	0.99	1.08*
Time served	1.00*	1.00*	1.00*	1.00*
Arrest History				
Prior arrests	1.02*	1.01	1.03*	0.98*
Prior charges	1.01*	1.01*	1.00	1.00*
Number of drug charges	0.94*	1.01	0.97*	0.97*
Most Recent Arrest				
Number of charges	1.00*	1.00	0.99*	0.99
Number of drug charges	0.87*	1.01	0.89*	0.88*
Model Fit Statistics				
Chi-Square (df=20)	9387.58*	1103.33*	4721.84*	2523.49*
-2 Log Likelihood	113728.77	808322.04	103731.63	79185.09
Cox & Snell R Square	.10	na	.052	.028
Nagelkerke R Square	.13	na	.073	.047

Table Note: All analyses also control for prior arrest severity in both their entire arrest histories and their most recent arrest.

Discussion

The current study set out to examine rates of re-incarceration for drug offenders relative to violent, property, and sex offenders. We also placed an empirical focus on the status of community supervision failure and how it affects re-incarceration using four distinct measures: 1) re-incarceration, time until re-incarceration (in months), community supervision revocation, and convicted and sentenced for the commission of a new crime. Analysis comparing drug offender to non-drug offenders show that drug offenders were significantly different on each measured factor that was found to be associated with higher recidivism rates with the exception of the number of charges in their most proximate arrest to the incarceration. While the raw recidivism rates in this study are much lower than the recidivism rates reported in previous studies (e.g., Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002), this is most likely attributed to the recidivism measure we analyzed (i.e., re-incarceration and not re-arrest).

Consistent with previous studies, we found that both legal (i.e., drug offense, prior record) and extralegal (e.g., gender, age, race/ethnicity) variables impact re-incarceration. Multivariate findings also reveal that drug offenders were re-incarcerated at a higher rate than violent and sex offenders, but at a lower rate than property offenders. Drug offenders failed community supervision more than any other offender type except property offenders. Also, drug offenders were less likely to be convicted of new crimes and committed to prison than property or violent drug offenders. Drug offenders who did re-offend were usually re-incarcerated for drug charges, followed by DUI. An important element of this study was the ability to control for prior community supervision failure. Analyses show that prisoners who failed community supervision were more likely to fail community supervision again and return to prison.

Although the current study provided useful insight on the re-incarceration of prisoners, several limitations of the study warrant attention. First, the study used administrative data from several different criminal justice agencies in Arizona which are not collected and intended for research purposes. For instance, researchers were unable to match the arrest (or arrests) that led to the conviction that placed the offender in our sample. Additionally, we were unable to explore the conditions to which each offender returned such as the socioeconomic and housing status of offenders upon release. These factors are particularly important as they have a significant influence on offenders' abilities to successfully reintegrate into society. Additionally, this study only used data from a group of offenders from Arizona, which went through at least one major drug offender policy change during the study period. Although the data were analyzed using different time periods to test for a history effect and found no differences, it is still possible that there was a history effect not captured by the analyses.

The findings from this study have several implications for policy. Drug offenders continue to struggle in their reintegration process post prison release. Drug offenders' struggles with community supervision, which leads to their re-incarceration are likely related to substance abuse problems. This would be consistent with a prior study on the Arizona prison population which found an increasing number of prisoners have probation revoked for drug-treatment provisions (Rodriguez and Webb, 2007). Given our findings, drug treatment services in the community must coincide with appropriate levels of supervision for offenders. The capacity of community supervision and reentry programs to address substance abuse among former prisoners will have a direct impact on parole violations and the number of drug offenders re-entering prison with substance abuse problems. If such services are not made available in the community, resources must be provided within prisons to address drug offenders' risks and needs. Since Arizona has a mandatory drug treatment law, efforts must be made to ensure

that drug offenders have been provided adequate treatment before offenders become part of the revolving prison door phenomena.

As a predictor of re-incarceration, community supervision plays an important role in both failing community supervision and the conviction of a new crime. Since prisoners who failed community supervision were more likely to be re-incarcerated due to community supervision failure, efforts must be in place to identify why former prisoners have such a difficult time reintegrating into society. Although ADC has a pilot reentry program in place, it is integral that community supervision services work on offenders' release plans that improve their chances of finding employment, securing housing, and completing treatment. Such efforts need to be in place upon release since offenders with a history of community supervision failure are likely to end up back in prison sooner than those who had not previously failed community supervision. In the end, the extent to which reentry programs and parole services are able to provide the services and proper monitoring of prison releases will have an important impact on levels of re-incarceration.

References

- Britt, C. (2000). Social context and racial disparities in punishment decisions. *Justice Quarterly* 17 (4):707-732.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2007). Prisoners in 2006. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2004). Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2000). Prisoners in 1999. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (1999). Substance Abuse and Treatment, State and Federal Prisoners, 1997. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Crawford, C. (2000). Gender, race, and habitual offender sentencing in Florida. *Criminology* 38:263-280.
- Farabee, D., Yih-Ing Hser, M. D. Anglin, and Huang, D (2004). Recidivism Among an Early Cohort of California's Proposition 36 Offenders. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 3, 563-583.
- Gray, M. K., Fields, M, and Maxwell, S. (2001). Examining Probation Violations: Who, What, and When. *Crime and Delinquency*, 47, 537-557.
- Hepburn, J. R. and Albonetti, C. (1994). Recidivism Among Drug Offenders: A Survival Analysis of the Effects of Offender Characteristics, Type of Offense, and Two Types of Intervention. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 10, 159-179.
- Kramer, J. H. and Steffensmeier, D. (1993). Race and imprisonment decisions. *Sociological Quarterly* 34:357-376.
- Kramer, J.. H. and Ulmer, J. (1996) Sentencing disparity and departures from guidelines. *Justice Quarterly* 13:81-106.
- Kruttschnitt, C., C. Uggen, and K. Shelton. 2000. Predictors of desistance among sex offenders: The interaction of formal and informal social controls. *Justice Quarterly* 17: 61-88.
- Longshore, S, Uranda, D., Evans, E., Hser, Y., Prendergast, M., Hawkins, A., Bunch, T., and Ettner, S. (2004). Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act 2003 Report. Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs. California Health and Human Services Agency.
- Petersilia, J. (2003) *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Petersilia, J. (2001) Prisoner Reentry: Public Safety and Reintegration Issues. *Prison Journal*, 81: 360-375.

- Petersilia, J., S. Turner, J. Kahan, and J. Peterson. 1985. *Granting Felons Probation: Public Risks and Alternatives*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Petersilia, J., S. Turner, and J. Peterson. 1986. *Prison Versus Probation in California: Implications for Crime and Offender Recidivism*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Rhodes, W. 1986. A survival model with dependent competing events and right-hand censoring: Probation and parole as an illustration. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 2: 113-137.
- Rodriguez, N. and Webb, V. (2007). Probation violations, revocations, and imprisonment: The decisions of probation officers, prosecutors, and judges pre and post mandatory drug treatment. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 18(1), 3-30.
- Rubinstein, G. and D. Mukamal. (2002) Welfare and Housing: Denial of Benefits to Drug Offenders. In Mauer, M. and Chesney-Lind, M. (Eds.) (2002) *Invisible Punishment: The Collateral Consequences of Mass Imprisonment*. New York: The New Press.
- Sampson, R. J., and J. H. Laub. 1993. *Crime in the Making*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sentencing Project. 1998 Drug Policy and the Criminal Justice System. Washington D.C.: The Sentencing Project.
- Sims, B. and Jones, M. (1997). Predicting Success or Failure on Probation: Factors Associated with Felony Probation Outcomes. *Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 314-327.
- Smith, L. G., and R. L. Akers. (1993). A comparison of recidivism of Florida's Community Control and prison: A five-year survival analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30: 267-292.
- Spivak, A. L. and Damphousse, K. (2006). Who Returns to Prison? A Survival Analysis of Recidivism Among Adult Offenders Released in Oklahoma, 1985-2004. *Justice Research and Policy*, 8, 57-88.
- Spohn, C. (2002) *How Do Judges Decide? The Search for Fairness and Justice in Punishment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Spohn, C. and Cederblom, J. (1991). Race and disparities in sentencing: A test of the liberation hypothesis. *Justice Quarterly* 8:305-327.
- Spohn, C. and Holleran, D. (2002). The effect of imprisonment on recidivism rates of felony offenders: A focus on drug offenders. *Criminology* 40 (2):329-358.
- Steffensmeier, D., J. Ulmer, and J. Kramer. 1998. The interaction of race, gender, and age in criminal sentencing: The punishment cost of being young, black, and male. *Criminology* 36: 763-797.
- Tonry, M. H. (1996). *Sentencing Matters: Studies in Crime and Public Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Travis, J. and S. Lawrence. (2002) *Beyond the Prison Gates: The State of Parole in America*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Travis, J., A. Solomon, and M. Waul. (2001) *From Prison to Home: The Dimensions and Consequences of Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Ulmer, Jeffery T. and Brian Johnson. (2004). Sentencing in context. *Criminology* 42:137-177.
- Visher, C.A., P. K. Lattimore, and R. L. Linster. (1991). Predicting the recidivism of serious youthful offenders using survival models. *Criminology* 29: 329-366.
- Visher, C. A., and R. L. Linster. (1990). A survival model of pretrial failure. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 6: 153-184.
- Visher, C. and J. Travis. (2003) Transitions From Prison to Community: Understanding Individual Pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29: 89-113.
- Whitehead, J. T.(1991). The Effectiveness of Felony Probation: Results from an Eastern State. *Justice Quarterly*, 8, 525-543
- Zatz, M. S. (1984). Race, ethnicity, and determinate sentencing: A new dimension to an old controversy. *Criminology* 22:147-171.

Appendix A. Data Dictionary and Coding Scheme

Socio-demographic Characteristics

Sex	Males (coded as 1); Females (coded as 0)
Race/ethnicity	White; Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans (dummy coded categories with Whites as reference category)
Age	Age at confinement
Citizenship	US Citizens (coded as 1); Non US Citizens (coded as 0)

Type of Offender

Drug	Convicted of any type of drug offense
Violent Drug	Convicted of drug and violent or sex offense
Property	Convicted of theft, property crime, burglary
Violent	Convicted of homicide, assault, kidnapping
Sex	Convicted of rape, sexual assault, molestation

Offenders were separated into categories:

Conviction

Community Supervision Revocation	Entered prison after failing community supervision (1 = yes; 0 = no)
Number of charges	Number of convictions on current sentence
Time served	Months incarcerated

Information based on current incarceration:

Arrest History

Prior arrests	Total number of arrests before prison entry
Prior charges	Total number of charges across all arrests
Number of drug charges	Total number of prior drug charges across all arrests

All arrests prior to prison entry, excluding the most proximate

Most Recent Arrest

Number of charges	Total number of charges
Most serious charge	Most serious charge, ranging from 0-75
Number of drug charges	Number of drug charges

Prior arrest most proximate to prison entry

